

Col. Samuel Rufus Gay, Jr., SSN [xxx-xx-xx] Infantry.
 Col. Trelawney Eston Marchant, Jr., SSN [xxx-xx-xx] Infantry.
 Col. James Andrew Mickie, Jr., SSN [xxx-xx-xx] Quartermaster Corps.
 Col. Eugene Francis Parsons, SSN [xxx-xx-xx] Field Artillery.
 Col. Kermit Aubrey Patchen, SSN [xxx-xx-xx] Corps of Engineers.
 Col. Harold Newton Read, [xxx-xx-xx], Military Police Corps.
 Col. Otto Ervin Scherz, SSN [xxx-xx-xx], Field Artillery.
 Col. Paul Carlton Short, SSN [xxx-xx-xx], Infantry.
 Col. Amos Martin Stonecipher, SSN [xxx-xx-xx] Infantry.
 Col. Herman Tenkin, SSN [xxx-xx-xx], Armor.
 Col. Holden Claude West, SSN [xxx-xx-xx], Armor.
 Brig. Gen. Robert Eugene Wilson, SSN [xxx-xx-xx] Adjutant General's Corps.
 Col. Arvin Reuben Ziehlsdorff, SSN [xxx-xx-xx], Armor.
 The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve Commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Charles Watts Fernald, SSN [xxx-xx-xx].
 Brig. Gen. Harry Jack Mier, Jr., SSN [xxx-xx-xx].

To be brigadier general

Col. Alfred Frederick Ahner, SSN [xxx-xx-xx] Infantry.
 Col. Albert Frank Fisher, SSN [xxx-xx-xx], Field Artillery.
 Col. Robert Samuel Ford, SSN [xxx-xx-xx], Armor.
 Col. John James Womack, SSN [xxx-xx-xx], Armor.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Robin L. C. Quigley, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of captain in the Navy while serving as commanding officer, Service School Command, San Diego, Calif., in accordance with article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution.

Rear Adm. Donald L. Custis, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery with the grade of vice admiral for a term of 4 years in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5137(a).

The following named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

James Grealish	Richard G. Altman
Phillip C. Koelsch	John R. Rohleder
Robert N. Pitner	Robert M. Garrick
Frank B. Guest, Jr.	

MEDICAL CORPS

William J. Mills

SUPPLY CORPS

Lee E. Landes

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Philip V. King
 JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS
 Hugh H. Howell, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Louis Metzger, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in accordance with the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5233 effective from the date of his retirement.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning Earl C. Acuff, to be colonel, and ending Ronald A. Jenkie, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 29, 1973; and

Army nominations beginning Rene J. Berard, to be colonel, and ending James K. Prough, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 8, 1973.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations beginning Lewis H. Abrams, to be colonel, and ending Billy W. Woodard, to be chief warrant officer (W-2) which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 23, 1973; and

Marine Corps nominations beginning David L. Adams, to be second lieutenant, and ending Billy Q. Yoder, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 23, 1973.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 28, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Be of good courage and He shall strengthen your heart, all ye that hope in the Lord.—Psalms 31: 24.

O God, open our minds that we may see ourselves as we really are and remove from within us any desire to hide our transgressions; that realizing our faults and acknowledging our sins we may be led by Thy Spirit to overcome them, to amend our ways, to be strengthened in goodness, and to walk with Thee in newness of life.

Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts as a nation and remove from our people the spirit of discord, injustice, and ill will. In our relationships with each other help us to be kind in our judgments, understanding in our attitudes, and friendly in spirit lest in bitterness and hatred we destroy ourselves.

Lead us, we pray Thee, in the paths of peace, unity, and good will for Thy name's sake. 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.

NATIONAL NUTRITION WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for

the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 196) authorizing the President to designate the period from March 4, 1973, through March 10, 1973, as "National Nutrition Week."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from California please explain the proposal?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Yes, I would be glad to explain it.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 196, as introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), authorizes the President to designate the period from March 4, 1973, through March 10, 1973, as "National Nutrition Week."

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 196

Whereas good nutrition is of vital importance to the health and well-being of this Nation's citizens; and

Whereas many Americans are not yet aware of the importance of good nutrition; and

Whereas most Americans are not entirely familiar with the necessary composition of a nutritious diet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and 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 period from March 4, 1973, through March 10, 1973, as "National Nutrition Week", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On page 1, strike out the entire preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and 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.

HOW MANY TIMES MUST WE BUY BACK WHAT IS OURS?

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Communist perfidy is again demonstrated in the failure of Hanoi to continue the release of U.S. POW's on schedule. The ink is hardly dry on the cease-fire agreement and already the Communists have welched on the one item that is most important to the United States. They have also violated the cease-fire by transportation of surface-to-air missiles into South Vietnam and in many other particulars.

It is a very trying situation for the United States. The President is right in proceeding firmly in the face of this new attempt at blackmail. I am confident he can depend upon the backing of our Nation if very positive steps are required. The Communists simply are increasing the price for release of POW's and if they get what they want, they will demand more and more in the future.

It should be very obvious the Communists have no regard for agreements or for their own commitments. These are the people to whom we are asked to pay reparations for aggression and for the war crimes they committed.

RELEASE OF AMERICAN POW'S

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) just said, but I would like to go one step further.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, the name of the game in Southeast Asia at this time is to obtain release of all the American prisoners of war and receive a full and factual accounting of those servicemen listed as missing in action.

I feel sure everyone realizes that the implementing of the peace agreement is at a very critical and sensitive stage. Therefore, it would seem to me that the best course of action for Members of Congress would be to limit public debate on the terms of the peace agreement until the other 400 Americans are home and we have learned more about the missing in action in Laos and other Southeast Asia countries.

WELCOME TO DON RIEGLE

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I join every member of my own political party in welcoming the distinguished and talented gentleman from Michigan, DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., to membership in the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives. We are delighted and proud that he has seen in our party promises of progress toward a better way of life for all Americans. We are pleased that to our ranks have been added the great skills and the wise and humane views of this fine Congressman.

FEDERAL DISASTER INSURANCE CORPORATION

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to create a Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation, to provide insurance to the people of our land against loss and damage from natural disasters, which insurance would be provided at a reasonable rate.

Our history shows that every year we have from 40 to 50 natural disasters, with hundreds of millions of dollars in property loss. There is no insurance available, at reasonable rates, for covering these losses.

What happens? We come to the floor of the House and appropriate vast sums of money out of the public general funds to make up these grievous losses. The Government, through the general fund, tax money, becomes the insurer. The reasonable way to meet this situation is to provide insurance and to provide it at a nominal rate to all persons concerned.

My bill will do that. It is being introduced today, and I want to invite others to join with me starting tomorrow.

EMERGENCY REPORTING TELEPHONE NUMBER

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, since 1967 I have been advocating the adoption of a single, uniform, nationwide telephone number for reporting emergencies. That number has been 911. Over 250 cities of the Nation are now using 911, and it is working very well.

Over the next few days I shall put in the RECORD some of the stories which have come from the use of 911, success stories, if you will, which will demonstrate the need for the adoption of this concept nationwide.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 345, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 345) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 27, 1973.)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the gentlemen from Texas does propose to take a little time to explain the actions of the conferees; does he not?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, the rules provide that each side will have 30 minutes, and we propose to discuss the continuing resolution.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents substantially the further continuing resolution which we passed a week ago today. The resolution, as we will remember, covers the \$30 billion Labor-HEW appropriation bill, and about \$3.6 billion for foreign aid activities.

The continuing resolution as passed by the House provided that we would extend these unfunded programs from February 28 throughout the balance of the fiscal year, until June 30, 1973.

When the resolution went to the other body the other body provided that with respect to foreign aid the termination date for the continuing resolution would be April 30.

The House conferees took the position that the House will be in recess for the Easter holiday over a period of about 11 days preliminary to that date, and it did not seem practical to the House that the resolution should be abbreviated. In view of the uncertainties surrounding the availability of authorizing legislation, we took the position that the resolution as passed by the House providing funding through June 30 should be approved.

The other body in the conference concurred in the position of the House and receded from its position.

The Senate amended the continuing resolution to make provision for funding the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. The Commission ran out of authority on February 15, and this will validate the actions of the Commission and continue this program from February 16 through June 30. I will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment.

Further, there was a technical issue involving customs preclearance in certain Canadian cities and in Bermuda and Nassau where people who are coming into the United States may receive customs preclearance, and thereby save time when they land in this country. Current law provided that funds for preclearance activities would not be available after May 15 and the Senate placed in the bill language repealing the cutoff date. There is language in the joint statement of the committee of conference that customs preclearance activities should be continued at the present level until the matter can be further considered and long-range policy determined. A motion will

be offered to concur in the Senate amendment.

Additionally, the other body added a provision which requires the President to periodically present to the Congress a statement as to funds which are being impounded. The debt ceiling bill passed last October already provides for "prompt" reporting to the Congress as to the impounding of funds. There was no serious objection on the part of the House or, as I understand, on the part of the Office of Management and Budget with respect to this reporting. A motion will be offered to agree to this section.

So, that is briefly the story with respect to this further continuing resolution.

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

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

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

Would the gentleman from Texas give us an estimate, since it has been so long ago that we dealt with the details of the bills of the amounts involved, both for foreign assistance, HEW, as well as the other provisions?

Mr. MAHON. I will be happy to.

The Labor-HEW portion of the measure makes available \$29.8 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say billion?

Mr. MAHON. \$29.8 billion, yes.

The foreign aid portion of the continuing resolution provides for an annual rate of \$3.6 billion—a total annual rate of \$33.4 billion.

I should say that this annual rate is not necessarily being accomplished at this time. The spending is at a lower level for some of the programs in these agencies. On the other hand, supplemental appropriations will be required for certain programs.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But we are here dealing with totals that amount to somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30 to \$35 billion for this fiscal year; is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And 8 months have already elapsed in this fiscal year; is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I would not ask the gentleman to reply to this question, but it seems to me, as I have tried to say before, that this is a sad commentary upon the legislative process that two major appropriation bills have not been cleared by Congress within 4 months, or approximately 4 months, of the end of the fiscal year to which those appropriation bills pertain. It seems to me that there is scarcely a sadder commentary on the operation of the 92d Congress, or any other Congress for that matter, than this.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is aware that on the Labor-HEW appropriation matter we passed two bills, each of which was vetoed. The first bill passed both the House and the Senate last year before the beginning of this fiscal year, but was vetoed. The second bill was pocket vetoed after the adjournment of Congress and there was no practical way to override the veto. Now, with the February 28 termination date upon us and considering

all the prevailing circumstances, we did not feel it was appropriate or responsible to bring forward at this time an additional appropriation bill, the future of which would be most uncertain. So we are reluctantly using the technique, as the gentleman knows, of the continuing resolution, having done the best we could to get action.

I agree myself that the Labor-HEW bill was too large. I voted myself to sustain the President's veto. But we now find ourselves in the position which I just outlined.

With respect to foreign aid, we passed an appropriation bill, and the other body passed an appropriation bill, but we could not go to conference because the other body declared through its leaders that it would not agree to an appropriation unless there were an authorization measure enacted into law. This proved to be impossible after long months of controversy and discussion between the two Houses.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. GROSS. I want to say again that I do not lay this responsibility at the door of the Committee on Appropriations. I lay the responsibility for this failure upon the leadership of both bodies of Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the conference report before us, I should hope that the House would concur in the actions taken by the conferees on items which were before us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I will be very brief. I just want to join my chairman in the remarks that he made regarding the continuing resolution and the necessity for action.

I think everyone is aware that this is the 28th of February. The continuing resolution expires today, so it is imperative that we take this action. There is no other way out, so I would urge that we go along with this.

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose House Joint Resolution 345, which includes funding for the Foreign Assistance program at an increased level over the previous fiscal year.

Our foreign assistance program in my personal opinion has become "world welfare." Every nation, friend or foe, wants to sign up for it. There is a lot of support for cutting off the welfare chiselers here at home—I believe we need to cut them off abroad as well.

Instead of continually doling out money around the world, we have to rethink our entire basis of foreign assistance. Let's stop using the out-dated generalities of the forties and start setting up logical priorities for the seventies.

Why should we continue to bail out countries that are helping to bring about the economic crisis at home we now face? How foolish we must look, and indeed are, to continue a never ending giveaway abroad while we tell our own taxpayers that we must cut back on domestic programs.

It is this mindless allegiance to venerable but logically bankrupt concepts that creates smug assurances in the

minds of those who propose billions of dollars in aid to North Vietnam.

The time to say enough is now. The time to say not one more dollar until we reexamine the logical basis for foreign assistance is now. The time to stand up for our fellow taxpayers who wonder why they have so little to live on is now. The time to depart from the mistakes of the past is now.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider their decision to compound the errors that have historically characterized our foreign aid program. Let us end the free ride, at America's expense, for many nations of the world. Let us let all those who would continue this program, and most specifically those who would pour billions into North Vietnam, know that we will not continue to put the American taxpayer last.

Mr. Speaker, there are several programs that will be funded as a consequence of our action here today that have much merit. Most of the programs funded through the National Institutes of Health fall in this category. The programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are other examples. But frankly, I resent being put in a position of having to vote against these worthwhile programs in order to oppose continued foreign assistance. This is not the way we should be setting our national priorities. In fact, commingling unrelated programs as we have done in House Joint Resolution 345 defies the setting of national priorities, and in my personal judgment is highly irresponsible.

I want to make an additional point regarding our action here today. I do not feel the U.S. Congress should continue to set our nation's appropriations policy in so slipshod and haphazard a fashion. The matters we debate here today should have been settled early last year. Obviously they were not, nor have they been yet. Does anyone really think that we will have appropriations bills passed by June of this year to fund all the programs funded by House Joint Resolution 345? We know it is not so. So what we are considering here today is simply to continue the shell game started last year.

Well, at some point this game needs to stop. It is my strong feeling and recommendation to this House that we resolve to handle all matters pertaining to appropriations for an ensuing fiscal year by not later than March 1 of the previous year. Since appropriating money is probably the most important action we take as a Congress, it certainly deserves all the attention we can possibly give it. This can be done, Mr. Speaker, it must be done.

We owe it to the various private and public agencies that must have time to plan for the effective expenditure of Federal dollars. We owe it to State and local governments for the same reason. We owe it to the President, who must reconcile his financial judgments with ours as we must with his. But most important, we owe it to ourselves as an institution. By not dealing responsibly and expeditiously with appropriation matters, we bring into grave question the very competence of the Congress.

It is no secret that the public looks at the Congress with an increasingly

jaundiced eye. There are many reasons for this, all of which we need to deal with in time. But the time to begin to deal responsibly with the public's money is this year. The time is now. House Joint Resolution 345 is a step in the same wrong direction that we have been moving in for the past few years.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the action considered today is regrettable and ill advised.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 2: On page 2, line 4, add the following:

Sec. 2. The joint resolution of July 1, 1972 (Public Law 92-334), as amended, is further amended by adding the following new sections:

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 2, line 7, insert the following:

"Sec. 110. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, obligations may be increased for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission at not to exceed the annual rate of \$6,224,000 during the period beginning February 16, 1973, and ending June 30, 1973.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: On page 2, line 12, insert the following:

"Sec. 111. Section 102 of Public Law 92-351 (86 Stat. 474) (July 13, 1972) is hereby repealed."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 5: On page 2, line 14, insert the following:

Sec. 3. Section 203 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 (as added by section 402 of the Federal Impoundment and Information Act) is amended to read as follows:

"REPORTS ON IMPOUNDED FUNDS

"SEC. 203. (a) On or before the dates set forth in subsection (c), the President shall transmit to the Congress a report on funds impounded during the periods specified in such subsection containing the following information with respect to each impoundment:

"(1) the amount of the funds impounded;

"(2) the date on which the funds were ordered to be impounded;

"(3) the date the funds were impounded;

"(4) any department or establishment of the Government to which such impounded funds would have been available for obligation except for such impoundment;

"(5) the period of time during which the funds are to be impounded;

"(6) the reasons for the impoundment; and

"(7) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect of the impoundment.

"(b) The reports transmitted to subsection (a) for the second, third, and fourth periods of a fiscal year shall also contain the following information:

"(1) any revisions in the information transmitted with respect to any impoundment for any prior period of the fiscal year, and

"(2) a cumulative statement, by program, activity, or project and by the department or establishment of the Government, of impoundments since the beginning of the fiscal year, including impoundments during the period for which the report is transmitted.

"(c) The first report for any fiscal year shall be transmitted on or before October 15 of such year and shall cover the period through September 30 of such year. The second and third reports for any fiscal year shall be submitted on or before the fifteenth and nineteenth days, respectively, after the submission of the Budget for such fiscal year and shall cover the periods through the date of the submission of the Budget and seventy-five days after such date, respectively. The fourth report for any fiscal year shall be submitted on or before July 15 following the close of such fiscal year and shall cover the remainder of the fiscal year. If on the day of transmittal of any report pursuant to subsection (a), the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, are not in session, the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized to receive such report for the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"(d) The President shall transmit to the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of each report transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) on the same day on which such report is transmitted to the Congress.

"(e) Each report transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be printed in the first issue of the Federal Register published after the date on which such report is transmitted."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 25]

Ashbrook	Harsha	Mills, Md.
Aspin	Harvey	Mollohan
Badillo	Hébert	Patman
Biaggi	Hillis	Pickle
Breaux	Hosmer	Price, Tex.
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Rees
Chisholm	King	Robison, N.Y.
Clark	Koch	Rooney, N.Y.
Clausen,	Kuykendall	Ruppe
Don H.	Landgrebe	Smith, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Lent	Steiger, Wis.
Clay	Lujan	Wilson,
Collier	McEwen	Charles, Tex.
Coughlin	Mailliard	Zion
Dennis	Martin, N.C.	
Gray	Mills, Ark.	

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

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

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CRIME

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 256 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 256

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1973, and until June 30, 1973, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of eleven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. The select committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of crime affecting the United States, including, but not limited to, (1) its elements, causes, and extent; (2) the preparation, collection, and dissemination of statistics and data; (3) the sharing of information, statistics, and data among law enforcement agencies, Federal, State, and local, including the exchange of information, statistics, and data with foreign nations; (4) the adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including constitutional issues and problems pertaining thereto; (5) the effect of crime and disturbances in the metropolitan urban areas; (6) the effect, directly or indirectly, of crime on the commerce of the Nation; (7) the treatment and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crime; (8) measures relating to the reduction, control, or prevention of crime; (9) measures relating to the improvement of (A) investigation and detection of crime, (B) law enforcement techniques, including, but not limited to, increased cooperation among the law enforcement agencies, and (C) the effective administration of justice; and (10) measures and programs for increas-

ed respect for the law and constituted authority.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is meeting has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

SEC. 4. The select committee shall report to the House as soon as possible with respect to the results of its investigations, hearings, and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable and shall submit its final report not later than June 30, 1973. Any such report or reports which are made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House. The select committee shall cease to exist on June 30, 1973, and its records, files, and all current material in its possession shall be transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Committee on Rules has reported to the House for consideration today House Resolution 256 to authorize the continuation of the select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of crime affecting the United States. As Members know, the effect of this resolution is to continue the Select Committee on Crime until June 30 of this year.

I hope and believe that the House will support this resolution and strongly urge its adoption. The subject of crime is one of major concern to the American people. The select committee which has been chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Florida has made an outstanding contribution to the understanding of the causes and elements of the whole broad spectrum of crime in this country. He and the members of his committee are to be congratulated for the thoroughness and effectiveness with which they have carried out the mandate of the House. The product of their work will be of immeasurable assistance to law enforcement officers throughout the country. The leadership which the able gentleman from Florida has given to his duties adds another monumental achievement to his long and illustrious career in both Houses of Congress.

I have been assured that consideration of the matters now under study by the select committee can be continued under the standing committees of the House. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has assured me that his committee can, and will, assume the major portion of the matters which have been under the jurisdiction of the Select

Committee on Crime. However, a period of transition is necessary and I hope we will make this transition as smooth and complete as possible. This resolution is vitally necessary so that the select committee can continue in an orderly fashion its ongoing investigations and can properly prepare reports for the consideration of the House.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this resolution extending the Select Committee on Crime until the 30th of June is a compromise. It was a compromise arrived at with very considerable difficulty. A number of people wanted the committee to continue for the full period of this Congress, and a number of people wanted the committee to terminate on the first day of this Congress. The view of the committee's effectiveness was mixed, but I think everyone will agree that during its life it has accomplished something. There are critics of a variety of types, and there are supporters of all kinds, and the compromise included more than the date when that committee would cease to function. It included the understanding of those who were parties to that compromise that the Committee on the Judiciary would give special attention to the functions undertaken by this select committee, and make a judgment which would result in some of those functions at least being prosecuted in some fashion by the Committee on the Judiciary. That is, not only is the Crime Committee phased out, but there are commitments that some of its functions will be undertaken by the Committee on the Judiciary, which felt that it should have the responsibility for this work.

I think that outlines the situation as I understand it. If I have not made it clear, I would be glad to respond to any questions from the Members.

Does the gentleman from California desire me to yield to him?

Mr. WIGGINS. I do, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of asking questions of the gentleman.

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

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the statement has been expressed by some Members that on June 30 there will be another request to extend the committee beyond that date. In the discussions which led up to the compromise, did the Members who negotiated the compromise go into that subject, and were there commitments made?

Mr. BOLLING. The discussions that led to the compromise did take that thought into account and I cannot, of course, speak for another Member, but the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is here, and I understand from the gentleman that he committed himself absolutely that this would be the terminal date of the select committee, as did the other members of the select committee who were present.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me.

I stated in the conference where this agreement was worked out, that I never meant, as the original introducer of the legislation under which the committee functioned in the past, that this should be a permanent select committee.

I do personally believe that there ought to be one committee here in the Congress that has comprehensive jurisdiction over all aspects of the subject of crime, or we should do with the subject of crime as we have done with the subject of small business, and create a permanent Select Committee on Crime. That is a matter entirely separate from this particular resolution, and certainly as far as I am concerned I will not make any effort whatsoever to extend the life of this committee beyond the agreed upon date of June 30.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this assurance from my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER). It is my intention, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), to support the passage of this resolution, and that my support is conditioned upon those assurances. I could not in good conscience support a resolution to continue the Select Committee on Crime beyond June 30 under any circumstances.

I now understand that firm commitments have been made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), not to make such a request.

Mr. BOLLING. That is my understanding, and I agree precisely with the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I do not care to prolong this discussion. I do feel that this House Select Committee on Crime, which was created by the House May 1, 1969, has made a meaningful contribution toward this problem. There are many facets of the problem of crime, but the recent Gallup poll has indicated that, now that the war is considered as being brought to termination or near termination, the most important subject in the minds of the people of this country is crime.

The House Select Committee on Crime has not solved the problem of crime. Neither has the Department of Justice; neither have the law enforcement agencies of the country; neither have the courts of the land; neither has the other body in the Congress of the United States, nor have the other committees of this House. But I do feel that we have made an important contribution, not only to the legislative action, but more is contemplated in the full reports of the committee which will be ready for submission to the House at an early date. Two of them deal with the penetration of organized crime, one of them into legitimate business, and the other into horse racing; one of them dealing with the important and challenging subject

of drugs in the schools, and the other one dealing with an equally challenging subject: The correctional institutions of this country.

To address myself to the latter first, the President stated some time ago that the correctional institutions of this country had become colleges for crime rather than correctional institutions, and we are filing with the House at an early date, after approval by the committee, a rather comprehensive report on that subject relating not only to the committee's view of Attica and other prisons in the country, but to extensive hearings, some of the most knowledgeable hearings in the country on this subject of correctional institutions.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. I think one problem that we might have with regard to this compromise is the possibility that in 4 months from today we might find the committee right in the middle of a very exciting and very involved investigation of some matter relating to crime, and that it would be very difficult for the House to then terminate the activities of the committee because of that tremendous activity that will have then been going on.

I wonder if the gentleman could assure the House that he is going to conduct the affairs of the committee in such a way that 4 months from today when it is supposed to terminate its activities, it will not find itself in that predicament.

Mr. PEPPER. I will certainly assure the gentleman that I have already made that commitment in the statement I made just a few moments ago. I was not reserving some intention to do contrary to what I said.

As I said at this conference, where the Speaker and the leadership on both sides of the aisle were involved, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the able gentleman from Missouri, and others, it would be a clean-cut break in the life of this committee by the end of June, the 30th of June. However, I made it clear in that conference—as I want to make it clear to the House—that one of the reasons we are asking for an extension of time is that we hope we might have a year in addition to what we have now, because last year we got into the subject of investigating the terrible problem of drugs in the schools of this country.

We were noticed on that subject by a documentary by one of the networks made in the city of New York, and two members of the crime committee from New York brought the people that made that documentary down here, and they showed us how drugs were being sold rampantly in the schools, how children were found stoned in their classes and in the corridors of their schools and the like, and the committee decided that the matter was of such import that we should go into it and do what we could on the subject, so we had hearings in

New York, Miami, Chicago, San Francisco, Kansas City, Kans., and Los Angeles on that subject.

That, and the elections, and the recess of the House delayed us in getting our report on the hearings that we have had ready, and in concluding one aspect of our inquiry, which we feel duty bound to conclude before we finish our work, that being an indepth study of street crime.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, that was an indepth study of street crime. We do propose to go into street crime between now and the termination of the committee, but it will be all so scheduled that at the completion of our report and at the end of the period in June the committee will terminate its activity and transfer its records to the Judiciary Committee.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the committee was established in 1969, as I remember it.

Mr. PEPPER. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. How much has the committee expended since 1969, and what will this 6 months' extension cost?

Mr. PEPPER. I hope we will be permitted to expend for this 6-month period at least at the same rate at which we spent last year, which was more than \$500,000 a year, something to that effect.

Mr. GROSS. What has been the total expenditure?

Mr. PEPPER. Something more than \$1 million.

Mr. GROSS. More nearly \$2 million, is it not?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the able gentleman from Iowa, if we have saved the life of one child with what we have done to alert the school authorities of this country to do something about drug problems, the expenditure will be justified.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose that could be said about a number of programs operated by the Federal Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. What we have done, if the gentleman will permit me to say, in the field of amphetamines is that, working with other committees, we have been able to set a quota system to permit 6 million pills a year to be sold. We are working on getting the same kind of quota on barbiturates because we find pupils in the schools are turning now to the barbiturates in their drug abuse.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 256.

I think the discussion thus far has made it abundantly clear that it is the product of consultation between the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and with the assurance that a crime-fighting subcommittee will be established in

the House Judiciary Committee to take over the files and to receive the report of the Pepper Select Committee, I think this indicates quite clearly that we are not in any sense abandoning the war against crime. For that reason I am pleased to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS).

Mr. WIGGINS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as many Members know I had opposed the continuation of the Select Committee on Crime on which I serve as the ranking Republican member. I do not think this controversy over the Select Committee on Crime, Mr. Speaker, should be permitted to disguise the very real accomplishments of that committee during the 4 years of its life.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Select Committee on Crime has conducted during its lifetime indepth hearings with respect to drug abuse, bringing a dimension to that problem which would not have been brought to the attention of the American people but for the activities of the Select Committee on Crime. In addition we have conducted inquiry into the infiltration by organized crime into certain legitimate aspects of American commerce, a field which has not been heretofore explored by a congressional committee. All of this is to the credit of the Crime Committee and to the leadership provided that Crime Committee by its able chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

But the issue today, Mr. Speaker, is not what the Crime Committee has done in the past. The issue is what needs to be done in the future in the 93d Congress. My opposition to the continuation of the Crime Committee was because of a belief that those activities which remain undone can best be done by the Judiciary Committee. I still hold to that view but I recognize that there must be a period of transition for those activities to be phased into the work of the Judiciary Committee and a time for those activities to be phased out of the Crime Committee.

Accordingly the extension until June 30 of this year is a fair and reasonable compromise which recognizes the practical problem of commencing this task which remains to be done by the Crime Committee. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking minority member of the committee (Mr. WIGGINS) for his remarks.

During the lifetime of this committee, it has been in hearings over 100 days. We have heard over 1,000 witnesses. We have visited over 20 cities in this country with these hearings. We filed numerous reports.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from

Ohio (Mr. LATTI) such time as he may consume.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I supported the creation of this committee and its continuation 2 years ago, and I support this resolution.

I think the committee has done a meritorious job. Any criticism which I might have is the fact that on the 7th day of February, a colloquy occurred on the floor between Mr. HAYS, of Ohio, and our distinguished minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, in which it was stated that over \$30,000 was expended last year on telephone calls. That is a lot of talk.

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

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not have the figures here before me. I would answer that comment, which was made by the gentleman from Alabama, to the effect that \$3,000 or \$4,000 a month was spent on long-distance telephone calls by saying that this committee said to me on the floor, "He is in error. It is \$2,500." As a matter of fact I will have the exact figures when we come up to the funding resolution, as I hope we will. It is closer to \$1,200 or \$1,500 per month than the other figure.

Mr. LATTI. If the gentleman from Florida tells the House that the figures that were used on the 7th of February were incorrect, that \$4,000 or \$5,000 per month was not spent on telephone calls, I think the record should be corrected.

Mr. PEPPER. I will correct the record I do not recall whether in 1 month when we had special hearings, for example, in San Francisco or Los Angeles, the bill might have been more than usual that month, but on an average the tele-

phone bill has run nearer \$1,500 per month than any other figure.

As soon as we come up with a funding resolution, I will have the exact figures.

As the able gentleman is well aware, all of our reports are submitted monthly to the Committee on House Administration, and we have never been called to account for any expenditures we have made in the past.

Mr. LATTI. As the gentleman knows, Mr. HAYS is the chairman of that committee and Mr. DICKINSON is a member. According to Mr. DICKINSON, on page 3678 of the RECORD of February 7, he said:

I am in favor of the resolution and wish to assist the gentleman from Ohio. In looking at the language, I notice it is very narrow in scope. It is my understanding that it is limited specifically to payrolls. The reason I bring this up is because, for some reason, this special subcommittee spent over \$30,000 in the last Congress in long-distance telephone calls, which at times ran over \$4,000 per month.

If this is incorrect, I think the gentleman from Florida ought to correct it.

Mr. PEPPER. It is not correct.

Mr. LATTI. I would hope the gentleman would correct the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall. I will have the exact figures for the information of the Members.

Mr. LATTI. As I said at the outset, that is lot of long-distance discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I might say, as I said at the outset, that I support this resolution but with the firm understanding by the Committee on Rules that there is an agreement between the majority and the minority, that this committee goes out of existence on June 30 of this year and that its files and records be turned over to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

I support this, but I will not support a

continuation beyond June 30, 1973. I think it is appropriate for a select committee to operate during one Congress, but in this case we have continued a select committee for two Congresses, and now it is requested that it be extended into a third Congress.

We do not want to set any sort of precedent by continuing this select committee beyond one Congress.

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

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) since my name was mentioned, I would like to say that if the figures I have read into the RECORD are not correct, I will be glad to correct them myself if the gentleman from Florida will agree that if they are correct, he will come back and correct his statement on expenditures.

I have not misquoted the RECORD.

The expense has exceeded \$4,000 in 1 month for telephone calls. I was using a figure furnished by our staff from the figures the gentleman's staff furnished us, as to what the expenditures were.

As a matter of fact the telephone expenses of the Select Committee on Crime for the months of August and September 1972, show an expense of \$3,160.02 and \$4,556.59, respectively. The total telephone expense for the 92d Congress was \$30,676.01 by the Select Committee on Crime. I attach statements covering all committee expenses for those 2 months of August and September 1972; from which can be seen the inordinate amount of spending by the Crime Committee on such items as telephone expenses compared with other committees:

Committee	Cumulative amount expended since January 1971	Balance remaining as of Aug. 31, 1972	Telephone expenses for August 1972	Cumulative for telephone amount expended since January 1971
Agriculture	\$140,110.13	\$109,889.87	\$9.25	\$467.49
Appropriations	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Armed Services	329,482.45	120,517.55	21.85	932.32
Banking and Currency	700,005.55	242,494.45	246.48	4,712.22
Banking and Currency on Housing	536,823.67	180,476.33	157.95	5,203.15
Select Committee on Crime	875,892.08	269,209.92	3,160.02	21,909.48
District of Columbia	177,758.17	72,241.83	0	0
Education and Labor	1,543,894.00	934,106.00	878.68	18,278.49
Foreign Affairs	595,255.45	341,406.55	244.14	5,618.40
Government Operations	1,403,997.28	428,602.72	169.96	5,213.19
House Administration	391,624.08	223,375.92	396.29	3,161.23
House Administration Computer Operations	607,647.97	892,352.03	0	249.73
Interior and Insular Affairs	408,846.77	295,153.23	84.90	2,625.73
Internal Security	365,651.41	187,419.54	405.00	2,732.81
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	\$1,167,931.00	\$285,243.00	\$398.43	\$7,698.22
Judiciary	559,587.96	240,412.04	107.54	3,254.62
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	351,171.80	167,828.20	10.03	5,332.54
Post Office and Civil Service	760,593.96	295,406.04	515.11	8,155.61
Public Works	1,871,560.00	554,606.79	0	5,440.88
Select Committee on House Restaurant	32,271.57	25,228.17	1.35	1.35
Rules	1,348.26	3,651.74	5.55	5.55
Science and Astronautics	564,201.04	225,798.96	0	2,047.86
Select Committee on Small Business	736,698.94	191,301.06	412.14	4,057.21
Standards of Official Conduct	1,443.00	23,557.00	0	119.27
Veterans' Affairs	180,136.32	79,863.68	0	601.68
Ways and Means	25,256.84	49,743.16	0	1,180.36
Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures	47,031.40	137,968.60	315.14	1,251.97

¹ Not reported.

Committee	Cumulative amount expended since January 1971	Balance remaining as of Aug. 31, 1972	Telephone expenses for August 1972	Cumulative for telephone amount expended since January 1971
Agriculture	\$146,417.41	\$103,582.59	0	\$467.49
Appropriations	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Armed Services	341,895.94	108,104.06	\$41.15	973.47
Banking and Currency	740,674.62	201,825.38	410.05	5,122.27
Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing	566,241.90	151,058.10	354.30	5,557.45
Select Committee on Crime	925,168.69	219,931.31	4,556.59	26,456.07
District of Columbia	180,207.97	65,792.03	0	0
Education and Labor	1,629,347.15	846,652.85	838.66	19,117.15
Foreign Affairs	631,019.38	305,642.62	315.24	5,933.64
Government Operations	1,469,700.19	362,899.81	211.29	5,424.48
House Administration	419,899.59	195,100.41	0	3,161.23
House Administration Computer Operations	709,310.34	790,689.66	220.52	470.25
Interior and Insular Affairs	424,352.50	279,647.50	174.95	2,800.68
Internal Security	\$408,398.62	\$144,672.33	\$534.00	\$3,221.81
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	1,227,981.21	225,192.79	637.66	8,335.88
Judiciary	588,561.37	211,438.63	170.32	3,424.94
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	372,418.77	146,581.23	695.74	6,028.28
Post Office and Civil Service	795,848.26	260,151.74	6.98	8,162.59
Public Works	1,391,462.30	480,097.70	245.44	5,686.32
Select Committee on House Restaurant	2,339.73	22,888.44	0	0
Rules	1,421.35	3,578.65	3.45	3.45
Science and Astronautics	589,627.16	200,372.84	119.48	2,167.34
Select Committee on Small Business	773,849.09	154,150.91	281.38	4,338.59
Standards of Official Conduct	1,547.64	23,452.36	2.50	121.77
Veterans' Affairs	191,659.28	68,340.72	10.11	611.79
Ways and Means	29,557.53	45,442.47	177.22	1,357.58
Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures	60,903.72	124,096.28	0	1,251.97

¹ Not reported.

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

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If I said anything that would call for an apology, of course I would be glad to give it.

I understood the able gentleman, when he made his comment the other day, to say that we were spending \$3,000 or \$4,000 a month.

I checked with the finance officer of the committee, and she told me it was about \$1,500 a month.

Remember that we are talking about a period of 2 years.

I am not saying that anybody is grossly in error. I will give the Members the facts. I am sorry, but I came over hurriedly from my office. When we come up with the funding resolution I will give the Members the exact figures.

Mr. DICKINSON. I understand. The figures that are in the record I placed in the RECORD. That is all I have to go on. I stand by those figures, because they were furnished by our committee and the gentleman's committee.

Mr. PEPPER. I will submit to the able gentleman the figures of the committee, and let them speak for themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this will be the third compromise on this issue in less than a year.

On April 11, 1972, there was a compromise entered into. At that time the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) who presently supports a third compromise on this issue, said:

I believe it is a very, very poor idea to have select committees that go on and on and on. I believe it should be very clear that an effort is going to be made to see to it that 4 years is the full life of this particular select committee.

He also said:

I do not say this in any personal way. I do not say it in any criticism of the Members, or even of the select committee. It is merely my view, in a situation where there is a shortage of space.

As the saying goes, "You'd better believe" there is a shortage of office space if you can believe those who are screaming around here every day not only as to office space but also parking as well. Abolition of this select committee would release office space as well as parking.

And Mr. BOLLING said:

A shortage of money—all kinds of shortages—that if our standing committees are not functioning in a way to carry out their duties there is something very seriously wrong.

I could not agree with him more.

He went on to say:

On that fundamental principle I want to serve notice that if I am able—in other words, if I am here—

Understand, that was April 11, 1972, before the election—

if I am here—as a member of the Rules Committee I intend to oppose that resolution, as I did in this Congress, and also to oppose it on the floor if the majority of the Rules Committee decides to support it.

There is part of the understanding that January 3, the end of the last ses-

sion of the Congress, was to mark the end of this select committee.

Then on February 7 of this year there came the second compromise. That was to pay the members of the committee staff for 2 months, January and February of this year. Again, that was to be the end of this select committee.

I am sure every Member who was here and heard the colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), who brought in the enabling resolution to pay the committee employees for 2 months, understood that at the end of February the committee would be out of business. Now here we are asked to breathe new life into the committee until June 30 at an additional cost of thousands of dollars.

I would not bet a plugged nickel, not one plugged nickel, that June 30 will see the end of this select committee, and no Member of the House will make such a bet if he values his plugged nickels.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, even if I am the victim of the gentleman's wit, I am always delighted to hear him display his wit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear that. Would the gentleman repeat it?

Mr. PEPPER. I said even if I am the victim of the gentleman's wit, I am always delighted to hear it.

Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Go right ahead.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has quoted the able gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

If the Members will look at the record of what Mr. HAYS said, they will find that he said that was the end of the committee unless the Committee on Rules recommended the extension by the House—

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes; I understand all that.

Mr. PEPPER. Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. Let me complete my thought.

And the House approved the rules of the Committee on Rules.

That is what is before the House now.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I understand.

Mr. Speaker, that is a part of the RECORD, that unless the House took action to reconstitute or continue the select committee, that was the "end of the ball game," as far as he, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) was concerned, but he gave everyone the impression—as did the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) when he spoke on this issue on April 11, 1972—that as far as they were concerned, this committee was to be out of business at the end of the last session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, you can interpret it in any way you want to, but that is the impression that was left with everybody.

As far as crime is concerned, in reading this morning's paper you get quite a picture. This so-called Crime Committee sits right here in Washington, D.C., in the Capital of the United States, which has recorded 57 homicides thus far this year. In other words, in just 2 months,

January and February, there were 57 homicides as compared with 44 in the same period last year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. The story goes on to say that 249 persons were victims of homicides in the District last year, or a rate of 35 such deaths per 100,000 population. That is nearly double the rate of New York City.

Mr. Speaker, here is a committee presumably investigating crime, sitting right on top of it and watching this city fast becoming the worst crime-ridden city in the world.

I do not know what service the committee performs. It will be interesting to note its accomplishments if there is ever an end to all these compromises.

I say again to the Members today, do not be surprised if you are confronted with another vote on June 30 of this year, or before, to continue this expensive select committee.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 317, nays 75, answered "present" 2, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll. No. 26]

YEAS—317

Abzug	Broyhill, N.C.	Danielson
Adams	Broyhill, Va.	Davis, Ga.
Addabbo	Buchanan	Davis, S.C.
Alexander	Burger	Delaney
Anderson	Burke, Calif.	Dellums
Calif.	Burke, Fla.	Denholm
Anderson, Ill.	Burke, Mass.	Dennis
Andrews	Burleson, Tex.	Dent
N. Dak.	Burton	Derwinski
Annunzio	Byron	Diggs
Armstrong	Camp	Dingell
Ashley	Carey, N.Y.	Donohue
Bafalis	Carney, Ohio	Dorn
Baker	Carter	Downing
Barrett	Casey, Tex.	Drinan
Bell	Cederberg	Dulski
Bennett	Chamberlain	du Pont
Bergland	Chappell	Eckhardt
Bevill	Chisholm	Edwards, Ala.
Bieber	Clark	Edwards, Calif.
Bingham	Clausen	Ellberg
Blatnik	Don H.	Erlenborn
Boland	Clay	Esch
Bolling	Cochran	Eshleman
Bowen	Collins	Evans, Colo.
Brademas	Conlan	Evins, Tenn.
Brasco	Conte	Fascell
Bray	Conyers	Findley
Breckinridge	Corman	Fish
Brinkley	Cotter	Fisher
Brooks	Cronin	Flood
Broomfield	Culver	Flowers
Brotzman	Daniels	Flynt
Brown, Mich.	Dominick V.	Foley

Ford, Gerald R.	McKinney	Sanbanes
Ford,	Madden	Satterfield
William D.	Mahon	Saylor
Forsythe	Mann	Schneebell
Fountain	Maraziti	Schroeder
Fraser	Mathias, Calif.	Seiberling
Frelinghuysen	Matsunaga	Shipley
Frey	Mayne	Shriver
Fulton	Mazzoli	Shuster
Fuqua	Meeds	Sikes
Gaydos	Melcher	Sisk
Gettys	Metcalfe	Skubitz
Gialmo	Mezvinsky	Slack
Gibbons	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Gilman	Milford	Staggers
Goldwater	Miller	Stanton,
Gonzalez	Minish	J. William
Grasso	Mink	Stark
Gray	Minshall, Ohio	Steed
Green, Oreg.	Mitchell, Md.	Steele
Green, Pa.	Moakley	Steelman
Griffiths	Moorhead, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.
Gubser	Morgan	Steiger, Wis.
Gude	Mosher	Stevens
Gunter	Moss	Stokes
Guyer	Murphy, Ill.	Stratton
Haley	Murphy, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Hamilton	Natcher	Stuckey
Hanley	Nedzi	Studds
Hanna	Nelsen	Sullivan
Hanrahan	Nichols	Symington
Hansen, Wash.	Nix	Talcoot
Harrington	Obey	Taylor, N.C.
Hastings	O'Hara	Teague, Tex.
Hawkins	O'Neill	Thone
Hays	Owens	Thornton
Hebert	Parris	Tiernan
Hechler, W. Va.	Passman	Treen
Heckler, Mass.	Patten	Udall
Helstoski	Pepper	Ullman
Henderson	Perkins	Van Deerlin
Hillis	Pettis	Vander Jagt
Hinshaw	Peyser	Vanik
Hollifield	Pike	Veysey
Holtzman	Poage	Vigorito
Horton	Podell	Waggonner
Howard	Preyer	Waldie
Hudnut	Price, Ill.	Walsh
Hungate	Pritchard	Ware
Hunt	Quillen	Whalen
Hutchinson	Randall	White
Ichord	Rangel	Whitten
Jarman	Regula	Widnall
Johnson, Calif.	Reid	Wiggins
Johnson, Pa.	Reuss	Wilson, Bob
Jones, Ala.	Rhodes	Wilson,
Jones, N.C.	Rinaldo	Charles H.,
Jones, Okla.	Roberts	Calif.
Jones, Tenn.	Robinson, Va.	Wilson,
Jordan	Rodino	Charles, Tex.
Karth	Roe	Winn
Kastenmeier	Rogers	Wolf
Kazen	Roncallo, Wyo.	Wright
Keating	Roncallo, N.Y.	Wyder
Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.	Wyllie
Kyros	Rosenthal	Yates
Latta	Rostenkowski	Yatron
Lehman	Roush	Young, Fla.
Litton	Roy	Young, Ga.
Long, La.	Roybal	Young, Ill.
McClory	Ruth	Young, Tex.
McCloskey	Ryan	Zablocki
McCormack	St Germain	Zion
McDade	Sandman	Zwach
McFall	Sarasin	

NAYS—75

Abdnor	Hammer-	Myers
Archer	schmidt	O'Brien
Ashbrook	Harsha	Powell, Ohio
Beard	Heinz	Railsback
Blackburn	Hicks	Rarick
Brown, Ohio	Hogan	Roussetot
Burlison, Mo.	Holt	Runnels
Butler	Huber	Scherle
Clancy	Johnson, Colo.	Sebellius
Cleveland	Kemp	Shoup
Cohen	Ketchum	Snyder
Coughlin	Kuykendall	Spence
Crane	Landgrebe	Stanton,
Daniel, Dan	Landrum	James V.
Daniel, Robert	Long, Md.	Symms
W., Jr.	Lott	Taylor, Mo.
Davis, Wis.	McCollister	Teague, Calif.
Dellenback	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Devine	Madigan	Thompson, Wis.
Dickinson	Mallary	Towell, Nev.
Duncan	Martin, Nebr.	Wampler
Frenzel	Mathis, Ga.	Whitehurst
Froehlich	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wyatt
Ginn	Mizell	Wymann
Goodling	Montgomery	Young, S.C.
Gross	Moorhead,	
Grover	Calif.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Arends	Riegle
NOT VOTING—37	
Andrews, N.C.	King
Aspin	Koch
Badillo	Leggett
Biaggi	Lent
Breaux	Lujan
Brown, Calif.	McEwen
Clawson, Del.	McKay
Collier	McSpadden
Conable	Mailliard
de la Garza	Martin, N.C.
Hansen, Idaho	Mills, Ark.
Harvey	Mills, Md.
Hosmer	Mollohan

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Koch with Mr. Rose.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Martin of North Carolina.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Mills of Maryland.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Collier.
Mr. E de la Garza with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. King.
Mr. Andrews of North Carolina with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Ruppe with Mr. Quile.
Mr. Price of Texas with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Robison of New York with Mr. Hosmer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

ORIENTATION BRIEFING IN HIGH TECHNOLOGY PROCUREMENT BY NATIONAL SECURITY INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION

(Mrs. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my new colleagues to an orientation briefing in high technology procurement by the National Security Industrial Association. NSIA is a long established nonpolitical, nonprofit communications medium between industry and Government in matters relating to national security and technology.

The purpose of the briefing is to familiarize new Members of Congress with the problems and complexities of defense and other high technology procurement.

I had the opportunity of attending a recent session and found it most informative and useful. The material was presented in an evenhanded and objective manner.

I am informed that they are going to have another session from 9:15 to 11 a.m., on Tuesday, March 6, 1973, in room 2216 of the Rayburn House Office Building for those Members unable to attend the earlier sessions. I believe that new Members and their aides would benefit from this briefing and I therefore commend it to their attention.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 18 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 18

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

Sec. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of

members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, before I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and before proceeding to discuss this resolution, I thought it might be helpful to some of the Members of the House if I indicated the order in which it is planned to call up these resolutions.

The Members should know that there is controversy on these ordinarily routine resolutions. There are nine of them, if I count correctly. I propose to call them up in the order in which each resolution was introduced. The one just called up is House Resolution 18, Banking and Currency; House Resolution 72, Agriculture; House Resolution 74, Judiciary; House Resolution 134, Veterans' Affairs; House Resolution 163, Interior and Insular Affairs; House Resolution 175, Education and Labor; House Resolution 180, Post Office and Civil Service; House Resolution 224, Government Operations; and House Resolution 257, District of Columbia.

I am not clear in my mind as to on how many of these resolutions the minority intends to pursue the approach outlined in the letter to the Members from the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND). Each Member, I presume, received a copy of this letter. I assume that there is a possibility that the minority, or Mr. CLEVELAND, or Mr. CLEVELAND and others, will want to raise these questions on all the resolutions, or perhaps not on all of them.

In any event, I do not propose to enter into that particular debate until the gentlemen on that side of the aisle have had an opportunity to discuss those aspects.

It is important, in looking at all of these resolutions together, for the Members of the House to understand that there has been a significant change in policy with regard to these so-called travel resolutions. The only way in which these resolutions differ from all the other travel resolutions over the years that have passed in each Congress, is that for the first time in, I think, about 15 years, the leadership and the majority of the Committee on Rules has ceased to attempt—I do not know how to put it elegantly—to supervise or nursemaid the great committees of the House in the execution of their duties insofar as they involve travel.

A number of years ago, in the speaker-

ship of Mr. Rayburn, when Mr. Martin was the minority leader, a few individual Members of the House were guilty of both excesses and indiscretions in such a way that it brought the House itself into bad repute because of things said and done overseas. Then, the Speaker and the minority leader requested the Committee on Rules to squeeze down on the committees of the House, to try to cut back on travel authorizations.

That attempt was made and it was never a success, because the fact of the matter was that the powerful committees got exactly the travel they wanted, and the less influential committees, which might have had a better reason, on occasion, for travel, were left out and had to come specifically before the Rules Committee in effect with hat in hand. It was not a successful procedure.

I sat on the Rules Committee throughout all of its attempt to use this procedure. It did not work. It was not fair.

This year, not in consultation with everybody but in consultation with the Speaker, the Rules Committee majority decided to put the responsibility for travel exactly where it has always belonged. The committee chairmen and ranking minority members and the committees as a whole are responsible for the behavior of the groups that they send traveling overseas or in this country.

This is to serve notice, as an agent of the majority of the Rules Committee, that instead of limiting some committees to travel only within the United States and allowing other committees to travel within and without, when the request was made the request was granted.

In other words, the responsibility. I repeat, rests on the committees and on the leaders of the committees and on the members of the committees. I am sure at this stage of history it will work, because I am convinced that there is not a committee chairman or a committee ranking minority member who wants to allow a situation to develop which will bring the House itself into disrepute.

I thought it ought to be very clear that this first resolution is an example. The committee requested full authority to travel overseas. In the last Congress it had limited authority to travel overseas. This resolution provides that full authority.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to point out, without taking too much time, that we passed a similar resolution, House Resolution 114, in the 92d Congress.

We came before the Rules Committee this session to ask a general travel resolution. It has been approved by the minority. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) appeared there yesterday and agreed to exactly what we asked for and said he strongly endorsed House Joint Resolution 18 as introduced.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman

from Missouri was quite correct in characterizing this series of resolutions, of which there are nine, as being ordinarily resolutions that are quite routine in nature.

If my understanding is correct, actually, under the provisions of rule XI, paragraph 29(a)(1) and succeeding paragraphs, without the language of these investigative resolutions actually, I believe each standing committee of the House, under the rules, would be limited to not more than six professional staff members and six clerks. Of course, as we all know, the committees of the House—each of them, I believe, almost without exception—employ staffs considerably in excess of that number.

As the gentleman from Missouri also indicated, these resolutions containing much of standard or boiler plate language of previous years have been very fundamentally changed in character with respect to the control which formerly was exercised by the Committee on Rules with respect to travel. Specifically, I think, with respect to this resolution, House Resolution 18, the Banking and Currency Committee formerly could not travel without the country. They could travel anywhere within the country but could not travel without the country unless special authorization were obtained first from the Committee on Rules and from the House of Representatives.

I believe there is another factor, in addition to these intrinsic facts within these resolutions themselves, which makes this particular debate more important than it might otherwise be.

And that is that extrinsic facts have entered in to indicate that the Democratic Caucus as of last week adopted certain rules which would move them away from the closed rule, from a procedure which makes it impossible to consider a resolution from a committee on the floor of this House without offering amendments thereto.

As a friend and proponent of congressional reform, I have watched these developments within the Democratic Caucus with great interest, and indeed I would applaud many of the things that have taken place, and I would concur in the headline or the editorial byline that I saw yesterday in the Washington Post: "A Refreshing Spirit in the House." But I wonder if that "refreshing spirit" is not doomed to become something of a stale vapor.

Mr. Speaker, that will be true, if today in acting on each of these nine resolutions we make it impossible for any Member of this body to offer an amendment which would alter this changed procedure that the gentleman from Missouri has described as it affects the travel of these committees.

I think that there are some other important respects in which these resolutions might be subject to amendment, and I refer specifically to the matter of minority staffing, which is certainly germane to any resolution which establishes the basic investigative authority of a committee of this House.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I will yield

to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in other words, under the rule under which we are considering these resolutions, an amendment to afford to the minority up to one-third of the staff upon request would not be in order?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman from New Hampshire is correct. That amendment would not be in order.

Mr. Speaker, it would be necessary to vote down the previous question on the resolution in order for the gentleman to prevail or to have the opportunity even to offer that amendment on the minority staff.

Mr. CLEVELAND. In other words, this comes to us under a closed rule?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Members are going to hear that disputed, and the able gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) will assure the Members that it does not come to the floor under a rule at all, which indeed it does not.

But the procedure is identical to that of a closed rule, in that the Members have got to vote down the previous question or they simply cannot amend the language of House Resolution 18 or any of the eight resolutions which will follow.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, may I ask, was any attempt made in the Committee on Rules to enable an amendment to be made to these resolutions?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. In response to the gentleman's question, I offered a motion on yesterday in the Committee on Rules that we bring these resolutions to the floor under a procedure that would make it possible to amend them. On a straight party line vote, eight Democrats who were present voted against my motion, and four Republicans who were present voted for it, and in effect clamped a closed rule procedure on what we are doing this afternoon.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman earlier spoke of that glowing editorial in the Washington Post applauding the Democratic Caucus for its opening up of the rules and its position against closed rules. That was yesterday morning.

And then is the gentleman telling me that the Committee on Rules controlled by Democrats at noon yesterday clamped a closed rule on these resolutions?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is precisely correct.

Mr. Speaker, I have the proposed resolution which was adopted by the Democratic Caucus last year, which they have entitled "Closed Rule Procedure," and it says, and I quote:

It shall be the policy of the Democratic Caucus that no committee chairman or designee shall seek, and the Democratic Members of the Rules Committee shall not support, any rule or order prohibiting any germane amendment to any bill reported from committee until four (4) legislative days

have elapsed following notice in the Congressional Record of an intention to do so.

Four legislative days have not gone by. These resolutions were voted out yesterday, 1 day ago, and they were voted out with eight affirmative votes of the Democratic members of the Committee on Rules.

I think that at least the spirit of that reform is being violated. We can stand up here and undoubtedly hear a learned discourse on how this procedure differs from the normal procedure of a bill coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means and that this particular closed rule procedure was designed to trim the power of the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to trade, tariff, and tax bills.

I submit that this proposition the gentleman raised of minority staffing is so important and is so germane to the very issue which confronts this House this afternoon that you violate the spirit of this reform, which is less than 1 week old, if you do not support us in the effort that we will make to vote down the previous question.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman.

The parliamentary situation then is that for a member of the minority to offer an amendment requiring the making of provision for one-third minority staffing on request—the procedure is we would have to vote down the previous question?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Let me say with specific reference to this resolution and the committee it concerns, the Committee on Banking and Currency, that I was given figures just before our debate began this afternoon which indicate the investigative staff of that committee is divided as follows: The majority 24, the minority 2. That to me does not represent a fair apportionment of the investigative staff of that committee to the minority.

The gentleman from Missouri has been quoted earlier by the gentleman from Iowa, as to remarks he made in 1972. I would remind that gentleman, in two very excellent books he wrote, he wrote as follows:

Without the staff to frame alternative proposals the minority cannot make its position clear on bills sponsored by the minority.

The gentleman from Missouri also wrote in another book the following:

The imbalance in the staffing of committees impairs the ability of the minority to make proper policy decisions. There should be adequate staff on the legislative committees for use of the members of the minority party, usually the Republicans.

It is not now generally the situation. However, it seems to me with respect to the gentleman from Missouri and those on the other side of the aisle the right time has never come to implement this. We had it in the 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act sponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON). What happened? By a binding

caucus vote you took it out in the early days of the 92d Congress. You repealed—you repealed—that feature of the 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act.

I suggest that this is a very good time this afternoon in voting on these resolutions to make it clear that this is an issue whose time has come.

I know that the gentleman is going to tell you his select committee on committee jurisdiction will look at the minority staffing subject. Why should we study and restudy an issue about which the gentleman has written years ago and which was the subject of the task force of the House Republican Conference that was formed in 1963 under the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), and they reported on this. This has been studied to death.

The time has come, I believe, to take some action. I suggest that you join me on both sides of the aisle in voting down the previous question on this resolution.

Mr. FRENZEL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRENZEL. I would like to see if I have this clear in my mind. As I recall it, when we convened on January 3 of this year, we passed some rules that allowed for greater use of the suspension process, which in effect gives the opportunity to operate under a closed type of rule. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. FRENZEL. Then on January 31 under a closed rule we approved some kind of committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, also on a closed rule. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct again.

Mr. FRENZEL. And today we will consider nine resolutions which cannot be amended without defeating the previous question, which is again the application of a closed rule. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct again in the statement he made.

Mr. FRENZEL. And these rules are coming from the reform-minded majority group who are opening up the whole world, and sponsoring sunshine bills, and signing John Gardner's pledge renouncing the devil and the closed rule?

What have we gained here? Is it true we have taken the closed rule away from the Committee on Ways and Means where we have a proportionate seating, and have given it to the Committee on Rules where the majority enjoys a two-thirds representation?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman I think has very aptly made the point I began, that the fresh breezes of reform have become the still and rapid vapors of retrogressive policy as far as the way in which the business of this House can be conducted.

Mr. FRENZEL. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say that I concur in all that the gentleman has said except in the gentleman's opening statement where the gentleman said there was some reform which he encouraged. And I say that the eyes of the world are upon those who are supposed to be opposed to

a closed rule. Not only my eyes, but the eyes of the press and all of our constituents will be upon that board when the previous question is ordered, and we will see who is in favor of a closed rule, and who is for reform in all these matters.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am going to close now because there are others to whom I have promised to yield, but let me close by saying this: That a few days ago the minority leader of this House, the minority whip and I, together with the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) held a press conference in which we talked also about the minority staffing, and present with us on that occasion were John Gardner of Common Cause and Ralph Nader, whose activities with respect to this body are certainly well known, and we discussed also the proposition that appears before us this afternoon.

Mr. Gardner, in a letter to every Member of this House on the 26th of February, specifically endorsed the idea that we ought to act now on a proposal to give the minority in this House adequate staffing.

So I think the gentleman is quite correct, that when the lights appear on the board we will see who the true friends of reform, in this House, are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, these halls have rung over the past few weeks with rhetoric about the necessity for the Congress to reassert its constitutional prerogatives and assume its rightful place in relationship with the executive branch. I have argued for several years, and I believe the Congress as a whole is now beginning to be in agreement with me, that we can only take our proper place within the system if we are willing to reform our own procedures and make ourselves into a truly representative and truly effective organization.

The question we have before us today is symbolic of whether we are determined to make those changes and to become effective. Our very system of government is on the concept of majority rule but with the cornerstone that the rights of the minority must be jealously guarded and fearlessly protected. To strip the minority party of adequate staffing is, as Congressman CLEVELAND said during debates 2 years ago.

Like stripping from the defendant in a court of law his right to counsel.

If the Congress is to work effectively, all points of view must be adequately represented.

All of us realize that access to staff and to information is key to effective legislation. Unless Members of Congress of all points of view have access to that information and staff, those who are prevented from receiving adequate staff support will be inadequately represented in the debates and the work of the Congress.

The specific question before us today is whether the minority will have access to the investigative work of the House of Representatives. It is in our hearings, our in-depth investigations of situations that the Congress most frequently de-

velops information on which to challenge executive branch proposals and to develop a legislative viewpoint of our own. Unfortunately, it is in this area that there is a particular bias against the minority. Although the Republicans comprise 44 percent of the total House of Representatives Members, only 9 percent of the committee investigatory funds were allotted to the minority party. The minority cannot possibly work effectively without the same kinds of staffing and access to information which is available to the majority.

The resolution before us this afternoon would assure the minority one-third of the investigatory funds whenever the minority felt that it was being inadequately represented by committee investigations. It is important to emphasize, I think, that this would not necessarily be an automatic but would come into play only when the minority felt that all points of view were not being adequately represented by the committee investigation. In many instances it would not be necessary for the minority to assert its "right" to the funds since their views would be taken into consideration on a routine basis. For example, the Science and Astronautics Committee on which I serve has a long tradition of bipartisan staffing and investigations which is available to every member of the committee, no matter which party. It is highly unlikely that those of us in the minority on that committee would ever have to call for our appropriate share of the investigative funds simply because we are for the most part already being adequately and fully represented by the professional staff.

Although the Education and Labor Committee, on which I also serve is far from bipartisan, it also has done quite a good job in providing staffing and funds to the minority.

This resolution would be called into effect only when there are true instances of lack of cooperation and failure of the majority to provide for the representation of the minority.

This is not really a partisan issue, although we seem to be lined up on opposite sides of the aisle on it today. John Gardner, Chairman of Common Cause, put it succinctly in his testimony before the Mathias-Stevenson hearings last December:

The ability of the Congress to hear and consider both sides of controversial issues is limited by insufficient staff resources for the minority.

We on the Republican side do not expect to be perpetually in the minority here in the House and, when we do assume control in the future, we strongly believe that the Democrats should have full access to the information and staff of the Congress.

I strongly urge all those who are truly concerned with the ability of the Congress to function effectively and to assert its proper role in the Government to join with me in voting down the previous question and voting to provide the minority with its fair share of the investigative funds of this body.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield 5

minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLLIE).

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

I am going to urge defeat of the motion on the previous question and the adoption of an open rule for the reasons which have been so succinctly stated here before, but I am going to ask for it for an additional reason. The reason I give may not be as fundamental as that of the minority staff question, but it may have as much to do with the image which this Congress creates.

I should like to offer an amendment, if we are able to vote down the previous question, which would bar the use of any of the funds authorized under House Resolution 18, which is under consideration at this time, by lame-duck members on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Legitimate fact-finding trips by Members authorized by the committee as valid and useful is one thing, but a trip by a member of the committee, after he has become a lame-duck Member of Congress, that can have no useful bearing on the consideration of future legislation by this body, is quite another thing.

I do not see how a trip for a Congressman who is not returning could be in the nature of a fact-finding trip for business of the Committee on Banking and Currency. To be sure, the amount of money spent on such a trip is small in relation to the overall Federal budget, but vacation travel at public expense by a lame-duck Member of Congress simply cannot be justified on any basis as a necessary expense. This practice, in my opinion, does not reflect credit on this body.

There are several bills before this Congress which would do this very thing, the original of which was introduced by the Honorable ROBERT MICHEL from Illinois. All such bills have been referred to the Committee on House Administration, and they would do what this amendment would do for all travel by all committees. However, it is not likely that these bills are going to be considered today or tomorrow.

I felt some obligation, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, while this House Resolution 18 is being considered today, to try and set a good example by putting our own house in order and imposing limitations where foreign travel at public expense just cannot be justified. This is not to say that any such travel has been authorized by the Committee on Banking and Currency in the past, or by any of its subcommittees, but others have authorized such travel, and we ought to go on record as being opposed to its continuation.

I, therefore, urge defeat of the motion on the previous question. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I have already vented my spleen on the subject of the closed rule, and I will not belabor that subject any more.

But, I should like to invite the attention of those interested to the fact that the resolution becomes effective on Janu-

ary 3, and the great Committee on Banking and Currency, I would note now, has not been able to organize itself yet and has had no meetings to date. I think that a committee, which is allowed to investigate and to travel, ought to be able to organize itself so that it can commence work on the public's business sometime sooner than 60 days after the Congress has convened.

We have pending before our committee, or should have if we ever get a committee, important bills such as the Revaluation, the Stabilization Act, the Housing Act—which, of course, expires in June. And while I realize the chairman is ailing at this time, he has not been ailing for most of the past 60 days. I would simply say that if we are going to be granted all of these wonderful powers, I think sometime the committee might want to organize itself and get together to start conducting the people's business.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding and I commend the gentleman on his remarks, as I do the other Members on our side who have spoken on behalf of minority staffing.

If we vote down the previous question on the resolution there will be an opportunity to vote on minority staffing. The gentleman from Illinois will offer an amendment which will be identical to the language in the Legislative Reorganization Act which has already been referred to.

I want to stress that this language will permit up to one-third minority staffing upon request. I am addressing myself now chiefly to the members of the Democratic Party, now the majority party. I want to make this point very clear. There will be some committees where there will be no request for minority staffing. Some committees have testified before the Committee on House Administration as late as this morning that there will not be such a request. The chairman and the ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee testified they consider their staff to be totally nonpartisan and totally professional and there is no desire expressed by the minority to have an allocation of staff.

This is not mandatory language. It is not mandatory at all. There are some committees which have already been very generous. The House Committee on Education and Labor is a notable example. The committee on which I serve, the Committee on Public Works has been extremely fair, although there were times when we had to fight hard for our rights.

The point I am making to the Democratic Members here is this, that the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) does not automatically impose upon all committee this one-third allocation. It will be upon request. There will be some committees where it will be requested, but this is not mandatory.

I would like to make another point to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). The gentleman was very articulate in his remarks on this subject. I commend the gentleman for his remarks, but the one thing I did not like about them was the gentleman chose to publicize that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri had written not one book on Congress but two books. The minority has enough problems in getting publicity without having a Member of the minority party publicize the majority's books. The minority wrote a book also. It was a great book but a bad seller. The gentleman had a chapter in it in that book, which was entitled, "We Propose a Modern Congress." The first chapter in that book is on the subject of minority staffing. I happened to write that chapter, which is why I am familiar with it. I am not going to burden the Members with the many excellent and lucid points I made in that chapter, I do want the Members to know however that I leaned heavily on quotations from distinguished Members of the Democratic Party and on quotations from a wide spectrum of political scientists.

This issue of minority staffing is a good issue. Everybody on the majority side knows it. I think it is time for them publicly to admit it. That is why I ask them to vote down the previous question.

The letter which the gentleman from Missouri referred to and addressed to all Members follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1973.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Wednesday, February 28, members of this body will have an opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to Congressional reform and to give expression to the bipartisan majority will, originally embodied in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

The vehicle will be the resolution authorizing travel and investigative activity of the Committees on Agriculture, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, Government Operations, District of Columbia, Interior and Insular Affairs, Judiciary, Post Office and Veterans Affairs.

An amendment has been prepared which reads as follows: "Up to one third of the funds authorized pursuant to this resolution shall be made available to the minority of the committee upon the request of a majority of such minority."

The resolutions, numbered H. Res. 13, 72, 74, 134, 162, 163, 175, 180 and 224, are to be submitted under a closed rule on the basis of an 8-4 vote of the Rules Committee, despite the recent Democratic Caucus vote to restrict use of this device. I urge your support in voting against the previous question to pave the way for the above amendment.

The intent is the same as language added to the Act of 1970, approved by a bipartisan majority of this body but later repealed.

The nonpartisan nature of our effort is exemplified by support from John Gardner of Common Cause and Ralph Nader, whose views on the subject and additional material can be found in the Congressional Record for February 5, pages 3229-3232.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself 10 minutes.

This is a rather intricate argument to make because I do not want to deal meanly with my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) or my colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

They are in error with regard to what is before us. What is before us is a privileged resolution under the hour rule. Under the hour rule, the person in control of the hour has control of the whole time.

The custom has developed over many years in the House, on a resolution that comes from the Committee on Rules, that one-half of that hour be yielded for debate to the minority, and, of course, that was done. But, there is an opportunity for an amendment, which will not be given to anybody on the House floor, because under the hour rule it is possible for the individual in control of the time to yield for an amendment. In other words, I could yield for an amendment, so that the description of the parliamentary situation has not been accurate up to this point.

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

Mr. BOLLING. May I continue until I am finished with the parliamentary problem?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to a point which was just made by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING). As I understood it, the gentleman said we were wrong when we said this is a closed rule.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman from New Hampshire may look at his original words when he gets his original copy back. He will see then, he will find that he indicated there was no other way to get an amendment in before the previous question. I am merely pointing out that there is another way, if I choose to yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. No, I would not.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for having made me correct on my previous statement.

Mr. BOLLING. If the gentleman feels that he is correct now, that is fine. I am trying to be kind about the whole thing and describe the situation accurately. If the gentleman feels that he is correct, that is all right, but I do not wish to engage in that kind of debate.

I am for the minority having up to one-third of the committee staff. I helped construct the provision of the Reorganization Act which provided that the minority would get one-third of the professional staff.

It had some key language in it which is the crux of the situation. When it gives to the minority an absolute right to select one-third, it reserves to the majority of the committee the right not to retain in its employ people who are of a certain kind. Now, it is understood that people of this particular kind would never be employed by those in the minority, but since the majority is responsible for the orderly management of committees, when it organizes committees it has to retain the responsibility across the board.

There may be some of us who are not aware that in this institution there have

been deliberately employed staff who were expected to wreck the operation of a committee, and the majority could not do a thing about it until a sufficient number of the minority became so outraged that they joined in correcting the situation.

Now, I am for—I repeat, I am for the minority having up to one-third of the staff, but the Reorganization Act said:

The committee shall appoint any person so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee.

Now, I got Mr. Gardner's letter. While I do not like to read to the House, I would like to read the reply I sent to him.

Mr. Gardner's letter came out flat for what is, I believe, the Anderson proposed amendment. I said:

DEAR JOHN: Thank you for your letter of February 26, 1973, concerning minority staffing. I heartily agree with its purpose and with the essence of its proposal and have long supported increased minority staffing. In fact, one third seems entirely fair and reasonable to me.

Of course, there are some of my Democratic colleagues who do not agree at all and with them I have little sympathy. On the other hand, many of the rest of us are aware of the ability of an irresponsible minority to use one or more staff men to wreck the orderly operation of a Committee and, in fact, under some circumstances bring its work to a standstill. True, this is not to be expected often and, in fact, has seldom happened. But since the majority is held responsible for the orderly operation of the committees, the majority of each committee must have the final say not on selection of minority staff but on whether or not a staff member, minority or majority, comports himself in a legitimate and constructive way and is of good character.

I can assure you that I will continue to seek a solution to the current deadlock so that a majority of the Rules Committee can report a resolution which will provide for the availability to the minority of an adequate staff of its choice and under its control of at least one-third of the total staff of each committee.

Perhaps, you will wonder why my resolution to create a Select Committee of the House to study House Committees provided for a 50-50 division of staff and other services between majority and minority in the light of what I have said above. There is a fundamental difference between such a committee dealing with a problem which is in no way is involved in partisan politics and a committee like Education and Labor which has to deal with the violently controversial and very partisan matter of compulsory arbitration and similar subjects.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

RICHARD BOLLING.

I submit to my friends on the minority and to my friends on the majority that while one may not agree with my position it is a position that is clear. It is a position that I have taken for a great many years.

I cannot conceive of my friends on the Republican side who would be responsible for policy on their side, in the event they became a majority, agreeing to allow completely uncontrolled minority staffing where there was no check by the majority—not the majority party, but the majority of the committee—on the matter.

I happen to believe that this whole

exercise is in the wrong place at the wrong time.

The rules, as I understand them, were adopted tentatively. I sympathize with my friends on the minority as to the delays that have been occasioned by the Democrats trying to emulate the minority in certain respects, in the way in which they handle their party organization and the organization of their side of committees. We have had some delays, but we think we have had some creative progress.

I submit a routine practice using a routine method is not really the right place to engage in a serious discussion.

Personally, as one Member of this institution, I regret the fact that in 1971 the Democrats saw fit to undo what had been done in the Reorganization Act. We labored long and hard in that Subcommittee on Reorganization to come up with a reasonable minority staffing position. I strongly support minority staffing.

I submit this is the wrong time to do it, to deal with it, and I therefore urge that the previous question be adopted.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Would the gentleman from Missouri yield for an amendment which would prohibit the use of the committee's funds by a "lameduck" Congressman after sine die adjournment?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri did not explain his situation in its entirety. The gentleman from Missouri, in order to yield, would feel compelled to get approval of the full Committee on Rules to so yield, the custom of not yielding for amendments is so well-established.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding from the gentleman's previous comment that he could yield for an amendment.

Mr. BOLLING. That is right; I could, but I would not feel that I should.

Mr. Speaker, I am not being clever; I am trying to make sure I am being understood.

Let me answer the gentleman further. Let me tell the gentleman what I would do.

I wholly agree it is ridiculous for a "lameduck" Member of this body or the other body to take trips that are not connected with congressional business. The gentleman said this was referred to House Administration. There had been some conversation about this, and I would think, although I do not know—I do not speak for a soul except myself—that in my opinion it would be wise, either directly or indirectly, to assure that that kind of thing did not happen, because it does in my opinion bring discredit on the Congress. However, I think we should follow the orderly process.

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

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, once again we have the question of minority staffing before us. This comes at a time

when the majority Members of this body have been giving a great deal of attention to reforming many of the anachronistic, outdated rules and customs that have grown up in Congress over the years. It also comes at a time when governmental action is being taken to secure and guarantee the legal rights—and indeed even the social and economic rights—of many of our long-neglected minority groups.

It would seem, therefore, both logical and appropriate for Congress to support the efforts of its own minority to secure equitable staffing arrangements in the standing committees. I urge the Democrats to vote against the previous question so that the travel and investigative resolutions can be amended to provide for minority staffing.

The rules of the House now provide for "fair consideration" of minority staffing needs. This fair consideration has resulted in some of the committees which operate on a partisan basis receiving as low as 4 percent, 6 percent or 11 percent of investigatory funds. Only one committee provided the minority more than one-third of the investigatory funds. I am not including in these figures those committees which operate on a bipartisan basis and do not divide their staff between minority and majority members.

Now I am not quite sure how to define "fair consideration" but I am certain that the statistics on committee staffing do not at present reflect anything at all resembling fair consideration. Republicans constitute 44 percent of the House of Representatives membership. We are not seeking 44 percent of the committee staffs. We have, instead, chosen to define "fair consideration" as "up to one-third" of the funds and staff available under the investigatory resolutions.

We feel this is fair. In fact, we have repeatedly gone on record saying that should the Republicans become the majority party in Congress, we would consider it only proper that the minority Democrats receive the same one-third staffing.

Republicans and Democrats have different viewpoints on many issues of vital importance. Our adversary system requires that differing viewpoints be presented as fully and forcefully as possible, so that all arguments can be fairly evaluated and decisions based upon as complete information as possible. In a time when public policy and political questions are growing geometrically more complex, not simpler, the minority cannot fulfill its responsibility to present its viewpoint unless it is adequately staffed with high-quality professionals in sufficient strength. The system does not now provide for this. I hope the majority members today will vote to change the system.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members from both sides of the aisle are slowly beginning to realize that extensive reforms of the legislative process are going to be needed if the Congress is going to live up to its constitutional duties. This has become one of the top issues in both the Democratic caucus and the Republican conference, and a number of measures have already been ap-

proved in those bodies to assure that reforms will be forthcoming.

We are today faced with a matter critical to effective reform in the House of Representatives. Nothing will enable the Congress to gain more respect and demand more attention than if it is able to pass the most responsible legislation possible for the American people.

At present, we cannot do this, for the legislation passing the House too often does not adequately reflect the thinking of nearly 40 percent of the House membership. The reason for this is the crux of our debate today: Inadequate committee staffing for Members of the minority party.

The committee staff is an essential source of input to nearly every major piece of legislation considered by the House each year. It is responsible for most of the research and drafting of proposed amendments, and its members prepare the reports to be read by the Members of the full House during their consideration of the bill. It is thus vital to the interests of the American people that the minority party of the House be adequately represented among the committee staffs.

Without this representation, Members of the minority party are left on their own in attaining the research material necessary to adequately challenge the position of the majority party in committee and on the floor of the House. The people represented by these Members are thus deprived of the effective representation they deserve. This was recognized by the Congress in the Legislative Reform Act of 1970, but the intent of that legislation has never been implemented.

Because I do not feel that this is fair to the people of our Nation, I cast my vote to vote down the previous question so we would be able to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 191, answered "present" 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—204

Abzug	Brooks	Denholm
Adams	Burke, Calif.	Dent
Addabbo	Burke, Mass.	Diggs
Alexander	Burleson, Tex.	Donohue
Anderson,	Burlison, Mo.	Dorn
Calif.	Burton	Drinan
Andrews, N.C.	Carney, Ohio	Dulski
Annuzio	Casey, Tex.	Eckhardt
Ashley	Chappell	Edwards, Calif.
Aspin	Chisholm	Eilberg
Barrett	Clark	Evans, Colo.
Bergland	Clay	Evins, Tenn.
Bevill	Conyers	Fascell
Bingham	Corman	Fisher
Blatnik	Cotter	Flood
Boland	Daniels	Flynt
Bolling	Dominick V.	Foley
Bowen	Danielson	Ford
Brademas	Davis, Ga.	William D.
Brasco	Davis, S.C.	Fountain
Breckinridge	Delaney	Fulton
Brinkley	Dellums	Fuqua

Gaydos	Madden	Roush
Gettys	Mahon	Roy
Ginn	Mann	Roybal
Gonzalez	Mathis, Ga.	Runnels
Grasso	Matsunaga	Ryan
Gray	Meeds	St Germain
Green, Pa.	Melcher	Sarbanes
Griffiths	Metcalfe	Schroeder
Gunter	Mezvinsky	Seiberling
Haley	Milford	Shipey
Hanley	Minish	Sikes
Hanna	Mink	Slack
Hansen, Wash.	Mitchell, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Harrington	Moakley	Staggers
Hawkins	Moorhead, Pa.	Stark
Hays	Morgan	Steed
Hébert	Murphy, Ill.	Stephens
Helstoski	Murphy, N.Y.	Stokes
Henderson	Natcher	Stratton
Hicks	Nedzi	Stubblefield
Hollifield	Nichols	Stuckey
Holtzman	Nix	Sullivan
Howard	Obey	Symington
Hungate	O'Hara	Taylor, N.C.
Ichord	O'Neill	Teague, Tex.
Jarman	Owens	Thompson, N.J.
Johnson, Calif.	Passman	Thornton
Jones, Ala.	Patten	Tiernan
Jones, N.C.	Perkins	Udall
Jones, Okla.	Poage	Ullman
Jones, Tenn.	Podell	Van Deerlin
Jordan	Preyer	Vanik
Karth	Price, Ill.	Vigorito
Kastenmeier	Randall	Waggonner
Kazen	Rangel	Waldie
Kluczynski	Rarick	Whitten
Kyros	Reid	Wilson,
Landrum	Reuss	Charles H.,
Leggett	Riegle	Calif.
Lehman	Roberts	Wilson,
Litton	Rodino	Charles, Tex.
Long, La.	Roe	Wolff
Long, Md.	Rogers	Wright
McCormack	Roncallo, Wyo.	Yates
McFall	Rooney, Pa.	Yatron
McKay	Rose	Young, Ga.
McSpadden	Rosenthal	Young, Tex.
Macdonald	Rostenkowski	Zablocki

NAYS—191

Abdnor	du Pont	McEwen
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Ala.	McKinney
Andrews,	Erlenborn	Madigan
N. Dak.	Esch	Mallory
Archer	Eshleman	Maraziti
Arends	Findley	Martin, Nebr.
Armstrong	Fish	Martin, N.C.
Ashbrook	Flowers	Mathias, Calif.
Bafalis	Ford, Gerald R.	Mayne
Baker	Forsythe	Mazzoli
Beard	Fraser	Michel
Bell	Frelinghuysen	Miller
Bennett	Frenzel	Mills, Md.
Blester	Frey	Minshall, Ohio
Blackburn	Fröhlich	Mitchell, N.Y.
Bray	Gibbons	Mizell
Broomfield	Gilman	Montgomery
Brotzman	Goldwater	Moorhead,
Brown, Mich.	Goodling	Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Mosher
Broyhill, N.C.	Grover	Myers
Broyhill, Va.	Gubser	Nelsen
Buchanan	Gude	O'Brien
Burgener	Guyer	Parris
Burke, Fla.	Hamilton	Pettis
Butler	Hammer-	Peyser
Byron	schmidt	Pike
Camp	Hanrahan	Powell, Ohio
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Pritchard
Cederberg	Harsha	Quie
Chamberlain	Hastings	Quillen
Clancy	Hechler, W. Va.	Rallsback
Clausen,	Heckler, Mass.	Regula
Don H.	Heinz	Rhodes
Cleveland	Hillis	Rinaldo
Cochran	Hinshaw	Robinson, Va.
Cohen	Holt	Roncallo, N.Y.
Collins	Horton	Rousselot
Conable	Hudnut	Ruth
Conlan	Hunt	Sandman
Conte	Hutchinson	Sarasin
Coughlin	Johnson, Colo.	Satterfield
Crane	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Cronin	Keating	Scherle
Daniel, Dan	Kemp	Schneebell
Daniel, Robert	Ketchum	Sebelius
W. Jr.	Kuykendall	Shoup
Davis, Wis.	Landgrebe	Shriver
Dellenback	Latta	Shuster
Dennis	Lott	Skubitz
Derwinski	McClory	Snyder
Devine	McCloskey	Spence
Dickinson	McCollister	Stanton,
Duncan	McDade	J. William

Steele	Treen	Willson, Bob
Steelman	Vander Jagt	Winn
Steiger, Ariz.	Veysey	Wyatt
Steiger, Wis.	Walsh	Wylder
Studds	Wampler	Wylie
Symms	Ware	Wyman
Talcott	Whalen	Young, Fla.
Taylor, Mo.	White	Young, Ill.
Teague, Calif.	Whitehurst	Young, S.C.
Thomson, Wis.	Widnall	Zion
Thone	Wiggins	Zwach
Towell, Nev.	Williams	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Culver

NOT VOTING—35

Badillo	Harvey	Fatman
Biaggi	Hogan	Pepper
Breaux	Hosmer	Pickle
Brown, Calif.	Huber	Price, Tex.
Carey, N.Y.	King	Rees
Clawson, Del	Koch	Robison, N.Y.
Collier	Lent	Rooney, N.Y.
de la Garza	Lujan	Ruppe
Dingell	Mailliard	Sisk
Downing	Mills, Ark.	Smith, N.Y.
Gialmo	Mollohan	Stanton,
Green, Oreg.	Moss	James V.

So the previous question was ordered. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.
Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Harvey against.
Mr. Gialmo for, with Mr. Collier against.
Mr. Koch for, with Mr. Lent against.
Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Hogan against.
Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Huber against.
Mr. Pickle for, with Mr. Lujan against.
Mr. Rees for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Mailliard against.
Mr. James V. Stanton for, with Mr. Ruppe against.

Mr. Carey of New York for, with Mr. Smith of New York against.

Mr. Badillo for, with Mr. Robison of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Brown of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this matter.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 72 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 72

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a

whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 1 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the full committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the full committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) However, with respect to matters within its jurisdiction pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act outside the United States.

(c) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

SEC. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committees' activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be

furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is specifically authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration, expansion, and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the use of agricultural commodities pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements and commodity marketing and pricing systems upon United States agriculture.

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

(3) All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies.

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers.

(5) The formulation and development of improved programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities.

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees.

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended; the development of land use programs pursuant to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 and the Agricultural Act of 1970.

(8) All programs of food assistance or distribution supported in whole or in part by funds authorized to be used by the Department of Agriculture, including but not limited to the food stamp program, the commodity distribution program, the school milk program, and programs established pursuant to the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

(9) The implementation and administration of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, the Wholesome Poultry Products Act of 1968, and the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970, including the establishment and development of inspection services as required by the Acts.

(10) All matters relating to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, and all agricultural chemicals registered and regulated under such Act.

(11) All matters relating to rural development.

(12) All other matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, beginning at line 15, strike out all of section 4.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield

30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture has concluded in section 4, the spelling out of the grounds of jurisdiction it felt that it already had, and the Committee on Rules decided on this one and another one, the one from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to eliminate that spelling out in order to assure that there was no unintentional intrusion on a controversial question of committee jurisdiction.

In other words, we left the status quo as far as jurisdiction on this one. Otherwise, it is a normal resolution about which I know of no controversy.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, obviously it would be possible, as we did in connection with House Resolution 18, in connection with this resolution, House Resolution 72, and the seven resolutions that follow, to make the identical argument that we did on the first resolution of voicing our objection to the procedure under which they are being brought to the floor.

However, I am going to be more considerate of the membership of the House than that. I think we have made our point. I think the record will speak. I hope not only today and tomorrow, but in time to come, as to the correctness of the case we sought to make.

I shall take only 1 minute, or perhaps 2 minutes, to respond to one argument that was made by my friend from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, because he moved the previous question and I had no opportunity to reply to his earlier remarks.

As I interpreted those remarks, he found some objection to the language which I would have suggested in the way of an amendment to House Resolution 18 had it been possible for me to offer such an amendment, on the grounds that it would make it possible for the minority to hire someone as a member of the staff who would be, I think he used the words, "a hatchet man"; who would disturb the orderly process in which the committee sought to carry on its responsibilities.

As I listened to the gentleman from Missouri, I could not help but be reminded of something that I had read just the other day that was written by the very distinguished lady who has now become the new Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Ray. She was expounding a bit on her philosophy as a good civil servant. I thought it was very interesting that she has used the analogy with which she was familiar as a biologist, of a living organism. I quote:

Every organism you can think of has this same—if you want to call it—conflict. No organism can be strong without stress. In our society there is a tendency to make things easy, not to subject ourselves to discomfort. An organization without challenge, competition, is like a jellyfish.

I would suggest that there might even be a little virtue in the idea of a staff that was somewhat combative, and one that would introduce a little stress into the committee system. I am not sure that would be all bad.

Perhaps if what the gentleman from Missouri has informed us is so, we will have another day in which to make that argument in fuller extent, and hopefully another occasion to debate the resolution to provide minority staffing for the standing committees of the House which I and the gentleman from New Hampshire and others have offered.

So, therefore, I rise to inform the Members of the House that on this resolution and on those that follow it is not my intention to call for RECORD votes on ordering the previous question, although there may be others on my side of the aisle who may wish to do so. For my part, I will rest my case on the record made on the first resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to respond for about a minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) on some of the statements he made about minority staffing.

We had some hearings this morning in the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration, as to financing committees. I noticed the minority members of that committee were in somewhat of a dilemma almost immediately, because on the one hand some of them wanted 30 percent of the staff to be minority staff and on the other hand they did not want to increase the amount of money that the committee got.

I take the position it is all right with me if they have the staff, but as a committee chairman and as chairman of a committee with a lot of routine work I have to have a staff to get the work out. I do not really call it a majority staff; it is a working staff.

So I might point out to the gentleman from Illinois that if Members want this business of increased staff for the minority then I hope they will be prepared to pay the increased price.

So far as this Member is concerned, I do not have too much objection either up or down the line about it.

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I think the gentleman makes a good point. For one, I would not disagree that if we want adequate staffing we have to pay for it.

Mr. HAYS. I had a little experience on this. We got into a jam the other day. I do not blame anybody, but I asked a member of the minority staff to do something, and he informed me he did not take orders from me, that all I did was to put their names on the payroll. Of course, I did tell him that by the same token I could take him off the payroll.

I think that if we are going to have a staff of 50, let us say, that is needed to do the work, and someone wants 30 percent additional, they had better be prepared to vote for 30 percent more money. I would have no objection if they would do that.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I favor minority staffing. I favor stress in or-

ganisms. I favor organisms and institutions like the House of Representatives and its committees that are not overwhelmed by chaos. That is my only reservation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 256, 93d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime affecting the United States the following Members of the House: Mr. PEPPER, of Florida, chairman; Mr. WALDIE, of California; Mr. BRASCO, of New York; Mr. MANN, of South Carolina; Mr. MURPHY, of Illinois; Mr. RANGEL, of New York; Mr. WIGGINS, of California; Mr. STEIGER, of Arizona; Mr. WINN, of Kansas; Mr. SANDMAN, of New Jersey; and Mr. KEATING, of Ohio.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 74 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 74

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 13 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

SEC. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on the Ju-

diciary of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy concerning this resolution. I merely repeat the stand I indicated I was taking earlier.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION AND STUDY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 134 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 134

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 20 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to

sit and act subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) In addition, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction regarding—

(1) medical facilities, hospitals, counseling programs, and veterans' benefits for American veterans and servicemen in the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam;

(2) present counseling programs, the quality of medical care, and the operation of education, pension, and other programs for American veterans and servicemen in Canada, Mexico, the United Kingdom, West Germany, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, Spain, Italy, and Greece; and

(3) cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) For the purposes of carrying out the investigations, studies, and inquiries enumerated in subsection (b) above, the committee is authorized to send not more than eleven members (six majority and five minority) and three staff assistants to those countries within which such investigation, study, or inquiry is authorized to be conducted.

(d) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

Sec. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country

whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

Mr. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the resolution be considered as read and that it be printed in the RECORD. It only explains the boilerplate language with regard to the limitations.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if there is no substantial difference between this resolution and any of the others? Is that not true?

Mr. BOLLING. There is very specifically no substantial difference between this resolution and any of the others, and there is no difference between the language I am asking to have considered as read and a great many of the others. It is boilerplate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, and I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). Pending that I yield myself such time as I may use.

Let me say I know of no controversy, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on the presumption that the minority will not be given one-third of the staffing under this resolution, I cannot help but take note of the fact that today the majority party gained a new member. That new member at one time was most concerned about the rights of minorities and congressional reorganization. Thus it is noteworthy that in his first vote cast as a member of this new party he voted against giving adequate staffing to the minority.

It sort of reminds me of a situation where my alma mater, the University of California, at one time lost a Rose Bowl game to Georgia Tech when our own center got a little confused and picked up the ball and ran the wrong way. Benny Lom tackled him on the 2-yard line. On the next play a California back was thrown for a 2-point safety which allowed Georgia Tech to win the game.

It is a strange coincidence that that center on the University of California team has been known ever since as "Wrong Way" Riegels.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 134, the pending resolution which

proposes to extend the investigative authority for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during the present Congress, differs slightly from the original investigative authority granted in the 92d Congress only in those provisions which pertain to travel. The investigative authority granted in previous Congresses is essentially the same, but the language relative to travel authority has been revised in an attempt to combine language which the Rules Committee approved last Congress in a resolution granting the basic investigative authority and a later resolution pertaining only to travel of our Members and staff outside the United States.

Actually, the present resolution is more restrictive, as to travel, than the two resolutions approved by the last Congress. Section 2(c) of House Resolution 134 authorizes travel of 11 Members—six majority and five minority—and three staff assistants to the countries named in the resolution. The initial travel authority granted last Congress (H. Res. 20) authorized travel of not more than five Members and two staff assistants to the Philippines and South Vietnam, and in addition authorized travel of an unlimited number of Members and staff to those countries where veterans' cemeteries or national monuments are located. Later in the 92d Congress, it became apparent that the travel authority contained in House Resolution 20 was too restrictive, and House Resolution 538 was approved. That resolution did not supersede House Resolution 20, but rather supplemented that authority, and authorized travel of not more than 11 Members—six majority and five minority—and three staff assistants to study various veterans' programs in Southeast Asia, the Philippines, and Western Europe.

The need for this investigative authority has not diminished. The Veterans' Administration continues to operate a large veterans' benefit program in the Philippines, where it maintains an office and where we continue to support a hospital. There is also a national cemetery in that country.

There are cemeteries and national monuments in a great many of the countries in Western Europe, including England, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, France, and Italy.

The non-service-connected pension program operates in virtually all of the countries in Western Europe, with a heavy concentration of veterans in Ireland, Italy, and Greece. There are also many pensioners residing in Mexico and in Canada, countries included in the present resolution which, by oversight, were not included in that approved in the 92d Congress.

Veterans are attending most of the major universities of Europe, as well as universities located in Canada and Mexico.

The military PREP program functions primarily in Germany, where there is a heavy concentration of military personnel.

Our committee has been, and continues to be, very interested in providing some legislation to combat the problem

which exists in drug abuse, particularly among our military personnel in certain Southeast Asian countries, and this is our principal reason for requesting authority for travel to the countries specified in House Resolution 134. This problem also exists in Europe, of course, but to a somewhat lesser extent.

I hope the House will approve House Resolution 134. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is my intention to use the same care and discretion in actual use of the authority granted as did my very distinguished predecessor in the office of chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 175

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 6 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

SEC. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the

United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the reason for making that unanimous-consent request was for the same reason that I made the request before on the prior resolution in that we are dealing with boilerplate and the usual language. I know of no controversy on this resolution.

I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois for the usual 30 minutes if he desires to yield time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. We have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 180 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 180

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 15 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any

subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any members designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

SEC. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

Mr. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the resolution may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy whatsoever regarding this resolution, but I would like to tell the House that I made a mistake, and we failed to call up a resolution in its proper order. The next resolution that I shall call up is going to be out of order. It should have been called up before the last two resolutions, and that will be House Resolution 163.

As far as this resolution is concerned, I know of no controversy regarding it whatsoever, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I take the time of the House only to inform them that in the discussion with the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), I am informed that by agreement with the ranking minority member this committee has allotted one-third of the staff of that committee to the minority. I think the gentleman ought to be publicly recognized for that fact, and that that fact ought to be acknowledged, and I mention it therefore this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 163 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 163

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 10 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, including (1) water resources planning and research programs of the Department of the Interior, (2) national outdoor recreation plans and land use planning, (3) long-range domestic minerals and energy programs affecting mining interests generally and the mineral resources of the public lands, and (4) the environmental impact of laws and programs within its jurisdiction. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to set and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings

and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States.

(c) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 6, after the word "Representatives" change the comma to a period and strike out the words "including (1) water" and strike out all of lines 7 through 12 on page 1.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 224 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 224

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 8 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by sub-

pena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

SEC. 3 (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purpose of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying the expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this is an identical resolution to the one which was passed by the 92d Congress for the Committee on Government Operations. I know of no objection by the gentleman from Illinois.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 345) entitled "Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes."

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 257 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 257

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) However, with respect to matters within its jurisdiction pursuant to subsection (a) of clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and the formulation of methods of preserving the Federal interest in the Capital City while promoting local and regional interest, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act outside the United States.

(c) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the rules of the House, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1975, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1975.

Sec. 3. (a) Funds authorized for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any

other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

Mr. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the resolution may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any controversy on this issue.

Does the gentleman from Iowa desire me to yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would yield.

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

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

What representation was made to the Rules Committee as to the necessity for foreign travel on the part of this committee which deals only with the District of Columbia?

Mr. BOLLING. The statement made I found very persuasive and so persuasive that I wondered why I had not thought of it myself. The chairman of the committee indicated one of the great dilemmas of the Committee on the District of Columbia was the question of the status of the District which in the United States is entirely unique. It is the Capital City of the United States and it has a local government.

The chairman made the point, which seemed so obvious to me that I wondered why I had never thought of it myself, which was that the only place he could look at other similar situations was in foreign countries because there are no other national capitals with local governments except in other countries.

I would say in addition to that the

chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Diggs), has been the chairman of an important subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a number of years and has traveled extensively. I think he has been in 41 countries on one continent and he and the other gentlemen who appear before us, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs are very experienced travelers. It was very clear to me that there is no intent to abuse this opportunity, that the intent was exactly what they indicated it was, and I believe those gentlemen should have every opportunity to travel for this committee.

Mr. GROSS. Has foreign travel ever before been approved for this committee?

Mr. BOLLING. I do not know that it has ever been but I thought the presentation was very persuasive.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think this was a reasonably good time, due to the financial stress and strain in this country, to rather stay with what little economy has been practiced on the part of the committees of the Congress?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman from Iowa and I are old friends and I do not really want to engage in a debate on that subject. I would simply say to him that if the Committee on the District of Columbia could figure out a way to improve the government of the District and the situation in the District in a manner that the gentleman mentioned earlier in any way, I would think the expenditure was very well spent. I think a serious effect is going to be made by the present chairman and the present committee to try to rationalize the situation that exists in the District of Columbia and I am for giving them every opportunity to find out how to do that. I sympathize with the gentleman from Iowa and with the point he is making and it is a valid point, but I think we may end up saving a great deal of money if we can figure out how we can run the District of Columbia more effectively.

Mr. GROSS. I think that is a full-time job, both on the part of the present District Government and on the part of this committee. That is one of the reasons why I oppose this resolution, because I think the committee ought to spend its time here, and not in some foreign fleshpot some place.

Mr. BOLLING. I understand the position of the gentleman from Iowa, but in my view the case was persuasive, and I am persuaded. I support the resolution.

Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to use time?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be asked where this committee proposes to go; to what points around the world and what way—points this committee propose to travel?

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

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the

gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his explanation of the objective.

That is simply to assess the comparative differences of foreign capitals, and out of this experience, hopefully, to find some way out of the quagmire that has existed for so long in this District with respect to the relationship between the Federal Government and local interests.

As the gentleman has pointed out, I know of no other area where we can intelligently make this kind of assessment except in some of the older capitals, comparable capitals in the free world and other areas.

Mr. GROSS. Where are some of those capitals?

Mr. DIGGS. For example, in London we have the kind of examples which I believe we can draw from. We have some of the greatest experts there; as a matter of fact, the greatest expert on the whole subject.

Mr. GROSS. How does the government of the city of London compare with the government of the District of Columbia?

Mr. DIGGS. Well, this is what we expect to find out.

Mr. GROSS. I think we can look at the population figures to ascertain there is little or no similarity by way of population as between the two places.

Mr. DIGGS. If the gentleman would yield further—

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. DIGGS. I think the gentleman can anticipate that this will be a serious undertaking.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether it is going to be a serious undertaking, or whether it is junketing for some people. I do not know.

I am intrigued by the fact that this is the first time, so far as I know—and I have been here a couple of years—that foreign travel has ever been authorized for the District Committee. It is going to take a lot of persuasion on the part of somebody here today to convince me that this committee ought to embark upon foreign travel.

The gentleman has informed the newspapers that he wants to go to Birmingham, England. Why does the gentleman wish to go to Birmingham?

Mr. DIGGS. Because one of the greatest experts on the whole subject of the relationship between a nation's capital and the local interests is located in Birmingham, England.

Mr. GROSS. He must be a real expert if he can draw any real comparison between Washington, D.C., and Birmingham, England.

I went through there one time a good many years ago on the way to France. It is an industrial city. The biggest industry in Washington, D.C., is shuffling papers.

Why in the world do you want an expert from Birmingham, England, to tell you what you should do in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DIGGS. Well, there have been experts from Birmingham coming over here seeking our advice with respect to a lot of different matters. That is just one aspect of it. That is just one person. That is just one capital.

Mr. GROSS. Birmingham, England, is not the capital of anything except perhaps a province or a county.

Mr. DIGGS. I think the gentleman understood what I meant by that.

We also have some experience we can draw from in such areas as Brussels, where there is an international community, and Geneva, which is another place where they have an international community and a national community and local interests.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am interested in the fact that you want to go to Geneva. What is there in Geneva? Geneva is not the capital of Switzerland, is it?

Mr. DIGGS. It is unique in that it has the international community, the national interests and the local interests all in one area, that we expect to examine to see what applies to the situation that exists here in this city of ours.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think that his committee can keep busy without junketing abroad to get so-called expert opinion from an industrial city in England or from some money-changer in Geneva or something like that? Does the gentleman not think the committee members can keep themselves occupied here looking into the business of the District of Columbia?

Mr. DIGGS. Well, we expect to be very busy. We have a very elaborate program. This is just one small aspect of it. The subcommittee that will be assigned this task is the subcommittee that will have oversight to evaluate all these self-determination matters.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I honestly believe that consideration should be given to the fine work done by the Nelsen committee, which went into the government of the District of Columbia in great depth and great breadth. That report is now ready for implementation and execution. It seems to me the Committee on the District of Columbia should devote its full time and attention to utilization of that work and its recommendations, rather than seeking advice by travel to countries A, B, C, and D.

I respectfully agree with the gentleman from Iowa and disagree with my friend from Michigan. There is a lot of work to do right here, in taking the Nelsen committee report and getting it implemented. Therefore, I honestly, strongly recommend that foreign travel be denied for this committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the defeat of the move to strike down the previous question earlier this afternoon, I am not going to make an issue of the previous question as to this resolution, but I certainly am going to attempt to get a vote on the resolution as a whole in the hope that it will be defeated and the committee will then bring it back without the foreign travel provision.

I hope the House will vote against the

resolution. The next thing we know the committee members will want to travel to Ouagadougou.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to comment further on this matter, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

I believe my friend the minority leader is wrong. It is very easy to make this into a joke.

The District of Columbia has been with us for a very long time. It has been a very difficult problem. We have not come up with solutions.

The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota I am sure has done great work. I have great confidence in his ability.

But as to the cost, we should not deny the new chairman of a committee which for very many years has operated in a certain way the opportunity to take a limited look at the way in which other foreign countries deal with problems that are acute.

We have had a problem, for example, of protecting the diplomatic community here. Other countries have had longer experience in that area. We were not as large a diplomatic center until the last 30 or 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that although I sympathize with the view that the solution is here, it is true that sometimes good things can be learned from other people.

I would like to cite an example from my own experience. I travel almost not at all at Government expense. When I travel from here, I like to do it on my own time and go on a vacation or go home to my district, one of the two.

But I found as chairman of the subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee that if I wanted to get the modern, up-to-date, innovative notions on urban planning, on the problems of cities, that I had to go to the capitals of a number of other countries, and I was urged to do this by a number of the members of this administration.

So for the first time in nearly 20 years I took a committee trip, and we got information which, believe it or not, seemed to be used by this administration in many of its approaches to certain technical aspects of housing and planning.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a wealth of information that may be learned from other nations, other free enterprise economies, and other mixed economies and societies about how they govern themselves and how they do things, and I really honestly believe it would be a great mistake to single out this committee as one committee that should not have an opportunity to pursue the truth wherever it is.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I will be delighted to yield to my friend from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), misinterpreted the intent of my remarks a few minutes ago. I was not being humorous or even seeking to be; I spoke, I thought, very seriously.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, and the question of humor was not directed to him. The gentleman was not trying to be humorous; he was being serious. I should have punctuated it better; the laughter from others was what disturbed me. I do apologize.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this clarification.

I have since checked and I find that the Nelsen Commission's recommendations totaled better than 450, and that they are included in three sizable volumes. The talent that served on that commission was very broad, and they did an excellent job under the leadership of one of our most able colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I, in all sincerity, say that this committee could perform a greater service by taking those recommendations and concentrating on their implementation and execution rather than visiting this capital or that capital of a foreign country.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS), the member of the committee who, I understand, will be dealing directly with the problem.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I might say to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), that this is not a great attempt to conduct a long series of world travels.

In answer to the gentleman's question or his statement about the Nelsen Commission report, the subcommittee has already taken that report under consideration, has taken the various parts of it and started looking through it, and it is an excellent report.

Mr. Speaker, it does not touch on some of the severe problems such as, for example, the relationship between the Congress, the Executive, and the local government of this city.

Here is part of the problem so that the gentleman understands. This is not something that has to be thought about. We will have a meeting on Thursday, which will be an open meeting, so any of you who wish to attend are invited. We will be having a discussion of the agenda as to how this committee goes about implementing the Nelsen committee report together with handling bills presented to us which suggest varying forms of local government and their relationships with the Federal Government. This was not addressed by the Nelsen committee report. We must deal with it in one form or another.

The same goes for the court system. We have a report also from one of the local groups here that went through the capitals of Europe. We will be asking the committee if they want to see the reports of what Dr. Robison, who is with the University of London, says with regard

to the relationship of cities and national governments. He is dealing there with the city of London. If it is better and more efficient for the committee to bring him here, we will certainly do so.

Also we have the fact that the University of Maryland has one professor in Brussels, Dr. Martin Heister, and another in London studying this particular relationship.

The director of one of the institutes in Maryland is doing this, also.

There are a lot of people in this country who are not satisfied with the way that we are running the National Capital's business. I can assure the gentleman from Iowa and the minority leader that if any trips are planned into these areas, they will be planned by the whole committee, who will be looking at it and looking at the specific relationships and talking to specific people.

I will say in the travels that I have done for other committees of this Congress, both the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have never found that these trips were any great pleasure junkets. We are usually scheduled in and out of towns and places and see people at such a rapid rate that by the time you get back you are exhausted.

I for one will say that if we are involved in these trips, that is the way they will be scheduled, and the taxpayers of the United States will receive the full benefit of them. We certainly intend to implement the Nelsen committee report.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield so that I can make an observation and ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BOLLING. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I heard that story all the time about how hard Members work on these junkets. It is a common summer complaint that they are overworked on these foreign junkets. Some of the stories that come back to us, however, dispute the fact that everyone works like hell when they go on a foreign trip.

Did the gentleman say there is someone in some foreign capital somewhere who is dissatisfied with the way the Government of Washington, D.C., is being run?

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. That is true, but I was not making that point. I did not mention that at all. If the gentleman wants to know if it is true, it is true, but I do not consider that a valid factor one way or the other. I am interested and the chairman and the committee are interested in how you make this Capital City work better—no more and no less.

This is no job, I might state to the gentleman, that I look forward to with a great deal of relish or that I have sought out, but somebody some place in this body is going to have to do it. If the chairman indicates that he wants to do it or wants me to do it, we will try to

work with the recommendations that the gentleman from Minnesota has made, which are excellent, and with the demands coming in from various parts of the country and from here and the questions asked by Members of Congress as to why we do not make it work better.

I have spent a lot of time here and I am sure the gentleman has too, and I think he will agree with me some improvement in our practices in the Nation's Capital's government are in order.

Mr. GROSS. I will tell you what I think of that. If we have to send some committee people out on foreign travel, on a committee which has never had permission for foreign travel before, if we now have to send them off to some foreign capital to get answers on how to run the District government, then we are in a whole hell of a lot worse shape than I thought we were.

Mr. ADAMS. I might say to the gentleman we are.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I must say that relative to foreign travel I anticipated there would be some difficulty in dealing with it. But I must say to my dear friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) that there have already been some benefits because of it. We have a great difficulty in getting people to accept an assignment on the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I have had two applicants since the resolution was reported from the Rules Committee. So there are some who might find that a matter of particular interest as it relates to this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, have you already made a commitment to take a junket someplace?

Mr. NELSEN. No, we have not.

Mr. GROSS. Even before the authorization?

Mr. NELSEN. No, we have not.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his observation.

Let me say this: With our new chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) and with the meticulous way in which he is going about setting up the organization and the work of the committee, I have an idea that the so-called Nelsen Commission report will be given careful examination under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan and subcommittee chairmen such as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS). I believe they will give careful consideration to the recommendations of the Commission and I should add that some have already been implemented by the mayor. So, I believe that the Nelsen Commission recommendations will be given a high priority.

Very frankly, it is my feeling that we have plenty to do to occupy all of our time given the Commission's recommendations. But, I want to also say that we are starting out with a new committee chairman, and I, as the ranking minority member on the committee, wish to say that our relations have been extremely good. I intend to cooperate with

my chairman, and for that reason I supported the resolution before the Rules Committee. I also hope that it will be passed here in the House and I will vote for it.

Let me close by saying that if there is travel outside the country I am sure that it will be requested for a good and proper purpose and that the authority given in this resolution will not be abused.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. BOWEN. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to the expenditure of any tax dollars to enable the House District of Columbia Committee to travel overseas.

As long as a man such as Senator JOHN STENNIS can be gunned down by hoodlums in front of his home, the District of Columbia Committee ought to find plenty to occupy its time here, rather than roaming around Europe at the taxpayers' expense.

I feel we need to economize everywhere possible in the Federal budget, and this is one place where we can save the taxpayers thousands of dollars.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 153, nays 234, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—153

Abzug	Evins, Tenn.	Matsunaga
Adams	Fascell	Mazzoli
Addabbo	Findley	Meeds
Ashley	Flood	Melcher
Aspin	Foley	Metcalfe
Barrett	Fraser	Mezvinsky
Bergland	Gialmo	Mink
Bingham	Gibbons	Mitchell, Md.
Blatnik	Grasso	Moakley
Boland	Gray	Moorhead, Pa.
Bolling	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Brademas	Griffiths	Moss
Brasco	Gude	Murphy, Ill.
Breckinridge	Haley	Murphy, N.Y.
Brooks	Hanley	Natcher
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi
Broyhill, Va.	Harrington	Nelsen
Burke, Calif.	Hawkins	Nix
Burke, Mass.	Hays	Obey
Burton	Helstoski	O'Hara
Carey, N.Y.	Holifield	O'Neill
Carney, Ohio	Holtzman	Owens
Clay	Howard	Patten
Conyers	Hungate	Pepper
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Perkins
Cotter	Jones, Ala.	Poage
Daniels	Jordan	Podell
Dominick V.	Kastenmeier	Preyer
Danielson	Kluczynski	Price, Ill.
Delaney	Kuykendall	Reid
Dellums	Landgrebe	Reuss
Denholm	Leggett	Rhodes
Dent	Lehman	Riegle
Derwinski	Litton	Rodino
Diggs	Long, La.	Roe
Dingell	Long, Md.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Donohue	McClory	Rooney, Pa.
Drinan	McFall	Rosenthal
Dulski	McKinney	Roybal
Eckhardt	MacSpadden	Sandman
Edwards, Calif.	MacDonald	Sarbanes
Ellberg	Madden	Schroeder
Evans, Colo.	Mann	Slack

Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stanton,
James V.
Stark
Steed
Stephens
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey

Abdnor
Alexander
Anderson,
Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Bafalis
Baker
Beard
Bell
Bennett
Bevill
Blester
Blackburn
Bowen
Bray
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collins
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Culver
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W. Jr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dennis
Devine
Dickinson
Downing
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Forsythe
Fountain

Studds
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waldie
Whalen
White

NAYS—234

Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gunter
Guyer
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Bray
Hanrahan
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heinz
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Hogan
Holt
Horton
Huber
Hudnut
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kazen
Keating
Kemp
Ketchum
Kyrus
Latta
Lott
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
Madigan
Mahon
Mallory
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Michel
Miller
Mills, Md.
Minish
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Mosher
Myers
Nichols
Parris

Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Young, Ga.
Young, Tex.

Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sikes

Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Symington
Teague, Tex.

Wilson,
Charles, Tex.

So the resolution was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Blaggi for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Koch for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Lujan against.

Mr. Rees for, with Mr. Maraziti against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.

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

Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. Regula against.

Mr. Badillo for, with Mr. Ruppe against.

Mr. Chisholm for, with Mr. Smith of New York against.

Mr. Symington for, with Mr. Lent against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. E de la Garza with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Dorn with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Breaux.

Mr. McKay with Mr. Milford.

Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Robison of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks at the appropriate place in debate on each resolution.

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

There was no objection.

POOR MAIL SERVICE

(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, several times within the past month, I have inserted statements into the RECORD listing cases of poor mail service throughout the country.

Today I have a horror story of my own to add.

On January 10, I wrote Frank Stanton, president of CBS, to ask him to confirm or deny rumors that CBS would begin showing X-rated movies on late-night television. I had received much adverse comment from constituents citing this fact and urging that Congress place a ban on the showing of X-rated films.

For weeks I waited for the response. I had promised to send on Mr. Stanton's reply to the constituents who had demanded congressional action in this matter, and I became worried that we would have to finally notify these constituents that Mr. Stanton had apparently chosen not to answer my inquiry

NOT VOTING—44

Hastings
Heckler, Mass.
Hosmer
King
Koch
Landrum
Lent
Lujan
McKay
Mailliard
Maraziti
Milford
Mills, Ark.
Mollohan
O'Brien
Passman
Patman
Pickle
Price, Tex.
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Robison, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.

and we would have to presume the rumor true.

Finally, on February 19—40 days after my inquiry was mailed out—I received the long-awaited letter. It reads as follows:

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 15, 1973.

Hon. ELWOOD H. HILLIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HILLIS: In response to your letter of January 10—received only today—concerning "plans which have allegedly been proposed by CBS to show X-rated films," I would make these comments.

First, no such announcement has been made by CBS, nor has any such policy been adopted. Every motion picture presented on either the CBS Television Network or any CBS Owned television station must meet the standards of both the Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters and our own CBS program practices, which frequently are even more severe.

Second, when a theatrical motion picture is considered for CBS broadcast, every foot of film is reviewed. Many times, sequences which were regarded as acceptable for theatre showing require editing to fit television standards. On occasion, it has been possible to remove from a picture a sequence rated X for theatrical showing and to present an edited version which meets our rigid standards. In no instance has material been broadcast by CBS which the Motion Picture Association's Code and Rating Administration has rated X for theatre showing. Nor is there any plan to change our firm practice that X-rated theatre films are not acceptable for television until and unless all objectionable footage has been deleted.

I hope I have been able to reassure you on a subject about which CBS policy is clear and firm.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK STANTON.

Somewhere, somehow, this letter had gotten lost for almost 4 weeks in the U.S. mail system. It is impossible to pin down where the mixup came, because the preferential mail network recently established assures that the mail goes through so circuitous a route in its delivery that no one could trace its exact journey.

For 40 days, Indiana residents have continued to believe, and spread, the rumor that CBS would show X-rated movies. These people and others they contacted, undoubtedly have also contacted CBS to indicate their strong opposition. Had I received the CBS response 30 days earlier, it could have saved these constituents and myself, as well as CBS, a lot of trouble, not to mention embarrassment.

Rapid communications is something we have come to take for granted today, as part of our modern era. We expect that when we ask for information via mail or telephone or telegram, that we will receive an immediate reply. When we do not, we assume the other party is at fault or has chosen not to reply; this is how much faith we have in our communications network and its ability to function as it should.

It can be argued that we maybe should change our presumption of faith in the reliability of the mail service. But to me, this would not only be a step back into the dark ages, but would represent a case of the tail wagging the horse.

Imagine if our letter to CBS, instead

of dealing with a legislative matter, had involved financial information or even some form of reimbursement for services. Millions of dollars travels through our mails daily—imagine the loss, in terms of interest, which a 40-day delay could involve when applied to such large amounts of money.

It is my hope that in the future, the time-honored adage of "Neither rain nor snow nor sleet will halt the mail" will not become a matter for reverie solely by the oldtimers. I intend to see that my grandchildren not only can quote this adage in the future, but can bank on its message.

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP
CHAIRMAN PHILLIP BURTON
WELCOMES REPRESENTATIVE
DON RIEGLE

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to welcome to our side of the aisle the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (DON RIEGLE). DON's action yesterday, and BROWNIE REID's switch to the Democratic Party last year, must be read as a commentary on the role of dissent in the Republican Party.

DON's statement yesterday in Flint, Mich., gives eloquent testimony to the role of dissenting views in President Nixon's Republican Party. Simply put, dissent is not tolerated. Those who oppose White House dictates are given but two choices—shut up or get out. Mr. Speaker, I submit that a political party that governs itself in such a tyrannical manner is a clear danger to the country, because the process through which a party governs itself cannot help but affect its attitude toward our institutions of government and our constitutional protections.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party which DON is joining has traditionally encompassed a broad spectrum of ideological view. Both in the national Democratic Party and here in our party caucuses in the Congress, we have opened our party to public scrutiny and reformed our party rules to guarantee that all points of view will be heard and taken into account. Our party structures are not—and never will be—the private preserve of one man, but the property of the millions of voters across this country who elect us to office.

Mr. Speaker, DON's crossing the aisle is an act of high political courage. Should the pressure to conform become too intense for any of those remaining on the other side of the aisle, I want to extend an invitation to join DON and BROWNIE in walking over into the sunshine.

Mr. Speaker, DON's statement of February 27 in Flint, is more than a mere announcement of his intention to join our party. It is a deeply felt and cogent analysis of what is wrong with this country today. I commend it to all Members and to the people of this country, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., FLINT, MICHIGAN, FEBRUARY 27, 1973

All of us who take part in public life find that our ability to directly influence events

is almost always limited by circumstances over which we have little control. The constant struggle to develop a significant degree of influence on events is really the central challenge of political figures in a self-government system.

In the political struggle of competing ideas and personalities, each participant must constantly cross-check himself to insure that his methods and efforts are both consistent with his conscience and as effective as possible in helping to solve the most urgent problems facing the American people.

It is in this context that I have just finished reviewing my own six year record of service in the U.S. Congress. I have evaluated my past experiences in an attempt to try to increase the meaning and effectiveness of my work in the future.

This appraisal has had many facets—but has time and again led back to the issue of the two party political structure in America—and the extent to which party affiliation is a major factor in influencing job performance.

Party affiliation is also a matter of conscience. These tests of effectiveness and conscience have convinced me that I should change my party affiliation from Republican to Democrat—and I am today announcing that decision.

This is an intensely personal decision that involves my deepest feelings and that necessarily affects many of the longest friendships and working relationships I have had in public life.

For many reasons it is painful to leave a party you have been part of for so many years. I am grateful to the Republican Party for the support it has given me over the years, and I wish the Party—and all its members—well in the months and years ahead.

I hope particularly to maintain my friendships—and the shared commitment to many non-partisan goals—with the active Republicans in Genesee County—with other concerned Republicans across the state of Michigan—and many of my Congressional colleagues from Michigan and across the country—most particularly Jerry Ford and Pete McCloskey.

At the same time, it is with a sense of hope and enthusiasm that I look forward to joining those people who make up the great broad stream of the Democratic Party. While neither party is without its faults, the Democratic Party in recent years has shown a greater responsiveness to the needs of all the people. Time and again it has shown itself able and willing to tolerate dissent—to undertake reform—to pursue justice and equity—and to hammer out issues in open debate. It has been willing to listen to people and try to help. While honest mistakes have been made, they have been made in the course of a search for a better answer.

Of the two major parties, the Democratic Party today is much more the people's party—its essential instinct is to care and want to help. I believe I can be more effective in serving my people by working within the party that is leading the fight to help people.

I intend to work long and hard within the Democratic Party structure to contribute whatever positive ideas and effort I can—and I am looking forward to learning much from those party members who have labored long and effectively over the years. In building new friendships and working relationships, I hope to actively participate in the search for sound and just answers to our nation's problems.

My decision to leave the Republican Party is based on a number of factors which have accumulated over a period of time.

In times past, the Republican Party has known greatness; it has been a vital national forum where diverse views were openly expressed and policies hammered out in a spirit of goodwill and mutual respect. At

those times, the voice of the American people was highly valued and listened to—policy was formulated from the people up, not from party bosses downward.

In recent years however, the national Party has steadily lost this character—increasingly its policies have been imposed from the top down, by a handful of people in the executive branch of government.

As the character of party policy formulation has changed, so has the test of party loyalty. Party loyalty is no longer measured by adherence to time-honored party traditions and principles; the new test of party loyalty is unswerving obedience to the current views of the incumbent administration; ultimately, the views of one man.

It is ironic and sad that a party that for so long championed individual freedom—separation of federal powers—limited and decentralized government—open debate and free competition—should now find itself having to abandon that heritage in favor of all powerful presidential paternalism. The Republican Party has been maneuvered into a straitjacket, where it has been forced to reject its heritage by declaring itself in favor of the most extreme exercise of unlimited executive control in our nation's history.

As party policy direction has become ever more tightly controlled, dissenters within the Party have been purged, had their patriotism impugned, and have been subjected to other pressures to silence or discredit their views. While many Republicans of diverse philosophical viewpoints have privately viewed these developments with growing alarm, these misgivings have not developed into an effective counter-force.

While I have been concerned about the centralization of control within the national Party, I have also been deeply troubled by many of the tactics and policies carried out in the name of the Party.

I have not been able to accept or support certain of the policies that have been imposed upon the Party, including such areas as: human rights, wasteful national spending priorities, hindrance of freedom of the press, excessive reliance on executive power, illegal and unconscionable campaign tactics and special interest government—among others.

I have tried, with others, to change the Party's positions in these areas, and promote reform and open the Party up to new people with diverse views. It is only after the repeated failure of these initiatives that I have concluded that the national Republican Party as presently structured and controlled cannot be significantly changed—at least for the foreseeable future.

A year and a half ago, I held out hope for a possible resurgence of moderate views and strength within the Republican Party. It was a small and guarded hope, but one that seemed worthy of pursuit and a major commitment of personal effort. As the months passed, that hope has been extinguished.

The openness and diversity that exists in the local Republican Party in Genesee County does not, unfortunately, exist in the present national Party structure. I believe the national Republican Party has tragically veered off course—largely abandoning the heritage of Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, and Eisenhower. Those who control the national Party have made it narrower, more rigid in its views—and less sensitive and relevant to the broad needs and concerns of the American people. And this has been reflected at the ballot box: in 1968 there were 31 Republican governors—today there are 19.

Working to restore the Republican Party to greatness is a worthy fight, and I deeply respect those Republicans who attempt it. Independent-minded Republicans of all viewpoints are essential to a vigorous two party system—and our country is strengthened by their dedication.

But there is an even greater crisis today, and that is the burning set of problems and issues facing America.

For me, and for most Americans, party issues are a distant second to conscience and country. In recent years, there has been a great loss of citizen faith in our self-government system—in politicians—and in our national parties. Government has largely lost touch with the most urgent and wrenching problems facing its people, and a vast number of our citizens have become cynical, apathetic and disgusted. They are wondering if they can believe anyone in politics anymore. Only 55 percent of the American electorate even bothered to vote in the 1972 Presidential election—a stark measure of the public's loss of faith in our political processes.

Things need to change—and change for the better. Either we regain citizen faith in the concept of self-government—or continue the slide toward inevitable one-man rule. We are dangerously far down that road now—and it is absolutely imperative that we reverse this trend by reinvigorating our political processes with integrity and meaning.

Here, in our own district, most of my constituents are working people. Most are independent minded—and they care less for partisanship than they do for some hard-nosed answers to the problems that are keeping them awake at night.

The average working person today desperately needs political leaders—and parties—dedicated to equal justice and opportunity—to more and better jobs—a safe and clean environment, a decent standard of living, good medical care people can afford, high quality education for our children and economic security in old age.

These are the goals I believe America can and must accomplish—not decades in the future—but now—for this generation of Americans. We have the resources and vision to do these things—but not unless we change our priorities and methods. It means we cannot passively accept a federal budget like the one that has just come from the Nixon White House—a budget that cripples needed hospital construction—diverts the resources needed to save and rebuild our cities—and takes away medical benefits from our old people who are sick—in order to fatten the defense budget or reward campaign contributors and cronies with special tax loopholes, massive subsidies and other government give-aways.

We must do better. I believe the greatest threat to America is rooted in inequity and broken dreams—of people who have been left out or find themselves locked in place on a treadmill—and these people number in the tens of millions. Americans are patient and long suffering if their burdens are equal, if their sacrifices are for just causes, and they are dealt with openly and honestly. They can be pitted against each other—and thus immobilized and exploited—only for a limited time. Ultimately, truth will prevail, and when it does, those who have twisted public policy to their own selfish ends will feel the full wrath of public outrage.

The party affiliation issue, then, comes down to a basic question of where I can be most effective in serving my people.

I believe I can do substantially more to advance these goals if I work within the framework of the Democratic Party. Believing this, I would not be honest with myself nor would I be keeping faith with my constituents if I were to remain in the Republican Party where I am convinced my efforts on these issues would have very little effect.

I should further note that challenges to existing party policy greatly irritate those who now control national party direction. Their antagonism has been an unpleasant and unrelenting fact of life that one can easily learn to endure.

Here at home, some local Republicans have also felt very uncomfortable about my dissenting views. Others have felt these differences should not be discussed publicly—that I should resolve them within private party channels. I understand and respect these

concerns and have been deeply troubled about the discomfort I have caused many of my Republican friends.

I have not welcomed the image of an antagonist within my party—I dislike constant conflict—and I do not enjoy the role of consistent opposition to policies within my own party. I have also seen that this opposition—however well motivated—is largely unwelcome and unwanted. It has become a growing source of pain to me—and to many Republicans.

I have had to ask myself whether my energies, beliefs and abilities can best be spent defending and fighting for an unpopular minority point of view within the Republican Party; or whether these same efforts can better serve people if I am working as part of a majority coalition within the Democratic Party which shares many of these same beliefs and goals. It seems to me far wiser and more productive to work within the party where my views are more often in agreement—where I can be affirmative—a protagonist.

In concluding, I should note that while political parties are essential to our nation, I have never taken positions—or voted on issues—on the basis of party label. I have always supported issues based on my evaluation of what was best for the people—regardless of party label—recognizing that all parties have some good ideas to contribute. While I am joining a party whose long historic record is more consistent with my beliefs—there will be times when I will find it necessary to dissent. I hope always to make that dissent reasonable and constructive. Ultimately, I must vote the way that best seems to meet the people's needs and squares with my own conscience.

To my constituents I would say that I am the same Don Riegle I have been in the past. It has been a great honor and privilege to represent you for the past six years in Congress, and I will continue our policy of full-time service to all our people. I have always kept partisanship out of the conduct of my official duties; I will do the same in the future.

Finally, I hope that my constituents, my colleagues, and the members of both parties can accept this decision with good will and a spirit of mutual faith in the concept of representative self-government. Active competition between political parties and the clash of opposing viewpoints is the very keystone of our democracy—and I believe each of us must search for the truth in our own way—at the same time respecting those whose views are different than our own. For whatever issues may divide us as individuals—within parties or between parties—there are many, many more which bind us together as fellow Americans who cherish our liberty and our processes of self-government. While we may compete aggressively on given issues—our mutual participation in the political process is an act of national unity which keeps Democracy vigorous and alive.

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to my friend from California, since he made a reference to the way the White House treats people who do not go along, I have never been one known as an exact supporter of the White House and yet, I will say to the gentleman, I have been treated in the very best manner. I believe I still have good relations with the White House in the Republican Party. We can have opinions and honest dissent. I have differed with the President, but still have been treated in a good manner.

Mr. BURTON. I would say that the gentleman speaks quite precisely. I do

not say one cannot have opinion and dissent. I merely note the gentleman does, and his exception proves the point.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that we have not arrived at special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McSPADEN). The Chair will observe that the gentleman has been recognized under the 1-minute rule, and the point is not well taken. The time of the gentleman from California has not yet expired.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, if I may.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take much time. I am just going

to say to the gentleman that I appreciate his taking time for this purpose. I had intended to do the same thing.

We welcome the gentleman from Michigan to this side of the aisle. We feel that what is the loss of our friends across the aisle is our gain over here.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

LOCAL IMPACT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1974 FEDERAL BUDGET

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my fellow colleagues some revealing statistics concerning the effect the proposed budget cutbacks would have on our cities. I feel that these statistics serve to illustrate in a startlingly clear manner the immense damage the currently proposed reduction in Federal funds will have on all manner of projects designed to revitalize our urban centers.

These grave statistics were given to me by the Honorable Lee Alexander, mayor of my home town of Syracuse, N.Y. Mr. Alexander is an acknowledged authority on urban affairs and is the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Community Development for the National League of Cities. He is also a member of the Legislative Action Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. The aforementioned statistics and Mr. Alexander's observations on budget cutbacks were first presented on February 21 before the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

The statistical chart follows:

LOCAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1974 FEDERAL BUDGET BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, WEDNESDAY, FEB. 21, 1973

Anticipated/actual Federal action, local agency	Current annual Federal funding level	Anticipated percent cut	Dollar impact	Jobs impact	Construction impact (units)	Comment
Termination of EEA:						
City.....	2,500,000	100	2,500,000	300	(¹)	
State (city residents only).....	1,133,000	100	1,133,000	111	(¹)	
County (includes city residents).....	2,642,000	100	2,642,000	320	(¹)	
Administrative consolidation of manpower programs into manpower revenue sharing and cutback of at least 20 percent:						
MDTA (city school district).....	949,791	20	189,958	69	(¹)	These cutbacks could be greater depending on the formula used for distribution to localities and what programs are eligible for funding with manpower revenue-sharing funds.
NYC:						
In-school (Peace, Inc.).....	102,791	20	20,562	28	(¹)	
Out-of-school (Peace, Inc.).....	237,210	20	47,444	16	(¹)	
JOP (New York State Employment Services).....	50,000	20	10,000	15	(¹)	
No summer program request in Federal budget:						
Summer, NYC (Peace, Inc.).....	430,220	100	430,220	1,072	(¹)	
Summer, EEA (city).....	44,000	100	44,000	112	(¹)	Both of these allocations came from reprogrammed funds so are not included in the allocations below.
Summer, MC (city).....	155,000	100	155,000	240	(¹)	
Recreation support (city).....	46,000	100	46,000			
Transportation support (city).....	7,000	100	7,000			
Existing manpower programs to be turned over to cities through special revenue sharing without money for continuation:						
Urban league.....	195,844	100	195,844	² 120	(¹)	
On-the-job training program.....	50,000	100	50,000	(¹)	(¹)	
BIMEP construction training program.....						No official word received yet, but expected shortly.
Termination (18 months freeze) on housing subsidy programs:						
Public Housing, Turnkey III, home ownership Syracuse Housing Authority.....		100			138	
Rehabilitation Syracuse Housing Authority.....		100			2,600,000	
					200	
					3,000,000	
Sec. 236—Rental housing (new construction) (Syracuse Urban Renewal Agency).....		100			300	Forcing substantial reductions in Neighborhood Development program efforts.
					7,500,000	
Sec. 236—Rental housing (under construction) (Syracuse Urban Renewal Agency).....					893	Housing expected for low- and moderate income-through New York State Urban Development Corp. now not available to them.
					1,500,000	Forcing substantial reductions in Neighborhood Development program efforts.
Sec. 312—Rehabilitation loans (Syracuse Urban Renewal Agency).....		100			550	
Project rehabilitation (Syracuse Urban Renewal Agency).....		100			8,250,000	
Termination and phasing down of HUD community development revenue-sharing legislation:						
Open space (city).....	450,000	100	600,000	(¹)	(¹)	Includes a \$150,000 of current \$450,000 application. Phase down followed by termination.
Model Cities (city).....	2,500,000	45/100	1,125,000			
			2,500,000			
Neighborhood development program (Syracuse Urban Renewal Agency).....	7,700,000	(²)	(²)			HUD Neighborhood Development program policy currently precludes most acquisition, capital improvements, and rehabilitation. This coupled with the housing freeze makes it virtually impossible to expend \$7,700,000 during next fiscal year.
Termination of Community Action Agency versatile funding: (Peace, Inc.).....	948,640	100	948,640	113	(¹)	
Termination and phase down of selected health programs:						
Regional medical program provides specialized grants to hospitals serving a 5-county region (city).....	1,100,000	100	1,100,000			
Neighborhood health center (city).....	2,100,000	18	375,000			
Grand total.....	23,321,496		11,599,668			

¹ Not available.
² Training slots.

³ Not known.

CHESTER, YESTERDAY'S HORSE

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in this body, and to the attention of all Americans, a television movie which will appear on "The Wonderful World of Disney" this coming Sunday, March 4.

"Chester, Yesterday's Horse" is the story of a 14-year-old boy's love for his horse which dramatizes the changeover from horse logging to balloon logging, a concept which has been pioneered by Bohemia, Inc., of Eugene, Ore.

We are all aware of the high quality of Disney productions, and I am told this particular segment is no exception.

Balloon logging is a relatively recent innovation and one that makes for some very dramatic pictures. But, perhaps most important of all, balloon logging is an environmentally sound concept, because it allows for the harvesting of trees without danger to other living things in the forests of our Nation.

I encourage my colleagues to join their children and grandchildren Sunday evening to watch "Chester, Yesterday's Horse" on "The Wonderful World of Disney." You will see some wonderful Oregon scenery located in the Fourth District which I am honored to represent in this Congress.

For the RECORD, I will include a few more details about the movie which are included in a press release issued by Bohemia, Inc.:

CHESTER, YESTERDAY'S HORSE

"The Wonderful World of Disney" will feature "Chester, Yesterday's Horse," on NBC-TV Network Sunday evening, March 4, nationally. It is a movie which dramatizes the change-over from horse logging to balloon logging which was pioneered by Bohemia Inc.

The movie stars Bill Williams, Barbara Hale, and Jeff Tyler, along with Chester, the giant Belgian draft horse, and was filmed in the Umpqua and Rogue River National Forests of Oregon. Major locations show Bohemia logging and sawmill properties which include the new helium-filled balloon that has revolutionized the harvesting of logs while protecting the environment.

The movie also shows company sawmill facilities at Culp Creek, Oregon, and the steam powered Oregon Pacific and Eastern excursion railroad owned and operated from Cottage Grove, Oregon, by Bohemia and Willis Kyle.

The film was produced and directed by Academy Award-winning Larry Lansburgh of Eagle Point, Oregon, who is an acknowledged master of equestrian films.

Bill Williams has appeared in many movies and was the star of "Kit Carson." Barbara Hale has starred in many movies, also, and is best known for her role as secretary for Perry Mason films.

Their latest movie utilizes the beautiful and rugged Oregon logging country for the background against which Chester is turned out to pasture by more modern logging methods and thus becomes "yesterday's horse."

This is the story of a 14-year old boy's love for his family's draft horse.

One of the movie sequences shows Chester as a contestant in the Albany, Oregon, Timber Carnival pulling contest in an effort to raise money for his needy owners.

Chester and the youthful Sliver become heroes in a later life-saving rescue of a logger from his overturned and burning log truck. A happy ending results when Chester earns his job back with the grateful logging firm.

Noted Singer-Guitarist-Composer Randy Sparks who created the New Christy Minstrels and wrote hit tunes like "Green, Green," "Today," and "Saturday Night," scored the beautiful music for the animal adventure drama.

A highlight of the film is a rescue scene in which Chester is lifted from a muddy river by the Bohemia logging balloon after the horse plunges through an old wooden bridge.

Bohemia's huge logging balloon which is being distributed internationally by the firm is attracting increasing worldwide attention because of its unique concept. The balloon literally "flies" logs out of the steep canyons, swamplands, and terrain previously inaccessible to conventional logging methods. It permits loggers to harvest those trees which are merchantable, yet protects the remaining trees and ground cover as well as other features of the environment such as streams, wildlife, and their natural habitat.

"Chester, Yesterday's Horse," will be aired on NBC-TV March 4 at 7:30 p.m. on the West Coast and at other times nationally.

L. L. Stewart, President of Bohemia, Inc., said that Bohemia is pleased to participate extensively in the filming of the Lansburgh movie. He said the motion picture will give Americans the opportunity to see the spectacular Oregon timber country and the nation's newest and most dramatic logging system in actual operation.

He also commended the work being done by the office of Governor Tom McCall of Oregon in attracting the movie industry to Oregon and thus creating jobs and other income for Oregonians.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 27 I was attending a meeting in room 135 of the Cannon Building. The bells did not ring to signal that rollcall, so I and other colleagues of ours missed that vote. If I had been present at that time, I would have voted "nay." I ask that the RECORD reflect this statement.

THE PROMISE OF PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most tragic consequence of our Nation's long involvement in Indochina has been the deep division the war has created here in our own society.

President Nixon, by negotiating an end to this conflict, has prepared the way for healing those wounds and accomplishing the pledge he made at his first inaugural 4 years ago: To bring us all together.

Much more now needs to be done, not only by the President, but by the Congress, if we are once again to enjoy the blessings of true national unity. Having achieved an end to the fighting—we must move to make good on the promise of peace—to develop a new direction for American priorities.

Through all the long years of bitter conflict, we looked forward, not merely to an end of the hostilities, but for the opportunity to turn our Nation's great energies once again to solving problems here at home. We differed by ideology, sometimes by region, on what the real solutions were; but most all agreed it was

imperative that our attention be turned homeward. And most Americans as a people, were united in their conviction that once we were freed of the burdens of this war, we could make a genuine difference here at home. I would like to offer for consideration my impressions of what our people want as national goals.

First of all, I think we assumed that we could put an end to massive Federal deficits and the runaway inflation which have resulted from this \$200 billion war. Inflation is nearing ruinous proportions and is intensely cruel—manifesting its greatest pain, as always, upon the lower-income groups.

Second, we shared hopes that the Nation's resources, long drained in Indochina, could once again be devoted to pressing, unfinished American tasks: Cleaning the filth from our rivers and the air we breath, ridding our cities of crime—and the human desperation on which it feeds. We looked with expectation on the chance to improve the quality of our education and our health and to bring new economic opportunities to those who have not fully participated in the Nation's march to the world's highest economic standards of living.

Third, we have looked beyond the Vietnam conflict to the time when our country could concentrate on improving our governmental structure, to reform in the Federal Establishment itself. Watching citizen alienation and distrust of the Government grow, we hoped to improve the system, to deliver a better, fairer quality of government.

But, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the war, our Government is not focusing on any of these three objectives, these three imperatives:

First. We have not balanced our budget. The peace dividend from a war which at one point cost over \$30 billion annually, turned out to be, as Patrick Moynihan predicted years ago, "as evanescent as the morning clouds at San Clemente." The war stops, and we await the President's call for refocused spending policies, he asks for \$6 billion more for defense, \$5 billion to rebuild Southeast Asia, and projects a deficit to \$12 billion for the first year of peace. He has forgotten his promise to support substantive tax reform.

Second. We have not redirected our spending to solving domestic problems. While asking for \$19 billion more to spend next year, the President decrees the death of almost every Federal effort intended to redress economic injustice and to prepare our people for the inevitable future shock the technological changes of the sixties have thrust upon us.

Third. We have not heard our Chief Executive support orderly changes of Government structure. He has not chosen to follow up on his early proposals to improve or abolish agencies or create better ones in the traditional ways of lobbying Congress, rallying public support, or bringing other pressures to bear upon the legislative branch. Instead, the President indicates a lack of confidence in the basic ability of the people to govern themselves through elected representatives. He has been disdainful of Congress and has exhibited a complete

lack of respect for our prerogatives. Instead of working with Congress to change Government structure, he has cynically chosen to terminate program after program set up and funded by the Congress, and agreed to by him or prior Presidents. These programs have been illegally and unconstitutionally done away with by the President's funding impoundments and his refusal, announced in advance, to obey laws Congress will pass. It is better, the President has indicated, that we have efficient government, than that we have democratic government. It is the old "ends justifies the means" situation all over again.

What will Congress do when the President refuses to follow our directives to spend money? Are we then reduced to taking him to court and sending U.S. marshals down Pennsylvania Avenue with a writ of mandamus to force release of the funds? Will the Secret Service in that case let the marshals enter?

Mr. Speaker, there is a custom in this great House that a new Member should bide his time before making an address such as this.

On coming to Congress, I fully intended to honor this custom. I speak today, 8 weeks after taking office, not meaning to dishonor custom, but to honor a greater pledge which I made to the people of Utah, whom I came to represent. I believe that my new constituents were justified in their hopes for a long-awaited redirection of our national resources. For them, peace held great promise.

I rise to speak today, for the first time, because I believe that this great promise of peace now stands in peril, and I want to speak out. My thoughts are not held forth as anything except the judgments of a young freshman Congressman from the West. I hope my colleagues will not think me presumptuous to take the time of the House for this purpose.

But I am greatly distressed that instead of a peace budget, we now get a war budget with war-time like sacrifice, which the President proposes shall be suffered almost alone by the poor and middle-income groups—those least able or least willing to assert themselves in their own self-defense.

And I am deeply disappointed that instead of reconciliation at home, we are offered vengeance and bitterness directed at our own disaffected youth whose voices were the first to be raised against a senseless war. What irony that the administration now proposes reconciliation with the enemy we have fought so bitterly, choosing as the object of its scorn those members of our own families who proposed reconciliation all along, and were willing to risk being despised and imprisoned for their beliefs.

And it has been a senseless war. We can not allow our euphoria at its conclusion to cloud our perspective on that. Studying this budget, I find it hard to imagine that its designers were even aware that a cease-fire has taken place in Vietnam.

Military spending would be set at its highest level in history: \$81 billion, a figure which is \$6 billion more than in the current year, \$20 billion of which would be devoted to the purchase and

construction of new military equipment—more than Federal spending for education, advancing health, pollution abatement, low-income housing, and conservation programs, all combined.

Where is the peace dividend? In the current fiscal year, we have been spending \$5 billion for military action in Vietnam, \$2 billion for the bombing, and another \$2 billion for military assistance to the Government of South Vietnam. Here is \$9 billion that could have cut directly from the fiscal 1974 military budget. Instead, the budget was increased by an additional \$6 billion.

Three hundred thousand American troops remain in Europe—four times what President Eisenhower said 10 years ago was necessary to maintain an American presence—all paid for at American expense for the defense of allies whose economies are sounder and stronger than ours. And the dollar quivers today in European markets, responding to the whim of those very nations for whom we have depleted our treasury to defend.

We spend \$800 million for foreign military assistance to support such governments as South Vietnam while the President now talks of spending additional billions to support their enemies, whom we have spent 55,000 American lives and \$200 billion to help defeat. This military budget is an insult to every American who believed in the benefits of peace.

In Utah, the impact of the President's budget impoundments and his proposed spending limits for next year will be enormous. Two weeks ago I held public meetings up and down my State. Reaction there to the President's impoundments were, I suppose, predictable, with widespread indignation and opposition, backed by a surprisingly knowledgeable understanding of the complex constitutional questions involved. The people know what our struggle with the President is all about, and I am convinced Congress can win.

Total lost revenues in my State may reach \$75 million annually—to be made up for out of Utah's Federal revenue share of \$30 million—a net difference of \$45 million, unless we go along with the administration's special revenue proposals, and even in that case the net loss would be very great indeed. There is no possible way that local government units can pick up even the best of Federal programs under the President's proposed spending.

A hidden hardship here is the fact that Governors and mayors and county officials were solemnly assured that revenue sharing would not be used to replace categorical grants when their support for revenue sharing was sought, and they believed the administration. Last year, commitments and decisions were made by them on spending revenue-sharing allotments, still believing that promise, and now, local programs and commitments will have to be changed, because Federal commitments have been changed.

The Four Corners Regional Commission, which has provided the small towns of economically overlooked Southern Utah with water and sewer systems, lengthened runways, hospitals, and valid public works, is to be discontinued al-

together. Nothing is offered in its place except an exhortation to sharpen the knife from thinner cuts from the revenue-sharing pie.

The Economic Development Administration is also to be abolished, as well as the emergency farm loan program and the Farmers Home Administration rural water and sewer grant programs. Educational aid to disadvantaged children, impacted area school aid, library services, all are to be phased out, or as the phrase goes, "folded into" special revenue-sharing funds much less than the total received last year in these programs. Water pollution funds are cut by 60 percent, health facilities construction, and community mental health centers will end. Funding for low-cost housing is abolished, the only Federal manpower program is eliminated and the OEO—war on poverty—dismantled and left to die.

Mr. Speaker, in the most earnest, respectful way, I urge my colleagues to reject, item by item, every single impoundment of funds for this current fiscal year. If Congress decides that good Government requires that the President have some impoundment powers, we should pass legislation outlining narrow restrictions on that power and providing that the Congress itself will have veto power over specific impoundment. But that authority must go to the Executive by way of a grant of power from the legislative branch, not by way of usurpation. I will probably support such legislation, which is now being prepared.

The issue is much greater than whether any given Federal expenditure is a good use of Federal Treasury. The issue here is no less than the constitutional question of whether we will be governed by one man or by a representative democracy, a question which I thought had been decided 200 years ago. At that time, Congress, representing as it did and does, the States and the people, was empowered to set out the sources from which the revenues would come and where they would be disbursed. And the Constitution set down as the President's sole responsibility, carrying out the laws Congress passed.

The President spends funds for purposes to which we have not agreed, and now, in a wholesale manner, he refuses to spend sums we do appropriate, and even indicates that he will refuse to spend sums which we direct him to spend. If we cannot establish maximum or minimum limits of spending, what power, then, does Congress possess? The whole constitutional balance of powers between the two branches is in serious jeopardy, in my judgment, and preservation of that principle is much more important than the question of whether the President or the Congress has acted in a fiscally irresponsible manner.

After public meetings in my State last week, I am convinced that Congress will have public support if we will impose a spending limitation upon ourselves, if we will set it forth in advance and then adhere to it. Congressional leaders are attempting, I understand, to do just that.

Unfortunately, the public is not generally aware that in the 4 years of this administration's life, the Congress has

each year methodically cut the President's budget requests, that we have given him over \$21 billion less in 4 years than he has requested. The fact that political demagoguery has imposed upon Congress the image of the spendthrift, should not frighten us from standing up to fight.

As a completely separate issue from the impoundments, I intend to give very serious consideration to the President's spending proposals for next year. I personally find that in the Federal Government there is waste and inefficiency as well as, in many instances, misdirection. I think there are Government agencies we can do without, and some of the President's proposals for next year I expect to support. There will be many difficult and complex questions for this new freshman in making those decisions.

But, I hope we will turn the crisis which the President has precipitated into a complete reevaluation of our domestic and foreign programs, and the spending which gives those programs life. If we will do that, then this struggle between the two branches can result in better, more efficient Government. And we will have preserved for ourselves, and for our posterity, the principle that this people is capable of self-government.

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

Mr. OWENS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I do not think the gentleman is being presumptuous at all. I think it is a wonderful gesture on the gentleman's part to have done all of the research he has with regard to the President's budget as it concerns his area of the country.

In today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have placed my own remarks and a newspaper article from the Boston Globe concerning the effects of President Nixon's austere budget in my home area and in my congressional district alone we will lose about \$200 million which affects housing, education, community programs, and health centers if it is left to stand by this Congress. I do hope certainly that we will take action to stop this. I know that unless we do take action it will be a really devastating blow.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I congratulate the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) for the work he has put in on this subject, and in informing his people back home as to the disastrous effect of President Nixon's budget, not only that it will have on his district, but on the Nation as a whole, and I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) is proving here that although this is his first speech that he has perception, understanding, and compassion for his people. We are all proud of him at this moment and know that he can do the job of representing his constituents.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. OWENS. I am delighted to yield

to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Utah for the remarks he just made. He brings to this body a wealth of experience in the legislative field and knowledge gained as an employee of the Congress. I am glad he has not delayed in giving us, as he put it, the judgments of a young freshman congressman from the West.

We have much talent in this year's new class and that talent should not be denied us or the country due to some old custom about being seen but not being heard. That is a saying that we often hear here that has absolutely no validity. Every Member should be heard when he has something to say. His experience and his age should have nothing whatever to do with that. The only thing he needs is to know what he is talking about, and obviously the gentleman knows what he is talking about.

The gentleman has given us much to think about in his speech about the problems which confront his State and the effects upon the people of his State of the present economic policies and impoundment of funds. These are problems they share with the entire country.

I wholeheartedly agree with my colleague that the constitutional balance of powers between the two branches is in serious jeopardy and that the preservation of that principle is much more important than the question of whether the President or the Congress has acted inefficiently or in an irresponsible manner, although, of course, both questions are important.

The people of the gentleman's district can and should be proud of his first speech in this body. He has by his actions today demonstrated that he will represent them in an outstanding manner. I want personally to thank the gentleman for his excellent presentation and to compliment him upon the job he has done.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the distinguished Speaker, the leader of my party in the House, for whom I have the greatest respect and devotion. I appreciate his very kind remarks. I will reassure him, too, that although I expect, as I think do most of my colleagues in the freshman class, to participate from time to time, it will be I hope within the confines of my experience and of what I think is appropriate to one who has a great deal more to learn than he has to teach.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, just a few hours ago one of the first prisoners of war to be freed, Norman J. Brookens, was released from Bethesda Naval Hospital. At this moment he is in this Capitol and, indeed, very near to all of us. He came to this Capitol to thank us for our efforts in securing his freedom and the freedom of all the prisoners of war. Indeed, he came here

directly from the hospital prior to proceeding home to Pennsylvania.

I say to Norman J. Brookens that he need not thank us, that rather we thank him. Indeed, he serves as an inspiration to all of us. We salute Norman J. Brookens. We thank him. He is a great American.

LIFTING MORATORIUM ON LOW-INCOME RURAL HOUSING

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to lift the recently imposed administration moratorium on certain low-income rural housing loans and grants by the Farmers Home Administration—FmHA—of the Department of Agriculture. I am joined by Representatives STEPHENS and TIERNAN.

On January 10, the Department, acting under the direction of the President's Office of Management and Budget, announced that several federally subsidized loan and grant programs for rural housing, primarily for low-income rural residents, would be subject to an 18-month moratorium, pending an evaluation of their effectiveness. The programs affected by this unilateral Executive action are:

Housing loans to low-income families carrying an interest subsidy, under sections 502 and 521 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

Rental and cooperative housing loans, under section 515.

Farm labor housing grants, under section 516, and farm labor housing loans carrying an interest subsidy, under sections 514 and 521.

I am informed that the moratorium on FmHA housing subsidies was ordered by OMB as a virtual afterthought following the decision to stop HUD subsidies.

The administration offered no reason for this action, other than a vaguely worded reference to the subsidized housing program of HUD, also placed under an 18-month moratorium, and the supposed need for "a comprehensive evaluation of the programs—to determine whether the programs in question are the most effective means for providing benefits to low-income families, whether the programs provide benefits to persons other than low-income borrowers, and whether the Government's role is an appropriate Federal role."

Mr. Speaker, this kind of reasoning is scarcely more rational than the infamous phrase:

We had to destroy the town in order to save it.

Farmers Home Administration loans have so far fallen far short of the administration's own goals for housing in rural areas, but not even FMHA's critics have been heard to suggest that the way to rectify its shortcomings is to shut the entire program down for 18 months.

The bill I am introducing today is similar to legislation already passed by the

House restoring the rural environmental assistance program and the rural water and sewer grant program. It would require FmHA to continue administering the affected programs in the manner in which they had been administered prior to the imposition of the moratorium, along with all the unaffected housing programs of FmHA. The bill would direct the Secretary to use the financial resources of the rural housing insurance fund, under section 517 of the Housing Act of 1949, at the levels specified in appropriations acts, to finance all the rural housing programs which are solely dependent on the fund for their financing and would also require that at least 60 percent of the housing loans in the aggregate be made from the fund at the subsidized rate, generally 1 percent, provided for under section 521. This mandated level of 60 percent would match the current practice of FmHA, and would not place any extra burden on the Treasury beyond that level already required by the authorizing and appropriations acts. The bill would also require the Secretary to make grants to nonprofit institutions and other eligible applicants for farm labor housing, at the levels specific in appropriations acts, \$3,750,000 in fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to report that as late as Monday morning, Farmers Home Administration had not yet prepared an exact estimate of the amount of budgetary savings from the moratorium. This is extremely odd, inasmuch as the moratorium was declared 7 weeks ago and came as part of the administration's drive to cut the budget. Now FmHA has provided me with such an estimate.

The estimated budgetary savings resulting from the moratorium are shown for the rest of fiscal year 1973, for fiscal year 1974, and for the remainder of the 33-year term of loans involved in the moratorium. The latter figure is based on an assumption of \$1,250,000,000 in loans and a repayment based solely on amortization, a highly unlikely but necessarily conservative assumption. The figures represent the difference between what FmHA had planned under the affected programs and what will now be spent.

BUDGETARY SAVINGS FROM FMHA MORATORIUM

[In thousands]

Program	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974	33-year savings
Farm labor grants.....	\$375	2,300	(1)
Farm labor loans.....	0	86	\$12,500
Rental and cooperative.....	0	851	40,000
Home ownership.....	3,200	26,800	1,000,000-1,100,000

¹Not applicable.

Total Federal expenditure for the next 18 months for all the affected programs would have been \$33,612,000, out of the total Federal budget for that period of around \$400 billion. For the entire 33-year period of the loans that would have

been made in fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974—assuming a loan rate equal to that of 1973—the entire expenditure for these loans would have been approximately \$1.18 billion.

Since of the 660,000 units currently being serviced by FmHA, only 800 are in foreclosure status, this is a safe investment in the future of rural America. Incidentally, the budgetary flow for the 18 months would represent approximately one-hundredth of 1 percent of the combined Federal budget for that period.

The bill denies the power of the executive branch to terminate or place under a moratorium an entire program that has been passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President. It would reaffirm that this is the law of the United States of America, and that the President and his representatives must take care that the law be faithfully executed, under article II, section 3 of the Constitution. The arguments pro and con on this issue are familiar to all my colleagues, but I thought that it would be helpful to refer to recent testimony before Senator ERVIN's Subcommittee on Separation of Powers by the Honorable Elmer Staats, Comptroller General, regarding the President's supposed "inherent" authority to impound and terminate. With reference to the Antideficiency Act, Mr. Staats said:

We are not aware of any specific authority which authorizes the President to withhold funds for general economic, fiscal, or policy reasons.

And with respect to debt ceiling and economic stabilization legislation, he stated:

There is nothing explicit in those laws which authorize (sic) the President to go beyond the Antideficiency Act in accomplishing the objectives of these acts.

On the merits of the issue—which, under the legal setting I believe are technically immaterial—there is a strong, demonstrable need for the continuation of rural housing subsidies. Fifty-eight percent of our substandard housing—lacking essential plumbing or overcrowded—is located in nonmetropolitan areas, despite the fact that only 31 percent of the people live there. The rate of substandard housing in rural areas is three times the rate in nonrural areas.

The administration's moratorium is focused on the very people who are least able to afford decent housing, since only subsidized loans, aimed at low-income recipients, have been halted. Rental and cooperative housing, which do not require interest assistance and may even result in a small Government profit, have also been halted. The sum total of the Government's actions will be to place in further jeopardy the ability of rural America to stem the tide against economic decay and stagnation. As the Washington Post recently stated in an editorial before the imposition of this moratorium:

Urban taxpayers often pay heavily for the neglect of the rural poor; bad housing has been a major cause of the population exodus from small towns and farms to the cities.

In the few years, FmHA programs now under moratorium have resulted in the construction of hundreds of thousands of housing units for the poor of rural America, but for all the thousands already served, hundreds of thousands remain—or will desert the countryside to further clog the cities. Now the administration announces that, in effect, its rhetorical commitment to rural development is an empty promise. Adequate housing is the glue which holds rural America together, if at all, and in the absence of governmental assistance to build decent, low-cost housing, that glue will become unstuck. The typical section 502 house costs a mere \$14,500, but its dividends could be measured in the vitality of both urban and rural America.

As the president of the National Association of Home Builders recently told the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

These actions will make rural areas less attractive to industry and individuals, and thus contribute to further rural-urban migration and its attendant social problems. In the long run—and, in fact, even in the relatively short run—these problems will be far more expensive to solve than they would be to prevent by vigorous use of the programs which Congress has provided for the purpose of rejuvenating of rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of this moratorium is great. Nearly 140,000 households who would have acquired decent housing during the 18-month period will now be deprived of that opportunity. The total dollar flow loss for the 18 months has been estimated from between \$1.5 billion and \$3.2 billion, including the loss of sewer and water facilities also eliminated by this administration in another penny-wise, pound-foolish action. The potential employment loss has been estimated at over 133,000 man-years. Where will the men and women affected by this moratorium find work? If not in rural areas, if not in urban areas, then an increase in the welfare rolls appears inevitable. I am appending to this statement a summary, provided by the Housing Assistance Council, Inc., of the potential losses stemming from this moratorium. What this summary does not include, of course, is the human suffering caused by the failure of this administration to respond to the real needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, a final and additional inequity facing rural Americans is that while the spigot was turned off both for HUD and FmHA programs, the effects of the moratorium will be felt much earlier in rural America. This is so even with the promise by FmHA to honor bona fide oral commitments entered into before the moratorium. Since FmHA operates more on a short-term basis than HUD, the projects already in the pipeline as of January 8 will reach their completion within 6 months. The Department itself has admitted as much by stating that—

Most construction under those approvals will occur during the upcoming spring building season.

This moratorium is illegal. This moratorium is unfair. Its effects will be felt by

the 139,000 households who will be deprived of adequate housing. It will be felt by rural and urban Americans both. It must be lifted.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4939

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That Section 517(c) of Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1487 (c)) is amended by (1) striking out the word "may" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "shall"; and (2) inserting before the period at the end of the sentence a comma, and the words "in the amounts specified in the appropriations Acts for that purpose; Provided, That not less than sixty per centum of such loans in the aggregate be made at the reduced rates provided for under Section 521 of this title".

Sec. 2. Section 516(a) of Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1486(a)) is amended by striking out the words "is authorized to" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "shall, in the amounts specified in the appropriations Acts for that purpose,".

ANOTHER FREEZE VICTIM: RURAL HOUSING IS THE NATION'S WORST
(By Lew Sichelman)

When people think of substandard housing, they usually think of the inner city, the ghetto. They close their eyes to conjure up visions of run-down tenements, boarded-up windows, floors covered with paint chips and rat-infested hallways.

And why not? The greatest concentration of our population is in our urban areas, where housing problems are easily seen and the difficulties of the poor are often heard about.

Yet, nearly two-thirds of the substandard housing in this country is in rural America. And over half of these dwellings are occupied.

These aren't just broken-down, overcrowded or shanties where several families huddle close together in the corner of one room to keep warm, for the government's statistics on inferior housing no longer reflect dilapidation. That would be too subjective and too difficult to determine.

They are only the homes with something wrong with the plumbing. They lack running water, or have no bathroom, or have no plumbing at all.

And they're not far removed from this area. All you have to do is take a ride toward southern Maryland through Prince Georges County or to the outlying Northern Virginia counties of Fauquier and Loudoun to see them first hand, close-up, big as life.

The problem of substandard rural housing is nothing new. It has always been there. It's simply that up until a few years ago, no one cared or thought enough about it to bring it to the attention of the public.

"We call it 'metropollyanna,'" says Clay Cochran, executive director of the Rural Housing Alliance, which was formed in 1969 to help low-income rural American's obtain decent housing.

"The focus has always been on the cities" be it housing, welfare or whatever, Cochran says in explaining 'metropollyanna.' "There's an implicit belief that sooner or later, everyone will move to the cities where everything is good." For instance, he asks, why would a mother with six kids living on a pittance in Arkansas stay there when her relatives tell her she can get \$300 in Chicago?

"Consciously and subconsciously," Cochran asserts, "we have been led by the unseen hand or another facet of our mythology to assume that the growth of our cities would redound to the benefit of all. Moreover, we

have assumed, very comfortably, that there was some technological imperative which dictated that sooner or later, when we really became civilized, 90 percent or more of our people would live on 1 percent of our land, happy, prosperous, cultured and secure."

RHA is, in Cochran's words, "the step-child of the American Friends Service Committee" which has been concerned with the plight of the poorly housed for more than 30 years.

In 1965, encouraged by the experience and success gained in sponsoring self-help housing programs in several areas, the service organized the International Self-Help Housing Association to foster the growth of the self-help approach to housing construction and repair. Neighbors help one another build or rehabilitate at a substantial saving in cost.

Funded by the Ford Foundation, the association opened an office here in January 1967. By the spring of 1969, the association had broadened its scope to include all rural housing programs and changed its name to the Rural Housing Alliance, which today is funded by the Ford Foundation, the Office of Economic Opportunity and some 500 members.

Until that time, says Cochran, there was no housing program focused on our rural areas. Even the "good" people who were quite concerned about substandard housing in the cities didn't think of the rural areas, he says. "They thought someone, somewhere, was taking care of that."

But they were wrong. There was little or nothing to help low or even moderate-income families obtain decent housing.

The Federal Housing Administration, which guarantees home mortgage loans, didn't function in towns of 25,000 or less because there was no one to lend the money for mortgages, according to Cochran.

And public housing programs, in which the government put up the construction money and assumed the poor could manage from there, never got off the ground in rural America "because incomes were so desperately low that the rural poor couldn't even afford the utilities."

So in 1969, RHA held the first national conference on rural housing problems to focus attention on just how bad the situation was out there. How bad was it? These figures may give you an idea:

In rural areas, one house in seven is substandard, according to the Census Bureau but only one of every 25 homes in the cities is substandard.

Fifty-six percent of the substandard housing in America is in places of 2,500 people or less, yet only 25 percent of the country's population lives in such places, said Census.

Four years ago, says Cochran, 57 percent of the poor in Mississippi couldn't have lived in public housing if they had it. And they didn't.

The conference brought this body of information to the people who could do something about it—the government, labor unions, churches—and came up with a number of recommendations designed to solve the rural housing problem.

Since then, there has been some progress, albeit not enough. "We have no illusions about how much has been accomplished since our formation," admits Cochran. "Except their has been an awakening to the desperate need for adequate housing in small towns and rural areas."

Through what RHA calls "a handful of inadequate federal rural housing programs," the Farmers Home Administration, an Agriculture Department agency created in 1961, lent \$1.6 billion last year, more than three times the \$500 million it lent for rural housing in 1969. Yet, only 10 percent of the FHA loans went to people with incomes of less than \$4,000.

But RHA no longer is seeking more money or deeper subsidies to reach lower income levels. Now RHA is fighting to get back what it had gained in the last four years, for early last month the Nixon administration suspended the FmHA's housing programs as well as the subsidized programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Since FmHA program commitments aren't as far advanced as HUD's, which will last for 18 months or so, they will end, says Cochran, in less than six months.

So this week Cochran traveled to Capitol Hill to seek restoration of the suspended programs. Testifying before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, he in effect said that a part of something that works, no matter how inadequately, is better than no program at all.

With its 1,700 offices generally available to rural people," the FmHA, even with its shortcomings, is "ideally suited to the operation of a direct lending program in rural areas" and "is the only effective agency in the country equipped to bring housing to many low-income rural families," Cochran maintained.

Projections by the Housing Assistance Council, he went on, show that the moratorium will mean an 18-month loss of \$1.55 billion in revenue nationally (assuming that every dollar spent on housing is worth \$3 in terms of economic impact) and 133,000 man-years of work.

The state hardest hit is South Carolina, which, Cochran said, will lose \$284.3 million and 8,338 man-years of work. Virginia will lose \$191.4 million and 4,992 man-years, and Maryland will be out \$45.5 million and 1,174 man-years.

In more specific terms, he said, over a thousand small contractors in Mississippi alone will be bankrupted immediately if the freeze is not lifted or altered.

"We cannot emphasize too strongly the loss to the emerging rural housing delivery system implicit in the imposed moratorium," he testified.

"It cannot be argued that the rural housing programs are tainted with corruption, nor can it be said that the \$27 million spent on them is a major element of inflation in an economy with a Gross National Product of \$1.1 trillion a year.

"We are not unaware of FmHA's shortcomings and inadequacies. But neither are we blind to its successes. We urge its continuation only until something better is substituted."

STATE OF COLORADO, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION LOSSES DUE TO HOUSING FREEZE

	Units	Amount
Home ownership program (502):		
Remainder of fiscal year 1972-73...	111	\$2,691,615
Remainder of fiscal year 1973-74...	375	5,310,000
Total.....	486	8,001,615
Rental program (515):		
Remainder of fiscal year 1972-73...	38	486,000
Remainder of fiscal year 1973-74...	76	978,000
Total.....	114	1,464,000
Farm labor housing:		
Remainder of fiscal year 1972-73...	200	150,000
Remainder of fiscal year 1973-74...	400	300,000
Total.....	600	450,000
Grand total.....	1,200	9,915,615
Loans available for moderate income people and not affected by the freeze:		
Fiscal year 1972-73.....	350	5,250,000
Fiscal year 1973-74.....	400	6,000,000

Source: Colorado Housing, Inc.

POTENTIAL LOSSES DUE TO 18-MONTH MORATORIUM ON FMHA SUBSIDIZED HOUSING PROGRAMS

State	(a) FmHA subsidized housing loans, fiscal year 1972 ¹	(b) Estimates fiscal year 1973 allocations subsidized loan funds ²	(c) Estimates fiscal year 1973 subsidized loan funds committed as of Jan. 1, 1973	(d) Estimates uncommitted fiscal year 1973 subsidized loan funds (b-c)	(e) Estimates fiscal year 1974 allocations subsidized loan funds ²	(f) Potential loss over 18-month moratorium (d+e)	(g) Potential employment loss over 18-month moratorium (man-years)
Alabama	\$37,962,140	\$41,578,000	\$20,483,160	\$21,094,840	\$41,578,000	\$62,672,840	6,587
Arizona	22,791,180	20,240,000	16,783,260	3,456,740	20,240,000	23,696,740	1,949
Arkansas	40,994,650	42,682,000	24,185,760	18,496,240	42,682,000	61,178,240	5,930
California	35,594,110	25,450,000	20,959,170	4,490,830	24,450,000	29,940,830	2,300
Hawaii	2,729,020	3,206,000	2,452,605	753,395	3,206,000	3,959,395	216
Nevada	1,131,840	1,202,000	798,000	404,000	1,202,000	1,606,000	110
Colorado	4,179,900	5,310,000	2,618,385	2,691,615	5,310,000	8,001,615	635
Florida	22,164,930	17,234,000	23,568,680	6,334,680	17,234,000	23,568,680	1,435
Georgia	39,174,010	43,586,000	16,526,685	27,059,315	43,586,000	70,645,314	6,591
Idaho	19,358,250	19,938,000	13,774,410	6,163,590	19,938,000	26,101,590	1,888
Illinois	14,614,870	22,242,000	12,771,390	9,470,610	22,242,000	31,712,610	2,404
Indiana	25,758,390	32,962,000	12,802,305	20,159,695	32,962,000	53,121,695	4,440
Iowa	14,400,910	23,830,000	10,717,380	13,112,620	23,830,000	36,942,620	3,244
Kansas	5,726,870	8,516,000	2,704,815	5,811,185	8,516,000	14,327,185	1,236
Kentucky	19,337,110	22,544,000	12,026,325	10,517,675	22,544,000	33,061,675	2,787
Louisiana	11,733,080	12,224,000	6,650,265	5,573,735	12,224,000	17,797,735	1,696
Maine	26,768,970	23,342,000	21,491,715	1,850,285	23,342,000	25,192,285	1,886
Michigan	26,637,720	40,867,000	17,978,760	22,887,240	40,867,000	63,773,240	4,692
Minnesota	8,718,330	14,224,000	7,197,945	7,026,055	14,224,000	21,250,055	1,605
Mississippi	53,040,860	51,498,000	30,248,370	21,249,630	51,498,000	72,747,630	6,880
Missouri	38,905,420	42,874,000	19,894,485	22,979,515	42,874,000	65,853,515	6,008
Montana	1,976,790	2,204,000	1,379,925	824,075	2,204,000	3,028,075	240
Nebraska	3,208,530	4,508,000	2,422,305	2,085,695	4,508,000	6,593,695	508
Nevada	3,983,920	8,216,000	2,181,855	6,034,145	8,216,000	14,250,145	1,115
Delaware	3,363,730	4,208,000	1,798,710	2,409,290	4,208,000	6,617,290	513
Maryland	5,460,090	9,218,000	3,265,440	5,952,560	9,218,000	15,170,560	1,174
New Mexico	5,609,130	6,412,000	3,990,315	2,421,685	6,412,000	8,833,685	803
New York	15,491,370	23,246,000	9,769,230	13,476,770	23,246,000	36,722,770	2,746
North Carolina	54,087,210	58,414,000	35,030,310	23,383,690	58,414,000	81,797,690	6,742
North Dakota	9,290,970	11,218,000	6,145,575	5,072,425	11,218,000	16,290,425	1,199
Ohio	42,988,690	37,672,000	23,258,820	14,413,180	37,672,000	52,085,180	4,102
Oklahoma	17,609,090	28,754,000	8,858,370	19,895,630	28,754,000	48,649,630	4,830
Oregon	9,540,600	8,616,000	3,910,065	4,705,935	8,616,000	13,321,935	1,063
Alaska	660,740	1,202,000	106,560	1,095,440	1,202,000	2,297,440	104
Pennsylvania	12,934,290	18,836,000	12,176,025	6,659,975	18,836,000	25,495,975	1,827
South Carolina	69,842,760	62,722,000	30,670,785	32,051,215	62,722,000	94,773,215	8,338
South Dakota	5,239,930	8,612,000	3,756,795	4,855,205	8,612,000	13,467,205	1,141
Tennessee	30,558,750	43,784,000	16,146,540	27,637,460	43,784,000	71,421,460	7,168
Texas	37,953,400	47,884,000	16,954,605	30,929,395	47,884,000	78,813,395	7,186
Utah	8,534,230	10,316,000	4,481,700	5,834,300	10,316,000	16,150,300	1,242
Vermont	5,465,530	6,512,000	625,710	5,886,290	6,512,000	12,398,290	1,034
Connecticut	1,691,400	3,406,000	351,900	3,054,100	3,406,000	6,460,100	486
Massachusetts	3,246,020	3,206,000	2,166,765	1,039,235	3,206,000	4,245,235	336
New Hampshire	5,053,610	11,010,000	3,835,875	7,174,125	11,010,000	18,184,125	1,452
Rhode Island	881,650	1,202,000	540,195	661,805	1,202,000	1,863,805	140
Virginia	64,633,400	56,810,000	49,843,755	6,966,245	56,810,000	63,776,245	4,992
Washington	15,809,210	17,234,000	10,042,440	7,191,560	17,234,000	24,425,560	1,989
West Virginia	12,066,060	18,336,000	10,461,435	7,874,565	18,336,000	26,210,565	2,141
Wisconsin	20,833,920	29,254,000	12,442,260	16,811,740	29,254,000	46,065,740	3,388
Wyoming	2,469,750	4,408,000	1,410,570	2,997,430	4,408,000	7,405,430	599
Total	932,210,330	1,062,978,000	574,658,715	494,653,975	1,062,978,000	1,557,631,975	133,120

¹ Includes sec. 502, 514, 515, and 516 programs.² Includes sec. 502 and 515 programs.

EXPLANATION OF METHOD

The attached tables show the potential loss of housing dollars and man years of employment due to the announced 18 month moratorium on Farmers Home Administration subsidized housing programs.

Column (a) is the actual state by state outlays for FmHA subsidized housing programs in Fiscal Year 1972. (see FmHA, Report of Loan and Grant Obligations 1972 Fiscal Year Through June 30th)

Column (b) is the FmHA tentative state allocations of Section 502 funds for subsidized loans and Section 515 loans in FY 73. Note: this estimate is based upon the stated FmHA policy that at least 50% of the Section 502 authorizations for each state should go into subsidized loans (for both the tentative allocation of funds and the policy statement, see FmHA Administration Letter 108 (444), Exhibit A, dated June 27, 1972.

Column (c) is the estimated commitments of FmHA FY 73 subsidized housing funds as of January 1, 1973. Since the actual commitments of these funds to date has not yet been calculated by FmHA, these estimates are based upon the monthly rate of commitments in the first four months of the fiscal year. (see FmHA, Report of Loan and Grant Obligations 1973 Fiscal Year Through October 31, 1972.)

Column (e) is the estimated program level for FmHA subsidized housing loans in FY 74 and is based upon the assumption that the

program level would be the same as in FY 73.

Column (f) potential dollars loss over the 18 month moratorium, is the combination of uncommitted FY 73 funds and the projected FY 74 funds which will not be forthcoming because of the moratorium.

Column (g), potential loss of employment, is based upon the calculation that approximately 80% of the lost FmHA subsidized housing funds would have gone into new construction or rehabilitation. (see President's Fourth Annual Report on National Housing Goals). This dollar amount of lost employment-producing construction is divided by the actual average cost of FmHA subsidized units in each state in the first four months of the fiscal year. (see FmHA, Report of Loan and Grant Obligations 1973 Fiscal Year Through October 31, 1972.) This results in the actual number of subsidized housing units forgone because of the moratorium. This number of lost units is then multiplied by the FmHA estimate of 1.7 man years of employment per unit—.7 years direct and 1 year indirect. (see Testimony of FmHA Administrator James Smith Before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the FmHA FY 73 Budget Request.)

Source: Housing Assistance Council, Inc.

RURAL HOUSING PROGRAM PROCEEDS ON UNSUBSIDIZED BASIS

WASHINGTON, Jan. 10.—The Department of Agriculture announced today that its rural

housing credit program, administered through the Farmers Home Administration, will continue on an unsubsidized basis.

The Department said several Federally-subsidized loan and grant programs for rural housing will be subjected to an 18-month evaluation study, during which the processing of new applications will be temporarily discontinued. This is a part of a government-wide program, previously announced by Secretary George Romney, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Farmers Home Administration (FHA) will confine its subsidized housing loan program this fiscal year to applications that have been certified for approval between July 1, 1972 and Jan. 8, 1973. Most construction under those approvals will occur during the coming spring building season.

Unsubsidized home ownership loans will continue to be made. It is estimated that there will be more than 100,000 housing loans for the fiscal year. The current interest rate on unsubsidized loans is 7¼ percent.

The Department said the suspension in a subsidized housing will be in effect for 18 months to allow time for a comprehensive evaluation of the programs. The study will seek to determine whether the programs in question are the most effective means available for providing benefits to low-income families, whether the programs provide benefits to persons other than low-income borrowers, and whether the Government's role in the programs is an appropriate Federal role.

Housing programs affected by the temporary discontinuance of new approvals are—

Housing loans to low-income families that involve an interest subsidy. Subsidized interest rates to borrowers have ranged as low as one percent under the present program.

Rental and cooperative housing loans.

The farm labor housing program of grants plus loans at one percent interest.

The announcement specified that all applications in these categories that have been certified for approval prior to the suspension will be processed through to loan or grant disbursement.

Housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration not affected by the discontinuance announcement are—

Housing loans to families of low and moderate income that do not involve interest subsidies.

Housing repair loans to low-income families (loan maximum \$3,500).

Mutual self-help housing loans under the program whereby low-income families perform much of the labor in building their own homes.

Grants to provide technical aid organizations that assist in organizing and carrying out self-help housing projects.

Loans to nonprofit organizations for development of rural homestead areas.

Farmers Home Administration housing programs are administered in rural areas, including the countryside and towns of up to 10,000 population, and serve people of low and moderate income who find no other housing credit available.

FACILITATING CLASS ACTIONS

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a simple bill to facilitate the use of class actions in the Federal courts, and to alleviate the unfortunate consequences of a recent Supreme Court decision. I believe that both logic and sound public policy command that Congress enact this amendment into law.

Class actions are a relatively modern device designed to minimize repetitive litigation and to enable citizens with claims which are too small to warrant vindicating their rights through a costly court suit to pool their resources and press their common claim in one suit. The class action opens up the Federal courts to those with just grievances who had previously been denied a Federal forum. It is a court procedure which at once satisfies our sense of fairness and our need for judicial economy.

The class action procedure was considerably simplified and broadened in applicability in 1966 when the Judicial Conference of the United States formulated amendments to rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the class action rule. Legal scholars and other interested commentators praised that action as a welcomed and long-needed reform in Federal procedure.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court in *Snyder v. Harris* (394 U.S. 332 (1969)) substantially undermined the efficacy of the new rule 23 by requiring that the claim of each member of the class satisfy the jurisdictional amount in controversy, which is \$10,000 and is set by the Congress. The Court chose to follow a judicial doctrine of long—and some

would say, archaic—standing which holds that claims cannot be aggregated to fulfill the amount in controversy requirement, except in rare circumstances. This decision in effect terminates the usefulness of the class action rule for all those groups of persons whose joint claim exceeds the jurisdictional amount but whose individual claims fall short of it.

In the words of the dissenting Justices in *Snyder*:

We should not allow the judicial interpretation of the jurisdictional amount requirement to become petrified into forms which are products of, and appropriate to, another time. To do this would vitiate a significant part of the reform intended to be accomplished by the amendment of Rule 23.

We in Congress have the authority to undo this judicial emasculation of the class action rule, and it is definitely in order that we do so.

Prof. Charles Alan Wright, professor of law at the University of Texas and this Nation's most respected authority on civil procedure, has written:

It would be highly desirable if Congress were to amend 28 U.S.C.A. 1332 to provide that [in] any case permitted to be maintained as [a class] action under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the aggregate claims for or against all members of the class shall be regarded as the matter in controversy.

My bill would precisely implement Professor Wright's recommendation. It reads as follows, in its entirety:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of determining jurisdiction of a class action suit brought in the federal courts of the United States according to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the aggregate claim for or against the entire class shall be regarded as the amount in controversy.

This simple measure would reaffirm the intent of the 1966 amendments to the Federal rules. It would also accomplish most of the objectives sought by the lengthy consumer class action bills which have been introduced in this and previous Congresses, without requiring that the Federal courts administer an unwieldy body of ill-defined consumer law. Perhaps best of all, this bill enables consumers and others to vindicate their rights, receive moneys owed them, and effect peaceful social change without adding a cent to the burden of the Federal taxpayer.

Finally, this measure fulfills the intent and purpose of the jurisdictional amount requirement which the Congress first enacted in the Judiciary Act of 1789 and revised upward to \$10,000 in 1958. Since the 1966 change in rule 23 makes any judgment binding for and against all members of the class, the true amount in controversy is the amount claimed by all the class members in total, not any individual amount. To require that each class member satisfy the \$10,000 amount is to defy logic and the intent of the amount requirement, which certainly is not to set an amount so high as to eliminate an entire category of legitimate actions from the Federal courts.

To cite Professor Wright again, aggregation in class action suits is "entirely

consonant with the stated purpose of the amount in controversy requirement, to avoid having the Federal courts 'fritter away their time in the trial of petty controversies.' " In 1958 Congress determined that \$10,000 at issue separated the significant controversies from the petty; it did not declare that controversies otherwise significant become petty when pursued by more than one plaintiff in the same action.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Congress will act quickly in approving this unusually simple and very effective legislation to restore the efficacy of class actions in the Federal courts.

THE SYRACUSE POST STANDARD WOMEN OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, there are occasions in any community to recognize outstanding individuals. One of the more unique such events, occurs annually in the city of Syracuse when the morning newspaper, the Post Standard, recognizes outstanding contributions to the community by women involved in a variety of ventures.

Under the leadership of Post Standard Editor J. Leonard Gorman, and the women's editor, Lois Vosburgh, the annual luncheon has become one of the most highly respected occasions of each year.

This year, the events were tinged with sadness because the woman designated as All Times Woman of Achievement, Mrs. Frederick A. Kreuzer, died unexpectedly shortly after the announcement of her award.

Mrs. Kreuzer, or Melanie, as she was known to her countless friends and associates, was a leader of civic causes in the central New York area for many years. She served as the first woman president of the Syracuse Common Council, the city's chief legislative body. The Post Standard recognized her accomplishments early by designating her as Woman of Achievement in Politics for 1953. Numerous other awards came to Mrs. Kreuzer; all richly deserved and graciously received.

Her untimely death removed from Syracuse one of its most vital forces for community improvement. Melanie's designation as All Time Woman of Achievement was a most fitting final tribute.

The Post Standard designated 10 other Women of Achievement by specific category. They are: Business, Miss Lena Diczka; career development, Mrs. Theodore Levy; community service, Mrs. Gerry Dietz; cultural development, Mrs. Joseph Lotito; education, Mrs. Marjorie Carter; good neighbor, Mrs. Alfred Cope; public relations, Mrs. R. Wesley Geerer; religion, Rev. Betty B. Schless; social service, Mrs. Caroline Ruhe; and volunteer leadership, Mrs. Thomas Barry.

It is a distinct privilege to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the stories of these outstanding Post Standard Women

of Achievement for 1972, by Lois Vosburgh, women's editor:

ALL-TIME: MRS. F. A. KREUZER

Beautiful and brilliant, Mrs. Frederick Kreuzer has a special grace, the willingness to work for good causes.

"I have been a lucky person," she will tell you. "I have been free to do the things I believe in, all my life."

As the result, she wears a treasured charm bracelet. One charm was presented to her when she was helping found the Community-General Hospital Auxiliary. "We secured 4,500 members," she recalls. "Thirty-eight per cent more than our quota."

One is a "thanks badge" from the Girl Scouts, recognizing service as commissioner and as a member of the national board.

One is a St. Francis medal, presented by her sorority at Syracuse University. Theta Phi Alpha, in recognition of community service.

The "Tree of Life" was presented by the Onondaga County Women's Republican Club, recognizing many terms as coordinator and as vice-chairman of the county Republican committee.

But the charm she cherishes even more than the others is a jeweled charm presented to her by the Syracuse Common Council at the conclusion of her term of four years as president of the organization.

"I spent eight years in the Common Council. I loved working with the men. I am proud that I was the first woman to be elected president," Melanie Kreuzer says.

Mrs. Kreuzer is a much honored woman. In addition to receiving The Post-Standard Woman of Achievement Award in Politics in 1953; was named Woman-of-the-Year by Beta Sigma Phi; and cited for citizenship by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mrs. Kreuzer's efforts have helped add new services to the community. She was a founder and charter member of the Corinthian Club, and now is vice chairman of development for Beaver Lake Nature Center.

Among the offices to which she has been named, "as part of my way of life" are president and board member of the Volunteer Center Inc., and board member of its predecessor, the Victory Center.

She was cochairman of the personnel officers division of the War Council during World War II, and a member of the Post-War Planning Council following the conflict.

She served the Community Chest (now United Way) as cochairman of the women's division and member of the budget committee.

Le Moyne College has tapped her talents electing her president of the Guild, also she has been named the Presidents Associates Member.

"All of this was made possible by the cooperation of my husband and our son, Mrs. Kreuzer says. "I couldn't have done it without their support."

BUSINESS: MISS LENA DISCENZA

She has been a guest of Maharaja Palden Thondup Namgyal and his wife, the former Hope Cooke, in their Shangrai-la-like place in Sikkim in the Himalayas, visited the late Albert Schweitzer in Africa, crossed Siberia and visited Outer Mongolia.

"Travel is my recreation," Miss Lena Discenza, The Post-Standard Woman of Achievement in Business says, and she hopes to obtain clearances for a trip to China March.

Miss Discenza's career was achieved in a 'heavy' industry, The O. M. Edwards Co. Inc., where she walks through the plant knowing every employe by his first name, knowing what the job takes in skill and competence and how the results look on the balance sheet.

For 30 years in personnel and administra-

tion, she has been the only woman labor negotiator with the union, the International Association of Ridge, Sheet Metal and Ornamental Ironworks, local 612.

She is an officer of the firm which grosses \$5 million a year. She was elected secretary in 1963, and in addition was elected treasurer in 1971.

Her firm's business is metal fabrication and it manufactures products only to specification. Among current contracts are telephone booths, doors for railroad cars, windows and doors for subways, special cabinets for IBM computers.

How does a woman, not a member of the family, gain executive status in industry, we asked Miss Discenza. "Taking every opportunity to learn every aspect of the business," was the reply.

She was president of the Syracuse Business and Professional Women's Club, editor of the state BPW magazine, then state treasurer traveling and speaking throughout the state. "It was fine training," she said.

More recently, she has been president of the male-oriented Council of Service Clubs, is active in Syracuse Zonta Club, the Corinthian Club, the English Speaking Union and the Humane Society.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT: MRS. THEODORE LEVY

A new category, Career Development, describes the activities of a uniquely talented woman who serves her husband and her temple as Mrs. Theodore Levy, wife of the rabbi, and who serves the community, particularly Syracuse University, as Ina Rae Levy, M.S.

The latter designation reflects the fact that although deeply involved in family commitments and community service, Mrs. Levy went back to college, first to complete her bachelor's degree, then to earn her master's.

"The whole purpose of completing my education was to better equip me for service, a concept instilled in me by my mother, implemented and liberated by her husband," Mrs. Levy says.

As a civic leader, Ina Rae Levy had many innovative programs to her credit when she returned to college.

She developed and presented two consumer fairs in cooperation with the state department of commerce as early as 1967. She organized drug abuse orientation for school administrators and parents in all county districts in 1968.

She was cochairman of the district attorney's advisory council; founding chairman of "Call for Action" sponsored by the Syracuse Federation of Women's Clubs and WHEN.

In addition to teaching at Syracuse University, Mrs. Levy is coordinator for the conference center for family planning and population information and chairman of public relations and promotion for the College for Human Development.

Among continuing civic activities, she is a member of the governing board of the Young Women's Christian Association; is second vice president and scholarship chairman of the state Federation of Women's Clubs; works with the boards of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, National Council of Jewish Women, Syracuse chapter, the Americanization League.

"I have been lucky in being associated with wonderful leaders," Ina Rae Levy says. "Those in my family, my husband and my mother; those in the Syracuse Federation of Women's Clubs; those at Syracuse University. I have learned so much from them."

COMMUNITY SERVICE: MRS. GERRY DIETZ

The record of leadership of Mrs. Gerry J. Dietz, The Post-Standard 1972 Woman of Achievement in Community Service, contrasts with the modesty with which she views her accomplishments.

A member of a large, active family circle; a world traveler who has friends from all

continents ever-welcome in her home; Cynthia Dietz radiates a quiet friendliness that makes those who work with her in the community take pleasure in their jobs.

She was elected to the prestigious position of president of the Syracuse Junior League Inc. in 1955. "But that was a long time ago," she says. "I think the thing I enjoyed the most was the time I worked with the Provisionals" (candidates for the Junior League).

She spent more than 15 years as a member of the board of Huntington Family Centers. "It was a wonderful opportunity to learn from stimulating people like Paul Weinandy and Laura Kohles," she comments.

She is deeply committed to her church, Park Central Presbyterian Church, where she has been a member of the session, a Sunday School teacher, and most recently president of the Women's Association.

She studies with the Broad-Kirk fellowship of the church as an expression of her philosophy, "You must keep abreast with the trends in society and learn to cope with changes."

She also studies with the Portfolio Club, of which she is a past president.

She is a member of the board of Priority One, concerned with many aspects of the urban crisis. She is interested in environment, and anxious to save New York state history.

A graduate of Smith College, she is a firm believer in education for women, and does not find her scholarship and involvement at odds with her love of gardening, housekeeping and antiques.

She travels with her husband on his business trips abroad, also goes trout and salmon fishing with him. She has many good times with their grown children: Hugh, Michael, Cynthia and Susan; is devoted to her parents, the Hugh Goodhearts of Skaneateles; to her husband's family and their friends.

Cynthia Dietz does not consider the long hours of community service a labor. "I like people," she says.

CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT: MRS. JOSEPH LOTITO

Patricia Montfort Lotito is an expert juggler. She keeps at least a dozen balls flying around in the air. She has two children, two dogs, two cats, a husband to look after, a house to manage and the Salt City Playhouse musical program to direct, scores to compose, and latent talent to discover, develop and promote. If this isn't juggling, what is?

With her help, her husband, Joseph Lotito, founded the Salt City Playhouse. Its purpose, Pat related, is to provide a higher level of theater quality in musicals and drama, and to give amateurs a chance to act with professionals. A second aim is to integrate young people into an adult setting, and to create a multi-racial casting.

Outstanding in all her endeavor is Pat's work with children and young adults. By bringing them into the theater, giving them singing or acting parts, she has uncovered many fine voices and dancing talents.

Through her efforts scholarships have been secured for gifted young dancers starting them on their way to a professional career.

Pat is not only an educator, but an accomplished musician and composer. All musical productions at the Playhouse are under her direction and many of these are set to her original scores. She goes into the schools with the juvenile plays giving students an idea of live drama.

"The Me Nobody Knows," and "Charlie Brown" played 52 area schools last year. In this community she has done public relations for Community College, Spitz Advertising and Station WSYR. Before coming to Syracuse, she worked in TV in Baltimore where she produced women's shows. She did the theme music for "Lady Bug's Garden."

A native of Kansas City, Mo., and a graduate of Missouri University, Pat studied in the American Foreign Study Program in Zurich, Switzerland, majoring in German literature and political science. She studied piano from childhood and when she came here she was a pupil of Ernst Bacon and George Mulfinger at Syracuse University. She has been a frequent concert soloist in this city.

With Al Ross, a young man active with the "Mask and Wig" show at the University of Pennsylvania, Pat co-authored an original musical review, "Out on a Limb" which was performed at the Boar's Head Theater at Syracuse University.

This was in 1964 and since then Pat has dashed off musical numbers and background music for the SCP, found time to teach private pupils, and act as accompanist for concert artists. In rare moments when she has all the balls bouncing independently, she manages to serve on the advisory board of the Mayor's Commission on Parks and Recreation.

Now she has her sights trained on a future objective which is to create a center for the performing arts where the young can have instruction and the senior citizens can find self expression.

Pat says that at the Playhouse she has done everything to get "the show on the road" both back stage and out front, and she boasted, "As a sweeper, I'm an expert."

EDUCATION: MRS. MARJORIE CARTER

Mrs. Marjorie Carter was the first black woman to be appointed as a teacher in the Syracuse School District. This past year, she became the first black woman to assume the office of president of the Syracuse Teachers Association. Mrs. Carter has been a forward-looking and energetic advocate on behalf of the 1,400 teachers represented by the STA.

For her dedicated work on behalf in Syracuse, she is being cited as The Post-Standard Woman of Achievement in Education.

Marjorie has wanted to be a teacher since age six. She says, "It's due to the kind of positive experiences which I had in school. It was a pleasant place for me."

In an effort to make school a positive experience for others, Mrs. Carter has focused on working with teachers in her career.

She also serves as an instructional specialist at Sumner School when she isn't busy working with the city school teachers—visiting them, helping with their problems and representing them in negotiations.

"Teachers' rights, teaching conditions—one hinges on the other. If teachers don't have security it influences their work with the kids," she says. She tries to help provide that security.

Mrs. Carter has been active in education on both the state and national levels, as well as the local level. She served as a delegate to the New York State Teacher Retirement System, the New York State United Teachers and the National Education Association.

She is also a state vice president of the Association of Childhood Education and a member of Delta Kappa Gamma, the honorary for women in education.

Mrs. Carter is cited as an example of teaching-professionalism at its best.

GOOD NEIGHBOR: MRS. ALFRED COPE

Dusting theater seats, checking on youngsters—"don't forget your overshoes"—feeding hungry young actors out of her basket canteen jammed with goodies, handling the box office, and don't forget all that mimeographing!

Mrs. Alfred Cope is a beloved mother hen to her coworkers at Salt City Playhouse. She is also our Post-Standard Woman of Achievement in the Good Neighbor category.

Her concern for underprivileged youngsters goes back to her first volunteer work as an undergraduate student at the University of

Chicago when she worked three years at the University Settlement House teaching a class of young immigrant Polish girls to knit and sew.

During the Spanish Civil War, Mrs. Cope and her husband spent a year in Spain working in a Child Feeding program for the Quakers. In Utica as her daughter, Joan, was growing up she was a Brownie leader, taught Sunday School, and devoted her talents to the Cosmopolitan Center, deeply concerned that too few black youngsters were graduating from high school.

In Syracuse she worked with disadvantaged students in Youth Opportunities Unlimited for eight years, serving as a board member and registrar for yearly conferences at Cazenovia College.

Mrs. Cope tutored for five years in the School Volunteer program at King and Danforth Schools and served on the United Nations Committee to prepare and distribute multi-ethnic booklist.

She occupied the position of Clerk in the Society of Friends for five years, both in Utica and Syracuse, and worked for a year with the International Student Center. She is one of the six white members of the National Council of Negro Women.

We are proud to honor Mrs. Ruth Cope as a Good Neighbor and our Post-Standard Woman of Achievement for 1972.

PUBLIC RELATIONS: MRS. F. WESLEY GREER

"It is clearly the responsibility of the public relations person to construct bridges of communication by which the community will be made aware of the organization's purposes and goals."

Mrs. F. Wesley Greer, who spoke these words, has done an outstanding job in constructing bridges of communication to the community on behalf of local organizations. It is for this reason she is being cited as the 1972 Post-Standard Woman of Achievement in Public Relations.

The enormous amount of work which she has done in public relations on a volunteer basis, but always with professional efficiency, has aided such organizations as PEO, University Methodist Church, Syracuse Day Nurseries, the Corinthian Club, Auxiliary to Community General Hospital, the World Health Organization in Syracuse and the Syracuse Symphony Guild. The work with the Symphony she considers her most challenging undertaking.

For her work with the Symphony Guild, she received the Theta Sigma Phi honorary mention for excellence in public relations. Also as editor "Intercom," the monthly newsletter for the Auxiliary to Community General. Mrs. Greer received the Theta Sig award for "Best Community Service Organization Newsletter."

When she undertakes a PR job, she gets in with both feet. "I immerse myself in it," she says, "and when I get involved, I give as much to it as I can."

Her involvement as the public relations person of an organization often has led her to the presidency of that organization. This has been the case in her work with Women's Society of Christian Service at University Methodist, the AD of PEO and the Corinthian Club where she served as president from 1964 to 66. She is currently chairman of the finance committee for that organization. And, last summer aPT Greer chaired their Stars-at-Luncheon Series.

Active in all types of public relations work, in 1968 she served locally as co-chairman of Citizens for Nixon-Agnaw. For her efforts she was invited to the Inaugural Ball.

Next October she will become the first lady of another organization when she takes over as president of the Auxiliary to Community General Hospital.

Perhaps the key to her success in communications is the way she looks at com-

munications. "Good communications between people in a matter of empathy."

RELIGION: REV. BETTY B. SCHIESS

"I believe the church is worth fighting for. Too long has it been shrouded in medieval hypocrisy—preaching one thing and practicing another. It has preached peace, but supported war, it has stressed brotherhood, but refused to give women equality in executive positions or in the ministry," said the Rev. Mrs. Betty Bone Schiess.

Mrs. Schiess has the distinction of being the first woman in the Episcopal Diocese to be ordained to the diaconate, and is now serving as curate in Grace Episcopal Church in Baldwinsville.

A native of Cincinnati and a graduate of Cincinnati University, she came to Syracuse University for master's degree in education, and here she met her husband Dr. William A. Schiess.

As an Episcopalian, Mrs. Schiess found she had no voice in the decision-making policies of the church. This bias against women prompted her to enter the seminary and study for the ministry. She became a student at the Bexley Hall Episcopal Seminary of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School in Rochester. For the past four years she has commuted from her home on Bradford Lane to the Kodak city, and having completed her studies, she was ordained by Bishop Ned Cole on June 25th in St. Paul's Cathedral.

As a part of her curriculum in the seminary, she was trained and became a qualified clinician to work with the Y-Med program for teen-age pregnant girls, a work she is continuing.

Mrs. Schiess is justly proud of her diploma confirming the completion of her four years of arduous study in Bexley Seminary. But she noted, this and her ordination to the diaconate are only a half-way mark toward her goal of full priesthood. Having passed the canonical examinations which are nationwide, she pointed out she must have the approval of the vestry, the standing committee, the bishop of the diocese, and the recommendation of the seminary faculty, simple for a man, but not so easy for a woman, she remarked.

Dr. and Mrs. Schiess have three children, Sally 15, Richard 23, and Billy 24.

Mrs. Schiess feels that women as ministers can be of greater service than men who have not had the daily contact in seminary with women as colleagues, yet are going into parishes where women predominate.

"The assumption is that only men can be clergymen, an illusion inherited from Biblical times," she said.

Mrs. Schiess is a committee member of the Gifford Foundation Scholarship Fund, she is on the state, national and church organization for civil liberties, vice president of the International Association for Women Ministers, and a board member of the State Coalition for Family Planning.

SOCIAL SERVICE: MRS. CAROLINE RUHE

A social worker, a wife, a mother, a teacher and a volunteer, Mrs. Caroline Ruhe has donated generously and unselfishly to the community of Syracuse. For this reason, she is being cited as a Post-Standard Woman of Achievement in Social Service.

Her career has encompassed many phases of social work, and her untiring efforts on behalf of others are well-known.

This year, as for the past three years, she has served as coordinator of the Christmas Bureau, and, as for the past three years, she has worked hard to make life a bit better for someone else.

She would prefer to be known as a doer, rather than a do-gooder and is particularly proud of being called "honest."

Her career in social work actually began

after college in Rochester where she used her knowledge in English and Drama for group work at the YWCA. Her interest in the YW carries through to the present day, since she served last year as president of the YW Board and helped institute the new group home at the YWCA.

She obtained her master's degree in social service at Boston University, and while in Boston worked at the well-known New England Home for Little Wanderers.

Her interest in children's welfare continued, and in her home she raised five foster children in addition to her own two offspring. She also worked as a case worker and served as a board member of Child and Family Services. And as early as 15 years ago, she was placing handicapped children in adoptive families.

In 1960, she became a member of the Syracuse University School of Social Work faculty where she developed and supervised the Field Work Unit. Four years later, she became training director of the County Department of Social Welfare and subsequently director of staff development and training for the Onondaga County Department of Social Services—a job from which she retired in 1970.

She was also first chairman of the Summer Careers in Social Work Program sponsored by the Y board.

She is active on both the presbytery and synod levels in the Presbyterian Church and has chaired the National Missions Committee of the Cayuga-Syracuse Presbytery.

The connection between her work with the church and her social work can be summed up in what she says: "One has to learn to be secure in their own beliefs in their own way to recognize the needs of others."

VOLUNTEER LEADERSHIP: MRS. THOMAS BARRY

"I guess I just like people," says Mrs. Thomas J. Barry, our Woman of Achievement in Volunteer Leadership, modestly summing up a career of unselfish involvement with people and good causes.

Just three years after joining the Mothers' Club at Webster School she found herself president. She organized the Grant School Parent Group, helped form the Henninger High School Community Organization, served as vice president and president of the Council of Independent Parent Organizations and chairman of the Scholarship Committee of CPO. The Syracuse City School District awarded her the Educational Distinction Award.

On the Five Year Building Program Committee for the Syracuse School System, she worked with the Study Committee for the new wing for Central Technical High School, and served five years as co-chairman of the College Week Program for Syracuse Schools. She was a member of the Committee for Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency in Onondaga County and co-chairman of the Advisory Committee of Onondaga Community College to study the needs for women at the college.

Grateful for her own recovery from polio, Mrs. Barry worked as Eastern New York state women's advisor for the National Foundation, as chairman of the Syracuse March of Dimes Drive, on the Board of Directors, and as chairman of the selection committee for Health Careers. She was president of the Robert W. Oliver Scholarship Fund and has worked with the Arthritis Foundation and the Mental Health Association.

A volunteer in the YWCA nursery for years, she has served as treasurer and vice president in the Federation of Women's Clubs. On the Board of Directors of the Better Business Bureau, Mrs. Barry is a member of its Consumer Advisory Committee. Recently she participated in the Red Cross's Project FIND. As chairman of WHEN'S "Call For Action" she is at her post two days a week and responsible for training the telephone volunteers.

CXIX—376—Part 5

Gen Barry's warm and close family includes husband, Thomas J. Barry, daughter, Linda, now Mrs. Anthony Viscome, and son, Thomas W. Barry, and one granddaughter, Lisa. We salute Mrs. Thomas Barry, our Post-Standard Woman of Achievement for Volunteer Leadership in 1972.

LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 I voted against House Joint Resolution 345 which was the continuing resolution which provided funds first for those activities financed in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill and second for foreign assistance programs.

I would today like to explain my vote on this resolution and to cite a practice of this distinguished body which I feel is not in the best interests of the American public.

I was elected to the House of Representatives on a platform which stressed fiscal responsibility and efficiency in government. I do not feel that I can adequately pursue this quest when Congress is forced to consider separate identifiable programs under one bill. I strongly object to the procedure whereby foreign aid was combined with educational funds. Being a strong supporter of education and an equally ardent critic of our foreign aid program there was no way which I could vote my conscience on these issues. In order to demonstrate my displeasure with foreign assistance I was forced to vote against educational moneys.

The Congress has a vital role to play in the implementation of a philosophy of fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government. This role will not be properly fulfilled if we persist in acting on measures such as House Joint Resolution 345. I strongly urge my distinguished colleagues to cease practice of grouping unrelated programs in such resolutions. This, I believe, is in the best interests of the taxpaying American people.

ABDNOR GOES TO BAT FOR THE AMERICAN FARMER WITH THE AFL-CIO

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

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a letter which I recently wrote to George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. The subject is food prices relative to labor demands for the coming wage negotiation period, and I believe it should be of interest to everyone who really wants to know what the farmer's standard of living actually is compared to the average wage earner.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1973.

Mr. GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL-CIO,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MEANY: It was with much regret that I read your recent comment that if

food prices kept rising there was no chance that labor would hold wage demands this year to the 5.5 per cent government guideline, suggesting that the limits be raised to 7.5 or 8 per cent.

Whether or not such raises are forthcoming, your statements regarding food prices shed an unfavorable light on the role of American agriculture in today's economy. Permit me to share some statistics provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture:

The average American spent just 16 per cent of his disposable income on food in 1972, as low as any time in the last five years and considerably less than the 23 per cent of disposable income budgeted for food in 1952.

Retail food prices have risen 46.5 per cent in the past 20 years. The wholesale value of those products rose 28.7 per cent, while the farm value of the products rose only 12.6 per cent.

The average wage earner's paycheck, meantime, has increased 230 per cent in 20 years with fringe benefits jumping a whopping 700 per cent.

In 1952 the producer got 49 cents of each food dollar. Today he sees only about 38 cents of it.

The farmer and rancher have faced a doubling in the cost of farm machinery in the last 20 years, and seed and other incidentals have gone up 50 per cent.

So much for those statistics, Mr. Meany. The end result is that many farmers operate on a marginal existence. Those who cannot survive are forced off the farm into our already congested urban areas. Since 1952 the portion of our population making its living on the farm or ranch has dropped from 15 per cent to just 5 per cent.

Your efforts in behalf of organized labor in the past have been commendable, Mr. Meany. The American worker today enjoys the highest standard of living ever. The American farmer is striving for that same standard of living. Who are you to deny him that right?

Sincerely,

JAMES ABDNOR,
Member of Congress.

NATIONAL BAKE AND TAKE DAY

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss legislation I am introducing today requesting the President to proclaim the fourth Saturday in March of each year as "National Bake and Take Day."

In President Nixon's inaugural address he stated—

In the challenges we face together, let each of us ask—not just how can government help, but how can I help?

This resolution will draw attention to the need for all of us to accept our commitment to our senior citizens and to share our society's abundance with those less fortunate.

The original idea for a Bake and Take Day was conceived by an organization called the Kansas Wheathearts. The Wheathearts serves as an auxiliary to the Kansas Wheat Growers Association and is comprised of the wives of the Kansas wheat growers. This event was originally planned in Kansas to share the product of the wheat grower in such a way as to bring happiness into the lives of the elderly, the shut-in, the needy, and the lonely. The Kansas Bake and Take Day has been most successful and I be-

lieve it merits a similar commitment on a national scale.

The participation on the part of citizens across our Nation in such a way would be a natural extension of the President's challenge—

Let each of us ask not just what will government do for me, but what can I do for myself—to what can I do for others.

It seems to me a Bake and Take Day can work on a national scale because of two basic reasons. First, America's agricultural abundance is a matter of record. Second, this type of volunteer action will not cost the taxpayer anything. What better way to initiate a new era of concern and compassion than through personal contact and the delivery of baked goods of wheat and flour. This expression of compassion and understanding should help us all recognize our debt to our senior citizens.

This type of volunteer action on the part of community, church, and service organizations in organizing and implementing a program of delivering baked goods of wheat to those less fortunate can be achieved without Federal or State cost and is representative of our Nation's Christian philosophy of sharing with those who are less fortunate.

I am hopeful that it will be possible for the Congress to take prompt action on this resolution to establish the concept that self-help is best help, and to recognize the vital role of volunteerism in our American system in satisfying the needs of our senior citizens and those less fortunate.

The full text of the resolution is inserted for your consideration:

H. CON. RES. 133

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

Whereas, wheat and the products of wheat, most commonly bread, are one of man's oldest crops and cultivated foods;

Whereas, wheat provides more nourishment for peoples of the world today than any other food, serving as a staple in 43 countries and to over a billion people;

Whereas bread and baked goods can play a significant role regarding our nation's commitment to feed the hungry and malnourished in the United States and throughout the world;

Whereas, bread and other bakery goods are recognized as containing needed nutrients to combat malnourishment due to their low-fat, low cholesterol characteristics;

Whereas, President Nixon has declared, "a just and decent society must recognize its debt to its older citizens and honor its obligations to them";

Whereas, the problems of hunger and malnourishment are especially acute among our nation's senior citizens;

Whereas, these problems can be answered, in part, through voluntary Christian action on the part of community, church and service organizations and achieved by the free delivery of baked goods of wheat to the elderly, the shut-in and the disabled;

Whereas, volunteer action on the part of community, church and service organization in organizing and implementing a program of delivering baked goods of wheat to the elderly can be achieved without Federal or State cost and is representative of our nation's Christian philosophy of sharing with those who are less fortunate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested to issue a proclamation designating the fourth Saturday in March of each year, as "National Bake and Take Day", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ating the fourth Saturday in March of each year, as "National Bake and Take Day", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

THE POSTAL "SERVICE"—OFF TARGET AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest experiences in English literature is to read the myriad of accounts of Robin Hood, Little John, and Friar Tuck and their merry band in Sherwood Forest. As you read of Robin who roamed free, taking from the rich and distributing the wealth among the poor, one is reminded of the modern-day version of Robin Hood which takes place in the U.S. Postal Service. Robin Hood, portrayed by Postmaster General Klassen, and his merry men whom he calls experts, who have added a new twist to the story. They dig deeply into the pockets of the rich and poor under the guise of efficiency.

In fact, the mailbox mandarins have even solved the age-old curse of discrimination. You see, they swipe postal service from everyone, regardless of race, sex, color, religion, national origin or political affiliation.

The obvious failure of the postal system has given birth to one question that has spread across the land—does anyone have a kind word for the U.S. Postal Service? Every town, village, city and State answers with a frightening silence, alas, no kind words.

Yet in a distance, a reassuring voice is heard. The voice grows louder and more intense until it becomes a deafening roar—"our postal service is better than ever before." Before what I ask—the invention of the wheel? Only one man would have the gall to utter such words of nonsense—enter Postmaster General Klassen mounted high atop his molasses-colored snail.

Seriously, the time has come for Congress to reexamine the entire operation of the Postal Service. After my last denunciation of the "Service," I had the pleasure to read hundreds of letters from citizens all across the Nation supporting my bill, H.R. 1152, which is designed to abolish the present U.S. Postal Service. I did not receive one letter of disagreement with my position, except for the correspondence I received from the Postal Service itself.

I do not feel my criticism of the Postal Service has been unduly harsh; in fact quite the contrary is true. The incompetency of the management elite in maintaining a line of communication with its employees is disgusting. I am now going to quote direct from the letters I have received—not from ordinary citizens, but from mailmen—past and present—who have witnessed the gross inadequacies and inefficiencies of the U.S. Postal Service. Also, in my previous statement regarding the "Service," I described the high echelons of postal management as being misguided idiots. I was wrong. There is no management at all—only a

flustered collection of redtape, razzle-dazzle functionaries whose self-imposed ignorance has raped the average postal employee of his zeal, perseverance, and pride.

My first exhibit of proof is a news item that appeared in the Johnstown Tribune Democrat of January 11, 1973, describing one employee's exit from the Postal Service:

EX-POSTMASTER SCORES SERVICE

EBENSBURG.—"The postal service has deteriorated to the point where there just isn't any service any more as far as I'm concerned," says Donald C. McBreen, who quit Dec. 31 as Ebensburg postmaster.

Mr. McBreen hung it up at the age of 49 with 28 years of service, thus losing 12 percent of what his retirement would have been had he waited until age 55.

"I used to love my job," said the former postal chief, "but I started hating it in September when I lost my assistant."

The assistant, Arthur Burkey, who has been officer in charge here since Mr. McBreen resigned, was transferred to the Altoona Post Office in September for several weeks.

Mr. McBreen said the Ebensburg office had lost three men—two carriers and an assistant—since last March, and had been given no replacements.

"This caused me to work 60 to 64 hours a week," Mr. McBreen stated.

"I was a clerk in the daytime and postmaster at night and weekends. I also lost 13 days of vacation I had coming. It was refused because I didn't have anyone to take my place."

As for the Christmas rush, the resigned postmaster says:

"This Christmas was the worst I've had the displeasure of working. We had the worst pileup of mail. There must be 50 sacks of third-class mail still there."

Mr. McBreen puts the blame on new policies that went into effect after the U.S. Postal Service took over.

As for John Burgo, who is manager postmaster in Johnstown, Mr. McBreen says:

"He's just following orders from higher up."

Another mailman from my district said he used to enjoy being a postman, but now—

We live more or less under what I would call dictatorial conditions. I was told by my superior not to contact you or any other elected official for I would be inviting dismissal . . . if anyone needs any answers send them to the working people, not to the top brass . . .

A letter from the wife of a postman asked me to look into the mess the Post Office has made:

My husband is not permitted to write to you because he is a mailman. For the sake of saving man hours, my husband said that they were forced to curtail as many as 2,000 letters per day because there was no help. Can't something be done to reverse this downward spiral of the Postal Service?

A postal clerk from Florida writes:

I have been a postal clerk for years and have seen the system deteriorate since the Postal Service took over. At our local office, management has done its best to threaten and intimidate the personnel . . .

Another employee of the "Service" states:

Things have been terrible around here for some time now and they don't seem to be getting any better. I do not know if I am permitted to send you this or not, I could get in trouble for it, I know we are not allowed to speak out against the Department

or anything like that. . . . The way they are doing things—they are driving good men out of the service. Men choose retirement rather than put up with the Department's methods. . . . the morale of this office has sunk to an all time low. . . . I think the Congress owes the public something better than the present group of uneducated, greedy, headline-hunters. . . . All the employees wish that the Postal Service had not been created because they do not try to solve problems. . . .

A constituent writes:

This is my 23rd year of service and the past year has been the worst I have ever experienced, all due to the present Postal Service. Career employees are being cut in hours, or their status is being changed so that they would either retire or quit. The remaining men are being harassed. . . . the service is a real inconvenience to the public and we as employees are the targets of very harsh criticism. . . .

A former postal employee, now living in Sacramento recalls the early days of the Postal Service:

When Red Blount introduced his next-day delivery program (for points within 600 miles), he talked to a group of us about commitment and how much he was counting on his administrative staff to see that the program worked. Well, recently I received a check in the mail from an individual in Sacramento (a few miles from my residence) and it was received five days after its local postmark. You will recall that about 650 of us left the Post Office (from headquarters alone) on May 30, 1971 and many more retired from the regional offices. It was not because we wanted to give up the salary. We saw the handwriting on the wall. . . .

A gentleman with 31 years of service describes his feelings:

Two words can describe the objectives of the Postal Service when I was an employee and they were efficiency and service. . . . This is all the people want today. My friends at the local post office are efficient and move the mail promptly. However, they must always operate as directed by the higher positions and I do not mean local postmasters because they must carry out the directions given to them. . . .

An employee from eastern Pennsylvania writes:

I am employed by the U.S. Postal Service. I would like to be proud to say that I am so employed, but under the present conditions this is impossible.

Another constituent states:

I am a postal clerk employed at . . . and I have worked in the service since 1956. I have career status now, but to remain in this office I have been given a choice to take a cut in status, which is a subclerk, also a cut in hours, or take a transfer to another office. It is up to the higher echelon. They send a lowly clerk anywhere they see fit. . . .

A long-term postman offers the following remarks:

Being one who has been a postman for 25 years, it does my heart good that there is really someone concerned about the service besides the rank and file who at one time were proud of the part they played in the delivery of the mails. . . . We the foot carriers are the real ones that hear the complaints of the public for we are closer to them and they trust us with expressing their opinions. Believe me, as of late they are really numerous. . . .

Finally, a union which represents postal workers comments:

It is very frustrating to us to be called to task for what is basically mismanagement.

If you are as shocked by the above remarks as I was, you realize the urgency with which Congress must act in order to regain control of the Postal Service. It is no wonder the employees are disillusioned with the system.

It is the duty of Congress to bring Postmaster General Klassen and his high-ranking prima donnas under control before they totally obliterate the postal system of this Nation.

The following passages are examples of countless situations that were caused by the lack of management in the U.S. Postal Service. I present them as further proof in justifying the revision of the postal operations of this country.

A newspaper owner in eastern Pennsylvania writes:

Being in almost daily contact with our Postal Service, I have seen my frustration increase over the past few years at their poor service, shorter hours and senseless regulations compounded by endless red tape.

A businessman in the northern section of my congressional district comments:

There is not one Postmaster that runs his own office in the Erie District. . . . I have to beg my local postmaster to move my first class mail, and how in. . . . can any office be run by remote control by the Superintendent of the mails. I have never seen moral so low in the 25 years in this Post Office.

The owner of an import-export firm in my district writes:

In fact we should close by mentioning that we have had letters coming from Pittsburgh (a distance of 65 miles) taking three days to reach us. How do you expect us to conduct business under such conditions. We hope that your complaint may be understood by your colleagues so that some Congressional directives may be issued for some improvement for the most disastrous service we have had during the past fifty years of our firm's activities.

Another constituent relates one of her perplexing moments with the "Service":

A relative who lives in Sandusky, Ohio sent three letters to us (Meyersdale, Pennsylvania). These letters were addressed correctly and all sent on the same day. One letter arrived four days later, and the third not until the seventh day. . . . This was after the Christmas rush. . . .

A lady in Johnstown, Pa., had a Christmas card mailed to her from England on December 12. I admit that this was a little late for mailing but the letter still did not arrive until February 7, 1973.

Another frustrated constituent remarks:

It doesn't make sense to me that a letter which is mailed at our post office should go 60 miles (to a regional sectional center) instead of going the necessary 1 to 3 miles for delivery. It takes four days for the letter to go 1 mile.

A lady from my district writes:

Last January, a friend of mine mailed a letter to me on Monday, January 10 before he went to the hospital for a heart operation. I received this letter Wednesday, January 19—two days after his funeral.

The letter only had to travel a mere 30 miles, yet it took 9 days.

A fraternal organization from my district states:

The last letter I mailed was on the 29th of December, 1972. It was to announce the meeting for the 18th of January, 1973. At the

meeting on the 18th I was advised that some of the members did not receive their notices until the 15th or 16th. . . . now this is getting out of hand. I know our letters do not rate priority but three weeks or more to get letters delivered in the same county is too much to accept. I was visiting a local post office outside the county the other day and noticed that they had stacks of mail in the back room. . . . They advised me that it was not their mail, but sent to them from a larger post office for sorting and was to be returned. They cannot do the work at the larger post offices and still they are cutting the work force.

A businesswoman from Johnstown, Pa., says:

It is our hope that the Government will again reclaim the Postal System. It's a mess in Johnstown. We made a test in October, 1972, by mailing a letter at the Post Office in Johnstown to be sent back to us about one and one-half blocks away. It was received four days later. . . .

Undoubtedly, you all read the UPI story describing the plight of one woman in Hawaii which read:

It took 61 days, but a postcard to Miss Olivia Lowcher made it the 1½ miles from the Waikiki-Kapahula Library to her home.

Finally, I would like to register my own complaint concerning the ineptness of the 20th century highwaymen. As a member of the Loyal Order of Moose, Suitland Lodge No. 1856, I was to receive the monthly activities calendar through the mail. There is no doubt I received it—on February 24. That is not too unbelievable considering it was mailed on February 2. After all, to deliver a letter to my home in Pennsylvania, less than 200 miles away, over a span of 22 days, with only two bent corners and a slight tear is quite an accomplishment. So continues the typical service of our postal system. For a moment, let us see what people expected from the postal service in the 1880's.

While reading a book written about the Old West, I came across a letter from N. Rush of Eagle Rock, Idaho Territory dated August 21, 1884, written to Josh Deane, Meeteetsee, Wyoming Territory. The closing line of the letter reads:

Got to go and stand by my day guard so I send this to town with one of the boys, hope it sees you before the snow flies. Good luck.

In other words, N. Rush hoped his letter—mailed August 21—would reach Josh before the snow fell in the middle of October. Therefore, he allowed approximately 2 months for delivery. Is it not ironic that the present postal service is equivalent to that of 89 years ago?

The above examples are typical of the complaints which I have received on the lack of service being offered by the U.S. Postal Service. You must agree, they make an exceptional case for eliminating the Service.

The actions of the mail moguls have led to the drafting of resolutions by several organizations in my district such as the one that follows which was adopted by the Somerset County Pomona Grange, No. 39. This particular resolution is a reaction to one of the countless mismanaged aspects of the U.S. Postal Service known as the regional sectional center.

Whereas, much dissatisfaction due to delay in mail deliveries has been experienced since the centralization of postal operations, and

Whereas, many of our citizens' livelihoods depend upon prompt, efficient and safe delivery of our mail, and therefore be it

Resolved, that we go on record as favoring a return to former way of handling our mail. (That is returning the sectional center to Somerset instead of taking the mail to Johnstown for distribution), and be it further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to U.S. Representative John P. Saylor and State Grange.

I could continue to introduce evidence to show that the Service should be eliminated, but I would need 500 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to do so. However, you may be assured that until the Postal Service is dismantled, I will continue to investigate the system and report all that I find wrong with its operations.

In summation, I remind you that 400 years ago, the first stories of Robin Hood appeared. There was little mail service then—and we seem to be regressing to that time.

I suppose the one major difference between Robin Hood and Mr. Klassen is that Robin had a quiver full of straight arrows, each landing exactly where he aimed. Whereas, Postmaster General Klassen has a quiver full of crooked arrows and a bow fashioned of "silly putty." His arrows fly through space, never hitting their target—just like his mail.

RESPONSE TO THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Speaker of the House, Hon. CARL ALBERT, responded to the President's message on the environment and natural resources in eloquent terms last week. The Speaker, on behalf of the Democratic majority in Congress, noted the achievements of the 92d Congress in passing major environmental programs and asserted that the 93d Congress will do even more to protect the environment. Our Speaker noted that much remains to be done, but that the Congress cannot succeed without the cooperation of the President. The text of Mr. ALBERT's radio statement of February 23 is inserted below, and I recommend his remarks to you all.

SPEAKER CARL ALBERT'S NATIONWIDE RADIO RESPONSE TO THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Democratic majority in Congress has asked for this radio time in order that I might talk with you about the environment and what Congress is doing to improve it.

Today the problems of pollution, waste and environmental degradation are critical. They threaten us on a long range as well as day to day basis. As solutions for old problems are found, new problems are uncovered. For example, within the last two weeks, an ocean-exploration team from the Department of Commerce discovered a vast sea-within-a-sea of floating oil and bits of plastic stretching from Cape Cod to the Caribbean.

Recently the Environmental Protection Agency determined that sulphur dioxide levels in most cities are so high as to be a

hazard to the health of school children and adults. I could go on and on.

The point is that the fouling of our environment has been a long, slow process stretching back to colonial times and rapidly accelerated in the 20th century. Our environmental achievements over the past 10 years are dwarfed by what remains to be done. It is an awesome project. It is a costly project. I can, therefore, understand President Nixon's eagerness to claim victory and withdraw from the environmental crisis.

I wish I could agree with Mr. Nixon's recent statement that "we are well on the way to winning the war against environmental degradation." However, the problem has been and still is very critical. The war is not close to being won.

Our air may be a bit cleaner, as the President says, but it is not clean enough.

Our water may be a bit cleaner, as the President says, but it is not clean enough.

I do not intend to paint a dismal picture of the environment just to take issue with the President. This crisis goes beyond partisan politics to the very heart of our existence. It is a crisis that demands our greatest dedication and expertise.

In his environmental message to the nation, Mr. Nixon chose 19 rather narrowly drawn bills—most of them left over from last year—as the vehicle of his environmental policy. The President would have done well to note that the last Congress passed more than 150 bills dealing with the environment and natural resources. More than 90 of these measures became law, and today they form the new nucleus of this nation's environmental programs. The 92d Congress can make good claim to having the most effective and productive environmental session in history.

Many of the most important bills passed last year were not requested by the Administration. One item the President claims in his list of 19—the Safe Drinking Water Standards Bill—was not initiated by the Administration and was in fact opposed by the Administration.

The most important environmental bill passed by the 92d Congress was the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. This was the biggest and most far-reaching anti-pollution measure in the history of the United States. It was designed to give us the muscle we desperately need to clean up our water.

Needless to say, it was a great disappointment to Congress and the nation when the President vetoed this bill. That disappointment resounded throughout Congress as both the House and the Senate voted overwhelmingly to override the President's veto. It was obvious that Members of Congress from both parties were determined not to let the President's action interfere with our all-out assault on water pollution. However, the President was just as determined to delay anti-pollution efforts and arbitrarily decided not to spend \$6 billion dollars of the money Congress appropriated.

In addition to the serious Constitutional question involved here, the President's action means that now we will not be able to move quickly to purify the water that you and I and our children will use. We will be losing precious months and maybe years—time we cannot afford to waste.

In addition to the Water Pollution Control Act, the 92d Congress enacted other measures of critical importance to the environment, including landmark legislation in such areas as anti-ocean dumping, pesticide control, noise pollution control, ports and waterways safety. Two other major measures were enacted over the bitter resistance of the Administration, one dealing with Coastal Zone Management and the other with the protection of Marine Mammals, Whales, Porpoises, Seals and so forth, which are fast headed toward extinction.

To be sure, there are certain environmental measures which were not enacted into law during the 92d Congress. First in priority are the bills which were vetoed by the President: This includes Flood Control Legislation which has already been re-passed by the Senate this year and is now pending before the House; it includes a vetoed mining and minerals policy amendment; and a vetoed environmental data system.

In our judgment, four of the nineteen measures mentioned by the President are of particular significance: strip mining controls; toxic substances controls; land use policy; and power plant siting. All of these are once again in the legislative mill. The Congress is aware of the need for legislation in these areas. Indeed, the initiative had already been taken in the House and the Senate to deal with them before the arrival of the President's message on the environment.

One area where the President has taken the initiative, albeit negative, is agriculture. Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz recently said: "I would like to invite all the people of the United States to join our farmers and ranchers in improving the quality of our environment. Farmers manage wisely a large part of our natural resources." Yet the President has impounded funds for the Rural Environmental Assistance Program. This longstanding and much needed program has greatly enhanced the environmental state of rural America and should be continued. A bill to restore these rural environmental funds has already passed the House.

I can assure you that environmental legislation will be given top priority. The 93rd Congress, like the Democratic Congresses before it, will accept its full responsibility to the American people to protect the environment.

However, Congress cannot do the job alone. We will need the help of you, the people, and the President of the United States. We cannot afford another crippling setback like the veto and withholding of funds from the Water Pollution Bill.

The battle is not won. It is just beginning. Only if we use every resource at our command will we ever begin to catch sight of victory. Only if the President will join with Congress in enacting and implementing strong, far-reaching environmental legislation will we be able to make the United States a more beautiful and safer place to live.

CONSUMER SAVINGS DISCLOSURE ACT

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would provide for the full disclosure of the terms and conditions under which earnings on savings deposits are payable. This bill is similar to H.R. 8365 which I sponsored during the 92d Congress.

I am extremely pleased that the distinguished Congresswoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN), chairman of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, has joined me in the introduction of this legislation.

The Consumer Savings Disclosure Act is a very straightforward piece of legislation. It would merely require the standardization of terms used by savings institutions. It would not impose upon savings institutions a uniform method of calculating earnings.

Americans place more than \$40 billion of disposable income into savings each year. This money is saved in order that consumers can meet short-term needs—such as the purchase of a new television set—and long-term needs—such as the purchase of a new home or the provision for a college education for children. When individuals shop for a new car, they attempt to find the best buy, taking into account many different factors—price, warranty, availability, and so forth. Accordingly, when individuals place funds into savings accounts, so should they look for the institution which best meets their needs for safety, liquidity, earnings, growth, and so forth.

Regretfully, at the present time, consumers do not have adequate information to determine which savings institution has the appropriate mix of factors best suited to their needs. According to the American Banking Association, there may be as many as 100 different methods of earnings computation in use today. These range from last-in-first-out, first-in-first-out, low balances, day-of-deposit to day-of-withdrawal accounts, daily interest and grace days, combined with the multitude of possibilities of compounding, which include semiannually, daily and continuously. It is no wonder the consumer cannot presently compare savings institutions to determine the one which best meets his needs.

In addition, the amount of information supplied consumers, albeit not necessarily in a standardized terminology, varies from fairly complete to minimal. Studies have shown that many times vital information necessary to make informed choices is lacking.

A graduate student at Kansas State University found that the officers at savings institutions frequently were unable to fully describe their own plans in a manner that would permit the comparison of one plan with another. Furthermore, it was discovered that it was possible for two institutions which would appear to be comparable to vary by as much as 171 percent in the amount of earnings paid on a 6-month savings program which the student had developed. The differences resulted from variations in the methods used in computing the balance to which the rate was applied, that is, whether the institution computed earnings by applying the rate to the savings balance derived by use of FIFO, LIFO, average daily balance, or other method. Such attention to differences in methods may seem petty, but quite obviously, they can be extremely significant to the consumer. Yet, such information is not routinely fully disclosed.

In addition, the consumer is not routinely supplied with information that would be needed to check the accuracy of the account, so that no matter how mathematically skilled the consumer, it is impossible to check the accounts. Dr. Richard L. D. Morse at Kansas State University, whose work was invaluable in the preparation of this legislation, opened two identical \$500 savings accounts on the same day with the same institution, each paying the same rate of interest, and so forth. At the end of the first year, one account paid \$18.96 and

the other \$22.04. Had these not been identical accounts, such differences probably would have gone unnoticed. He was unable to compute the correct amount of interest from the information given him on the passbooks. When the differences were called to the attention of the savings institution, the error was readily acknowledged and both accounts were subsequently credited with the \$22.04.

There are three critical points in the savings transaction when the consumer must have full information in order to act intelligently and responsibly:

First. At the time the consumer is shopping for a savings institution in which to place his funds so he can select the one which best meets his needs and thereby fulfill his responsibility of rewarding that savings institution which serves him best;

Second. During the life of the contract so the consumer can exercise his responsibility of taking advantage of opportunities in the market as they arrive;

Third. When earnings are paid in order to verify his account.

There are five items which need to be uniformly disclosed to the consumer:

First. Period—the time unit for compounding—quarterly, daily, and so forth;

Second. Periodic percentage rate—the rate which is actually applied in figuring earnings for the period;

Third. Annual percentage rate—the annualized expression of the periodic percentage rate, that is, the periodic percentage rate multiplied by the number of periods in a year;

Fourth. Annual percentage yield—a percentage expression of the dollars of earnings over a year's time per \$100 of initial deposit, resulting from applying the periodic percentage rate at the end of each period to the initial deposit plus previous earnings;

Fifth. Balance—and how it was computed—the amount to which the periodic percentage rate is applied—LIFO, FIFO, daily balance, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for clear and meaningful savings disclosure. I think that the bill I have introduced answers those needs. The American public deserves to have all the facts needed to make prudent investment decisions, not merely to be protected from misleading practices. This bill sets disclosure standards which all consumers, indeed all savings institutions, should welcome. It in no way tells financial institutions what they should pay or how they should pay it. They are free to compete. It merely directs these institutions to present, in a clear and direct manner, what they are actually doing, and what they intend to do, for the depositor.

There has been concern expressed that the purposes of this act can be accomplished by regulation; that is, the regulatory agencies could exercise their authority so legislation is unnecessary. To this, I wish to make three observations:

First. Not all savings institutions are regulated, so standardization of terms for usage by regulated institutions would give an unfair competitive advantage to unregulated institutions;

Second. From a consumer's viewpoint, all savings terms and proposals should

be comparable—not just those offered by regulated savings institutions;

Third. To date, the regulatory agencies have failed in their efforts to propose comparable regulations. Indeed, last May regulations were issued to clarify the question concerning the number of days in a year, and did so by leaving institutions free to use 360, 365, or 366 days. Furthermore, they recognized fractional years by allowing such a month as February to be figured as 30/360, 30/365, 28/360, or 28/365.

The Consumer Savings Disclosure Act, like its predecessor "Truth in Lending," would require the standardization of terms in order to allow more efficient and accurate communication. This is very important to consumers. Consumers have certain rights, needs, and responsibilities which, if met, will enable them to perform better their role in a free enterprise economy. President Kennedy first stated the rights of consumers to be the right to safety, the right to be informed, to choose, and to be heard. In the Consumer Savings Disclosure Act, the right of the consumer to be supplied with the information needed to make informed choices is that which is addressed.

I invite my colleagues to read this bill, the text of which is included below:

H.R. 4985

A bill to establish a Consumer Savings Disclosure Act in order to provide for uniform and full disclosure of information with respect to the computation and payment of earnings on certain savings deposits

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Truth in Savings Act."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that economic stability would be enhanced and competition among savings institutions would be improved by the full disclosure of the terms and conditions under which earnings on savings deposits is payable. It is the purpose of this Act to require a meaningful disclosure of the terms and conditions of the payment of earnings on individual savings deposits so that the individual will be able to compare the various savings programs available to him.

DEFINITIONS; APPLICABILITY

Sec. 3. (a) For the purpose of this Act—

(1) "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

(2) "Individual" means a natural person;

(3) "Individual savings deposit" means (a) any deposit or account in a savings institution which consists of funds deposited to the credit of one or more individuals or in which the entire beneficial interest is held by one or more individuals, and upon which earnings are payable, or (b) shares in a savings institution which are issued for the savings of its members and upon which earnings are payable, or (c) any evidence of indebtedness issued by a savings institution to one or more individuals or in which the entire beneficial interest is held by one or more individuals, and upon which earnings are payable. Such terms includes regular, notice, and time deposits, and share accounts, and any other such deposits and accounts, whether or not evidenced by an instrument;

(4) "earnings" means any amount accruing to or for the account of any individual as compensation for the use of funds constituting an individual savings deposit. Such terms

includes dividends and interest on any individual saving deposit.

(5) "payable", when used with respect to a certain date or period of time, means the date on which or the period of time after which an absolute right to earnings exists, regardless of whether the earnings are actually paid;

(6) "savings institution" means any person, firm, corporation, association, or organization which in the regular course of business receives and holds or issues individual savings deposits and pays earnings thereon;

(7) any reference to this Act, to any requirement imposed under this Act, or to any provision thereof includes reference to the regulations of the Board under this Act or the provision thereof in question.

(b) Nothing in this Act applies to any transaction involving—

(1) a deposit of funds if the principal purpose of that deposit is to secure or guarantee the performance of a contract or the conditions of a contract for the sale or use of goods, services, or property;

(2) interest payable on premiums, accumulated dividends, or amounts left on deposit under an insurance contract;

(3) any obligation issued by a Federal, State, or local government, or any agency, instrumentality, or authority thereof, except that the Board shall prescribe rules and regulations to require disclosure by any agency, instrumentality, or authority of the Federal Government.

DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE, PERIODIC PERCENTAGE RATE, AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD

SEC. 4. (a) Periodic percentage rate is the rate applied each period to the principal amount for that period to determine the amount of earnings for that period and may be referred to as the PPR. If the period is less than one day, for purposes of disclosure, the period shall be construed to be either one day or the actual time interval after which earnings are payable, whichever is less, and the rate to be disclosed in lieu of the true periodic percentage rate shall be the factor used to determine the amount of earnings for a one day period.

(b) Annual percentage rate is the periodic percentage rate multiplied by the number of periods in a calendar year of 365 days for all years including leap year, and may be referred to as the APR.

(c) Annual percentage yield is the amount of earnings which accrue in one year to a principal amount of \$100 as the result of the successive applications of the periodic percentage rate at the end of each period to the sum of the principal amount plus any earnings theretofore credited and not withdrawn during that year, and may be referred to as the APY.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act. These regulations shall provide for clear, concise, and uniform disclosures of information required by this Act, and may contain such classifications, adjustments, and exceptions as the Board determines are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this Act. All disclosures required by this Act shall be made only in terms as defined or used in this Act, as defined or used in the Truth in Lending Act or in regulations prescribed under that Act, or as such terms are further defined by the regulations of the Board. The Board may authorize the use of tables or charts for the disclosure of information required by this Act.

(b) The Board may prescribe such other rules and regulations as it determines to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS OF DISCLOSURE

SEC. 6. (a) Each savings institution shall make available in writing to any individual

upon request, and at the time he initially places funds in an individual savings deposit in such savings institution the following information with respect to individual savings deposits:

(1) The annual percentage rate;

(2) the minimum length of time a deposit must remain on deposit so that earnings are payable at that percentage rate;

(3) the annual percentage yield;

(4) the periodic percentage rate and the method used to determine the balance to which this rate will be applied;

(5) the number of times each year earnings are compounded;

(6) the dates on which earnings are payable;

(7) any charges initially or periodically made against any deposits;

(8) any terms or conditions which increase or reduce the rate of earnings payable as disclosed under items (1) or (3); and

(9) any restrictions and the amount or method of determining the amount of penalties or charges imposed on the use of funds in any deposit.

(b) Each savings institution shall disclose annually and at the time any earnings report is made to an individual in person, or by mailing to his last known address, with respect to his individual savings deposit—

(1) the amount of earnings paid;

(2) the annual percentage rate;

(3) the periodic percentage rate;

(4) the principal balance to which the periodic percentage rate was applied, and the method by which that balance was determined;

(5) any charges made against the account during the period covered for purposes of computing the payment of earnings and making the report; and

(6) any other terms or conditions which increased or reduced the earnings payable under conditions as disclosed under items (1) or (3) of subsection (a).

(c) The Board may, by regulation, authorize or publish tables of periodic factors which reflect compounding, and such other information as it determines to be necessary or appropriate in order to facilitate the individual's ability to verify the computation of earnings payable on any individual savings deposit.

(d) Not less than ten days before a savings institution adopts any change with respect to any item of information required to be disclosed under this section, that institution shall notify each individual depositor of each such change, unless such change is directed by regulatory authority.

DISCLOSURES IN ADVERTISING

SEC. 7. (a) Every advertisement relating to the earnings payable on an individual savings deposit shall state in print of equal prominence the annual percentage rate and the annual percentage yield. If that rate is payable only on a deposit which meets certain minimum time or amount requirements, those requirements shall be clearly and conspicuously stated.

(b) No such advertisement, announcement, or solicitation shall—

(1) include any indication of any percentage rate or percentage yield based on a period in excess of one year or on the effect of any grace period; or

(2) make use of the term "profit" in referring to earnings payable on such deposits.

ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 8. (a) Compliance with the requirements imposed under this Act shall be enforced under—

(1) section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, by the Comptroller of the Currency;

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), by the Board;

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System), by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(2) section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, section 407 of the National Housing Act, and sections 6(1) and 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (acting directly or through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation), in the case of any institution subject to any of those provisions; and

(3) the Federal Credit Union Act, by the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration with respect to any insured Credit Union.

(b) For the purpose of the exercise by any agency referred to in subsection (a) of its powers under any Act referred to in that subsection, a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed to be a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. In addition to its powers under any provision of the law specifically referred to in subsection (a), each of the agencies referred to in that subsection may exercise, for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any requirement imposed under this Act, any other authority conferred on it by law.

(c) Except to the extent that enforcement of the requirements imposed under this Act is specifically committed to some other Government agency under subsection (a), the Federal Trade Commission shall enforce such requirements. For the purpose of the exercise by the Federal Trade Commission of its functions and powers under the Federal Trade Commission Act, a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. All of the functions and powers of the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act are available to the Commission to enforce compliance by any person with the requirements imposed under this Act, irrespective of whether that person is engaged in commerce or meet any other jurisdictional tests in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(d) The authority of the Board to issue regulations under this Act does not not impair the authority of any other agency designated in this section to make rules respecting its own procedures in enforcing compliance with requirements imposed under this Act.

CIVIL LIABILITY

SEC. 9. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, any savings institution which falls in connection with any transaction subject to this Act to disclose to any individual any information required under this Act to be disclosed to that individual is liable to that individual for the damage sustained which—

(1) shall not be less than \$100 nor greater than \$1,000; and

(2) in the case of any successful action to enforce the foregoing liability, the costs of the action together with a reasonable attorney's fee as determined by the court.

(b) An institution has no liability under this section if within fifteen days after discovering an error, or upon receipt of written notice of an error and prior to the bringing of an action under this section the institution notifies the individual concerned of the error and makes whatever adjustments are appropriate and necessary.

(c) An institution may not be held liable in any action brought under this section for a violation of this Act if the institution shows by a preponderance of evidence that the violation was not intentional and resulted from a bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such error.

(d) Any action under this section may be brought in any United States district court, or in any other court of competent jurisdiction.

tion, within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation.

CRIMINAL LIABILITY FOR WILLFUL AND KNOWING VIOLATION

SEC. 10. Whoever willfully and knowingly (1) gives false or inaccurate information or fails to provide information which he is required to disclose under the provisions of this Act, or (2) otherwise fails to comply with any requirement imposed under this Act shall be fined not more than \$5,000.

VIEWS OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 11. In the exercise of its functions under this Act, the Board may obtain upon request the views of any other Federal or State agency which, in the judgment of the Board, exercises regulatory or supervisory functions with respect to any class of savings institutions subject to this Act.

EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

SEC. 12. (a) This Act does not annul, alter, or affect, or exempt any savings institution from complying with the laws of any State relating to the disclosure of information in connection with individual savings deposits, except to the extent that those laws are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or regulations promulgated under this Act, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

(b) This Act does not otherwise annul, alter, or affect in any manner the meaning, scope, or applicability of the laws of any State, including, but not limited to, laws relating to the types, amounts or rates of earnings, or any element or elements of earnings, permissible under such laws in connection with individual savings deposits, nor does this Act extend the applicability of those laws to any class of persons or transactions to which they would not otherwise apply.

(c) Except as specified in section 10, this Act and the regulations promulgated under this Act do not affect the validity or enforceability of any contract or obligation under State or Federal law.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 13. The Board shall report to the Congress each year concerning the administration of its functions under this Act, and shall include in its report an assessment of the extent to which compliance with the requirements under this Act is being achieved and such recommendations as it deems necessary or appropriate.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 14. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to join the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Roy) in introducing H.R. 4985, the proposed Consumer Savings Disclosure Act known also as the Truth in Savings Act. This measure is intended to give to consumers the same kind of information about the interest return on their savings deposits that they are now required to be given about the interest costs of their credit transactions.

The intense competition among thrift institutions for savings deposits, even within the limitations on interest rates set down by the Federal regulatory agencies under regulation Q, has led to a multiplicity of methods used by banks and savings and loans in determining the bases on which interest on savings accounts is paid or accrued. There are scores of different ways in which the

interest can be figured, just as there are innumerable ways credit charges can be figured on open-end consumer credit arrangements. Until the Truth in Lending Act went into effect, the consumer had no practical way in which to compare the advantages or disadvantages of different revolving credit systems because essential information did not have to be disclosed. The consumer is still in that situation as regards the highly advertised claims of savings institutions about the advantages of their respective savings accounts in terms of annual interest yield.

Hence, a Truth in Savings Act is a logical reciprocal to the Truth in Lending Act, since the purpose of both measures is to enable the individual citizen to make intelligent choices in the handling of personal finances from among the many very complex accounting systems that even financial experts have trouble understanding.

Just as the Truth in Lending Act did not require all creditors which extend open-end credit to use the same methods of determining their finance charges, but did require them to explain their method or methods and then use the same yardstick for translating their charges into comparable annual percentage rates, so the truth in savings bill would not impose uniformity in the methods used by savings institutions in computing interest yield. But the savings institutions would have to explain their computation methods and then translate them into comparable annual percentage rates and annual percentage yields. It would then be up to the saver to select the kind of account he or she wants to open on the basis of the facts as they apply to the intended use of the account.

Such a law would not make instant experts out of every person opening a savings account. But an individual who wished to study the options intelligently in order to obtain the best deal for the "rental" of money—to use Calvin Coolidge's famous reference to interest rates—to a savings institution would be in a position to compare competing offers and make an informed judgment.

DR. RICHARD L. D. MORSE'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, in his remarks on H.R. 4985 today, Congressman Roy referred to the important contributions to this legislation made by Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, head of the department of family economics of Kansas State University.

Dr. Morse has been a pioneer and innovator in the field of consumer credit education and played a vital role in the long fight begun in 1960 by former Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, to enact truth in lending. When my Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency took up the legislation in 1967 which became the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, Dr. Morse was an invaluable adviser to me and the cosponsors of my bill in the subcommittee, Representatives GONZALEZ, MINISH, ANNUNZIO, BINGHAM, and former Representative Halpern. He was an excellent witness before the subcommittee and brought a great deal of original research to the

hearing. I am, indeed, grateful to him.

Dr. Roy has been working diligently since coming to Congress to advance the concept of a truth in savings bill, and has convinced me that this bill deserves serious consideration. Hence, I have decided to cosponsor his bill, and I will do my best to see to it that it is scheduled for hearings in this session in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ARTICLE FROM CHANGING TIMES MAGAZINE

Mr. Speaker, one of the most useful discussions of the confusing situation consumers face in making intelligent decisions about the comparative benefits of different types of savings accounts—all paying the same interest rate—was contained in an article in *Changing Times*, the Kiplinger magazine, for February 1971 entitled "Maybe We Need 'Truth In Savings,' Too."

This article leans heavily on research conducted under Professor Morse's supervision by a graduate student at Kansas State University, Miss Jackie M. Pinson, who demonstrated that the interest return on the same money deposited under different systems which all paid the same interest rate could vary as much as 171 percent.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From *Changing Times* magazine, February 1971]

MAYBE WE NEED "TRUTH IN SAVINGS," TOO

How much interest are you earning on your savings account? Alert savers have long been aware that you can't answer that question merely by looking at the percentage rate of interest. Two institutions that offer the same rate may pay different dollar amounts on interest because one compounds and credits interest more frequently, adds bonus interest on balances left for a stated period, or gives you a longer "grace period"—the days after the beginning or before the end of an interest period in which you can deposit or withdraw money without losing interest.

Even those factors, though, provide only part of the answer. The real key lies enmeshed in a confusing variety of systems that banks and other savings institutions use in computing interest when you make either deposits or withdrawals during the interest-earning period.

That aspect of banking operations is so obscured by technicalities that most people—including, probably, many who work for savings institutions—are not aware that a problem exists. *Changing Times* first brought the issue into the open more than five years ago ("Make Your Savings Earn More," Sept. 1965). Since then, federal regulatory agencies have made one passing attempt to improve the situation, but it has proved largely ineffective. Yet in these inflationary days it has become doubly important to increase the earning power of your money where you can. One student of the subject has actually proposed a federal "truth in savings" law to require institutions to provide savers with full information on interest-paying methods on a uniform basis.

THE SYSTEMS MAKES THE DIFFERENCE

The American Bankers Association estimates there are at least 54 widely used ways of computing interest. Recently, a research thesis written by Miss Jackie M. Pinson for Kansas State University demonstrated that a high-paying system can produce 171% more interest—in dollars and cents—than a low one with the same percentage rate.

Whether you would find a comparable spread in your town depends, of course, on the types of systems being utilized. In a sampling of seven institutions, Miss Pinson

found a low-to-high difference or 60%, so it could be well worth your time to check in your area before deciding where to save.

The trick is to know what to look for. Fortunately, you can learn to spot the essential points quickly by following the results of the Pinson study.

She developed her comparisons by applying 40 interest-payment systems to the hypothetical savings account shown on this page, using for purposes of illustration a uniform 6% rate.

Date	Withdrawal	Deposit	Balance (without interest)
Jan. 1, 1970			\$1,000
Jan. 10, 1970		\$2,000	3,000
Feb. 6, 1970		1,000	4,000
March 5, 1970	\$1,000		3,000
March 20, 1970	500		2,500
March 30, 1970	500		2,000
April 1, 1970			2,000
July 1, 1970			2,000

The 40 systems represent combinations based on quarterly and semiannual differences in compounding and crediting interest, varying grace periods for deposits and withdrawals, penalty charges for exceeding prescribed limits on withdrawals during a stated period, and these five recognized formulas for calculating interest on deposits and withdrawals:

LOW BALANCE

Under this arrangement the bank pays interest on the *lowest* balance in the account for the interest period. For example, if the standard account were compounded and credited quarterly, you would receive 6% on only \$1,000 for 90 days (the first quarter), or \$14.79, which would be credited to the account and give you a second-quarter starting balance of \$2,014.79. Since no withdrawals are made during the second quarter, the bank would pay 6% of \$2,014.79 for 91 days, or \$30.14. For the entire half year, the account earns \$44.93 (\$14.79 plus \$30.14).

FIFO ON BEGINNING BALANCE

FIFO stands for first in, first out. Withdrawals are deducted first from the starting balance of the interest period and then, if the balance isn't large enough, from subsequent deposits. In effect, that means you lose interest on withdrawals from the start of the interest period or the early deposit dates rather than from the date you actually took the money out.

In the standard account, the \$1,000 withdrawn March 5 would be treated as if it had been withdrawn January 1 and you would receive no interest on that amount for the entire quarter although the bank had use of those funds from January 1 to March 5. The March 20 withdrawal of \$500 would be deducted from the \$2,000 deposit of January 10 (the starting balance was exhausted by the first \$1,000 withdrawal), wiping out the interest the \$500 would have otherwise earned for January 10 to March 20, the period in which the bank had the money in its till. The \$500 withdrawal of March 30 would also be deducted from the January 10 deposit, eliminating more interest.

Total interest paid for the six months under this system would come to \$52.44.

FIFO APPLIED TO FIRST DEPOSITS

With this plan, the \$1,000 withdrawal would be deducted from the first deposit—the \$2,000 put in January 10. You would lose interest on the \$1,000 for 81 days of the 90-day quarter, rather than the full 90 days as in the other FIFO plan. If the first deposit won't cover withdrawals, the remainder is deducted from subsequent deposits. For the entire half year, this system would pay \$53.93.

LIFO—LAST IN, FIRST OUT

Withdrawals are deducted from the most recent deposits in the interest period and

then from the next most recent ones. The \$1,000 withdrawn March 5 would be taken out of the \$1,000 deposit of February 6 and you would lose interest for only 54 days—from February 6 to the end of the quarter. The standard account interest under this formula amounts to \$58.44 for the half year.

DAY OF DEPOSIT TO DAY OF WITHDRAWAL

This method, also known as daily interest, instant interest, and day in, day out, pays interest for the actual number of days money remains in the account. Therefore, you would receive interest on the \$1,000 withdrawn March 5 for 63 days (January 1 through March 4) and lose interest for only the 27 days (March 5 through March 31) left to the end of the period. For the whole six-month period, the account would yield \$75.30 interest.

Lining up the five methods, you can see your money would have earned most on the day in, day out plan and least on the low-balance method:

Interest earned in 6 months

Low balance	\$44.93
FIFO on beginning balance	52.44
FIFO on first deposits	53.93
LIFO	58.44
Day of deposit to day of withdrawal	75.30

FIND THE BEST DEAL

In practice, interest systems can't always be matched up and compared so neatly. A different pattern of deposits and withdrawals, for example, could make the low-balance method superior to FIFO on the beginning balance. Here and there you will also find institutions that have created their own hybrid systems or use a different terminology. For example, a FIFO-on-beginning-balance system may be referred to as "day of deposit to end of interest period," which sounds disarmingly like day of deposit to day of withdrawal but is actually less favorable to the depositor.

Moreover the interest payoff or any method can be substantially reduced or increased by other factors, such as frequency of compounding and crediting, number of grace days, and withdrawal penalties. In the Pinson study, the largest amount of interest on the standard account was yielded by a day-of-deposit-to-day-of-withdrawal formula with quarterly compounding and crediting, and ten grace days at the start of each month. The lowest payment was produced by a low-balance formula with semiannual compounding and crediting, no grace days, and a penalty for more than two withdrawals a month.

Of course, extending the study to the multitude of other possible combinations would alter those findings. And keep in mind this significant qualification: If you deposit only at the beginning of an interest period and withdraw only at the end, the formulas don't matter because the interest will be determined solely by the percentage rate and the frequency of compounding and crediting.

How in the world, then, can the ordinary person spot the highest-paying deal? Generally, you can obtain a good yield—although not necessarily the best—by selecting an account with these characteristics:

A high percentage rate of interest—that's still a fundamental factor to take into consideration in shopping for a savings institution.

No penalties for withdrawals.

Interest calculated on the day-of-deposit-to-day-of-withdrawal plan.

Quarterly (or more frequent) compounding.

Quarterly (or more frequent) crediting. An account that compounds quarterly but credits semiannually may not yield as much as one that compounds and credits quarterly.

A NEW RULE

It should be easier these days to obtain the information needed to distinguish a good

account as a result of a directive issued last year by the three major federal agencies in the field—the Federal Reserve Board, the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. The institutions they regulate—which account for most of the nation's banking-savings business—were given the responsibility of telling the depositor when he opens an account how his interest will be computed and notifying him of any change that would reduce his payments.

However, the directive was framed as an advisory "interpretation," which, according to one of the concerned officials, doesn't have the full force of a "regulation." And enforcement was left to the examiners whose primary job is monitoring an institution's financial position.

Months after the interpretation was issued, examination officials were still unsure of how many institutions were complying. They presumed it was working because they had received no significant number of complaints.

As a test, *Changing Times* visited three banks in Washington, D.C., at random. Two of them supplied the required information, but one prominent bank, within walking distance of all three agencies, furnished the would-be depositor with a card containing few of the required facts. Thus, you may have to do some enforcement by asking for more complete information.

Ironically, with so many possible combinations of methods, full disclosure by all institutions might at times only serve to mire depositors in a bog of confusing details. Ideally, a saver should be able to compare accounts without going through the laborious calculations performed by Miss Pinson.

The Pinson study was entitled "Truth in Savings" and recommended consideration of legislation that would do for savers what the truth-in-lending law of 1968 did for borrowers. Before the truth-in-lending law, borrowers faced much the same problem confronting savers—the percentage rate on a loan did not necessarily indicate how much the loan really cost. The "6%" personal loan, for instance, usually worked out to about 12% simple interest.

Now lenders must follow standardized methods for computing interest. Each is free to charge more or less than a competitor, but each must state the rate on his loan the same way, thereby enabling a borrower to judge quickly which is lowest.

Most of us are savers as well as borrowers. And it's clear you can lose as much by choosing the wrong savings account as by choosing the wrong loan.

Though some authorities have expressed interest in the truth-in-savings idea, there's no evidence yet of the same kind of national concern with savers' problems that led to enactment of truth-in-lending. Meanwhile, take the precaution of checking which system your bank is using. If it's one of the lower-paying varieties, shop around because you might be able to earn more on your money elsewhere.

WHO USES WHICH SYSTEM

Although it's relatively simple to check percentage interest rates offered across the country, it's extremely difficult to determine the proportion of institutions using the different types of interest-computing methods explained in the accompanying article. Government agencies and trade associations, which compile all sorts of figures, appear to have largely ignored that highly important aspect of business. The major exception is the American Bankers Association.

The following roundup will give you an idea of national practices. Remember, though, that interest-paying policies change in line with "money market" trends. When banking institutions need money to lend out and invest, they tend to offer depositors a more attractive return, as they have over the past few years by compounding and cred-

iting more frequently, increasing percentage rates, and adopting more liberal interest-paying plans.

BANKS

The 1968 ABA survey showed:

Interest payment system:	Proportion of banks using (in percent)
Low balance.....	32.3
Day of deposit to day of withdrawal.....	9.9
Day of deposit to end of interest period.....	9.1
FIFO.....	28.8
LIFO.....	11.4
Others.....	8.6

Bigger banks were more generous on the whole than smaller ones. For example, 31.9% of the banks with deposits of \$500,000,000 and over employed the top-paying day-of-deposit-to-day-of-withdrawal system, compared with 8.9% of the banks with less than \$10,000,000 in deposits.

Interest compounding and crediting practices broke down this way:

[In percent]

Frequency	Proportion of banks using	
	Compounding	Crediting
Annually.....	1.4	0.9
Semiannually.....	68.7	72.3
Quarterly.....	27.4	26.5
Monthly.....	7	2
Daily.....	1.5	0
Other.....	.3	.1

Again, the big banks led in offering the more liberal arrangements—the more frequent compounding and crediting periods.

Savings and loan associations. Federally chartered associations are required to use a LIFO system. But each association can elect to change to the more favorable day-of-deposit-to-day-of-withdrawal plan. One researcher in this field doubts whether many have switched because of the additional interest expense involved.

Mutual savings banks. The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks has not surveyed its members but believes a "large number" are now on the day-of-deposit-to-day-of-withdrawal plan.

Credit unions. In federally chartered credit unions, deposits received on the first or during a grace period earn interest from the month of deposit on. But no interest is paid on money withdrawn before the end of the interest period. Also, any balance less than a multiple of \$5 does not earn interest. Many state-chartered credit unions follow the federal system.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas.

There was no objection.

CHANGE IN SPACE JOBS

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, you have received a request from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and

Space Administration for legislation to double the number of positions in the agency under level V of the executive schedule.

The agency proposes to replace individual identification of the three Associate Administrators with a single title, and provision for six positions under that title.

In accordance with the request, I am introducing the proposed legislation today and, as a part of my remarks, I am including the text of the explanatory letter to the Speaker:

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of a bill "To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a change in the titles of the NASA Associate Administrator positions listed under Level V of the Executive Schedule, and to add three more such positions to such Schedule," together with a sectional analysis thereof. This is addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to Rule XL of that House.

Under the draft bill, section 5316, title 5, United States Code, would be amended by deleting paragraphs (15), (16) and (17) and substituting therefor a new paragraph (15) which would redesignate the NASA Associate Administrator positions listed under Level V of the Executive Schedule by that generic title alone, and would increase the number of such positions from three to six.

The present identification of the three Associate Administrators listed under Level V of the Executive Schedule reflects the programs and organization of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at the time the Executive Salary Act was first enacted. However, since that time, in order to more accurately describe its functions, the Office of Advanced Research and Technology, headed by the Associate Administrator for Advanced Research and Technology, a title listed in 5 U.S.C. 5316, was renamed the Office of Aeronautics and Space Technology on January 14, 1972. Moreover, since the time of the initial enactment of the Executive Salary Act, the positions of Associate Administrator for Tracking and Data Acquisition and Associate Administrator for Organization and Management were established, the former on January 2, 1966, and the latter on March 15, 1967. Also, the former Office of Space Science and Applications, headed by the Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, a title also listed in 5 U.S.C. 5316, was reorganized on December 3, 1971, into the Office of Space Science and the Office of Applications, each headed by an Associate Administrator. As a result of all of the foregoing, therefore, there are now six offices headed by these Associate Administrators, all of whom have positions of comparable responsibility and authority, but only three of whom are presently identified in the statute.

The draft bill, if enacted, would permit the Administrator of NASA flexibility to establish the titles of the Associate Administrators presently listed under Level V in a manner consistent with evolving functional responsibilities as they may develop and be altered from time to time; and to add three such positions to provide salary equality among all Associate Administrators having comparable responsibilities and authorities.

It should be noted that providing for a specific number of positions having the same title within the same level of the Executive Schedule is not unique. Language to similar effect is now found in 5 U.S.C. 5316; for example, paragraph (66) reads "Assistant Directors, National Science Foundation (4)," and paragraph (75) reads "Assistant Direc-

tors, United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (4)."

Under the Executive Schedule salary rate currently provided for by 5 U.S.C. 5316, the enactment of this proposal would not affect NASA's budgetary requirements.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration recommends that the draft bill be enacted by the Congress. Moreover, the Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of the subject proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. FLETCHER,
Administrator, National Aeronautics
and Space Administration.

NEW YORK CITY'S NEW PLANNING CHIEF

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday Mayor John Lindsay swore in as the chairman of the New York City Planning Commission, John E. Zuccotti. I am extremely delighted and proud of John's new position. As the members of the Housing Subcommittee are aware, John Zuccotti served as a special counsel to the Housing Subcommittee during 1970 and 1971. In that capacity we were all made aware of his outstanding abilities, and I would go so far as to say here that I consider John to be one of the foremost experts on urban matters in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I join with John's family and friends in wishing him the best in what is a most difficult endeavor. I include, Mr. Speaker, the New York Times article of Tuesday, February 27, 1973, in the RECORD following my remarks:

A STREET-WISE PLANNER—JOHN EUGENE ZUCCOTTI)

The politicians and family friends packed into the Blue Room at City Hall heard the new chairman of the City Planning Commission speak out yesterday on the need to get government out into the neighborhoods. In easy, conversational tones, he read through his seven-page text. Then, just as easily, with no awkwardness in transition, he switched to a conclusion in Spanish, followed by still another in Italian. The performance was calculated to assure New York City's mixture of ethnic strains that here was a man they could relate to.

In John Eugene Zuccotti, sworn in yesterday as the \$41,000-a-year Planning Commission chairman, the city got a mixture of educated urbanologist (Princeton '59, Yale Law School '63) and street-wise New Yorker—a blend of two types who people the upper echelons of Mayor Lindsay's governmental-political apparatus.

WAS JAVITS INTERNE

Mr. Zuccotti's family—mother, father, aunts, uncles, cousins—still live all in one Greenwich Village building near the place where he was reared. He remembers 18-cents-a-show Saturday afternoons—double feature, Laurel and Hardy comedy and two cartoons—at a movie house on Christopher Street that the neighborhood kids called "the dump" but that later found a respectable life as the Theater De Lys.

When he was first appointed as a part-time member of the City Planning Commission in 1971, politicians speculated that he was what their jargon describes as the "contract" of Peter Tufo, his law partner and the

former head of the Washington office the Lindsay administration had set up.

Actually, Mr. Zuccotti's first brush with public service had been as an interne in Senator Javits's office in 1962, where he worked under Richard R. Aurelio, then the Senator's No. 1 aide, subsequently Mr. Lindsay's Deputy Mayor.

"Most of the internes get so wound up in socializing that you only see them a few hours a day," Mr. Aurelio recalled yesterday. "John was an exception. He worked even longer hours than I did. And he picked things up so fast that we began using him almost as a full-fledged staff member."

When Mr. Zuccotti's name came up in the hunt for some one from Brooklyn to succeed the last non-Lindsay appointee on the commission, Mr. Aurelio remembered him with approval.

During that summer Mr. Zuccotti had met another interne—a slim brunette named Susan Sessions—and they got to know each other well enough that they were married the following year.

Mrs. Zuccotti is a doctoral candidate in Italian history at Columbia, and her husband says that his main recreation consists of talking with her about history.

Now they live—with Gianna, 6 years old, and Andrew, 4—in a 14-foot-wide, four-story brownstone at 36 Second Place in the Carroll Gardens section of Brooklyn. "An Italian neighborhood."

PLAYED FOOTBALL

It was the sort of neighborhood that he was born into on June 23, 1937. The family rented an apartment over a tavern on Perry Street. His father, Angelo, had started as a busboy at El Morocco and was working his way up to headwaiter, the post he still holds.

John went to St. Joseph's Academy, then to LaSalle Military Academy in Oakdale, L.I., where he made the all-county and all-Catholic football teams as a guard. He hoped to play football at Princeton, too, but a knee injury in his freshman year ended that ambition.

Besides, he said, by that time he had started to concentrate on studies. He got his degree in history.

After law school (where Mr. Tufo was his roommate), he served under Robert C. Wood (later Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development) and a man Mr. Zuccotti describes as "my mentor" in an urban-development program in Venezuela.

NORTHEAST RAIL LINE CORP.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most critical problems before the Congress is how to preserve the railroad service essential to the economic health and social well-being of the Northeast region of the United States. The Penn Central disaster and the bankruptcy of five other railroads have put into stark relief the importance of rail transportation for both freight and passengers in that region and throughout the country.

The Northeast cannot be seen as a unit isolated from the rest of the country. A collapse of rail service there would have immediate, disastrous consequences for its residents—but it would not be long before the economic impact would be felt throughout the Nation. Disruption of transportation service in the Northeast would soon affect the lumber producer in the Northwest, the farmer in the Midwest, and industries everywhere which ship their goods to the dense con-

centrations of population on the eastern seaboard.

The Congress has long recognized the gravity of the situation. Since the collapse of the Penn Central in June of 1970, we have grappled with the problem by enacting legislation for emergency loans to the Penn Central, by enacting legislation for loans to railroads severely damaged by Hurricane Agnes, and most recently by delaying a crippling strike against the Penn Central for 90 days. These have only been stop-gap measures, and none offer any possible permanent solution to the chronic problem of the Eastern railroads. We cannot delay such a solution any longer; the clock is running. The delay in the Penn Central strike runs out on May 9, 1973. The creditors of the Penn Central and the other railroads in bankruptcy are growing impatient. It will not be too long before the courts in the various reorganization proceedings involving these railroads are confronted with demands for liquidation of those railroads to prevent the further erosion of the railroad assets available to compensate the creditors.

The trustees of the Penn Central stated in their report of February 1 that, absent a large infusion of Federal funds, it would be impossible to reorganize the Penn Central because even in bankruptcy the railroad has a negative cash flow and therefore cannot be reorganized under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. Even if the other, smaller, roads could be successfully reorganized in traditional terms it is questionable how they would operate if the Penn Central connecting lines, terminals, and so forth were liquidated.

It is clear to me that something must be done soon and certainly by not later than the end of this session of Congress. The pressure of time and the magnitude of the economic crisis facing us should rail service collapse in the Northeast creates a great danger but we must act in a time of crisis and make it an opportunity. The opportunity is to once and for all develop a practical, long-term solution to the problems of the railroads in the East. There is great danger that the Congress may be pressured into a hasty and ill-conceived resolution of the problem. One such hasty action would be to take the deceptively easy route of nationalization. To me this would be the worst course of action. It would be hideously expensive to the taxpayer. Furthermore the Federal Government should no more be in the railroad business than it should be in the airline, trucking or barge business.

Therefore, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which must grapple with the problem of the bankrupt railroads, I have been seeking a solution which is compatible with our free enterprise system and which will continue a viable Northeast rail transportation system. On March 26 we will have the report of the Secretary of Transportation. About that time the ICC should be ready to make its recommendations resulting from its investigation of the Northeast railroads situation in Ex Parte 293. I am sure that the railroad industry itself will have its own suggestions, as will

shippers and other groups vitally affected. Certainly the States and major cities in the States in which the bankrupt railroads operate will come forward with their proposals. All of these proposals will be given serious consideration by the Congress; I don't think that anyone has yet, or will, come up with the single perfect answer to an immensely difficult and complicated question.

I am introducing today a bill which offers one possible solution to the transportation crisis impending in the Northeast. This proposal would put into legal form a suggestion made by many groups and individuals. Under the proposal the railroad rights-of-way of bankrupt railroads would be acquired by a quasi-governmental entity and private rail carriers could continue to operate trains over the tracks, which would be upgraded and maintained with Federal funds. A user charge would be paid by those using the tracks and these funds would pay for maintenance and upgrading.

This proposal would establish a Northeast Railroad Corporation. The Corporation would have a 13-member board of directors, with members appointed by the President, the House, the Senate and including representatives of the rail industry, rail labor, shippers, and the States in the Northeast. For the purposes of the bill the Northeast is given a broad definition so that the entire territory of the Penn Central would be included as well as that of the Lehigh Valley, the Boston and Maine, the Reading, the Central of New Jersey, and the Erie Lackawanna.

The corporation would be authorized to acquire the rail lines of the railroads now in bankruptcy in the Northeast region from their trustees. The rail lines would be purchased by Government guaranteed debentures and the purchase price would be determined by the judge in the bankruptcy proceeding on the basis of the net liquidation value of the acquired rail line. The corporation would be authorized to issue up to \$1 billion of such debentures for this purpose. Railroads in the Northeast region which are not in bankruptcy could voluntarily convey their rail lines to the corporation in return for proper compensation.

Once the lines were acquired, the corporation would rehabilitate them, perform routine maintenance, and maintain and operate their signal systems. Rail carriers which had been operating over those rail lines carrying freight or passengers would continue to do so in return for payment of a user charge of 60 cents for each thousand gross ton-miles of locomotive and train operation. A freight carrier, not operating on the rail lines, could apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for an order permitting it to operate on the corporations lines and the ICC could issue such an order if it found that the new service was required by public convenience and necessity and would not impair the ability of the carriers already using the line to serve the public adequately. A passenger carrier would make an application directly to the corporation to provide new service.

The bill protects the rights of railway

employees. All maintenance, rehabilitation and improvement work on the rail lines, as well as signaling and communication operations would be done by employees of the railway operating companies, and they would not be employees of the corporation. Existing collective-bargaining agreements would be preserved. The interest of employees affected by an abandonment of line by the corporation or reduction in freight traffic on the corporation's lines would also be protected. I believe the language of the bill makes clear the intent that the interest of the railroad worker as much as possible will be protected. The bill would require that line abandonments be in accordance with procedures providing substantial notice, ICC approval, plus an opportunity for affected States, communities, or private companies to retain the service by sharing on a 50-50 basis the maintenance and rehabilitation costs.

Mr. Speaker, a bill similar to mine establishing a Northeast Rail Line Corporation has been introduced in the Senate by Senator HARTKE and cosponsored by Senators PELL, PASTORE, RIBICOFF, WEICKER, KENNEDY, and WILLIAMS. I believe that this proposed solution deserves serious consideration by the House. I introduce it today so that it will be one of the alternatives to be considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. My bill would put the rail carriers of the Northeast region in the same position vis-a-vis the Federal Government as are the other transportation modes. Just as Federal funds go to the construction of highways and airports which are used by privately owned transportation companies, so under this bill railroad rights of way would be rehabilitated and maintained by Federal funds—an investment which would be in part recovered through user charges. It is clear that private resources are unable to provide the large amount of money required to put the railroad track back into shape after years of neglect. This bill creates a means whereby the necessary investment of the taxpayers' money in preserving a vital transportation service can be properly managed under the scrutiny of the executive branch and the Congress.

I would welcome comments and suggestions as to the proposal contained in my bill.

RESTORATION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to encourage the restoration and rehabilitation of historically significant buildings by allowing State and local governmental units to issue tax-exempt bonds for such purposes.

While recognizing that many historic building cannot be appropriately or viably preserved or restored without provision for commercial use, the measure I submit today would permit governmen-

tal units to finance the preservation or restoration under careful controls, with provision for commercial use, on the same tax-exempt basis as is now provided for other projects for environmental quality.

Enactment of this legislation would allow qualified historic structures to be used for limited commercial purposes, such as offices or small retail businesses. The lower interest costs incurred by tax-exempt bonds would make possible rental charges which would be more competitive with normal rentals for commercial and office space in the areas involved.

Such benefits would help to offset the higher maintenance costs and restoration expenses to which these older buildings are subject, and to counterbalance the tax incentives for accelerated depreciation rates, which encourage the construction of new buildings.

Thus, historic structures could achieve an economic viability which would otherwise be unattainable for them in competition with newer buildings.

FAILURE TO FEED HUNGRY CHILDREN: THE ADMINISTRATION CONTINUES TO PROVIDE INADEQUATE SUPPORT FOR THE SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, once again I must report to the Congress that the Department of Agriculture is failing to fulfill the mandate given it by the Congress to provide free and reduced-price lunches to children from low-income families and from areas with heavy concentrations of working mothers.

The program in question is section 13 of the National School Lunch Act, known as the special food service program. The National School Lunch Act was amended in 1968 to provide for a pilot program for 3 years to assist the various States in initiating, maintaining, or expanding nonprofit food service programs for children in service institutions such as day care, Headstart, and nursery school centers. In general, preschool children have low-income areas are eligible to receive year-round assistance in child day-care-type centers, while school-age children from areas of economic need or from areas with a high concentration of working mothers are eligible to participate in lunch programs during the summer months. For these school-age children, the special food service program is a summertime continuation of the long-established and highly successful school lunch program.

As the administration's fiscal year 1974 budget describes the program:

Each State may receive a basic grant of \$50 thousand. The remaining funds are apportioned, determined by the ratio of the number of children (aged 3 to 17 inclusive) from families with incomes under \$3 thousand per year in each State, to the total number of such children in all States. Up to 80% of the total cost of meals served may be paid in cases of severe need . . . All meals served must meet minimum nutri-

tional standards as a condition for receiving assistance.

In fiscal year 1972, 76.8 million meals were served to an average of 1.0 million children in the summer program, which included July-August 1971 and June 1972. This was more than double the number of meals served in the fiscal 1971 summer program. Each child received an average of 1.5 meals per day at a cost of approximately 51 cents per child. Approximately 104.5 million meals were served in the fiscal 1972 year-round program to an average of 192,000 children. Each child received about 2.2 meals per day at a cost of about 37.4 cents per child.

From this budget description, it appears that the Department is quite proud of its achievements and that the program is a complete success.

The program is a success—as far as it goes. The problem is that the Department has consistently resisted asking for a truly adequate level of appropriations to serve the number of children eligible for the program. As the original sponsor of this program, I appreciate the growing support which it has received. But the fact is that more needs to be done. For nearly four years now, the Department has attempted to hold back funding for this program which seeks to provide nutritional meals to children—many of whom depend on these meals as the only sound meal of the day and who would otherwise go hungry.

Last winter, I polled the various State directors of the section 13 program. The replies to my questionnaire revealed an enormous unmet need, and helped document the failure of the administration to provide an adequate summer feeding program during the summer of 1971. Those findings helped provide for increased appropriations for last summer's program—a program which was relatively successful.

I have just again completed a poll of the States which directly administer their own section 13 program. That poll again shows a serious unmet need. Expenditures for the year-round program in fiscal 1973 are \$23.4 million. While exact calculations are impossible, using ratios, it appears from the answers which I received from 26 States, that the current year-round program is being underfunded by at least \$12.5 million.

In my own State of Ohio, the program is administered through the Chicago office of the Department of Agriculture. Relying on statistics provided by that office therefore, it appears that in Ohio, with its fiscal year 1974 allocation of \$793,622 for the year-round program, there is a shortage in funds of approximately \$2.4 million. Ohio is funding 100 programs but has prohibited expansion of food services in these programs. Another 200 program applications or inquiries have been denied. In short, only 25 percent of the need in Ohio is being met.

I would like at this point to enter in the RECORD a table on the status of section 13 compiled by my staff from the replies which I received from the State directors.

It is my hope that this table will be of interest and use to the Congress in evaluating the need for additional funds for this vital program:

State	Fiscal year 1973 allotment		Sec. 13 applications received dollar value			Number of children served under allotment (total)	Number of children served if full funding	Estimated deficit or surplus
	Year round	Summer	School year	Summer	Total			
Alabama	\$816,003				450,000		(1)	+366,003
Alaska	68,526				22,000	467	(2)	+46,526
Arizona	195,570	35,826			525,393	1,889	3,491	-329,823
California	863,437	\$6,000,000				757,000	*1,400	(1)
Colorado	275,570	75,000	300,000	7	300,000+	1,600	2,500	-71,134
Connecticut	298,596				337,687	633,325	745,780	(1)
District of Columbia	192,276	816,583	360,836	1,056,000	1,608,313	42,822	53,955	-600,000
Hawaii	87,934					1,421	(2)	(2)
Illinois	960,000	7	1,300,000			9,821	15,000-18,000	-340,000
Iowa	318,615							0
Kansas	213,137		125,870	11,527	137,397			+75,740
Kentucky	665,428	±338,594	693,775					-28,347
Louisiana	736,524	650,957	811,151	632,338	1,443,489	73,965		-56,000±
Maine	134,006				200,000			-70,000-140,000
Massachusetts	491,712				993,971	18,779	23,145	-502,259
Michigan	\$30,133	±2,214,654	1,482,218	2,200,000	3,682,218	47,000	77,200	-997,431
Minnesota	50,000	151,644			998,280	3,619	16,192	-296,636
Mississippi	795,224	155,184	351,996					0
New Jersey	468,060	2,165,212	868,060	±2,500,000	3,368,060		14,000	-1,067,000
New Mexico	190,414				130,000			0
North Carolina	1,116,064	528,093				32,279		0
Oklahoma	420,000	±284,879	501,600		501,600	5,017	5,697	-81,600+
Pacific Island Trusts	22,499		50,000		50,000	465	2,000+	-27,500
Pennsylvania	767,827	1,184,332				8,492	(1)	(1)
Utah	98,559	15,724	±60,000	±17,715	77,715	1,250		±\$40,000±
West Virginia	380,947		400,374				9,000	-\$20,000
Wyoming	71,680	2,256						

¹ All valid applications approved.

² No applications refused due to lack of funds.

³ Year round.

⁴ Indefinite deficit.

⁵ Deficit.

DISASTER INSURANCE: AN UNMET NEED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, we never know when a disaster may strike. Early this morning, an earthquake was felt on the east coast from Baltimore, Md., to Trenton, N.J. Last week, there was an earthquake in California. During 1972, there were 48 presidentially declared natural disasters caused by floods, earthquakes, storms, mudslides, freezing weather, and even toxic algae. Hundreds of lives and billions of dollars worth of property were destroyed in these catastrophes.

We cannot prevent natural disasters, but we can take steps to assure that every American has the opportunity to protect himself against losses due to natural disasters. Also, we can take steps to encourage State and local governments to adopt comprehensive plans to mitigate or prevent the adverse consequences of natural disasters, by adopting wise zoning and land-use policies.

I have today introduced legislation which will establish a Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation authorized to insure our people against losses due to natural disasters. This Corporation will have an authorized capital stock of \$1 billion to be subscribed by the United States. Beyond this subscription, the Corporation is to be financially independent of the United States, with its income to be derived solely from insurance premiums.

Additionally, subject to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the corporation can condition the providing of insurance to areas that refuse to take appropriate steps to minimize disaster damage.

It is clear that, at the present time, our existing system of private insurance and the patchwork of aid rendered by as

many as 25 different Federal agencies is not protecting the public from disaster losses as efficiently and as effectively as is necessary. The insurance industry has tried to meet the need, but the economic realities of disaster insurance make this task very difficult.

With respect to the Federal Government's efforts, our present system calls for disaster relief through subsidized loans, outright disaster relief grants, and tax deductions. This is improvident, a great financial burden on the Nation's taxpayers, and it is not sufficient to meet the needs of disaster victims. A low-interest loan can help a person replace what he has lost due to a natural disaster, but he is still paying twice the price he had originally paid, and often finds himself paying two mortgages instead of one.

This problem has been very ably stated by a recent KFWB radio editorial which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

SUGGESTING FEDERAL DISASTER INSURANCE—
FEBRUARY 22, 1973

(By Arthur A. Schreiber)

For twenty fearful seconds yesterday, it seemed another earthquake disaster might be striking Los Angeles.

It didn't. But what if it had?

Would homeowners still paying off their 1971 quake damage loans be seeking still more loans? Many of them are people who couldn't very well afford the disaster loans they have, even interest-free.

There are 40 million homeowners in America. Every year, a small fraction of one percent are wiped out by a natural calamity... tornado, flood, earthquake hurricane.

The normal remedy now is a federal low-interest disaster loan, with which people rebuild their homes and spread their losses over many years.

Many, however, cannot carry the financial burden of a regular mortgage payment, plus a disaster loan payment.

If they were foreigners, we'd probably send them the money and write it off as foreign aid.

In 28 years, we've given away \$125 billion dollars in foreign aid. Peru, Maritius, Upper

Volta, Brunel, Surinam and Lesotho alone got \$525 million.

Surely, we should do as much for our own disaster victims here at home.

KFWB suggests that our congressmen set up a federal low premium insurance for homeowners. It should be cheap enough that all homeowners can afford it, and it should cover their total loss in an act-of-God disaster.

We know there will be at least one natural disaster this year. What we don't know, is where it will strike.

With respect to Federal aid, the President's disaster fund will eventually spend approximately \$547 million on disasters that occurred in 1972, but the damage caused by just a single disaster in 1972—Tropical Storm Agnes—has been estimated to be \$3 billion.

Under our Federal flood insurance program the maximum insurance available at subsidized rates is \$17,500 for a single-family dwelling, \$30,000 for a small business or two- to four-family dwelling, and \$5,000 for the contents of each unit. Additional insurance is available in an equal amount at actuarially determined rates. This is an excellent program but it offers protection only in limited amounts, to a limited class of persons under limited circumstances; namely, the owners of one- to four-family dwelling units and small business for damage due to flooding.

Homeowners have historically found it difficult to insure themselves against all types of disasters at economically feasible rates without substantial deductibles. Further, the private insurance industry, which has been beset with fluctuating, costly, and often inadequate reinsurance facilities, cannot be expected to shoulder the total burden of providing comprehensive disaster insurance throughout the Nation on all types of properties for unpredictable catastrophes.

These circumstances result in a situation where natural perils are rarely covered by a standard homeowner's policy, and persons desiring additional coverage must purchase additional policies to cov-

er each type of disaster. In some areas, insurance for certain specific types of disasters is not available at all. Moreover, some companies are reluctant to write disaster coverage in large amounts.

In California, for example, which is an earthquake-prone region of our Nation, it has been estimated that only about 3.5 percent of the property insured against fire is also insured against earthquake. This may be due, in part, to public apathy or complacency, but it is also the result of built-in difficulties in the existing system.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would assure that every American would have the opportunity to insure himself against the damage and losses caused by every type of natural disaster, and to do so through insurance without reliance upon general tax funds. This opportunity does not exist today, despite the fact that nature can wipe out in a moment what it has taken man decades to build. Congress should give thorough consideration to adopting and implementing a program that will guard against the disruption and destruction that accompanies these catastrophes.

CHANGE OF PARTY BY HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we heard some exchange on the question of the departure of our colleague from Michigan, DON RIEGLE, to the other side of the aisle.

I believe it is important for us to recognize that there is no cause for recrimination on the part of Republicans over the departure of a colleague who philosophically made that sojourn to the other side of the aisle several years ago. I think it is in order, in fact, for us to recognize he did indeed do the honorable thing.

The purpose of a viable two-party system is to provide meaningful dissent. I have never been one who subscribed to the theory that the parties should be an umbrella of such all-embracing nature as to take in all philosophical differences, because when that happens the parties will have lost their purpose for existence, and that purpose basically is to provide the opportunity to register meaningful dissent.

That is quite obviously impossible when one cannot find basic fundamental differences between the party positions.

As I noted last year when the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID) made a similar change, there are these wide ranging philosophical differences within each of our two major parties. Many have insisted that this is desirable, that the parties to be truly national must be all-embracing and reflect every shade of opinion. I have never subscribed to this concept of political parties.

Those who today insist upon blurring meaningful distinctions between parties really do a disservice to the purpose of political parties. That purpose is to guarantee that those on either side of the

philosophical spectrum shall always be guaranteed the right to register meaningful dissent.

The gentleman from Michigan has obviously made a decision of conscience that was not easy but proper. There is still a residuum of meaningful difference between the Republican Party's approach to problem solving and the Democratic Party's approach to problem solving. My colleague opted in favor of the national party that more nearly reflects his own philosophical convictions.

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

Mr. CRANE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) was a Member of Congress when I came here 4 years ago. I agree with the gentleman that he has made what would seem to be a reasonable choice, and it ought to be much easier on his conscience on the other side of the aisle, because I have not, myself, seen him cast one conservative vote since I have been here.

On the other hand, my dear colleague from Illinois, I would like to point out that across the aisle there are some mighty fine Americans. In just one issue yesterday of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the one of February 27, two very prominent Democrats put articles in the RECORD deriding the wasteful habits of this Congress and expressing praise for President Nixon in his attempts to bring about fiscal stability in our country again.

So all in all, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) will not find himself totally happy over there. In fact, I do not think he will find himself totally happy in this Congress.

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

Mr. CRANE. Yes, I will be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding. I am appreciative of the fact that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has raised an important point, and that is that there are genuine philosophical differences between the two parties.

The gentleman from Illinois is correct in stating that there are clear philosophical differences between the Democrat and Republican parties.

It is important to point out that our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) found himself philosophically in conflict with the concepts of less government, maximum individual freedom, the free enterprise system, and minimum Federal Government intervention in the affairs of men, which are basic principles of the Republican Party, and which the gentleman from Michigan evidently found it difficult to follow. So, it is more than proper that, after an honest assessment, he moved to participate in the so-called big umbrella of the Democrat Party which believes in massive Federal spending, huge bureaucratic agencies as a major solution to all human problems, and other similar points of view.

Mr. RIEGLE, as the gentleman from

New York, OGDEN REID, did before him, has chosen a change in parties in keeping with his own conscience and, therefore shows that there are clear philosophical differences between the two parties.

According to the latest statistics, there are roughly 85 million working people in this country who pay Federal income taxes and they are the ones who ultimately must share the burden of the cost of the Federal Government. The Republican Party has always tried to be very mindful of these hard-working people as well as the families for whom these hard-working people provide a living. Evidently, our good colleague from Michigan has felt that he wishes to join the party that claims to be for the "little man," but has constantly called upon this same little man who has to earn a living to carry a bigger and bigger taxation burden to keep this Federal Government afloat.

Evidently this same Democrat Party has been basically unwilling to provide for the American people an honest accounting of how these massive tax funds are spent. And, further, has clearly deviated from the Thomas Jefferson admonition to "bind the hands of men with the chains of the Constitution" so that they will not permit the Federal Government to improperly invade the privacy and true civil rights of the individual. It becomes apparent that our colleague from Michigan is sincere in his desire to join the party of "big spenders" and "massive Federal interventionists" and, by his own statements, appears to be more comfortable with the trend and direction of this effort.

Many of us feel that the Republican Party clearly represents a much broader segment of the American public than some of the mass media would have the people believe. Opinion polls have been taken over and over again showing that the Republican Party's stand on issues coincides with the general American public thinking more times than does that of the Democrat Party. Polls provide substantial proof that the position we have taken as a Republican Party here in the House of Representatives is more in keeping with the thoughts of "the little man" than are those of our Democrat colleagues across the aisle.

So, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion today about this particular subject. I think that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has been correct in taking time to show that this decision by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) was arrived at with an honest and sincere conviction that there are clear philosophical differences between our two parties.

We commend him for doing that. It needed to be done. He felt he might not be able to achieve the things that were important for him and his district. It will be interesting to see if he will be able to achieve these within the framework of the Democratic Party since he maintains that that is where he should go.

So I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

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

Mr. CRANE. I am sure that the decision that was made by our colleague involved considerable soul-searching as his lengthy statement of February 27 indicates.

In his statement, however, the gentleman from Michigan made a number of charges concerning the Republican Party, which he contrasted unfavorably with the Democratic Party, and which merit some analysis.

He stated that—

The Republican Party has increasingly had its policies "imposed from the top down, by a handful of people in the executive branch of government.

He lamented that—

The Republican Party, which for so long championed individual freedom—separation of federal powers—limited and decentralized government . . . should now find itself having to abandon that heritage in favor of all powerful presidential paternalism.

He charges—

The leaders of the Republican Party are not sensitive and relevant to the broad needs of the American people, and this has been reflected at the ballot box.

He charges the Republican Party with responsibility for "a great loss of citizen faith in our self-government system, in politicians and in our national parties." He states that the Democratic Party is, in fact, "the party of the people."

This is an interesting analysis of today's political situation. To argue that the Republican Party, whose Presidential candidate carried all but a single State, has lost "at the ballot box," is an unusual analysis of our most recent election. To state that Republican Party policy is "imposed from the top down," totally ignores the fact that Republicans in Congress have decidedly not been a rubber stamp for the Nixon administration but have, where they disagreed, been vocal and persuasive in their disagreement. The family assistance plan, for example, was vigorously advocated by the administration, vigorously opposed by many Republicans in Congress, and finally defeated.

Mr. RIEGLE states that dissent is not welcomed in the Republican Party, yet two of our colleagues in the Congress, Mr. McCloskey and Mr. Ashbrook, challenged President Nixon in the Republican Party primaries. Both have been re-elected to the Congress. Both are Republicans, and both have received a fair hearing within the party.

To argue that a party as diverse in viewpoint as to contain men of such differing views as Senators JAVITS, CASE, HATFIELD, and MATHIAS, on the one hand, and Senators GOLDWATER, THURMOND, CURTIS, and HELMS, on the other, is intolerant of dissent is to misunderstand the totality of our political situation. One wonders where the Republican Party being discussed by Mr. RIEGLE exists. It certainly does not exist in this Congress at this time.

More surprising, however, is the manner in which Mr. RIEGLE blames the Republican Party for the increasing lack of faith in government which is all too evident in the American society. There are

good reasons for this loss of faith and, in many respects, it should be welcomed. Why government ever possessed such faith is a more interesting question to explore than why it is now losing it, but the facts of today's political life remain misunderstood by too many.

Permit me to cite several examples.

Discussing public housing in the New York area, Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times declared that the Fort Greene project in Brooklyn is a "20 million dollar slum" ideal for breeding criminals. Such projects, Salisbury states, "are centers of juvenile delinquency. They spawn teenage gangs. They incubate crime." A housing man is quoted as saying—

The first thing that happens is the kids begin to destroy the property. Even before it is built. They steal the place blind. As soon as the windows go in they smash them. They smash them again and again. What difference does it make, it's public ain't it? That's what they say.

Have the liberal welfare programs, which Mr. RIEGLE hails as being of and for the people, really given individuals a stake in their communities, and a realistic hope for the future? Negro leaders think not, while men such as my colleague from Michigan continue to disagree. Bayard Rustin, director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute of New York, said that the War on Poverty is an "immoral bag of tricks" amounting to a "new form of slavery." He stated that—

The problem for Negroes and Puerto Ricans and poor whites . . . is that America has no commitment to turn muscle power into skills.

Rustin expressed the view that simply giving people a "dole" without asking them to work and helping them to attain skills is no answer to the real problem. The hopelessness and futility remain, what has been called the "psychology of poverty." Unless this psychology is changed, Government programs such as those initiated by previous Democratic administrations, and evidently envisioned by Mr. RIEGLE, provide only a tranquilizer and not a cure.

The late militant black leader, Malcolm X, has expressed a similar opinion. In his "Autobiography," he addressed these words to self-proclaimed white liberals, those he found most guilty of supporting the idea of a dole for the ghetto:

If . . . (they) wanted more to do, they could work on the roots of such ghetto evils as the little children out in the streets at midnight with apartment keys on strings around their necks to let themselves in, and their mothers and fathers drunk, drug addicts, thieves, prostitutes. Or . . . they could light some fires under Northern city halls, unions, and major industries to give more jobs to Negroes to remove so many of them from the relief and welfare rolls, which created laziness, and which deteriorated the ghettos into steadily worse places for humans to live . . . one thing the white man can never give the black man is self-respect. The black man never can become independent and recognized as a human being who is truly equal with other human beings until he has what they have, and until he is doing for himself what others are doing for themselves.

The philosophy of "spend and spend" which my colleague would like to see adopted by the Republican Party has

failed, not only in the fields of welfare and relief, but in other fields as well. Such an approach is not a program, it is a simple substitute for a program. Problems are not solved by the simple expenditure of large sums of money. We have seen this repeatedly, yet today we learn that the Republican Party is not "responsive or relevant" because it will not continue to embrace a false philosophy and programs which have failed. It is that kind of "relevance and responsiveness" which produces not only a deteriorating society, but also a lack of faith in government and, in addition, the kind of electoral results Mr. McGovern produced in the past election.

The gentleman from Michigan argues that the Republican Party no longer believes in decentralization, a position which completely overlooks the fact that it is precisely the idea of decentralization which has caused this administration to urge a policy of increased power and authority for State, county, and city governments.

My colleague argues that the American people have lost faith in an "unresponsive" government, not considering the fact that it is the bureaucrats who are elected by no one, and must not go to the people for their approval or disapproval at regular intervals, who now make rules which have the effect of law. It is this administration which is seeking to limit the authority of such bureaucrats, while the Democratic Party, since the days of the New Deal, has presided over the expansion of the bureaucracy which has led to our present situation. The people oppose schoolbusing, yet the buses roll. If they believe government is not responsive, they are quite right.

The question before us, in reality, is the basic question of what kind of a society we want to have. Do we want a society in which individuals become dependent upon government and the taxpayers for their livelihood? Do we want a society in which those who live in slums become locked into the "culture of poverty" and become unable to escape from it. Do we want a society in which the Federal Government is directly dictating to all citizens in the conduct of the intimate and personal matters of their lives?

Or, on the other hand, do we want to adapt our traditional principles of individualism and freedom to the changed circumstances of a mass society? Do we want to use the Government, not to employ people, or put them on a dole, but to assist them in obtaining the necessary skills to become independent and self-supporting citizens?

The gentleman's lengthy statement does not really address itself to any of these important questions. It presents an analysis of the Democratic and Republican Parties which has little relationship to reality and even less to the "needs of the people," about which one party is allegedly concerned and the other is not.

If, for a variety of reasons, Mr. RIEGLE has decided to become a Democrat, this, in a free society, is his privilege and right. His attack upon the Republican Party, which has always given him and others full latitude to express any view about any subject, is ill advised and erroneous

in content. Hopefully, he will come to this decision himself upon further reflection.

OBSCENE RADIO BROADCASTING— VII

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have inserted into the RECORD several items relating to controversial broadcasts by station WERE in Cleveland, Ohio, and on how this appears to be part of a national trend in programming by radio.

Members of this body who have a similar problem in their own congressional districts might wish to check the RECORDS of February 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, and 26, for material leading up to the insertion I am making today.

This is a letter to me from the U.S. attorney in Cleveland, and obviously it is self-explanatory. I think my colleagues here will find it of great interest. I have no comment to make at this time on the more substantive portions of this letter, but I do want to point out that the first paragraph of the February 22 letter from the U.S. attorney is in conflict with what he had told me earlier. For elucidation of this point alone, which, while important, does not go to the heart of the matter, I insert here, in addition to the aforementioned February 22 letter, a letter from the U.S. attorney to me, dated December 6, 1972, and a letter from me to him dated February 9. The letters follow:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
U.S. ATTORNEY,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 22, 1973.
Hon. JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: In reply to your letter of February 9, wherein you inquired as to whether all tapes which I had requested from Station WERE were made available to me, I wish to advise you that all such tapes were made available and were reviewed.

In reply to your letters of February 21, 1973 and January 30, 1973, wherein you request that I explain to you my reasoning in arriving at my decision respecting prosecution, I must now respectfully decline your request.

As a Member of Congress, you are certainly aware of the separation of powers of our various branches of government. The Executive Branch is not more answerable to the Legislative Branch than either the Legislative Branch to the Executive Branch or even to the Judiciary. I would remind you that I am a member of the Executive Branch.

Prompted by my respect for you personally, as an individual, as well as my wish to extend a courtesy to a member of the Legislative Branch, I did offer to disclose to you certain information, on a confidential basis. I must now withdraw that offer and direct you to the standard procedure which confronts members of the Department of Justice.

As United States Attorney, my activities are directly supervised by the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, Washington, D.C. That office handles matters respecting congressional inquiry. Should you wish to have further information respecting the operation of my office, I would suggest that

you communicate with the following-named individual:

Mr. Philip H. Modlin, Director, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530.

Very truly yours,
FREDERICK M. COLEMAN,
U.S. Attorney.

U.S. ATTORNEY,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO,
Cleveland, Ohio, December 6, 1972.

Re Gary Dee—Radio Station WERE.

Hon. JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: In reply to your letter of November 1, respecting the broadcast of November 1, 1972, and any possible violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1464, I wish to present the following information.

In response to a request from this office, an investigation was conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding the matter. The hours during which Gary Dee broadcasted, on that date, were from 5:00 A.M. through 10:00 A.M. The investigation revealed that Station WERE was able to provide the investigator with tapes of recordings between the hours of 5:00 A.M. through 7:15 A.M. and from 9:30 A.M. through 10:00 A.M. on the date of November 1. The recordings of other broadcasts by Gary Dee were missing and could not be located.

A review of the tapes which were presented for investigation revealed the use of some questionable language by the broadcaster, but it contained nothing which constituted obscene language. At best, much of the material was broadcasted in poor taste, as opposed to constituting a criminal violation.

Under the circumstances, and in consideration of the results of the entire investigation, I have declined prosecution in the absence of a finding of the criminal violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1464.

Should you require additional information, please feel free to get in touch with me.

Very truly yours,
FREDERICK M. COLEMAN,
U.S. Attorney.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 9, 1973.

Mr. FREDERICK M. COLEMAN,
U.S. Attorney, Northeast District,
Cleveland, Ohio

DEAR Mr. COLEMAN: As an addendum to my January 30 letter to you regarding the Station WERE matter, I would like to call your attention to:

1. Your December 6 letter to me, in which you said: "The recordings of other broadcasts by Gary Dee were missing and could not be located."

2. My February 1 letter to Chairman Dean Burch of the Federal Communications Commission, a copy of which was sent to you, in which I refer, on Page 7, to this same problem.

In your reply to my January 30 letter, which I assume is in the process of preparation by you, I would appreciate your informing me as to whether all the tapes you requested of the January 17 broadcasts by Station WERE were made available to you by the station.

Whatever difficulties you may have had in this connection, either with respect to the November 1 or January 17 broadcast days, would be of interest to me, since it is conceivable that legislation might be required to correct these problems.

Therefore, it would be very helpful to me if you could send me a complete report on this aspect of the situation—again, as an addendum to the information I have already requested from you.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

THE TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which attempts to develop practical and timely economic adjustment programs to help workers, companies and communities adversely affected by foreign imports, and by the movement abroad of multinational corporations.

I introduce the Trade Adjustment Assistance Organization Act of 1973 in the hope that my colleagues and the executive branch will fully recognize that the Nation needs workable solutions to the economic issues which confront us—loss of jobs, continuing inflation, and our mounting trade deficit—and that in response to these issues the Congress and Executive will work together to give this or a similar bill a very high priority in new trade legislation.

I am concerned, however, about recent reports that the administration, in developing its forthcoming trade bill, may not be fully considering the essential link between trade safeguards and a workable trade adjustment assistance program. A mix of the two approaches will be needed to provide lasting economic adjustment, and to avoid a lapse into escalating protectionism. Thus, in special situations—where there has been rapid market penetration by imports—trade adjustment assistance should be linked to carefully designed safeguards, which would provide interim protection to industries and workers during difficult transitional periods of adjustment.

For the past four decades the United States has pursued an outward-looking foreign trade policy—a policy designed to seek freer trade, from which all nations could benefit economically and politically. The United States did not take this course until after learning, in the hard school of the Depression and Smoot-Hawley tariff years, the grave disadvantages of indiscriminate trade restrictions, political isolationism and retaliatory trade barriers, which in turn forced many American businesses to lay off workers. Since 1934 and the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Act, and especially after World War II, the United States has encouraged cooperative and interdependent international economic policies. On balance, the result of our outward-looking foreign economic policy has been U.S. economic growth with increased sales abroad, strengthened economic and political relations with foreign countries, and an increased standard of living at lower costs to consumers in the developed countries, including the United States.

Over the last year, however, there has been growing concern in the United States about our mounting trade and balance-of-payments deficits combined with an intolerable 5 to 6 percent unemployment rate. We are confronted with these facts, but have been unable to reach a consensus as to their root cause, and more important have, to date, been unable to develop truly constructive solutions.

Some concerned citizens have pointed to unfair trade practices engaged in by foreign companies and governments, which have gone unchallenged by the executive. Others have suggested that the root of our employment and trade difficulties are to be found in our domestic economy, through the lack of economic policies effectively controlling inflation, and the failure to develop and rely on forward-looking economic policies to stimulate innovation, productivity and vigorous competition.

But one fact is clear. Millions of American workers are gripped by the fear that imports are undermining their job security, and they are joined in this fear by diverse industries which feel the pressure of foreign competition.

As a result, we are witnessing the shift of more and more of our Nation's business, labor, and economic leaders from an outward-looking foreign economic policy to a more protectionist one, and have seen the introduction of legislation which would greatly restrict imports across the board as well as the activities of American companies abroad.

These events are warning signals that the United States must develop and pursue fresh concepts to meet the problems of economic dislocations caused by imports. Warning signals that new trade legislation must confront the need to provide greater job security and opportunities for American workers, but in a way which is truly humane, effective economically, and consistent with the best interests of the U.S. international role.

Of critical importance will be a vastly improved adjustment assistance program.

THE NECESSITY FOR A WORKABLE TRADE ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

In the last year and a half, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, which I chair, has held a series of hearings on the domestic and foreign ramifications of U.S. foreign economic policy. We examined successively the economic impact of enlargement of the European Common Market; the international implications of the new economic policy; and the state of our politico-economic relationship with our two largest trading partners, Canada and Japan. From these hearings there are a few facts on which a consensus did emerge.

First, to the extent the United States reacts unilaterally in the world economic arena to trade and international monetary problems, we risk incurring foreign political losses which could seriously endanger our country's security. Furthermore, there is every reason to believe that the unilateral imposition of trade restrictions by the United States would provoke retaliation in kind by our trading partners. The resulting trade wars can only seriously undermine our general economic well-being. As in the 1930's American jobs will be lost, not gained because of trade wars.

Moreover, import restrictions damage the U.S. consumer by reducing competition for domestic producers and permitting them to raise prices. It is estimated that present U.S. trade restrictions now

cost U.S. consumers as much as \$10 to \$15 billion every year.

In a State such as Iowa, which I represent, both consumers and working people have no cause to rejoice in a trade war since exports are a vital part of Iowa's economic base.

Agricultural exports shipped from Iowa to foreign markets accounted for \$620 million in fiscal year 1972; and the State was again second in the Nation in total as well as per capita exports of farm products. Most important, Iowa's growth rate in agricultural exports leads the Nation.

Iowa is also major exporter of manufactured goods, ranking 11th among the States in per capita exports of these products. Iowa's export trade in manufactured goods nearly doubled in the 1960's and continues to grow.

Cedar Rapids, for example, is the State's major producer of manufactured goods for exports, predominately farm and heavy duty road equipment, as well as electrical and food products.

Waterloo also exports large amounts of farm and road equipment; other important export centers are Dubuque, Des Moines, and the metropolitan area of Davenport.

Second, the concerns being voiced by labor and management in the adversely affected sectors of our economy are real concerns, and cannot be ignored or answered by resorting to the vague conceptual slogans of either "free trade" or "protectionism."

Third, trade adjustment assistance, in its present form as enacted in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, has been employed so ineffectively and so marginally that continued business and labor criticism of adjustment assistance as nothing but burial expenses must be accepted.

For workers the assistance was supposed to be extra unemployment and retraining benefits. For companies the program specified loans and technical advice in modernizing their production facilities or moving them into new product lines. But 10 years after these laws were placed on the books, the actual record of accomplishment is pitiful. Only two companies and 20,000 workers have been temporarily helped, while another 17 companies and their workers, who did manage to survive the dense bureaucratic jungle necessary to qualify for assistance, have, to date, received nothing useful to help them.

We must face the fact that adjustment assistance as it was enacted 10 years ago was unworkable and obsolete the day it was passed.

The emphasis today must be put on a better delivery system, more substantive assistance and an early warning network to spot in advance those industries and companies which are running into trouble. Then Government assistance can be useful before the company is financially beyond hope, and it can enroll workers into training programs before their skills become obsolete. The Government must anticipate problems and identify industries likely to become uncompetitive. But, most important, the assistance must be adequate, practical, and quick. Otherwise, we will always be

in a position of doing too little, too late.

As a result of its failure to soften the burdens of foreign competition by the rapid reemployment of workers and resources into more profitable and productive enterprises, trade adjustment assistance has failed to encourage large segments of business and labor to continue to support an outward looking foreign policy. Now, we find that many of those who have grievances against foreign competition are supporting legislation to restrict international trade as the only alternative to deal with damaging foreign imports.

It would be irresponsible to dismiss this understandable action without suggesting any viable alternative. In view of the tremendous impact which imports have had on workers, industries and entire communities, a positive alternative to trade restrictions and trade wars is called for.

THE TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1973

In April and May of last year, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy held hearings to examine workable mechanisms for economic conversion as an alternative to trade wars. During these hearings, the subcommittee received testimony from knowledgeable private witnesses drawn from former Government officials, universities, public interest groups, labor and business, as well as from key Government officials.

The general consensus reached during the hearings was that trade adjustment assistance has not been given a meaningful test; that the trade adjustment assistance program provided for in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 in its design could not work and therefore hasn't; and that, most important, a trade adjustment assistance program can be designed to provide prompt and effective assistance to the workers, firms and communities who need it, at a lower cost to the economy than, and without the foreign policy disadvantages of, import-restricting relief.

For the purpose of providing a workable alternative to trade restrictions and trade wars, I am introducing today the Trade Adjustment Assistance Organization Act of 1973.

This bill is based on the recommendations made in the subcommittee's report on trade adjustment assistance, and is, in my opinion, a reasonable and constructive means of making adjustment assistance a workable answer to economic dislocations caused by imports. The bill is, however, open for refinement and I welcome any constructive suggestions.

In submitting this legislation I would like to raise an inherent broader issue which presented itself in our hearings—the issue of developing a national industrial conversion and manpower training program.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE—A MODEL FOR A NATIONAL PROGRAM

We live in an era of "future shock." The social and human costs of economic dislocation caused by rapid technological change, changes in consumer tastes, Government procurement programs, international trade, and other factors, make the development of effective ad-

justment mechanisms imperative where such dislocations occur.

Viewed in the context of the various factors which can cause economic dislocations, it is hard to justify helping workers suffering unemployment for some reasons while neglecting others whose unemployment arises from different causes equally beyond the workers' control. To a firm or worker thrown out of business by impersonal forces, it makes no difference whether the cause is increased imports, changing choice and technology, or rapid and sudden shifts in Government programs. Textile firms and workers in the Northeast were probably hurt far more by the internal relocation of their industry to the South than by imports from the Far East. Similarly, the aerospace engineer in California now driving a taxicab can attribute his misfortune to diminution of the U.S. space program, not construction of the Anglo-French Concorde. And the family farmer who leaves his land because he cannot compete with the mechanized efficiency of large corporations may never have even heard of the variable import levy restrictions on his potential exports to the Common Market.

Moreover, as the Vietnam war and our orientation toward a military economy wind down and as the 1970's bring a new awareness of the human and environmental problems which confront the Nation, we must develop a national priorities and economic conversion program which serves to shift industry from less productive areas to those for which there is a need for greatly expanded services, manpower, and capital investments—health, education, energy, low cost housing, pollution control, mass transportation, and rural and urban development.

To deal more effectively with the problems of unemployment, inflation, low productivity, lack of competitiveness, worker dissatisfaction, and redirecting our economic priorities, the United States must commit itself to the development and implementation of national manpower and industrial priority programs. It is time to develop mechanisms to provide adequate training and retraining opportunities with the genuine prospect of a job at the end of the line for all workers.

However, with the imminence of new multilateral trade negotiations, it is all the more timely to develop a workable trade adjustment assistance program, which can also serve as a demonstration model for a national manpower and industrial program. Moreover, a strong trade adjustment assistance program will strengthen our position in international economic negotiations as well as fulfill an important responsibility to our domestic economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be joined in the cosponsorship of this legislation by 44 of my colleagues. At this point I would like to submit a summary of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Organization Act of 1973:

A SUMMARY OF THE TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION ACT

TITLE I—REORGANIZATION

Since the effective administration of an improved adjustment assistance program

requires a cohesive organization which can provide greater coordination at the Federal and state levels, this title transfers the trade adjustment assistance functions of existing Federal agencies to a newly created Trade Adjustment Assistance Administration, which will be in the Labor Department.

This new administration will absorb all or parts of the following existing offices:

- (1) The Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance of the Commerce Department;
- (2) The Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance of the Labor Department;
- (3) The adjustment assistance functions of the Tariff Commission; and
- (4) other relevant Federal programs.

The Administrator, appointed by the President, will be the chief executive of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Administration. He will be authorized to establish, certify and support training programs, and to coordinate the administration's activities with local and state bodies.

To help anticipate adjustment problems, identify industries most in need of modernization, establish national economic priorities, and review operations, an Economic Priorities Council will be created. It will consist of twelve members, three from labor, three from industry, three from consumer groups, and the Secretaries of Commerce, Treasury and Labor. Appropriate staff will be provided by the Department of Labor and the Trade Adjustment Administration.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE

Subtitle A establishes a simple criteria for eligibility for benefits under this Act. This simplified criteria will expand coverage and speed up delivery of benefits. The Secretary of Labor will be responsible for determining the eligibility of workers, companies and communities.

A firm shall be eligible for economic adjustment assistance if it establishes that a significant number or proportion of its workers have become unemployed or underemployed or are threatened with unemployment or underemployment, and that the situation has been caused in substantial part by increased imports of articles competitive with articles produced by the firm without linkage to trade concessions.

Workers shall be eligible for economic adjustment assistance under the same criteria as firms, as well as in the situation where the relocation or proposed relocation of facilities of the firm to a place outside the United States causes, or threatens to cause unemployment or underemployment.

Communities shall be eligible for economic adjustment assistance if—

- (1) a firm in such community is eligible for economic adjustment assistance and the economic situation of the firm has been a substantial cause or threat of serious injury to the economic base of the community, or
- (2) if the relocation or proposed relocation of facilities of a firm will be a substantial cause or threat of serious injury to the economic base of the community.

To the extent practicable, joint firm-worker and firm-worker-community adjustment proposals and petitions should be encouraged. Such cooperation would expedite economic readjustment. Lacking such coordinated efforts, the Administrator shall notify the authorized representatives of all parties of pending petitions and adjustment proposals and consult with them in order to develop a coordinated economic adjustment program.

Subtitle B provides for assistance to firms. Companies deemed eligible for assistance will be entitled to make application for the following forms of assistance:

- (1) interim financing pending the approval of longer term loan assistance;
- (2) loan terms more favorable than existing commercial rates;

(3) technical assistance;

(4) research and development assistance for projects which would create new job opportunities; and

(5) continues existing tax benefits and provides the opportunity for new benefits for those companies whose particular economic circumstances warrant such preferential treatment.

Subtitle C would expand the present adjustment assistance program under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by increasing the amount and availability of benefits to eligible workers. To assure maximum equitable coverage and a minimum of hardship, a 60 day time limitation is placed on final determination of eligibility, and the qualification criteria concerning previous work, earnings and head of household status are liberalized so that there is a broad qualification for those workers who have been separated from their jobs. In addition, the readjustment allowance in this Act is raised from 65 percent to 85 percent of the displaced worker's average weekly wage rate.

In order to encourage workers to seek retraining, workers who, in addition to their readjustment allowance, receive assistance from other manpower services—such as state unemployment or retraining programs—will now be eligible to receive 100 percent rather than 75 percent of their former wage. Eligible workers will not, however, be able to receive more than 100 percent of their former wage. Payment of readjustment allowances continues for the entire period of retraining, and the length of the retraining period is left to the determination of the Administration so that the period is adequate to complete the extensive training required for high skilled services and technologically advanced industries. Furthermore, qualified workers will be allowed to pursue technical, professional or academic training as well as the traditional vocational training.

To assist workers, the Administration will develop retraining programs teaching skills needed for priority economic areas, and will provide testing, counseling and job placement assistance.

Workers still employed but who can demonstrate that they are threatened by loss of employment in the future will be eligible for retraining programs.

In addition, the Administration will provide relocation assistance, continuation of health insurance, and speeded up retirement, pension and social security benefits for other wise eligible displaced workers who are over 60 years of age.

Subtitle D provides economic adjustment assistance to communities. Adjustment assistance under this subtitle consists of technical assistance in the development of programs to enable communities to absorb the effects of economic dislocation and maintain a stable economic base by diversifying its industrial base, and wherever possible to reconstitute the local firm and its work force. In addition, the Administration shall submit to, and coordinate the communities adjustment proposal with the agency or agencies it determines to be appropriate for furnishing the technical and financial assistance to carry out the adjustment proposal.

TITLE III—RELOCATION OF FIRMS

This title provides that any firm which relocates facilities outside the United States must apply for all economic adjustment assistance for which its workers are eligible. In addition, such firms are required to offer first choice of future employment opportunities in their other production facilities to individuals at the old location who have been or will be rendered unemployed or underemployed by reason of the relocation of facilities. This should be done in cooperation with the appropriate labor representatives.

TITLE IV—AN EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

In order to have an effective adjustment assistance program there be a mechanism

which can spot in advance economic hardship among industries and workers so the government can then initiate adjustment programs before the hardship actually occurs.

In recognition of this factor, Title IV directs the Trade Adjustment Assistance Administration to develop an integrated system of foreign and economic statistics. In addition, it requires, on a confidential basis, advance notice of corporate decisions to relocate facilities abroad, which would result in a reduction of workers.

HOUSING STOPS STYMIE RURAL NEEDS

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, many of us from rural parts of the country often feel that the metropolitan press has closed its eyes to the problems that exist beyond the outer limits of the suburbs.

For that reason, I was especially pleased to read a feature article on rural housing problems in the February 9 issue of the Washington Star.

Lew Sichelman, the new real estate editor of the Star did an excellent job in pointing out that two-thirds of the bad housing in the entire country is in rural America, in telling what organizations such as the rural housing alliance have done to help remedy the situation, and in making it clear that the effect of the administration's freeze on housing hits very hard at low-income rural families. I submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues the text of the article.

ANOTHER FREEZE VICTIM—RURAL HOUSING IS THE NATION'S WORST (By Lew Sichelman)

When people think of substandard housing, they usually think of the inner city, the ghetto. They close their eyes to conjure up visions of run-down tenements, boarded-up windows, floors covered with paint chips and rat-infested hallways.

And why not? The greatest concentration of our population is in our urban areas, where housing problems are easily seen and the difficulties of the poor are often heard about.

Yet, nearly two-thirds of the substandard housing in this country is in rural America. And over half of these dwellings are occupied.

These aren't just broken-down, overcrowded shacks or shanties where several families huddle close together in the corner of one room to keep warm, for the government's statistics on inferior housing no longer reflect dilapidation. That would be too subjective and too difficult to determine.

They are only the homes with something wrong with the plumbing. They lack running water, or have no bathroom, or have no plumbing at all.

And they're not far removed from this area. All you have to do is take a ride toward southern Maryland through Prince Georges County or to the outlying Northern Virginia counties of Fauquier and Loudoun to see them first hand, close-up, big as life.

The problem of substandard rural housing is nothing new. It has always been there. It's simply that up until a few years ago, no one cared or thought enough about it to bring it to the attention of the public.

"We call it 'metropollyanna,'" says Clay Cochran, executive director of the Rural Housing Alliance, which was formed in 1969 to help low-income rural Americans obtain decent housing.

"The focus has always been on the cities" be it housing, welfare or whatever, Cochran says in explaining "metropollyanna." "There is an implicit belief that sooner or later, everyone will move to the cities where everything is good." For instance, he asks, why would a mother with six kids living on a pittance in Arkansas stay there when her relatives tell her she can get \$300 in Chicago?

"Consciously and subconsciously," Cochran asserts, "we have been led by the unseen hand or another facet of our mythology to assume that the growth of our cities would redound to the benefit of all. Moreover, we have assumed, very comfortably, that there was some technological imperative which dictated that sooner or later, when we really become civilized, 90 percent or more of our people would live on 1 percent of our land, happy, prosperous, cultured and secure."

RHA is, in Cochran's words, "the stepchild of the American Friends Service Committee" which has been concerned with the plight of the poorly housed for more than 30 years.

In 1965, encouraged by the experience and success gained in sponsoring self-help housing programs in several areas, the service organized the International Self-Help Housing Association to foster the growth of the self-help approach to housing construction and repair. Neighbors help one another build or rehabilitate at a substantial saving in cost.

Funded by the Ford Foundation, the association opened an office here in January 1967. By the spring of 1969, the association had broadened its scope to include all rural housing programs and changed its name to the Rural Housing Alliance, which today is funded by the Ford Foundation, the Office of Economic Opportunity and some 500 members.

Until that time, says Cochran, there was no housing program focused on our rural areas. Even the "good" people who were quite concerned about substandard housing in the cities didn't think of the rural areas, he says. "They thought someone, somewhere, was taking care of that."

But they were wrong. There was little or nothing to help low or even moderate-income families obtain decent housing.

The Federal Housing Administration, which guarantees home mortgage loans, didn't function in towns of 25,000 or less because there was no one to lend the money for mortgages, according to Cochran.

And public housing programs, in which the government put up the construction money and assumed the poor could manage from there, never got off the ground in rural America "because incomes were so desperately low that the rural poor couldn't even afford the utilities."

So in 1969, RHA held the first national conference on rural housing problems to focus attention on just how bad the situation was out there. How bad was it? These figures may give you an idea:

In rural areas, one house in seven is substandard, according to the Census Bureau but only one of every 25 homes in the cities is substandard.

Fifty-six percent of the substandard housing in America is in places of 2,500 people or less, yet only 25 percent of the country's population lives in such places, said Census.

Four years ago, says Cochran, 57 percent of the poor in Mississippi couldn't have lived in public housing if they had it. And they didn't.

The conference brought this body of information to the people who could do something about it—the government, labor unions, churches—and came up with a number of recommendations designed to solve the rural housing problem.

Since then, there has been some progress, albeit not enough. "We have no illusions about how much has been accomplished since our formation," admits Cochran. "Except there has been an awakening to the desperate

need for adequate housing in small towns and rural areas."

Through what RHA calls "a handful of inadequate federal rural housing programs," the Farmers Home Administration, an Agriculture Department agency created in 1961, lent \$1.6 billion last year, more than three times the \$500 million it lent for rural housing in 1969. Yet, only 10 percent of the FmHA loans went to people with incomes of less than \$4,000.

But RHA no longer is seeking more money or deeper subsidies to reach lower income levels. Now RHA is fighting to get back what it had gained in the last four years, for early last month the Nixon administration suspended the FmHA's housing programs as well as the subsidized programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Since FmHA program commitments aren't as far advanced as HUD's, which will last for 18 months or so, they will end, says Cochran, in less than six months.

With its 1,700 offices generally available to rural people, the FmHA, even with its shortcomings, is "ideally suited to the operation of a direct lending program in rural areas" and "is the only effective agency in the country equipped to bring housing to many low-income rural families," Cochran maintained.

Projections by the Housing Assistance Council, he went on, show that the moratorium will mean an 18-month loss of \$1.55 billion in revenue nationally (assuming that every dollar spent on housing is worth \$3 in terms of economic impact) and 133,000 man-years of work.

The state hardest hit is South Carolina, which, Cochran said, will lose \$284.3 million and 8,338 man-years of work. Virginia will lose \$191.4 million and 4,992 man-years, and Maryland will be out \$45.5 million and 1,174 man-years.

In more specific terms, he said, over a thousand small contractors in Mississippi alone will be bankrupted immediately if the freeze is not lifted or altered.

"We cannot emphasize too strongly the loss to the emerging rural housing delivery system implicit in the imposed moratorium," he testified.

"It cannot be argued that the rural housing programs are tainted with corruption, nor can it be said that the \$27 million spent on them is a major element of inflation in an economy with a Gross National Product of \$1.1 trillion a year.

"We are not unaware of FmHA's shortcomings and inadequacies. But neither are we blind to its successes. We urge its continuation only until something better is substituted."

BOSTON COLLEGE ALUMNI PUBLICATION HAILS MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., BOSTON COLLEGE, 1936

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

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1973 edition of Bridge, a magazine for the Boston College community, there appears a most interesting article by Rich Morrison about one of Boston College's most distinguished alumni, the Honorable THOMAS PHILIP O'NEILL, JR., of the class of 1936, the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. Speaker, even though my undergraduate education was at Fordham University, a longtime Jesuit rival of Boston College, I join with the bald and

grey Eagles of Boston College in hailing "Tip" O'NEILL an outstanding son of Boston College. I can well understand their pride in his outstanding career as speaker of the great and General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as majority whip and now majority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Because I know all Members of this House on both sides of the aisle would be interested in knowing what Tip's old friends from undergraduate days think of him, I ask that "A Political Architect Plans a Stronger House" appear at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

A POLITICAL ARCHITECT PLANS A STRONGER HOUSE

(By Rich Morrison)

Thomas P. O'Neill doesn't forget old friends. The night of Congressman O'Neill's election as Majority Leader in the House of Representatives was party night in Washington. During a get-together at the International Club with family and friends, the thorough-bred Bostonian (in typical fashion) broke out into rousing song with some of the old BC crowd. Above the melodic din, Tip's dulcet tones could be heard leading an impromptu chorus of *For Boston*, the traditional fight song of the Heights, written by T. J. Hurley in 1885. It was the Class of 1936 all over again.

One of BC's most illustrious alumni to date, sociable energy notwithstanding, Tip did not forge his political career by throwing parties. His commitment to the welfare of the people he represents goes back to his student days. O'Neill has not lost an election since 1936 when, as a Boston College senior, he lost a seat on the City Council by a mere 150 votes. His 36 year fling with politics has been on the upswing ever since, the most recent stopover being the majority leader's seat, left vacant after the tragic plane crash that killed Louisiana representative Hale Boggs last fall.

The burly Irishman is described by his son Michael as a "super-fan" of Boston College. His career reflects his BC education and the strict Irish Catholic upbringing in Cambridge, where his family settled after immigrating from County Cork. When the legislature allows him some free time (he spends about 12 days a month home), he is in Cambridge, where he lives with his wife, Mildred. Of their five children, Rosemary, 29, works for the State Department in Washington, Susan, 26, is a teacher in Virginia, Tom 3rd, 27, was just elected to the Massachusetts legislature, Christopher, 23 is a recent BC graduate and Michael, 21, is presently a student at Boston College.

After engaging in a few novice espionage techniques in an attempt to learn the congressman's home phone number in Cambridge, one colleague suggested simply, "Why don't you try the phone book?" I did and discovered that O'Neill makes it easy for his constituents to keep in touch with him. O'Neill was contacted shortly after his recent election and asked if he saw any difficulty setting priorities between his role as congressman, and as majority leader. His quick reply was, "There's no question about it. My constituents come first. And I'm dedicated to serving them with all my ability. Of course, having the majority leader's post will help my district. As majority leader I'm responsible for scheduling legislation on the floor and I'm in constant contact with the speaker and the committee chairmen. When legislation that affects my district is before these committees I know I'll get expeditious service and I schedule our bills for the floor immediately."

Possessed of a quick wit and fierce loyalty,

the 60 year old alumnus is concerned with the vital issues perhaps more than any majority leader in recent history. Commenting on the fiscal crisis of the nation's cities, O'Neill said, "I definitely believe that an institution of higher education should be able to render services in lieu of taxes. After all, a college is a community organization and has a responsibility to improve the community using its resources as best it can, whether this be in the form of taxes or educational programs, it is a contribution just the same. Boston College is a national leader in community involvement and I am proud to be a member of the Board of Trustees."

O'Neill was nicknamed "Tip" by his family, after an 1880's baseball player whose name was O'Neill and who had a famous proclivity for "tipping" foul balls. He's a product of the times, from a working-class background. Parochial schools are a tradition in his family and there was a time when the four oldest children shared the same bedroom.

A nine-term member of the House Rules Committee and co-chairman of the Democratic Congressional Committee, the Roosevelt New Dealer has been among the unofficial leadership of the House since 1952, when representative John F. Kennedy moved to the Senate. Accused by some of old-time politics, the candid O'Neill has taken very visible stands on controversial issues. His split with the late Lyndon Johnson over the Vietnam war in 1967 was a difficult move for him, but one which he felt, in good conscience, had to be made.

The new majority leader is energetic and untiring. His roots in Boston are deep and he has never forgotten the people who elected him congressman. Both conservatives and liberals share the expectation that Tip O'Neill will provide the kind of "can-do-get done" leadership in his critical House job.

THE FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAY ACT—A 1973 VIEW

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, of the many issues presently confronting us in the 93d Congress, none will have a more lasting effect on the future of urban America than the resolution of the problem of Federal highway funding and its relationship to modes of mass transportation. We have all heard the arguments concerning how the moneys from the highway trust fund should and should not be used. Myths and distortions have been developed on both sides of the controversy. In a continuing discussion of this type, there are few absolute rights and absolute wrongs, but only vast gray areas where an advantage for one group is looked upon as a setback for the other.

But the goals in resolving this current funding dispute should not be set in these terms of victory or defeat, but rather the goal should be a transportation system in which the American people result as the only clear winners. To promote such a program, both mass transportation and well-planned highway systems must be utilized to achieve the utmost flexibility in planning for urban and rural America alike.

The need for such flexibility in transportation planning for the 1970's was eloquently expressed by Robert E. Gallamore, on behalf of Common Cause, in his

testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Roads, February 15, 1973. In addition to being director of policy development for Common Cause, Robert Gallamore, as an individual, has impressive credentials in the field of modern transportation. After receiving a degree, Phi Beta Kappa, from Wesleyan, he earned a master's degree in public administration and a doctorate from Harvard. Before joining Common Cause in his present capacity, he was in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation. As an economics specialist at DOT, he was involved in many of the recent economic advancements in the field of transportation and is best known as one of the originators of Amtrak.

At this point, I would like to insert Mr. Gallamore's testimony in the RECORD for my colleagues' attention. Although I do not necessarily agree with every point in his presentation, I feel that his was a rational approach which answers many of the questions that have troubled us all on this issue:

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT E. GALLAMORE

I am speaking on behalf of Common Cause, a citizen's organization of more than 200,000 members throughout the 50 states. Before joining the Staff of Common Cause I served under both Democratic and Republican administrations as an economist with the U.S. Department of Transportation, and my academic specialization was in the economics of transportation.

At the outset I would like to commend this Subcommittee on the breadth of these hearings. The importance of this subject to the larger question of national budgetary priorities should be clear to us all. The road vs. transit debate will focus this issue for the 93rd Congress much as did proposed funding of the American SST two years ago.

Among the issues that concern Common Cause are the revitalization of government at all levels, protection of the environment, equal opportunity in every aspect of American life, sound fiscal and tax policies, improved education, housing and urban transportation, and better planning for anticipated national growth, both in cities and rural areas.

Our basic concern in the urban transportation area stems from the imbalance of federal transportation spending on highways versus mass transit. Primarily because of the Highway Trust Fund concept, Americans are locked into a highway building program based on the erroneous view that the federal gasoline tax is a "user charge for highway construction." Since 1956, when the Highway Trust Fund was first established by Congress, we have spent over \$200 billion on highways, and less than 2% of that amount on mass transportation alternatives. Estimates of growing highway "needs" through 1990 are being used to urge spending \$600 billion more on highways. Present Department of Transportation proposals are to spend no more than \$20 billion on developing mass transit in the same period. This funding level for mass transit as compared to highways is a vast improvement over the ratio that has prevailed in the past, but mass transit remains insufficiently funded. Common Cause applauds the Administration on its support last year, and again last week in the testimony of Department of Transportation Secretary Brinegar, for increased funding of mass transit from the Highway Trust Fund.

We believe that new developments are making the automobile increasingly less desirable as the chief mode of urban transportation. Considerations of environmental

quality, energy and other resource conservation, wise use of land and safety compel us to consider alternatives to the automobile for urban travel.

In this testimony I will present the reasons for Common Cause's position. We support the Muskie-Baker amendment to the Committee Bill, S. 502, which provides for funding public transit projects from the Highway Trust Fund. This is the revised version of the Cooper-Muskie bill which passed the Senate last year. We also favor legislation such as that offered by Senators Kennedy and Weicker which goes even further in providing local option for use of Trust Fund monies on other transportation solutions.

THE "TRUST FUND" AND GASOLINE TAXES

As this Subcommittee knows well, the Highway Trust Fund was established in 1956, primarily to assure full funding of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, which was created at the same time. Highway Trust Funds also support construction within the federal-aid A.B.C. System and certain other highway-related purposes. The Trust Fund receives almost \$6 billion per year, and another \$300 million in general funds are appropriated annually for federal highway projects. Of total federal highway spending, about half goes to the Interstates, although only a little more than 20% of all vehicle-miles are travelled on the Interstate System.

The first issue to be settled in considering whether to broaden the Highway Trust Fund to uses other than highway construction is this: Does logic demand a strict correspondence of gasoline tax collections to highway construction expenditures? Set aside legal and "moral" considerations. Legally the Trust Fund was created a number of years after federal gas taxes were first levied, and this Congress can decide to undo a legalism just as an earlier Congress created one. Morally there is no issue, for there is no single public group with which a specific contract to build an unchangeable Interstate Highway System was signed—the Interstate map has been changed, and there are substantial cross-subsidies among different highway users in different parts of the country and among operators of different types of vehicles. Also, the Highway Trust Fund has been used for non-Interstate purposes from its outset.

Common Cause does not believe that federal gasoline tax revenues and the other levies which go into the Highway Trust Fund must forever be devoted to highway construction. The Trust Fund as originally designed has served its purpose and now should be radically altered. Today's tax receipts should be used to fund today's most urgent priorities.

The view of those who regard the Trust Fund as sacrosanct is that I, as I pull in to have my gas tank filled up, thereby choose the auto mode over other possible forms of transportation and therein dedicate a portion of my transportation budget to the purpose of building more new highways. I am by preference a highway user and willingly pay this "user charge."

Nonsense. Highway users are at any given moment highway users because it is more convenient and perceived to be cheaper than other transport options. *Highway users don't have to pay the full social costs of that decision!* Noise, congestion and air pollution spillovers are shared with others. Large portions of dislocation costs are borne by unfortunate people whose incomes and often whose race do not enable them to move out of the path of new freeways until it is too late to make that choice voluntarily. Gasoline is relatively cheap because all taxpayers subsidize oil companies through the percentage depletion allowance, intangible drilling cost write-offs, and foreign tax credits. Federal general funds pay for forest and park

roads, among others. Local jurisdictions pay for traffic police out of general funds. And if parkland is taken for new highways, individual motorists do not have to pay for that obvious cost to the whole society.

Nor do highway users choose to have federal gas taxes spent only on new highway construction. They make no contract with the Federal Highway Administrator and expect no "trust" from him. I pay gas taxes because my car consumes fuel traveling over existing highways. I may never travel on one of the new roads paid for out of the Trust Fund. If I live in a metropolitan area, I subsidize the construction of roads in rural areas with my federal gasoline tax payments. And if I do drive on one of the new roads, the maintenance costs I impose on it will come out of state and local fuel taxes, not my federal tax. Thus the whole notion of federal fuel taxes as user charges for highway construction collapses.

Fuel taxes are more appropriately considered as a general sales tax—as the federal gasoline tax was designed when first imposed and as some state taxes and tolls on motor vehicles still are. Secretary Brinegar provided a discussion of this issue in his testimony before this Subcommittee last week. As he noted:

"The excise tax on gasoline goes back to 1932, and the excise tax on tires and tubes back to 1919 [whereas the Highway Trust Fund was not established until 1956]. To show the significance of this historical pattern, if we today computed the share of the 1974 trust fund monies that came from general fund sources prior to 1956, we find the total to be approximately 50 percent. (I interpret this to mean that roughly half of Trust Fund monies comes from new taxes imposed at the time of the Fund's creation and dedicated to it.) Thus, on grounds of equity it seems fair to consider that a sizable amount of trust fund monies could be legitimately used for transportation purposes that broadly benefit a large segment of the population."

Another way of looking at fuel taxes is as sumptuary taxes on a perceived social evil—motor vehicle exhausts. In fact, if this country were so wise as to adopt a comprehensive emissions or effluent tax system, one place to begin would be the gasoline tax. Viewed as an emissions tax, present federal fuel taxes are both too low and dedicated to the wrong purposes. That is, present federal fuel taxes in large urban areas probably are insufficient to cover the social cost of motor vehicle emissions. Moreover, one of the purposes of effluent charges is to discourage consumption of the polluting commodity, and that we do not ordinarily accomplish in the motor vehicle case by new highway construction. (Exceptions: construction of bus transit facilities, and, rarely, investment in highway projects which genuinely reduce existing congestion and do not induce new traffic.)

Common Cause therefore does not object to the idea of increases in fuel taxes deemed absolutely necessary to pay for improved alternative forms of transportation, but we emphatically object to the contention that existing fuel taxes could not be expended for the same purpose. We would go further and suggest that one reason so many plainly unwarranted urban and suburban projects have been built—in the face of enormous costs, adverse impact on the environment and legitimate citizen protest—is that the Highway Trust Fund had made the funds available and therefore they had to be spent. *State highway officials have to use the funds on highways or lose them.* This is a covenant of trust with the American people? It cannot be so.

The injury to common sense is even more grave when we consider the other uses to which those highway funds might have been put.

Before leaving this subject, just a personal word about trucking; (Common Cause has no position on this issue). I agree with Secretary Brinegar that truckers have a stronger claim than do motorists in calling their fuel taxes user charges. I do not believe, however, that large trucks (particularly diesels, four and more axles) pay their fair share into the Trust Fund. This contention is supported by a 1969 cost allocation study performed by the Federal Highway Administration. Building the Interstate System to truck standards increased the cost of those highways enormously. Trucks reduce the capacity and increase the congestion of roads substantially, and trucks (frequently overloaded) impose maintenance costs on roads in an almost unbelievable ratio to automobiles. According to a study done for the Department of Transportation by Charles River Associates, each large truck on the highways causes maintenance costs equal to that of 2000 automobiles! Safety is another consideration. Unless and until truckers pay their full fair share into the Trust Fund, they should have no complaint about diversion.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

The efficiency of most transportation systems, especially highway networks, depends chiefly on their design. There is little that good management can do to make up for poor design, and well planned systems seem to work out in spite of bad management.

The rural and exurban portions of the Interstate Highway System are superbly designed for both freight and passenger traffic. No other transport network in the world is their equal. But somewhere along the line someone decided that new inner-city highways should be built the same way as rural Interstates. Those great freeways could be bored right through the center of cities—with almost the same clearances, land requirements and speed limits. It hasn't worked. Most of those 50-60 mph freeways wind up like every other main artery in rush hour—clogged with stop and go traffic.

By the same token, some mass transit advocates have become totally infatuated with rail systems, whether or not their city is big enough and densely populated enough to support them. What is good for New York is good for Portland or Springfield, goes the reasoning. Thus the danger that a city large enough to support an excellent bus-on-exclusive-lanes system may build a subway system that is hopelessly uneconomic.

Bad planning takes other forms. Urban areas do not make adequate use of existing rights of way (sometimes because of poor cooperation from railroad companies). Traffic departments are reluctant to take on auto commuters and reserve curb lanes for buses, allow only buses to make left turns at certain intersections, and provide park and ride facilities. These and other innovations could be adopted relatively inexpensively.

On the national scale, bad planning takes the form, for example, of a 1972 Highway Needs Study that gives inadequate consideration to railroad piggyback or container operations as a substitute for long haul trucking. Planning for the so-called "priority-primary" system—or worse, a new "super-Interstate" program—also misses the mark. The country does not need another overlay of superhighways nearly so much as it needs to plan for access and egress from regional wholesaling centers—limiting road construction primarily to upgrading existing routes which radiate from these centers as spokes from the hub of a wheel.

With improved transportation decision-making made possible by greater flexibility in investment of federal funds and an end to the "use it for highways or lose it" rule, it is entirely possible that we can reduce the share of total government revenues going to the transportation sector and still improve

freight and passenger mobility—both rural and urban.

LOCAL INITIATIVE AND RESPONSIBILITY

Good transportation planning encompasses local initiative. Urban transportation planning in particular has been plagued by at least three defects attributable to the alliance of federal Highway Trust Fund monies and unresponsive state highway department officials.

The first problem is the rigid allocation formulas for highways versus transit systems. States pay only 10¢ for every dollar they spend on Interstate Highways, which include nearly all important (and controversial) new urban highway segments. By contrast, local jurisdictions must put up $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ of the money spent on transit projects financed by the Urban Mass Transit Administration. Even under the Department of Transportation's single urban transport fund proposal, which Common Cause supports, the federal contribution could not exceed 70% for mass transit, while it would remain 90% for uncompleted urban Interstate segments. These imbalanced matching formulas are to blame for much of the urban transport "crisis" today.

The Committee bill, S. 502, recognizes that the use of some Highway Trust Funds for highway-related transit purposes may benefit remaining highway users by relieving road congestion. Rail transit can, of course, accomplish an identical function, so regarding cases where rail transit is efficient, there is no logic whatsoever in approving Trust Fund expenditures while denying them to the rail mode.

The second factor undermining balanced urban transport planning and local initiative is the method by which urban freeways are proposed, located, and mandated. I have already referred to the poor design of many freeways, but the process by which they are proposed to be built in the first place is equally infirm. Highway engineers build up inflated estimates of further highway "needs" from arbitrary standards that are to be met by all highways of a given class. These estimates are based on extrapolations from existing travel counts and expected population growth patterns, but they give inadequate attention to alternatives. Once built, the highways will be used—to the point of congestion, usually. But it is a fact that highway "needs" studies are more self-fulfilling prophecy than proper transportation planning. This will remain the case as long as Highway Trust Fund monies can be used only for more highways.

The difficulty for local jurisdictions is that once a highway gets into the "needs" study and is approved by Congress, there is no turning back. It is mandated. It has to be built whether it is wanted or warranted or not. Fortunately the Committee bill, S. 502, would end this intolerable situation. Common Cause strongly supports the concept in S. 502 whereby designated urban Interstate segments could be withdrawn and the funds thus saved be transferred to other urban transit uses, and we favor the Muskie-Baker proposal that these uses include the option of rail as well as highway-related expenditures. Common Cause also supports S. 502's pass-through provisions, which provide funds directly to urban transportation authorities.

The third way in which the power of the Trust Fund and the state highway departments undermines local responsibility is by inadequate inclusion of citizens in the most important parts of the planning process. Too much is done by the "experts". Public hearings are frequently called after the key decisions are made. Options are too restrictive—such as whether to build a highway here or there, not whether to build it at all or what other transport mode should be considered. Common Cause believes that this Committee

should do all it can to improve citizen participation in the transportation planning process. We favor Sec. 120 of the Committee bill which concerns public participation, and we would ask this Committee to give periodic oversight to how well the Department of Transportation Secretary carries out this provision of the law. Another specific step would be to enact a clear guarantee of the citizen's right to sue in a court of law for enforcement of federal laws governing the planning process.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Some of the strongest arguments for developing alternatives to the automobile for urban transportation center on the preservation of our natural resources. Statistics gathered by the Council on Environmental Quality identify the automobile as the major source of air pollutants in the country. Half of hydrocarbon, $\frac{3}{4}$ of nitric oxide, and $\frac{3}{4}$ of carbon monoxide pollution is produced by car engines. Lead concentrations in the dust of some cities have been found equivalent to the lead in paint now prohibited by law. Research on the dangers from exposure to these and other pollutants is just beginning.

In order to meet the 1977 deadline for air quality standards required by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Ruckelshaus last month suggested that Los Angeles should be rationing gasoline in order to reduce driving more than 80% during the smog-prone summer months. Other large cities may have to adopt similar measures.

The automobile, even without fuel-consuming anti-pollution and air-conditioning devices, is the most wasteful common means of surface transportation. The auto uses five times more fuel to transport a person one mile than does a bus, and 10 times more than a train. Automobiles use extremely high grade petroleum fuels. Petroleum is becoming more scarce and eventually its consumption may have to be restricted to use as a raw material (e.g. in plastics manufacture) and not as a fuel. It is estimated that at the current rate, transportation fuel demands could deplete the entire proven Alaska oil reserves in 7 years. Reducing the auto's use in urban areas by only one-fourth, the Highway Action Coalition estimates, would save one million barrels of petroleum per day, which is equivalent to the full operating capacity of the trans-Alaska pipeline.

Nor are other resources inexhaustible. Automobiles use 21% of the steel, 61% of the rubber, and 10% of the aluminum produced in our country each year. Much of this material ends up abandoned on city streets or rusting in junkyards.

In recent years we have become painfully aware of the results of unplanned growth in and around our cities. We face a national land use scandal, much of it attributable to the car and its concrete pathways. In many cities, up to 60% of the land is being devoted to the movement and storage of the automobile. The New Jersey Planning Department has predicted that by 2000, transportation will consume $\frac{1}{3}$ of the entire land area of New Jersey!

We continue to allow highway construction to displace housing units at a time when there is a national housing shortage and a reduction of federal assistance for the construction of new housing. In the three years between 1967 and 1970, highways were responsible for the destruction of 147,000 residences, 17,000 businesses, and 5,000 farms.

Buses and trains allow more efficient use of land space and offer an aesthetically pleasing alternative to the expressway. One bus lane can move at least as many people as 6 expressway lanes beside it. A double-tracked rail transit line can carry as many commuters per hour as 20 lanes of freeway

at existing average rates of passengers-per-vehicle.

Common Cause joins with the Highway Action Coalition and other groups urging preservation of the basic citizen's protective legislation affecting highway and mass transit programs, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 and Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. We also endorse the proposal sponsored by Senator Muskie to require states to inspect motor vehicle emission control devices, and to pay for the costs of the inspection program from the Highway Trust Fund.

I have not treated specific estimates of the costs of highway congestion or traffic accidents, or the comparative costs of auto vs. mass transit systems under varying circumstances, but this Subcommittee has received other testimony on these important considerations.

CONCLUSION

A recent survey by National Opinion Research Corp. indicated 57% of the American people thought we should limit automobile traffic in downtown areas; 66% of those who live in cities of a million or more thought it a good idea. The latest Conference of Governors overwhelmingly favored mass transit alternatives to highway building in cities. Governor Sargent of Massachusetts has recently imposed a ban on more roadways in Boston, and is spending money instead on an improved public transportation system.

It is clear that changes have occurred in the nation's thinking about highways since the Interstate Highway System and the Highway Trust Fund were conceived, almost twenty years ago. At that time the gap between perceived highway needs and existing roads was clear—a twenty year planning framework made sense. And as far as intercity connections go, the Interstate Systems was well designed.

But the view from 1973 is distinctly different. A basic system is already substantially in place. Additions to it, new highways, must be weighed on their merits and on a link-by-link basis. Other modal alternatives must be considered. Funding for those alternatives must be flexible and unbiased, or we risk wasting vast sums of precious national resources.

The concept of a single-mode trust fund—whether for highways, airways or rail transit—is hopelessly outmoded. Transportation opportunities should be viewed regionally and by function—that is, by final purpose of the movement rather than by what kind of equipment gets the object from one place to another. Certainly the existing Highway Trust Fund should be broadened, Common Cause believes, and any new transportation funds should be based on broad functions (such as urban passenger transport) rather than modes (such as rail transit). Broadening of the Highway Trust Fund is a necessary step from the point of view of overall national priorities, and a proper way to provide the substantially larger sums for urban mass transit which we believe to be in the best interest of the general public.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S BUDGET ON SIXTH MASSACHUSETTS CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I held hearings in my district, the

Sixth District of Massachusetts, on the local impact of the Nixon budget. I wanted the opportunity to explain to my constituents the effects the budget will have informed myself about this effect. From both points of view, the hearings were a marked success.

The hearings, in fact, were so successful that I will use the technique developed to produce the information for the hearings in my own district to examine the impact of the budget elsewhere in Massachusetts.

I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the information I released to the hearings.

The statement follows:

HARRINGTON CHAIRS FIRST BUDGET HEARING

The first in a series of Congressional hearings on the Nixon budget proposals got underway this morning at Lynn City Hall. The hearing was chaired by Congressman Michael J. Harrington (D-Mass.).

Harrington said the hearings are being held "to educate the public about the local impact of the Budget, to determine which programs are in fact working, and to help myself and other members of Congress better plan responsible alternatives."

Twelve persons representing all aspects of programs affected by the cutbacks were scheduled to testify on the Budget's cost to the Sixth District and Massachusetts.

While acknowledging that there was room for improvement among existing programs, Congressman Harrington charged that the "Budget does not offer constructive change, but is a thoughtless document reflecting no careful analysis of the effectiveness of domestic programs but eliminates workable and worthwhile programs."

Harrington said that future hearings would be held in other parts of Massachusetts and New England to determine the full impact of the Budget cutbacks.

The following persons are scheduled to testify before Congressman Harrington's hearing in Lynn on the subjects indicated.

Bill Carney from the Peabody Council on Aging will talk about the effects of Medicare regulation changes on social security recipients.

Dr. Robert Paul, Jr., Superintendent of Schools of Amesbury, will discuss a variety of federal assistance programs for public schools.

Dr. Anthony Patton a thoracic surgeon will testify on all areas of health care.

Dr. Donald Beattie, the Acting President of North Shore Community College, will discuss the overall effect of the Budget on higher education.

Mary Clare Ciulla, a student at Northern Essex Community College, is from Haverhill and will tell the hearing about work-study and direct student loans.

Dr. Frank Keegan will discuss a specific instance of a terminated program at Salem State College, where he is the President.

Rev. James Gambrill from St. Stephens Church in Lynn will discuss the effects of the Budget on elderly housing.

Lynn Model Cities Executive Director Phil Mamber will explain the services now rendered by Model Cities and who is affected by them.

Bob French, the Mayor of Gloucester, will discuss cutbacks in the Emergency Employment Act and other federal programs as affects the City of Gloucester.

Ipswich Town Manager Dick Conti will discuss the overall impact of the proposed cutbacks on municipalities in general, and upon the town of Ipswich in particular.

Denton Crews, Director of the Gloucester Community Action Program, will discuss the Budget impact on citizens now being served by Community Action Programs.

Al Marrs, Director of the Southern Consortium of the Emergency Employment Program, will explain the overall impact of the EEA on the Sixth District and how it will be affected by the new Budget.

ELDERLY

Programs that have been terminated concerning the elderly are many of the housing programs such as rent subsidies, nonprofit sponsor housing which allowed nonprofit organizations to build housing for low-income groups including the elderly, various social services provided by community action agencies and Model Cities agencies. One of the most severe costs that will affect the elderly is the change in the deductible under medicare.

MEDICARE

The amount the elderly will have to pay to supplement medicare hospital and physician payments will rise appreciably.

HOSPITAL CARE

At present, for the first 60 days, \$72 deductible.

Nixon plan, full cost of 1st hospital day (North Shore average \$90).

At present, 61st to 90th hospital day, \$18 per day deductible.

Nixon plan, 10% of full cost of each hospital day after the 1st (average \$15 per day at least). A two-week hospitalization would cost an elderly person a minimum of \$300.

PHYSICIANS' COST

At present, physicians average \$600; Nixon plan, \$600.

Medicare patient pays, \$168; Nixon plan, \$214.

In the Sixth Congressional District there are approximately 45,000 people on medicare.

For those on medical, all dental care has been eliminated.

EDUCATION—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Funds for Elementary and Secondary Education are granted to every town and city in the 6th Congressional District. (See following sheets)

The largest program is Title I under the Elementary and Secondary Act, aid to educationally deprived children. Funds under this program in fiscal year 1973 totalled \$1,854,086.

Money for library resources, aid to innovative education, research, aid to state departments of education, aid for handicapped children, and for programs for drop out prevention have all been cut to zero in the President's budget.

This year more than 6000 children in the 6th District were aided by Title I funds.

This year \$964,000 came into the 6th District for vocational education. This program is terminated in the Nixon budget—\$169,000 came into the District to buy audio visual equipment for local schools, under Title III of the National Defense Education Act. This program is terminated in the Nixon budget.

Local school boards have received funds under the Special Milk Program.

School systems had planned on receiving close to \$160,000 in fiscal 1974.

Now this program has been cut by 75% in the Nixon budget.

More than \$900,000 has been received by local school districts under the program for school assistance in federally affected areas. This would be terminated in the Nixon budget.

The following represent a projection of the proposed cuts in FY 74 budget in some areas of education.

PROJECTION OF PROPOSED CUTS

City or town	Special milk program	Federal assistance in impacted areas	ESEA (all titles)
Amesbury	\$3,873	\$38,000	\$21,699
Beverly	(C)	63,000	277,126
Boxford	999	5,211	4,320
Danvers	15,249	*37,204	144,005
Essex	(C)	5,000	961
Georgetown	(C)	25,687	13,103
Gloucester	5,707	16,915	142,008
Groveland	(C)	3,300	1,194
Hamilton	2,442	3,000	6,720
Haverhill	(C)	77,000	371,520
Ipswich	(C)	6,658	19,675
Lynn	28,773	200,000	805,440
Manchester	(C)	17,403	9,846
Marblehead	4,070	53,000	270,720
Merrimac	(C)	2,500	13,286
Middleton	741	6,000	9,600
Nahant	(C)	14,316	2,393
Newbury	(C)	3,100	5,376
Newburyport	5,920	*28,462	127,676
North Andover	7,664	53,430	27,798
Peabody	13,320	96,000	106,560
Rockport	740	(C)	(C)
Rowley	247	1,239	4,370
Salem	8,669	77,000	304,329
Salisbury	8,880	9,092	26,371
Swampscott	77,104	43,771	43,771
Topsfield	1,436	*24,420	*7,532
Wenham	1,038	4,000	6,576
West Newbury	222	5,472	2,300
Hamilton-Wenham Region	1,216	65,251	(C)
Pentucket School System	(C)	2,112	27,000
Masconomet School System	1,343	(C)	20,000
Triton School System	(C)	1,200	13,000

¹ Not available.

² Figures based on fiscal year 1972.

Title I—ESEA (Grant, no. of children served, employees).

Sixth Congressional District.

Total \$1,854,086.

No. of children served—5914.

Full-time employees—961.

Part-time employees—179.

City or town and amount of grant

Amesbury	\$27,179
Beverly	139,486
Boxford	4,061
Danvers	39,519
Essex and Manchester	*4,530
Georgetown	11,246
Gloucester	146,671
Groveland	12,808
Hamilton	5,779
Haverhill	253,980
Ipswich	*89,684
Lynn	706,957
Manchester and Essex	*4,686
Marblehead	24,836
Merrimac	12,340
Middleton	10,465
Nahant	10,778
Newbury	5,311
Newburyport	71,852
No. Andover	22,180
Peabody	67,322
Rockport	7,810
Rowley	3,593
Salem	179,473
Salisbury	24,836
Swampscott	24,367
Topsfield	7,029
Wenham	9,216
West Newbury	6,092

* Denotes approximate figure.

NEWS RELEASE HEALTH CARE

Regional Medical Program: Funds for the Regional Medical program have been impounded and the 1974 Budget terminates the program. The North Shore Regional Health Planning Council will continue to be funded for their review and planning activities. The R.M.P. has been most helpful to the North Shore Regional Health Planning Council by providing consulting staff for special projects.

For example: The Regional Medical program has completed a study of the pediatric and maternity needs and facilities on the North Shore for the N.S. Regional Health Planning Council. The next step would be interpretation of data to the North Shore

Hospitals and planning for consolidation of services to avoid the duplication that now exists. The regional medical program was supplying the staff for this project and that staff has already been terminated. As of now the Pediatric and Maternity study is ended.

The Regional Medical Program has recently approved a proposal by Lynn Model Cities to provide primary medical care in the Lynn Model Cities area. At present there is one (1) 73 year old physician serving the Model Cities area as a family physician. He is unable to admit patients to either Lynn or Union Hospitals. The Model Cities proposal would establish a physician in the Model Cities area to provide primary care, along with nurse practitioners and ancillary medical personnel. R.M.P. had approved funds of \$24,000 from its budget.

Because of R.M.P. termination, there is no hope for this proposal and there cannot be adequate primary care for 15,000 in the Lynn Model Cities area.

MENTAL HEALTH

There will be no new program money for the community mental health. The Union Hospital in Lynn has had a 1.5 million dollar staffing grant approved by the State and by the National Institute of Mental Health. Because N.I.M.H. funds have been impounded, the grant has not yet been funded and because of 1973 budget cuts in the N.I.M.H. it will not be funded.

This means that Lynn residents must continue to use Danvers State Hospital as a mental health treatment facility rather than remaining in the community.

The projected Union Hospital Community Mental Health Center would provide all phases of mental health care for Lynn residents without the institutional stigma and effects of a Danvers State Hospital.

Potential job loss to the Lynn area will be 150 jobs in the health care area.

It is unlikely that the State will be able to fund any of the community mental health centers once the federal money is withdrawn. At this time, third party payment is virtually non-existent in any consistent way for mental health services.

It would seem that for now, community mental health is emasculated.

ADVANCED FUNDS FOR MEDICARE

When Medicare was started, the federal government advanced operating funds to the hospitals on the basis of projected Medicare patients. This practice has continued so that the hospitals could operate.

The Nixon administration is discontinuing this practice and demanding return of the funds advanced this year.

This will mean that district hospitals will have to return \$569,000 to the Federal Government by July 1, 1973. Most of the hospitals will have to borrow these funds at a commercial interest rate to survive.

CURRENT FINANCING TO BE RETURNED

Nationally, \$300 million.
Massachusetts, \$7,000,000.
District, \$569,000.
Lynn Hospital, \$148,000.
Union Hospital, \$60,000.
Salem Hospital, \$160,000.
Beverly Hospital, \$100,000.
Addison-Gilbert Hospital, \$48,000.
Hunt Memorial Hospital, \$55,000.

HILL-BURTON

There will be no construction funds for additions or modernization of hospitals or long term care facilities (nursing home).

NURSES TRAINING CAPITATION GRANTS

All capitation grants for nurses' training are cancelled.

AMOUNTS LOST BY SCHOOLS OF NURSING

Lynn Hospital School of Nursing, \$20,000.
Salem Hospital School of Nursing, \$27,000.
North Shore Community College, proposed nursing program, \$75,000.

Lynn and Salem Hospitals will raise tuitions at least \$200 per student.

There are between 400 and 500 student

nurses in the Sixth Congressional District who will lose grants because this program has been ended.

HOUSING AND BASIC WATER AND SEWER GRANTS

Low rent public housing and multi-family housing both have a zero dollar figure projected in the 1974 Nixon budget. In fiscal 1973 \$7.7 million was allocated to Massachusetts for these programs. \$2.6 million of that has been impounded.

Housing for the elderly, college housing, non-profit sponsor housing all have no money allocated to them in the Nixon budget. These are being held up pending "evaluation".

Because of the impoundments in fiscal 1973, housing starts are already a year behind, and no new money is authorized in the President's proposed budget.

Housing generates more long-term employment and has a greater multiplier effect than do most other projects. The severity of these cuts on employment will increase.

In fiscal 1973 no cities in Essex County received Basic Water and Sewer Grants. Applications for Danvers and for the Salem/Beverly Water Board had been approved for \$3 million dollars, but these projects remain unfunded due to the President's impoundment.

Cities and towns in Essex County estimate needs that total \$38,155,650.

Lynn, \$16,800,000 (over a four year period).

Haverhill, \$6,000,000.
Amesbury, \$1,329,650.
Groveland, \$3,750,000.
Ipswich, \$3,500,000.
Merrimack, \$480,000.
Nahant, \$3,160,000.
Swampscott, \$136,000.

Some of these cities and towns are under court orders to abate sewage discharges.

There is no money for new starts in basic water and sewer programs in the Nixon budget.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Community Action agencies in the 6th Congressional District received \$1,083,000 in FY 1973 from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The four agencies (Lynn, Gloucester, Haverhill and Beverly) served 15 cities and towns and mobilized and additional \$2,366,000 in funds—37,000 people have been served by these programs.

Services provided by these agencies include: youth training and employment, child care, housing assistance and development, job training and placement, business development, food distribution, transportation services and other programs.

Cuts in the Nixon budget will seriously affect these programs by destroying the CAP agencies. Most of these programs will be terminated immediately. In Gloucester the CAP agency operates the public transportation system which serves 500 daily riders. Housing assistance and housing programs will be terminated, and consumer protection efforts in Haverhill and Beverly will be terminated.

The Nixon budget allows no funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity and the President has ordered its immediate dismantling.

MANPOWER AND EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

These federal programs have placed a wide variety of persons in many different work programs, benefitting both the participants and their communities. 1848 were employed under Manpower in FY 73.

MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The Sixth Congressional District received a total of \$1,430,555 in FY 73. The specific programs include Manpower Development Training Assistance Institutional; Neighborhood Youth Corps In School; Neighborhood Youth Corps Out of School; Neighborhood Youth Corps Summer; and Job Optional. Those served under these programs include youths who are working while attending

school as well as those who have dropped out.

In fiscal year 1974 under the Nixon Budget, no funds will be received for any of the above programs.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

This was a relatively new federal employment program, the purpose of which was to provide jobs to those unable to find them and to allow communities to have workers for particular areas of need—40% of those hired with EEA funds were Vietnam War Veterans; 25% were persons 45 years of age or older; job salaries averaged between \$7000 and \$7500 per annum.

In the life of the program all 29 cities and towns of the Sixth Congressional District participated. \$4,616,653 was spent in FY 73. A total of approximately 700 persons have been employed during the existence of the Emergency Employment Act.

A summer youth program gave 195 youths work for 9 weeks; they would otherwise have been without work.

LIBRARIES

Title I, II, and III of the Library Services and Construction Act have been cut from the FY 74 budget.

Since the inception of the act in 1965, the Sixth Congressional District has received \$363,780. Haverhill received \$200,000 to construct a new library; Lynn, Marblehead, Ipswich, Haverhill, and other communities have used this money to provide library services in housing for the elderly, audio-visual materials for bi-lingual programs, and large print books for elderly persons. The loss of the federal funds will mean a gradual erosion of library services.

Note: Two cities in the Sixth Congressional District had planned for library funding in FY 74:

Gloucester, \$220,000 (construction of wing).
Salem, \$128,000 (addition).

EDUCATION

LOCAL COLLEGES

North Shore Community College, Northern Essex Community College, Salem State, & Merrimack College.

FY 74 budget does not provide for funding for the National Direct Student Loan Program. Approximately 250 students at Northern Essex will be deprived of some \$94,000 during the next FY.

Work-Study is being hurt: A total of 840 students will be adversely affected. Northern Essex alone had 250 students participating.

In FY 73 4,170 students at the four schools above benefitted from federal funds. 1,641 students have scholarships at stake to some extent.

HIGHER EDUCATION/FINANCIAL AID

The Direct Student Loan Program and Educational Opportunity Grant are abolished by the Nixon Budget, and replaced by Basic Opportunity Grants. The result of this is to severely limit the sources for financial aid for those students who are financially in need of it. One reason for this is that the Basic Opportunity Grants are limited to students coming from families with incomes effectively below \$7000.

HEW funded Economic Opportunity Grant: In FY 73 Massachusetts received \$7,713,410. For FY 74 \$15,297,917 was requested, but no monies are expected to be forthcoming.

100 institutions and 9,234 students in Massachusetts will be adversely affected by the fact that the FY 74 Nixon Budget provides for no money for the economic opportunity grants.

WORK-STUDY

For FY 73 Massachusetts received \$8,956,291. For FY 74 \$33,760,769 was requested but only \$5,967,000 is expected.

In the entire federal FY 73 budget funding reached \$269 million.

Anticipated decreases in available funding will adversely affect 117 institutions and 16,409 students in Massachusetts.

HEW funded National Defense Student Loan:

Massachusetts received \$10,948,434 in FY 73 and requested \$31,321,019 for FY 74, but no money is anticipated.

In Massachusetts 113 institutions and 24,882 students will be adversely affected.

OTHER EDUCATIONAL FUNDING

This includes handicapped aid, as well as aid for occupational, vocational and adult education. Special revenue sharing may provide some funding, but at best only at a level of $\frac{1}{2}$ of present funding.

For The Handicapped: The state grant program is terminated, and there is no actual federal funding to replace it.

Occupational, Vocational & Adult Education: As with the previous category, the state grant program has been terminated, and there is no actual federal funding to replace it.

WAR POWERS ACT WOULD AFFIRM CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the rise of the United States as a world leader and defender has coincided with the rise of the power of the Presidency.

Vietnam, Santo Domingo, Lebanon, Korea. Since World War II the President alone has made decisions as to whether American soldiers should be committed to the field of battle. It was Vietnam, finally, that taught us that the decision for war or peace is too big for any one President, no matter how great his intellect or insight.

WAR POWERS AND THE CONSTITUTION

I am today introducing legislation designed to require congressional approval of armed intervention. The bill answers our need for a mechanism to apply the Constitution's intent to undeclared conflicts. The Constitution empowered Congress alone to raise armies and navies and to declare war. Writing in the *Federalist Papers*, Alexander Hamilton explained the views of those who participated in the Constitutional Convention:

The President is to be commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the king of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces . . . while that of the British king extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature.

The ominous specter of nuclear war, and especially nuclear war as the final stage of escalation, make it unlikely that the United States will ever declare war formally again.

Without a formal state of war a nation has more flexibility to deal with other powers. But our Constitution did not intend collective judgment of the executive and legislative branches to be pushed aside by circumstances. A formal declaration of war may be obsolete; the Constitution is not.

THE WAR POWERS ACT

In a recent questionnaire mailed to my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Washington State, I asked

if congressional approval should be required for armed intervention. Yes, the vast majority replied. The bill I am introducing today responds to their views and reflects my own thinking as well.

The intent of the bill is to require congressional sanction for any armed intervention longer than 30 days. Specifically, the bill limits the President's authority to introduce troops in the absence of a formal declaration of war. American Armed Forces could be introduced only to repel and forestall attacks against the United States or against U.S. Armed Forces outside of America.

The War Powers Act also specifies that troops could be sent by the President to evacuate American citizens. However, the measure requires the President to make every effort to secure approval of the government of whose nation we were invading, and to make every effort to avoid conflict while evacuating our citizens.

The crux of the War Powers Act states that no appropriations bill nor any treaty contain authority to send troops. This makes NATO, SEATO, and other treaties non-self-enforcing. Congress must approve each action. The measure also forces precise congressional sanction for "area" resolutions such as the 1955 Formosa resolution, the 1957 Middle East resolution, and the now repealed Tonkin Gulf resolution.

A critical element in the legislation is that both Houses of Congress, and not just the Senate, would have to approve troop commitments. To argue this stipulation exists today because of the need for appropriations bills is true in theory, wrong in actual practice. With understandable reluctance, Congress has always turned down proposals to cut off funds for our men in the field.

THE 30-DAY LIMIT

To avoid presidential wars the legislation specifies that no armed intervention may last longer than 30 days without the express consent of Congress. Procedural changes would be made so that a resolution asking approval of intervention could not be filibustered to death; a resolution would have to be voted on in 3 days.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of the War Powers Act is to furnish Congress and the American people with a way of passing judgment on those situations in which we cease to be repelling or retaliating against an attack and then begin to make a commitment to war. As Vietnam has shown us, an attack on two U.S. destroyers 9 years ago became a general land and air war that exacted a terrible toll. Not until 1971 did the House of Representatives take a rollcall vote on this conflict. The War Powers Act affirms the Constitution by affirming the collective judgment of those in whom the people have placed their faith.

FOOD PRICES AND FARMER INCOME

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture has been under con-

stant attack for his honest and forthright statements that he has been making with respect to food prices and farmer income. In fact, now that farm prices are getting to be somewhat respectable, there are those who would place food prices in harness and, in the process, invite food shortages, black marketing, and the ration books which go with taking that route.

I would like to call attention to some recent figures which I hope will place the farmer-consumer picture in proper perspective.

Two interesting sets of figures have come into being recently which prove that we can have good farm income and, at the same time, fair prices for consumers. In brief, the goals of high farm income and reasonable food prices for the people of this country are fully consistent.

The one set of figures come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, and they show that the average weekly spendable wages—income after social security and Federal income taxes are deducted—in December 1972 were up 7 percent over December 1971. During the same 12-month period, the Consumer Price Index rose only 3.4 percent. Food prices at retail, including restaurant meals eaten out, were up only 4.7 percent.

Those who might have in mind wage increases will want to keep these figures in mind, for they reveal we are making real progress toward bringing inflation under control.

The other set of figures show that while the worker is doing alright, so is the farmer. While workers' incomes were rising faster than the prices they pay for food, the average net income of farmers rose to an all-time high in 1972; that is, to a total of \$19.2 billion. In summary, the demand for food is thriving, and farm prices have strengthened. In addition, farm exports are at a new high, moving toward an \$11 billion total this fiscal year.

To put farm prices in a little better perspective, I would like to refer to the record of wholesale prices of industrial products compared with wholesale prices of farm products for the past 25 years. While wholesale prices for industrial products have risen steadily since 1947, wholesale prices of farm products have moved erratically and have declined in about half of those last 25 years. The record wholesale price for farm foods set in 1951 was not reached again until July of 1972. With 1947 as a base, the index of wholesale prices of industrial commodities in January stood at 169.6. The index of wholesale prices of farm products by comparison now stands at 131.8.

The trends of food expenditures, as a percentage of income, show that food expenditures closely paralleled take-home pay of workers up until about the mid-1950's, when the gap began to widen as personal disposable income pulled ahead of food expenditures. The result was that the percent of income spent for food showed a downtrend since the World War II period. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while food expenditures have been taking a smaller percentage of average consumer income

each year for many years, this reduction took place even though consumers have shifted to more expensive foods, bought more services with their foods and ate more meals away from home.

One gains a clear picture of the food-cost situation when he recognizes that in 1972 total food expenditures amounted to only 15.8 percent of total take-home pay, while in 1929 it amounted to 23.4 percent.

We can refine that situation a little more: Over the past two decades, a family of median size and median income spent an even more rapidly declining share of its income for food. Estimates from the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that a family of median size and income in 1972 spent 17.4 percent of its income for food, as compared with 30.8 percent in 1950. That is a drop of almost one-half in a period of 22 years.

Let me refine these figures further. If one looks at food prices broken into two segments; that is, food purchased away from home and food eaten at home, he sees an interesting divergence. The index of prices of food eaten away from home parallels very closely the index of prices of all consumer services. Both of these indexes are above the Consumer Price Index. In comparison, in recent years, food at home has fallen below the Consumer Price Index line.

I am sure you get the point. Our policies in the areas of agriculture and food need not and, in fact, must not, be farmers vs. consumers. What has happened in agriculture is good for all of us, both as consumers and taxpayers. Within a few months we will be out of, or almost, Government holdings of surplus grains. This will be the best position that we have been in since World War II. It certainly will be a welcome day for farmers, for Congress, the Government, the Nation, and the consumer-taxpayer.

The facts before us make it perfectly clear that we are moving toward more farm income from the free market place and less from the Government Treasury. I am sure that every consumer joins with the farmer in applauding this kind of progress.

In a nutshell summary, our farmers are producing the widest variety of the highest quality foods for the lowest percentage of individual income of any nation in the world. It, therefore, is quite apparent that the way to get an increase in these high-quality foods is not to burden these food commodities with price controls and/or ceilings, for this course would invite rationing and black marketing.

The obvious solution is that the consumer-taxpayer must quickly come to realize that the American farmer is his best insurance for an abundance of high-quality foods at what are proportionately low premium rates. When the consumer-taxpayer becomes conscious of this fundamental fact, he will realize that he and the farmer share a mutual benefit which, in effect, makes them "partners in progress."

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK T. BOW

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the day the House eulogized our beloved former colleague, the late Frank T. Bow of Ohio I was unavoidably absent due to a longstanding speaking engagement in California. Fortunately, it was not too long ago that I was able to pay tribute publicly to Frank Bow's tremendous contributions while he was still here among us to listen at the close of the 92d Congress. His well-earned retirement after 22 years in the House was deferred, however, at the request of President Nixon, who gave him the extremely sensitive diplomatic assignment of Ambassador-designate to Panama. Before he could be confirmed in this new responsibility, however, Frank was suddenly taken from us.

This was a stunning personal loss and a great loss to our country. I had the honor of serving on the Committee on Appropriations with Frank Bow for many years and, later, of relying heavily on him as the ranking minority member of that committee during the time I have been minority leader. No one has ever been a more dependable ally or a more faithful friend in victory or defeat. I shall not repeat all the compliments that other colleagues have paid him but I second them all. He was as dedicated a public servant as any the great State of Ohio has produced and they have been a distinguished galaxy. He was also my dear friend. My wife Betty and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Caroline Bow, their sons and all the family.

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, regarding the discussion today on House Resolution 256 to continue the Select Committee on Crime through June 30, 1973, I thought it might be of interest to the House to have a summary of the officials, organizations and individuals who have recommended to the Speaker that the Crime Committee be continued.

These communications will vindicate the confidence of the House that the Crime Committee has made meaningful contributions in the fight against crime. The summary of these communications follows:

Wires and letters to the Speaker of the House copies of which have come to Congressman Pepper's Congressional Office, supporting the Select Committee on Crime include the following:

Nine Governors—Florida; New York; South Carolina; Kentucky; Alaska; Hawaii; North Dakota; Oregon, and Puerto Rico.

Sixteen Attorneys General—Florida; New York; California; Rhode Island, South Dakota; Louisiana; Mississippi; Alaska; New Mexico; Idaho; Kentucky; Nebraska; Montana; North Carolina; West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Twenty-two Mayors or City Managers—Oakland, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Shreveport, La.; Miami, Fla.; Hartford, Conn.; City of Hartford, Connecticut; City of Sacramento, California; Tallahassee, Fla.; Memphis, Tenn.; Baton Rouge, La.; Hialeah, Fla.; Providence, R.I.;

Detroit, Mich.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Knoxville, Tenn.; York Pa.; New Haven, Conn.; Pontiac, Mich.; South Bend, Indiana, and Kansas City, Mo.

Twelve Police Chiefs or Associations—Cook County (Chicago) Ill.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Oakland, Calif.; New England State Police Association; New Jersey State Police; Miami Beach, Fla.; San Francisco, Calif.; Baton Rouge, La.; North Miami, Fla.; American Federation of Police; Fraternal Order of Police, and New York State Police.

Twenty-nine Citizen Crime Associations—National League of Cities; United States Conference of Mayors; National Commission on Crime and Delinquency; National Association of Citizen Crime Commissions; Atlanta Crime Commission; Miami Crime Commission; New Orleans Crime Commission; Philadelphia Crime Commission; New England Crime Commission; New York Crime Commission; Georgia Crime Commission; Arizona Crime Commission; Kansas City Crime Commission; Mississippi Coast Crime Commission; Fort Worth (Texas) Crime Commission; Chicago Crime Commission; State of New York Commission on Investigations; New York Waterfront Commission; Oklahoma Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Control Commission; New England Organized Crime Intelligence System; Connecticut Planning Commission on Criminal Administration; Ohio (State) Racing Commission; New Mexico Council on Crime and Delinquency; Georgia Council on Crime and Delinquency; Washington (State) Council on Crime and Delinquency; Iowa Council on Crime and Delinquency; Florida Medical Association, and the Connecticut Conferences of Mayors and Municipalities, and Texas Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Fourteen District Attorneys—Massachusetts District Attorneys Association; Contra Costa County, Calif.; Bronx, N.Y.; Miami, Fla.; Albuquerque, N.M.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Nassau County, N.Y.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Ardmore, Okla.; Queens, N.Y.; Norfolk, Mass., and 12th Judicial Circuit of Florida.

Nine School Superintendents—Los Angeles, Calif.; Oakland, Calif.; Charleston, S.C.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Anaheim, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Houston, Tex.; Shawnee Mission (Kansas) Public Schools.

Three judges—Kansas City, Mo.; 6th Circuit Court of Florida; Juvenile Court of Hamilton County, Tennessee.

Eight Senior Citizen Groups—Greater New York; Northeastern Ohio; District of Columbia; North Miami Beach, Fla.; McDonald, Ohio; Youngstown, Ohio; Peoria, Ill.; Miami Beach Retirees, and International UAW Retired Workers.

Nine Unions—Teamsters International; National Maritime Union; UAW in Grand Rapids, Mich.; Air Line Employees; Air Line Pilots; Transport Workers; American Insurance Association; United Rubber Workers, and International Association of Machinists.

Also: WTTW Channel 11 Public Television in Chicago, Illinois.

Abe Beame, City Comptroller, New York City.

The Florida Cabinet.
Art Linkletter.

National Council of Jewish Women.
National Education Association.

National Parent and Teachers Association.
Nathan B. Eddy, Consultant, National Institutes of Health.

Marvin E. Wolfgang, Director, Center for Studies in Criminology and Criminal Law, University of Pennsylvania.

Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan.

Institute of Correctional Administration.
Chicago Parent and Teachers Association.
Illinois Drug Abuse Program.

James F. Ahern, Director, Insurance Crime Prevention Institute.

Arthur Goldstein, Chairman, Huntington Narcotics Guidance Council.

Robert Amastas, Drug Counselor, Massachusetts Teacher of the Year.

Robert W. Warren, President, National Association of Attorneys General and Attorney General, State of Wisconsin.

GERSTEIN DIRECTIVE

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment is, in my opinion, and the opinion of many citizens of this country, being grievously threatened. One of the greatest threats to this freedom is the denial of some courts and other authorities of protection to information gathered by investigative reporters for the press. I have noted a very significant action on the part of the distinguished States attorney of Dade County, Fla., Hon. Richard Gerstein, in announcing that he would as States attorney protect the confidential sources of news reporters. This announcement is referred to in an editorial of WFUN Radio in Miami, Fla., which I offer hereafter for the Record.

A pertinent editorial dealing with a similar subject appeared in a broadcast on January 26, 1973, by WPLG of Miami, Fla., which I offer for insertion also. I commend to the consideration of my colleagues and our fellow citizens these thoughtful editorials upon a very pertinent subject:

[Radio WFUN editorial, Feb. 1, 1973]

GERSTEIN DIRECTIVE

WFUN has editorially supported Florida Attorney General Robert Shevin in his request for a reporter's immunity law which would protect the confidential sources of news reporters.

Now, we are pleased to report that Dade State Attorney Richard Gerstein has taken his own initiative in the same area. Gerstein has ordered his assistants not to subpoena newsmen to testify about stories they have investigated . . . unless the reporter in question was an actual witness to a crime. Even then, the subpoena will have to be cleared with Mr. Gerstein himself.

The State Attorney says that constant badgering of reporters by the courts is a danger to freedom of the press. We agree with Mr. Gerstein when he says that the same information can usually be obtained through normal law enforcement channels . . . and that there is no reason why reporters should investigate cases for the police.

[A WPLG radio editorial, Jan. 26, 1973]

WHAT IS IT THEY DON'T WANT YOU TO KNOW?—PART IV

This is the home of the Dade County Grand Jury, scene of more secret intrigue and behind the scenes drama than perhaps anywhere else in South Florida.

All it does affects the public and nearly all it does is secret. Sometimes the secrecy is abused.

About a year ago a Grand Jury refused to release an investigation of Dade County's airports that cost taxpayers \$50,000. A year before that a Grand Jury did criticize State Attorney Richard Gerstein. But Gerstein successfully pleaded with the presiding judge to suppress the report . . . forever.

Some members of that Grand Jury, the last to be appointed by a governor's commission, accused other members of carrying

out a political vendetta inspired by then-Governor Claude Kirk. We will never know what really happened in that Grand Jury. It was all secret.

Why is it they don't want you to know? Why shouldn't you know what your Grand Jury learns about your government, using your tax dollars?

What we have learned came through the print and broadcast media from confidential informants. But confidential informants are becoming rare. They now know a reporter may face a choice of disclosing his source, or going to jail.

This is one of a series of editorials aimed at showing why Congress must pass a law to protect your right to hear what confidential informants have to say.

FIRST HELICOPTER

(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, one of the great innovations in aviation has been the helicopter. I have found it most interesting to learn the early history of the helicopter and the circumstances under which apparently the first helicopter was built and who built it. All this information has been compiled by my distinguished friend, Baron Vladimir Kuhn von Poushental, of Miami Beach, Fla., who was a friend and associate of Dr. George de Bothezat, who built the first helicopter. Baron von Poushental presented this valuable compilation of papers to the U.S. Air Force Academy for permanent storage at the Academy's library. The country owes him a great debt of gratitude in making this material available to the Air Force Academy.

The story of Baron von Poushental's presentation to the Academy appeared in the Realtor, published January 8, 1973. I submit this article, Mr. Speaker, for insertion in the Record following my remarks:

PLANS OF FIRST 'COPTER DONATED BY REALTOR

A Miami Beach Realtor who, in a career too implausible for Hollywood to offer with a straight face, has served as a WWI White Russian Army flier, founder of an American colony of loyalist Russians, and aviation historian, has presented the U.S. Air Force Academy with films and documents tracing the construction and flight of what is said to be the world's first helicopter.

Baron V. Kuhn von Poushental, after the White Russian Army was defeated in the Crimea, fled to America in 1918 and quickly sought out his former pilot friend and fellow refugee, Dr. George de Bothezat. The latter was a mechanical genius who shortly thereafter was commissioned by the U.S. government to build a radical new aircraft, based on an aeronautical theory de Bothezat had evolved. The result—the prototype helicopter, built in 1922—lifted 4,400 pounds using a 170 horsepower engine. This was a ratio of more than 20 pounds per unit of horsepower, an efficiency of performance the Realtor says has not since been achieved.

Following de Bothezat's death in 1940, Baron von Poushental, who had been briefly in business with the inventor, commenced collecting and cataloging the latter's records, consisting of four original manuscripts, eight typed scripts, 62 photos of the first helicopter flight and historical records of de Bothezat's private helicopter companies.

The culmination of von Poushental's de-

votion to his friend and mentor came last August, when he was invited by the superintendent of the U.S. Air Force Academy to present the de Bothezat materials for permanent storage at the academy's library, where they are available for study by cadets, faculty and scholarly researchers.

In a letter to the donor, Lt. Gen. A. P. Clark, superintendent of the academy, said in part, "You may be sure these papers will be reviewed by cadets for years to come, for their historical significance as well as the unique record of one of our pioneers in aviation. The academy library and cadets are enriched by your generous contribution."

FOREIGN-MADE CRANES CORNER THE MARKET AT THE MADISON LIBRARY SITE

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year the United States ran up a trade deficit of over \$6 billion and for the second time in 14 months the dollar has been devalued. A part of this outflow of dollars flooding Europe is going for the purchase of French-made construction cranes that are helping to build the \$90 million Madison Library Building across the street. For over a decade the vast majority of these tower cranes, costing anywhere from \$125,000 to \$150,000 apiece, have been purchased from France, Germany, and Belgium.

Why should foreign-made cranes be bought in order to construct our public buildings and cities when the same tower cranes are made and available in this country at competitive prices?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. COLLIER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from February 27, on account of back injury.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. McFALL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. LENT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. MAILLIARD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROX.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGNER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHALEN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WALSH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONLAN, for 60 minutes, Wednesday, March 7.

Mr. ABDNOR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CRANE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CRANE, for 60 minutes on Wednesday, March 7.

Mr. SEBELIUS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCFALL, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. ROY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DULSKI, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. BARRETT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ADAMS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DANIELSON, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CULVER, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. MELCHER, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON and to include tables and extraneous matter on the continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 345 conference report.

Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. BOLING) to revise and extend his remarks on House Resolution 256.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEINZ.
Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.
Mr. HORTON.
Mr. CARTER.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. HILLIS.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. FISH in two instances.
Mr. ERLNBORN in two instances.
Mr. BAKER in two instances.
Mrs. HOLT.
Mr. HUTCHINSON.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. HUBER.
Mr. CLEVELAND.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. CONLAN.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. MALLARY.
Mr. KEATING.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. FROELICH.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. RONCALLO of New York in four instances.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in seven instances.
Mr. SYMMS.
Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OWENS in five instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in 10 instances.
Mr. HOWARD.
Mr. DULSKI in six instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in four instances.
Mr. FRASER in five instances.
Mr. WOLFF in three instances.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS in five instances.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. SYMINGTON in six instances.
Mr. STOKES in three instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
Mr. MACDONALD.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee in three instances.
Mr. HUNGATE.
Mr. REID.
Mr. BLATNIK in five instances.
Mr. O'NEILL.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. JONES of Alabama in two instances.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. ROE in two instances.
Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.
Mr. CAREY of New York.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. DRINAN.
Mr. O'HARA.
Mr. WON PAT.
Mr. HEBERT.
Mr. WALDIE in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

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. 345. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 1, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

509. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

510. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting his semiannual report of receipts and expenditures for the period July to December 1972, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 93-51); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

511. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reform the mineral leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

512. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the management, protection, development and sale of the national resource lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

513. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assure that the public is provided with safe drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

514. A letter from the Vice President for Public and Government Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting a report covering the month of January 1973, on the average number of passengers per day on board each train operated, and the ontime performance at the final destination of each train operated, by route and by railroad, pursuant to section 308(a) (2) of the Rail Passenger Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to deduct from gross tonnage in determining net tonnage those spaces on board vessels used for waste materials; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

516. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise the reporting requirement contained in subsection (b) of section 1308; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

517. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize an appropriation for site development work at the previously authorized International Center for Chanceries of Foreign Embassies in Washington and for a new headquarters for the Organization of American States; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

518. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of U.S. economic and military aid to Ecuador; 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. 4897. A bill to create a not-for-profit corporation to acquire and to maintain rail

lines in the Northeast region of the United States; to provide financial assistance for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and maintenance of such rail lines; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 4898. A bill to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 4899. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 4900. A bill to amend title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, of the United States Code, to provide for the aggregation of claims in the determination of the jurisdictional amount in controversy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself and Mr. Roy):

H.R. 4901. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 4902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 4903. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. DORN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. GINN, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. GROVER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 4904. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. HANRAHAN):

H.R. 4905. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4906. A bill to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4907. A bill to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4908. A bill to amend section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that amounts which the taxpayer pays as

alimony or separate maintenance shall be deductible from his gross income in determining adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 4909. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4910. A bill to amend the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 4911. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to equalize the taxation of certain cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4913. A bill to amend section 707 of the Social Security Act to extend for 1 year the existing authorization of grants for the expansion and development of undergraduate and graduate programs in social work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 4914. 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.

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 4915. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 4916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself and Mr. WHALEN):

H.R. 4917. A bill to establish within the Department of Labor a Trade Adjustment Assistance Administration, to transfer thereto certain functions and duties of other departments and agencies relating to trade adjustment assistance, to establish a comprehensive program of trade adjustment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.R. 4918. A bill to establish within the Department of Labor a Trade Adjustment Assistance Administration, to transfer thereto certain functions and duties of other departments and agencies relating to trade adjustment assistance, to establish a comprehensive program of trade adjustment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PIKE, Mr. REES, Mr. REID, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL,

Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STEELE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WADDIE, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4919. A bill to establish within the Department of Labor a Trade Adjustment Assistance Administration, to transfer thereto certain functions and duties of other departments and agencies relating to trade adjustment assistance, to establish a comprehensive program of trade adjustment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 4920. A bill to create a Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation to insure the people of the United States against losses due to major natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4921. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4922. A bill to provide for the duty-free entry of animal glue valued under 40 cents per pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4923. 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.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 4924. A bill to improve education by increasing the freedom of the Nation's teachers to change employment across State lines without substantial loss of retirement benefits through establishment of a Federal-State program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4925. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Commission on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4926. A bill to amend section 225 of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 4927. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make level V of the executive schedule applicable to three additional positions within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 4928. A bill to change requirements of existing law that certain executive pay recommendations of the President be transmitted to Congress as part of the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 4929. 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. 4930. 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. 4931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that charitable contributions in excess of certain amounts shall not be deductible for purposes of the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BURTON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. DANIELSON):

H.R. 4932. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1968, relating to the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources, to establish a national policy with respect to the Nation's beach resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WON PAT, Miss JORDAN, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. STEELMAN, and Miss HOLTZMAN):

H.R. 4933. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1968, relating to the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources, to establish a national policy with respect to the Nation's beach resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 4934. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4935. A bill to terminate the airlines mutual aid agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4936. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove certain limitations presently imposed upon the types of optometric services which are covered under the medicare program, and thereby to provide coverage under such program for all of the services normally provided by an optometrist; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4937. 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.

By Mr. ERLBORN (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. THONE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. HANRAHAN):

H.R. 4938. A bill to amend the Freedom of Information Act to require that all information be made available to Congress except where executive privilege is invoked; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado (for himself, Mr. STEPHENS, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 4939. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out all rural housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 4940. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to provide that food products shall not be exempt from guidelines issued which limit increases of the levels of prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4941. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of

Michigan, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 4942. A bill to permit coordination and cooperation in accelerated research and development of devices and equipment to meet Government standards for motor vehicle exhaust emissions and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 4943. A bill relative to the oil import program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 4944. A bill to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to amend title XI of such act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4945. A bill to create an air transportation security program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4946. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with the resulting benefit costs being borne equally by employers, employees, and the Federal Government, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary may have without suffering deductions from his benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4947. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code, to limit the availability of guns not suitable for lawful sporting purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANRAHAN:

H.R. 4948. A bill to authorize the clearing of the channel of the Little Calumet River, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 4949. A bill to amend section 161 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, to utilize a portion of the funds for home-making and consumer education programs to assist the elderly; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4950. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. MITCHELL of New York):

H.R. 4951. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 with respect to the exclusion of agricultural from export controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 4952. 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. HAWKINS (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY,

Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NIX, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 4953. A bill to enforce the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo as a treaty made pursuant to article VI of the Constitution in regard to lands rightfully belonging to descendants of former Mexican citizens, to recognize the municipal status of the community land grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY):

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code relating to promotion of members of the uniformed services who are in a missing status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4955. A bill to provide for increasing the amount of interest paid on the permanent fund of the U.S. Soldiers' Home; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (for himself, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MARAZITI, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 4956. A bill to order the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in the southern area of New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 4957. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to its findings and policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Miss HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 4958. A bill to promote the separation of constitutional powers by providing that 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, and December 18, 1972, ordered the Chief Justice to transmit to the Congress shall have no force or effect unless they are expressly approved by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4959. A bill to promote the separation of constitutional powers by providing that 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, and December 18, 1972, ordered the Chief Justice to transmit to the Congress shall have no force or effect unless they are expressly approved by the Congress prior to the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 93d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 4960. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code, to limit exemptions to disclosure of information, to establish a Freedom of Information Commission, and to further amend the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 4961. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require that Public Health Service hospitals, Veterans' Administration hospitals, and hospitals receiv-

ing assistance under the Hill-Burton Act make available to persons entitled to benefits under the medicare program, at cost, prescription drugs not covered under that program, eyeglasses, and hearing aids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 4962. 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. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 4963. A bill to promote the exploration and development of geothermal resources through cooperation between the Federal Government and private enterprise; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4964. A bill to transfer to the Secretary of Commerce functions of the Secretary of the Interior relating to encouraging, promoting, and developing travel within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 4965. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to make certain that recipients of veterans pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 4966. 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; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4967. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Indian Claims Commission for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, and Mr. BERGLAND):

H.R. 4968. A bill to protect producers' incomes when rebuilding reserve stocks of wheat or feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEZVINSKY:

H.R. 4969. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an agreement between the States of Illinois and Iowa relating to the establishment by certain of their political subdivisions of a regional air pollution control board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. HILLIS, and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H.R. 4970. A bill to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to amend title XI of such act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4971. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4972. 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. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to exempt from income taxation interest on certain governmental obligations issued for historic restoration and rehabilitation purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4974. A bill to establish a program of nutrition education for children as a part of the national school lunch and child nutrition programs and to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts for purposes related to strengthening the existing child nutrition programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4975. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 4976. A bill to amend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970, to revise and extend the programs of financial assistance authorized by that act, to authorize XXX grants for education projects respecting alcohol and tobacco abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 4977. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRITCHARD:

H.R. 4978. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to promote public confidence in the legislative branch of the Government of the United States by requiring the disclosure by Members of Congress and certain employees of the Congress of certain financial interests; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 4979. 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.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4980. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to assure that the school food service program is maintained as a nutrition service to children in public and private schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. MCFALL, and Mr. MR. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 4981. A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4982. A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools

throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4983. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4984. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROY (for himself and Mrs. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 4985. A bill to establish a Consumer Savings Disclosure Act in order to provide for uniform and full disclosure of information with respect to the computation and payment of earnings on certain savings deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 4986. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as credible service for civil service retirement purposes service as an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. REES):

H.R. 4987. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase immigration from Western Hemisphere nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4988. A bill to authorize Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to own stock in and invest in loans to certain State housing corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 4989. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 4990. A bill to provide for the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the improvement and operation of museums; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4991. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, to further cultural activities by making unused railroad passenger depots available to communities for such activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4992. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Homestead National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 4993. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of Federal standards for youth camp safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BOLLING, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. WILLIAM

D. FORD, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.R. 4994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to lobbying by certain types of exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to lobbying by certain types of exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: H.R. 4996. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THONE: H.R. 4997. A bill to promote commerce and amend the Federal Power Act to establish a Federal power research and development program to increase efficiencies of electric environmental impacts, develop new sources of clean energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. BINGHAM):

H.R. 4998. A bill to improve the Nation's energy resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL: H.R. 4999. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT: H.R. 5000. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 years the program of assistance for population research and voluntary family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK: H.R. 5001. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATRON: H.R. 5002. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to revise the health and safety standards affecting anthracite mines, and to suspend enforcement of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 until he has completed such revision; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5003. A bill to extend the period within which a reorganization plan transmitted to Congress by the President may become effective; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN: H.J. Res. 389. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating October 14, 1973, as "German Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. ABZUG, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EILBERG,

Mr. FISH, Mr. FROELICH, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. LENT, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.J. Res. 390. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RABICK, Mr. ROE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TREEN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.J. Res. 391. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA: H.J. Res. 392. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. QUITE, and Mr. O'HARA):

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 to extend the authorization of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education and the period within which it must make its final report; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York: H.J. Res. 394. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure that due process and equal protection are afforded to an individual from conception; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON (for himself and Mr. VAN DERLIN):

H.J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to establish a national music of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California: H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADEMANS: H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SEBELIUS: H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the fourth Saturday in March of each year as "National Bake and Take Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK: H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to negotiate with the Government of Canada to establish water levels for the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. WOLFF): H. Res. 258. Resolution of inquiry on the incarceration of certain prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. FOLEY):

H. Res. 259. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to strengthen the requirement that committee proceedings be held in open session; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H. Res. 260. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to an international compact regarding the

safety of persons entitled to diplomatic immunity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

55. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

56. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the establishment of a national cemetery at a site near the Fort Randall Dam in Gregory County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: H.R. 5004. A bill to convey the mineral rights in certain real property located in Izard County, Ark., to L. M. Brown, the owner of such real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO: H.R. 5005. A bill for the relief of Robert DiFranco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California: H.R. 5006. A bill to authorize the temporary appointment of Col. Roy C. Weinstein, U.S. Air Force Reserve, to the grade of brigadier general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: H.R. 5007. A bill to grant a Federal charter to the National Association of Auto Racing Fan Clubs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 5008. A bill for the relief of Liceria M. Bautista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5009. A bill for the relief of William T. McCormick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAY: H.R. 5010. A bill for the relief of Henry D. Espy, James A. Espy, Naomi A. Espy, Jean E. Logan, and Theodore R. Espy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER: H.R. 5011. A bill for the relief of James Lennon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON: H.R. 5012. A bill for the relief of K. Heinz Moehring and his wife, Isle Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN: H.R. 5013. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Robert W. Krasnow, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS: H.R. 5014. A bill for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS: H.R. 5015. A bill to authorize the temporary appointment of Col. Roy C. Weinstein, U.S. Air Force Reserve, to the grade of brigadier general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, 56. The SPEAKER presented petition of the Board of Commissioners, Wayne County, Mich., relative to bombing of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.