

is really a success. I recently released new statistics revealing an upward swing in the accuracy of the program. But the military still has a long way to go before the program successfully identifies all drug users within the military. For example, within a recent week at Tripler Army Medical Center in Hawaii, only 40 percent of the heroin users were correctly identified in its accuracy sample. Hundreds of GI's are still probably slipping through the drug testing screen.

Low accuracy ratings have also been recorded in recent weeks by the Air Force in San Antonio, Tex., the U.S. naval hospital in San Diego and Oakland, and one private laboratory—Washington Reference Laboratory in Washington, D.C. At present, the worst situation exists at the Air Force Base in San Antonio where only 62 percent of the heroin samples, 68 percent of the barbiturate samples, and only 40 percent of the amphetamine samples, are correctly identified.

However, the overall success rate has been improved in the last year.

The Pentagon has exceeded its goal of correctly identifying 90 percent of the samples of heroin and amphetamine users. But the drug testing program still incorrectly identifies 19 percent of the barbiturate users.

While progress has been made, more is needed until the drug screening program correctly identifies all drug abusers and offers them help.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 27, 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.

Almighty God, unfailing source of light and life, whose glory is in all the world and who calls us to walk with Thee that we may truly live, prepare our hands and hearts for the work of this day. Help us to turn from the errors and mistakes of the past, treasuring only the wisdom and the humility they may have taught us.

Deepen within us a love for goodness, truth, and beauty. Renew in us the spirit which enables us to really live all our lives and which helps us to lead our citizens toward a more abundant life together.

Bless our Nation with Thy most gracious favor. Keep her firm in her faith in freedom, just in her exercise of power, generous in her protection of weakness and wise in her activities on behalf of mankind. May righteousness and good will mark our national life and may our deepest trust ever and always be in Thee.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 91-510, appointed Mr. HELMS as a member of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations in lieu of Mr. WEICKER, resigned.

THE HONORABLE CORINNE C. BOGGS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mrs. CORINNE C. Boggs, be permitted to take the oath of office today. Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOGGS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PROJECT VIETNAM

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, in these hopefully closing days of U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam, I would like to pay tribute to two outstanding Americans from my congressional district who performed so well during this war although they were not wearing military uniforms at the time of their service. I am referring to Al and Del Ettinger who gave birth to an idea in 1966 called Project Vietnam which eventually was responsible for sending 12,175 gift packages to soldiers from the Sarasota County area who were stationed in South Vietnam.

Anyone who has ever served the Nation in wartime on foreign soil appreciates most fully the importance of mail call and will readily agree it was usually the most effective morale boosting event of their days in combat. Al Ettinger remembered this fact of service life from his experience during the First World War in the famed Rainbow Division and later in the Second World War as a marine. He became determined to make as many soldiers as possible know that they were remembered and appreciated during this country's most recent war. He and his wife started Project Vietnam alone, but as the months passed they began receiving help from volunteers, local civic organizations, and private contributors. Their humanitarian gesture stands proudly alongside the many other patriotic acts carried out by Americans during the war in Southeast Asia.

In recognition of their unselfish efforts, these two very special Americans were

named Citizens of the Year in Sarasota and became recipients of a national award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. I would personally like to thank Mr. and Mrs. Al Ettinger, who with many others went beyond the call of duty to relieve some of the heavy burden our men in uniform were called upon to shoulder during the long Vietnam war.

IMPOUNDED FIRE CONTROL FUNDS RESTORED

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform our colleagues that I have been advised that the \$4 million previously impounded from the cooperative forest fire prevention program has been restored by the Office of Management and Budget.

This will allow the fire protection program to continue at the \$20,027,000 level already contracted for in current fiscal year.

I have been assured by the Chief of Forest Service that the money will now be made available to State foresters for this vital program; and that the proper State authorities have been so informed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN GIVEAWAY TO ALGERIA

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, while we sit here earnestly delving into means to tighten the reins of Federal spending—while the Office of Management and Budget cuts the heart out of needed domestic programs—the administration has the temerity to approve a foreign giveaway of monumental proportions to a country with which we do not even have diplomatic relations.

According to a report which I saw this morning, the Directors of the Export-Import Bank have approved a deal which, if we in the Congress have any fiscal integrity left, we will try to bring to an immediate halt.

Despite the fact that we do not have diplomatic relations with Algeria, the Export-Import Bank has approved a \$402 million financing package to construct an LNG plant in Algeria.

To put the icing on the cake, Algeria insisted on putting up the faith and credit of their Government instead of repaying the loan out of the proceeds from the gas. Faith and credit. Look at the history, here again our energy needs are to be put at the mercy of an unfriendly government. How stupid can we get?

The safety of liquefied natural gas transportation cannot yet be assured. My colleagues will recall that I have spoken on the floor about a Bureau of Mines report as well as a Coast Guard study both of which present serious questions regarding the safety of LNG transport.

I feel we must act to stop this deal because of the cash outflow from our country and because, in addition to a dollar drain, this is of questionable safety in the first place.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman has made a very appropriate statement. I want to agree with him.

It is incredible that the Export-Import Bank has just authorized a \$157 million direct loan at 6 percent interest to Sonatrach, Algeria's state-owned gas and oil monopoly, for liquefied natural gas facilities to be constructed at Arzew. The action of the Export-Import Bank provides loans of \$157 million and guarantees of \$157 million in matching loans for the same project from the First National City Bank of New York and other lenders. To my knowledge, this is the first time the Export-Import Bank has guaranteed loans to a nation with whom America does not have diplomatic relations.

Another extraordinary feature of this project consists of an Export-Import Bank guarantee for \$52.5 million that Sonatrach—the Algerian monopoly company—expects to borrow from non-U.S. lenders to help cover "local costs" of the project. This constitutes a recent increment to Export-Import Bank policies since it guarantees a loan made by foreigners to foreigners.

I am fully aware of our need for energy resources—gas needs are critical—but it appears necessary to establish some reasonable limitations on what the American taxpayer must pay to get it. Under the present plan \$314 million will be exported to build a facility in a country with which we have no diplomatic relations. All of the risks and all of the interest subsidy is being thrust on the back of the American taxpayer.

Several weeks ago, the Export-Import Bank granted a 6-percent loan to a Japanese company for the purchase of American aircraft. How can we justify a

taxpayer-subsidized loan to a developed company already swamped with surplus dollars?

In fiscal year 1972 the Export-Import Bank loaned \$2.3 billion at subsidized interest rates which are not available to American enterprise. In addition, in fiscal year 1972, it has provided guarantees of \$1.2 billion, all of which are a contingent liability of the American consumers. Under present laws, the Export-Import Bank can do anything it likes provided the President says it is in the national interest. It can loan and guarantee loans to any citizen in any nation at interest rates which discriminate against comparable enterprise developed in America.

If the Export-Import Bank can continue unrestrained in subsidized loans and guarantees to dollar-heavy nations and high risk loans and guarantees to nations which despise us to the point of nonrecognition, the Export-Import Bank may well be on the way to exporting what little remains of national solvency and credibility.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman.

REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2107, RURAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2107) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

A SAD DAY AND A HAPPY DAY

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today is a sad day and also a happy day. We have just witnessed a ceremony that recalls to us the sadness of the day when our majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana, Hale Boggs left us. It is a happy day for us to welcome the gentlewoman from Louisiana, "LINDY" Boggs, to this body.

It was 33 years ago that LINDY came here with Hale and myself to begin our service in the Congress. It is a happy day, LINDY, for the Members of the Louisiana delegation. It is our pleasure at this time to welcome you to this body and to say we are glad because it is not as a stranger, but as an old-time friend and somebody who knows us, as we know her.

Mr. Speaker, may the days ahead in this body be as long and as happy for the gentlewoman from Louisiana as they were for Hale.

Our hand of welcome is out to the gentlewoman from Louisiana, and may God bless her.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join in extending a personal welcome to a courageous and lovely lady, a long time friend, and the newest Member of this body.

LINDY Boggs is no stranger to Washington. She came here with her able and distinguished late husband in 1941 and she has been well and affectionately known since that time not only for the effective and constant support and the love she gave to Hale Boggs, but for her own contributions to a stronger Democratic Party and a better America.

Through the years Hale Boggs was destined to become one of the Nation's great Congressmen and an outstanding leader of his party and LINDY was constantly at his side helping and encouraging in his important work.

Now that Hale has been lost to us, we are indeed fortunate that LINDY has picked up his fallen mantle and that she will carry it forward in the splendid tradition of her husband. We know also that LINDY Boggs will leave her own imprint on the pages of history. Her ability has long been recognized and I am confident her contributions will be many and they will be important.

I compliment the people of her district for exercising the good judgment to send her to Congress. They have a deserved pride in her, a pride which we in Congress also share.

Because of the long and warm friendship which Mrs. Sikes and I have had for LINDY and Hale, I am particularly happy to join in this welcome. I know that she brings courage and strength and ability which are needed in the deliberations of this body. I know also that this lovely and devoted lady will hold high the best traditions of good Americanism in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join my distinguished colleagues in welcoming the Honorable LINDY Boggs to the House of Representatives. I am sure she will serve the citizens of Louisiana's Second Congressional District as effectively and honorably as did her husband, Hale, before his tragic disappearance in the Alaskan wilderness.

During Hale's distinguished service in the House, I developed a close friendship with the Boggs family and I am especially pleased to be able to welcome LINDY to the House. I wish her a long and rewarding term as Louisiana's Congresswoman. In the final analyses the people of her district, her State, and the Nation will prove the true beneficiaries because LINDY Boggs came to Congress.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that we are now assured of the continuation of the famous Boggs garden parties which have become a Capitol Hill tradition.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FOREST AND GAME MANAGEMENT

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, A well-founded, intensive forest management program is needed not only to meet increasing demands for wood fiber, but to meet increasing demands for other amenities of the forest, too.

Game populations, for instance, increase and thrive in managed young growth stands and this has been pointed out by a number of studies conducted by game experts at various universities scattered around the Nation.

Old growth stands have been described as "biological deserts" while the reverse is true of young growth timber stands. In young growth, say the experts, more sunlight reaches the ground because the canopy or "over-story" has been opened up. Sunlight is necessary, not only for trees, but for low-lying brush and shrubs vital in the food chain for many animals.

And any hunter knows that "edge effect" is important in big game habitat. "Edge" results in timber harvest areas when openings are created by removal of timber and hunters know that elk and deer feed in the openings where the browse and forbs are found but they like to have thickets and escape routes into the thickets available when danger approaches.

Log landings, secondary haul roads and skid trails not only produce a great deal of browse and forbs but are also excellent as escape routes.

Intensive forest management can, and does, provide for the multiple amenities of the forest.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the opportunity to listen to a well-known international banker. He announced that by mid-summer the balance of trade would be in our favor and we would no longer be in a deficit position.

This is reminiscent of the period of 1960, 1961, and 1962, to my memory. It is nothing but the same old ploy that has always been pulled every time this Congress faces a problem of a deficit in our international trade. They will change it around; it is very simple; they will export less to the United States and import a little more from the United States for a while and change it to such a position that we will start to shout "hallelujah" and give them 5 more years of coming into the American market. If we do what the President wants us to do, as he suggested I believe a week ago, I can assure

this Congress that in the next 5 years you will not recognize this country.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 325) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 325

Resolved, That Donald W. Riegle, Jr., of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 326) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 326

Resolved, That Corinne C. (Lindy) Boggs, of Louisiana, be, and she is hereby, elected to the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

PROVIDING FOR STRIKING OF MEDALS IN COMMEMORATION OF ROBERTO WALKER CLEMENTE

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3841) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of Roberto Walker Clemente.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, or at least I hope I shall not object.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. This is the bill I discussed with the gentleman from Iowa the other day.

Mr. GROSS. And there is almost no expenditure of funds?

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. There is no expenditure from the Treasury.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3841

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the outstanding athletic, civic, charitable, and humanitarian contributions of Roberto Walker Clemente, the Secretary

of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, (1) one gold medal, to be awarded at the discretion of such organization, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by such organization subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and (2) not more than two hundred thousand duplicate medals of sizes and alloys to be determined by such organization subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be made and delivered at such times as may be required by such organization in quantities of not less than two thousand. Any profits derived by such organization from the sale of such medals shall be contributed by such organization to the Roberto Clemente Memorial Fund, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The medals are national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint, shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. No medals shall be made under the authority of this Act after December 31, 1974.

The bill 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.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Seventh Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities, for fiscal year 1972.

It is essential that the disciplines of the humanities—languages, history, philosophy, literature and ethics among others—be brought to bear on problems of contemporary concern, both national and international. The Federal Government recognizes this need—and has been responsive to it.

I particularly commend to your attention the program of "Youthgrants in the Humanities," begun in fiscal year 1972, which provides needed support for young people doing scholarly work in the humanities. Another impressive effort is the Endowment's State-Based Program, which, in less than two years, has established committees in 38 States to encourage public education. The "Jefferson Lecture in the Humanities," aimed at bridging the gap between humanistic learning and public affairs, is also successfully underway.

The public's response to the work of

the National Endowment for the Humanities may be measured in part by the fact that public contributions to the Endowment have exceeded federally appropriated funds for the third year in a row. This is clear evidence of broad public support for the objectives of the National Endowment and, I believe, gives added justification to the steadily increasing funding which I have requested and which the Congress has provided for its very worthwhile endeavors.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 27, 1973.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE DELMARVA PENINSULA, A SUMMARY REPORT TO THE CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-68)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit the enclosed report, "Water Resources of the Delmarva Peninsula, a Summary Report to the Congress," by E. M. Cushing, I. H. Kantrowitz, and K. R. Taylor, which was prepared in compliance with Public Law 89-618 (S. 2287), October 4, 1966.

The Delmarva study was made in response to the specific act cited above, which was sponsored by Senator J. Caleb Boggs of Delaware (S. 2287) and Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton (H.R. 9922) who was a Representative from Maryland in 1966. Public Law 89-618 authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive investigation of the water resources of the Delmarva Peninsula. The principal objective of the study was to determine the availability of fresh-water supplies to meet future needs of the peninsula area. The summary report indicates that the amount of fresh water that can be developed perennially on the peninsula is about 1,500 million gallons per day. This amount is more than 10 times the use in 1970 and about six times the estimated use of water on the peninsula by the year 2010.

In addition to this summary report to the Congress, required by Public Law 89-618, the Geological Survey plans to compile and publish in 1973 a more detailed report on the study for use by public and private agencies and individuals. That report will provide information for use in long-range planning, development, and management of water supplies.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 27, 1973.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 58]

Abzug	Frelinghuysen	Minish
Andrews, N.C.	Gialmo	Mink
Armstrong	Gray	Nelsen
Aspin	Harsha	Nix
Badillo	Harvey	O'Brien
Bell	Hawkins	Price, Tex.
Bingham	Helstoski	Rangel
Blatnik	Hollifield	Reid
Burke, Calif.	Horton	Rooney, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio	Hudnut	Roybal
Chisholm	Karth	Sikes
Clark	King	Staggers
Derwinski	Koch	Stanton
Diggs	Kuykendall	J. William
Esch	Lent	Steiger, Wis.
Eshleman	Madigan	Tiernen
Flowers	Mann	Wilson, Tex.
Ford	Meeds	Young, Ill.
William D.	Milford	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

CHANGE OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House that H.R. 3153, the technical and conforming changes in the Social Security Act, has been taken off the calendar for today at the request of the chairman.

DEMOCRATS ASSUME LEADERSHIP IN RENT-PRICE CONTROLS

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats introduced yesterday a bill fixing rents and freezing all prices and interest rates for 60 days.

Once again, the Democrats have taken the initiative to fill the hiatus made by the Nixon administration's inability to provide effective leadership in controlling inflation.

Let us take a look at what the Nixon economy has brought us. Indeed, Nixon has terminated mandatory wage and price controls and given us rent increases as much as 30 percent in some of our major cities, a far cry from the 5.5 percent "voluntary guidelines" of phase III.

And President Nixon has told the American housewife that she must now pay 2.5 percent more this week to feed her family than she paid last week. That spells an annual cost increase of \$34 for madam consumer. Last month, beef increased 7 percent and pork 5.3 percent.

And all this represents the highest jump in food prices for a single month in a generation.

It is beginning to look as if we are entering a period of accelerated inflation. Phase III just is not working and the

American people are not buying the Nixon administration's "self-enforcing" game plan to take this Nation down the primrose path of economic malaise.

Immediate action is needed to halt the spiraling increase in food prices, rents, and interest rates.

But the White House has not yet come up with any meaningful proposal to curb inflation. So, Congress is taking the initiative to strengthen the stabilization program and put an end to inflation. The Democrats on the Banking and Currency Committee, under the aegis of Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, and with the strong endorsement of the democratic leadership, have submitted their own proposal to work out a new economic stabilization plan to replace President Nixon's unacceptable phase III program.

Following the 60-day freeze, the President will be required to institute mandatory controls across-the-board on all elements of the economy when the rates of inflation exceed 3 percent for a 3-month period.

Rents will be stabilized at levels prevailing on January 10, 1973, the last day of phase II.

A consumer council will be established to serve as an ombudsman for the consumer's benefit.

GAO will be vested with the power to review all reports concerning prices, profits, wages, salaries, rents, and interest rates, which are submitted under the stabilization program.

And the democratic alternative will provide for greater public disclosure by companies seeking price increases.

Controls under phase II were not infallible. But the reluctant imposition of these controls by President Nixon has given this Nation by far the best record of any developed industrial nation of holding in check the forces of inflation.

And the Democratic Congress can assume the credit for that, just as the Democratic Congress is now offering an alternative to phase III that has teeth in it.

In introducing a strong rent-price control measure, Congress has gained the confidence of the American people and exercised the responsibility of economic review which will lead our Nation toward sound economic policy and well-being.

NEW TAX PLAN FOR CIVIL SERVICE PENSIONS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, civil service employees have for years been at a disadvantage with regard to the income tax treatment of their contributions to pension funds. Employees of private corporations generally have noncontributory pension benefits, and self-employed individuals can deduct their contributions to qualified retirement plans under the Keogh plan. Employees of tax-exempt organizations are granted special tax advantages with respect to annuities purchased for them by their employer.

Only the public employee is required to pay taxes on the money which is mandatorily withheld each year as his contribution to a retirement fund. While most other Americans need pay taxes on their pension benefits only when those benefits are received, the public employee's contributions are taxable in the year in which they are contributed, when the taxpayer is in a much higher income bracket than after retirement.

Several years ago, the Internal Revenue Service issued Revenue Ruling 69-650, which seemed to say that mandatory employee contributions to retirement were not includible in income in the year earned. Last year, however, in Revenue Ruling 72-250, the IRS indicated that the previous ruling did not apply to civil servants. Several groups of public employees have brought lawsuits in various parts of the country to resolve the issue, but no decisions have yet been handed down. I believe that it is up to Congress to end this discrimination against public employees, and I have introduced legislation today to accomplish that purpose. This bill amends the Internal Revenue Code to defer the payment of income tax on amounts deducted from a public employee's wages for purposes of retirement, until the amounts are actually received by the taxpayer. The enactment of this legislation will erase a glaring inequity in our tax laws, and will extend to our public employees the same advantages that are available to privately employed and self-employed individuals.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(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, March 25 marked the 152d anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

This observance is mocked by the fact that a backward-looking, repressive dictatorship has now ruled Greece for nearly 6 years.

The regime in power brings no honor either to Greece or to the Western Alliance. It has stifled the free and creative energies of the talented Greek people, and made the Greek police and army the jailers of their fellow citizens.

The Greek nation has thus been denied, in Churchill's phrase, "the health-giving controversy" that springs from democracy.

Only the most gullible or the most shamelessly cynical can contend today, after years of repression and deception, that the ruling junta is moving Greece toward a genuine democracy.

The question is sometimes asked, "Well, why don't the Greeks revolt?" American officials themselves have used this tactic to deter critics. To which Greeks respond, as, "So you want us to revolt?" And that usually ends the conversation.

Revolt? With what arms? All the weapons are in the hands of the police and army. In addition, there is the further, crippling weapon of fear based on a system of spies and informers and torture.

A coup from within, by those with weapons, is possible, especially if the situation deteriorates.

A sudden change could occur, for the seeming passiveness of the Greeks is misleading. Under the surface apathy is a feeling of permanent grievance similar to that which repeatedly exploded in Eastern European nations during the 1950's and 1960's.

Recently we have read of the student disturbances in Athens, Salonika, and Patras.

I regard these disturbances as significant, for it takes more guts for a Greek student to challenge the government than it does in most Western nations.

First, they are contending with a repressive dictatorship, with beatings, jailings, and an absence of due process as the tools of reprisals.

Second, it is very difficult to be accepted into a Greek university, for facilities are limited. In the polytechnical school, for example, only a small percentage of qualified applicants are accepted.

Third, once a student graduates jobs are scarce.

Fourth, the blacklist is common and a blacklisted student can have his career ruined.

So the risks are not light nor lightly taken. There was a certain desperation in the student action, a crying out in the wilderness to the civilized world.

A comprehensive article on the student protest, by foreign correspondent Dan Morgan, recently appeared in the Washington Post. It is set forth below.

In addition, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a letter written by Mr. Emmanuel Kothris, former Minister and Deputy in the Greek Parliament, to the Creton newspaper Masochios.

Mr. Kothris, a political elder, has not sought the safety of the sidelines but has continued to speak out as a matter of honor and conviction. As a consequence he has been hounded by surveillance and has been called in for police interrogation. A few weeks ago he was denied a passport to come to Washington to attend, along with national and international representatives, the 21st Annual Presidential Prayer breakfast. An interesting counterpoint was provided by the regime when it issued a passport to Elias Ellou, a leftist former deputy, to attend a Communist gathering in Moscow.

It is believed that one reason Mr. Kothris was denied a passport was the letter reproduced below.

Solomos, the Greek "national poet," inspired generations of Greeks with his "Ode to Liberty," which became the national anthem. When the students of Athens sang this hymn on the grounds of the university earlier this month they were savagely beaten by the police.

Those who love freedom must honor those who take risks in freedom's cause.

Accordingly, the article and letter follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1973]

PROTESTS SHOW CRACKS IN GREEK REGIME

(By Dan Morgan)

ATHENS.—"I don't understand where the foreign correspondents who visit this country

find all this opposition to the regime," an American diplomat here said a year ago. "I live here year-round but I'm darned if I can find it."

That assessment of a population's acquiescence in the military-backed dictatorship established by the April 1967 army coup expressed one of the puzzles of Greek life at that time. Despite the suspension of most civil and political liberties and repression of dissidents, Greece under martial law has projected an image of prosperity, stability and contentment.

After a months of widespread student unrest, however, some small cracks have appeared in the picture. At the universities themselves, the campus protests revealed a sizable opposition to policies that have eroded educational independence and imposed controls over many aspects of academic life.

Government assertions that the unrest was engineered by a tiny minority of "anarchists," "former politicians," and "Communists" seem unconvincing after sit-ins, protest meetings, and boycotts that involved a majority of the 80,000 Greek university students.

[The government closed the Athens University Law School for a week yesterday and banned a general student meeting, according to wire service reports from Athens. Police and uniformed military police patrolled the area, and witnesses said several demonstrating students were arrested.]

There is also at least some evidence that the drafting of 97 students into the army, and the beating of some of them inside university buildings, may have cost the government the confidence of segments of society that had been neutral or even in favor of its authoritarian rule.

Some 1,200 citizens signed a protest against the induction of students into the armed services. The presumably thoroughly pro-government Senate (Executive Council) of the embattled Athens Polytechnic University resigned in protest against police brutality.

The position of Prime Minister George Papadopoulos still seems unassailable. He commands the police, army and security services and has the support of Greece's business and financial groups. Even the government's most bitter critics have trouble presenting a credible scenario that would lead to its downfall.

Yet Papadopoulos conceded the essential difficulty he faces in governing a country that lacks any political mechanism for defusing tensions.

Although Papadopoulos promised the student-faculty group that he would heed legitimate student requests, few observers believe that the government is in any position to make essential compromises without jeopardizing its own status. Hints from officials suggest that the government may be preparing to use the unrest to justify further delays in moving toward more representative government.

Public opinion is difficult to measure in Greece. The vast majority of Greek citizens seem to a non-Greek eye to be preoccupied with enjoying their booming consumer society. But opponents of the government maintain that the outward indifference is artificial and that the real significance of the student protests was that they roused many Greeks from their political passivity.

"The image of inviolability has been broken," said a journalist. "The sense that the regime is in total control of everything is less strong than it was."

"Education is the essence of society and without free education you cannot develop a society," said a professor. "We are returning to the 19th century, when our fight was over academic freedom and the inviolability of the university."

"The events have made all Greeks sensitive to the deprivation of their basic liberties," said a young student interviewed in Athens last week. "The way the government handled

the demonstrations made the whole country conscious that they were living under a violent regime."

Such views clearly are a shock to a government that has energetically courted the younger generation in hopes of winning it over to the ideals of its so-called April revolution. Students have been pampered with free medical care, cheap meals, loans and free movie tickets.

While offering these blandishments, however, the government tightened its controls over Greece's universities. Through a series of decrees and new constitutional acts, it assumed powers to dismiss and appoint professors and named government commissars (usually generals) with broad powers to supervise universities. An estimated one-third of Greek professors are believed to have left their posts because of dismissal, resignation or early retirement since 1967.

In responding to a steadily growing student movement which was demanding a larger voice in educational matters, the government has followed a zigzag course. Under pressure from several thousand students, the government permitted students to elect their own boards last November.

But dissident sources claimed that pro-government forces tried to control the outcome with intimidation, procedural tricks and fraud.

Student demands include the release of the 97 drafted students, repeal of the special decree that withdrew their deferments, undergraduate participation in drafting a new law on higher education, new elections for student boards, and removal of police informers and suspected members of the former strongarm Fascist youth organization "EKOS" from the campus.

What happens next may depend on the depth of underlying tensions in Greek society and the strength of mass support for change. Student sources say their movement is independent of any political party. But for any opposition to be effective ultimately, it would have to offer some convincing alternatives to the present government. Such an alternative does not exist, and some Greeks fear that the opposition could become divided between leftists and social reformers on one side and conservatives who would like to restore the monarchy of exiled King Constantine.

At this stage, Greek prosperity may be working against social agitation. Greek per capita income exceeded \$1,000 in 1971 and national income grew by 8½ percent. Strikes are illegal in Greece but there has not even been a wildcat walkout of serious proportions in six years.

Opponents of the government insist that the euphoria is misleading and that worker unrest will soon appear over rapidly rising prices. More than 250,000 Greeks have gone abroad to seek better jobs. Economic critics say that corruption has increased under the dictatorship and that economic inequalities have widened as a result of special tax treatment for powerful economic groups.

They also maintain that such important economic indicators as private capital investments in manufacturing have dropped off since 1967.

Workers in Greece have seldom been an effective political force. For this reason, some government opponents put their hopes in the army, whose position toward the government's handling of the student issue is uncertain. However, student leaders say they are doubtful that the army could play a role in restoring democracy and more progressive policies.

"Since the Greek civil war, our army has become more and more reactionary and riddled with secret organizations," said one source. Nevertheless, the Papadopoulos government apparently worries more about opposition to it from the right than from the

left. Many retired army officers are still angry over the expulsion of King Constantine after an abortive royal counter-coup on Dec. 15, 1967.

"What unites us," said a former conservative politician this week, "is our contempt for the regime. We Greeks shall pursue the road that leads to our freedom."

MR. KOTHRIS PROPOSES GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL UNITY

(Mr. Emmanuel Kothris letter to Messoghios)

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I am answering your questions:

You are wrong in believing—and I regret to state so publicly—that the Prime Minister and the majority of his collaborators sincerely wish to reach an understanding with the political leadership for the restoration of parliamentary Democracy and free institutions in our Country.

If they really wanted it, this would have been achieved because the political leaders would not refuse to make sacrifices if they were convinced that in this manner that national interest is served. However, I believe that in this case, through this policy, of supposed understanding with the "political world" and the alleged "march towards true democracy," only the humiliation and submission of the political leaders to the regime are being sought. But, in this respect the rulers underestimate the political maturity of our people. It has not been realized as yet by them, that there is no "old" and "new" political world, but a unique one, which is continuously being renewed according to the political life of our Country. Therefore, the creation of an artificial and unnatural political life, like the one they are pursuing, leads neither to true Democracy nor does it serve the Nation.

If the Prime Minister truly believes that return to political normalcy is a duty that serves the Nation's interests, he does not need to have any preliminary understanding with the "political world," least of all with its spokesmen.

He can, (and according to the Constitution, he has the right), invite exiled King Constantine to return to his throne with the possibility that the latter could exercise unhindered his Constitutional duties. Thus the process for the return of the country to normal political life would start smoothly and political leaders would be given the opportunity to contribute to National Unity under the leadership of the King. Similarly, the return of the exiled politicians, including Mr. Caramanlis, and with their participation, the formation of a transitional government of National Unity to face crucial problems and to conduct free elections in due time would be facilitated. In this manner the country would march steadily on the normal political course and any danger of anarchy as a result of the continuation of the current political anomaly will be averted.

We should not forget that the cooperation of the democratic political leaders with any regime must depend on its ideological goals and not on its longevity. Thus, the political leadership of our country reserves the right to enter a dialogue with the representatives of the present regime only when we are convinced that they too sincerely seek return to normal political life.

But when they declare that we do not exist and at the same time they do not permit the creation of new political forces in a normal way, that is, through the normal operation of democratic processes, when they do not implement the Constitution nor the institutional laws which they themselves formed. (i.e. as the law on political parties), when in essence they keep in force martial law throughout the country and when they attack a King and the system of Crowned Democracy through controlled press and forget that they promised to maintain of the

present form of government of Crowned Democracy, then how is it possible to believe that by such policies they aim at the return of political normalcy?

Is it a proof of political normalcy that we move "freely" in our cities, "thanks to the compassion of the government" and not on the basis of our lawful constitutional right? Or when the policing of the political and social life of the leaders who have offered numerous national services and of many of our followers increases day by day?

I agree that violent overthrow of the regime will have unfavorable repercussions on the security of the Country. This is an additional reason that all should contribute towards a speedy political normalization. But, no one can exclude unpleasant developments in our political life as long as the present political anomaly continues.

Sincerely,

EMMANUEL KOTHRIS.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, the frustrations of trying to deal with the U.S. Postal Service have been well documented by both Houses of Congress, by the media, by word of mouth, and by Postal Service officials themselves. We have shared with our constituents the agony of trying to have mail delivered within a reasonable interval. Through it all, the post office management has pursued budget cutting to the point of irrationality without having to share in the financial losses they have caused their customers.

Today, I am introducing legislation which will require the Post Office to be held financially accountable for their ineffectiveness under a guaranteed insured delivery system. This will create a new class of mail which will allow patrons to purchase an assured date of delivery. If the Post Office Department does not fulfill its responsibility under the agreed upon terms, then it will be liable for provable damages up to statutory limit of \$2,500.

Today, the small businessman or average consumer is at the mercy of an unreliable and unpredictable Postal Service when conducting his financial dealings. I have documented cases of customers suffering real and potential losses as a direct result of the inadequacies present in the system. Also it seems to me that even under a usually reliable delivery schedule that there should be some means of the consumer protecting himself against a loss that is not his responsibility. However, my proposal goes beyond the factor of financial loss. It goes to the very root of what I believe is wrong with the management of the post office. They are insensitive to the attitudes and needs of their customers. I see this measure as one means of raising their level of concerns for those customers who are most affected by their poor performance. Hopefully, this legislation will also serve as a starting point for other services which are more fully responsive to the needs of their patrons.

In summary, I believe this proposed legislation fills a gap in the services offered to postal customers. It should also serve as means of overcoming the Postal Service management's oftentimes cavalier attitude toward customer service. I think these are goals worth pursuing under the best of conditions but absolutely necessary ones in view of the continuing inability of the Post Office Department to meet its responsibilities.

THAT CHAMPIONSHIP SEASON

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night in New York City, Mr. Jason Miller's play, "That Championship Season" received the Broadway theater's Tony Award as the best play of the season. It was an award that was richly deserved, and followed the Critics Award as best play of the season given to the same drama.

Jason Miller is a native of the city of Scranton, the son of John A. and Mary Miller, who reside at 118 South Fillmore Street in Scranton, and who must be overwhelmed with joy to see their fine son so honored by the most exacting drama critics in the world. To make it on Broadway is to walk into the history of the drama in perpetuity. Jason Miller has made his own mark on the history of American drama.

Jason was an outstanding young man in Scranton, where he attended St. Patrick's High School in West Scranton. He attended the University of Scranton, and it was there, and in the plays at Marywood College, that Jason has his first experience in the theater. He was, as all who knew him at the time agree, an intense student of drama, who spent long hours of studied concentration on the part assigned him, so that he would be believable from the first moment he walked on the stage. It is perhaps this concentration which has made "That Championship Season" a play so intense in individual characterization.

From Scranton, Jason went to the noted theater of the Catholic University of America, here in Washington. He met and married a wonderful young lady named Linda Mae Gleason, the daughter of one of the great action comedians in American television, the incomparable Jackie Gleason.

Now Jason has stepped far beyond those days when he was a student of the drama, and has become a formidable voice in the writing of American drama. Additionally, he has pursued his own career as an actor, and will shortly be seen in a motion picture that is also centered in this city of Washington, "The Exorcist," after the remarkable novel of the same name.

It is a delight for me to extend my own warmest congratulations to Jason Miller on this singular and most-deserved honor, and I know I speak for all my colleagues here in the Congress in so congratulating him.

ACTION TO STEM ALARMING RISE IN FOOD COST

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, in light of yesterday's announcement of the most recent increase in the cost of food, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues action being taken by one of my constituents which is designed to help in part.

We have heard and seen accounts of various consumer groups and indeed individuals who are boycotting beef because of the steady and alarming price increase. But I could not think of any such action taken by a commercial establishment, until I received a letter from Philip Romano.

Mr. Romano owns a fine restaurant in Palm Beach. In fact, Romano's 300 has received several awards, including the Holiday Magazine Award in 1973 as one of the 190 finest restaurants in North America.

But as of April 1, Mr. Romano will not carry beef on his menu. In his letter to me, he says that he has no doubt that his clientele could afford the increase he would attach as a result of rising prices, but that instead of taking this action, his menu will simply be beefless.

Mr. Romano notes that he received help from the Government via a small business loan and his action is an attempt to help the Government in trying to bring beef prices back in line.

I would also note that I have heard that the students at the University of Maryland are planning to petition to have beef removed for at least 1 month from its menus in an attempt to accomplish the same goal. I understand that the university uses about a ton of beef a day.

I commend both for their action in doing their share to help stem the alarming rise in food which has caught this Nation by storm over the past 3 months, and I am passing on Mr. Romano's letter to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Cost of Living Council as a call for some immediate action on this inflationary problem. I also call on the President to establish guidelines if he remains firm in his conviction that a price control is unwise.

ISSUES FACING THE CONGRESS AND THE NATION

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning the leadership of the House and the Senate met in another of the series of meetings on the issues facing the Congress and the Nation. At this time I would like to insert in the RECORD the press release on the meeting of March 27.

The House-Senate Democratic leadership held the third in a series of monthly meetings today in an office of the Speaker of the House. Attending the meeting were Speaker CARL ALBERT, Sen-

ate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, House Majority Leader TIP O'NEILL, Senate Majority Whip ROBERT BYRD, House Majority Whip JOHN McFALL, and Senator TED MOSS.

The deteriorating state of the national economy and the lack of firm and effective leadership on the part of the President in restoring stability to the Nation's economic life dominated discussion. There was consensus that the lifting of phase II controls was premature, and several factors contributing to the inadequacy of present administration economic policies were noted: rising inflation and cost of foods, lumber, steel, and other items; the recent devaluation of the dollar, the second such action in 15 months; the recent precipitous drop in the stock market; the continued adverse balance of trade and rapidly rising rents.

The joint leadership endorsed recent action taken by the House Committee on Banking and Currency concerning future economic policy and agreed that legislation providing anything short of phase II controls would be inadequate.

Other topics discussed at this morning's meeting were: Congressional spending and the budget ceilings; the scheduling of floor action of bills which were vetoed by the President in the last session; the scheduling of anticipated Presidential vetoes in the next few weeks, the status of impounding legislation and a general discussion of the legislative schedule in the House and Senate.

The leaders agreed that they would make every effort to clear the regular appropriations bills, at least through the House, before the first of July, and they jointly urged committee chairmen in both bodies to move their authorization bills as rapidly as possible in order to expedite the passage of the appropriations bills.

ANNOUNCING HEARINGS ON NIXON IMPOUNDMENTS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, Wednesday, March 28, the House Rules Committee will open hearings on the various bills pending pertaining to the impoundment programs of President Nixon. These hearings will open in room 2154, Rayburn Building, at 10:30 a.m. The hearings will be televised. On Thursday, the hearings will continue in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, No. 2170, at 10:30 a.m.

I think that a substantial majority of Members agree that we do have an immediate and pressing need for some form of anti-impoundment legislation.

President Nixon has abused the principle and the precedents of impoundment. The Congress knows that the law requires him to prevent deficiencies in specific accounts. The Congress recognizes the commonsense in holding back money when you can get the job done for less.

But we do not concede that the President has any right to use impoundment

to slow down a job or to halt it altogether, merely because he happens to disagree with that particular program. No theory of impoundment gives the President the right to thwart the will of the Congress.

Thus far, Mr. Nixon has used impoundment to curtail or to shut off a vast spectrum of programs that cut across the entire domestic scene and that affect the well-being of millions of Americans. Impoundments of 1973 funds have held up more than half a billion dollars for housing and urban development programs, more than \$159 million for the food stamp program, hundreds of millions of dollars for conservation programs and other programs to benefit the rural areas, almost \$2.5 billion in aid to highways, and \$6.6 billion in grants for construction of water and sewerage treatment facilities. Millions of dollars have been curtailed on educational programs.

Mr. Nixon has, in effect, substituted his wishes for the collective and deliberative judgment of 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 100 U.S. Senators.

What is at stake here is whether we are going to have one-man rule or whether we are going to continue our system of shared and balanced powers.

President Nixon seeks now to overstep his share of the powers distributed by the Constitution and to intrude upon the very fountainhead of congressional powers.

A recent poll taken by Oliver Quayle in St. Louis shows that the people are worried about trusting too much authority to a single individual.

Overwhelmingly, the people felt that the Congress—not the Executive—should set the ceiling on spending.

The people have not supported Mr. Nixon to the extent that they would give him a Congress of his own party—one which might be more responsive to his wishes. Mr. Nixon is the first President since Rutherford B. Hayes not to have had even one Congress of his own political persuasion.

Lacking a congressional mandate, President Nixon has gone ahead and taken power, including the power reserved to the Congress, and has used it as it has pleased him.

I think the people recognize President Nixon's unilateral impoundment actions as a growing threat to our democratic processes, and they are wary of those tendencies.

President Nixon is attempting to impose on this Nation his personal philosophy of a Federal Government remote from the people and uninvolved with their needs. He wants a retreat from social responsibility—a repudiation of the kind of humanitarian principles that have prevailed in Government for 40 years.

STUDY OF FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fiscal

Policy of the Joint Economic Committee I want to share with the Members the findings of a major study of that committee based on data gathered by the General Accounting Office at my request.

Our committee has been working away for more than a year now, describing and analyzing the whole range of welfare programs or income maintenance programs. We counted up 100 programs and found that they cost the Federal taxpayers more than \$100 billion a year.

But we wanted to know more. We wanted to show these programs in practice, not just in theory.

We asked the GAO: "Who is getting these benefits? How much are they getting, and from how many programs are they receiving them?"

Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell what we found makes the offerings of the two Georges—McGOVERN and WILEY—look like pikers.

The GAO at my request went into six low-income areas and drew samples of 1,758 households in all. They went to the records of 100 Federal, State, and local programs to see whether any members of these households have gotten benefits during the year.

They searched records of Federal, State, and local agencies sending out checks for programs such as AFDC, general assistance, social security, those passing out food, those which house people, those which pay health bills, and those which provide day care and other services. We added up the value of the benefits from all these programs, and for the first time we can give the Members a picture of what is really happening in welfare today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our findings do not necessarily apply to the entire country or even to all of the poor. But I for one find that it makes a convincing case for drastic action.

This shows us how all income maintenance programs work in chart 3.

In chart 3 the sheer number of people who have contact with the public welfare bureaucracy is staggering. And I might add that it is far greater than one would guess by just looking at the number of AFDC recipients alone.

Sixty percent of our households receive benefits from at least one program, and the chances are very good that each receives more than one benefit; 40 percent receive benefits from two or more programs; 11 percent participated in 5 or more programs, on down to almost one percent involved in 9 to 11 programs. Our big winner was a household of 5 people which got benefits from 11 different programs. The benefits totaled 691 tax-free dollars, of which \$599 was in cash.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to keep pointing out to the Members and keep reminding the Members that not only are these benefits not taxable; they are not garnisheeable. This money is not like other money.

In chart 4 we can see that descriptive language rather than actual cities has been used for the sites: eastern city, south Atlantic city, southern city, northwestern city, western city, and rural counties.

Mr. Speaker, what is incredible to me is that if one lives in the two southern cities, one is apparently more likely to already have had contact with the public welfare establishment than if one lives in the three other urban sites. This is shown in chart 4.

A lot of people were very upset because the President's family assistance plan would have made so many people in the South eligible for benefits. Those people are too late. They are already getting them.

Mr. Speaker, who are these people who get so many benefits? Of course, many are members of large households or those with children or those with aged heads. But we have to look at some actual cases to understand how it can happen that households get five or more benefits and to understand the variety of situations. There is no general rule. But all of this is legal.

There is no fraud; no fraud is necessary to do very well under our present way of doing business.

Look at this couple in an eastern city, for example. They are supporting a young wife and a wife's teenage brother with AFDC, general assistance, food stamps, and medicaid benefits. They live in a public housing unit and the teenager is with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. They have tax-free benefits which are worth \$385 a month supplemented by the wife's earnings of \$429.

In B you find a young woman who has a total of \$460 a month in cash from AFDC and the Neighborhood Youth Corps and from private earnings. She also gets food, housing, and health care subsidies.

I want to point out to you we found other households in this same city each also having three people whose earnings were far less than this woman had in cash; yet they got not one penny of help from any program. Do you know why? In large part it is because the families were married couples. These four families were struggling along with earnings of less than \$350 a month—no food stamps, no medicaid, no public housing, no welfare to add to their earnings. The young woman with \$460 in cash plus everything else is far better off.

C. In this three-generation family of five in a southern city—and this is one of the big winners, also—they received 11 benefits, 5 of which were cash payments totaling \$599 a month. They also got food, medicaid, housing, and service benefits, bringing the grand total to \$691 monthly.

D. This mother of 10 children in a midwestern city received an average of \$793 in monthly benefits. This is over \$9,500 a year. A working man or woman would have to earn over \$11,000 gross to have the equivalent net income after taxes and work expenses. In the midwestern city, the low-income neighborhood where this woman lives, earnings for a woman working full time at the median wage are less than \$5,000; they are less than \$7,000 for men.

Now, some of you may be troubled because we put dollar values on benefits like food and medicaid and housing and

services. You may say goods and services are not as valuable as cash to people. This is probably true in many cases, but if you ignore these benefits altogether, you are really saying that these non-tax benefits have no value at all. I can tell you this is false, because we have heard from the recipients themselves when Congress or the administration has tried to tighten the food stamp eligibility requirements or increase the deductibility and copayment amounts under medicare.

In fact, in the State of Pennsylvania there is now pending a case. In that State you can be too poor to be eligible for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's section 236 subsidized rent programs. There is a minimum rent specified that cannot exceed a certain percentage of your income. The State of Pennsylvania in a class action suit charged that the HUD policy is illegal because HUD fails to include food stamp and medicaid benefits as income. In other words, the State believes that ability to pay should take into account all noncash benefits.

Chart 6: Make no mistake, the system is unfair. You can take two families with exactly the same income and of precisely the same size and you will find that what they get varies all over the place.

We have had some actual cases here that make this perfectly clear. In an eastern city we found a woman rearing her three children on \$355 a month and benefits of \$359, \$281 of which was cash from AFDC.

Household B here is another family of four, but it is headed by a man. He earned an average of \$346 a month and he had unemployment benefits averaging \$25 for a total of \$371. But this family is not eligible for AFDC, of course, so it has less than household A, even though the man's earnings are lower than those of the woman receiving AFDC.

Then in the lower part of chart 6 we have two elderly couples living in the rural counties site. Couple C gets welfare for the aged, called old-age assistance, because its social security check is small.

So these people, because they get old age assistance, automatically qualify for surplus food commodities and medicaid, both of which go along with public assistance in the rural counties site.

Couple D's income, on the other hand, is too high to draw old age assistance, and so they do not get free food commodities or medicaid either. Couple D does get medicare coverage, but medicaid would be more valuable to them. For example, if couple D wants physician's insurance under part B of medicare they must pay \$11.60 per month for it. Medicaid pays this premium for couple C. If couple D has hospital, doctor, and drug needs not covered by medicare, it must do without them or pay for the treatment, or seek charity care. Medicaid will pay for most such health care needs for couple C. So in effect for the elderly it would be better not to have too high social security so they could qualify for old age assistance so they can receive all the rest of these benefits.

We are taking care of the poor far better than we are taking care of people who have only social security.

Then chart 7: Of course, most of these programs were set up to help the poor. You would think that families lucky enough to receive benefits from five or even more programs would surely escape poverty. The truth is, some do not. Chart 7 shows just how much benefits these households receive, they receive a great many benefits.

The top bars in chart 7 show that most beneficiaries in fact are poor when they apply for their benefits. After they get their cash benefits, 67 percent of these households in the southern city and 29 percent in the eastern city are still poor. But when their food and housing benefits are added in too, as shown here in the third set of bars, the percentage in poverty falls to 31 percent in the southern city, and 8 percent in the eastern city.

I can assure you that this way of looking at these programs and how they can reduce poverty is far more accurate than the official counts of who is poor and how poor they are. The census surveys do not include the value of food and housing benefits at all. This means that the \$2 billion in food stamp bonuses, for example, are implicitly given a value of zero. Of course, even if the census did count these benefits in, this country would still have a serious poverty problem, but we would know far more about how well we are doing in eliminating poverty, and who is still poor. So before the President declares an end to the war on poverty, maybe we really need to know how many prisoners of war are left behind. You cannot just look at cash benefits such as AFDC or social security alone in judging whether benefits are adequate when recipients usually get other benefits too. It is a little like the woman getting alimony and child support who also got the family house, and everything in it, the savings account and a car and a settlement that requires the man to educate the kids and pay all their health bills. Believe me, that man and woman and their lawyers added it all together, the cash and everything else.

Finally, if we add in the Government costs of all benefits such as health and other services—as if they were income, we will still find some poor households. This is shown in the last set of bars in chart 7. But we also find that some people do very well.

For example, at two of the six sites the five-benefit households had total private incomes and benefits averaging over \$6,500 a year. In fact, benefit levels can easily exceed what people could earn in a full-time job and what their neighbors are currently earning.

Chart 8: Chart No. 8 shows just that. Here we compare the actual benefits of nonworking people with children, receiving five or more benefits, with what their neighbors in the low-income areas are earning. In eastern city food, cash, and housing benefits alone average \$426, none of which is taxable, and for which there are no work expenses. This amount for nonworkers exceeds the median wages for women who are working full-time in eastern city as well as in southern city, and benefits very nearly equal these

wages in South Atlantic and midwestern cities.

If we deduct \$60 a month for income taxes and work expenses, benefits are even close to the average workingman's wages in these areas.

We can see that benefits are significantly below men's wages only in midwestern and western cities.

Does it not seem time to make the system fairer to these people, to the workers?

Chart 9: Not only do some benefit packages compete with wages, but the programs themselves do not match our workfare rhetoric. They do not insure that recipients can better themselves financially by going to work. Quite simply, working can leave one little better off, and sometimes worse off, because his benefits are reduced if he does work.

After your benefits are reduced, and after you net out work expenses and payroll taxes, if you are a recipient who goes to work, you may see little change in your total income. Your AFDC grant falls; you pay more for food stamps and public housing; and there are steep social security taxes. Why break your back for even a reasonable \$3 an hour when you can keep only 75 cents of it?

In this chart it shows that 70 percent of these people with five benefits from \$1 earned would get either nothing at all or a high of 32 cents, so that they would work 8 hours for a little more than \$2.50.

Chart 9 shows, then, that some of them would get 33 cents up to 49, and so on, but this shows the difference in what we are saying and in what we are really doing. If we cut out all of these benefits when they go to work, they really do not realize anything from it.

Chart 9 shows the pitifully small gain that some beneficiaries get from these earnings. Since most of the households in chart 9 include AFDC, we may be tempted to assume that work incentives are irrelevant because AFDC recipients are either unemployable or unemployed. But here are the facts. Adults in urban AFDC households do work. The first bar for each site here in chart 10 shows the proportion of AFDC households having adult earnings for some part of the year. We see that about one-quarter to three-quarters of the AFDC households had an adult earner and, therefore, had income in addition to the AFDC grant for some portion of the year.

The second bar on each site applies only to AFDC households in which there is only one adult, generally a woman. We see that the AFDC parent was known to have worked in from 19 to 70 percent of these households. This means that the work-incentive features of AFDC and other programs are important—and they are important for women heading families.

Would AFDC recipients have worked more or reported more earnings if they did not lose benefits at such a high rate? We do not know, but it does seem unfair to recipients who work to be so little better off relative to those who do not.

These facts suggest to me that we ought to quit trying to divide people up into categories such as "employable" and "unemployable" on the basis of their

sex and other such characteristics. These theoretical categories exist in the minds—maybe our minds—but not in the real world of the poor.

If people are in need, perhaps we should help all of them uniformly and fairly.

Chart 11: The subcommittee has gone around the country looking into how all these programs are administered. I now have a great deal of sympathy for case workers who are struggling with constantly changing rules. They have an impossible job. And one of the most unfortunate things about having so many programs helping the same group of people is that we are wasting money duplicating administrative tasks. Meanwhile, these programs are stumbling all over each other and preventing one another from effectively carrying out our legislative intent. With all of these agencies checking on income and family circumstances, keeping records, mailing checks or paying vendors, and enforcing program rules while serving largely the same clientele, the amount of wasted motion must be fantastic.

We can get an idea of the administrative problems from this chart, No. 11. This is, of course, something of an extreme case. It shows the flow of benefits from 10 programs for one household over a 1-year period. These nine people got medical care from the Public Health Service and through medicaid; they received unemployment insurance, AFDC, and food stamps; they got free school lunches, special title I educational aid, and milk for the children; they participated in MDTA manpower training and the concentrated employment program; and they had some private income. I ask Members: would you want the responsibility of assuring that these people got exactly the amount they should—no more, no less—every week and every month of the year or, indeed, at the precise moment when the Federal auditors come around?

If I had to give you the conclusions I draw from all of this, it would be the following: For years we have been designing programs as if each had its own unique constituency and as if each operated all by itself. We have not paid much attention to coordinating them before now, and we have not added them all up. What is happening? We have ended up with so many programs that they cannot be run well. Some people are left out while others scoop up thousands—far more than we could possibly provide to everyone in similar circumstances on a fair basis, and no one is in charge of all this.

If we look at only the 21 major income maintenance programs with some Federal involvement, we find they fall under the jurisdiction of 10 legislative committees of the House and nine of the Senate, and they are administered by 11 Federal agencies. No one committee has the responsibility for viewing them all together. The executive branch, which has initiated a good share of these programs, is even blinder.

But the Congress at least is digging into the issues. In my judgment, studies such as this are crucial—we just have

never looked before at all the programs together.

This study has been very much a cooperative undertaking. The subcommittee and I greatly appreciate the expert assistance of the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office, Elmer Staats, and his staff in helping to design this study and in gathering the data in a thoroughly competent way. Secondly, I want to thank Congressman WAYNE HAYS, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, for processing the data collected with the computer facilities of the House information systems center. I would also like to thank both the majority and the minority leadership of the House for making this study possible, the majority and minority members of the Ways and Means Committee and of the Joint Economic Committee and the Committee on Appropriations. All of them have cooperated.

I think this study is historic. It is the first time the Congress has collected this type of information and then run it through the computers and analyzed the data itself. I hope that this is only the beginning of congressional efforts in which we share resources to produce studies from which the entire Congress—and certainly the administration—will benefit.

If there are some questions and I have the time, I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Michigan for this very informative presentation.

Will this be made available in a public document?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Yes, we have it available now. We even have the charts available and we will see to it that all Members have a copy.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to compliment the gentlewoman from Michigan on this very great study. It is something which has been needed for a long time.

I would like to ask this question: Has the gentlewoman from Michigan come to any conclusions on what might be done now that we have this information, even though we have no way of continuing it?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. One of the things which I think we ought to do at once is that I feel we should set up some type of device in Congress where, if we are going to offer one of these programs or a Member offers one of these programs, it should first be analyzed by some experts to show us the effect on that program upon all other programs. It seems to me that would be the correct method if we do it at once, but I hope that before this study is over, we are going to be able to offer a substitute for the entire mess.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If the gentlewoman from Michigan would continue to yield, I know that the gentlewoman has spoken of this often and we have often discussed the possibility of every recipient of any kind of program having a social security card and a number so that all of these benefits could be listed.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Yes, a social security number for everyone, in my opinion, is an absolute necessity.

For a long time the only people who did not have social security numbers were those who were getting something from the Government. If a person earned anything, the Government demanded that that person have a social security number because the Government wanted its share of his earnings. However, I think everyone should have a social security number. I think it should be given to a person and put on his birth certificate so that we can absolutely identify which of these programs help and which does not.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There are two follow-up questions: Does the gentlewoman from Michigan feel that we would be able to introduce and pass legislation making this a requirement?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I have been trying this for 8 years. We have now gotten to the place where, if a person has any kind of benefit coming to him, he has to have a social security number.

I think a number should be given at birth.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The second question I have is this: If such a thing were possible, if everyone had a social security number, at what time does the gentlewoman from Michigan think that these benefits then could be put onto the record of the individual in the same method as earnings are put on?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I presume it could be done, but what I think we need to stop this mess is a program that helps people more equitably than having 11 programs.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to congratulate the gentlewoman from Michigan. She has done a terrific job in pulling all this material together and presenting it in such a dramatic way.

In the minds of many people, the alternative to all of these programs is going to be a guaranteed annual income.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. In place of 100 different guaranteed incomes, which is what we have.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Michigan whether she thinks the same type of analysis ought to be applied to that. I looked into it in a very small way. I found that the guaranteed income as it was presented to us several years ago in the Nixon proposal also offered practically no incentives to work. Under that proposal, if a person added together the cost of going to work—such as transportation, lunches, work clothes, and the fact that he cannot paint the bathroom while he is working—the person who worked got almost nothing out of putting in 50 hours working and traveling back and forth to his job.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Before we have finished I hope that we will be able to analyze whatever program we suggest and present it to the Members, to show them exactly how it will work.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I just want to

warn the gentlewoman that the alternative to this—a seemingly simple program—may have almost as many pitfalls.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Yes. There will be many problems, but not as much as for this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentlewoman from Michigan has expired.

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. GRIFFITHS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to join other Members in commending the gentlewoman not only for the accumulation of the material but also for her excellent presentation of it. I wish to say to her that I now have an excellent reason for having voted for "Women's Lib."

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman can see that the place where the men are really being treated badly is in welfare. What we are really doing is breaking up families.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I, too, want to commend the gentlewoman from Michigan.

It is obvious that the gentlewoman has focused attention upon the duplication and fragmentation of programs. There are simply not enough in the way of incentives for this to work, and there is too much in the way of incentives for those who are on the benefit side of the welfare program.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend most highly the lady from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) not only for this special order she has taken today to discuss and inform us on the proliferation and overlap in our public welfare assistance programs, but to state for the record that the information she has collected and presented, with the assistance of the General Accounting Office, has been long overdue and in my view will indeed stand forever as an historic document. The time and hard work this dedicated legislator and her staff have devoted to compiling this study, in my judgment, merit our highest praise.

As Mrs. GRIFFITHS has so ably stated, her concern over the huge overlap in federally assisted public welfare programs did not just develop during the past few months. As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, her in-depth study will, I am sure, receive thoughtful and careful analysis by her colleagues on the committee and hopefully by the whole House as well.

I have long shared Mrs. GRIFFITHS' concern for the widespread duplication and fragmentation that permeates our public welfare programs which, as she has documented here today, have offered more incentives for people not to

work and for families to split up, than they have for people to seek gainful employment or to keep their families together.

What this study reveals represents a tragedy and a travesty not only for the needy disadvantaged, but for all working men and women in America. While, over the years, the Congress has created program upon program in all good faith, and in spite of the many warnings, we never stopped long enough to survey the counterproductive giant we were actually creating. One of the most revealing aspects of this study, in my view, is the documented manner in which competing public welfare programs have completely undone the original intent of the Congress. As a result, I believe a tremendous disservice has been done to the very people we were trying to reach.

From this study and the followup action that is so desperately needed, I would hope that a joint legislative-executive effort along truly bipartisan lines can now go forward to completely overhaul and improve our public welfare programs in this country. Certainly, Mrs. GRIFFITHS has documented the need for reform here today and I do not believe there is any question that the time has come.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, because I believe they will want to associate themselves with the remarks the gentlewoman from Michigan has made.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL HANDLE FOR THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, and particularly in recent months, there has been rising concern over congressional responsibility and ability to deal with the Federal budgetmaking process. I believe it is of vital interest to the Nation that the Congress recapture and maintain control of the national budget.

Congress has recognized the critical need for this by establishing the Joint Study Committee and Budget Control. The interim report of the joint committee has pointed clearly to the many facets of the complicated budgetary control problem which has arisen. Another point which should also be made is that failure to obtain control of the budget—from the raising of income, to the allocating of resources through spending of available funds—will continue to restrain the power of the Congress to reorder national priorities.

I would like to share with my colleagues today some of the views which I have expressed to the joint committee.

Congress must adopt a firm policy that will hold the line on spending. The Nation's taxpayers are already overburdened. A tax increase could be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Congress must establish a firm policy of working within a fiscally sound budget. Individuals and companies adopt this as good business practice in order to avoid bankruptcy. Is it not also sound governmental policy?

Congress must establish a national policy that is designed to curb and end inflation. The crudest method of payment for Government services is through the allowance of inflation which indirectly taxes those who can least afford to pay—persons on the lower end of the income scale and persons on small fixed incomes.

Some very basic reform is needed in the Federal budgetary process.

Congress must establish a national fiscal policy directed at achieving maximum employment, productivity and purchasing power in nongovernmental activities, and maximum efficiency and effectiveness in using governmental financial resources.

Ceilings must be established on spending and on new obligatory authority. This is not to say that new activities should not be considered, or authorized, but that spending should not be mandated for them which would violate congressionally adopted fiscal policies.

A policy for appropriating funds to be available for a limited period of time should be adopted. If, in accordance with responsible fiscal policies, the funds have not been spent or definitely obligated at the end of the period the spending, obligatory or contracting authority should lapse. And, if Congress deems it necessary and wise, new appropriations should be made. The minimum time limit on this authority should be 1 year and the maximum period should be 2 years.

I recognize the workload this implies. But, I believe continuous and timely review of the spending, contracting, and obligatory policies of the Federal Government is absolutely necessary to the maintenance of budgetary control.

Trying to do the work required of Congress without the staff and equipment it needs is like trying to fly a jet aircraft on a washing machine motor.

A mechanism—informational system staffed by nonpartisan, professional personnel and provided with sufficient modern equipment—should be established to provide the Ways and Means and Finance Committees with accurate data on the income which will be available for Federal programs.

The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate should be provided with a similar mechanism which can provide all Members of the Congress with clear, up-to-date information on financial obligations of the Federal Government.

There should be established within the House and the Senate budget committees charged with the responsibility of recommending to their respective Houses the level at which the Federal budget should be set. These committees should have the authority to recommend al-

locations for each of the committees of the House and the Senate telling them what portion of the budget they may use in authorizing the contribution, or the establishment, of programs over which they have jurisdiction.

The membership of the House budget committee should be composed of the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the minority whip, and the chairmen and ranking members of each standing committee.

In the Senate the budget committee should be composed of the majority leader, the majority whip, the minority leader, the minority whip, and the chairmen and ranking members of each standing committee.

The budget level recommendations of each House should become effective only after a vote of approval by the membership of that House. A joint committee of the membership of the House and Senate budget committees should be established and charged with the responsibility of reconciling the differences in the levels and allocations to committees of the budgets agreed on by the two Houses. When they have completed their work, their agreement should be brought to each House for acceptance or rejection.

A strict schedule for these committees to complete their work and the Congress to agree on budgetary levels and allocations to committees should be established.

Depending on the time schedule that is adopted, it would be possible for the other committees of both Houses of Congress to be carrying on their work of hearings, studies, and investigations at the same time that the first steps of the budgetary process are taken. By the time the budget levels and allocations are agreed upon by the Congress many, if not all, of the hearings in these committees should also have been completed.

A ceiling should be included in each appropriations bill. And, no individual appropriations bill should become effective until congressionally approved within the context of the total budget. At, or near, the end of each year, the Congress should meet specifically for the purpose of considering whether budget ceilings should be adjusted and whether taxes should be increased or deficit spending should be accepted.

The proposal that Congress regain and maintain control of the national budget means a significantly increased workload. But, it is a job that we as elected representatives of the people are morally and constitutionally bound to accept and carry out.

It is essential that the Congress gain and maintain control of the national budget. To do so will require increased efficiency of operation within the Congress. Vital to this is the development of a system of communication and coordination within each House and between the Houses of Congress. Congress is not now equipped to play in the same league with the Executive. The task of handling the national budget is a demanding one which cannot be carried out unless Congress is willing to equip itself with sufficient professional staff and equipment

to development and analyze the information required for budgetmaking.

Throughout the 20th century Congress has taken a backseat to the Executive. Now, more than at any other time in this century, we of the Congress have an opportunity to strive for the position of an equal legislative branch which would restore the balance of powers as intended by the Constitution.

I am convinced that Mr. Nixon has skillfully captured the feeling of the general public on the subject of Government spending. But, most every American would agree that it is far better to return the responsibility for the budget to the Congress than allow it to continue to concentrate in the Executive.

The task of responsible, knowledgeable, responsive budgetmaking is a demanding one. To do it properly will require significant congressional reform. I urge that the Congress meet this challenge head on and make the changes necessary for gaining and retaining control of the Federal budget process.

REESTABLISHMENT OF RENT CONTROLS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support for the reestablishment of rent controls on a nationwide basis. As we all know, these controls, which were flexible, were removed in phase III of the President's "new economic policy" because his advisers had assured him that the rental market was "soft." The rental market, Mr. Speaker, is about as "soft" as a block of case-hardened steel. The fact is, that in many areas, rents have gone up from 20 to 40 percent since the removal of controls.

Housing is one of man's most basic needs. We must act to assure all Americans that the cost of a roof over their heads will not be prohibitive. Our first step must be the immediate reinstatement of strong rent controls that will cover all rental units nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area with which the Congress should concern ourselves because it directly contributes to the high cost of housing. Lumber is one of the most expensive components in all types of housing, and the price of all lumber continues to soar.

I oppose the classification of lumber as an agricultural product. This erroneous classification allowed prices to climb steadily throughout phase II, and with the relaxation of controls in phase III, the cost of lumber has now nearly doubled. To remedy this situation, we must move quickly to control lumber prices. In fact, we must move to bring the prices of all agricultural products and meats under control.

One of the most urgent problems is the need for controls on the export of logs, particularly to Japan. Controls on this currently unrestrained exportation of a vitally needed resource will help meet our expanding needs for new housing starts here at home.

The Banking and Currency Committee is holding hearings on extending the Economic Stabilization Act, and any such extension must be such to bring inflation completely under control. It is expected that the committee will move rapidly to complete these hearings and report the extension of the Economic Stabilization Act to the House for consideration.

Congress must then act quickly to meet our responsibilities to the American people to control spiraling housing costs, keep rents within the reach of our people, and control inflation.

TAX-FREE LOTTERIES

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

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last June I introduced a bill which would exempt State lottery winnings from an individual's taxable income.

Today I am reintroducing this legislation in the hope that the 93d Congress will be able to get around to enacting this proposal. I do not have to stand before you and detail the fiscal problems presently affecting many of our States. In recent years, the State-operated lottery has come to the fore as a chief means for many of these States to raise extra revenue. At present, seven States are operating lotteries and have already grossed over \$875 million. In its first month alone, the State of Michigan grossed over \$14 million.

The primary purpose of my bill is to encourage the growth of these lotteries and to remove a tax which stands as an obstruction to further growth. Last year, when I contacted the lottery commissioners concerning the idea of tax-free lotteries, they wholeheartedly welcomed this concept and many pointed out that a prime source of public dissatisfaction with lotteries is the exorbitant size of the Federal tax bite. Commissioner Joseph Burns of Connecticut forwarded information showing that in winning a top prize of \$75,000, the average family in my State would return \$39,780 to the Federal Government. Such a tax bite becomes even greater in States such as New York where winners still face payment of State and local taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to mention that this legislation would be very detrimental to one segment of society. The illegal numbers rackets, which gross staggering profits for organized crime, would be dealt a severe blow. In reporting on this legislation last year, Mr. Robert Waters, Washington correspondent for the Hartford Courant, pointed out:

In Connecticut and the five other states where lottery winners have faced this problem, McKinney's bill should draw heavy support.

But the professional gamblers won't like it—and for good reason. The popular practice of "piggybacking" the state lottery would lose part of its attraction. "Piggybacking" happens when bookmakers take bets on the winning lottery numbers. Why would anyone want to play the state lottery via a bookie?

Here's one good reason: The winnings are paid off in funds that aren't taxable. Legally, of course, all gambling winnings are taxable. But when you do business with a bookie he isn't about to tell the Internal Revenue Service how much you won. So, if you're a greedy winner, neither do you.

Thus, if you take home \$75,000 from a bookie, you get to keep it all.

The official state winners don't enjoy this anonymity. These lucky people get their pictures in the newspapers complete with names and addresses. And of course, they also get to share a fair share of their winnings with the IRS.

McKinney's bill would equalize this situation. On payoffs, at least, the state and the bookies would offer the same attraction: a tax free jackpot. And with an official IRS exemption for state lotteries, McKinney's bill has an edge over the bookies. The winners would have a "legal tax free prize."

I think Mr. Waters has advanced a good point which serves to highlight the fact that with over 30 States actively considering instituting lotteries, now is the time to change this archaic, counter-productive Federal policy. For anyone worried about the effect of this proposal on the Treasury, it is my feeling that there would be little loss of revenue should this bill be enacted into law. Taxes on lottery winnings already come under the category of unanticipated revenue, and I think it is very necessary that the Congress act now to adopt tax-free lotteries before the Federal Government becomes too dependent on their moneys.

In closing, I would like to call your attention to the fact that we have been speaking about tax reform in Congress for a number of years. It finally looks as if we will get around to initiating some reform during the 93d Congress. I would like to think that this bill deserves all due consideration in this regard. It is time that we closed the credibility gap of one segment of government promising the average American a chance for a small fortune, while, if he is lucky enough to win, another government entity comes along and takes half of it back.

I would like to take this opportunity to include in the RECORD some of the letters from the lottery commissioners which I hope my colleagues will take the time to review:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
COMMISSION ON SPECIAL REVENUE,
Wethersfield, Conn., March 2, 1973.

Hon. STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR STEWART: We were delighted to learn that you are planning to reintroduce your bill that will exempt lottery winnings from Federal income taxes. We certainly enthusiastically support this legislation.

Our argument is, of course, that the lottery itself will be considerably strengthened by this proposal and will encourage greater participation and thus provide greater income for the State. In addition, the money provided for winners will be funneled into the mainstream of our economic activity and should really net just as much money in Federal taxes as if they were taken at the source. Everything we can do to ease tax burdens on a local basis will, in our judgment, result in less demand from states to the federal government for support. We believe this is a sound argument.

During the period from February 15, 1972, when we began to sell lottery tickets and the end of January, 1973, we sold almost eighty million tickets at fifty cents each. The State of Connecticut received a net profit from this lottery of more than fifteen million dollars. If our prize structure were based on lottery free winnings, we believe we could considerably improve upon that performance.

For the same period, fourteen million dollars was awarded in prize money and thousands of Connecticut residents benefitted. We know that the Federal income tax received a good portion of this sum, but we also feel that the money would have performed more profitably, both for Federal and State Government, had it been received tax free.

The problem of convincing non-lottery states of this sales incentive may be difficult, but we do applaud your efforts.

Please let us know if we can furnish any more definite material for your use.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH B. BURNS,
Executive Secretary.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
BUREAU OF STATE LOTTERY,
Lansing, Mich., March 5, 1973.

Hon. STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCKINNEY: Thank you for your recent letter and background materials dealing with your proposal to exempt lottery winnings from federal income taxes.

There is no question that your proposed revision of the tax code would be popular with residents of lottery states and others who participate in lotteries. We have found in our brief history that nearly everyone anticipates winning a big prize someday and expresses concern about the federal "tax bite." Lottery winnings are exempted from state and local taxation.

Michigan's lottery started last November 13 and has averaged sales of more than 5 million tickets each week in our first 15 weeks (through March 1). The Lottery Act provides that at least 45% of gross revenue shall be earmarked for prizes. Operating costs will be somewhere between 10-15%, leaving about 40% for the State's General Fund. Lottery revenues are not now earmarked for any particular use by the state.

We will attempt to keep you informed of our progress in the coming months and we wish you well in your attempt to change the tax code. If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

GUS HARRISON,
Commissioner.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE LOTTERY
COMMISSION,
Newton, Mass., March 7, 1973.

Hon. STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCKINNEY: I wish to express appreciation on behalf of the Massachusetts State Lottery Commission for filing legislation which will exempt state lottery winnings from federal income taxes. We strongly support this bill.

We will be following the passage of this legislation with great interest and sincerely hope the outcome will be favorable.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. PERRAULT.

STATE LOTTERY COMMISSION,
Trenton, N.J., March 1, 1973.

Hon. STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
Member of Congress, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thank you for your letter expressing your interest in the fur-

therance of State operated Lotteries by the introduction of legislation geared to exempt State Lottery winnings from Federal Income Taxes.

The New Jersey Lottery Commission is grateful to you for your activity in this regard. The New Jersey Congressional Delegation will be informed of our concern in this matter.

I am, also, taking the liberty of appropriately notifying the Executive Directors of all other State operated Lotteries of your proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

RALPH F. BATCH,
Executive Director.

SWEETSTAKES COMMISSION,
Concord, N.H., March 7, 1973.

Hon. STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCKINNEY: We were very pleased to learn that you are planning to introduce another bill that would exempt state lottery winnings from federal income taxes. The enactment of this legislation would be received most enthusiastically by the public. Since the federal government has instituted revenue sharing programs for the States, it seems logical that Congress should take other reasonable steps that would further increase State revenue. In addition, by making the purchase of legal lottery tickets sold by sovereign states more attractive to the public, the goal of eliminating illegal forms of gambling operated by racketeers might be realized.

In 1972 over \$2,700,000 was distributed to the State School Districts in New Hampshire—about \$17 per student. An Income and Expense Statement is enclosed.

We shall urge our Congressional delegation to support your efforts. We also hope that you will give your support to pending legislation that would amend the present archaic federal antilottery laws and permits the use of the mails, radio and television for state legalized lotteries. We certainly are entitled to at least the same status that Congress has given pari-mutuel racing.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD J. POWERS,
Executive Director.

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND
FINANCE, DIVISION OF THE
LOTTERY,

Albany, February 23, 1973.

Hon. STEWART B. MCKINNEY,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCKINNEY: Thank you for your letter of February 16, 1973 stating that you were continuing your fine efforts to exempt State Lottery winnings from Federal Income Taxes.

The New York State Lottery is a Division of the Taxation and Finance Department under the direction of Commissioner Norman Gallman who is of the opinion that exemption of Lottery prizes from taxation would provide a real impetus to the New York State Lottery as well as many other state lotteries.

However, the Commissioner is concerned that a problem might arise as the New York State Personal Income Tax Law generally conforms with the Federal Income Tax Law and the New York State Division of the Budget might be inclined to oppose exempting Lottery prizes from State Income Tax, not so much for the revenue involved, but rather because this might result in potential further exemptions on pari-mutuel and other gaming profits.

However, the New York State Lottery Commission, which serves as an advisory body to the Commissioner of Taxation and Fi-

nance on Lottery matters, has filed a bill in the New York State Legislature to exempt winnings in the State Lottery from all local and state taxes.

We anticipate the New York State Lottery will raise over \$53 million for additional aid to education for the 12-month fiscal period ending March 31, 1973. Since the beginning of the Lottery in June of 1967 the State has received nearly \$198 million in revenue.

Please feel free to contact me if any further information is required.

Sincerely,

ERNEST T. BIRD,
Director.

ROLE OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the question of procedural paralysis in Congress was discussed by Senator WALTER MONDALE, of Minnesota, in a recent Chicago appearance at the Time, Inc.-sponsored "Role of Congress" symposium. The gentleman from Minnesota's remarks are included in today's RECORD, along with some panel discussion, moderated by Henry Grunwald of Time, Inc.:

ROLE OF CONGRESS

Is the Congress somehow procedurally paralyzed? Or does the Congress represent what the people want? I think many times we get those two things confused.

Examine the impasse that is growing between the Executive Branch and the Congress over the impounding of funds. They have impounded highway funds, they have impounded housing funds, sewer and water treatment funds, auto-safety funds and so on. Many people say that that proves the Congress is incompetent and impotent. I do not think it is that simple. I think many of the Brahmins in the House and Senate agree with what the President is doing. And while they may object publicly, they kind of go along with him because he represents some of the priorities that they believe in.

It is not necessarily just procedural hang-up, although I agree that that is part of it.

I want to close with two points, as I see them. First, and I understand this was not dwelt on this morning, what I regard to be the fundamental importance of financing in campaigns. This is the dark side of the political moon. This explains a lot of the mysteries of the Congress, of the presidency, of the state legislatures, of the county boards, the school boards and the city councils.

This morning my friend, Senator Goldwater, said, "I detest the notion that people do things for money in politics," which is another one of Goldwater's great contributions to thought in American life.

I have a friend with whom I was discussing this issue of money and politics. He is a rich man, a wonderful man, and I said: "You know, we need to get your money off the backs of politicians. We need to make it possible for an honest man to be elected and remain honest if he wants to."

He said, "I understand that, but how would we control politics then?"

That was a perfectly honest question, and I think it expressed the standard operation of business and financial interests in this country today. And it is not getting better, it is getting demonstrably and tragically and dangerously worse.

I do not know what this last presidential campaign cost, but I would guess that when the two candidates and the other presidential nominees and candidates were involved, very close to a \$100 million, just at the

Presidential level. Then you had the Senators, Congressmen and the local officers, and you must have a bill close to \$200 or \$300 million.

How do you raise that money? There are a couple of ways you can't raise it. There's just not enough money in UNICEF boxes to raise it any more. You go places where people have money. That's how you raise money. There are, thank God, a lot of wonderful people in this country who I think do contribute generally for good government. But I think the subtlety and the corrosiveness of money in American politics is the most fundamental issue in Congressional reform. What is not explained is the financial arrangements, the influence of money, the influence of the large contributor. The power to get in and out of an office is, more than any of us here want to admit, influenced by money and those who have money. If you change all of the procedures of the Congress and leave the present corrupting system, I don't think you are going to see much change.

Now, I don't want to be misunderstood. I think the system is much more honest than we have any right to expect it to be. I think I am honest—I'm talking for myself—I know Bill Saxbe is, and I think most of my colleagues are. But there isn't a single one of us who does not detest the present system of having to run for office and raise these massive and growing amounts of money. It is a national scandal and it mortgages American politics to money.

The American people now know that. They see it. They read about it, whether it is the ITT case or the other cases we have heard about in both political parties. They know that increasingly politicians are being forced to respond to money. I think the biggest thing we can do to reform Congress and American politics is to have some system of public support for campaigns.

Now, some people say: "Well, let's solve it through public disclosure, through the timeliness of the disclosure of campaign expenditures." That is a good idea, but it does not work effectively. I think we are going to find, even with this new Campaign Disclosure law, that when the record is written and we look back at it, there was an awful lot of washing of money.

The whole idea behind the Campaign Disclosure law is to tell the American people where you are getting the money. We saw how some of it went through the Mexican banks, but a lot more of it went in different ways, I am convinced of that. I do not have any evidence, but I am convinced that if a person of doubtful stature wants to get some money into the campaign of a good friend, he can find plenty of ways of doing it without anybody except him, his donee and God knowing about it.

I think finally what we need to do in American politics is to do what Teddy Roosevelt urged us to do in 1906. That is to get some kind of system of public support, the dollar check-off, some kind of per-vote contribution, so that it is possible for an honest man to run for office, be elected and deserve the office once he is in. Today, regrettably, I think there is more doubt about that than any of us know or care to admit.

The final point is trying to encourage and help gifted young men and women seeking public office, and this is where I think the media are to be criticized.

You follow the star system. You over-cover the big names. You will play up the dumbest idea if it comes out of some mouths and you will ignore the most creative ideas if they come out of Saxbe's mouth.

You wait for the gifted young man or woman to get elected to the local school board, the local city council, the state legislature. You let him try to put together his team and his organization, you let him try to learn government, you let him try to stay free from corruption and then slowly work

his way up until finally some time he gets to Washington. And then, 10 or 15 years later, he somehow comes to your attention.

I think that one of the best things that the media of this country could do is to have an annual search to look for gifted and talented young men and women seeking office for the first time. A search for people who are making creative and courageous proposals, who are standing up for things that are important. And then try to give them some coverage when they most need it.

You can't keep Nixon out of the headlines. But there are today at least 5,000 wonderful, wonderful people trying to get elected to a state house or a state senate or a city council. I have seen hundreds of them in Minnesota quit because no one pays a darned bit of attention to them, never mentions the fine work they are doing or what they are saying. They can't get a story, they can't get any coverage and as a result they lose hope for their political careers. These are some of the things I hope we might do. Thank you.

Mr. GRUNWALD. Thank you, Senator Mondale. I think your idea of an annual, shall I say, talent search being conducted by the press is fascinating, and I promise you we will give it very serious attention.

I think Senator Saxbe deserves perhaps not equal time, but at least a chance for a comment.

Senator SAXBE. Thank you.

Fritz and I have been on the same side more often than we have been on opposite sides. For instance, this year I carried the ball against the aircraft carrier, with the same results that he had before, and if there ever was a bug hitting the windshield, it is when you try to tell them about the aircraft carrier.

But also I agree with him on most of the things he says. Now, money in politics is a problem that bothers all of us. But it always bothers me as to who is going to decide who gets the money. Who is the bright young man? As Irvin Cobb said one time: "Every time they talk about birth control, I remember I was the fourth child."

Now my experience on money is much like Fritz's. People who give you money for a campaign damn well want their money's worth. They are like the fellow that buys a girl a beer for a quarter and then tries to squeeze it out of her. They are going to get their money's worth.

Now, as to the effectiveness of Congress at the present time. Fritz talked about the great service we have done in regard to the Viet Nam War, that we have done in consumer areas, in ecology, and so on. What he is saying reminds me of the boxer that tells his opponent: "Look, I'll get even with you. I'll bleed all over you."

We are telling the President: "We can't top you, but we'll make you feel bad."

That to me, rather than dramatizing the power of Congress, dramatizes the weakness of Congress. We can't stop him, but we have built a backfire that has served to some extent the purpose which we intended.

Thank you.

Mr. GRUNWALD. Thank you. I wonder whether any of you would like to ask a few more questions of our panel, and especially the Senators here?

Mr. MARTIN. I am Louis Martin.

I would like to ask the Senator if he would comment on a cause that some of us are concerned about, and that is the abolition of some of the antiquated voting registration laws. These help to discourage a great many poor people from registering, because the process is outmoded and it is a bureaucratic mess to get them registered.

I was wondering if, perhaps, some reform of the registration process of qualified voters would not in turn improve the representative character of the Congress?

Senator MONDALE. I do not think there is

any question about that. I think it obviously would. I saw the figures, and I think that something like 45 million eligible people did not register, did not bother to qualify. And I would bet that 90% of them were below the poverty level, poor people, working people.

On election day in Minnesota I was having coffee in a hotel, and two waitresses came up and said, "Can I vote?" I said, "Certainly." The said, "We didn't register. Can we register today?"

Well, you may say they are certainly low in civic understanding. But they are working wives with families at home and husbands who work, and it is very hard to go down to City Hall to register during working hours because they can't afford it. I personally think that you ought to be able to register when you vote, sign up.

Mr. GRUNWALD. Are there any other questions?

Mr. STEELE. John Steele.

This morning we heard a good deal of talk from the panel about the congressional role in the spending process, and we also hear a good deal of talk about establishing national priorities in the fiscal field.

Is there any way the Congress can be brought into the business of budget making, or is that purely an executive function? Neil, I suggest perhaps several of our panel members might be willing to comment on that.

Mr. MACNEIL. I think it is critical that the Congress do exactly that.

I have lost my once-detailed knowledge of the creation of the Budget Bureau, but my recollection of it is that in the period prior to its creation—it was created in 1921—Congress and the Executive had come to a catastrophic stage in dealing with national spending. Not only did the Congress literally force on President Harding the creation of the Budget Bureau, but they also restructured their own committees for this purpose.

The appropriations committees sometime in the 1880s in effect lost control of the spending processes. The appropriations were distributed among the legislative committees.

The Budget Bureau was an agency, as I understood it, created in the 1920s to help Congress handle the budget in a meaningful way. In the years since it has been variously reshuffled. It was once in the Treasury Department. It is now a wing of the White House, under the direct control of the White House, but it was created initially to aid Congress in its approach to national financing.

The Congress now has no agency to make sense out of the federal budget. I think the Congress either should create its own budget bureau and approach the problem that Senator Saxbe mentioned this morning of relating spending to taxation, as it once did, or make the Budget Bureau a joint agency of the Congress and the President, so that the Congress can approach this critical area in American government, of who gets the cookies.

Mr. STEELE. This to me is such a critical question and so much to the point of our discussion that I wonder if the Senators might have a word on their reaction?

Mr. MACNEIL. I would like to add to your question. Why isn't the appropriation process a policy-making decision by Congress on where the money goes?

Senator MONDALE. I think it should be. In the last Congress we established a joint committee of the House and the Senate to study ways of enabling Congress to regain its control over federal spending.

With reference to the debate over the debt ceiling, I was strongly against the ceiling because I think it would have thrown all the congressional spending powers under the Constitution to the President, but it did raise the question of congressional responsibility over its own spending. Congress once did take a substantial role and did serve responsibly in trying to balance out individual

appropriations with an overall target, priorities and the rest.

This, I am afraid, we do not do very well, and I think we should. I strongly support the proposal and I hope the joint committee will come up with an approach for some sort of overall budget responsibility in the Congress and with the necessary staffing.

One of the proposals that Senator Javitz and I have led on, which has passed the Senate twice, is to set up an Office of Budgetary Priorities in the Congress, with computers, staffing and the rest, to help us analyze and sort out the problems and do a better job of discharging our responsibility there.

Senator SAXBE. The difficulty of trying to straighten this out from a spending-taxing concept is almost impossible to comprehend.

You have heard that New York is an ungovernable city, in other words, it has gone so far down the road that nobody can get the handle on what is happening in New York City. There is also this intimation in our national affairs. In other words, that the elected officials have abandoned to the civil servants the job of putting together the budgetary requirements of this government.

Now, one of the difficulties that always come up in this is the fact that so many of these things are frozen in. If you have a 5% annual wage increase, you have a 5% increase in the Department of Defense and all other areas. This is built in, you have no control over this at the present time, and 60% of the DOD budget is frozen into personnel. The only thing you can do is to lop off great numbers of personnel, because you cannot change that part of the budget that has to do with personnel. This is true in most of our other departments, and personnel takes an increasingly large amount of this budget.

Now, the problem we have today is that there is no common meeting place for spending and the taxing, so one goes its merry way and the other goes its way. The Bureau of the Budget is put in the catbird seat in saying to the Congress: "Well, you passed this and you appropriated this money, but there is not enough money to go around, so we are going to lop it off here and we are going to lop it off there." Then when Congress comes back to the President, we say: "You can't do this. We passed this money."

Well, that is not the issue. The question is, what is the priority, and this is what Fritz is talking about, establishing a priority of what we are going to do.

Now, I think I have given you enough of an intimation to ask, is it possible to straighten it out, or is this federal bureaucracy of unmanageable proportions?

Unless Congress puts the spending and the budgeting together, unless we can somehow get these two together in the Congress, we strengthen the Executive Branch. It can then be so righteous as to say: "O.K., you appropriated this but you didn't provide the money for it, so somebody has to stand in there in a position of reality." That makes us appear rather ridiculous to the public.

Mr. LEVI. Julian Levi, University of Chicago.

Time after time the relevant information as to the effectiveness of programs is in the hands of the bureau chiefs and the department heads in the Government, and in fact, it is a bitter contest, often not won, for the Executive himself to find out what is occurring.

I don't know why the appropriations committees of the Congress do not include a provision in the appropriation that a small sum, one-tenth of 1% or something of that sort, be set aside to be made available to the committees of the Congress for them to commission the studies that ought to be made to determine the effectiveness of the programs.

I can say to you that as to the programs which I know best, in the housing and the

education fields, surveys and studies of that kind, independent of the Office of Education, independent of Housing and Urban Development, would have long ago dictated the abandonment of programs that are totally ineffective and often, as a matter of fact, accomplishing the exact opposite of what anybody intends.

Mr. MACNEIL. The gentleman raises a whole area of concern that we have not touched, which is the overview responsibilities of the Congress in seeing to it that the decisions of Congress, the will of Congress, is in fact administered by the Administration.

There was a time, I think in his Inaugural Address, William Henry Harrison, who may be noted for nothing less than the making of an Inaugural Address, said that he was prepared to act on the decisions of Congress, and I think Presidents at that time did so.

The idea of providing the Congress with a few odd bob to check on whether the programs are effective is interesting, and could be useful. But to me the problem is not whether the program itself is effective. It is whether or not the Administration is following the will of Congress. The whole area of congressional overview is neglected and any idea to produce an overview is useful.

Mr. GRUNWALD. With your permission, I will now simply thank Senators Saxbe and Mondale and Dr. Jones, as well as Neil MacNeil, for being here, and for being so stimulating and provocative, and above all, I would like to thank all of you for giving us your time to join us here today.

It is impossible for a single meeting or a series of meetings to bring about fundamental changes, but I hope that in the future you will look back on this and feel that perhaps you have been present at the beginning of something fairly important.

As far as our publications are concerned, I can promise you that we will not, as far as we are able, drop the issue.

Thank you again, and goodbye.

THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

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

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I was pleased to have the opportunity to present my views on the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity to Representative HAWKINS' Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor. The subcommittee is presently looking into the Nixon administration's plan to dismantle the OEO and destroy utterly the community action programs which have been the backbone of its work on behalf of the forgotten citizens of our country.

I believe that the OEO has proven its great value in the 8 years since it was established, and am a sponsor of legislation that would preserve it.

The text of my statement to the subcommittee follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BELLA S. ABZUG BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Nixon Administration has changed the war against poverty into a war against poor people, the elderly, small businessmen, unemployed veterans, the handicapped, mothers and working people.

In dismantling the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administration is saving about \$350 million at a terrible human cost to

Americans. At the same time its new budget proposes to squander \$311 million for more military aid to Laos, a favor the people in that bombed and devastated country would no doubt prefer to be spared.

The Administration is cutting \$519 million in Emergency Employment Assistance and \$252 million on other manpower programs for its citizens at the same time that it is planning in fiscal 1974 to throw another \$750 million to \$1 billion into paramilitary aid programs for South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

It is spending \$15 million on an Army contract awarded to its pet corporation, ITT, to provide a military communications system for the government of General Thieu. That is just \$5 million less than the total amount O.E.O. provided to the Human Resources Administration in New York City during the current year for community action programs.

These priorities are undoubtedly highly profitable for the defense contractors who have fattened off the taxpayers for decades and who use their profits to manipulate and further corrupt the Executive branch. But they are cruel and perverted when judged against the needs of our people.

You have heard in detail the kinds of programs that will be destroyed in the Nixon axe-cutting spree. In the 20th Congressional District, which I represent, the O.E.O. cuts alone mean a loss of \$2,413,665, about 359 staff jobs and 2800 summer jobs. These cuts, are, of course, only part of the Administration's attack on the living standards and quality of life of the more than 400,000 residents in the 20th C.D.

Under other Nixon budget cuts, mental health clinics, educational programs, medical research, housing subsidies, economic development for small business, child care, homemaker services for the elderly, legal assistance for the poor, aid to veterans, rehabilitation help for drug addicts and alcoholics—all are to be mercilessly slashed or completely abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, the most recent data available for the 20th C.D. show that more than half the families living there have incomes of less than \$10,000 a year. Twenty-three thousand families have incomes below \$5,000 a year. Compare this with the yearly income of almost \$11,000 which the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that a family of four needs to maintain a moderate standard of living. And then compare BLS figures with the real cost of living in this city, where food prices are shooting up at an incredible rate and the only help consumers get from the federal government is advice to buy slide rules or to eat less.

To eliminate the community action programs that help people survive and to eliminate jobs for the poor and the youth is particularly callous in view of the abnormally high unemployment rates among Puerto Ricans and Blacks in the low income areas of this city, including parts of the 20th C.D.

A survey of these low income areas for 1971 showed that 70 percent of their population are Blacks and Puerto Ricans and more than half of the families living there are headed by women. In these low income areas, the unemployment rate for Black men was 7.2 percent and 5.9 percent for Black women. For Puerto Rican men it was 8.8 percent and 10.2 percent for Puerto Rican women. The jobless rates for teenagers are shocking: 39.8 percent for Puerto Rican men and 30.1 percent for Puerto Rican women; 35.8 percent for Black men and 32.7 percent for Black women.

Now the Nixon Administration, which has the nerve to preach about the "work ethic" and self-reliance, is cutting the life-lines for thousands of people dependent upon community action programs for jobs and assistance.

I urge the members of this committee to

OXIX—602—Part 8

help reinstate the OEO program through decisive legislative action, and I urge it to act quickly before the OEO regional offices are shut down by the end of April.

Congress must call the President's bluff by developing its own Counter-Budget and by showing that the \$12 billion Mr. Nixon is squeezing out of programs to meet basic human needs can be more than made up by cutting military spending and closing tax loopholes that favor the rich.

I also urge the members of this subcommittee to lend their full support to speedy enactment of such measures as H.R. 1415, a bill that provides for the federal government to encourage and assist states and local communities to develop and implement comprehensive programs for public service employment in hospitals, schools, parks, recreation centers, public health, sanitation and other municipal and state services.

We are doing far too little for those in need. We must do more, not less. We must, at the very least, save the OEO and allow it to continue to serve the needs of individuals and communities.

CHURCH STOCKHOLDERS OF U.S. BUSINESSES IN NAMIBIA

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert for the attention of my colleagues the press release of the Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa on American Metals Climax & Newmont Mining, their stockholder resolutions calling on two American mining corporations to wind up their involvement in Namibia, South West Africa.

The official policy of the United States is to discourage investment in Namibia. I wish to take this occasion to heartily applaud the efforts of those shareholders who are working to cause their corporation to review its involvement in Namibia. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to insert the text of resolution filed by ECSA with AMAX.

EPISCOPAL CHURCHMEN
FOR SOUTH AFRICA,
New York, N.Y., January 25, 1973.

CHURCH GROUP PRESSES U.S. CORPORATIONS TO WITHDRAW FROM NAMIBIA

Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa has filed stockholder resolutions calling on two American mining corporations to wind up their involvement in Namibia (South West Africa). ECSA charges they are part owners of a company which pays taxes to and accepts the apartheid laws of South Africa, which occupies Namibia in defiance of the United Nations. The U.S. companies are American Metal Climax, Inc. and Newmont Mining Corporation, each of which owns 29 percent of Tsumeb Corporation, a major component of Namibia's rich mining industry. Newmont operates Tsumeb. AMAX and Newmont are both listed on the New York Stock Exchange. ECSA holds three shares of AMAX and two shares of Newmont.

The United Nations General Assembly in 1966, by a vote of 114 to 2—the United States concurring, terminated the League of Nations mandate by which South Africa had governed Namibia. The U.N. set up the Council for Namibia to administer the country, but it has not been able to exercise its territory. General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and a 1971 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice have consistently sustained the U.N.'s lawful rights in Namibia.

The Namibian people's determination for freedom has mounted over the past two and a half decades. Namibians have been shot, tortured, arrested, tried in South African courts and condemned to South African prisons. Last year Namibian workers, including those at Tsumeb mines, protested against South African rule and apartheid with a nation-wide strike. Leaders of the National Convention, which represents the bulk of Namibia's 800,000 inhabitants, reject South African rule and call for a U.N. presence there to assist their country to independence.

In 1972, ECSA, a non-profit organization of churchpeople, presented proposals at the AMAX and Newmont shareholder meetings asking for disclosure of information about Tsumeb's operations. At the AMAX meeting, Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, representative at the United Nations and in the Americas for the South West Africa People's Organization declared:

"The future legitimate government of Namibia will be most eager to deal with foreign interests in Namibia according to their prior exploitation and discriminatory and repressive practices in collaboration with the illegal occupying apartheid regime. . . I must remind you in the strongest possible terms that your company is reaping huge profits on the backs, sweat, tears and blood of my people."

RESOLUTION

Resolution filed with American Metal Climax, Inc. by Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa, a shareholder

Whereas, the United States Government has declared that its policy is to discourage any further investments in Namibia (South West Africa); and

Whereas, such investment serves to strengthen the illegal control the South African Government maintains over Namibia and increases South Africa's vested interest in continuing its occupation of Namibia;

Therefore, be it resolved that the stockholders request the Board of Directors to adopt appropriate resolutions to initiate the process of amending the Certificate of Incorporation of the Corporation by adding the following new subparagraph at the appropriate place:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Corporation shall not conduct or be party to any operations in Namibia (South West Africa), either directly or through subsidiaries or affiliates, and shall use its best efforts to see to it that present operations in Namibia (South West Africa) in which it has an interest are wound up."

STATEMENT

Statement supporting resolution filed with American Metal Climax, Inc. by Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa, a shareholder

The South African Government refuses to yield control over Namibia (South West Africa) to the United Nations, the lawful authority. The United Nations in 1966 terminated a League of Nations mandate by which South Africa had governed Namibia. Since then resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice have consistently sustained the United Nations' lawful right in Namibia. The United States Government has accepted the World Court decision and has stated a policy of discouraging further investments in Namibia. The Corporation is part owner of Tsumeb Corporation, one of the largest investors in Namibia, which pays taxes to and accepts the racially discriminatory laws of South Africa in Namibia. Such cooperation presents a danger to the Corporation by involving it in direct support of an illegal regime and the use of forced labor.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I spoke in New York before the Sixth Annual Institutional Investor Conference and emphasized the importance of attracting foreign direct investment in the United States. I would like to include in the RECORD the following excerpts from that speech:

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT COULD HELP THE DOLLAR AT HOME AND ABROAD

Everybody recognizes achieving balance in our international payments as a top priority. But we are overlooking what could be our best bet—vastly increased foreign direct investment in high-technology U.S. plants. For the past fifteen years, we have been exporting our capital and technology, to the great benefit of our multinational corporations and of most of the industrialized world. It is now time to look homeward and encourage the reverse process—direct U.S. investment, joint adventures, licensing agreements by productivity-conscious European and Japanese firms.

Direct foreign investment can aid our balance of payments in three important ways:

1. Increased capital inflows, spurred by the exchange rate realignments which make U.S. plant and equipment 20-30 percent cheaper than before. Some investing countries are shy of capital themselves, but even if the investment capital would need to be raised in this country, the incoming technology by itself would be a help.

2. The products made in the United States, particularly with the help of U.S. marketing methods, could further aid our balance of payments by displacing imports.

3. With our high wage scales, we need to concentrate on high-technology exports. It is about time we got a 'reverse lend lease' from Europe and Japan.

Take the case of the recently opened Kikkoman soy sauce plant in Elkhorn, Wisconsin. Local interests initially opposed this Japanese direct investment, despite the fact that the Japanese had been buying midwestern soy beans, shipping them to Japan, making the sauce, and exporting the sauce back to the middle west. Today, Kikkoman is a howling success. There are 50 new jobs; a brand new \$9 million plant will be on the local tax rolls; our balance of payments is helped; and the new Japanese families are much in demand at Rotary luncheons, and a delight to the local school system.

Even though foreign direct investment looks like our best road to balance of payments salvation, practically nobody in government is really beating the drums for it. The White House wants to remove all controls on U.S. capital investment abroad, on the somewhat fragile theory that our bread on the waters will be returned some day. The State Department is gung ho about foreign portfolio investment in Wall Street—which would be nice for our investment account, but not much help in making American jobs or upgrading American technology. The Treasury, with its very expensive and not very successful DISC tax bonanza, is all out for vastly expanded U.S. exports. The Department of Commerce is devoting a big budget toward enticing more tourists to the U.S.

Attracting foreign direct investment is a rare opportunity for American manufacturing firms, American banks, and the American

investment industry to make jobs, increase productivity, and boost our balance of payments.

The January 16, 1973, issue of World magazine contained an excellent article by Stefan H. Robock on the impact of foreign investment in the United States. Excerpts from the article, entitled "The Silent Invasion," follow:

THE SILENT INVASION (By Stefan H. Robock)

Silently but surely the United States is being invaded. . . . I am referring to the accelerated but little noticed trend of foreigners to establish or acquire business enterprises in the United States. European and Japanese direct investment in American business operations has been growing at a faster rate in the last few years than has American business investment abroad. Furthermore, this silent invasion promises to pick up even greater momentum.

The rapidly expanding foreign-business presence in the United States is neither narrow nor of limited interest. Much of it does not come into popular view: for instance, the vast array of industrial chemicals, industrial machinery, and agricultural fertilizers produced in the States by foreign-owned companies. But at the consumer level, the range and variety of products locally manufactured by foreign firms is almost endless.

As of 1970 the value of U.S. direct investments (i.e., investments that carry with them participation in management as contrasted with portfolio investments, which do not) in Europe reached almost \$25 billion, whereas the value of direct investments in the United States by Europeans was slightly less than \$10 billion. But as shown in the table (page 29), the growth rate of inflows of European direct investments increased to almost 13 per cent annually over the 1966-1970 period from only 5 per cent annually during the 1959-66 period, whereas the rate of U.S. investment in Europe dropped to 12.7 per cent from a level of 17.1 per cent over the earlier period.

When examined by type of business activity, the trend of European investments in the U.S. is even more impressive. Foreign investment in the insurance and finance field has not grown rapidly; but European investments in both petroleum and manufacturing have been at much faster rates than reverse flows to Europe by American companies.

The value of Canadian investment in the United States is large, totaling more than \$3 billion in book value as of 1970, but recent growth trends have been less dramatic than those of the European investors in the United States. Japanese investment is still small but growing rapidly. The Japanese have been shying away from direct investment in the U.S. except to build up sale and service organizations and to develop sources of supply for forest-product raw materials. Since the international financial crisis of late 1971 and the revaluation of the yen, however, the Japanese situation has changed radically.

The revaluation has made imports from Japan more expensive, and several Japanese companies are now assembling color television sets in the U.S.—Hitachi and Sony in California and Matsushita in Puerto Rico. By building sets in the U.S., the Japanese say they can make quicker deliveries, lower their transportation costs, and possibly enter the console market. But the most important reason is to hedge against any further revaluation of the yen, which would reduce even further the competitiveness of imports.

The continuing large balance of payments surplus of Japan and new government policies to encourage Japanese to reduce this surplus by increasing outflows of investment capital has accelerated still another trend toward buying into U.S. companies.

At least four major changes laid the foundation for a delayed European and Japanese response. First, a new world balance in the economic strength of the leading industrial nations had emerged. Secondly, by building on a venerable research capability that was disrupted by the war, the Europeans were able to close the technology gap and reassert technological leadership in a number of traditional fields. The Japanese also came to the fore as technological leaders by a highly effective program of quickly absorbing and building on top of the technology of the West. A third factor was a crash program supported by foreign governments to strengthen European and Japanese firms through mergers and through closing the gap in management skills. A fourth factor was the growing realization that the Americans were not necessarily unbeatable in the economic and business fields.

To emphasize the change in relative strength in international economic relations, the German and Japanese governments have begun to encourage the direct export of capital, in some cases by tax concessions, for private business investment abroad, while President Nixon, who had hoped to remove the restrictions on American investment abroad, was forced to ignore the subject and retain his predecessors' restrictive measures. Of course, the causes of the U.S. balance of payments difficulties go beyond the Vietnam War. The U.S. began to run a balance of payments deficit beginning about 1950, but the problem was not regarded seriously so long as we continued to hold most of the world's gold supply.

In any event, without reviewing all the complexities of the international financial situation and the recent difficulties of the international monetary system, a principal result of these events has been the strengthening of foreign currencies relative to the U.S. dollar. This development gave a double boost to foreign investment in the U.S. The cost of goods produced at home by foreign companies rose relative to those produced abroad.

At the same time, a revalued German deutsche mark, a Swiss franc, a Dutch guilder, and a Japanese yen were able to buy that much more in dollar assets. It should be no surprise, therefore, that the European countries with the three strongest currencies—the Swiss, the Dutch, and the Germans—are the same three countries that provided the bulk of the new direct investment in the U.S. during the late 1960s.

To explain the silent invasion as a result of foreign superiority in technology may come as a blow to the American ego. But the flood of imports from Europe and Japan based on technological advantages rather than simply on cheap foreign labor should have already brought home to Americans the reality that the technology balance has shifted. Also, it may be well to recall that before World War II the technological lead in such fields as pharmaceuticals and chemistry was held by Swiss and German firms with long traditions of R and D.

Early in the post-World War II reconstruction period, European governments and private companies adopted strategies to close the technology gap, in some cases through cooperative research efforts across national boundaries in such fields as space, nuclear research, and aircraft.

America's technology lead has been heavily military in origin but in such glamorous industries that the narrowness of its base was often unnoticed.

Servan-Schreiber, with his best-selling book *The American Challenge*, did much to persuade Europeans that they were lagging behind the Americans in business-management skills. Management skills, even more than technology, have been the driving force behind U.S. industrial expansion abroad. Europe's tardy appreciation of this fact has been largely offset by the zeal with which European legislators, educators, and a host of public and private organizations have turned to the promotion of management education in Europe.

Academic and other training courses may become the major source of management strength in the future. But in the immediate past the most effective institution for the management training of Europeans and Japanese has been the U.S. foreign subsidiary.

Concurrently with the push for management training, European and Japanese governments have actively encouraged business mergers so that their national firms would not lack size for competing internationally.

Probably the most fascinating of the ingredients supporting the silent invasion was the shrugging off by European and Japanese businessmen of a long-standing inferiority complex vis-à-vis dynamic American businessmen. Export success in labor-intensive products, such as shoes, apparel, and textiles, was easily explained as due to lower foreign wage rates. But foreign producers have also had dramatic success in exporting to the U.S. more sophisticated products, such as automobiles, industrial machinery, and electronics, which did much to shatter the image of American business superiority and increase foreign business confidence. Along with this factor, Nicholas Faith has added the effect of the Vietnam War in challenging at an even broader level the sense that the Americans were unbeatable. But not to be underestimated are the many success stories of foreign firms who were brave enough to invade the U.S. market and managed to survive and even prosper.

Such has been the overall setting for the silent invasion. At a more specific level, individual firms were able to find in the U.S. special opportunities related to their area of operations and capabilities. With growing self-confidence many foreign enterprises have taken over U.S. businesses, motivated mainly by the availability of dollars for investment; government encouragement to invest in the United States; and opportunities for profitable returns. In some cases the establishment of new plants was based on technological advantages. In other situations foreign firms had built up a large enough demand in the American market through exports to justify the establishment of an American plant that would offer locational advantages in transportation savings and in better servicing the market. One important motivation shared by a number of foreign companies operating in the United States is the opportunity to learn sophisticated advertising, marketing, and product-development techniques, which can be applied elsewhere in the world by other subsidiaries of the foreign enterprises. Such has been the justification in part of Unilever's operations in the United States.

Will the trend continue, and what are the implications of the silent invasion? * * * I expect Americans to continue relaxed about the foreigners in our midst. * * * And so long as our international balance of payments situation remains unfavorable, the U.S. official position is certain to encourage capital inflows in the form of direct or portfolio investments.

Even some of the American labor unions, while opposing foreign expansion by U.S. firms as a form of exporting jobs, have followed the governmental pattern of encouraging foreign firms to enter the United States. United Auto Workers President Leonard Woodcock visited Japan in October 1972; and one of his missions was to encourage Japanese auto producers to set up shop in this country. At least three state governments have set up offices in Europe for attracting new industries to their areas, and numerous state delegations have visited foreign countries to discuss future investment in their regions.

In those cases where foreign firms are willing to enter into joint ventures, or be somewhat silent partners, as in the aforementioned Japanese cases, American firms can profit through partnership in the United States with foreign corporations by gaining access to overseas distribution channels and to foreign technological developments.

Another interesting pattern now emerging is the proposal by capital-surplus Middle Eastern oil countries, Saudi Arabia in particular, to make major investments in the U.S. oil industry. As in most of the major oil-producing countries, oil royalties and taxes at new high rates are pouring into the government treasury much faster than the government can spend them. The strategy to invest in "downstream" facilities offers the hope of sharing even more in the profits reaped from their own natural resources. In the hope of improving their bargaining power and securing continued access to Middle Eastern oil, American international oil companies are likely to accede to the expressed wishes of Saudi Arabia.

So long as the silent invasion brings new products and increases competition in the American market, the American consumer will have little cause to complain. Even when acquisitions of existing companies, such as the Olivetti take-over of the old Underwood typewriter company, mean that existing sources of supply will be saved from extinction or operated more efficiently, consumers' interests are benefited.

Of course, the silent invasion will not be in those fields of production where low labor costs are the prime consideration, such as shoes, textiles, some lines of apparel, and electric components. But as students of locational economics are aware, the most efficient site for many industries is near the source of raw materials, such as industrial water in the case of chemicals and electric power in the production of aluminum. Despite the widely accepted notion that wage rates are the critical factor in the competitiveness of American industry, the silent invasion is ironic proof that for many foreign firms it is most advantageous to manufacture in the United States.

In large part the European-Japanese response was inevitable. * * * The silent invasion may be hard on the American ego. Yet through Vietnam we have learned to adjust to the new reality that we are not invincible in military affairs; now we will have to adjust to the reality that America's dynamic business capability is being successfully challenged. Fortunately, a successful silent invasion can have favorable, rather than unfavorable, results.

THE COST OF MEAT—THE PRICE SPIRAL CONTINUES

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, there is really no need to repeat it—every shopper in America knows it: meat prices are soaring through the ceiling, and meat is soaring off the kitchen table.

During the last 18 months, a community committee on consumer prices, located in the eastern suburbs of Cleveland, Ohio, has done a brilliant job in providing me with data on changing food and consumer prices in the Greater Cleveland area. I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point, some of the latest sample data which the committee has provided me.

	Fall 1971	Mar. 1, 1973	Mar. 19, 1973	Percent change fall, 1971 to Mar. 19, 1973
Beef:				
Hamburger.....	\$0.69	\$0.92	\$0.99	43
Ground chuck.....	.68	.98	1.04	53
Roasts:				
Chuck, semi-boneless.....	.88	1.14	1.18	34
Pot roast.....	.74	1.09	1.18	59
Steaks:				
Chuck, semi-boneless.....	.98	1.24	1.35	37
Top round.....	1.09	1.68	1.78	70
Sirloin.....	1.34	1.64	1.68	25
Porterhouse.....	1.64	1.88	1.94	18
Poultry:				
Fryer, whole.....	.29	.52	.54	86

I would like to add here that the chairman of the committee, Mrs. Carolyn Suguchi, who along with the other volunteers has done such an excellent job, will be testifying before the Joint Economic Committee here in Washington, next Wednesday, April 4. It is my hope that her testimony—and the food price documentation which is pouring in from all over the Nation, will lead to substantial amendments to the administration's proposed phase III program.

It is imperative that when the Congress considers extension of the Economic Stabilization Control Act and the laws governing phase III, that direct controls be applied to foods. It is inflation in the food goods sector which most directly affects those on fixed and low incomes and those with large families.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add at this point that I am heartily in support of the efforts which have sprung up, spontaneously throughout the Nation, to protest the price of meat. Meat boycotts are being organized throughout the Nation, including some in my own 22d Congressional District.

The uncontrolled food inflation over the past 19 months has devastated the budgets of all Americans. Millions of our citizens have been moved from self-sufficiency to dependency by the cruel impact of inflation. Even more seriously, the high price of meat is eliminating a proper share of this essential food from the diet of our young people who require more for growth and development.

While such boycott efforts are commendable citizen action and can play an important role in reducing the demand for meat and lessening price pressures, the American public expects more from its government leaders. It expects a government policy that will make meat boycotts unnecessary.

While the administration is to be commended for reducing the number of farm acres in the set-aside program—a type of "soil bank" program in which the farmer is paid to keep land out of production, there are still some 20 million acres of farmland which are not being fully used and for which the farmer is being paid to keep out of full production. These remaining acres should be brought into full use as soon as possible.

Finally, and in the meat sector particularly, permanent repeal of the meat import quota is needed. The Meat Import Quota Act of 1964—an anticonsumer bill which I opposed at that time—regulates the supply of foreign meat entering the United States, limiting the amount of foreign meat to about 3 percent of total U.S. meat consumption.

We all appreciate the need for an adequate income to American farmers. But the simple fact is that the supply of meat is inadequate at prices which large families and low-income families can afford. This shortage, which is worldwide, will become more acute in the years ahead.

Foreign meat is tougher, leaner, lower grade than U.S. meat. It is almost exclusively of the processing meat variety—hamburger, hot dog, and sausage. It is the type of meat primarily used by large and low-income families. As a recent Tariff Commission report pointed out, it is generally not competitive with domes-

tic meat which specializes in choice, tender steaks and roasts.

I might add here that American meat is just about the finest in the world—with the result that many of the most famous—and expensive—restaurants of Europe and Japan are importing American steaks and roasts. It now appears that while domestic prices continue to soar, we are exporting over 52 million pounds of the finest cuts of "Kansas City steaks" to the gourmet restaurants of the world. These exports further restrict supply at home, with the result that the shopper pays more.

Recognizing the crisis in meat prices, the administration temporarily suspended meat import quotas last June for a period of 6 months. In December of this year, it announced suspension of supply restrictions for another year.

But temporary suspension of meat supply restrictions does not appreciably increase the supply of this cheaper priced processing meat. Foreign producers will not substantially alter their production and shipping plans for what appears to be a temporary change in the American market—a market which may be suddenly restricted by the stroke of a pen. For example, Australia, one of our principal trading partners, requires its ranchers to sell 1 pound of meat in the world market for every 2.5 pounds sold in the American market—even though they would rather sell more in the American market. The temporary relaxation of import quotas will not substantially increase meat supplies since producers must plan years ahead to increase herds to meet American needs.

In addition to my legislation to provide for permanent repeal of the Meat

Import Quota Act of 1964, I will be introducing legislation tomorrow to provide for a repeal of the 3 cents per pound duty now being charged against every pound of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef imported into this country. Similarly, efforts must be made to repeal the tariff rates now applied against mutton and lamb—rates which are almost as high as the rates on beef. Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable to maintain a tariff against meats when the price of domestic—and foreign—meats is skyrocketing and has gone beyond the regular purchase price of millions of American families.

ARE MEAT PRICES STARTING TO DECREASE?

During the past week, there has been considerable comment to the effect that, because of reduced demand, meat prices were beginning to decline. An analysis of the Chicago wholesale meat markets between Monday and Wednesday of last week could have supported that contention. But a study of the market's performance on Thursday and Friday and on Monday of this week indicates that the price decline in choice cuts is already being halted and is climbing upwards again. This price "turn-around" appears to be due to a decision by the ranchers to withhold livestock until prices stabilize or the boycott ends. In the live cattle markets in Omaha on Thursday, March 22, and Friday, March 23, "not enough steers and heifers [were] on offer for adequate price test."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the relevant Chicago meat price tables in the RECORD at this point. They are a clear warning that stronger Government action is needed and needed immediately.

MEAT PRICES¹

	August 1971 ²	December	Feb. 27	Mar. 16, 1973	Mar. 22, 1973	Mar. 23, 1973
Choice:						
Steers, 6/700	53½	57½/57½	66½/66½	69½/69½	66½	68½/69
Trimmed loins, 40/50	98	86/87	96	1.02	1.05	1.05
Ribs, 30/35	74	79/80	82	85	86	86-87
Processing:						
Full carcass, bull, fresh	70	77½	94	1.00	99	99
Boneless beef, fresh, 90 percent lean	65	73½/73½	92/93	94-95	92½/93½	91½/92½
Boneless chucks, fresh	66	75	91½	95	94	93/94
Trimming, 85/90	61	67	38½	90½	89	87/88
Imported:						
Cow, 90 percent	61½	71	92½/93	92/93	89	87
Bull, 90 percent	63½	74½	94½	95½/95½	93/94	92/93
Shank meat	64½	74½/74½	94½/95	95½/95½	92/93	91/92

¹ Domestic meats, f.o.b. Chicago. Imports ex dock, port-of-entry as listed, national provisioner yellow sheets about the middle of each month.

² Average prices during 30 days prior to Aug. 14, 1971.

Not only does the Choice meat market appear to be climbing back upward, but at the close of business Monday, March 26, Choice steers, 600 to 700 pounds, were being quoted in Chicago at 70 cents per pound.

It should also be remembered that the prices in this table are wholesale prices. Even the high prices of last March 16 have not yet been fully passed onto the retail stores.

Finally, it should be noted that there is some weakness in price in the imported meat categories—although they are still nearly 50 percent higher than

in August of 1971. Some of this price softness may be attributed to continuing uncertainty in the world money markets—an uncertainty that is likely to diminish in the weeks ahead—as well as to rumors that the administration may ask for a removal of the 3 cents a pound tariff on imported meats. Since this rumor has caused some downward pressure on these foreign meats—the type of meats so important for large families and those with fixed incomes—it is obvious that we should take positive action to change that rumor to fact: We should

take immediate action to repeal the tariff as soon as possible.

Finally, in an effort to help the American consumer during the present meat crisis, I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point, a brief analysis, released by the Department of Agriculture and printed in the Family Economics Review of December 1972, which lists the grams per pound of various products and the relative price of these products. These two figures can tell the shopper which products provide the most protein for the dollar. The U.S. Department of Agriculture table follows:

TABLE 1.—COST OF 3 OUNCES OF COOKED LEAN FROM SPECIFIED MEAT, POULTRY, AND FISH AT AUGUST 1972 PRICES

Item	Retail price per pound ¹	Cost of 3 ounces of cooked lean
Hamburger	\$0.76	\$0.20
Chicken, whole, ready-to-cook	.41	.20
Turkey, ready-to-cook	.55	.22
Beef liver	.80	.22
Ocean perch, fillet, frozen	.77	.22
Chicken breasts	.78	.27
Ham, whole	.78	.27
Pork, picnic	.63	.29
Haddock, fillet, frozen	1.07	.31
Ham, canned	1.23	.31
Chuck roast of beef, bone in	.85	.38
Pork loin roast	.92	.46
Rump roast of beef, boned	1.50	.51
Round beefsteak	1.51	.51
Pork chops, center	1.29	.58
Rib roast of beef	1.32	.59
Sirloin beefsteak	1.58	.68
Veal cutlets	2.76	.69
Lamb chops, loin	2.04	.94
Porterhouse beefsteak	1.87	.97

¹ Average retail prices in U.S. cities, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 2.—COST OF 20 GRAMS OF PROTEIN FROM SPECIFIED MEATS AND MEAT ALTERNATES AT AUGUST 1972 PRICES

Item	Retail price per pound ²	Cost of 20 grams of protein
Dry beans	\$0.25	\$0.06
Peanut butter (12 oz. jar)	.50	.12
Eggs, large (dozen)	.51	.13
Chicken, whole, ready-to-cook	.41	.15
Bean soup, canned (11½ oz. can)	.17	.16
Beef liver	.80	.19
Hamburger	.76	.19
Tuna fish (6½ oz. can)	.45	.20
American process cheese (8 oz. pkg.)	.54	.21
Ham, whole	.78	.22
Round beefsteak	1.51	.33
Frankfurters	.91	.33
Rib roast of beef	1.32	.44
Pork sausage	.86	.45
Bologna (8 oz.)	.63	.46
Bacon, sliced	.99	.52

¹ One-third of the daily amount recommended for a 20-year-old man.

² Average retail prices in U.S. cities, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE ON THE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today 20 Democrats on the Banking and Currency Committee are introducing legislation to stiffen the economic stabilization program and to provide an effective alternative to President Nixon's altering phase III effort.

The bill was cosponsored by myself and WILLIAM BARRETT, Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN, HENRY REUSS, WILLIAM MOORHEAD, FERNAND ST GERMAIN, JOSEPH MINISH, RICHARD HANNA, TOM GETTYS, FRANK ANNUNZIO, THOMAS REES, JAMES HANLEY, FRANK BRASCO, Ed KOCH, WILLIAM COTTER, PARREN MITCHELL, WALTER FAUNTROY, ANDREW YOUNG, JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY, and PETE STARK.

The legislation will impose an immediate freeze on prices and interest rates at levels no higher than those prevailing on March 16, 1973. The freeze will remain in effect indefinitely, but the President is to immediately launch a program

designed to roll back prices and interest rates to reduce inflation.

The rollback plan is to be implemented and completed within 60 days after enactment.

The bill allows the President to make adjustments in the freeze order when it is necessary to prevent gross inequities. However, the President must publish a specific determination with a statement of considerations for the action in the event any adjustments are made. Any exemption from the rollback orders must be accompanied by a similar statement and justification.

At the end of the 60-day period, a "triggering mechanism" will go into effect which will allow the Congress and the public to monitor the progress of the stabilization program. If the rate of inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, exceeds 3 percent for any 3 months—or 2.5 percent for any 12-month period—the President must revert to a mandatory set of controls over all elements of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that this three-step plan will apply pressure on the President to develop a firm stabilization program which will bring inflation under control and allow us to stabilize the economy.

It should be noted that what we are proposing are amendments to existing law. He will retain the broad powers he now has under the Economic Stabilization Act plus the additional powers and requirements granted and imposed under these amendments. Thus, the President will retain flexibility necessary to administer the program, but the Congress will have provided strong direction for any future stabilization program.

It is hoped that the President will be sufficiently firm under the freeze and rollback orders so that there will be no necessity for the trigger mechanism for mandatory controls to be placed into effect. But the triggering mechanism—the 3-percent guideline—does provide a strong incentive for all elements of the economy—as well as the administration—to support efforts to reduce inflation. If banks continue to insist on higher interest rates, if the business community pushes for higher prices, or if labor demands unwarranted wage increases, then there is danger that the trigger mechanism will be tripped and mandatory controls instituted across the board.

Incidentally, the guidelines—the 3 percent for a quarter and the 2½ percent for the year—basically track the claims which the administration has made for its own stabilization efforts. So we are simply holding the administration to its own word.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation assures that the administration cannot continue to allow the Nation to drift into more and more inflation. It sets up a timetable—with a monitoring device—which says that the President must either stabilize the economy or he must resort to mandatory controls across the board. This will put an end to the vagueness which has existed, particularly since the announcement of phase III.

In summary, it provides: First a freeze; second, a rollback; third, a continuing monitoring of stabilization programs;

and, fourth, mandatory controls without exception if the stabilization program falters again.

The legislation also includes these other major areas:

Stabilization of rents. This amendment stabilizes rents at levels prevailing on January 10, 1973, the last day of phase II. The President may allow rents to increase from the established level but only where there has been an increase in taxes imposed by a State or local government, a capital improvement during the period of occupancy and increases in the cost of services and materials. Only actual cost increases may be passed on. This amendment also allows the President to roll back rents beyond January 10, 1973.

Regulation of credit for commodity futures trading. This amendment allows the Federal Reserve to regulate credit in the commodity futures.

Consumer Counsel. This establishes an Office of Consumer Counsel. The Counsel is empowered to examine all records, information, and testimony relating to any matter before the President in respect to economic stabilization. The Consumer Counsel is empowered to require a public hearing and written decision by the Cost of Living Council in respect to any price, interest rate, or wage adjustment which is covered by the act. The Consumer Counsel is also directed to advise consumers in ways to make beneficial decisions to themselves in the purchase of goods and services so as to affect the cost-of-living economy. The Counsel is vested with subpoena power and standing to sue the Cost of Living Council whenever it fails to act in accordance with the law or with its own regulations.

General Accounting Office. This amendment empowers the Comptroller General to review all reports concerning prices, profits, wages, salaries, or interest rates submitted by any person to the President in the stabilization effort. The Comptroller also must inform the Congress whenever he discovers that a person has taken, or is about to take, action which departs from the standards for prices, profits, wages, salaries, or interest rates established under authority of the Act.

Public disclosure. This amendment would require business enterprises subject to reporting requirements of the Cost of Living Council to make public any report it is required to submit to the Council. It also requires any person who raises any interest rate to make public a report justifying such a raise. This amendment, however, would allow a business enterprise to exclude from any report made to the public any information which is proprietary in nature and which relates to the amount or sources of its income, profits, losses, costs, or expenditures. It may not exclude from that report data concerning its price for goods and services.

Reporting. This amendment requires the President to transmit a quarterly report to Congress describing changes in productivity, consumer prices, wholesale prices, corporate earnings, interest rates, wage earner rates and employment and

unemployment on an industry-by-industry basis.

Authority to allocate petroleum products. This amendment allows the President to establish priorities for the use and allocation of supplies of petroleum products to meet the needs of various sections of the country and to prevent any competitive effect resulting from the shortage of such products.

Definition of substandard earnings. This amendment requires the President to exempt all wages from controls which are \$3.50 per hour or less.

One-year extension of the act. This amendment extends the stabilization authority until April 30, 1974.

The legislation, as introduced, follows:

H.R. 6168

A bill to amend and extend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970

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

Amendments to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970

SECTION 1.—The Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by redesignating sections 204 through 220 as sections 209 through 224, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 203 the following new sections:

"§ 204. Freeze of prices and interest rates.

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, all prices and interest rates are hereby frozen at levels no higher than those prevailing on March 16, 1973. The President may, by written order stating in full the considerations for his action, make adjustments with respect to prices and interest rates in order to correct gross inequities.

"(b) Immediately, but not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, the President shall, by written order stating in full the considerations for his action, roll back prices and interest rates to levels lower than those prevailing on March 16, 1973, in order to reduce inflation and otherwise carry out the purposes of this Act. The President may make specific exemptions from the rollback by written order stating in full the considerations for his action determining that such rollback is unnecessary.

"(c) (1) Whenever the consumer price index (all items—United States city average) as compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, for a calendar month exceeds—

"(A) an annual rate of 3 per centum for any three consecutive months (the first such months of which begins after the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this section), or

"(B) an annual rate of 2.5 per centum for any 12 consecutive months (the first such month of which begins after the close of December 31, 1972), then within thirty calendar days the President is authorized and directed to issue orders and regulations to establish a mandatory program to—

"(i) stabilize prices, wages, and salaries at levels not less than those prevailing on May 25, 1970, in order to reduce inflation; and

"(ii) stabilize interest rates and corporate dividends and similar transfers at levels consistent with orderly economic growth.

"(2) (A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no order or regulation may be issued under this subsection unless it is made on the record after opportunity for a hearing.

"(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the public shall have access to all data and other information

which is the basis for or is used in any manner to formulate any standards issued by the President under this section.

"§ 205. Stabilization of rents.

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the President is authorized and directed to stabilize rents at levels prevailing on January 10, 1973. Thereafter, the President shall only allow rents to increase by the actual amount of any increase in any tax, fee, or service charge levied by a State or local government and any necessary capital improvement after the beginning of the preceding period of occupancy (and not previously charged to any lessee) and allocable to that residence, and any reasonable increased costs of services and materials.

"(b) The President may roll back rents to levels lower than those prevailing on January 10, 1973, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"§ 206. Regulation of credit for commodity futures trading.

"For the purpose of preventing the excessive speculation in and the excessive use of credit for the creation, carrying, or trading in commodity futures contracts having the effect of inflating consumer prices and industrial costs, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall prescribe regulations governing the amount of credit that may be extended or maintained on any such contract. The regulations may define the terms used in this section, may exempt such transactions as the Board may deem unnecessary to regulate in order to carry out the purpose of this section, and may make such differentiations among commodities, transactions, borrowers, and lenders, as the Board may deem appropriate.

"§ 207. Consumer Counselor

"(a) There is established in the legislative branch the Office of Consumer Counselor, which shall be headed by the Consumer Counselor, who shall be appointed for a term of one year by the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals established by section 216(b) (1) of this Act. The Consumer Counselor shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level III of the Executive Schedule.

"(b) The Consumer Counselor may appoint such employees of the Office of the Consumer Counselor at such salaries as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(c) Notwithstanding section 210, the Office of the Consumer Counselor, under the direction of the Consumer Counselor, shall have authority to investigate fully, on complaint from a consumer, or otherwise, all official actions of any board, commission, or similar entity charged with the duty to carry out the provisions of this title, and any such board, commission, or similar entity shall promptly upon request make fully available to the Office of the Consumer Counselor all records, information, and testimony relating to any matter which such Office investigates.

"(d) The Consumer Counselor, or his delegate, shall have authority for any purpose related to his official duties, to issue subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant books, papers, and other documents, and to administer oaths. Witnesses summoned under the provisions of this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States. In case of refusal to obey a subpoena served on any person under this subsection, the Consumer Counselor may apply to the district court for any district in which such person is found for appropriate relief to compel such person to obey such subpoena.

"(e) The Consumer Counselor may, as the result of an investigation under subsection (c)—

"(1) intervene by submitting a written statement of his objections and the reasons therefor; or

"(2) require a public hearing and decision on the record as provided in section 556 of title 5 of the United States Code;

In any rulemaking or adjudication or other decision of any board, commission, or similar entity, where the Consumer Counselor determines such intervention or requirement is necessary in order to prevent the making of a rule, the adjudication of a case, or the making of any other decision contrary to law, contrary to the intent of the Congress, contrary to the Constitution, or contrary to the rules of such board, commission, or similar entity.

"(f) If any board, commission, or similar entity makes any rule, adjudication, or other decision notwithstanding the objections of the Consumer Counselor under subsection (e), the Consumer Counselor may apply to the appropriate district court for all appropriate relief to compel such board, commission, or similar entity to act in accordance with law, the intent of the Congress, the Constitution, or the rules of such board, commission, or similar entity.

"(g) The authority conferred upon the Office of Consumer Counselor and upon the Consumer Counselor by this section with respect to any board, commission, or similar entity charged with the duty to carry out the provisions of this title shall also extend to any action of any officer, agency, or entity of the Federal Government which in any manner affects the stabilization of prices, rents, wages, salaries, dividends, or interest.

"(h) The Office of the Consumer Counselor shall take all necessary action to advise consumers of information necessary to make intelligent decisions on the purchase of consumer goods and services and so effect cost-of-living economies.

"§ 208. General Accounting Office

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States (hereafter referred to in this section as the 'Comptroller General') shall have authority to review all reports concerning prices, profits, wages, salaries, or interest rates submitted by any person to any officer, department, agency, board, commission, or similar entity established pursuant to authority granted the President by this title.

"(b) The Comptroller General shall promptly inform the Congress whenever the review provided for in subsection (a) reveals that any person has taken or is about to take action which departs substantially from the standards for prices, profits, wages, salaries, or interest rates established under the authority of this title. Neither section 210 of this Act, nor section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, shall in any way limit the information which the Comptroller General may transmit under this section to the Congress."

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

SEC. 2. Section 210 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as redesignated by section 1 of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking out "All" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), all"; and

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

"(b) (1) (A) Any business enterprise subject to the reporting requirements under section 130.21(b) of the regulations of the Cost of Living Council in effect on January 11, 1973, shall make public any report (except for matter excluded in accordance with paragraph (2)) so required which covers a period during which that business enterprise charges a price for a substantial product which exceeds by more than 1.5 per centum the price lawfully in effect for such product on January 10, 1973, or on the date twelve months preceding the end of such period, whichever is later. As used in this subsection, the term 'substantial product' means any single product or service which accounted for

5 per centum or more of the gross sales or revenues of a business enterprise in its most recent full fiscal year.

"(B) Any person who raises any interest rate shall make public a report justifying any such raise.

"(2) A business enterprise may exclude from any report made public pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) any information or data reported to the Cost of Living Council, proprietary in nature, which concerns or relates to the amount or sources of its income, profits, losses, costs, or expenditures but may not exclude from such report, data or information so reported which concerns or relates to its prices for goods and services.

"(3) Immediately upon enactment of this subsection, the President or his delegate shall issue regulations defining for the purpose of this subsection what information or data are proprietary in nature and therefore excludable under paragraph (2), except that such regulations may not define as excludable any information or data which cannot currently be excluded from public annual reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by a business enterprise exclusively engaged in the manufacture or sale of a substantial product as defined in paragraph (1)."

REPORTING

SEC. 3. Section 221 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as redesignated by section 1 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) On the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this subsection, and at monthly intervals thereafter, the President shall transmit to Congress a report describing any action taken by him or any delegate of his under this title and giving his assessment of the status of the program authorized by this title.

"(d) The President shall transmit reports to Congress not later than thirty days after the close of each calendar quarter describing changes in—

"(1) productivity, compensation per man-hour, and unit costs, by major industry;

"(2) consumer prices for all items and for major components;

"(3) wholesale prices for all items and for major components;

"(4) corporate earnings by major industry, including profits before and after taxes and profits before and after taxes as a percentage of stockholders' equity or investment and of sales;

"(5) interest rates for consumer and business loans;

"(6) average hourly earnings by major industry within the private nonfarm sector; and

"(7) employment and unemployment by major industry; which occurred when comparing such calendar quarter to the calendar quarter immediately preceding it (by percent and including index numbers)."

AUTHORITY TO ALLOCATE PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of section 202 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by striking out the period at the

end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and that in order to maintain and promote competition in the petroleum industry and assure sufficient supplies of petroleum products to meet the essential needs of various sections of the Nation, it is necessary to provide for the rational and equitable distribution of those products."

(b) The first sentence of section 203(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) provide after public hearing, conducted with such notice, under such regulations, and subject to such review as the exigencies of the case may, in his judgment, make appropriate for the establishment of priorities of use and for systematic allocation of supplies of petroleum products including crude oil in order to meet the essential needs of various sections of the Nation and to prevent anticompetitive effects resulting from shortages of such products."

DEFINITION OF SUBSTANDARD EARNINGS

SEC. 5. Section 203(d) of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The President shall prescribe regulations defining for the purposes of this subsection the term 'substandard earnings', but in no case shall such term be defined to mean earnings less than those resulting from a wage or salary rate which yields \$3.50 per hour or less."

ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF THE ACT

SEC. 6. Section 223 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as redesignated by section 1 of this Act, is amended by striking out "1973" both times it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

INFORMATION AND THE USE OF EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

(Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce forthcoming hearings by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee on the subject of so-called "executive privilege," a matter of vital interest and importance to the Congress.

Hearings will be on H.R. 4938, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) and cosponsored by a number of members of the Government Operations Committee. It would amend the Freedom of Information (5 U.S.C. 552) to require that all information be made available to Congress or the

Comptroller General by the executive branch, except where executive privilege is invoked by the President himself. Hearings will commence at 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 3, in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building. They will continue on April 4 and 5.

Our subcommittee held extensive hearings in the last Congress on the issue of executive privilege and its many ramifications that affect the right of Congress to information that is of vital importance in the exercise of our constitutional responsibilities. These new hearings will probe further into the ways in which the present constitutional crisis of power between the White House and the Congress may be dealt with in a rational and intelligent manner.

Members of Congress and others interested in the subject area of these hearings who wish to testify or submit statements should contact the subcommittee office, room B-371B, Rayburn House Office Building—225-3741.

BUDGET IMPACT ON HEALTH MANPOWER PROGRAMS

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, another measure of the impact of President Nixon's budget for fiscal year 1974 on important domestic programs is to consider the area of health manpower programs.

At my request, the following data on budgetary effects have been compiled on the consortium of health manpower programs, a partnership of all educational institutions and health care delivery systems in the St. Louis metropolitan area.

As the data indicate, the 17 non-Federal members of the consortium will be required to absorb an estimated \$1.6 million cutback in Federal support. Much of this reduction is in support for nurse training programs. At a time when health manpower shortages are cited as critical, I find it difficult to understand the administration's rationale for its budgetary recommendations in the health manpower field. Moreover, with increasing concern over the quality of health care received and the efficiency of health care delivery, it is inconceivable that the administration would make such recommendations.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include the following table summarizing the cutbacks and listing the institutions affected by the budget reductions:

School	Nurse Capita- tion	Nurse and allied Health Loan Trainee- ships	Division of allied Health Special Projects	Division of allied Health Special Improvements	National Institute of Mental Health	Other	School	Nurse Capita- tion	Nurse and allied Health Loan Trainee- ships	Division of allied Health Special Projects	Division of allied Health Special Improvements	National Institute of Mental Health	other
Belleville Area College, Belle- ville, Ill.	\$27,996	\$14,420				\$56,957 Regional Medical Program Grant	State Community College of East St. Louis, East St. Louis, Ill.	\$12,000	\$9,000		\$138,000		
							Lewis and Clark Community College, Godfrey, Ill.	8,939	18,897				

School	Nurse Capita- tion	Nurse and allied Health Loan Trainee- ships	Division of allied Health Special Projects	Division of allied Health Special Improvements	National Institute of Mental Health	Other	School	Nurse Capita- tion	Nurse and allied Health Loan Trainee- ships	Division of allied Health Special Projects	Division of allied Health Special Improvements	National Institute of Mental Health	Other
Maryville College, St. Louis County	\$94,498		\$25,000				Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville), Edwards- ville, Ill.	\$27,000	\$144,264			\$30,032	\$54,120
St. Louis Junior College, St. Louis City	39,600	\$67,000		\$70,000			Total	304,499	469,220	\$35,303	\$340,909	30,032	421,232
St. Louis University, St. Louis City	94,466	215,639	10,303	132,909	2 \$92,961 2 107,194		Grand total			\$1,601,195.00			

1 Regional medical program grant.

2 Nursing special project.

3 Physician's assistant.

VENICE RED DEVILS—TRUE CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Venice, Ill., Red Devils high school basketball team recently completed an outstanding season, culminating in a third-place win in the Illinois statewide class A competition.

Anyone familiar with Illinois high school basketball realizes the excellence required to make it through regional and sectional playoff competition to reach the final tournament at Champaign, Ill. The Red Devils led by their outstanding coach, Bill Ohlendorf, not only made it through the regionals and sectionals but fought their way to a third-place finish at Champaign.

Last Sunday, March 18, the citizens of Venice turned out to welcome their Red Devils home their great showing. The Granite City Press-Record, which serves the Venice area, covered the event. In joining the many loyal supporters in congratulating the team I include the Press-Record article:

VENICE THIRD IN STATE, FIRST IN FANS' HEARTS
(By Walter "Mick" Strange)

Signs and banners welcoming home the Venice High School cagers lined the streets of Venice as over 300 carloads of Red Devil fans began to gather at 12:30 p.m. Sunday at the stoplight intersection of Illinois Route 203 and Bend Road.

The team, it was clear, might be third in state class A (small high school) competition, but it was first in the hearts of many thousands of fans.

The autos—along with fire trucks, police cars and motorcycles—were decorated with red and white streamers and large signs reading "Venice Red Devils—Our Champions."

The parade traveled through the Eagle Park area, down Second Street in Madison and all around Venice, ending at the school.

Over 1,000 fans filled the Venice gym to pay tribute to the team.

"Needless to say, everyone in Venice, in fact everyone in the Tri-Cities, is proud of our team," Mayor John E. Lee told the gathering.

"Both the team and the cheerleaders on and off the floor at Champaign made everyone proud of them."

The team won Friday night and divided two Saturday tournament games to capture the third-place statewide trophy.

Venice School Superintendent John O. Pier, Lewis Sabin, high school principal, Leo Davinroy, president of the Venice board of

education, and Horace Calvo, state representative, all gave high praise to the team and the cheerleaders.

When Devil Coach Bill Ohlendorf was introduced to speak, he received a standing and enthusiastic round of applause that lasted several minutes.

Ohlendorf, filled with emotion, lauded not only the basketball talents of the team but its attitude and behavior during the entire season. The squad was described by the coach as "truly outstanding."

Following the 45-minute program in the gym, a social for the fans and team was held in the cafeteria.

ASSESSING DESIGN FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, many of us have expressed concern over the shape of President Nixon's domestic program structure. One of the most objective assessments of the new design appeared in a March 18 editorial in the Metro-East Journal, a Lindsay-Schaub newspaper in East St. Louis, Ill.

For the benefit of my colleagues who share my concern I include the editorial at this time:

NIXON TEARS DOWN BEFORE REBUILDING

President Nixon's design for a new structure of federal domestic programs still ignores too many of the barriers that stand between today's inadequate domestic situation and a better tomorrow and national life.

The President has not yet sent to Congress bills to implement his special revenue sharing programs. At the same time, he already is tearing down as fast as the law will allow, and in some cases faster, federal social programs that many people, especially low income people, need desperately even with their shortcomings.

That has made it impossible for state and local officials around the country to plan their budgets for the upcoming fiscal year. It is an invitation to much governmental fiscal chaos and more than a little individual human tragedy for the millions of minorities, poor white and elderly caught in poverty.

Nor has Mr. Nixon made it clear how the increasingly troubled central cities of the nation's large and medium sized metropolitan areas will make up for the revenues and social programs they will lose to suburbs and less troubled areas.

Equally disturbing is Mr. Nixon's failure to lead on the important issues of race relations and local government modernization and consolidation, issues that must be dealt with to achieve what the President is trying to achieve.

The still uncorrected flaw of both general and special revenue sharing is that both disperse a large, but relatively limited number of federal domestic aid dollars to existing local governmental units across the country without much regard for relative national importance of the many problems they face.

General revenue sharing, which the President sold last year as extra rather than replacement federal aid, made sense as it was originally proposed. But coupled with the President's outright cutbacks in many direct federal aid programs this year, at the moment it amounts to a retreat from efforts to deal with nationwide human problems on a national basis.

That's because political boundaries in most metropolitan areas of the country, and in many more rural regions as well, especially here in Illinois, make little sense. Neither do the local government structures that have grown up with them. The boundaries separate rich and poor, blacks and whites in ways that make much of local government exceptionally wasteful and unable to cope adequately with the problems that face people living in those areas.

Revenue sharing, general or special, almost surely will fall for these reasons, just as have many federal direct aid programs, which operate much more through state and local governments and much more on the initiative of officials of those governments than the President concedes or most people realize.

Unfortunately, revenue sharing as now constituted encourages those in effective governmental units to put off reform; it offers no incentive to consolidation or modernization.

The President's failure to provide leadership on the question of racial integration in education and employment, and most crucially in residential patterns, over the past four years, only makes this difficult situation even worse.

The fatal flaw in the Nixon domestic program as it now stands is not that it is heading in the wrong direction. The President's intentions are sound.

The real weakness is that it is a simplistic response to national problems that are intertwined and complex.

National opinion polls show that the majority of Americans oppose most of what Mr. Nixon has proposed to do domestically in his budget.

Most people don't disagree with the President's desire to put the national house in better order. Nor do we.

But all of us have a substantial stake in much of the old national house that has been built painfully even if inadequately over the years.

Mr. Nixon should heed the message, go back to the drawing boards and provide a lot more details of what he has in mind before he goes further in tearing down the old house before he has in hand a more detailed, comprehensive plan for a new one.

TEXAN NAMED OUTSTANDING HOME BUILDING REPRESENTATIVE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the National Association of Home Builders selects one of its representatives as the "Outstanding Representative of the Year." The award honors the representative whose "leadership does the most in any year to support and advance the National Association of Home Builders and building industry objectives, locally, statewide and nationally."

This year the Outstanding Representative Award has been awarded to Harold P. Hill, an outstanding builder who has been a member of the National Association of Home Builders for 23 years.

Texas has long been a leader in home building and it is only fitting that a Texan, Harold Hill, ought to be honored by the National Association of Home Builders as its Outstanding National Representative for 1972.

THE COMMITTEE ON INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS' INTEREST RATE GAME

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has just watched another of the continuing interest rate charades which has resulted in higher prime rates.

The Committee on Interest and Dividends, an entity established under the Economic Stabilization Act, is supposed to be protecting the American people from the ravages of higher interest rates, but in reality it is serving as a mechanism to implement these higher rates.

Back on February 2, a group of bankers raised the prime rate from 6 percent to 6½ percent and Dr. Arthur Burns, chairman of the Committee on Interest and Dividends, went into a flurry of letters and telegrams, presumably aimed at forcing a rollback. We had the rollback for a few days, and then the Committee on Interest and Dividends suddenly announced that an increase to 6¾ percent was justified. We then had 6¾ percent interest rates across the board throughout the United States—with the official imprimatur of the Committee on Interest and Dividends.

We racked along at 6¾ percent until March 19, when another group of big banks announced that they were raising their interest rates to 6¾ percent. The Committee on Interest and Dividends then hurriedly summoned the bankers to Washington and now we have a new agreement that interest rates can be raised to 6½ percent. And today the prime rate stands at this higher 6½ percent at most banks throughout the United States—again with the official imprimatur of the Committee on Interest and Dividends.

—603—Part 8

To sustain the public relations of these CID-approved increases, there has been talk about the establishment of a so-called dual rate. Under this plan, as the Committee on Interest and Dividends has propagandized it, the prime rate for large corporations would fluctuate with market rates while the rates for small businesses and others would be under some kind of general surveillance.

The CID has not explained how this might help the small businessman, the farmer, and the consumers who are already paying rates two and three times those enjoyed by the large customers—the prime borrowers. It is difficult to determine from this latest propaganda just what a dual rate would mean for a consumer paying 36 percent on a small loan or for a small businessman paying 10 to 15 percent to maintain his operations. The truth is that the smaller borrowers never have the advantage of the prime rate. And the concept of a dual rate is just window dressing to try to make the interest rate increases more palatable.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that we do not see any more reenactments of the games which the Committee on Interest and Dividends and the banks played last week. Apparently, the banks have the feeling that they can freely announce large interest rate increases—far beyond any reasonable justification—and then when the pressure is applied, they can simply cut these increases in half. By halving the difference everyone is happy—as the banks and the CID see the world.

This way, the banks get what they wanted in the first place—an interest rate increase—and the Committee on Interest and Dividends look like it was tough by cutting the increases in half. But this little game has brought us steady increases in interest rates and has left the American public with no protection.

A large part of the public excitement—the telegrams and letters and public pronouncements about interest rates—stemmed from an administration effort to ward off congressional moves for mandatory interest rate controls. The CID, which has been dormant for most of its life, has appeared active in recent weeks in anticipation of congressional hearings on the Economic Stabilization Act. The effort is to make the CID appear to be vigorous in pursuing its "voluntary program" and to indicate there is no need for mandatory controls.

But underneath this public relations flurry, interest rates have been going up for all borrowers—not just for prime borrowers. The interest rate picture is going to get worse before the year is out and we may have a credit crunch approaching the magnitude of the high interest, tight money period of 1969 and 1970.

The real test now is whether the Congress will join the Committee on Interest and Dividends and the big banks in deluding the American public. It is essential that the Congress not join in this charade and that it stands up and de-

mands a full set of controls on money lenders to protect the American public.

The Congress has been fooled in the past by Administration claims on monetary policy and interest rates and I trust that the Members will not allow themselves to be deluded any longer on an issue which affects everyone in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star-News for March 26 and the American Banker for March 26.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star-News, Mar. 26, 1973]

BANKS, GOVERNMENT SETTLE PRIME RATE CONTROVERSY

(By Lee M. Cohn)

Banks around the nation today established a 6½ percent prime lending rate, up from 6¼ percent, with the Nixon administration's tacit approval—pending the removal of federal controls from rates charged on loans to big corporations.

The 6½ percent prime rate—the minimum interest on bank loans to the most credit-worthy corporations—was a compromise reached during the weekend between leading bankers and the administration's Committee on Interest and Dividends.

Several leading banks had raised their prime rate to 6¾ percent last week, provoking a confrontation with CID Chairman Arthur F. Burns, who also is chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

After listening to the bankers' arguments, the CID said, Burns told them that "on the basis of the committee's present criteria a prime rate of 6¾ percent could not be justified."

The formal statement did not say specifically that a quarter-point increase to 6½ percent had been cleared, but a spokesman noted that the CID had not objected to that rate level and added "6½ percent is acceptable."

Banks which had raised the rate to 6¾ percent took the CID's hints and rolled it back to 6½ percent. Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., New York, which had initiated the move to 6¾ percent, clinched the deal today by cutting its rate to 6½ percent.

Other banks, which had held at 6¼ percent while awaiting resolution of the argument, raised their rates to 6½ percent. That rate is expected to become universal within a few days.

There were clear indications that the banks settled for 6½ percent with the understanding that additional increases would be permitted soon, particularly on loans to big corporations.

Burns last week suggested and during the weekend specifically endorsed the idea of a "dual" prime rate.

"If such a plan can be developed, the interest rate on business loans to large corporations might well be left to the market," the CID said. "However, interest rates on loans to smaller businesses, farmers, home buyers and consumers would remain under strict surveillance" by the CID.

That is, the CID would abandon its effort to control the prime rate for big corporations, if the banks would agree to go slow in raising rates on loans to small businesses and the other categories of borrowers.

This does not mean that small businesses would pay lower interest rates than big corporations.

Few small companies qualify for the prime rate. In many cases, their rates are a specified percentage increment above the prime.

Thus, if the prime rate for big corporations should rise to 7 percent after removal

of controls, a small company might pay 7½ percent or more.

But the banks would undertake to raise the rate on small business loans more slowly than the prime rate for big corporations, instead of automatically maintaining the full amount of the traditional rate spread.

The CID said its staff will work on the dual rate idea in cooperation with banking experts and loan officers of the banks.

Meetings with several banks scheduled by Burns for today were canceled. The agreement was worked out at meetings Saturday and Sunday, supplemented by telephone conversations.

President Nixon has refused to impose mandatory controls on interest rates, relying instead on "voluntary" restraint backed up by Burns' pressure tactics.

While tightening credit and raising interest rates in his capacity as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Burns as chairman of the CID has tried to hold down the most visible and politically sensitive rates—on prime, small business, home mortgage, consumer and farm loans.

MORE CONTROL FEARED

The administration fears that rapid increases in these rates might lead Congress to impose mandatory controls on interest rates, and might undermine support for wage and price controls.

The new 6½ percent prime rate is the highest since January, 1971. The rate dropped to 4½ percent in early 1972, then began rising last March as the Federal Reserve started tightening credit. The increase from 6 to 6½ percent occurred last month.

Manufacturers Hanover said today it is trimming its rate to 6½ percent "for the time being." The bank said it will "look forward as a matter of some urgency to the formulation by the (CID) of an effective version of its dual rate proposal to help relieve the aggravated condition of money and credit markets."

[From American Banker, Mar. 26, 1973]

POLITICS MUST BE WEIGHED IN PRIME MOVES, BURNS TOLD BANKERS

(By Ben Weberman)

NEW YORK.—Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Committee on Interest and Dividends and the Federal Reserve Board, acknowledged when he met with commercial bankers late last week that it is painful and disturbing for commercial banks to hold down the prime lending rate, but he insisted that it is necessary for them to assume that burden in order to avoid Congressional imposition of ceilings on interest rates.

Thus, he placed the context of the discussion primarily in political terms and warned that adherence to economic analysis and adjustment to market forces without concern for politics would bring consequences that could well obliterate operation of the free market in banking.

Under these conditions, he set down no guidelines to inform bankers exactly which level of prime rate would be acceptable at any particular time. The main thrust of the meetings last week among CID staff, Mr. Burns' staffs and executive officers was to discuss conditions under which it would be possible to increase the prime lending rate.

Conflict between two main forces precipitated the confrontation over plans by the \$13.9 billion-deposit Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. and seven other banks to raise the prime rate to 6¾ percent from the 6¼ percent level established Feb. 26; how to eliminate distortions in the money market which accounted for an exceptionally rapid rise in short-term interest rates since bank loans began rising sharply in early February, and how to do so without bringing down the

wrath of Congressmen who want to impose ceilings on interest rates.

The Congressional temper was demonstrated last Tuesday when a proposal by Sen. Thomas J. McIntyre, D., N.H., to amend the Economic Stabilization Act by freezing interest rates at the highest point during the 30 days up to March 16 was defeated by the narrow margin of 41 in favor and 45 against. Mr. Burns cited this to bankers last week as an example of the political danger they were courting.

By the close of business Friday, the prime rate situation was thoroughly confused. Among the eight banks which had announced an increase in the prime initially, four remained at the 6¼ percent level they had originally established, and four shaved part of the increase and moved down to 6½ percent.

All agreed to hold unchanged the rates charged to small businesses, along with those for consumer installment and mortgage loans.

Remaining at 6¾ percent were Manufacturers Hanover Trust, the \$3.4 billion-deposit First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co., the \$3.4 billion-deposit Franklin National Bank, and the \$785 million-deposit Southern California First National Bank, San Diego.

Retreating to 6½ percent were the \$4.8 billion-deposit Marine Midland Bank-New York, the \$9.6 billion-deposit Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., the \$2.7 billion-deposit Republic National Bank, Dallas, and the \$4.6 billion-deposit First National Bank, Boston.

In addition, the \$12.5 billion-deposit Chemical Bank, New York, announced an increase in its prime lending rate to 6¾ percent Friday, coupling this with a statement which management believed conformed to the criteria set down by Mr. Burns in a press release accompanying the Feb. 23 go-ahead to the \$2.5 billion-deposit Girard Trust Bank, Philadelphia, permitting an increase to 6¼ percent from 6 percent. These criteria were repeated in the statement released last Thursday afternoon when the meeting with the group of seven banks terminated.

Chemical said that "in line with the suggestion of the CID that the banking community consider a dual prime rate structure, this increase will not apply with respect to smaller businesses which are not contractually tied to the prime. On the loans to small businesses, future policy will be to moderate the extent of any increases and such adjustments would be delayed. No changes are contemplated in home mortgage consumer lending rates. He believes this new overall lending policy will help assure availability of credit to small businesses and consumers."

But Chemical soon received a telegraphed office at 2:30 p.m. Monday, bringing complete invitation from Mr. Burns to appear at his fact-finding information on costs and warning them to be prepared to clarify policy with respect to loans to small businesses.

Later Friday afternoon, the \$24.9 billion-deposit Chase Manhattan Bank announced that it, too, would raise its rate to 6¾ percent for prime rate borrowers but coupled this announcement with an outline of a "graduated prime rate structure." And this touched off a telegraphic invitation to meet with Mr. Burns.

The bank said that under the new rate pattern, interest on loans at or tied to the prime in size up to \$500,000 would remain unchanged and linked to the present 6¼ percent rate. The charge for larger credits would go up to the 6¾ percent base.

Unlike Chemical and Chase, the \$2.4 billion-deposit Philadelphia National Bank, the \$7.4 billion-deposit Wells Fargo Bank, San Francisco, and the \$642.6 billion-deposit Commerce Bank of Kansas City, Mo., announced increases in their prime rates to only 6½ percent during the day. They received no summons from the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Virtually every bank which took prime rate

action stressed in its announcement that it would hold unchanged the rates charged to small businesses. These charges will remain—at least for the time being—at levels set when the prime was 6¼ percent, they explained.

But there was some confusion about the definition of a small business. "A corporation which earns \$500,000 in New York is small," one banker said, "but in my area, these are the giants."

One reference by Mr. Burns at his meeting on Thursday to loans of \$25,000 as typical of a small business need was derided by one banker who declared that such loans are hardly larger than consumer installment borrowings. . . .

THIRD HIGH SCHOOL CREDIT UNION OPEN IN CONNECTICUT

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on past occasions I have discussed with Members of this House two high school credit unions that were being operated at Fort Knox, Ky., and Natick, Mass. Now there is a third high school credit union which opened just recently in Norwalk, Conn.

The credit union was organized after the school system's mathematics courses were updated to contain a unit on credit unions. During the development of the course, school administrators felt that the students could set up and operate their own credit union.

A group headed by Mr. Malcolm Austin, supervisor of the mathematics department of the Norwalk Board of Education, obtained permission from the Connecticut State Bank Department to allow the United Credit Unions of Norwalk, a credit union that serves all of the board of education employees, to include all registered high school students in the city.

The United Credit Union will underwrite all expenses of the student credit union until it becomes self-supporting. While United will supply management assistance, it will stay for the most part in the background allowing the students to run the credit unions themselves. The students have already elected their own board of directors and named their credit and supervisory committees.

While the credit union in Connecticut is the third student credit union in the country, it is the first student credit union to cover more than one school. In addition to Norwalk High School, the credit union covers students at Brien McMahon High School and the Center for Vocational Arts, Norwalk's two other high schools.

Not only will the credit union enable students to better understand our monetary system and to gain a firsthand look at how financial institutions are operated, but the credit union will also mean that the student can establish a credit rating while he is in school, and after he graduates, he can use that credit rating to good advantage.

It is, indeed, encouraging to see another student credit union in operation and I hope that in future months additional credit unions will begin operations throughout the country. As I have stated in earlier discussions of the student

credit union in every school system in the country.

ENERGY POLICY BLUEPRINT

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Oil Daily an article indicating that the General Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association had produced a comprehensive position paper regarding the Nation's energy problems.

The report was prepared over a 2-year period during which time Nick Wheless of Shreveport, La. was president of the association. Without having read the report itself—although I will do so—I can tell you that it is a thorough and definitive job if Nick Wheless had anything to do with it. Nick is a farsighted individual who possesses as much expertise in his field as anyone I know. He has long been recognized as a leader in the oil and gas industry by his peers.

According to the Oil Daily article, the report outlined several recommendations to the current problem, which, I feel, have merit. Specifically, it urged the Federal Government to honor all bids at offshore leases sales which meet minimum, preannounced standards. In addition, it recommended that future import programs should be directed at improving increased domestic producing and refining capacity.

As one who is particularly concerned with finding solutions to the current energy problems, I noted with interest the statement from the report that "there is no justification for direct government participation in oil and gas exploration, drilling or development operation," as long as private enterprise is encouraged to do so on its own.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article which appeared in the Oil Daily for February 19, 1973 at this point:

ENERGY POLICY BLUEPRINT

(By Billy G. Thompson, editor, the Oil Daily)

Houston.—The General Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association has produced a position paper which should be a boon to industry and government, alike, as they grapple with the petroleum imports issue and the overall U.S. energy problem.

Adopted last week at the annual meeting of the Mid-Continent of directors, the "statement on national energy and petroleum imports policy" reflects the views of leading independent and major producers of oil and gas. Even so, it takes cognizance of the roles and woes of other segments of the domestic petroleum industry to the extent that they can be comfortable in lending endorsements.

Two years in the making, the Mid-Continent document traces broad guidelines within which industry, legislators and regulators can advance without difficulty toward an early and meaningful national energy policy.

The position paper deals with economic and political considerations, oil and gas imports, ecological issues, energy resources on public lands, and research and development activities aimed at bettering the U.S. energy base.

In numerous instances, the Mid-Continent paper is similar or embraces positions taken by other oil industry organizations in these areas. But, it appears to move deeper

and/or broader—oftentimes with a sharper thrust—to position.

In the section on oil and gas imports, for example, the association declared:

"Without a strong domestic petroleum producing and refining industry, the United States would be at the mercy of foreign cartels. These cartels would be in a position to raise oil prices even more rapidly than they are already being raised today."

Mid-Continent supported the mandatory oil import program as an instrument needed for national security. But the association found security needs to extend beyond military requirements to include sufficient oil supplies to sustain economic growth, provide essential civilian demands and to meet the need of industry.

Mid-Continent urged retention of quantity-restriction imports controls but it steered away from "peril-point" levels, saying, "any import level which is established should be designed to provide additional incentives for domestic energy production."

Elsewhere in the imports section, the association urged:

—Development of contingency plans to cope with emergencies resulting from import supply interruptions. Such plans should include a security storage program backed up by an emergency rationing system.

—Origins and destinations of imports should be as diverse as possible. Regional preferences should be contingent upon a clearly defined advantage to the U.S.

"To the extent that additional imports, such as LNG, are required, special attention should be given to diversifying the sources of these supplemental supplies and the destinations within the U.S. to which such supplies are to be delivered." Mid-Continent said. "Where petroleum feedstocks, such as naphtha or LPG, are required to produce substitute natural gas, these feedstocks should be refined in the U.S. to the maximum extent possible to avoid exporting domestic refining capacity."

—Future changes in the imports program should be aimed at improving the security of U.S. petroleum supply by promoting increased domestic producing and refining capacity. To this end, Mid-Continent said, "changes should include reducing the percent of total imports represented by products and unfinished oils, and placing increased emphasis on imports of crude oil, condensate and gas liquids."

On ecological considerations in developing an energy policy, the association urged "sensible long-range goals for environmental quality with regard both for the protection of public health and welfare and for society's need for increased production and consumption of energy resources."

Emphasizing that much of the U.S. energy resources is situated on publicly owned land, the association urged continuation of oil, gas and other mineral exploration and development in those areas "under the sound and long-standing principle of multiple use."

Mid-Continent called for larger and more frequent sales of outer continental shelf leases. "There should be a sufficient number of lease sales each year to support an annual leasing program of 3-5 million acres per year," the association said.

Mid-Continent found administration of the National Environmental Protection Act has delayed, beyond legislative intent, development of offshore petroleum provinces.

The association urged the federal government to honor all bids at offshore leases sales which meet minimum, preannounced standards.

"The government's recent practice of rejecting bids because they did not equal a figure held in secret, after disclosing the operator's evaluations, is discriminatory and prejudicial toward the bidders and could destroy their competitive position in future bidding," Mid-Continent asserted.

The current practice of awarding five-year leases in frontier and difficult operating areas may not be adequate, said the association in proposing longer leasing terms where difficulty of operations warrants.

Mid-Continent called on Washington to revise an announced position under which the U.S. would renounce all rights to seabed resources beyond 200 meters water depth.

Overall, Mid-Continent maintained, "there is no justification for direct government participation in oil and gas exploration, drilling or development operation," if an economic and political climate that encourages private enterprise prevails.

Preparation of the Mid-Continent position paper spanned the two-year tenure of N.H. Wheless Jr. of Shreveport, La., as president of the association. It is a sharp reflection of the philosophies of Wheless and many other independent operator-producers who stand tall in the domestic petroleum industry, even among the major companies.

The Mid-Continent paper, by almost any measure, is an excellent blueprint for the Congress and the White House to use in hammering out a national policy that will lift the U.S. from a wilderness of "vague objectives, fuzzy programs and policies, and the cumbersome machinery dealing with the nation's growing energy problems," as Wheless described the situation last week.

WALTER LIPPMANN AT 83

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, a most thought-provoking article appeared in Sunday's Washington Post, which I would like to call to your attention. If you missed it, you will have a chance to see it in the RECORD, as I will include it following my remarks.

The article consists of an interview with the renowned political writer, Walter Lippmann, who at age 83 has some different ideas about society and Government than he has had at some times in the past.

Although I certainly do not agree with everything Mr. Lippmann has to say, there is a good deal that I do agree with.

Mr. Lippmann maintains that attempting—as the Government has—to do everything for everyone has historically proven to be an incorrect course to follow.

To attempt to improve society, Lippmann says, is the desirable and humane thing to do; however, he maintains that to attempt to "perfect an imperfectable society," as some from the new liberalism camp would do, is a mistake. Man cannot be perfected by changing his environment.

It's not possible by government action or any other action I know to create a perfect environment that will make a perfect man.

The fallacy lies in "the belief in human perfectibility through Government action." The rejection of the radical ideas of the new left in the 1972 Presidential election was to be expected.

His interviewer, with reference to Lippmann's professed conservatism, queried, "It is effective to deal with the symptoms of poverty, for example rather than the causes?" Lippmann's reply deserves consideration: "Can anybody know what the causes are? There are many causes: laziness, wastefulness.

Those are traits inherent in human beings. Some make for poverty and some make for wealth."

According to Mr. Lippmann, part of the myth of the perfectability of man is that he can solve everything and that Government can provide solutions to all of our society's problems, that we in Government can answer all the questions and remedy all of the ills, and that everything will be taken care of if we can just spend more and more of the taxpayers' money. Mr. Lippmann terms this nonsense as "the American myth." In a word, Lippmann cuts out the heart of the new left philosophy.

We in the Congress cannot provide a panacea for every problem that confronts us. And I think that it would be refreshing, indeed, if more political leaders admitted as much.

I cannot agree with Mr. Lippmann's view that parliamentary democracy is a "doubtful experiment" that will become increasingly unworkable as the population continues to grow. Representative government is the hope of our civilization.

It is an interesting volte-face from Mr. Lippmann's early years as a political writer when he did espouse some of the same views as those he now criticizes. Nevertheless, coming from Walter Lippmann, it is as refreshing as a breath of fresh spring air.

WALTER LIPPMANN at 83: AN INTERVIEW WITH RONALD STEEL

Q: Nixon's been President for over four years. How would you assess his performance?

A: His role in American history has been that of the man who had to liquidate, defuse, deflate the exaggerations of the romantic period of American imperialism and American inflation. Inflation of promises, inflation of hopes, the Great Society, American supremacy—all that had to be deflated because it was all beyond our power and beyond the nature of things. His role has been to do that. I think on the whole he's done pretty well at it.

Q: Aside from his prolongation of the Vietnam war, which you've criticized, how do you feel about his domestic policies?

A: He will do anything he thinks is expedient.

Q: Is that necessarily a bad thing?

A: No, it isn't. He's a Keynesian when it suits him and he isn't when it doesn't suit him. That's the way public men have to act.

A: You see him as responsive to public mood?

A: He's very cunning.

Q: So you would give him rather high marks?

A: Yes. He has played a very disagreeable role, but a role imposed upon him by historical necessity.

Q: Do you look on Nixon's crushing defeat of McGovern as merely a personal victory, or as something deeper—a repudiation of the philosophy of the New Deal and of the Great Society?

A: My feeling is that what happened in the Nixon-McGovern election is what happens in all elections of advanced modern industrial societies when the basic policy of the Jacobin or Rousseauistic philosophy is repudiated. By that I mean the belief that man is essentially good and can be made perfect by making the environment perfect, and that the environment can be made perfect by taxing the mass of people to spend money for improving it. Modern society won't accept that philosophy and it is usually repudiated. Sometimes the repudiation takes the form of fascism, but

this rejection is morally and intellectually the equivalent of it, without some of the ugly features of fascism.

Q: What do you mean by the "moral equivalent" of fascism?

A: The equivalent of fascism in my view is the repudiation by the society, by the masses of people of the whole Rousseauistic belief in man's inherent goodness and perfectability. The mechanics of the repudiation is another matter. Whether the society takes the form of a dictatorship or a parliamentary system is a secondary question to what is being repudiated.

Q: Were these ideas repudiated because they were too ambitious or because they represented something incapable of achievement?

A: I think they represent something that is incapable of being achieved in human society. They are philosophically and morally untrue. Man is not naturally good, nor is his nature perfectable by economic means. The Jacobin philosophy is being repudiated in every advanced society because it involves attempting to do by taxation and appropriation things not possible to do. It's not possible by government action or any other action I know to create a perfect environment that will make a perfect man.

Q: Do you believe that those policies did in fact fail?

A: I don't think every detail of those policies, every reform, failed. But the idea that motivated them has failed.

Q: If the idea has been repudiated then what happens to the effort to achieve social change through government action? Is that repudiated too?

A: It goes on, but there are a lot of errors that have been discarded in the course of human history, and this is one of them.

Q: Do you think the effort to achieve any kind of social change through the government is undesirable?

A: Certainly it's desirable. It's not the effort to achieve reforms that's wrong, but the inner ideological or philosophical content of these particular efforts. This is where the fallacy lies—the belief in human perfectability through government action.

Q: Did McGovern represent this philosophy?

A: Yes. McGovern believed in all the corollaries that go with this philosophy and he espoused any one of them that seemed to him promising. In this election, the people themselves showed that they won't have it. This is a philosophy that has been more or less prevalent in the Western world since the 18th Century. People have fallen for it for generations. But now it is being repudiated almost everywhere. Sooner or later it always gets repudiated.

Q: How would you distinguish what you all call Jacobinism from the kind of liberalism represented by Lyndon Johnson?

A: The difference is that liberalism is a much more measured form of human improvement. It neither claims nor seeks the exaggerated results claimed by Rousseauism and Jacobinism. It regards man as improvable but not perfectable; it takes a much more modest view of what mortal man is capable of doing.

Q: Were the goals of the New Deal and the Great Society rooted in this Rousseauistic or Jacobin approach?

A: Yes. We have been in the grip of this general view of the nature of society at least since Woodrow Wilson.

Q: If this philosophy has been repudiated, does this mean there will be less government intervention in the lives of the people?

A: No, I wouldn't say it would mean less intervention, but the difference between perfectability and improbability is a very big one. The belief in government as the agent of perfectability is what has been repudiated. People have rejected the idea that you can use the government—by controlling it, by

getting the majority or physically seizing it—to do what I regard as what history has now shown to be impossible. Sometimes this repudiation can take the form of fascism. But it didn't here. Instead it took the form of Nixon Republicanism. But a corruption of that, or a more extreme form of it, could lead to fascism, just as fascism can lead to Nazism. The Jacobin-Rousseauistic view of society and human nature will lead to the most dangerous forms of fascism or even Nazism if it is not brought under control.

Q: So this administration should be welcomed by liberals because it's headed off a reaction that could have degenerated into fascism?

A: I supported Nixon in '68 and I preferred him vastly to McGovern in '72. In that sense, yes. That doesn't mean I'm enthusiastically pro-Nixon. What he's done is historical: Nixon has performed a service that historically had to be performed if American society was not to be blown up or disintegrate or crumble.

Q: Nixon has certainly appealed to self-reliance and attacked the social welfare programs of the past four years. Won't this lead to a cynical neglect of the poor, the disadvantaged and the abandoned?

A: I thought there was no hope for those abandoned, if you call them that, members of society in those programs. These programs had been greatly excessive, as occurs in every advanced society. But it was much exacerbated in our society because actually taking from those who had really meant taking from whites to give to blacks. That was a cause of deep division and bad feeling in this country.

Q: But if the government does not play a big role, what hope is there for the disadvantaged?

A: I'm not accepting Nixon's philosophy. But no government can bring people up. They have to achieve it themselves. The belief that the government can do it is one of the great illusions of our time.

Q: In the kind of society we have, can the disadvantaged achieve economic and social equality?

A: I don't know. Nobody knows enough now to say yes or no to that question. There are all kinds of hidden assumptions we don't know the answers to.

Q: Being opposed to what you call Rousseauian Jacobinism, do you consider yourself a conservative?

A: I am a conservative; I think I always have been. But that doesn't mean that I'm a conservative who agrees with William Buckley.

Q: What kind of conservative are you?

A: I never joined Barry Goldwater or anybody like that. I don't consider myself that kind. I hope and trust I am a conservative in the line of Edmund Burke. I believe in certain fundamental things in philosophy and constitutional law which are conservative as against the Jacobins.

Q: One of the definitions of conservatism is a belief in a hierarchical traditional society. Do you believe in that?

A: Well, I believe in what we used to call mellorism. You can make things better, but you can't make them perfect.

Q: Is it effective to deal with the symptoms of poverty, for example, rather than the causes?

A: Can anybody know what the causes are? There are many causes: laziness, wastefulness. Those are traits inherent in human beings. Some make for poverty and some make for wealth.

Q: The liberal would say we can isolate and eradicate the causes of poverty.

A: Does he know them? If he thinks he does, he's mistaken.

Q: Is this rejection of the Rousseauian philosophy also a repudiation of the goal of social equality and progress?

A: Social equality, if you carry it far

enough, is an absurdity. That doesn't mean that you have to be in favor of social privilege or inequality.

Q. I suppose the essence of Rousseau's thought is that man is corrupted by his environment and by social conditions—"Man is born free but he is everywhere in chains." It's this conception you consider false?

A. Yes, if you like, that's one thing.

Q. If you reject Rousseau's argument that man is born free, but is enchained by unjust laws, how do you achieve equality and justice?

A. Look, man isn't born everywhere free and equal. It's impossible that he should be born that way. The Rousseau-Jacobin doctrine was that he could be perfected by changing his environment.

Q. If you reject this, isn't the alternative simply to ride along with the status quo?

A. I don't think so. I don't think it does at all. It just makes you work very hard. You have to do things specifically and practically and in accordance with the possibilities of man. I read the other day a quotation from a Chinese which seems to me to sum up that Jacobin view. He said, "On television we watched the men the Americans put on the moon. We are going to be the first to put a new man on earth." That, I think, is exactly the Jacobin revolutionary philosophy.

Q. I suppose the idea that man is not perfectable is based on the belief in original sin. Do you believe in original sin?

A. In that sense, yes.

Q. Government is playing a much greater role in the lives of its citizens. Do you see this as irreversible?

A. Yes, I do. We're a mass society and a great many of our troubles and evils come from that. There are too many people alive in order to govern, control them and inform them. You have to have things that you wouldn't have dreamt about if you had a smaller population.

Q. So even though the people have rejected the idea of the government as an agent of perfectability, they've accepted that the government must play a powerful role in their lives?

A. We've accepted it, but we're very rebellious about it, too. I mean people hate filling out all the forms—I know we do in this house—and we have to employ lawyers and bank people and so on to fill out forms for us and tell us what they mean. That's a burden. There are a lot of people who have just resigned themselves, taken themselves out of what we would call the welfare state. They don't fill out the forms, they just don't live in it.

Q. As a result of this growing governmental role, do you see a danger of authoritarianism and repression?

A. There's always a tendency of the governing power to be repressive if it can be. That has to be resisted.

Q. What are the best means of resisting? Through the courts?

A. The role of people is crucial. We resisted Joe McCarthy in the 1950s by denouncing him. McCarthy didn't have enough power to arrest us, those of us who did denounce him, and so we revealed him for what he was. Finally a lot of people got angry with him.

Q. Do you see the government's prosecution of Daniel Ellsberg as an act of repression or intimidation?

A. No, I don't think it's an effort to do that. I think public papers which are classified and regarded as secret should not be stolen or revealed by anybody who is not willing to pay the price of doing it. It's the case of the Boston Tea Party: If the king's tea is there and you dump it in the harbor, then you expect to pay the penalty of dumping it in the harbor. One thing I like about Ellsberg is that he doesn't deny that he will take the penalty.

Q. If there's a higher loyalty than the law itself should those with the courage to defy it be applauded?

A: I think it was a good thing to reveal the Pentagon Papers because classification has become a vicious habit which needs to be resisted. But that doesn't mean that every paper should be stolen or revealed. The penalty for doing that must be enough to deter anybody from doing it frivolously or easily.

Q: There's a great controversy now about executive privilege and whether members of the President's personal staff and his Cabinet should be obliged to testify before Congress. Do you feel the President is abusing this prerogative?

A: While there obviously has to be some kind of executive privilege, it must be used with the utmost discretion and restraint. Our system of government will simply not work if any principle is pushed to an extreme. There must be respect for the rules on the part of everybody—the President, the Congress, the courts. The men who wrote the Constitution were rational gentlemen. They knew the system they were devising could not work unless the rules were respected. Their primary assumption was that the kind of people who were running the government would play by the rules. If the President refuses to do this, nothing works and you don't have our constitutional system. The President of the United States is actually a king, with all the powers and all the limitations inherent in a king. What is important is that there be respect for the unwritten law, which is an important part of the American constitutional system.

Q: It's been said that one of the effects of the Vietnam war has been the questioning of all forms of authority—the family, state, religion. Do you think this is happening?

A: I don't think it's the result of the Vietnam war. The breakdown of forms of authority is a much deeper and wider process in modern history than the Vietnam war. I wrote a book back in the beginning of the century about the dissolution of the ancestral order. Clearly, the ancestral order of the family, for instance, has been much more affected by the contraceptive pill than it has by anybody's speeches or by the war.

Q: Is this breakup of the ancestral order dangerous?

A: Well, yes. It's dangerous in the sense that the fabric of society is of a cellular structure, of families related to each other in tribes and nations. Of course the destruction of that threatens to produce the chaos of modern times.

Q: You see this as leading to authoritarianism or fascism?

A: It's absolutely one of the things that will occur. Yes, there'll be all kinds of repression.

Q: It is said that we live in an age of permissiveness in which all the old values pretty much have been destroyed, including the belief in patriotism and the state. Can people live with that kind of uncertainty in their lives without any focal point of attachment?

A: I think it's a good question, but there's no easy answer to it. Whether people can live without an organized life around authority and the belief in something is a question that the modern age has been experimenting with, and hasn't solved.

Q: I suppose it's in periods like this that people have created new religions in the past.

A: When they've been lucky.

Q: How do you feel about the future of parliamentary democracy?

A: I think it's increasing unworkable mechanically with the growth of population. Aristotle said long ago that there's a certain size a good city should have so that the human eye could see its limits. There is a limit which we have passed in these mass democracies. Societies are not capable of governing themselves if they're that crowded and that numerous.

Q: Then you look at parliamentary democracy as . . .

A: As a doubtful experiment.

Q: And a parenthesis in history perhaps?

A: Parliamentary democracy was the product of a much simpler, less numerous, stratified society, class system. Whether it can be applied to these massive modern democracies, I don't know. It's very doubtful.

Q: What do you see as the alternative?

A: I don't think anybody can see an alternative. I certainly haven't got a panacea for it. That's a very American question you asked. I'll tell you what: Part of this illusion of what I call Jacobinism for short is that there's a remedy for every evil and a solution for every problem. A lot of things are not solvable.

Q: If they're not solvable, what attitude can we take toward these problems—stoicism?

A: Stoicism, resignation, acceptance. Part of the myth of the perfectability of man is that he can solve everything.

Q: If we're forced to live in a world where we recognize that problems can't necessarily be solved and also that America may not have anything very special to give to the world, we're in for a very difficult process of adjustment. Isn't the basis of our society that we can create the future?

A: It is the American myth.

Q: Other societies have something to fall back on; the continuity of their history, a religion, a strong social structure. We have nothing like that.

A: No, and we have this feeling—this comes from the Puritans—that we are a chosen people with a mandate from God Himself to make a perfect world for ourselves and for everybody else. Of course that is a terrible myth.

Q: There's been a great concern over the freedom of the press recently—the right of newsmen to protect their sources, the effort of the government to intimidate the media. You've been concerned with this problem throughout your career. Do you think there is a serious threat to freedom of the press?

A: I think that very often troubles of the press come from a commercialized desire to get scoops, to be the first to print the news. These "sources" very often are places to get tips of what's going to happen. The desire of newspapers to be the first to print particular information is corrupting to the whole journalistic process. In the journalistic world I grew up in, it wasn't a question of law whether you had to divulge your sources. It was a question of whether the reporter had the guts to refuse to reveal where he got the information, whether he was willing to go to prison if necessary. That was regarded as the elementary code of a newspaper man. The reverse of that was—and this was always my practice—when someone told me something in confidence, I didn't pass it on to the reporters so we could get a scoop. I had a relationship with the man I was interviewing and I didn't want to print that.

Q: Does the press have a responsibility to publish what it thinks is newsworthy at whatever cost?

A: I wouldn't make a generalization. I think raw news, raw fact, is not intelligible anyway to the public, and has to be explained. The explanation is as important as the fact itself. The duty of the press is to put forth no raw news but explained news.

Q: Does the press have a responsibility to the government to keep secrets, even if it thinks the government is doing something wrong—as in the Bay of Pigs or the Pentagon Papers?

A: I think that's a matter of conscience. I would decide only in specific cases.

Q: You've known many officials during your career. What is the proper relationship between reporters and government officials?

A: I certainly have. I feel that newspapermen cannot be the personal or intimate friends of very powerful people. They just can't. It won't work. They'll either end in corruption of the press or a quarrel, and I've

said that before. You cannot be in the confidence of a king.

Q: There is a lot of talk now about the press abusing its privileges and of government restraints on the press. Should the press monitor itself through a public commission, as a way of preventing the government from interfering?

A: The press should be responsibly edited. But it shouldn't edit itself by law, decree or fiat or anything like that. Commissions to monitor the press and things like that are artificial anyway. They never work.

Q: You have probably been the most successful political journalist we've ever had in this country. But if you had it to do over again would you have chosen a different kind of life?

A: Had I been gifted to do it—and I wish I had—I would like to have been a mathematician.

Q: Why?

A: I would have liked that kind of life. The precision, the elegance . . . there's something about it that attracts me esthetically.

Q: Did you consider the writing of books or your journalism more important?

A: I considered writing books the more important thing. I always viewed journalism as the place where I accumulated facts and information that I used for my books. Being a journalist was rather like the doctor, you know, who has to go and practice.

Q: Forty years ago you launched a new kind of column—serious political analysis—that had never been done before. But with the growth of TV and news magazines, do you think the political column still plays an important role today?

A: I think it plays an important role whether or not it's signed and presented as a column. The columnist is really a specialist writing editorials. The column is an editorial, and an editorial really should be an explanation of a fact. A good editorial is something which makes a fact much clearer.

Q: Are the newspapers performing that task adequately today?

A: No, but it's a very difficult task to perform.

PHASE II CONTROLS NEVER REALLY EFFECTIVE

(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, phase II of the control program in respect to rents never was really effective. In my area rents were enormously increased in many instances, sometimes 30 to 40 percent. There were many tragic instances of people who were turned out of their apartments because of rent increases they could not pay. Then came the complete lifting of rent controls July 11 by the President's directive. Rents again took a surge upward in countless places, often imposed upon the very poor, so that there is a tragic need today for effective rent controls to protect the people of this country who rent against excessive charges by money-hungry landlords. At least we should go back to, and freeze, the rents in effect January 11 until a system of controls can be reestablished that will give a fair measure of protection to the people who have to rent living facilities in this country.

I want to commend the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman, and the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee for the hearings they began Monday of this week on the general subject of the extension of the au-

thority to the President to impose controls upon the critical elements of the economy and especially for the consideration given by the committee for the necessity of giving some relief to the people who rent. From Miami two very able spokesmen for the renting population of our area appeared before the committee, one of whom was Alan Becker, distinguished member of the Florida House of Representatives, able attorney, and counsel for the Tenants Association of Florida, Inc., and the Florida Coalition of Mobile Home Owners. These two consumer-oriented tenant organizations have a combined south Florida membership of over 15,000 people. Mr. Becker is an able and aggressive attorney fighting for the rights of people who rent in the south Florida area against excessive charges by landlords. He presented in his statement glaring instances of such excessive charges.

Other Members of the House will, I am sure, find conditions similar to those Mr. Becker describes in their districts and will, I hope, join in the fight to give relief from excessive rents to the people in this country who have to rent. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Becker's statement and exhibits in the Record following these remarks:

STATEMENT BY MR. ALAN BECKER

FLORIDA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tallahassee, Fla., March 26, 1973.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to urge the mandatory reimposition of controls on rent.

Over the past two years I have been the attorney for the Tenants' Association of Florida and the Florida Coalition of Mobile Home Owners. These two consumer oriented tenant organizations have a combined South Florida membership in excess of 15,000 people. I am also an elected member of the House of Representatives of the Florida Legislature. In each capacity I have been deluged with the plaintiff cries of people now confronted with the seemingly endless escalation in the cost of rental housing. In Friday's Miami Herald, columnist Charles Whited reported that he had encountered many people who have to scrimp on food to pay the rent. As an emergency action the Miami Beach City Council last week passed an ordinance of doubtful constitutionality freezing rents for a 90 day period.

People are in trouble and are looking to this Congress for help. The abandonment of Phase II marked an unparalleled abandonment of the American people. We are all too well aware of what has happened since January 11th. I received a letter from a 76 year old lady which is typical. Living on her \$132 welfare check each month, her rent was \$100. The day after the President ended the freeze her rent was increased to \$120 a month leaving \$12 for her to live on. There are many such senior citizens in Florida. Their Social Security checks and meager income is continuously eroded by inflation. Then there is the example of a moderately luxurious apartment building whose rent range was from \$400 to \$600. On January 12th the range jumped to \$600 to \$900 per month.

The effect of such increases would obviously be disastrous to the preponderance of Florida retirees who, although in many cases are affluent in terms of net personal wealth, receive relatively small current incomes. The fears of the later years are certainly enough without adding the fear of living too long to afford a place to live.

Another group of citizens unique in their number of Florida are its almost one million residents of mobile homes. They consist

mostly of retirees and young couples just starting their lives together; all have limited means. They buy the mobile home and rent the lot it sits on. And their rents go up. From throughout the state we've heard reports of gauging beyond belief. A Miami mobile park immediately imposed a 20% increase. And the people asked for help. In Broward County one park raised the rent 57%, another 52%. These examples are not atypical.

Excessive increases in rent have plagued our South Florida Community in the last two months. Certainly Phase II controls were no model of efficient and fair stabilization of inflation. Enforcement was infrequent and inept. Complexity and loopholes allowed rent increases far in excess of wage increases. Those on the front lines in the battle against inflation thought the rent stabilization guidelines to be a meager governmental effort, hardly meaningful. But with the coming of Phase III every tenant was to learn just how bad things could be. In our area there has been a continuing rash of rent increases average over 30% for all types of accommodations.

What brought about these soaring rentals? South Florida leads the country in new housing construction but we cannot make a dent in the less than 1% vacancy rate for available housing, substandard dwellings included. According to the latest figures available Dade County Florida (which includes Miami and Miami Beach) has the second highest median rent in the country at \$122.00 per month. I don't think, however, that anyone here would live by choice in one of Miami's \$122 apartments. The highest rents in our nation are those of Broward County, Florida (including the cities of Hallendale, Hollywood and Ft. Lauderdale) just to the north. In Dade County, 41% of the population overpays for rent (over-payment being defined as more than 25% of income for rent). In my district of over 350,000 people the figure is higher with more than 50% of the population overpaying for their housing, as much as two thirds of their income among the 79% of the people on Miami Beach who are over 60 years of age.

In a market like this it is obvious that no voluntary controls are going to work. Greed and opportunity for exploitation will not subside for the sake of a healthy economy. Only reimposition of the Phase II controls will provide some small measure of relief. I think this Committee and Congress realize that what is needed is not only extended authority for the President to control inflation but a Congressional mandate to stabilize the most significant economic factor in the life of most Americans, the cost of housing.

In establishing effective guidelines for the regulation of rents I would suggest that the guidelines existing under Phase II were not unreasonable. If properly and diligently enforced and interpreted they would undoubtedly effectuate the goal of temporary control leading to a more permanent stabilization. I would only caution against rigidity in the promulgation of regulations. Specifically, I have in mind the definition of so-called "luxury" apartments. In Tallahassee last week I heard that defined as rental units in excess of \$200 monthly rental. In Dade County that amount would provide barely adequate shelter. The Miami Herald column I referred to earlier told of a lady who pays \$2,400 a year for a one room efficiency that was \$1,600 a few years ago. The room includes just bedding and dishes. I've seen many of these small, old apartments. They have no heat or air conditioning and more than their share of dirt. But the rents are high and getting higher.

I am, therefore, asking you as the ultimate representatives of the people for help. We are now told by some that it is patriotic not to eat meat. Without Congressional relief—and fast—there will soon be no patriotic place

to live. It is imperative that the Congress extends controls on the economy and impose controls on rent without delay.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 7, 1973.

DEAR MR. BECKER: I am a widow 76 years old having had my second stroke and a nervous collapse recently. I am barely existing on aid to the aged (\$132.00 monthly) I have been living in this same apartment (No. 10) for 18½ years as of Feb. 1. When I came here in 1954 my rent was \$40.00 then it went to \$45 after 13 years. When the present landlord, Richard Cappeletti took over Feb. 1st, 1970 he raised my rent from \$45 to \$85 and then to \$100. Now he has given me notice as of March 1 my rent will be \$120.00 which will leave me \$12 to exist on. As you know, this is utterly impossible.

I trust you will be able to assist me. Thanking you: I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARGARET A. TEEPLE.

P.S.—I get no social security.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 3, 1973.

Representative ALAN BECKER.

DEAR SIR: All I want you to know is that since our dear President lifted the Rent Control he left the control to the Land Lords and they went to town fast.

I am at Little Farms Mobile Ct. and I was raised \$10.00 per mo. I own a 10 x 45 trailer and I paid \$70.00 per mo. and next mo. it will be \$80 per mo. What is this all about and where do we go from here. I am a senior citizen and is there no respect for us.

Thank you,

CHARLES ZARRIELLO.

[From the Daily Sun Reporter, Feb. 18, 1973]

DADE LEGISLATORS HEAR RENT, HOUSING ILLS
(By Walter Dozier)

Dade legislators conducting a forum on housing and landlord-tenant ills Friday heard calls for either rent control or more public housing based on a claim that nearly half the county's residents pay more than 50 per cent of their income in rent.

The meeting, called by Dade State Sen. Jack Gordon, took place in the county commission chambers and included a panel of Gordon, Senators George Firestone and Ken Meyer along with Representatives Alan Becker, Barry Kutun, Marshall Harris and Bill Lockwood. Athalie Range, former director of the state Department of Community Affairs, also attended.

George Reed of Dade County "Little HUD" (federally-funded housing and urban development) told the lawmakers, "we have 64,818 people in this county waiting for public housing."

"Some on that list have been there for over a year and some are elderly," Reed said.

He said that in light of the recent federal freeze on funds for low-income housing, state legislators should consider pressuring Washington into lifting the freeze or "help us with state funding."

Rep. Harris told the panel and audience that, "the state just doesn't have the money to finance public housing like this."

"There's a lot more opposition to housing on the state level than many people realize," he said.

Mrs. Range echoed Harris on that point. "Since we are dealing with a highly prejudiced legislature, and I say that without reservation, we just aren't going to get much public housing," she told the group.

The lawmakers were then confronted with an alternative in rent control by a legal services attorney and spokesmen from local tenant groups.

Legal Services attorney Howard Dixon told the lawmakers that between the current

sewer connection moratorium, a growing population and higher rents they should act.

"Here in Dade County tenants pay more rent out of their incomes than in any place in the country and that calls for action."

Dixon urged the panel to push the passage of an enabling act in Tallahassee that will give local governments the authority to institute emergency rent controls.

In 1969 the Florida Supreme Court ruled that without such an act, local governments cannot institute any form of rent control, regardless of the need.

Dixon pointed out that "if the state can't fund public housing, if the moratorium can't be lifted, the least you can do is give us this rent stabilization act."

He said it won't cost the state any money and added that if it wanted to the Dade delegation could get the bill passed.

Such a bill, in fact, has been filed by Becker and Rep. Gwen Cherry and has been assigned to the House Community Affairs Committee.

Lockward is a member of that committee and when asked about the chances of getting the enabling act passed, he said "it won't be easy."

"I'm afraid if we press on it too much they'll (legislators from northern and central Florida counties) try to throw out everything else on housing we want."

But Dixon and Eufala Frazier, of the Florida Tenants Association, said the problems of high rents, limited housing and low incomes are common throughout the state.

"Jacksonville, Tampa, Orlando—they got the same problems we do, so they're going to need this legislation too," Mrs. Frazier said.

[From the Miami News, Jan. 18, 1973]

HOLDING RENTS DOWN

Several local tenant organizations report that landlords are already knocking on tenants' doors for more money since President Nixon announced the end of rent controls.

Some sort of increase is probably justified in the face of higher maintenance costs. This assumes, however, that property owners will undertake necessary repairs, especially in the low income neighborhoods where landlords have a tendency to boost the rent and forget the maintenance.

Tenants have little recourse under Florida law, which makes no provision for placing rents in escrow until the property is brought up to minimum standards. One practice, also known as the rent strike, has been effective in cleaning up slum properties in other cities.

In the face of expected rent hikes, leases provide the only protection for tenants. But many tenants are not familiar with the legal terms of compliance in their leases. They can easily be intimidated into accepting a decrease in services or an increase in rent without offering resistance. (And in effect, a decrease in services or maintenance constitutes a rent increase.)

Tenant groups are talking about seeking court injunctions to prevent excessive rent hikes. But this process, as in most court cases, is long and expensive. By the time the courts can move, tenants are likely to find themselves in the street, the subjects of evictions.

Local rent controls have been declared illegal according to Florida's constitution. Yet increased pressures from tenants and tenant organizations in the last few years may give the Legislature the incentive to pass enabling legislation that would allow local governments to impose controls.

We hope local housing officials can deal with the compliance aspect while landlords work towards better tenant relations. Everyone would benefit if landlords resolved to provide decent living conditions and hold rents down.

RENT CONTROL URGENT

It is indeed appalling to read the latest edict of the President, the man who stated prior to election day in his order calling for a rent watch, that he would not tolerate any unconscionable rent gauging by property owners.

How in the name of common sense he can justify his words with his actions is something we must be shown. If the President is sincerely of the understanding that there will be no unusual rent increases, he is, I am afraid, in for a shock. I would indeed be pleasantly surprised and my faith in humanity will have been given a much needed boost, if no run-away increases begin to show up in our area, in fact in all of Dade County.

This action points up that much more how urgent it is that the state legislature give speedy approval to an enabling act as has been prefiled by Rep. Gwen Cherry. This act would authorize local government to determine the need for rent control in its own community.

I, for one, am strongly in favor of the county government giving this matter its immediate attention so that in the event the state legislature does grant the authority no time shall be unnecessarily lost. A city in this state is too small to effectively organize the force required and to budget such an enforcement agency.

I am urging all citizens to write to their respective legislators and demand that action be taken. It may be well that our esteemed governor consider the calling of a special session to meet this serious situation.

Unless our property owners meet this economic problem with compassion and fairness they may well create a mood which will result in a county-wide rent strike. As has been said: the best of wells runs dry.

LOUIS KROLL,

President, Miami Beach Retirees.

[From the Daily Sun-Reporter, Feb. 18, 1973]

HAS IT REALLY HAPPENED?

Was there a time when you had gone to bed with a free and clear mind; had a good night's sleep; awakened in the morning and in your newspaper you read an article which raised your eyebrows and you exclaimed, "has this really happened?"

This dilemma has probably happened to thousands and thousands of people who were shocked, disappointed, depressed and frustrated, because of one short sentence, "The President has decontrolled rents."

As one of those who became aware of the President's order, I certainly found myself muttering, "Is this a dream or is this true?" How could that happen? Only a week or so before the Jan. 11 order I, as president of the Tenants Association of Florida, had received bulletins from the Price Commission and from the Rent Advisory Board indicating their plans of increasing the force to compel compliance of the economic stabilization regulations.

Was it a joke when the administration issued a publication called "Rent Watch" in October of 1972, advising the senior citizens that their social security increase will be fully protected since they will monitor and spot check apartment buildings to be sure that landlords will not take advantage of the few extra dollars which the elderly will have to spend?

Maybe that extra dress for her; or maybe a few shirts for him; or maybe just a trip to Disney World on the bus; or maybe a trip to visit their daughter and see the grandchildren; it may take them a year to save these few dollars but they will have put it away.

Now that there is not protection for the tenant, some landlords have advised the social security recipient and those on fixed

incomes; your rent is being increased now that controls have been eliminated!

I wish I could ask our esteemed President, Why did you sell these people out? Why was it before your election, you indicated and promised, that under Phase II, all violators would be dealt with?

Mr. President Nixon, did you not in your heart know, that this was only a Political promise; as so many of our politicians have been doing for the past one-hundred years? Are we people still gullable?

Do these people who need places to live have to tread softly and must they still fear the wrath of their landlords? O! Mr. President Nixon, I have always said and you should agree, it is better to die on your feet than to live on your knees. I do not believe in militancy but if militancy achieves an objective, I am for it!

I am warning landlords; "your greed will be your downfall." We have just begun to fight and in my years on this earth I have never gone into a fight unless I know I can win and with the public being treated unfairly by these unscrupulous landlords they must join together.

People are human beings and we must have a feeling in our hearts that we cannot stand by and allow unfairness and inequities to continue. I wish to repeat that my message does not point the finger at every landlord, but from the stack of complaints that are being registered, there must be action, taken which will bring to light, who is responsible; and who is riding the crest of the wave of misery to the defenseless tenant!

SHEPARD W. DAVIS,
President, Tenants Association of Florida.

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 1, 1973]

TRAGEDY OF BEACH'S ELDERLY POOR

(By John Pennekamp)

At least 15 of the United States have smaller total populations than Dade County, yet each has a problem that is particularly highlighted here—in Miami Beach:

What to do about the elderly who are poverty-stricken or nearly so?

Miami Beach has situations that place it apart from all the others.

It is a top-ranked resort area.

Many of its property owners want to demolish buildings placed on their lands in the 1920s, with their thoughts now on high-rise, big-money developments.

It is a city that is divided between those who live with federal, state and local welfare help and those whose wealth is great. In between are those who get along comfortably.

And, even more spectacularly, there is an almost absolute division of the areas marking the living places of these residents.

Much has been made of a growing morals question involved in Miami Beach's situation where elderly couples, unmarried, live together. In that way each receives the maximum of public funds; if they were married, the total would be less.

In most instances the situation is simply a practical solution, but immorality is the critics' charge.

Some receive help from their children, or other relatives, who see this as a simple solution; it eliminates bother, which is one of the evils of old age.

Quite a few are in disagreement with their landlords, who try to eke all the income the traffic will bear and neglect their places in the hope of a city order to tear them down, thus opening the way with the help of zoning variations to bigger and more remunerative buildings.

Structure for structure, Miami Beach's so-called slum area bears little adverse comparison with areas of similar identification in Miami and other Florida cities, with New

York, Chicago, Seattle, and a hundred others throughout the country, with one exception:

The promise of real-estate value increase here is greater, and money has a way of wiping out other considerations: it produces some severe judgments.

We don't want the poor and the elderly in Miami Beach, says a public official, his eyes trained on the one room housing units, often closet-like, with toilet facilities "down the hall."

The judgment is raw and harsh, more so than intended, and could be better stated.

Obviously, many of the people living in Miami Beach's slums don't belong in one of the world's foremost resort cities. Miami Beach itself cannot condone the development, nor can it finance change.

Neither can the state or federal government, while there are millions of younger people who want to come to Miami Beach—for a look at least—but who may not be able to do so in their lifetimes.

The Federal government, supplemented by the state, has moved far in the direction of caring for the poor and elderly, but with Miami Beach there is the constant question:

It is a preferred property. Should the federal, or any other government or agency, move in, buy property and prepare it for the elderly and poor? If so, who is to get the favor of resort-city living for which thousands hanker?

I don't know the answers, do you? Remember all of the time that this is only one of the problems that are repeated with variations, not quite as bleak or serious as those of Miami Beach.

You don't solve it by giving the poor and often destitute nice-sounding names. Those you can't eat or sleep on, although they might add a little dignity.

Few want that kind of dignity. All appreciate that they have given an average lifetime of service to their country and its institutions. They only feel that luck has done them in.

Which is, of course, true.

TENANTS FILE CLASS ACTION OVER INCREASE IN RENTS

(By Pat Gurosky)

Tenants of a downtown Miami apartment building, claiming their landlord violated Phase Two rent controls, have filed a class-action suit against him.

They say the alleged violations resulted in rent increases of up to 60 per cent.

Residents of the Parkleigh Apartments, 530 Biscayne Blvd., have asked in the suit that Howard Garfinkle, owner of the building, award them three times the amount their rents were increased, retroactively.

Tenants Maria Llerena, Annina Deutsch and Joseph Verses are listed as plaintiffs along with all residents "similarly situated." There are about 234 residents in the 90-unit apartment house.

About 15 of them, including the three above, who signed leases during Phase Two of the federal economic stabilization plan last year, were notified Nov. 30 that their rents would go up Jan. 1.

Rent controls were lifted Jan. 11. The Parkleigh rent increases were later postponed until Feb. 1.

Apartment manager Phil Comoro said in a letter that the building was exempt from the Phase Two rent curbs because it qualified as a "rehabilitated dwelling."

The controls exempted buildings in which the cost of rehabilitation exceeded half the fair market value of the dwelling. About \$800,000 worth of improvements were to have been made in the Parkleigh by Nov. 30.

The tenants, however, claim that many of the improvements have not yet been made, and that despite some redecorating, service has gone down in the building since rents went up.

Phil Mendick, active in the Parkleigh Tenants Association, said that his \$136 efficiency apartment will cost him \$200 a month when his lease expires in May.

"Some whose leases have already run out had to move because they couldn't afford the increase," he said. "And others have been paying under protest."

The tenants in question had a rider attached to their leases listing the increases that would take place in the event the building qualified for the exemption.

TENANTS ASK NIXON TO CUT RENT RISES

(By William A. Elsen)

Representatives of 150 area tenant associations voted unanimously yesterday to ask President Nixon for an immediate rollback of rent increases, some of which have approached 50 per cent here.

The 250 persons attending a meeting of the Washington Area Federation of Tenant Associations also recommended that tenants resist rent increases but did not call solely for rent strikes.

The group passed unanimously six resolutions in a four-hour meeting called in reaction to rent increases made after the President abolished Phase II rent controls Jan. 11.

Voting came after Del. Walter E. Fauntroy (D-D.C.) addressed four workshop sessions during the meeting at All Souls' Church, 16th and Harvard Streets NW.

Fauntroy told the sessions that he will produce a draft of rent-control legislation "by this time next week" and invited area tenants to submit to his office specific information on their problems with landlords since the end of Phase II.

"Unless the people affected (by rent increases) scream," they're going to get hurt, Fauntroy said.

Fauntroy also revealed that he and six other area congressmen will meet Wednesday or Thursday with representatives of the Cost of Living Council to discuss the legislators' request last week for reinstitution of Phase II rent sanctions against landlords who retaliate against legal activities by tenants.

The congressional group also includes Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.), Sen. J. Glenn Beall (R-Md.), Rep. Marjorie S. Holt (R-Md.), Rep. Lawrence J. Hogan (R-Md.), Rep. Gilbert Gude (R-Md.) and Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.).

"Any time you get Mr. Broyhill with us, you know it's time to move," said Fauntroy, apparently referring to Broyhill's probusiness reputation.

Asked if his legislation could be enacted in time to help area tenants fight rent increases due March 1, Fauntroy said: "Time is a function of the political pressure you build. Once you get it started, it depends on the kind of pressure brought on various congressmen."

As Fauntroy began to answer a question on immediate return to Phase II controls, he stopped in midsentence to inquire: "Is the press here?" The press was, and Fauntroy told his questioner: "I just can't get into that now."

Fauntroy did express confidence that a forced rent rollback may come after this week's meeting with the Cost of Living Council. "This is a holding action," he said, "until we can push through some legislation."

The group later passed a resolution supporting a bill already introduced by Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) who called for a return to Phase II guidelines which limited rent increases to 2½ per cent.

The group approved three methods of tenant resistance—payment of the increase with a check saying "Paid under protest," initiation of partial rent strikes by placing the amount of rent increase in an escrow

account each month or initiation of total rent strikes by placing the entire rent due in an escrow account.

THE 26TH REPORT TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the 26th report to Congress which was recently issued by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information is a remarkable document in two respects. In the first place, it sums up the experience that this Government has had with overseas information and cultural programs for the past 25 years as seen through the eyes of an outside, independent advisory commission of five private citizens who are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for 3-year terms.

As the House knows, together with my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee I tried for 5 years to disentangle the various overlapping strands and bureaus on the executive side which dealt with the ideological aspects of the cold war. The hearings that we held and the reports that were issued are matters of record but the progress that has been made on the executive side as a result of these hearings has been slim.

The value of the present report lies in its analysis of the growing importance of international communications as a potent new force in our foreign relations, and in the 18 recommendations for the improvement of USIA that it offers. The report also directs its comments to the President and to the Congress of the United States with the recommendation that this arm of our foreign policy be substantially strengthened in a new period of international detente and dialog.

Second, the Advisory Commission's report also signals the departure of the Commission's Chairman—Dr. Frank Stanton, vice chairman of the board of CBS—who has completed three terms in this capacity and spanning both Democratic and Republican administrations. The report contains his judgment and experience of 9 years with USIA coupled with the judgments, professional experience, and knowledge of his colleagues on the Commission.

I have had the opportunity, as have some of my colleagues in the House, to spend many hours with this Commission over the years in examining and discussing the USIA. We share a common interest in the potential of our country's public diplomacy. And we have benefited from their advice, counsel, and wisdom.

Dr. Stanton's present colleagues have summed up his contribution to this work in the following manner:

Finally, four members of this Commission wish to acknowledge with genuine appreciation the distinguished leadership of the Commission's Chairman, Dr. Frank Stanton, the former President and current Vice Chairman of the Board of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who is retiring from the Commission after having been its Chairman for almost nine years.

Dr. Stanton led his Commission with vigor and imagination. He gave of his time, thought and energy with unstinting generosity, and

left a record deeply etched by his personality, foresight and accomplishments. One of America's statesmen in mass communications, his advice and counsel to the Executive, to the Congress, and to Directors of USIA have helped substantially improve the U.S. Government's projection of the voice, pen and vision of America to the people of other countries. This we would like to record as colleagues and as witnesses in the enterprise.

I would like to join in this well-deserved tribute. I may add from personal knowledge that only recently Dr. Stanton took off 48 hours from his busy schedule to fly to Costa Rica in order to help inaugurate a new binational center in that country.

When Public Law 402 was written in 1948 the Congress was highly skeptical over the idea of a permanent foreign information program. To insure that it would develop in the most exemplary manner possible the authors of the legislation wisely provided for an outside advisory group which would be composed of five of America's most qualified citizens in communications for the purpose of overseeing the activity. This Commission is also authorized to give advice to the Congress and to the executive by sharing with them their professional experience in the field of communications and public opinion.

Throughout these years this Nation has benefited from the uniformly high caliber of the men and women who have served on this Commission. I have come to know and admire them and to respect their judgments and recommendations. Through written reports to Congress, periodic testimony before committees of Congress and personal consultation, the quality of their advice and their intensive commitment to the task of achieving greater international understanding of the United States has been made apparent to us all.

A glance at the present membership will bear out my remarks. The chairman has been known as a statesman in the broadcasting industry. Equally important, his interests have been as varied and encyclopedic as the scope of this country's public diplomacy and mission abroad. Mr. Hobart Lewis president and editor-in-chief of the most widely read magazine in the world, *Reader's Digest*. Mr. James Michener is an internationally renowned author of great distinction. Mr. John Shaheen's interests include broadcasting and newspaper publishing along with his worldwide interests in national resources development. And Dr. George Gallup, this Nation's leading authority in public opinion polling and a pioneer of this field throughout the world, is a recent appointee to the Commission.

These are the members who have produced the report which I hope will serve as policy guidelines as well as inspiration to Mr. James Keogh, the new Director of USIA, and to the new management team that has recently taken over at USIA, including our own former colleague from Utah, Sherman Lloyd. I will be looking forward to the Agency's response to the recommendations in this report.

For the report summons the USIA to

devote itself energetically and imaginatively to the task of perpetuating through communications the atmosphere of international detente that has been ushered in by the historic trips of President Nixon to the PCR and the USSR.

The Commission's report puts it this way:

President Nixon's historic achievements in opening channels of communications to the People's Republic of China and in improving them to the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries provide the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), as the government's principal communications agency in foreign affairs, with an enormous opportunity. For USIA is an ideal agency in a time of detente and dialogue.

As a Member of Congress I would like to express appreciation and gratitude to the members of this Commission who, working without compensation, have labored in one of the most difficult yet important areas of our country's obligations—international communications, ideology, and foreign policy. In a world which has shrunk so much in the past 25 years the work of the U.S. Information Agency must not be allowed to falter or diminish. Indeed, in my mind its importance should increase as international detente, dialog, and negotiations gradually replace crisis, violence, and polemical diatribe.

I urge my colleagues to read the entire report. I believe it will add to your understanding of what USIA can do on behalf of the United States if it is properly equipped, properly managed, properly funded, and properly positioned in the Federal foreign affairs structure of the executive branch of the Government.

This report commemorates the 25th anniversary of the passage of Public Law 402, known as the Smith-Mundt Act, which established the legislative policy framework for the work of USIA. The report concludes with 18 recommendations for USIA which should help it improve further its organization, its policies, and its programs. I hope the Agency will respond positively to these recommendations and I hope that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will have an opportunity to examine them as well. I include with my remarks a copy of the release that accompanies the report, for the benefit of my colleagues in the House:

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

"President Nixon's historic achievements in opening channels of communications to the People's Republic of China and in improving them to the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries provide the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), as the government's principal communications agency in foreign affairs, with an enormous opportunity. For USIA is an ideal agency in a time of detente and dialogue."

This is the major conclusion of the 26th Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information,* addressed to the Congress and released today.

*Frank Stanton (Chairman), Columbia Broadcasting System; Hobart Lewis, *Reader's Digest*; James Michener, Author; John Shaheen, Shaheen Natural Resources Company; George Gallup, American Institute of Public Opinion.

The Commission's Report summons USIA to meet the inherent challenge of the President's new foreign policies by formulating information policies and programs that are aimed at expanding dialogue and detente among the nations of the world. For "just as crisis tends to feed on crisis," the Commission said, "so detente can generate detente . . . (and) the communications of detente reinforce and help perpetuate atmospheres of detente."

The mission of USIA should be directed to the task of achieving the new objectives of the nation as enunciated by the President in his inaugural address:

"Let us continue to bring down the walls of hostility," the President said, "which have divided the world for too long, and to build in their place *bridges of understanding*—so that despite profound differences between systems of government, the people of the world can be friends. Let us build a structure of peace in the world in which the weak are as safe as the strong—in which each respects the right of the other to live by a different system—in which those who would influence others will do so by the strength of their ideas, not by the force of their arms."

Since this Report was completed the President has further spelled out these objectives in his speech of February 20, 1973 to the South Carolina legislature when he said,

"We will continue the dialogue with the Soviet leaders; we will continue the dialogue with the People's Republic of China, and in this year ahead, we will renew discussions that we have been having in the past with our friends in Europe and in other parts of the world, because as we talk to those who have been our adversaries in the past, we must not overlook the vital necessity of strengthening the bonds we have with our allies and our friends around the world."

The Commission believes that "an Agency dedicated to such policies and goals, thoroughly integrated in the government's foreign affairs structure cannot help but be acceptable to the Congress, to the President and to the American people. For it will then be operating in accordance with the best wishes and hopes of those who wrote the basic legislation (that authorizes this activity). Equally important, the U.S. as a force for peace will be brought home to the other nations of the world where competition between the ideologies and political systems of the major powers will continue for a long time."

This 26th Report to Congress commemorates the 25th anniversary of Public Law 402, the Smith-Mundt Act which has provided the statutory framework for this country's foreign information and cultural service.

In a broad, general review of USIA's mission and performance during the past 25 years (including its predecessor agencies in the Department of State) the Commission concludes that although an information agency cannot guarantee approval of U.S. policies through communications alone, it can strive to make them understood. This, the Commission believes, USIA has done successfully in many areas of the world, including countries where a direct U.S. presence is not possible.

The Commission's Report contains 18 major recommendations for improving the policies, programs, and organization of USIA and its position in the federal foreign affairs structure. They are:

1. The United States Information Agency's unique resources and knowledge of foreign public opinion should be communicated by its Director and his associates at the highest levels of government—the President, the Secretary of State and the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs. USIA

should be in on the takeoffs as well as the landings in foreign policy.

2. The President's active role in foreign communications calls for a more explicit utilization of the resources and personnel of USIA.

3. The U.S. should remain competitive with other nations in the information and cultural fields.

4. USIA should develop plans to orient both new and veteran U.S. Ambassadors to the Agency's mission and resources and to urge the closest relationship between Public Affairs Officers and their Ambassadors.

5. USIA should expand its practice of inviting U.S. Senators and Representatives to attend U.S. Information Agency regional conferences and exhibitions abroad.

6. USIA should substantially augment its programs in explaining U.S. economic policies and problems. It should develop further its personal capabilities in this complex but increasingly important area of American foreign policy.

7. USIA should bring into better balance its cultural and information programs. It should also appoint a prominent cultural affairs director to invigorate the cultural programs and to help achieve this balance.

8. USIA should avoid "press agency" in its programs to reach important foreign audiences.

9. USIA should focus as much of its time on improving the substance of its effort as it does on techniques and methods.

10. The Voice of America must be kept competitive. Today it ranks fourth behind the USSR, the People's Republic of China and the Arab Republic of Egypt in number of languages and in number of hours broadcast per week. VOA also lags in its capacity to deliver a signal.

11. Although USIA is compelled at present to live within its reduced budget by concentrating primarily on select audiences, it should not ignore or turn away from responding to interest in the U.S. that is expressed by the average citizen or by those "natural audiences" disposed to use USIS libraries abroad.

12. USIA must improve the coordination of its media programs.

13. USIA should reexamine the effectiveness, format and content of its magazines.

14. USIA must conduct a comprehensive review of its motion picture and television objectives.

15. USIA is ready to provide the fullest assistance to national plans for the celebration of the Bicentennial.

16. The Commission wishes to repeat a recommendation made in its 25th Report which called for a maximum information program in a test country in order to determine the effectiveness of the function in achieving U.S. objectives if that function is properly funded.

17. USIA top management, its senior officials in Washington and its Public Affairs Officers abroad, should subject its programs and policies to systematic appraisal.

18. The Commission once again renews its recommendation first enumerated in the 23d Report to Congress in February 1968 that there be instituted an independent, comprehensive reexamination of USIA's mission and operations by an outside organization.

The Commission stresses the crucial role played by communications today and notes that more people have expanded their focus of attention to include information about other countries including the United States.

The Commission concludes that "this increase in the people's attention zone all over the world is the major pivotal contribution of communications." As a result, all major nations of the world are engaged in foreign information work that has led to a tremendous exchange of ideas, products, life styles, and a gradual modification of attitudes.

USIA has used every conceivable communications technique to keep millions of people throughout the world more accurately informed about the people and policies of the U.S. The best estimates of those who struggle with methods of determining the reach of USIA's information and message about the U.S. is that it ranges "from a conservative figure of 150 million to 230 million people a year."

The Report highlights the Agency's two basic functions. The first, to disseminate information about the U.S., has been implemented despite a steadily declining financial base. The second, to serve as a reliable feedback of what people around the world think about the U.S. and its policies, has been used but sparsely by those who are responsible for formulating U.S. foreign policy and U.S. national security policy. In the Commission's judgment, USIA must not only strive to increase international understanding of the U.S. but to bring to the attention of top U.S. officials the attitudes and opinions of people around the world.

The Report focuses on the President as the most visible symbol of American foreign policy abroad. It recommends that USIA must be brought closer to the national security and foreign policy decisionmaking process in order that its unique insights and information can be made available at the place where American policy is forged. The Commission reasserts that USIA should be in at the takeoffs as well as the landings in foreign policy in order to accomplish its mission with maximum effectiveness.

Copies of the Commission's 26th Report may be obtained from the Commission's office at 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, Room 1008. For further information contact Louis T. Olom, Staff Director, Telephones: 632-5211 or 632-5227.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information—a citizens group created by the Congress in 1948, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate—conducts a continuing overview of USIA operations, and in its annual report both assesses those operations and proposes recommendations for the future. Its current membership: Frank Stanton (chairman), vice chairman of the Columbia Broadcasting System, New York; Hobart Lewis, editor-in-chief of *Reader's Digest*, New York; James Michener, author, Pipersville, Pennsylvania; John Shaheen, president of Shaheen Natural Resources Company, New York; and George Gallup, chairman of the board, American Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, New Jersey.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR GOLD STAR WIVES OF AMERICA

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with our colleague, Mr. FORSYTHE, in seeking a Federal charter for the Gold Star Wives of America.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been active in the veteran's organizations and have had the privilege and pleasure of meeting with the Gold Star Wives on many occasions. They are such a dedicated group of women who have proven so many times in so many ways their devotion to the great cause for which they stand.

The national organization was founded in 1945 and its membership, now more than 2,000, is made up of the widows of our fighting men who lost their lives in service to this great Nation.

Their main objective is to serve the widows and children of those who made the supreme sacrifice for America. They provide moral and material support to them and generally help them through their anguish.

This is a most praiseworthy effort and I firmly believe the Gold Star Wives deserve the charter which they seek. I urge all of my colleagues in the House to support this effort.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CRONIN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McFALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. STUDDS) and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PATMAN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CRONIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TREEN.

Mr. QUIE in three instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. PARRIS in five instances.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. MIZELL in five instances.

Mr. WAMPLER.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. BURGNER.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DE LUGO.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. ALEXANDER in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Ms. ABZUG in five instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. ROUSH in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. REES in three instances.

Mr. McFALL.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in six instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. HANNA in three instances.

Mr. ULLMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STUDDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAN DANIEL.

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 26, 1973, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3298. An act to restore the rural water and sewer grant program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 28, 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:

658. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report on military construction contracts awarded by the Department of the Air Force without formal advertisement during the 6 months ended December 31, 1972, pursuant to section 804 of Public Law 90-110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

659. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to transfer certain farm labor housing and rural rental housing loans and related liabilities from the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund to the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

660. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to expand the National Flood Insurance program by substantially increasing limits of coverage and

total amount of insurance authorized to be outstanding and by requiring known flood-prone communities to participate in the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

661. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92-403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

662. A letter from the Executive Director, American Academy of Arts and Letters and National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the annual reports of the Academy and the Institute for 1972, pursuant to section 4 of their charters; to the Committee on House Administration.

663. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on activities during 1972 under the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972, pursuant to section 203 of the act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

664. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain laws affecting the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5683. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish a Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund to provide adequate funds for rural electric and telephone systems through insured and guaranteed loans at interest rates which will allow them to achieve the objectives of the act, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 327. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5610, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-92). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 328. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5293, a bill authorizing continuing appropriations for the Peace Corps; (Rept. No. 93-93). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. 6121. A bill to amend title II the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 6122. A bill to increase the subsistence payments to students at the State Marine schools; to the Commission on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6123. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to advance to the last Sunday in May the commencement of daylight saving time and to advance to the last Sunday before the first Monday in September the conclusion of daylight saving time period for the year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6124. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6125. A bill to increase from \$240 to \$480 per year the amount of earned income which will be excluded in determining eligibility for and amount of benefits payable to individuals under the Federal program for supplemental security income for the aged, blind, and disabled, established by title XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6126. A bill to amend the program of supplemental security income for the aged, blind, and disabled (established by title XVI of the Social Security Act) to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits provided thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6127. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that a recipient of disability insurance benefits under title II of such act must wait for 24 months before becoming eligible for coverage under medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6128. A bill to provide for repayment of certain sums advanced to providers of services under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 6129. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 6130. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that when an individual under age 62 retires from covered employment after 30 or more years of service under an employees pension benefit plan, the period after such retirement and before his attainment of such age shall be excluded in determining the amount of his social security benefits if the exclusion of such period would increase the amount of such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6131. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 6132. A bill to authorize a national bicycle transportation system in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. SARASIN):

H.R. 6133. A bill to provide a privilege for newsmen against the compelled disclosure of certain information and sources of information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 6134. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, so as to extend from 1 to 3 years the period that a member of the uniformed services has following his retirement to select his home for purposes of travel and transportation allowances under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DE LUGO:

H.R. 6135. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 6136. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased awards of service-connected compensation to certain blinded veterans who are suffering from additional disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6137. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an additional aid and attendance allowance to certain service-connected blinded veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 6138. A bill to guarantee the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H.R. 6139. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding and improving the family planning services and population sciences research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6140. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a mail delivery insurance program under which a person who insures an article of mail could recover for losses occurring when there is late or no delivery of the article; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself and Mr. DRINAN):

H.R. 6141. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for annual flu shots; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 6142. A bill making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the national industrial reserve under the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself and Mr. ROSE):

H.R. 6143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 6144. 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.

H.R. 6145. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the duration-of-marriage requirements (and other special requirements) which are presently applicable in determining whether a person is the widow of an insured individual for benefit purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6146. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to allow a State in its discretion, to such extent as it deems appropriate, to use the dual signature method of making payments of aid to families with dependent children under its approved State plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6147. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a national program of health research fellowships and traineeships to assure the continued excellence of biomedical research in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. VETSEY, Mr. WARE, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 6148. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act

of 1970 to establish minimum mandatory sentences for persons convicted of offenses involving narcotic drugs, to provide emergency procedures to govern the pretrial and posttrial release of persons charged with offenses involving certain narcotic drugs, to provide procedures to reach large sums of money used for narcotic trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6149. A bill to extend through fiscal year 1974 the expiring appropriations authorizations in the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, and the Development Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 6150. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to provide that Army and Air Force National Guard technicians shall not be required to wear the military uniform while performing their duties in a civilian status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 6151. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to direct the President to establish a Rent Control Board which, through the establishment of a cost justification formula, will control the level of rent with respect to residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 6152. A bill to provide adequate mental health care and psychiatric care to all Americans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 6153. A bill to assure the imposition of appropriate penalties for persons convicted of offenses involving heroin or morphine, to provide emergency procedures to govern the pretrial and posttrial release of persons charged with offenses involving heroin or morphine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6154. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the time limitation within which programs of education for veterans must be completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6155. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans who were prisoners of war shall be deemed to have a service-connected disability of 50 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIS (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 6156. A bill to establish improved nationwide standards of mail service, require annual authorization of public service appropriations to the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 6157. A bill to encourage and support the dissemination of news, opinion, scientific, cultural, and educational matter through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 6158. A bill to provide for improved labor-management relations in the Federal services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 6159. A bill to protect the freedom of choice of Federal employees in employee-management relations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 6160. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act and

other related acts to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of alcohol abuse and alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCFALL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 6161. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to establish a temporary Price-Wage Board, to provide temporary guidelines for the creation of price and pay rate stabilization standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 6162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts won in State lotteries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 6163. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program providing for the inspection of fish produced on fish farms in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. VANIK, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. THONE, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 6164. A bill to prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements with respect to any non-market economy country which denies to its citizens the right to emigrate or which imposes more than nominal fees upon its citizens as a condition of emigration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HUBER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 6165. A bill to amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reserve up to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 6166. A bill to amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reserve up to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 6167. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COTTER, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 6168. A bill to amend and extend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 6169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to defer the payment of income tax on amounts deducted from a public employee's wages for purposes of retirement until the amounts are received by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 6170. A bill to provide a moratorium in which the payment of interest on U.S. obligations will be suspended, to provide that for this period interest-bearing obligations will be refunded with 20-year non-interest-bearing obligations, and to provide that the saving to the United States will be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain uncompensated services of attorneys and physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 6172. A bill to provide for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 6173. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 6174. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 6175. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute on Aging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6176. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to permit members of the Reserves and the National Guard to receive retired pay at age 55 for nonregular service under chapter 67 of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6177. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to expedite the making of amendments to the uniform standards for evidencing the lawfulness of interstate operations of motor carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6178. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to extend coverage of such act to certain motor vehicles used to transport schoolchildren and teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6179. A bill to amend section 402 of title 23, United States Code, to extend certain deadlines relating to apportionment of

highway safety funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. ECKHARDT):

H.R. 6180. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide improved enforcement of motor carrier safety regulations; to protect motor carrier employees against discrimination for reporting violations of such regulations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Ms. ABZUG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. METCALFE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 6181. 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. SISK:

H.R. 6182. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 6183. A bill to provide self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 6184. A bill to permit collective negotiation by professional retail pharmacists with third-party prepaid prescription program administrators and sponsors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6185. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY (by request):

H.R. 6186. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 regarding taxability of dividends received by a corporation from insurance companies; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. GROVER, and Mr. MAILLIARD):

H.R. 6187. A bill to amend section 502(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. LATTI, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BURKE of Florida, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 6188. A bill to extend until November 1, 1978, the existing exemption of the steamboat *Delta Queen* from certain vessel laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. CULVER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BRAY, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 6189. A bill to extend until November 1, 1978, the existing exemption of the steamboat *Delta Queen* from certain vessel laws; to

the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, and Mr. GROSS):

H.R. 6190. A bill to amend the Criminal Code to prohibit former Members of Congress from using seals, flags, license tags, or other insignia or devices which imply they are currently Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 6191. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of zinc be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DIGGS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. FREY, and Mr. DANIELSON):

H.R. 6192. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the authority of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases in order to advance the national attack on diabetes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ROE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. YATRON, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 6193. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the authority of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases in order to advance the national attack on diabetes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 6194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an energy conservation tax, to establish the Energy Development and Supply Trust Funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 6195. A bill relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to readjust the schedule of ratings for the disabilities of veterans; to the construction, alteration, and acquisition of hospitals and

domiciliary facilities; to the closing of hospital and domiciliary facilities and regional offices; and to the transfer of real property under the jurisdiction or control of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 6196. A bill to prohibit assaults on State law enforcement officers, firemen, and judicial officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6197. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a Federal minimum death and dismemberment benefit to public safety officers or their surviving dependents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 6198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction for individuals who rent their principal residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.J. Res. 463. Joint resolution designating November 11 of each year as "Armistice Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 22d day of April of each year as Queen Isabella Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss JORDAN:

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution prescribing model regulations governing implementation of the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to the administration of social service programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.J. Res. 466. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October each year as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to permit the imposition and carrying out of the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

112. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Federal assumption of welfare costs of the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

113. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the National Health Care Expansion and Improvement Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

114. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to most favored nation status for the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENITEZ:

H.R. 6199. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Rivera Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 6200. A bill to grant a Federal charter to the Crime Stoppers Club, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 6201. A bill for the relief of Claudia Montgomerie-Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H.R. 6202. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 6203. A bill for the relief of Albertina C. Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 6204. A bill for the relief of Helen Lampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

79. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif., relative to automobile emission standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

80. Also, petition of Paul A. Leipo, Jr., and other members of the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, Local 332, Bridgeport, Conn., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

81. Also, petition of Lt. Bob Bostic and other members of the Greensburg, Ind., Police Department, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

82. Also, petition of O. S. McCaw and other members of the Fraternal Order of Police, Blue Grass Lodge No. 4, Lexington, Ky., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

83. Also, petition of Joseph R. Ray and others, Sanford, Maine, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

84. Also, petition of William Pavia, Bellingham, Mass., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

85. Also, petition of Joseph A. Clabaugh and other members of the Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 69, Hanover, Pa., relative to protection of law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

86. Also, petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, N.Y., relative to the "Fort Worth Five"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

87. Also, petition of the city council, Euclid, Ohio, relative to controlling the level of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE—Tuesday, March 27, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES ABOWREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of our lives, in this quiet morning interlude help us to put aside all other thoughts and duties that for a moment we may know Thy nearness. Fill our lives with new meaning and purpose. Help us to grasp the truth that we labor not alone, for Thou art with us; we work not

in our own strength, for Thou dost support us. Rekindle the fire of faith our fathers gave us. Make our hours radiant with truth and our daily work resplendent with the faith which believes in the ultimate triumph of righteousness.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.