

which should be taken to make such warnings effective, and how to make a decision to issue such warnings.

(b) The Board will be responsible for dissemination of the results of the research efforts for preparation of high seismic risk areas for the occurrence of earthquakes, particularly for the purposes of defining emergency community planning, insurance needs, architectural and engineering goals, and other such studied applications which would serve to protect life and property.

(c) The Board is authorized to enter into

contracts, agreements, or other appropriate arrangements with the National Academy of Sciences, public entities and organizations, and private entities or organizations to provide the necessary scientific advisory services as may be required to carry out the purposes of this section.

Sec. 4. The Earthquake Research Board shall make information developed pursuant to the Act available to the President, the Congress, Governors of States in high seismic risk, and other government and private organizations which are concerned with prepara-

tions for or reactions to earthquakes or earthquake warnings.

Sec. 5. (a) For purposes of section 2 of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, the sum of \$15,000,000 and for each of the next following six fiscal years the sum of \$12,000,000.

(b) For purposes of sections 3 and 4 of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next following six fiscal years, the sum of \$400,000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 29, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rt. Rev. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the American Hungarian Reformed Church, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of all nations, we stand before Thee in humble reverence as leaders, chosen representatives, and lawmakers of this great Nation.

We invoke Thy gracious blessing upon this great assembly. We confess that we are unable to carry the heavy responsibilities of our enormous tasks without Thy help. Give us Thy guidance and wisdom. Our entire world is in turmoil, divided as it is, needs Thy deliverance.

Make us all instruments in Thy hand to bring about a better and more peaceful world.

We pray for our beloved country, the "Land of the free, and the home of the brave."

We give Thee thanks for our great heritage that is ours in this Nation.

We thank Thee that by Thy spirit Thou hast kindled the longing for freedom in the hearts of men.

On this day we remember the noble people of Hungary who so gloriously attempted to achieve a free and independent nation 125 years ago.

Lord, Thou knowest that their dreams and aspirations have not been fulfilled yet.

We beseech Thee to hear their prayers and mercifully grant freedom to all enslaved nations on earth.

We pray for our President and all Members of the Congress. Give them Thy wisdom and Thy strength to serve Thee and our country in Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1975. An act to amend the emergency loan program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2107) entitled "An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 1136. An act to extend the expiring authorities in the Public Service Act and the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

THE RIGHT REVEREND ZOLTAN BEKY

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

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Right Reverend Zoltan Beky, who has just said the prayer, for many years has been and is head of the American Hungarian Federation. They have their own buildings out on New Mexico Avenue and have over 1 million members.

This is a great group. I want the Members here to know that the administration of the American Government does not have any more loyal supporters in any phase of American life than this group, whose country is overrun and controlled by a foreign army, whose people cry out for freedom.

These Hungarians who are now Americans support the foreign policies of our Government to preserve freedom all over the world. They are great Americans. I think it is wonderful that we have Bishop Beky here today to bless us with the opening prayer. I thank him ever so much.

THE 184TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(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, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that the House of Representatives was organized in New York City

on April 1, 1789. This coming April 1, 1973, marks the 184th anniversary of the first meeting of this august body.

April 1, Mr. Speaker, has traditionally been known as April Fool's Day.

BASKETBALL CRISIS

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to alert my colleagues to a terrible crisis facing our Nation which we in Congress must confront squarely.

I am referring to the dreaded basketball crisis, which has gradually taken hold in the United States.

This crisis culminated in the conquest by the team of the University of California at Los Angeles of the NCAA National Basketball Championship for the seventh time in a row.

UCLA also vanquished its 75th straight opponent last Monday night.

Some political commentators have warned that this situation constitutes "five-man rule."

Whatever it may be, we in West Los Angeles realize it is certainly demoralizing to all those basketball players and fans in America who have chosen a team other than UCLA as their own.

Since I represent the UCLA five in this Congress, I have been given advance word that the administration is planning to send to the Hill very shortly a special basketball revenue-sharing bill. The Better Dribbling Act of 1973, which would allocate funds to each State's universities to provide for expanded basketball facilities and training.

The sharing formula will exclude California entirely as a fund recipient.

This is certainly one plausible approach.

Whatever course of action this Congress in its wisdom elects to follow, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the record of the UCLA team, led by Coach John Wooden, Bill Walton, Tommy Curtis, Larry Farmer, Larry Hollyfield, Greg Lee, and Keith Wilkes will stand unchallenged for a long time to come.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SUPPORTS CON- SUMERS SUPERMARKET PRO- TEST ON FOOD PRICES

(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, Consumers Supermarkets in the Washington area have announced that they will close Saturday—their biggest business day—to protest the fantastic increase in food prices.

This will be a considerable financial sacrifice for Consumers, and it should serve to drive home the point Consumers is trying to make: that wholesale and retail food prices have shot up alarmingly in the past year and are still climbing.

That is not news to our wives, of course. Their beef boycott already has had some success in forcing down meat prices.

Consumers has rightly caught the mood of public outrage. The store documented the staggering increases of the past 12 months in commodities which grocers must purchase to supply their customers. Wheat has gone up 61 percent; hogs up 66 percent; steers up 24 percent; broilers up 54 percent; eggs up 39 percent; coffee up 41 percent.

These kinds of price rises are intolerable. What we are experiencing is the result of the Nixon administration's politically motivated farm policies of 1972. Agriculture Secretary Butz set out deliberately to see how high he could drive food prices. Look how well he has done.

Mr. Speaker, Consumers is asking its customers to sign petitions to President Nixon, telling him that the Nation wants something done about these unbelievable increases in food prices. Consumers' effort and its financial sacrifice deserve the appreciation and support of the public.

THE AMERICAN FARMER UNDER THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful to the distinguished Democratic majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) because he has given me some very fine quotes which I intend to use in some political speeches in the farm areas of America.

I am delighted that he is condemning the good fortune of the American farmer under the Nixon administration. I do not think the farmers of America will respond very well to the condemnation of American agriculture by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America are good people. They deserve for their labor and investment fair share of the benefits of our economy, and I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), the Democratic majority leader, is condemning their efforts to produce the food and fibers for the American people.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I shall be glad

to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), the majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I admire the courage of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), the Republican minority leader, in that he would have the courage to go before the American farmers to explain the wheat deal with Russia which took place last year. If the gentleman does that, I know it will be extremely interesting.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer, by the gentleman's own quotation, has done extremely well as a result of that transaction. We have had the surpluses under Democratic administrations, and the taxpayers now have been the beneficiary of the foreign sales of our agricultural production.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I think what we really need is a little less "bull" on the floor of the House and more bulls in the marketplace, and I think that is exactly what is going to take place in the near future.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 342 AND H.R. 4586

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file reports on two bills, H.R. 342 and H.R. 4586.

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

There was no objection.

GRAIN EMBARGO

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks, I have sponsored hearings in New York along with a number of colleagues from the metropolitan area in which we have considered the questions relating to the tremendous price rises in the cost of food over the last few weeks. One clear fact that has emerged has been the direct relationship between the Russian wheat deal and the impending China grain deals, other grain exports, and the rise in prices of bread, meat, poultry, and dairy products. The administration's food policies are quickly leading to a national disaster of major proportions.

The President has called for increased production of grain on our farms. But by the time we see any results from the President's policy, millions of families may be driven to the poorhouse. The people of America need relief immediately, so that the laws of supply and demand can operate freely in this country. It is wrong to be shipping our grain

abroad when our supplies for domestic consumption are so inadequate.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to halt all grain exports from the United States until such time as it can be shown that our domestic needs are being adequately met. While this action may appear drastic, so is the condition of the American food market today. I would hope that we could act in concert to protect the interests of all our constituents.

NATIONAL CLEAN WATER WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 437) to authorize the President to designate the period beginning April 15, 1973, as "National Clean Water Week," and ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this resolution does not place any financial obligation on the Federal Treasury, does it?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. The answer is "No." It places no financial obligation on the Federal Government.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 437

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, to emphasize the importance of intelligently planned use and distribution of the Nation's water resources, and in recognition of the highly developed professional and industrial techniques which provide the American people with a constant supply of clean water for use in home, office, school, factory, hospital, and wherever else such clean water is needed, the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning April 15, 1973, and ending April 2, 1973, as "National Clean Water Week", calling upon interested groups and organizations to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am here to urge my colleagues to join me in approving House Joint Resolution 437 which will authorize the President to designate April 15 through 22 as "National Clean Water Week."

The problems of keeping water clean and usable have become more familiar to Americans as the ecological movement has increased in recent years. Few people ever wonder how they get that water into the kitchen sink, however. We owe

this convenience to the largest and oldest trade association in the construction industry—the National Association of Plumbing, Heating, and Cooling Contractors.

Civilization has always depended on the efforts of these trades. Today our skyscrapers and cities depend on the talents of this industry. Without the convenience and service afforded by this industry our life-styles would be vastly different. Certainly the plumbing, heating, and cooling industry has greatly affected the level of health in the United States by providing high quality water and effective waste removal systems. We owe these trades more than we realize.

Nearly 2 million men and women will join the national association in celebrating this event. Our economy and society receive important benefits from these individuals' service. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me and join in support of this resolution to authorize "National Clean Water Week."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CHECK YOUR VEHICLE EMISSIONS MONTH

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 337) authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 1973 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month" and ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the distinguished gentleman from California the same question as I did on the prior joint resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I assure the gentleman from Iowa there is no cost to the Federal Government for any of these purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 337

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the month of April 1973 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month", and call upon the motorists and the automotive industry of the United States to take appropriate steps during the month of April to reduce substantially air pollution from the motor vehicles operating on the streets and highways.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, passage of House Joint Resolution 337, which authorizes and requests the President to proclaim April 1973 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month" will insure that a voluntary program to help clean up the air will be well on the road to success. Members of the oil and automotive industry organized into an ad hoc Vehicle Emission Check Committee have sparked an enthusiastic program to encourage automobile owners to participate in a program to substantially reduce air pollution by testing the emissions from their automobiles.

The resolution calls upon motorists and the automotive industry of the United States to take appropriate steps during the month of April to reduce substantially air pollution from motor vehicles operating on streets and highways. Congress passed a similar resolution last year, and the members of the industry engaged in a widespread educational program to encourage drivers to check the content of the emissions of their automobiles and to make repairs when needed. The ad hoc committee developed a standardized engine emissions check and developed program tie-in materials for repair service outlets. The industry's business press and trade associations actively publicized the program.

These activities are an important part of the total effort to clean up the air. While new automobiles must comply with Government standards for emissions, older automobiles on the roads continue as the worst offenders of the environment. Tests have indicated that simple adjustments and minor tune-ups can result in a minimum of 15- to 25-percent reduction of automobile air pollution. For example, engine misfire caused by a malfunction of the ignition system is a major cause of hydrocarbon emissions. Carbon monoxide emissions can be controlled by the adjustment of the idle air/fuel ratio and idle rpm. When such adjustments are made, motorists can expect an additional direct benefit in money saved because engine life is increased, performance improved, and operating costs reduced.

The automotive and oil industry must assume a major responsibility for cleaning the air. Yet, we cannot expect them to shoulder complete responsibility. The educational effort which was conducted in accordance with the resolution passed last year, and will be conducted again this year, brings to motorists' attention the fact that they too can actively contribute to improving the quality of the air we breathe. Furthermore, it may serve to discourage motorists from asking mechanics to adjust their new automobiles to provide better performance but dirtier emissions.

Members of the ad hoc committee which has organized industry and civic group efforts are: James Bates, Ignition Manufacturers Institute; William D. Cushman, American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association; Richard F. Curry, American Automobile Association; Richard D. Kudner, Champion Spark Plug Company; Arthur H. Nelle,

Jr., Car Care Council; A. J. Russo, Shell Oil Co.; Lynn Stitt, American Association of University Women; and Charles E. Sundin, the U.S. Jaycees.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5293, PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 328 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 328

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) authorizing continuing appropriations for the Peace Corps. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 328 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 5293, which is a bill to authorize appropriations to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during fiscal year 1974 and fiscal year 1975.

H.R. 5293, as amended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, authorizes an appropriation of \$77,001,000 for fiscal year 1974 and limits the appropriation for 1975 to an amount "not to exceed \$80,000,000." For fiscal year 1973, the Committee on Foreign Affairs recommended, and the House of Representatives passed, an authorization of \$88,027,000. The total amount appropriated

is expected to amount to approximately \$81,000,000 by June 30, 1973.

The Peace Corps has attempted to provide skills and knowledge in the person of U.S. volunteers in underdeveloped countries. It has tried to improve the image of the United States abroad and it has tried to bring back to the United States an understanding of the countries which are hosts to our volunteers.

The Peace Corps carried out its services in Africa, Latin America, Southeast Asia, and the South Pacific. Its activities have important foreign policy implications.

Today our Peace Corps volunteers have a higher degree of skill than ever before, and a greater percentage have a higher degree of education in the specific areas which they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 328 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 5293.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 328 provides for the consideration of H.R. 5293, Peace Corps Act Amendments of 1973, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The primary purpose of H.R. 5293 is to authorize appropriations for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

This bill authorizes \$77,001,000 for fiscal year 1974 and \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 1975.

As introduced, the bill authorized \$77,001,000 for fiscal year 1974 and "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal year 1975. The Committee on Foreign Affairs amended the bill to limit the 1975 authorization to an amount "not to exceed \$80,000,000." In addition, the Committee amended the title of the bill with a technical change to make it clear that the bill authorizes "additional" appropriations for the Peace Corps and does not provide for "continuing appropriations."

In order to put into perspective the amounts authorized for fiscal years 1974 and 1975, it is useful to note that for fiscal year 1973, \$88,027,000 was authorized.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. 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. 60]

Armstrong	Gettys	Riegle
Ashbrook	Gialmo	Roberts
Aspin	Griffiths	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Grover	Rosenthal
Biaggi	Guyer	Roussellot
Blatnik	Hanna	Roybal
Bolling	Harsha	Ruppe
Brown, Calif.	Harvey	Schneebell
Burton	Hawkins	Sisk
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Smith, Iowa
Carney, Ohio	Ichord	St Germain
Chappell	Jones, N.C.	Steele
Chisholm	King	Teague, Tex.
Clark	Kuykendall	Thompson, N.J.
Clay	Lujan	Udall
Davis, S.C.	Mann	Wilson,
Dent	McClary	Charles H.,
Erlenborn	McKinney	Calif.
Flowers	McSpadden	Wilson,
Foley	Mills, Ark.	Charles, Tex.
Fraser	Passman	Wright
Frelinghuysen	Price, Tex.	Young, Ill.
Gaydos	Reuss	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 368 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) authorizing continuing appropriations for the Peace Corps.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5293, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 5293 is short and simple. It authorizes an appropriation of slightly over \$77 million for the Peace Corps for the fiscal year 1974—and \$80 million for the fiscal year 1975.

The proposed authorization for the coming year is \$11 million—or 12.5 percent—lower than what the Congress authorized for fiscal year 1973.

The fiscal 1975 authorization is \$8 million less than the current authorization.

The actual cutbacks in authorizations are even more severe than the figures I just quoted would indicate.

This is because of the 25 percent devaluation of the dollar during the past 17 months.

Nevertheless, the committee felt that

the sums recommended will be sufficient to carry out legitimate Peace Corps activities during the coming 2 years.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee was of one mind on this issue.

The bill was reported from the committee with strong bipartisan support, by a vote of 19 to 0.

Moreover, the committee made only one change in the executive branch request:

In place of an open-ended authorization for the fiscal year 1975, the committee recommended a fixed authorization of not to exceed \$80 million.

Over the years, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has done its best not to bring any open-ended authorizations to the floor of the House.

Our action on the Peace Corps request is consistent with that policy, and our desire to see close congressional supervision over all overseas undertakings.

LOWER PROFILE

Another thing which the committee favors, Mr. Chairman, is a lower profile for the Peace Corps.

This lower profile has been becoming a reality during the past several years.

In 1968, for example, the Peace Corps consisted of nearly 14,000 volunteers and trainees.

This year, it is down to about 7,000.

Looking at it from the financial standpoint, the Peace Corps budget request for 1968 amounted to nearly \$125 million.

The authorization proposed for fiscal year 1974 is almost \$50 million lower; it amounts to \$77 million.

EMPHASIS ON PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

The size of the Peace Corps, and its budget, are not the only things that are changing.

Under the "new directions" program introduced not too long ago, the Peace Corps is emphasizing professional skills in the recruitment and placement of its volunteers.

The Peace Corps is seeking men and women who can do jobs in agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, building trades, and other fields—not only generalists and college graduates.

And the Peace Corps is beginning to attract some people with such professional skills.

By the end of 1972, over 300 Americans, age 50 or over, were serving with the Peace Corps overseas.

Also, more than 300 families—married couples with one or more children—were carrying out Peace Corps programs.

All of these people had more maturity, more experience, and more skill than the average Peace Corps volunteer of the 1960's.

This, in my opinion, is a good, healthy trend.

Our committee has encouraged the Peace Corps to continue: to forget about high numbers of volunteers and to concentrate instead on getting people with the right skills to do the jobs that need to be done.

There is much room for improvement in that area of Peace Corps activity. The committee investigations have pointed out some weaknesses in Peace Corps recruitment procedures. The officials of the agency are now aware of them, and hopefully, will try to correct them.

PEACE CORPS OVERVIEW

The lower profile and the new emphasis in professional skills have not changed the mission of the Peace Corps—or reduced its usefulness.

The Peace Corps remains a very important, and very American, instrument for sharing our know-how and helping others solve their own problems.

It personifies one of the finest, and most humane, undertakings in our national history.

At the present time, there are about 7,000 Peace Corps volunteers and trainees working on 955 projects in 58 countries.

Some of them are working in agriculture and rural development.

Others are in education and health.

Still others are working on urban problems, and helping their host countries learn about business procedures and public management.

All of them are living on the same level as their host-country counterparts, getting only \$75 a month for their support.

They do not live in fancy apartments—sporting expensive clothes and cars—or putting money in the bank.

They are out there in the field—or in a school—or in a village—because they honestly want to help somebody.

They are a credit to America's voluntary tradition.

Moreover, most of them—when they come home—apply what they have learned in their Peace Corps assignments to the solution of the problems of their own communities.

BUDGET BREAKDOWN

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to say a few words about the budget proposed in the bill before us.

About 40 percent of the Peace Corps budget—\$32 million in fiscal 1974—will be spent for program support.

A smaller part—about 38 percent or \$30 million—will go for the support of the volunteers in the field.

The remainder—about \$15 million—will be spent for training.

Within these broad categories, a couple of significant changes are taking place:

First, staff costs—in Washington and abroad—are going down by about \$1 million: from \$16 million in the current year to \$15 million in fiscal year 1974; and

Second, Peace Corps' share of ACTION administrative support costs will also decrease by about \$400,000: from \$13 million to \$12.6 million.

These changes represent some tightening of the program on the administrative side.

When you add them to the lower authorization levels, and the effects of the

25-percent devaluation of the dollar, they become significant.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion—I believe that the bill before the House is sound and reasonable, and that it ought to be approved.

Admittedly, the Peace Corps has experienced some difficulties in placing more emphasis on volunteers with professional skills. But the agency is aware of its shortcomings and is trying to correct them. This warrants some patience on our side.

Moreover, the proposed authorization is within the President's budget request and represents a substantial decrease in comparison with authorization levels of recent years.

For these reasons, and because I believe in the program, I urge the approval of H.R. 5293.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 5293, which would provide a 2-year authorization for the Peace Corps. This legislation authorizes an appropriation of \$77,001,000 for fiscal year 1974 and \$80 million for use in fiscal year 1975.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, has already reviewed in some detail the committee's action in bringing this legislation before the House.

However, I think it is appropriate to emphasize here today the extent to which the Peace Corps has become more responsible and mature in the way in which it conducts its operations.

The emphasis in today's Peace Corps is on quality—not quantity. In fiscal year 1974 the Peace Corps expects to have 7,265 volunteers and trainees—less than half the peak of 15,556 volunteers and trainees in fiscal year 1966.

Despite a steady increase in volunteer applications since a low period in 1969, the Peace Corps has limited its numbers. It has placed its emphasis on the selection of volunteers with the attitudes and skills needed to meet the requests of host countries.

As part of an effort to provide the most practical and effective training possible, more of the volunteers are being trained in the countries in which they will serve.

Host country requests have been increasing with particular emphasis on skills needed in agriculture, education, and health. A meaningful job awaits every volunteer in his host country.

Today's volunteer is more mature, more practical, and more job oriented. The average age is now 27, with 5 percent of the volunteers over 50 years of age. There are 300 families with dependent children.

The new directions of the Peace Corps have brought results. Countries are requesting more skilled volunteers than we can supply. The number of applications by prospective volunteers with maturity and skills is increasing.

I urge your support of H.R. 5293.

I feel that the program as a whole has been steadily improving in the last 5 or 6 years, and I think the House has every reason to support this program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this bill.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5293. It is my strong feeling that the Peace Corps has come of age. I have been a close observer of this agency's progress since its inception 12 years ago and I am now convinced that it has become an integral part of the U.S. program to aid underdeveloped countries. Its purpose and quality have reached a new maturity while still maintaining its pride of service to peoples overseas.

The Peace Corps has shown remarkable flexibility and willingness to accommodate the countries it serves by updating its screening process and training program to better fulfill the needs and requirements of host countries. It now appears that volunteers are more carefully screened, have skills in areas which have been specifically requested by the host country, and are showing a marked maturity and responsiveness in working with the host country government and its peoples.

Job assignments are now geared to the priority needs of developing nations and the Peace Corps waits for the host country to request a program. Recruitment of volunteers focuses more on people with skills and they are largely being trained in the country in which they will serve. Operating in 58 countries, volunteers no longer go out to "do their own thing"—their job is defined even before recruitment begins.

Reflecting the greater maturity of the Corps, the average age of the volunteers now is 27 rather than the past average of 23; and one-fourth of the volunteers are married.

The "new direction" of the Peace Corps is now emphasizing quality rather than quantity and I should like to urge my colleagues to support the Peace Corps program.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

Mr. Chairman, many Americans are not aware of the great service the Peace Corps is rendering our own country. One, of course, may ask how can the Peace Corps render a service to the United States when all of its programs are based in foreign lands.

Peace, Mr. Chairman, is and should be one of the highest priorities in our time. As its name implies, this is one of the missions of the Peace Corps. To promote peace through better understanding is the great service the Peace Corps is rendering America. Through its work in the underdeveloped world, Peace Corps is generating goodwill for the United States. Everyday Peace Corps volunteers create hundreds of friends for the United States all over the world,

by presenting to the people they serve a view of America they have never seen: a view of America as a brother helping those less fortunate, a view of America as a land in which our youth are willing to live a part of their lives in a strange, rigorous environment so that the lives of others may be bettered. In the past we have encouraged the people of these countries to come to America to seek a better life. Now we are going to those people to help them attain a better life in their own countries, their own surroundings, their own cultures.

It has been said that one of the goals of the Peace Corps is to eventually work itself out of a job, and I hope to see the day when there is no need for us to be here debating a Peace Corps authorization bill. That will mean that the underdeveloped world has achieved a reasonable degree of self-sufficiency in these skills now being provided by Peace Corps volunteers. But until that day, Mr. Chairman, I pledge my strong support to this meritorious program. Because, as long as we receive a request for an authorization for the Peace Corps it means that there is hunger, disease, and illiteracy in our world. And, while it is not within our ability to cure all the evils of the world, I submit that it is within our province, it is our obligation, to try to lessen them.

Mr. Chairman, as proof of the goodwill it is generating, permit me to quote briefly from some letters received by the Peace Corps from high ranking functionaries of the countries they serve:

From the chairman of the Coordination Committee Operation Help in Afghanistan:

The Prime Minister has asked me to extend the deepest appreciation of the Royal Government to the Peace Corps . . . we wish to share this feeling with those members of the Corps who so selflessly participated in our program. They reflected great credit on the nation which they serve and on themselves.

From the village chief of Bargule, Ivory Coast:

The whole population is assembled to express their thanks and gratitude . . . to the whole American Peace Corps and to put our gratitude into tangible form, a monument will be erected to commemorate the Peace Corps of the U.S.A.

From the governor of Haipai, Tonga:

The Peace Corps Volunteers are so different from other *Palangis* (foreigners). They give up their good life back home and come here to live in hales, and teach in our poor schools.

Mr. Chairman, this is only a small sampling of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials given the Peace Corps during the last year. I believe they are proof of the goodwill generated by this organization.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps is alive and well; and its good health is especially apparent in the Near East and South Asia area. Programs in Iran, India, Afghanistan and Nepal are being carried out by over 600 volunteers in a variety of technical

areas, and some of these programs are among the most successful in the Peace Corps.

In Iran, Peace Corps programs have, over the last decade, emphasized agriculture, secondary education, public works and urban planning projects; in India, Peace Corps programs are oriented toward rural community development, small business development and education.

Afghanistan and Nepal, two small states with giant neighbors, are determined to protect their independence. They are among the least developed countries in the world with less than one of every 10 citizens literate and a per capita annual income less than \$100. One hundred and sixty Peace Corps volunteers in Nepal concentrate on agricultural, rural development, forestry and educational projects; over 200 volunteers in Afghanistan stress a variety of educational, health and urban development projects along with activities similar to those in Nepal.

SOME PAST SUCCESSES

The Peace Corps is appreciated by the governments and the people of each of these countries. The demonstrated accomplishments of the volunteers include these examples:

First, in Iran nearly 500 English teacher volunteers have taught, since 1963, close to 200,000 Iranian students and almost 250 Iranian teachers who participated in in-service English language courses.

Since 1965, over 75 volunteers have labored on urban planning projects. The exemplary results include: 48 5-year city growth guide plans; 45 city parks; 34 urban design projects; 52 architectural projects; and 25 research projects. The American civil engineers, architects, planners, economists and sociologists involved in these projects represent the new breed of volunteer with technical expertise.

In Afghanistan, the Peace Corps program has not produced as much evidence of detailed plans and large-scale efforts but it can point with pride to several programs in the countryside and the cities where Peace Corps volunteers have helped in a variety of self-help vocational training and education programs and in health care efforts, all designed to help eradicate disease and famine and increase the supply of skilled manpower.

Operation Help, a dramatic international program, gave nearly 240,000 Afghans a renewed hope for survival in 1972. Droughts in 1970 and 1971 had spread famine and disease throughout many rural areas of the country and in 1972, the world community united to get donated food, clothing and health supplies to remote and isolated regions. The Agency for International Development played an impressive role in this operation and several Peace Corps volunteers remained on the scene in remote towns and villages to help make this program a success.

SOME FUTURE PROSPECTS

Past and present accomplishments in the Middle East and South Asia area

are an important reason for supporting the Peace Corps program. But it is equally significant that the Peace Corps will be expanding in 1973 into a new area—the Arabian Peninsula.

In 1972, the United States signed Peace Corps program agreements with the Yemen Arab Republic and Oman and it is possible that other states will follow. By the end of 1973, small programs involved in health, education, central economic planning and water supply will have begun with just under 50 volunteers. We should encourage this modest addition to the Peace Corps for it is bringing self-help programs to some of the most isolated and poorest people in the world in a region which may become vital to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it is a long distance from Washington to Afghanistan, Nepal and the Yemen but it may be an even longer ride from the capitals of these countries to the towns and villages where Peace Corps volunteers usually work. These Americans are bringing to ordinary people the important message that America does care about helping others help themselves.

We are not sending volunteers where local talent can do the job. We are sending them where they are wanted and where the host countries are willing to help pay for American expertise and assistance. Because they are willing to pay to benefit their own people, we should be willing to help them.

I urge your support of the Peace Corps.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly concerned over the matter-of-fact manner in which we are considering this piece of legislation today to extend the Peace Corps for another 2 years. It appears there will be little or no debate on a bill which provides for an expenditure of \$77 million in fiscal year 1974 and \$80 million in fiscal year 1975. Even though \$157 million over a 2-year period may not seem like much money in view of the extremely large authorization bills to which we have become accustomed, I can assure you that it is indeed a large sum of money in view of the tight restrictions on the Federal budget.

In view of the pressing needs in our own Nation, I believe we need to question very seriously an expenditure of this size that will be spent overseas. Not only will this money be lost for domestic needs, but I fear that it will further contribute to the staggering deficit in our balance of payments.

Mr. Chairman, at the time the concept for the Peace Corps was envisioned it had the very noble purpose of trying to assist the so-called developing nations with their most basic problems in the field of education, health, agriculture, and public works. But this was 11 years ago and it appears that we are still there, so to speak, trying to do all the work ourselves.

I believe it is time we realize that we cannot continue to provide all the manpower needed for activities being conducted under the Peace Corps. It is time we changed our mode of operation and trained people in each country to do the work we are still attempting to do our-

selves. I certainly feel that in the long run this would prove to be much less expensive for the U.S. taxpayers.

The present concept of operation for the Peace Corps needs to be revamped and we need to begin looking to the day we can phase the program out and turn the full responsibility over to the individual nations. We need to teach people of other countries self-reliance and not total dependence on the United States. It escapes me completely how in a period of 11 years, we have been unable to impart our expertise to a core group of people in each nation who in turn could perform the same functions we are sending our own people to do year after year after year.

Mr. Chairman, if we are truly serious about holding the line on Federal spending then we should defeat this bill and give the Committee on Foreign Affairs an opportunity to draft another bill which would be more in line with our spending priorities. We have to make the resolve to start somewhere in establishing new and better priorities for the Federal budget. I can think of no better place to start than with the rejection of the excessive spending limits contained in the Peace Corps Act Amendments of 1973.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay tribute to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER).

Once again, he has presided over the deliberations of this body with fairness and consideration for the rights of all Members.

I do not know how many Members of the House are aware of this, but our esteemed colleague from Kentucky, Mr. NATCHER, has chaired the Committee of the Whole House on every occasion that the Peace Corps authorizations had been before the House, except one.

Because of this, he has been associated very closely with the legislative history of the Peace Corps.

I would like to add that that association has always reflected most favorably upon the gentleman from Kentucky. He is a scholar of the legislative procedure. He has been judicious and eminently fair in his rulings. And I personally appreciate the many courtesies that he has extended to our committee—on both sides of the aisle—when we have brought these bills before the House. *

Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first phrase of section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2502(b)), ending with a colon, is amended to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$77,001,000 and for the fiscal year 1975 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On the first page, beginning in line 7, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed \$80,000,000."

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT FOR THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment for the committee amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 1, strike all of lines 7, 8 and 9 and insert the following: "\$80,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would do two things: It would cut the \$77,001,000 down to \$60 million and hopefully launch Congress on the way to phasing out this international WPA, and it would limit the authorization to 1 year, rather than 2 years.

I cannot understand how Members of the House, in view of the financial crisis that confronts this country, can go on financing this boondoggle, at \$77,001,000 a year. And is it not interesting that it is 77 million, 1,000 dollars? And when I asked the Peace Corps representatives who come before the committee, why the \$1,000, they said, in effect, "Well, it just came out that way."

No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how the House, in this time of financial trouble and with the cutbacks and cutoffs in spending on programs in this country can go on with this outfit at a cost of \$77 million next year and \$80 million in fiscal year 1975.

There is not a Member of this House who has any idea about what the financial situation of this country will be a year from now, or what it will be like by the end of this summer—whether there will be another devaluation of the dollar by the end of this summer. Moreover, this is one of several programs that ought not to be projected over a period of 2 years. What business have we committing the American people here and now to spending \$80 million on the Peace Corps for the 1975 fiscal year in view of what is going on financially in this country?

So, I have offered this amendment in good faith in an attempt to do something for the taxpayers of this country by cutting \$17 million out of next year's funding and all the \$80 million for 1975. I hope, as I have said before, that that will be the beginning of the end of this boondoggle.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN), a few minutes ago, read some plaudits of the Peace Corps from some foreign government pooh-bahs. I have no doubt that they appreciate having the Peace Corps, because we are spending money in those countries. But it is my understanding the Peace Corps has been kicked out of 17 countries. I notice he did not say anything about that. I do not know whether they were kicked out of any foreign countries last year, but it is evident that not all is gold that glitters with this outfit.

I offer this amendment in the hope

that this can be the beginning of some financial sanity on the part of the Members of the House. I cannot think of anything that could be better dispensed with, in view of what is going on, than this entire program.

Mr. Chairman, more than \$1 billion has been spent on this international WPA since its inception and for what? Our problems around the world have increased, not diminished. Now it is proposed to borrow and spend another \$157 million in 2 years. To what end?

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from Iowa has pointed out one potential avenue of cost cutting in his amendment to slice \$17 million from our total budget. This morning I have just attended a meeting in the Veterans' Affairs Committee at which time the Disabled American Veterans presented their testimony concerning the very sad and very serious situation all disabled veterans face. The pittance that is referred to as pension funds falls miserably to maintain minimum standards for those who have sacrificed a normal and healthy, and full life for our country. Nowhere do I see this plight of our honored disabled veterans being given the priority of treatment that is so justly deserved. The high priority goes overseas to, as my distinguished colleague so aptly phrased it, an international WPA. I think we would be doing a far greater justice to our taxpayers as well as our disabled American veterans if we would slash this \$17 million from our Peace Corps and place it in the hands of our disabled veterans. For that reason, I totally endorse the gentleman from Iowa's economy move.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Before I deal with the substance of the gentleman's amendment, I wish to assure him that the Peace Corps was not asked to leave any country in the last fiscal year. The Peace Corps withdrew from Uganda because of a border clash between Tanganyika and Uganda. A Peace Corps volunteer was killed there, so we immediately withdrew the Peace Corps from Uganda. But no country asked the Peace Corps to leave during the last fiscal year.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. How many countries have the Peace Corps been kicked out of?

Mr. MORGAN. They have been removed from about 15 countries. Some countries invited them back. Several countries removed the Peace Corps and then invited them back.

The gentleman from Iowa is a member—and a very valuable member—of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He has an outstanding reputation as a great economist. He has been opposed to proposals to spend dollars overseas for a good many years. I realized that this amendment would come from him.

I would like to point out, however, that the 2-year authorization request was

made by the administration. The Committee on Foreign Affairs did not manufacture it; it came from downtown.

As a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules pointed out here when the rule was being debated, our committee knocked out the open-end authorization requested by the administration for the second year. This was done through an amendment offered by the distinguished Member of Congress from the great State of Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN). His amendment closed the open end and provided for a 2-year authorization with an \$80 million ceiling in fiscal 1975.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank my chairman for yielding. The amendment to provide \$80 million for fiscal year 1975, which is an increase over fiscal year 1974, was adopted by the committee in a matter of 5 minutes; was it not? And the Peace Corps never testified in behalf of the \$80 million.

Mr. MORGAN. The Acting Director of the Peace Corps testified in support of the open-ended authorization for fiscal 1975. That could have gone as high as \$100 million. The committee would not buy it. In its wisdom, the committee decided, however, that they would give the Peace Corps some flexibility and give them \$77 million in fiscal 1974 and \$80 million the following year.

Mr. GROSS. But, of course, the committee knew that the House would not adopt an open-end authorization. So the committee threw in \$80 million which is not a decrease, but an increase. How in all conscience can this be approved?

Mr. MORGAN. As the gentleman knows, I have always opposed open-end authorizations, and I opposed this one in the committee during the markup.

At the same time, our committee has watched the Peace Corps since 1961. The Peace Corps reached a peak in 1968 when they had 14,000 trainees and volunteers, and the program was costing about \$124 million. In more recent years, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has worked with the Peace Corps to move it in a new direction, to reduce the number of volunteers and to improve the quality of its performance. They have done a good job moving in those directions. There are only 7,000 volunteers this year. The budget has come down from \$124 million to where we are now asked to approve \$77 million. And the quality has gone up considerably.

The main reason the Peace Corps is asking for a 2-year authorization is because we, among others, have criticized them for their shortcomings in recruitment and training. To get the right kind of volunteers and to get them ready within 1 year's authorization, is difficult. We realize this. And for this reason, we propose to give them a 2-year authorization so that they will have the opportunity to select better qualified volunteers, and to improve the performance of the Peace Corps.

So I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will not be

adopted. The Peace Corps has been a good program. It has been received very well overseas in most of the countries. To give the Peace Corps a chance to move in the new direction and to enable it to attract volunteers with the right kind of skills, we should give it a 2-year authorization and the funding provided for in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) for the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 24, noes 28.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5293) authorizing continuing appropriations for the Peace Corps, pursuant to House Resolution 328, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

NOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Unalterably and unequivocally, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the Bill H.R. 5293 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: On page 1, strike all of lines 7, 8 and 9 and insert the following: "\$60,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 132, nays 238, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—132

Abdnor	Gross	O'Brien
Andrews, N.C.	Gunter	Pettis
Arends	Haley	Poage
Baker	Hammer-	Powell, Ohio
Beard	schmidt	Quillen
Bennett	Hanrahan	Randall
Bevill	Harsha	Rarick
Blackburn	Henderson	Robinson, Va.
Bray	Hogan	Roncallo, Wyo.
Brinkley	Huber	Rose
Burleson, Tex.	Hudnut	Rousselot
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Ruth
Butler	Hunt	Satterfield
Byron	Hutchinson	Saylor
Camp	Jarman	Scherle
Carter	Johnson, Colo.	Sebelius
Casey, Tex.	Jones, Okla.	Shibley
Cederberg	Jones, Tenn.	Shuster
Clancy	Kazen	Sikes
Clawson, Del.	Kemp	Skubitz
Cleveland	Kuykendall	Slack
Cochran	Landgrebe	Snyder
Collier	Landrum	Spence
Collins	Latta	Steed
Conlan	Long, Md.	Steelman
Crane	Lott	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniel, Dan	McCollister	Stubblefield
Daniel, Robert	McEwen	Stuckey
W. Jr.	Mahon	Symms
de la Garza	Maraziti	Talcott
Dennis	Martin, Nebr.	Taylor, Mo.
Devine	Martin, N.C.	Thone
Dickinson	Mathis, Ga.	Towell, Nev.
Dorn	Mayne	Treen
Downing	Michel	Vessey
Duncan	Milford	Waggonner
Evins, Tenn.	Miller	Wampler
Fisher	Mills, Md.	White
Flynt	Minshall, Ohio	Whitten
Fountain	Mizell	Wiggins
Freulich	Montgomery	Williams
Fuqua	Moorhead,	Wylie
Gettys	Calif.	Wyman
Ginn	Myers	Young, S.C.
Goodling	Nichols	Zion

NAYS—238

Abzug	Corman	Hansen, Idaho
Adams	Cotter	Hansen, Wash.
Addabbo	Coughlin	Harrington
Alexander	Cronin	Hastings
Anderson,	Culver	Hays
Calif.	Daniels,	Hébert
Anderson, Ill.	Dominick V.	Hechler, W. Va.
Andrews,	Danielson	Heckler, Mass.
N. Dak.	Davis, Ga.	Heinz
Annunzio	Davis, Wis.	Helstoski
Archer	Delaney	Hicks
Ashley	Dellenback	Hillis
Barrett	Dellums	Hinshaw
Bell	Denholm	Hollifield
Bergland	Derwinski	Holt
Biester	Diggs	Holtzman
Bingham	Donohue	Horton
Boggs	Drinan	Hosmer
Boland	Dulski	Howard
Bolling	du Pont	Johnson, Calif.
Bowen	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Pa.
Brademas	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, Ala.
Brasco	Elberg	Jordan
Breaux	Eshleman	Karth
Breckinridge	Evans, Colo.	Kastenmeier
Brooks	Fascell	Keating
Broomfield	Fish	Ketchum
Brotzman	Flood	Koch
Brown, Mich.	Foley	Kyros
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Gerald R.	Leggett
Broyhill, N.C.	Forsythe	Lehman
Broyhill, Va.	Frenzel	Lent
Buchanan	Frey	Long, La.
Burgener	Fulton	McCloskey
Burke, Calif.	Gibbons	McCormack
Burke, Fla.	Gilman	McDade
Burke, Mass.	Goldwater	McFall
Carey, N.Y.	Gonzalez	McKay
Chamberlain	Grasso	Macdonald
Chisholm	Gray	Madden
Clark	Green, Oreg.	Madigan
Clausen,	Green, Pa.	Mailliard
Don H.	Gubser	Mallory
Cohen	Gude	Mathias, Calif.
Conable	Hamilton	Matsunaga
Conte	Hanley	Mazzoli
Conyers	Hanna	Meeds

Meicher
Metcalfe
Mezvinisky
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Neill
Owens
Parris
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Podell
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Pritchard

Quile
Rallsback
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Reid
Rhodes
Rinaldo
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Runnels
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shriver
Staggers
Stanton
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes

Stratton
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor, N.C.
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornston
Tiernan
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walsh
Ware
Whalen
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolf
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

NOT VOTING—63

Armstrong
Ashbrook
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Blaggi
Blatnik
Brown, Calif.
Burton
Carney, Ohio
Chappell
Clay
Davis, S.C.
Dent
Dingell
Eckhardt
Erlenborn
Esch
Findley
Flowers
Ford
William D. Fraser

Frelinghuysen
Gaydos
Gialmo
Griffiths
Grover
Guyer
Harvey
Hawkins
Ichord
Jones, N.C.
King
Kluczynski
Litton
Lujan
McClory
McKinney
McSpadden
Mann
Mills, Ark.
Passman
Price, Tex.
Reuss
Riegle

Roberts
Rogers
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Schneebell
Shoup
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Steele
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Ullman
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Wright

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Davis of South Carolina for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.
Mr. Chappell for, with Mr. Burton against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Rosenthal.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Bafalis.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Steele.
Mr. Wright with Mr. King.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Rogers with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Dent.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Carney of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 299, nays 72, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—299

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Ashley
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Biester
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Breau
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyles, N.C.
Broyles, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Butler
Carey, N.Y.
Cederberg
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Cohen
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Cronin
Culver
Daniels, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Derwinski
Reid

Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Elberg
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Frenley
Frey
Freohlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gibbons
Gilman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Gude
Gunter
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hays
Hebert
Heckler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Hogan
Hollifield
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Okla.
Jordan
Kard
Kastenmeier
Staggers

Kazen
Keating
Kemp
Ketchum
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
McFall
McKay
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallory
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinisky
Miller
Mills, Md.
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Owens
Parris
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Podell
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Quile
Rallsback
Rangel
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Waldie

Rhodes
Rinaldo
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Roncallo, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Runnels
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Slack
Smith, N.Y.

Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steelman
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornston
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Treen
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito

Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolf
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—72

Beard
Bevill
Blackburn
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Tex.
Byron
Camp
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cochran
Collins
Conlan
Crane
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
de la Garza
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Downing
Duncan
Fisher
Flynt
Gettys

Ginn
Goodling
Gross
Haley
Hanrahan
Huber
Hutchinson
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, Tenn.
Landgrebe
Latta
Lott
McCollister
McEwen
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Mathis, Ga.
Michel
Milford
Minshall, Ohio
Montgomery
Myers
Pettis
Poage
Powell, Ohio

Quillen
Barick
Robinson, Va.
Rose
Roussellot
Ruth
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Shuster
Skubitz
Snyder
Spence
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Symms
Taylor, Mo.
Waggoner
Whitten
Wiggins
Young, S.C.

NOT VOTING—62

Armstrong
Ashbrook
Aspin
Badillo
Blaggi
Blatnik
Burton
Carney, Ohio
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clay
Davis, S.C.
Dennis
Dent
Eckhardt
Erlenborn
Esch
Flowers
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gaydos
Gialmo

Griffiths
Grover
Guyer
Harvey
Hawkins
Ichord
Jones, N.C.
King
Kluczynski
Landrum
Leggett
Lujan
McClory
McKinney
McSpadden
Mann
Mills, Ark.
Nichols
Passman
Price, Tex.
Reuss
Riegle

Roberts
Rogers
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Schneebell
Shoup
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Steele
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Ullman
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Schneebell.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Dennis.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Shoup.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. King.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Steele.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Price of Texas.
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. Leggett.
 Mr. Fraser with Mr. McSpadden.
 Mr. Aspin with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Clay.
 Mr. Carney of Ohio with Mr. Passman.
 Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Reuss.
 Mr. Rogers with Mr. Ullman.
 Mr. Symington with Mr. Udall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the Peace Corps."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed (H.R. 5293).

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to respond to the distinguished minority leader.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of April 2d is as follows:

On Monday, Consent Calendar, no business.

Suspensions. H.R. 3153, technical and conforming changes in Social Security Act; House Resolution 330, Law of the Sea Conference.

On Tuesday, Private Calendar, there is no business. There will be no suspensions for Tuesday.

On Tuesday, before the hour of 2:30, we anticipate that the vocational rehabilitation veto will have arrived on the floor subject, of course, to the action of the other body.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, there is H.R. 5683, insured loan program for REA, subject to a rule being granted. There is H.R. 3180, franking privilege for Members of Congress, subject to a rule being granted; House Joint Resolution 205, Atlantic Union delegation, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for an amplification of his comment on the Tuesday program?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Am I correct that the other body is going to vote at 2 o'clock on Tuesday on the veto on S. 7, and, that as soon as that is considered over there, and on the assumption that it will not sustain, it will be sent over here and we will vote right after that?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman from Michigan is correct.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What will be the situation on Tuesday if this one vote is not scheduled? Will there be any business at all on Tuesday?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would have to say that there is no business scheduled other than the vote on the vetoed bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman clarify this? If we have to wait for the other body to send the veto message over, will we recess in the interim?

Mr. O'NEILL. Well, we could make a motion to recess, or we could take the special orders that would normally be asked for to use the time.

We have been notified by the other body that they anticipate that the vote will be at 2 o'clock and that the other body would send it forthwith.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If there were four special orders on Tuesday, in order to occupy the time, would we be able to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts discourse further on the high cost of food?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would be happy to associate with the gentleman from Iowa. I am sure he appreciates the problem of the farmers out there and how they are sweating it out.

Mr. GROSS. I sure do.

Mr. O'NEILL. And the Russian wheat deal. I know the gentleman from Iowa is in sympathetic feeling with the farmer because of the high price of grain and things like that. I appreciate his sympathetic attitude.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, APRIL 2, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with business

in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

PREDATOR CONTROL

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

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, on March 19 the National Audubon Society presented testimony before a subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on predator control bills. With their testimony they filed for the hearing record a supplementary statement on payments made under the National Wool Act and on alleged "low" grazing fees paid by livestock producers.

Their statement, in my opinion, was misleading. Since one of my colleagues published their statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I felt it proper to publish the rebuttal statement submitted for the hearing record by the National Wool Growers Association which follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION

This statement is submitted in rebuttal to a statement filed for the hearing record by a witness for the National Audubon Society. While not related to the subject of the hearings, predator control, the witness named several sheep producers in Wyoming and Colorado and listed payments she claimed they receive in 1971 under the provisions of the National Wool Act.

For example, the witness alleged that Vern Vivion, immediate past president of the National Wool Growers Association "received a fat government check in 1971." Vern Vivion did not receive a fat government check in 1971. The facts are that Vern Vivion and his family are one of three families that are a part of the Leo Sheep Company of Rawlins, Wyoming. The corporation and not Vern Vivion individually did receive a larger-than-usual payment in 1972 and no payment was received in 1971. This is what actually happened:

In 1970 and 1971 wool prices in this country were extremely depressed, as they were all over the world. When wool prices reached these very low levels in 1970, the Leo Sheep Company, like many other sheep ranches held their 1970 wool clip over into 1971 in the hope for a higher market price which would mean a lower Government payment. When 1971 did not bring higher prices, but instead the lowest prices in 33 years, the Leo Sheep Company, like many other sheep ranches, was forced to sell two years' production of wool at the depressed prices.

What the witness failed to state is that the check she is referring to covered payments on two years' wool production. This is also true for some others she names. She also failed to state that due to the much better wool market this year, there is an extremely good possibility that there will be no Government payments on the 1973 wool clip.

Furthermore, the Leo Sheep Company is a highly respected pioneer sheep ranching operation in an area near Rawlins, Wyoming. It has been a family operation for several generations and, in fact, provides a livelihood for three separate families; namely, Charles Vivion, his two sons and their families. Since it is in a semi-arid region where crop production is not possible, it is necessary that

it be a large operation to form an economic unit. Bigness does not denote badness.

While the witness emphasized low market prices for wool in 1971 and consequent higher payments under the National Wool Act, she neglected to state that in all of the other years since the inception of the Wool Act, market prices were higher and payments were lower. In some years market prices were much higher and consequently payments were much lower. If the witness wants to be fair she should list the payments of these same growers for all other years in which they participated in the Government program and not just the year of highest payments when there was a worldwide depression in wool prices. Why did she fail to list the low payments for 1957, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965 and 1966, for example?

The witness is really attacking the legislative wisdom of Congress when it enacted the wool program to provide for situations of this type and to assure that we have a viable domestic wool industry in this country.

The lack of knowledge of the witness on how the National Wool Act operates is shown by her statement concerning "the peculiar way in which wool incentive payments are calculated." She infers that the large growers receive more per pound than the small growers. This is not true. Instead of calculating the cents per pound difference between the incentive price level under the Wool Act and the market price, the difference is calculated on a percentage basis. This one percentage rate (the percentage required to bring the national average price for wool sold in the free market up to the incentive level) is applied to the net sales proceeds received by each grower to determine the amount of his incentive payment. By making payments on a percentage basis, growers are encouraged to improve the quality and marketing of their wool to obtain the best price possible, because the higher the price the individual grower gets in the free market, the greater his payment.

The quality of a man's wool clip rather than the size of his operation determines the incentive price per pound he receives under the Wool Act. If a small grower prepares a better clip of wool, and receives a better price for it on the open market, the return will be more per pound than that of a large grower who prepares a clip of lesser quality. To associate the payment per pound with the size of the grower's operations which the National Audubon Society witness has done, is misleading and utterly ridiculous.

As for "low grazing fees" just what does the witness mean by such a statement? Grazing fees in many instances are probably high for the type of desert and semi-arid grazing land that is involved. Much of it requires 100 acres to graze one cow or five sheep. Much of this land would be useless and would lie idle if it were not for sheep and cattle to convert the sparse grass into meat and wool to feed and clothe the people of this country. The witness fails to give any credit to the livestock industry for developing the economy of these semi-arid and desert regions, providing taxes for roads, schools and other necessities to many Western communities and making it possible for these communities to exist.

The economic theory of the witness with regard to "savings" to graziers on public lands

is apparently based on a comparison of grazing fees on private leased lands with those on Federal lands. The witness fails to state that in many cases private lands are superior pasture lands capable of grazing more animals on a smaller acreage and, consequently, command a higher lease fee.

Furthermore, on private lands the grazier has tenure and the owner of the private land gives the grazier the right to manage the land he is leasing. A great deal of the acreage of Federal lands is land that was not valuable enough to be taken up by homesteaders. Much of it is land on which the Federal Government would realize no return whatsoever if it were not for livestock to graze it for a part of the year.

The witness says that one-third of the grazing fee is used for range improvements "which benefit the grazier such as fence building." She does not state that over one-half of the fencing on Federal lands was paid for by the graziers themselves and she fails to mention that range improvement fees also go for re-seeding, erosion control and other good husbandry practices which have made much of the grazing land better and more productive than when it was first grazed. A good portion of range improvement fees are used for the development of water sources and other improvements beneficial to wildlife as well as domestic livestock.

Her statements on grazing fees demonstrate a misunderstanding of the theory and application of the 1966 Western Range Livestock Survey. For example, she makes the statement:

"The livestock interests did not succeed in having the interest cost considered as an operating cost when the fee was set, but other costs including moving animals, lost animals, herding, salting and feeding were deducted before the fee was set."

The costs referred to were not used for the purpose of deductions at any time. Fees and other cost items are common to operating on both private and public lands and when computed and compared, conclusively demonstrated that the cost of grazing on public lands was higher than the cost of grazing on private lands.

The witness also latched on to these hearings as one more opportunity to recite the death in Wyoming of some eagles in 1971. She is apparently going on the theory of "guilt by association." Because several ranchers were accused of violating the law she is apparently intimating that the other 175,000 respected citizens of this country who happen to be sheep farmers and ranchers are also guilty of wrong-doing. The National Wool Growers Association does not condone any violations of the law; neither do we believe that law-abiding citizens should have any stigma of guilt attached to them because they happen to be sheep farmers and ranchers.

I would like to get this clarification on the hearing record and to state further that the type of testimony offered by the Audubon Society, in my opinion, does nothing to assist the Subcommittee in its earnest deliberations to solve the predator problem—a problem which affects not only the sheep producers which the National Audubon Society is attacking, but cattlemen, turkey producers, other farmers and also meat processors who are trying to supply American consumers with an abundant quantity of meat at the

lowest possible prices. Really the fundamental issue here does not involve the National Wool Act or grazing fees, but rather the right of farmers and ranchers producing calves, lambs, turkeys and other defenseless living things to protect their property through adequate measures to control depredating animals.

FARM SUBSIDIES

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I expect momentarily the annual honor roll of the Department of Agriculture: The list of those farms that received subsidy payments of \$20,000 or more under the Federal Government's cotton, feed grains, and wheat programs for 1972.

A record number of 12,309 farms received subsidy payments of \$20,000 or more last year for withholding production of these crops. This select group received a total of \$411.8 million, which is more than 10 percent of all Federal farm subsidies paid in 1972.

Total farm subsidies last year were \$4 billion, spread among 2.4 million farmers.

Contrary to my previous practice, I will not insert this list in the Record. It would fill about 90 pages, and the cost to the Public Printer would exceed \$15,000.

As much as I would like to make this list a permanent part of the Record, my conscience restrains me from spending such an exorbitant sum of the taxpayers' money.

However, I shall make this list available in my office.

In this time of high food prices, meat boycotts, and feed grain shortages, the magnitude of the Federal Government's generosity to the big, rich farmers is clearly outrageous. It is time to phase out these welfare-for-the-rich programs, starting right now.

I fully support the administration's plan to terminate these giveaway programs and unleash the farmers' full productive capacity. I have been advocating this for years.

The American taxpayer is tired of forking over an added \$4 billion to Uncle Sam every year. The consumer has been knifed too long by artificially high food prices. And the farmer is ready to be weaned from Federal spoon feeding.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The number of farms that have received subsidy payments exceeding \$20,000 has tripled since 1967. The following table demonstrates this remarkable growth:

TABLE 1.—PRODUCERS RECEIVING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS OF \$20,000 OR MORE AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS RECEIVED, 1967-72

	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Number of producers:						
Cotton.....	3,494	5,249	6,194	7,753	8,810	9,066
Feed grain.....	80	877	1,482	1,395	245	1,855
Wheat.....	542	741	1,123	1,223	1,088	1,388
Total producers.....	4,116	6,867	8,799	10,371	10,143	12,309
Total payments received (million dollars).....	(1)	\$266.6	\$344.9	\$408.9	\$350.1	\$411.8

¹ Not available.

Three programs account for almost 90 percent of all farm payments made by the Department of Agriculture in 1972. These programs are the feed grain set-aside program, \$1,845,383,693; the wheat set-aside program, \$855,844,734; and the cotton set-aside program, \$808,039,560.

The Department of Agriculture has provided figures showing a State-by-State breakdown of these programs:

TABLE 2.—PAYMENTS TO PRODUCERS BY STATES AND PROGRAMS DURING 1972

[Amounts in dollars]

State	Cotton set-aside program	Feed grain set-aside program	Wheat set-aside program
Alabama	45,663,377	14,401,968	382,935
Alaska			
Arizona	37,266,251	4,342,750	833,049
Arkansas	73,539,705	2,252,133	1,127,862
California	76,748,787	11,801,900	4,862,028
Colorado		23,644,209	29,895,587
Connecticut		113,599	542
Delaware		1,394,688	316,198
Florida	1,048,618	6,626,951	117,543
Georgia	35,228,488	34,483,359	1,299,148
Hawaii			
Idaho		4,798,475	30,757,034
Illinois	112,086	211,250,592	23,964,491
Indiana		109,108,214	17,255,469
Iowa		304,947,571	1,173,259
Kansas	249	98,479,508	137,240,367
Kentucky	384,197	26,213,436	2,212,834
Louisiana	35,832,280	2,138,211	262,234
Maine		68,256	2,651
Maryland		6,524,139	1,748,636
Massachusetts		26,665	91
Michigan		34,496,082	16,009,705
Minnesota		147,890,208	17,762,451
Mississippi	108,985,481	9,207,249	593,491
Missouri	20,800,087	98,121,343	20,238,963
Montana		16,539,714	73,215,780
Nebraska		166,119,365	54,003,504
Nevada	245,137	70,759	424,097
New Hampshire		26,289	
New Jersey		2,233,478	634,663
New Mexico	11,608,951	13,037,539	7,921,749
New York		8,997,813	4,911,110
North Carolina	14,636,933	30,520,335	4,801,980
North Dakota		53,587,067	141,243,764
Ohio		58,597,268	19,731,214
Oklahoma	20,936,518	19,259,312	70,637,073
Oregon		3,398,707	13,880,405
Pennsylvania		11,680,650	4,720,855
Rhode Island		1,517	
South Carolina	29,641,579	12,534,656	2,125,605
South Dakota		57,713,566	40,719,532
Tennessee	31,246,287	18,365,954	1,541,565
Texas	263,805,941	153,621,378	54,157,238
Utah		1,197,602	3,964,560
Vermont		101,054	738
Virginia	308,608	9,884,587	3,176,372
Washington		5,823,497	41,542,398
West Virginia		662,104	169,353
Wisconsin		47,703,703	575,325
Wyoming		1,354,273	3,689,286
Total	808,039,560	1,845,383,693	855,844,734

Other subsidy programs and payments made in 1972 were:

Extra long staple cotton	\$4,601,882
Sugar Act	85,133,583
National Wool Act	113,139,476
Milk indemnity	34,127
Beekeepers indemnity	6,125,490
Cropland conversion	107,702
Conservation reserve	4,966
Appalachian region conservation	
Cropland adjustment	1,084,137
Rural environmental assistance	51,509,259
Emergency conservation	\$181,931,135
Office of emergency preparedness	4,539,985
Hay transportation assistance	125,200
Wild hemp elimination	2,958
Water bank	2,916
	272,104

The grand total for all Federal agricultural payments in 1972 is \$3,957,882,907.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1967 four of my House colleagues and I published the results of our detailed examination of the Nation's Selective Service System. In our book, "How To End the Draft: The Case for an All Volunteer Army," Congressmen FRANK J. HORTON, RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER—now U.S. Senator—GARNER E. SHRIVER, ROBERT T. STAFFORD—now U.S. Senator—and I observed that—

The draft, however necessary, is inherently incompatible with the basic principles of democracy.

My cosponsors and I concluded that the draft should be replaced by an all-volunteer Armed Forces which could be realized "within 2 to 5 years, if preliminary steps are taken now—1967—in pursuit of that objective." Our research indicated further that such an all-volunteer force "would not necessarily be over-representative of the socially or economically deprived segments of the U.S. population, but neither is it inappropriate for the services to offer an opportunity to the deprived to better their economic conditions."

It was with considerable pleasure, therefore, that I read Defense Secretary Elliot Richardson's March 21 statement indicating that—

It will not be necessary to extend the draft induction authority beyond its expiration date of July 1.

Thus, the all-volunteer military concept, for which my four fellow Representatives and I pleaded 6 years ago, has become a reality. True, the conditions contributing to the present zero draft call are dissimilar to those assumptions upon which my colleagues and I postulated our conclusions. Today, termination of hostilities in Vietnam has permitted a reduction in active duty troop strength from 3,367,000—as of January 1, 1967—to 2,309,967. In 1967, however, Messrs. HORTON, SCHWEIKER, SHRIVER, STAFFORD, and I reasoned that a higher force level—over 3,000,000—could be maintained on a volunteer basis even "in times of limited war"—such as then existed.

The administration is to be congratulated upon the attainment of President Nixon's goal of an all-volunteer Armed Force to which so many of us in Congress have subscribed. It is clear that the Nation derives at least three major benefits from the accomplishment of this objective.

First, by ending military conscription our Government reaffirms the premise of individual liberty—freedom of choice—the cornerstone upon which our democratic society rests.

Second, terminating Presidential induction authority should remove the temptation to become involved in potentially expansive "brush-fire" wars or so-called peace-keeping operations. It can be argued that Presidents Kennedy and Johnson might not have accelerated our

Vietnam commitment had they been required to go to the Congress for reinstitution of draft induction authority.

Third, allowing section 17(c) to lapse should help resolve the "war-powers" question. If, in the future, a President perceives a threat to our national security which requires a rapid troop build-up, the draft machinery would become operative only through an act of Congress. This would represent a shared responsibility between the legislative and executive branches for any subsequent military developments.

It is the hope of every American citizen that, having embarked upon a generation of peace, this eventuality never will materialize.

TAILLIGHT REGULATIONS

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation requiring new automobile taillighting regulations designed to prevent rear-end related collisions which in 1971 resulted in at least 2,500 deaths and about 8 million accidents.

The legislation to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act is cosponsored by Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON.

It would require a separate green taillight to signal when the automobile is accelerating; an amber light to indicate when the car is coasting, and a red light to warn that the vehicle is being braked. The early warning system would be mandatory on all vehicles built after August 15, 1973.

Since passage of the National Highway Safety Act, a number of significant steps have been taken to reduce the traffic toll which includes an estimated 56,300 deaths and 16.4 million accidents in 1972. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has inspired many of the improvements in automobile construction and traffic regulations. However, the problem of rear-end collision related accidents is an area that deserves immediate attention.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has stated that nearly 50 percent of all accidents and 10 percent of all traffic fatalities are rear-end collision related.

The cost of rear-end collisions is estimated by the Library of Congress as in excess of \$2 billion property damages, over a quarter of a million disabled injuries, and 26 million man-hours of production labor, annually.

However safety authorities are generally agreed that our means of signalling between drivers on increasingly crowded streets and highways, are seriously inadequate. Traffic conditions have made it virtually impossible for drivers to perform safely and successfully.

By way of illustration, Dr. John Crosley, University of Indiana, proved 10 years ago that, considering such factors

as travel rate and traffic density, it is mathematically impossible to avoid rear-end collisions in emergency conditions at peak traffic volume, given conventional automotive safety equipment—ordinary brake lights. Crosley's research indicated even then that conditions were steadily worsening. If today's rear-end fatality rate continues, the rear-end fatality toll will increase to approximately 7,500 annually by the end of this decade, given present rates of travel, traffic density, and our limited human response capabilities. Crosley said the solution to the problem is to put green, amber and red early warning signal lights on the rear of all motor vehicles.

The technology is available and economical. In the past 50 years hundreds of patents dealing with taillighting improvements have been issued, including many of the type that Crosley recommended. Nearly all are gathering dust in the patent files—because the auto industry has not responded to the challenge—and the DOT has not paid sufficient attention to the immediate needs of the motoring public.

The plea is heard that the resources of both industry and the DOT are insufficient to handle both accident severity reduction projects and accident prevention projects simultaneously.

I will go on record with the observation that a considerable contribution to accident prevention can be made immediately with no strain on any sector. And that is by installation of color-coded early warning signals on the rear of newly manufactured vehicles—and by encouraging such installations in service.

DOT is well aware of the demonstrated advantages of color-coded accelerator pedal early warning lights but has shown singular neglect in putting its knowledge into effect despite the growing rear-end collision problem.

We have seen postponement after postponement at DOT of moves to put early warning standards into effect.

Present indications are that DOT may issue a notice of proposed rulemaking for a permissive standard on early warning sometime soon. Meantime, the daily toll continues.

I am satisfied that the merits of color coding of taillights have been sufficiently established at this point in time.

I am satisfied that a green, amber and red taillight system showing accelerator pedal position as well as brake pedal position will improve driver communication and reduce frequency of traffic accidents and that this has been sufficiently demonstrated. I, therefore, propose that the NHTSA be directed by act of this Congress to stipulate specifications for such a system leading to mandatory adoption of all U.S. motor vehicles without further delay.

I have prepared a bill which would enable the above by its adoption. This bill specifies that color-coded pedal position indicator benefits be made mandatory in the motor vehicle field no later than August of 1973. It will positively assure that we move ahead in this area with as much energy and determination as we have, for example, in the more publicized

areas of air pollution and passenger restraint. The time has come to quit talking about the problem. Therefore, the following legislation is proposed to assure that the appropriate action is taken decisively and immediately:

H.R. 6349

A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the establishment of standards related to rear mounted lighting systems

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 103 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1392) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "(1) the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, prescribe such standards under this section as may be necessary to insure that motor vehicles be equipped with rear mounted lighting systems as follows: (1) with a constant green light when the motor vehicle is moving forward under power from its engine, (2) with a constant amber light when the motor vehicle is moving forward or standing and idling, but not under power from its engine, (3) with a conventional red brake light when the motor vehicle is being braked through the use of its braking system, and such other information with respect to such motor vehicles as the Secretary deems necessary."

(b) The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect no later than August 15, 1973.

I urge this Congress to take this important vehicle safety aspect under immediate consideration and support its passage without delay. Let us give our motor vehicle safety program the green light and get on with the job of saving more lives.

EXECUTIVE IMPOUNDMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the Rules Committee on a bill that I introduced early this session on the question of executive impoundment of appropriations.

Before the committee, I offered a compromise version of my original legislation and I am introducing this revised proposal today.

I insert my remarks before the Rules Committee which detail my original proposal and the proposal that I now offer in the RECORD at this point:

TESTIMONY OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE J. J. PICKLE

Mr. Chairman, and my distinguished colleagues, I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss with you today the courses available to us in dealing with the problem of Executive impoundment of lawfully appropriated funds.

The first point I want to make is that Presidential power to impound, or not spend, lawfully appropriated funds is neither clear-cut nor inherent.

It exists in the final analysis only at the will and wish of this United States Congress. It is in our power today, as always, to define the limits of lawful impoundments—or even to state when or whether they are legal at all.

The President and his officers at the Office of Management and Budget have claimed that the Presidential authority to impound funds is derived basically from Article II,

Section I of the Constitution, that it is inherent, and that it is complete.

But they also hasten to add a host of other justifications for their impoundments—an action which in itself indicates they themselves are still searching for a bedrock authority to do what they want. Impoundment has been recently justified on the grounds that appropriations are not mandatory, that there was a need to manage expenditures so as not to exceed the debt ceiling, that spending of money which might result in increased prices or taxes would violate the Employment Act of 1946 which makes it federal policy "to promote maximum employment, protection, and purchasing power."

Claims such as these flounder because of the possibility of satisfying them through other means or of the distinct Presidential possibility of putting the bug on the Congress to resolve these difficulties itself.

Just because the Executive has found impoundment useful—and sometimes even essential—as a tool to achieve its objectives does not mean that impoundment is a legal tool as it is used today.

Moreover, the "inherency" of any power that requires more than 170 years to become apparent is to me dubious. The assertion that the President may not spend lawfully appropriated funds involves the tenuous propositions that the President can break the laws that he is to faithfully execute—for appropriations are laws.

The best case the Executive has for impoundment is simply precedent. Since the Constitution is a living document, this is not a negligible or unimportant basis to stand on.

But the precedents for impoundment are being misread and misconstrued today because what those precedents are is not clearly understood.

Even Associate Justice William H. Rehnquist, who, I would assume, well understands these precedents, wrote of impoundment as an assistant Attorney General in 1969:

"With respect to the suggestion that the President has a constitutional power to decline to spend appropriated funds, we must conclude that the existence of such a broad power is supported by neither reason nor precedent."

I think it would be extremely helpful to this Committee to review a bit of the history of impoundment over the past two centuries in this country.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to insert into the hearing records the testimony of Professor Joseph Cooper, Department of Political Science of Rice University, Houston, Texas, before the Senate Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, March, 1971, as it gives an excellent and detailed history of impoundment.

And I would also like here briefly to summarize that history myself.

The first period we can look at would be the time prior to 1921 and the creation of the Bureau of the Budget. In this time only one impoundment case stands out—and it stands out because it is being so frequently quoted as a precedent for the Administration's current actions. That case is the deferring of funds by President Jefferson in 1803 to build 15 gunboats for service on the Mississippi River. I use the word deferral—not impoundment—very purposefully, for that is precisely what Jefferson did.

In a message to Congress, Jefferson reported that he had not spent the money for the gunboats because the Louisiana Purchase had ended any immediate need for them.

But as pointed out in a recent letter to the *Washington Post*, he did not tuck the money away forever. He did not "claim a right to impose his own policy judgments on the execution of law, to kill or trim programs in accord with his own policy desires."

Instead, since the immediate need was re-

moved, he waited to spend the money until he was sure the new gunboats would be the best possible. And he did spend the money within a relatively short period, according to the best historical analysis available.

In 1905 and 1906, in an effort to foster more efficiency in government spending, Congress passed the Anti-Deficiency Acts. These Acts sought to prevent, and I quote, "undue expenditures in one portion of the year that may require deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year." These acts further provided that apportionments could be waived or modified in the event of "some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstances which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment."

It said nothing about waiving appropriations for policy reasons or because of differences of opinion between the Legislative and Executive branches at the time of appropriation.

In 1921 the creation of the Bureau of the Budget brought a new step in the impoundment history. The first Director, Charles Dawes, firmly believed that the new agency's purpose was to bring efficient business management to bear on federal spending.

Accordingly, he formulated the now oft-cited formula that appropriations are not mandatory. But Dawes did not use this formula as it is used today. Dawes meant that an agency did not have to spend the full amount of an appropriation—if it could accomplish the same program objectives while spending less.

I think a quote from Mr. Dawes' book, *The First Year of the Budget of the United States*, makes clear what Mr. Dawes really had in mind:

"I want to say here again that the Budget bureau keeps humble, and if it ever becomes obsessed with the idea that it has any work except to save money and improve efficiency in routine business it will cease to be useful in the hands of the President. Again I say, we have nothing to do with policy. When as we love the President, if Congress, in its omnipotence over appropriations and in accordance with its authority over policy, passed a law that garbage should be put on the White House steps, it would be our regrettable duty, as a bureau, in an impartial, nonpolitical, and non-partisan way, to advise the Executive and Congress as to how the largest amount of garbage could be spread in the most expeditious and economical manner."

Some wags even today seem to think that this bickering between the Executive and the Congress is a lot of political garbage, but believe you me it isn't.

In the 1930's, this notion that appropriations are not mandatory or that money might be withheld to effect "savings" was broadened by President Hoover under the pressures of the Depression to withhold funds to effect savings by controlling the tempo or rate of program implementation.

And soon after, in the early 1940's, the Budget Bureau began to move to effect savings not simply by controlling the rate or tempo of program implementation, but by controlling the rate or tempo of program implementation, but by controlling the achievement or execution of particular programs *per se*.

Thus, in 1941, President Roosevelt announced that because of the war emergency he was not going to allocate any funds for any water resource project that did not have an important national defense value. He took that next step from shrinking entire programs to removing portions of programs at his own discretion.

And Congressional outcry, for the first time, was massive and bitter.

As a result, by 1950, following the recommendation of the 1949 Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Budgeting that

"additional legislation is needed to sustain the Bureau's powers with regard to both apportionments and reserves," Section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act of 1951 amended the Anti-Deficiency Act as follows:

"In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available."

The following statement from the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress sums up the present statutory authority under the Anti-Deficiency Act to impound funds:

"Even as amended it is hard to see how the language of this section can be interpreted to give the Bureau of the Budget unlimited discretion to apportion reserves. The establishment of reserves is authorized 'to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available.' This seems to preclude the establishment of reserves simply because of a disagreement of policy between the Executive and Legislative Departments on the basis of the facts existing at the time the appropriation was made."

The language was clearly not intended to authorize the Budget Bureau to frustrate the legislative purpose of the Congress. Read narrowly, it authorizes no more than what Charles Dawes had expounded thirty years before.

But the language was broad and was easily stretched to reach as an authorization of control of the tempo or rate of program implementation in the interests of economy. And controlling the tempo or rate of program implementation and controlling the achievement of the program at all are merely matters of degree. They blend into one another.

But the Hoover Commission which recommended the legislation clearly recommended that the President be granted authority "to reduce expenditures under appropriations, if the purposes intended by the Congress are carried out."

The impoundments we see today not only transcend in number and scope those of previous years, they have an important qualitative difference.

The Administration is treating these statutory provisions as though they represent a blank check to implement whatever policy he sees fit.

In no law has the Congress given the President authority to have final say over the policy of this land.

Some may question if this authority was given when we changed the Budget Bureau to the Office of Management and Budget in 1970. But I ask permission to include here in the hearing record the text of the Executive Order which created the OMB. I want to include it because when one reads it it is tacitly clear that in no way has the OMB been given authority to set policy. In no way has the OMB been given authority to thwart the priorities of the Congress or the programs set up by the Congress.

In 1949 the Hoover Commission noted that the Executive needed more legislative authority for impoundment. I think that is basically the question we face today—whether we will expand that authority or put it back into historical and Constitutional perspective.

Mr. Chairman, with the history and legal background in mind, I wish to state briefly why I am so concerned over impoundment.

Last year, I stated that the Congress would wake up and find that everything we legislated could be meaningless. I warned that we

could complain when money for our District was withheld, but that someday everybody's District could suffer. I warned that many philosophies—liberal, conservative, rural, urban, and so on—would be affected. I warned that someday constituents would request our help and we could do nothing.

Well, Mr. Chairman, someday is today, considering the recent massive impoundments.

What does this mean? It means that the Federal officials most responsible to the people, the Federal officials most accessible to the people, are no longer able to help the people.

When a constituent calls you, as a Member of Congress, for help in getting Federal aid from a program impounded by the Executive, I do not advise you to tell him to come to Washington to see his friendly OMB man—your constituent would not understand because he thought that you, the Congressman, were elected to serve. So, unless we take steps this year to restore Congress as an equal branch of the government, we may disappear from the halls of actual government.

Unless we take steps towards restoration, we will not be able to maintain the faith that those who elected us entrusted to us. Unless we do something our words and our actions in the Congress will become as "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal"—and maybe little else.

Another disturbing point about impoundment is that a bunch of back-room boys down at the OMB are making the specific impoundment decisions.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, the Office of Management and Budget has become the "invisible government" of the United States.

This title used to be reserved for the CIA; but, there is a committee of Congress to oversee the CIA.

To those who think that the President himself reviews each OMB decision, I have only to cite the recent proposal to cut disability payments to Viet Nam veterans. Although much blame was placed on the Veterans Administration for the proposal, the real culprit was the OMB.

When the President got full wind of what the OMB was doing, we all know that he quickly withdrew it, for further study.

The President may not need enemies with his political friends down at OMB wanting to cut disability payments to Viet Nam veterans.

Furthermore, even if the Chief Executive himself went over each impoundment with a fine tooth comb, I would be upset.

Unbridled impoundment of funds is placing too much power in one man.

Now, many say that all the talk about the Executive running over Congress, of the Executive gathering power in one man, is a bunch of hot-air rhetoric.

All of us being politicians, there is probably a great deal of truth in the rhetoric criticism.

But there are also some very serious questions involved.

Some say Congress is archaic. Some say Congress does not represent all the people—that only one Federal official, who is not even elected directly by the people does. Some say that only the Executive Branch, mostly populated by bureaucrats, can control the budget, and thus make policy decisions.

I say that if these people are correct, then let us re-write the Constitution to weaken the role of the Legislative Branch.

As a believer in representative government, I would fight such a change with all my heart; but I would respect an attempt at changing the Constitution much more than the backhanded implementation of government by one man and his Star Chamber through the OMB.

Such advocates of one-man rule and Star Chamber rule exist in the highest levels of our government today.

I refer the Committee to an interview Dan Rather had with John Ehrlichman of the White House.

Mr. Ehrlichman asserted the right of the President to manage the budget, with his White House advisors, not answerable to Congress.

Dan Rather questioned Mr. Ehrlichman if this was not a drift into "one-man rule."

Ehrlichman answered, "That's what the President of the United States is, Mr. Rather."

Mr. Rather, in surprise, replied, "One-man rule?"

Ehrlichman responded, "Yes, sir. He's the only elected officer elected by all the people of the United States, unlike the Senators or Congressmen."

I respectfully disagree with Mr. Ehrlichman, Mr. Chairman, and I think the American people would, also. This country does not need an elected monarchy.

Before addressing myself to my own anti-impoundment bill, I would want to discuss anti-impoundment bills and fiscal responsibility in general.

The anti-impoundment measures we are considering are not an endorsement that the Congress intends to spend excessively for every proposal made. Clearly, anti-impoundment and high Federal spending is not a cause-and-effect situation.

The authorization and appropriations process of the Congress and the will of the Congress determines the levels of spending. Once that will has been worked, it represents the will of the people.

In the same manner that we are responsible for constitutional government on impoundment matters, we are responsible for a sane fiscal policy.

Perhaps the most important question facing the Congress is how it will control spending. I must say that this question is equally as important as the impoundment question. Congress must be able to control its spending. Hopefully and prayerfully, this session will see us do something about this question. In the meantime, if we are to preserve this Republic, we must preserve our right to spend.

To wed anti-impoundment to irresponsible spending is a shot-gun marriage.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to the specific proposal that I have made to restore equal power to the Congress.

There has been general confusion as to the differences between the various anti-impoundment bills that have been proposed.

The bill that I introduced, in close cooperation with Congressmen William Ford (Michigan), Paul Sarbanes (Maryland), and Michael Harrington (Massachusetts), has a long history.

The bill was originally introduced by our former colleague William Anderson (Tennessee) in the 92nd Congress. I joined nearly one-hundred and fifty Members of the House who co-sponsored the Anderson bill.

This bill was nearly identical to the one introduced by Senator Sam Ervin. The bill on the Senate side had 50 Senatorial co-sponsors.

Senator Ervin's bill was originally drafted after four years of study of the impoundment question by the Senate Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers.

This study included public hearings in 1971.

On July 22, 1972, I offered an abbreviated version of the bill as a floor amendment to the appropriations bill for the Treasury, the Postal Service, and General Government purposes. My amendment was ruled non-germane.

Four days later, I reserved a Special Order for one hour of general debate on the growing powers of the Office of Management and Budget. During my remarks that day I discussed fully what the Anderson, Pickle, et al, anti-impoundment bill was about.

The Pickle-Ford-Sarbanes-Harrington bill differs from the Mahon anti-impoundment measure in two major respects.

First, under our bill, the impoundment message is placed immediately on the House and Senate calendars, without being referred to any Congressional Committee. Under the Mahon bill the impoundment matter is referred to the Appropriations Committee of both Houses of Congress.

The second difference is under our bill the Congress must approve the impoundment for it to take effect for longer than 60 days. Under the Mahon bill, the Congress must disapprove the impoundment for it not to take effect for longer than 60 days.

These are the two major differences, Mr. Chairman, and before going into what I think about these differences, I want to repeat a statement that I have made time and time again.

I have listened to all ideas. If this Committee believes other approaches will better suit the job than mine, I will listen. Let me state firmly that I place working to get something that will pass both Houses of Congress above being bullheaded for my bill only.

I still stand by this statement.

In this spirit, I offer a compromise to the Committee between my bill and the Mahon measure.

I cannot say that all my colleagues who co-signed my bill will join with me in this compromise proposal. I do believe the majority will, because we have discussed this matter thoroughly. I am hopeful that this Committee and the Congress will approve my proposal.

My proposal is this:

(1) Allow the impoundment message to be referred to the Appropriations Committee; and require the Committee to report a resolution on the message within 30 calendar days after receiving the President's message.

(2) State that the impoundment is to cease within 90 days if the Congress does not approve the impoundment, or the impoundment as recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

In brief, I am willing to give the Appropriations Committee the jurisdiction on the impoundment messages. The House Appropriations Committee represents the 55 most knowledgeable Members on appropriations in the House. Furthermore, this Committee is led by a most distinguished Chairman, the Honorable George Mahon of Texas.

This Committee could sniff out the real thrust of the Executive Branch's action. In doing so, it could go into each nook and cranny of appropriations pipelines, and share its findings with the other Members.

I concede that the original bill that I proposed did not do this.

On the second point, I must stand by my original belief that the Congress must approve an impoundment before it is effective over a great length of time.

Let us look closely at what is involved legislatively with this anti-impoundment procedure.

The Congress appropriates monies. The President signs the appropriations into law—he makes it the law of the land.

Then the Executive Branch impounds the money. In short, the Executive nullifies a law, or part of a law.

To say that the Congress, by doing nothing, allows a law to be nullified by Executive fiat is a gross abdication of Congressional authority.

On the other hand, to have the Congress approve an impoundment is requiring the Congress to do no more than pass a modified appropriations bill.

Another point, Mr. Chairman, is that the impoundment matter, going to the heart of Constitutional balance between the Executive and Legislative branches, should not be left entirely in the hands of one Committee.

Also, the majority party, or a majority

clique on a Committee by holding an impoundment message up could dictate the course on this all-important matter of balance between Congress and the Executive.

I feel that in the final analysis the whole Congress should pass judgment on the impoundment.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that 113 Members of Congress are co-sponsors of the Pickle-Ford-Sarbanes-Harrington bill, including five members of this Rules Committee.

The approach I offer today, I feel, combines the best of the Mahon bill with the best of the Pickle-Ford-Sarbanes-Harrington bill.

I submit to the Committee a suggested draft of such an approach.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let the Congress say to our countrymen, "The 93d Congress again made the United States a country of government by the people, a government of three equal branches."

A greater gift we could not give to this country as we approach our 200th anniversary.

We all know the old story about the lady who cornered Ben Franklin as he emerged from the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia.

"What do we have, Sir, a monarchy or a Republic," she asked.

"A Republic," replied Dr. Franklin, "if you can keep it."

Let us keep the Republic.

SUCCESS OF DUBUQUE FLOODWALL

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Mississippi River in Iowa reached one of the highest flood crests since records have been kept. I do not rise today, however, to seek Federal help in mitigating the effects of a natural disaster, but rather to call attention to and to thank the House for its role in preventing a disaster. The new floodwalls in Dubuque and Guttenberg, built in part with Federal funds, performed their tasks perfectly and kept those cities dry.

It is rare that we have such a clear opportunity to see immediate results from a project, and I think it is instructive to reflect on our successes as well as our failures. Therefore, I would like to call your attention to some facts about these floodwalls and the flood that did not happen.

The initial planning grant for the Dubuque floodwall was made in fiscal year 1964 by the Army Corps of Engineers. Additional grants were made for planning and construction in each succeeding year until 1973, when a total of nearly \$11 million in Federal funds had been invested in the project. This amount was augmented by well over a million dollars of local funds.

The total Federal contribution only tells part of the story, however, since the timely completion of the floodwall last year is what prevented substantial flood damage this year. On two occasions, testimony by Dubuque city officials resulted in an increase in the funds allotted to the project. In fiscal year 1967, according to a Corps of Engineers official in Rock Island, the \$145,000 proposed by the Bureau of the Budget was increased

to \$250,000 following their testimony. And in fiscal year 1970 their testimony resulted in an increase in construction funds for that year from \$1.6 million to \$2.1 million, even though the President had declared a 75-percent reduction in contract awards. Without these funding increases to accelerate the project at these crucial stages, the floodwall would not yet be completed and Dubuque today would be shoveling mud out of its homes and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Dubuque floodwall is an excellent example of a sound investment of the taxpayers' dollars. Constructed at a total cost of \$12 million, the floodwall prevented a flood in its first year that would have caused an estimated \$19 million damage. I would like to quote from an article in the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald, written 2 days before the flood's crest last Friday:

It is startling to think what Dubuque would be like this spring without its dike as floodwaters inch toward an expected 22-foot crest on Friday. As food for thought, City Engineer John White has some interesting statistics.

According to White, the Mississippi River today, if it were not for the floodwall, would have a west bank along South Main Street, the East Fourth Street-Central Avenue intersection along Elm Street all the way north to 22nd and Kniest streets.

Celotex, Caradco and the Dubuque Packing Co. would be shut down, not to mention all industries and businesses east of them. Homes of "Flats" residents and some Washington Street neighborhood dwellers would have water and muck lapping at the foundations. Sewers would be backing up all over the city.

In Guttenberg, the situation is similar. The floodwall there cost about \$2½ million, and the Corps of Engineers estimates that this year alone it prevented a million dollars in property damage and cleanup costs.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Dubuque and Guttenberg are profoundly grateful for the assistance which has helped to build their floodwall, and I want to particularly thank the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Public Works Committee for their support. The gratitude of the people in Dubuque and Guttenberg, and the evidence of the sound investment the U.S. Government made in helping to fund these projects, indicate to me the importance of rapid completion of a similar project in the city of Clinton.

The Mississippi crested at 20 feet in Clinton last Saturday—4 feet above flood stage—for the seventh worst flood in Clinton's history. Emergency flood protection constructed in 1969 prevented an estimated \$7 million in damage this year, but the project is not complete and the city is incurring major flood prevention costs; \$300,000 is in the Corps of Engineers fiscal 1974 budget for construction, and completion of the project for Clinton is scheduled in 1977. The success of the Dubuque and Guttenberg floodwalls in preventing any damage during this year's high water should be a sufficient stimulus to us to insure adequate funding and prompt completion of the Clinton project.

CXIX—640—Part 8

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

Mr. CULVER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear of the success of the Dubuque and Guttenberg floodwalls, in preventing major floods this spring, but the gentleman from Iowa has neglected to mention his own important role in securing adequate, and timely Federal funding for these projects. In fiscal year 1967 and again in 1970, when economy measures and competing priorities resulted in reduced allocations, it was the gentleman from Iowa who testified and arranged for city officials to testify in administrative hearings on the Corps of Engineers budget. It was also the gentleman from Iowa who worked for these projects from the day he came to Congress in 1965, the year of the worst flood in the history of the upper Mississippi, until they were completed last year. In 1967, at his invitation, I toured some of the areas which had been flooded and I saw the need for those projects. This firsthand experience enabled me to urge favorable action on these projects in the Appropriations Committee.

Credit is obviously due to the cities of Dubuque and Guttenberg and to the Corps of Engineers, but the record would be incomplete if it did not include reference to the tireless efforts of the gentleman in the well. He has been remarkably persuasive and effective in convincing us of the need to accelerate the timetable for these flood control projects. His dedicated work has saved not only millions of dollars but insured the safety of countless lives, and he is to be commended for a job well done.

Mr. CULVER. I wish to thank the gentleman very much for his kind remarks and once again say to him how extremely grateful we all are for his invaluable help on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman.

APPROPRIATIONS AND MANPOWER

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, our Federal forests which collectively contain 58 percent of the Nation's standing sawtimber inventory, are not being intensively managed for lack of funds and manpower. Average current receipts for timber sold under Federal contracts are more than four times greater than timber management costs. Yet these proceeds are not returned in full to the agencies which manage the timber, notably the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

Instead, timber sale proceeds are funneled into the general fund and reappropriated annually by the Congress. Funding requests of the managing agencies are further subject to the whims and domination of the Office of Management and Budget.

If we are to increase the output of our

Federal forests on a sustained basis, we simply must find a way to inject stability into the financing of our Federal timber management agencies. And the most dependable solution is through new legislation.

We must provide the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management with sufficient dollars on an assured basis to bring their reforestation programs into line with their timber sale programs. It is a national disgrace that nearly 5 million acres of our Federal forests, a priceless national heritage, are lying fallow for lack of enough money and manpower to establish new forests.

Large industrial landholders cannot and will not permit similar conditions to prevail and are the leaders in the field of intensive forest management. It is time that the Federal Government adopts a similar philosophy and that we come to regard management of Federal forests as an investment in the future.

LEGISLATION FOR LOWER COST HOUSING

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the gentleman from California (Mr. BOB WILSON) I am introducing legislation today which will eliminate building code and union work rule restrictions on the use of industrialized building products in federally assisted and subsidized housing programs.

The prospective home buyer is faced with construction costs spiraling at a rate greater than 10 percent per year. The recent curtailment of housing subsidy programs will increase his outlay even more. Now more than ever, we must find the means to drastically cut construction costs. Many experts say a prime method is through wider use of prefabricated and preassembled construction products. However, testimony last year before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs confirms that restrictive union work rules and outmoded building code provisions, the later often union instigated, continue to hamstring efforts to employ such industrialized building techniques.

By inclusion of provisions in collective bargaining agreements, the building trades unions have assured themselves that they will not have to handle or install specific products or materials or if they do, that they will be paid reparations. Although Congress intended to outlaw such conduct in the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, the National Labor Relations Board and the courts have limited the effectiveness of the congressional intent.

Building codes also restrict the use of modern construction technology. As pointed out in the 1967 Battelle Memorial Institute Research Report for the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, patchwork building codes discourage volume production that could be obtained from serving a wide geographic area.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing, I proposed a measure similar to the bill I introduce today during subcommittee consideration of H.R. 16704, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972. It is the outgrowth of legislation proposed by the gentleman from California (Mr. Bob Wilson) in the 91st and 92d Congresses. I want to commend my colleague for his continuing efforts in behalf of low-cost housing for all our citizens and for his assistance in the preparation of this bill.

The basic elements of my bill are:

First, through a civil court action in a Federal or State court, any person, including a builder, a contractor, or a manufacturer may prevent the enforcement of any local code, law, ordinance or work rule that restricts his use of new techniques or materials in a federally assisted housing program. No action by a governmental agency is required.

Second, the remedy does not apply if the restrictive code or work practice is required to protect the health or safety of working or living conditions. However, the person invoking this exception must show by a preponderance of the evidence: first, that the restraint is necessary to assure safe and healthful working conditions, and second, that the prefabricated product fails to provide this assurance. In placing the burden of proof on the person invoking the health and safety exception, I have modified the proposal I presented to the subcommittee last year. In doing so, I have eliminated a provision involving HUD-designated testing and standard setting agencies. Now my bill will require no administrative duties of HUD. There is no way that my bill could lead to the adoption of national building standards.

Third, the court may order equitable or preventive relief and damages, although damages may not be assessed against a local governmental body.

Fourth, the safety and health issue and all other questions under the bill will be decided by a State or Federal court in the locality.

There are few more significant consumer issues today than providing lower cost housing to all Americans, but particularly those in the middle and lower income groups. The Department of Commerce Technical Advisory Board's Panel on Housing Technology reported that in 1970 over 10 million families were housed in unacceptable conditions and that to meet this need a production rate of 2.5 million units per year is needed in the decade of the 1970's. This is an increase of 65 percent over the annual production rate of the previous 10 years.

Meeting the needs of the housing consumer at a price he can pay, without at the same time overburdening the taxpayer with increasing Federal housing subsidies, is an almost unsolvable problem. My bill will allow the free use of the most modern building techniques and products, and, thus, offers a partial solution.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 6303

A bill to promote the utilization of improved technology in federally assisted housing projects and to increase productivity in order to meet our national housing goals, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) any provision or requirement in any building code or other local law or ordinance, or in any contract or agreement, or any practice or other restraint which interferes with or restricts the use of new or improved techniques, methods, or materials or the use of preassembled products in connection with any development, construction, rehabilitation, or maintenance activity assisted under any program administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall be unlawful with respect to such activity: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this paragraph (a) shall be construed to make unlawful any such provision, requirement, practice or restraint if it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence (1) that such provision, requirement, practice or restraint is necessary to assure safe and healthful working or living conditions and (2) that such technique, method, material or product fails to assure such safe and healthful working or living conditions.

(b) Any person who is aggrieved because of any provision or requirement in any building code or other local law or ordinance, or because of any contract, agreement, practice, or other restraint unlawful under subsection (a) of this Act may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court notwithstanding any other provision of law and without regard to the amount in controversy, or in any appropriate State or local court of general jurisdiction to obtain equitable or preventive relief for violations of this section, or for appropriate damages, and may request such relief, or enter a claim for such damages, in any court whenever relevant in connection with a defense to, or counterclaim in, any suit or action brought against such person in that court, except that damages shall not be awarded where the person bringing the action under this section is aggrieved by reason of any provision or requirement in any building code or other local law or ordinance.

PRIVATE PENSIONS

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

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 23, I had the privilege of being present at Field Hearings in Pittsburgh, Pa., of the House Education and Labor Committee's Pension Task Force. Serving both as a witness and, by leave of the chairman, as a guest member of the committee panel, I believe the work of this committee is particularly important, as evidenced by the valuable testimony taken from a number of witnesses. I especially want to commend the chairman of the Task Force, Mr. DENT, for his efforts and would add that the hearings demonstrated to me even more forcefully the need for strong remedial action in the field of private pensions.

Over the past several years, we have witnessed a growing, and intensive concern by the public and the Congress over the problems of living in retirement in America. Stories in the media and con-

gressional hearings have dramatized the difficulties of living on a fixed income when the costs of necessities skyrocket daily.

This is just part of the picture which details the difficulty of life for the aged. As a former member of the Special Studies Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I came to view firsthand many of the shortcomings and inconsistencies of the programs, and forms of aid, which Government has created to help our elderly. I am firmly convinced that many of these efforts are inadequate, and for this reason, I have offered legislation to create a select committee on the problems of the aging so that the House can focus more effectively and intelligently on the problems of aging and their legislative solutions. I recognize, however, that the landscape is not totally bleak.

In the last 3 years Congress has focused attention on social security legislation, and granted a substantial boost, totalling 45 percent to 20 million recipients. Today we are in the midst of a growing controversy over private pensions, which cover 30 million of the more than 80 million Americans now in the work force. Private pension trust funds today aggregate \$153 billion and pay out annually an average of \$1,600 to about 5¼ million recipients. The question then is why is there a growing controversy over pensions, both private and federal? The reason is that neither social security nor private pensions provide most Americans the income security they have every right to expect after long years of work. Since last year Congress passed social security legislation, there is little chance for more legislation this year, particularly when new changes would result in increased taxes. The thrust, quite properly, will be in the area of private pensions, where the problems are not being solved in the marketplace of American commerce and industry. The testimony presented by witnesses in Pittsburgh and around the country indicates a serious problem overdue for remedy, but a look at the future gives an even clearer picture and justification for action at the soonest possible moment.

The fact is that we are becoming an older America where every day 4,500 Americans celebrate their 65th birthday. For the first time the average age of our population is increasing, not decreasing, and it is doing so with surprising rapidity considering the vast numbers involved. In part this is due to the drop in the birth rate, in part due to advances in medicine that enable us to live longer and enjoy it more.

But even this trend does not fully reveal the tremendous rate at which Americans are retiring from the workforce. This is no longer a question of reaching the magic age of, say, 65. The retirement age is moving down to 62, and even 55 in some pension plans. Civil servants, the military, not to mention congressmen, can claim a substantial retirement stipend after 25 or 20 years of service.

Less job satisfaction and added frus-

trations at work are sadly becoming an accepted fact of life. There are pressures to ease people out of jobs to create positions for younger people pushing up, and obstacles to continuing work even to able-bodied and experienced men and women. There is a youth culture and prejudice against a fullness of years. Just living in the 1970's, hustling to beat the traffic, struggling to make ends meet and somehow make the next mortgage payment or son's tuition payment make life more demanding and, let us face it, more tiring, too.

The result of these trends and forces is to accelerate people at ever increasing numbers into retirement.

In addition to all this, the costs of being retired are rising steadily. Inflation is rampant today and those now on fixed incomes know just what a toll it exacts. As the standard of living of our Nation improves yearly by the rate that wages and productivity gain on inflation, so also increase the needs of retired people and the amount of income they need to maintain a decent standard of living.

But perhaps most critical of all to the retired person is the cost of good health and combating the illnesses that afflict us all as we grow older. In recent years, no cost has escalated more rapidly than that for health care. Even with the establishment of medicare, the elderly person today still spends the same proportion of his income on medical care as in 1965 before medicare was enacted. As we develop new and more expensive means to secure good health while living longer, we can, once again, expect compounded demands on the incomes of retired persons.

The job of Congress is then to develop and pass legislation making private pensions sounder, fairer, and more responsive and broader in their coverage to meet these evolving challenges that I have just mentioned. But equally important, your job is to remedy the inequities and vagaries of a system whose shortcomings are becoming clearer in the growing body of evidence that builds almost daily.

Some companies fail, leaving hundreds or thousands of employees with little or no coverage to show for the years they worked. This has certainly been the case with Studebaker employees and those laid off by the Penn Central Railroad.

In other cases, funds are mismanaged by scandalous and unethical practices of speculating in the stock market, or using the pension funds for the administration of union functions.

Some employees are fired before their pension funds are vested as a way of saving the company money.

Employees change jobs voluntarily, or because of involuntary conditions such as a bad job, a poor supervisor, or dangerous working conditions.

While there are many problems to be addressed, I would like to focus on a list of five key problems that I believe must be solved above all.

(1) VESTING

Vesting is probably the single most troublesome item for the retired Amer-

ican worker today. It is the promise of security for the worker who has labored for a company for years and who has participated in its pension plans and who has the right and the expectation that he will draw a pension when he retires. Today's odds are against his receiving pension benefits. Under present practices, only one-third to one-half of the 30 million people who currently participate in private plans can expect to receive the benefits the contributions were supposed to assure for them. This is despite the fact that three-quarters of these people are enrolled in plans which permit vesting.

What is the reason for this? The provisions of vesting vary from plan to plan. Only 1 percent of the private pension plans in force today permit vesting before 5 years of service; about 35 percent permit vesting from 5 to 10 years; another 30 percent require from 11 to 15 years, which means that as many as one-third of the plans require 16 years or more for vesting.

The picture varies from industry to industry, from union to union. In this highly mobile society, some industries operate on a boom to bust schedule so that layoffs and early terminations may destroy the chance to vest pension income. For example, of the 50,957 employees who left the A & P before retirement, fully 37,461 forfeited all rights to any pension benefits. And what is more many people find themselves short-changed when their industry fails or when there are large scale layoffs as is the case in defense-oriented and aerospace industries.

The present vesting provisions reward the long-term and higher paid employees with the payments of those who went on to other jobs. It seems to me that early vesting is highly desirable and should be achieved within a reasonable number of years of initial employment, or a combination of age and employment years.

(2) DISCLOSURE

It is clear to me that companies will have to tell employees and Government more about the way their pensions work and are administered. We can no longer abide the confusion and despair that results from misunderstandings about pension shortcomings, nor can we tolerate the unethical or even highly questionable activities of pension administrators. Their investment activities need to be watched closely by plan participants as well as by corporate shareholders and the Government.

The present Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is sufficiently general as to be useless in pinpointing misconduct. What proves the point is the number of classic cases of union and corporate misuse of the trust they hold in employees' pension funds, and the slow response in tracking down these abuses. Unquestionably, some funds, and their uses, need watching.

(3) FUND MANAGEMENT

The impact of \$153 billion in pension funds on the securities market cannot be ignored by Government. There should

be concern not only for the protection of investors, but primarily for men and women who will have to rely on the soundness of pension funds that will be their lifeline in retirement.

(4) REINSURANCE

Vested pensions should be guaranteed through reinsurance against any plan termination which leaves funds bankrupt and their pensioners stranded on a mound of financial hardship.

(5) PORTABILITY

The question of portability goes to the heart of employment practices in the United States. The time honored principle of holding down one job for a lifetime seems to be going the way of living in one house for a lifetime. Americans in the 1970's look for better opportunities and are necessarily employment mobile to achieve them. Although few young people in their 20's or 30's concern themselves with pension rights, it's the man in his 40's who may receive his most challenging and attractive job offer, who has to consider what happens to his pension if he changes jobs. As a result, he may choose not to take this opportunity. Or it is the man in his fifties whose job prospects are probably less bright who is forced to change jobs—but does not have the right or the chance to take with him his pension credits.

Clearly we have to develop a way to insure that a man who vests in his pension does not lose his equity if he changes jobs. We need portability as a means of guaranteeing the future of retired people. Although by no means the only alternative, an early and fair vesting requirement is one of the surest ways to achieve this objective.

In considering portability, I think we have to be frank in recognizing there is a strong body of feeling in a number of labor unions and corporations which holds that transfer of funds to other pension plans will make it difficult to continue the high and protective pensions which they presently offer retired employees and prospective retirees, but I am confident we can find a satisfactory solution to these objections.

If we can achieve these five main goals, I think we will have taken a giant step in assuring the future security of the American people, and we will be helping to restore their confidence that Government can and does fill a vital job as watchdog of the public interest.

In closing, I would add a note of caution. Too often concepts are oversold and in trying to treat problems they later lead to a new low in disillusionment. Today employees pay directly only \$1.5 billion of the \$14 billion contributed to pension funds in their name. Reform will be costly, and either the present level of benefits will be spread thinner across more retirees, or today's employees will be bargaining less for an increase in direct wages and more for a contribution to their pension fund as a substantial part of their wage package. Nonetheless, we should not be deterred in finding or enacting a just and necessary solution. We must pass a strong, workable, and responsible pension reform bill.

FORMER SPEAKER JOHN MCCORMACK AT MEDFORD HIGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear that our former Speaker John McCormack is enjoying an active and healthy retirement, and I was especially pleased to read a recent account of the Speaker's appearance at Medford High School in Massachusetts.

From a news story by Peter Theroux, we learn that the Speaker is as tireless as ever. Mr. Theroux reports in the Medford Daily Mercury that John McCormack stressed the continuing need for a strong legislative branch of Government. "Therein" he told the students, "lies the true power of the people and the democratic spirit of the country." How true and timely this reminder from our friend and former Speaker.

I know John McCormack's friends will be interested in the account of his appearance in Medford, and I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Medford (Mass.) Daily Mercury] "MR. SPEAKER" BIG HIT AT MEDFORD HIGH (By Peter Theroux)

MEDFORD.—On Tuesday Medford High School students had the chance to hear and ask questions of John W. McCormack, former Speaker of the House.

He spoke at Sounding Board, the program at MHS whereby several times a week teacher Thomas Convery presents various well-known or interesting individuals or groups. In the past, the program has featured such things as Hare Krishna groups, opera singers, gospel singers and musicians from the New England Conservatory of Music, office holders and also sports figures.

Mr. McCormack appeared for two class periods, and spoke with and to the students, answered questions and, after the school hours, talked with more students, faculty members and local politicians who were there to hear him speak.

McCormack has had a long and fruitful political career. He has held elected offices for 51 years of his life. He has served under eight presidents of the United States (Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Nixon).

He believes, he told the students, in an exceedingly strong legislative branch of the government, for therein lies the true power of the people and the democratic spirit of the country. He insists that the executive (or judicial) branches of our government ought to never impound or threaten, or in any way limit, the clout of the legislative branch. "The Congress," he said, "is for the country."

Former Speaker McCormack also answered many questions from the students and faculty concerning current affairs in the government.

One student asked the retired Congressman's opinion of amnesty for those who have fled the USA rather than fight. McCormack replied that before we turn our attention to those who have fled, we first have the prisoners of War to deal with. He said he believes that first we must wait until all our fightingmen are back safe here, before we decide the fate of those who are concerned by amnesty. However, he reminded the students, the issue of amnesty is not a simple one at all, for there are several federal laws concerning amnesty, as well as certain army regulations that face the ex-armymen in Sweden and Canada.

Perhaps the issues which McCormack felt

most strongly about was a questioning of the significance of student government, and also the feasibility of Congress wielding real power against an extremely powerful central executive figure.

McCormack said "absolutely that government of all sorts, in every walk of life, is vitally important, and that government at high schools, and this includes Student Councils as well as 'reps', are the very roots of a democratic society."

"The great democratic government must have factions such as students getting to know their school laws, for this is the springs, he said. McCormack also said he believes implicitly in the democratic system, and feels "absolutely" that the government can both uphold the law and be fair. He stressed that faith, from legislators as well as citizens and students, is "wholly necessary."

At the end of the period, when it was time for the students to return to their classes, the elder statesman was greeted with a thunderous round of applause from all.

He stayed a bit longer than planned, after school hours, speaking with faculty and Medford officeholders for some time, before ending the day with his return home.

CONSUMER REVOLT

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

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, when I first called for a nationwide consumer revolt on March 1, I did so for two reasons. First, I believed that it was possible—if enough people observed the April 1 through 7 meat boycott—to impact the marketplace, to halt the absurd upward spiral of food costs. Second, I believed that such a demonstration of consumer clout would generate enough heat in Washington to force the administration into action.

Today's Wall Street Journal contains three stories which demonstrate not only the market clout of the irate consumer but also the growing political muscle of this ad hoc consumer movement.

I include these articles for the benefit of my colleagues:

LIVE HOG PRICES DROP RECORD \$5 PER 100 POUNDS AT INDIANAPOLIS; CATTLE QUOTES DECREASE \$1 TO \$2

Live hog prices tumbled a record \$5 per 100 pounds at Indianapolis and \$2 to \$4 at other leading marketing terminals.

Live cattle prices dropped \$1 to \$2 per 100 pounds.

Brokers said the wholesale beef trade showed the first sign of genuine weakness in some time yesterday, with the price for choice beef falling three cents a pound to 68 cents. Two weeks ago, retailers paid a record 71½ cents for supplies. The meat handlers said that even at the lower prices, demand remained slow.

The wholesale price weakness and further sharp declines in futures markets for live animals and meat products continued to reflect expanded reports of consumer boycotts and curtailed packer operations; packers don't want to have large meat stocks on hand if next week's scheduled widespread boycotts are effective.

A New York wholesaler who usually handles three boxcars of beef weekly said he ordered only one this week and these supplies were moving slowly. He feared a big price loss if he operated with larger supplies and the consumer resistance prevailed. Large restaurants in New York City and other areas started to push fish and other nonred-meat dishes, meat handlers said.

PROCESSING DECLINES

Federally inspected packing plants processed 208,000 head of cattle on Monday and Tuesday, 21,000 less than a week earlier. The 632,000 hogs slaughtered was down from 641,000 in last week's first two days.

Farmers shipped 32,100 hogs to the 11 major Midwestern marketing terminals yesterday, down from 37,600 a week earlier and 48,300 a year before. Livestock men said that even the reduced supplies could only be sold at sharply lower prices. They noted that hog prices at interior markets also were sharply reduced.

Price weakness in the wholesale pork trade during the previous four or five sessions attracted some buyers. Hams needed to fill the Easter trade sold at 62 cents a pound, up 1½ cents from Tuesday. With chain stores featuring pork loins, some buyers wanted to replenish stocks and they paid 64 cents a pound for the cut, two cents more than Tuesday. The price, however, was still 16 cents below the record a month ago.

Live hog prices yesterday were down as much as \$10 per 100 pounds from the record two weeks ago.

Chicago cattle, hogs, pork bellies, soybean meal and soybeans dropped their respective price limits when trading started yesterday. As the day progressed, these commodities recorded extremely nervous price movements. For cattle, live hogs, pork bellies and soybean meal it was the third day of limit declines. For soybeans it was the second day of maximum losses.

However, the day ended with prices for pork belly futures off ¾ cent to up ½ cent a pound hogs closed up ¾ cent to off ¼ cent a pound, and cattle ended one cent a pound lower.

Chicago soybeans closed down the 15-cent limit. Soybean meal closed off \$5 a ton, and the wheat market ended 1 cent a bushel lower to 3¾ cent higher.

Chicago shell egg futures closed off two cents a dozen, the daily limit.

Soybean selling was induced again by this week's Agriculture Department action that will allow farmers to use more set-aside land to plant soybeans, feed grains and other crops.

The first ship entered the St. Lawrence Seaway in the 1973 shipping season yesterday, marking the earliest opening in the history of the 14-year-old inland waterway. Almost 55 million tons of cargo were moved over the water route to the Great Lakes last year.

TIGHTER PHASE 3 CONTROLS URGED ON NIXON BY HOUSE REPUBLICANS LEST CONGRESS ACT

WASHINGTON.—House Republicans have privately told the Nixon administration what the Democrats have been saying publicly for weeks: that unless it tightens up on Phase 3 economic controls, Congress will order tougher standards.

Cost of Living Council Director John Dunlop went to Capitol Hill yesterday to brief Republican members of the House Banking Committee on the administration's request for a simple one-year extension of the President's wage-price authority, to April 30, 1974. But according to participants, the private session centered around congressional complaints that Phase 3 is inadequate.

"We told him they better move pretty quickly on food prices and rents or they're dead up here," said one of these Republicans. Mr. Dunlop reportedly remained noncommittal on possible moves to tighten the controls. But, recalled one participant, at the close of the meeting Mr. Dunlop said: "We've got your message."

MEMO CIRCULATED

Mr. Dunlop apparently held the unannounced session in hopes of staving off a House drive for tougher controls. At the meeting, he circulated a memo attacking the major proposals for stiffening price controls.

The administration remains "totally and

completely opposed" to a Senate-adopted amendment that would impose rent controls in areas where vacancy rates are low, the memo said. Earlier this month, the Senate approved a one-year extension of the wage-price authority but attached this rent-control provision.

The administration memo also was sharply critical of a proposal by House Banking Committee Democrats that would impose a 60-day freeze on all prices and interest rates. "In addition to being contrary to the President's goal of decontrolling the economy, a freeze is not warranted or justifiable on economic grounds," the memo stated.

In response, however, most of the Republicans warned Mr. Dunlop that the only way to avoid these measures is through dramatic and tough action to curb spiraling prices. "We really gave him an earful," said one Republican Congressman.

MEANY ASSAILS PHASE 3

At the full committee's public hearing on the controls legislation yesterday, AFL-CIO President George Meany sharply assailed Phase 3 and urged the panel to impose strict controls on food prices, rents and interest rates. Speaking more harshly against the Nixon administration than has been his custom lately, the labor chieftain warned that if Congress fails to act, "workers and consumers will be stampeded by food prices, gouged by landlords, fleeced by money-lenders, and squeezed."

Mr. Meany listed several specific actions he said Congress should take in the wage-price legislation. These included a reimposition of rent controls and a rollback of recent interest-rate boosts, to be followed by ceilings on these rates and provisions to allocate available credit. He also insisted on "temporary direct controls on prices of raw agriculture products," which are currently exempt from controls.

Spiraling food prices could hurt the outcome of this year's wage settlements, Mr. Meany warned. If these prices "aren't brought down, there is no way union members are going to let their unions settle for a wage increase that won't even pay for their increased food bill," he declared.

He further contended that Congress should impose an excess-profits tax on corporations, though he conceded this doesn't fall within the Banking Committee's jurisdiction. He called for continuing congressional review of Phase 3 and also urged the House to adopt a Senate-approved amendment exempting all workers who make less than \$3.50 an hour from wage controls.

While insisting these changes are necessary to make Phase 3 equitable, Mr. Meany said, in response to questions, "I'd really like to get back to where we were before Phase 1." He strongly attacked the administration and Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns for allegedly relying heavily on higher interest rates to curb inflation.

Mr. Meany also said he is "confused" over the actual Phase 3 wage control policies. Labor leaders have privately been told by administration officials that there isn't any "single wage standard" in Phase 3, but other officials have insisted that a 5.5% guideline remains in effect.

STORES, PACKERS, FARMS BEGIN TO FEEL IMPACT OF HOUSEWIVES' OUTRAGE—DEMAND IS FALLING MARKEDLY; SLAUGHTERING IS CURTAILED; HOG PRICES IN RECORD DROP—BUT HOW LONG WILL TUNA DO?

(By Mary Bralove)

"Let 'em eat tuna casserole."

The phrase may lack that old revolutionary ring, but it seems to be catching on nonetheless. It's the cry of the American housewife as she battles soaring meat prices.

Scattered groups around the country have launched a widely publicized effort—backed

by various politicians, economists and consumer groups—to get people to sacrifice meat next week in an "April Fool's" boycott in the hope of driving meat prices down.

But housewives have begun to demonstrate their power even before the boycott begins, and there's increasing evidence that their muscle is being felt where it hurts—in the pocketbooks of supermarkets, meat packers and livestock growers. Supermarket chains report consumers are buying less meat and cheaper cuts. A number of Midwest meat packers have curtailed their operations as a result of the decreased demand, wholesale beef prices have slipped a bit, and hog farmers are already panicky at plunging wholesale pork prices.

"The consumer resistance to present high prices of meat is real, and it's making itself felt in the marketplace," says Emerson E. Brightman, executive vice president of Grand Union Co., a supermarket chain. "Shoppers are buying thinner steaks, smaller roasts and stretching their meat over more meals a week."

"SITUATION WILL GET WORSE"

As housewives mix soybean fillers into their hamburger meat to stretch it further, supermarket chains report a sharp drop in meat sales. A survey of 16 major supermarkets conducted two weeks ago by The National Association of Food Chains showed, for instance, a 2% to 15% plunge in the weekly amount of beef sold. As a result, packers are being forced to cut back their operations. Iowa Beef Processors Inc., the Nation's largest beef packer, currently operates an eight-hour shift at most of its plants down from the 10-hour days worked recently at some of its slaughtering plants. Needham Packing Co. last week closed two of its four beef slaughtering houses, and Spencer Foods Inc. says it has cut back to "minimum" work hours at two slaughter plants.

"I think the situation will get worse before it gets better," says Gerald L. Pearson, president of Spencer. He reports a 25% to 30% drop in meat demand.

In reaction to the drop in demand from packers, hog farmers have hastily begun to liquidate stocks.

"A panic has set in among hog producers," comments Paul McNutt, an Iowa City farmer who says he sold some 210 pound hogs for \$35 each three days ago rather than waiting to sell them when they're heavier.

RUNNING FOR COVER

On Tuesday alone, live hog prices in the Midwest tumbled a record \$3.75 per 100 pounds, winding up \$6 to \$6.50 per 100 pounds below the historical highs of two weeks earlier. And they fell even lower yesterday, to as much as \$10 below recent highs in some markets. (For further details see Commodities column on page 26.)

The sudden plunge had old livestock hands shaking their heads with disbelief. "The drop in prices has been psychological—everybody's running for cover," says one hog producer who adds that he plans to wait out the panic.

More experienced packers, or more cynical marketers, think consumers will soon have their fill of peanut butter-and-jelly sandwiches and will return to buying meat no matter what the cost. Says one packer who views the current resistance to high meat prices as temporary: "Once people have had their fun and games, they'll go right out, restock their freezers and create higher demand."

In fact, no matter which way shoppers turn for a better buy, their demand creates a spiraling price. For instance, in the New York area, the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. last week featured 2½-to-3½ pound chickens for 39 cents a pound; A&P had paid a wholesale price of about 38 cents a pound. The chain sold a lot of chicken; but had to

discontinue the special when its wholesale price for chicken jumped to 44 cents a pound.

THREE HOURS FOR FISH

In the Washington, D.C. area, Giant Food Inc. advertised a special on fish. The supermarket chain was inundated with shoppers anxious to stretch their grocery money—so anxious that many waited as long as three hours in line.

But switching to tuna shortcakes or cheese souffles doesn't completely ease the pinch on the consumer's pocketbook. Wholesale prices of American cheese, for example, have jumped to 68 cents a pound from 63 cents a pound a year ago and extra large eggs have risen to 53 cents a dozen from 39 cents a year earlier.

"The real problem the housewife is facing is that there are no attractively priced meat alternatives," says Tim McEnroe of the National Association of Food Chains. "Meal money has got to go someplace, and everything is in short supply."

Because the housewife has nowhere else to turn and is receiving little satisfaction from her government representatives, she seems to be enthusiastically embracing the meat boycott movement. Although in a practical sense avoiding meat will lead to higher prices for fish and nonmeat products, the boycott seems at least to be providing an emotional outlet for pent-up shoppers' frustrations.

And the anger of the consumers is very real. Last Saturday, for example, Mr. McEnroe, after promising his children a rib roast for dinner, traipsed off to a local grocery store. With rib roast in hand, he lined up at the checkout counter. Spotting the roast, his fellow shoppers began muttering ominously and for a while there, Mr. McEnroe says, he wasn't sure whether he would get out safely.

In preparing for next week's official boycott, supermarket chains are keeping a tight rein on orders for meat products. They're cutting back particularly hard in areas such as Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles, where the boycott is expected to be particularly effective. Supermarket executives expect consumers on both coasts will be more receptive to the idea of boycotting meat than their traditionally less militant counterparts in Midwest and Southern areas.

No one, however, can predict how effective or widespread the April Fool's boycott will be. The first week in any month is when many people get their paychecks and are in a buying mood, and it's harder to pass up steak when there's cash in your pocket.

If the meat boycott is more successful and lasts longer than retailers counted on, supermarket chains will be stuck with a lot of fresh beef that will spoil fairly rapidly. Traditionally, meat sales account for some 25% of all grocery-store sales, and the industry—already in a profit squeeze—can ill afford another setback. One supermarket executive predicts: "If the supermarket chains are hurt by the boycott, they'll start marking up groceries. They'll mark up cheeses, fish and everything else. The money has to come from another source to keep the stores operating."

CAMBODIAN BOMBING CONTINUES

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, now that the long agony of Vietnam appears to be ending, it is tempting to sigh with relief and turn to the pressing problems of our own Nation.

Unfortunately, appearances are decep-

tive: the war is not over, and the United States is still deeply involved in the conflict in Southeast Asia. Every day our bombers devastate the lovely land of Cambodia, just as they devastated Vietnam for so long.

Defense Secretary Richardson calls Cambodia "kind of a lingering corner of the war," which we will continue bombing as long as the Lon Nol government "requests" our help. William Sullivan, a State Department official reportedly said that the justification for the bombing is "the reelection of President Nixon." People who voted for Mr. Nixon must be surprised to know that.

The President supposedly has two lawyers frantically trying to come up with a constitutional justification for the bombing. He would not find one. Like the rest of the Asian war, this intervention has never been authorized by Congress. With the last of our troops and POW's coming home from Vietnam, that excuse can no longer be made.

The real purpose, obviously, is to demonstrate American support for the military regime which controls Cambodia. In other words, we are now doing in Cambodia precisely what we did for so long in Vietnam—bombing and killing daily in order to prop up an unwanted government in an Asian country. How long can this go on?

The New York Times today editorializes on the same question. I include their editorial at this point:

OUT, BUT NOT OUT

The expected return today of the last American combat troops and prisoners from Vietnam should be an occasion for universal relief and rejoicing, marking the end of the long and anguished United States intervention in Indochina. To most Americans it is inconceivable that this country would again become militarily involved in a regime so remote from any vital national strategic interest.

And yet intervention persists. United States military aircraft based in Thailand continue to devastate the countryside of Cambodia in support of a shaky military regime. The White House says this bombing will continue until Communist forces in Cambodia stop their military operations and agree to a cease-fire, which at the moment appears to be an extremely remote possibility.

Any further American military action in Cambodia after the completion of disengagement from Vietnam would raise the most serious constitutional questions. Following repeal of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, President Nixon's sole justification for operations in Indochina has been his alleged powers as President and Commander in Chief "to protect American forces when they are engaged in military actions." Even this dubious claim evaporates with the departure of the last United States combat soldier from Vietnam.

So far neither the Defense nor the State Department has been able to come up with a substitute justification for what is going on in Cambodia although a State Department official reportedly told Congressional aides that his department had two lawyers working on the problem. White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler has lamely explained that the heavy daily bombings are being conducted because "the Cambodian Government has asked for our air support."

That is a doctrine for Presidential intervention in foreign conflicts that must not be allowed to stand unchallenged. It would

mean, in effect, an assumption of Presidential authority to invoke the devastating power of American air forces wherever and whenever a government which enjoyed White House sympathy was in trouble.

Failure of Congress to assert its own constitutional prerogatives promptly and forcefully could result in continuing unauthorized bombing in Cambodia and would establish a perilous precedent for future Presidential intervention in trouble spots around the world, not excluding an already threatened resumption of American hostilities in Vietnam.

DOWNWARD AVERAGING—TAX EQUITY FOR THOSE WITH DIMINISHING INCOMES

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today to discuss legislation that I have introduced along with my colleague, the Honorable JAMES V. STANTON, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow taxpayers who have had sharp declines in income to benefit from the same averaging provisions that are now available only for those individuals who have had significant increases in their income over previous years.

This legislation is embodied in two bills, H.R. 2416, and H.R. 3168, which we introduced in the opening weeks of this session. They would permit a taxpayer who suffers a reduction of income to, in effect, average his income for that year with his income from a 4-year base period. Such a taxpayer may be said to have overpaid his taxes during the 4-year base period. Under the bill, he would recover this "overpayment" through reduced taxes in the current year, and in some instances he might even be entitled to a refund. It is estimated that, if this bill had been in effect for calendar year 1971, Federal individual income tax liabilities would have been decreased by about \$335 million, assuming everyone eligible for downside averaging under the bill would have elected to use this procedure.

What we are trying to do here is restore reasonableness to the tax laws, which supposedly are based on the principle of progressive taxation—the more you earn, the more you pay. The obvious corollary is that, the less you earn, the less you should be obligated to pay.

It does not make sense to me that all the breaks in this area go to people who really should pay higher tax in a year when they can best afford it—while at the same time, others who can least afford it, because of bad breaks, get no consideration at all from the law.

Under our proposal, the tax is computed by (1) determining the average income for the base period; (2) computing the tax on 80 percent of that amount; (3) subtracting the current year's income from 80 percent of the average base period income to determine the amount of the reduction in income; (4) computing the marginal tax on one-fifth of the reduction in income and multiplying that tax by 5; (5) and by

subtracting the final figure in step (4) from the tax computed in step (2).

To be eligible to use these averaging provisions, the taxpayer would have to suffer a reduction in income of at least \$3,000, as compared to 80 percent of the 4-year base period average. Also, he would have to include in income unemployment benefits not otherwise taxable.

For example, if a worker with an average base period income of \$18,000 were laid off for part of the year, and his taxable income plus unemployment compensation amounted to \$10,000, his savings under the bill would be \$60. If he had no income—and no unemployment compensation—his tax savings under the bill would rise to \$668.

The following table illustrates the effect of the bill:

ASSUME TAXPAYER, FILING JOINT RETURN, WITH \$18,000 AVERAGE BASE PERIOD INCOME

Current year taxable income plus unemployment compensation	Tax under the bill	Regular tax	Tax saving from the bill
\$10,000	\$1,760	\$1,820	\$60
\$8,000	1,260	1,380	120
\$6,000	760	1,000	240
\$4,000	260	620	360
\$2,000 (credit)	228	290	518
0 (credit)	668	0	668

Persons who have a reduction in income due to retirement would not be eligible to use these provisions. Retired persons already receive a number of substantial tax breaks under the revenue laws such as the exclusion of social security benefits and the retirement income credit. Also, retired persons generally have diminished family responsibilities and an opportunity to plan for retirement.

The primary purpose of this bill is to help persons who have no opportunity to plan—for example; those persons out of work because of a plant shutdown; workers who are laid off; and families where a wife quits work in a given year to give birth to a child.

Persons who elect to take advantage of downside averaging would have to forgo certain other tax benefits, for example, the alternative capital gains tax and the exclusion of tax-exempt interest on bonds. In most cases these provisions will not affect persons whose primary source of income is wages from employment.

On the whole, the result of this bill would be to allow individuals who suffer a reduction in income to receive credit for taxes paid in years in which income was higher, thus lowering their taxes in the current year.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee which is presently considering potential changes in the Internal Revenue Code, I am sponsoring this legislation because I feel that it will bring about greater equity in our tax system for those who have suffered sharp declines in income. I ask that my colleagues on the committee and in the Congress consider the possibilities of this legislation, both now and when my colleague Jim STANTON comes before the Ways and Means Committee on April 17, 1973, to testify on its behalf.

IN SUPPORT OF DOWNWARD AVERAGING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) on the need for downward averaging to promote greater equity in the tax laws.

Although I will appear before the Ways and Means Committee next month to explain our proposal in greater detail, I would at this point, like to outline what I believe are some of the chief arguments in support of our proposal.

Our legislation would impart a reverse twist to income averaging. This tax-saving device, long enconced in the Internal Revenue Code, currently has a thrust only in one direction. It is available exclusively to those fortunate enough to suddenly enjoy a very good year—for example, movie stars and athletes who make it big, and ordinary persons whose income soars in a given year because of a promotion or transfer to a much higher paying job.

Under our plan, the benefits of averaging would be extended to other classes of persons—for example, those thrown out of work because of a plant shutdown; workers who are laid off; persons in their first year of retirement; and families where a wife quits work in a given year, say, to give birth to a child.

The IRS instructional booklet distributed with the 1971 income tax forms advises the reader that he or she can qualify for averaging "if after subtracting \$3,000 from your 1971 taxable income, the balance is more than 30 percent of the sum of your 4 prior years' taxable income". By averaging the high income from the current year with the lesser incomes from prior years, the well-heeled taxpayer thus is able to show for tax purposes, a lower figure in the current year than he actually earned. His tax is reduced accordingly.

Similarly, the less fortunate person could show through the averaging method that he had overpaid his taxes in the 4 prior years, since the low income from the current year would bring down his average for the prior years. Consequently, this taxpayer would pay less than otherwise would be required of him in the current year, so he could make up for the overpayment of the prior years. If the gap were wide enough, he could qualify for a refund of taxes withheld from his pay in the current year.

This proposal, as Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI pointed out, is an attempt to fully utilize the concept of progressive taxation. Those who are able to average their income to avoid going into a higher bracket should not be placed in a better position than those whose income has been on the decline, but are unable to recoup for higher taxes paid during their previous good years. In fact, it is my opinion that the principle of upward averaging should not be allowed to remain in the Internal Revenue Code unless

downward averaging is inserted in order to eliminate the discrimination which is inherent in any one-way averaging.

Our legislation, which, of course, would only apply to individual taxpayers as are defined under section 1303(a) of the Code, would cost far less than does the existing averaging provision. In addition, it would provide relief to a far more deserving segment of taxpayers, that is, those whose income is on the decline, rather than those who resort to averaging merely as a means of softening the impact of higher taxes which are the result of a far more productive year.

EXPERIENCE OF IRVINGTON, N.J., ON CODE ENFORCEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the experience of Irvington, N.J. with a very successful code enforcement and rehabilitation loan program.

In the housing field, as in a number of domestic program areas, the administration has chosen to employ a meat-ax approach which falls indiscriminately upon both the good and the bad.

Last week, Mr. James Zangari, executive-director of the Irvington South Ward Improvement Project, presented testimony to the Housing Subcommittee on efforts, with Federal assistance, to halt the spread of urban blight in Irvington.

I commend Mr. Zangari for his constructive presentation and I recommend the testimony to all Members of the House as an outstanding example of how Federal housing programs, competently administered, can and do work to improve a community and the lives of its residents:

SOUTH WARD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT Irvington, N.J.

Chairman Barrett, and Members of the Housing Sub-Committee:

I herewith submit, on behalf of the good people of Irvington, New Jersey a plea for the continuance of the HUD programs relating to rehabilitation with Federal Financial Assistance.

I would like to submit some information about Irvington, giving some pertinent facts and statistics. Geographically, we are set in a most desirable position, having the Garden State Parkway and the soon to be completed Route #78, which enables one to travel in all four directions with a minimum of time and effort. Although, we are but three (3) square miles, there are 60,000 inhabitants having thirty-four (34) persons residing on every acre of land; making Irvington the most densely populated Town in the Country. We have become a haven for senior citizens, numbering 20,000 and 15,000 are of ages to 18 years old. In effect, this represents 58% of our total population. Considering that the 1970 census lists Irvington as a lower middle income Community, you can appreciate the burden which lies on the productive part of our Community. Struggling to maintain our dignity, and yet, survive, we have tightened our belts to a point where it just cannot be asked for more, without further agony and despair to our residents.

We have been penalized in the distribu-

tion of Revenue Sharing Funds because our Community is called "Town of Irvington." We need your continued help in receiving funds, to stabilize our Community and to relieve the tax burden that has become a noose so tight that we cannot breathe.

At this point, I am giving documented evidence that justifiably, Irvington can boast with pride on matters where Federal Funding are concerned. We boast of one of the best administered Housing Authority's in the Country, and I am sure the records will verify my statement. I boast of our unique program known as the South Ward Improvement Project, N.J. E-11, with these documented figures as of March 9, 1973:

	Structures	Residential	Non-residential	Mixed	Dwelling units
Total in area and inspected to date.....	2,069	1,857	131	81	4,362
Total closed.....	1,730	1,554	118	58	3,546
Balance to be re-inspected or awaiting assistance.....	339	303	13	23	816

I would also like to insert, for the record, that I have a program that is run effectively, and to substantiate my statement, here is a breakdown of cost:

DIRECT FEDERAL REHABILITATION FUNDS FROM JULY 1, 1969 THROUGH MARCH 9, 1972

\$638,109.00 disbursed, \$.5392 cost per dollar to administer.

DIRECT FEDERAL REHABILITATION FUNDS FROM AUGUST 1, 1972 THROUGH MARCH 9, 1973

\$222,812.00 disbursed, \$.2900 cost per dollar to administer.

DIRECT FEDERAL REHABILITATION FUNDS FROM JULY 1, 1969 THROUGH MARCH 9, 1973

\$861,121 disbursed, \$.4763 cost per dollar to administer.

As you can see by the above figures, the administration cost in relation to Federal Financial Assistance to property owners in our program has been steadily reduced as we moved along with our project. This has been accomplished due to the fact that my staff has gained the needed expertise to handle and expedite all cases with experience gained in passage of time. We are gratified that our documented figures show, very clearly, that, the residents of the Project Area are getting dollars worth of service for every dollar's worth of Federal money (tax money) being spent in our project. We have had a remarkable public improvement program in the project area. Today, anyone can walk proudly through and see the physical change that has been transplanted in the area. This could only have happened through the good graces of the assistance that was provided by the Federal Government. I feel it would be disastrous to our Community, and to our Country, to curb the momentum we have generated in the past few years in the area of rehabilitation. It is imperative that Section 312 of the National Housing Act be continued beyond the current expiration date of June 30, 1973.

If you can appreciate the feeling of our urban community struggling to maintain its dignity, then we respectfully urge your continuing support for Irvington and the Nation.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES ZANGARI,
Executive Director.

THE RHODESIAN CLOSING OF THE ZAMBIAN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Michigan (Mr. Diggs) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the situation on the Zambia/Southern Rhodesia border has recently been a subject of great concern to those interested in bringing freedom and democracy to the minority-ruled states of Southern Africa. In January the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia arbitrarily closed the border to all Zambian traffic, in an attempt to sabotage the economy of this land-locked country. This proved in fact to have been a rash move. Zambia is finding alternative means of transportation for its vital copper exports, and has refused to accept this attempt at blackmail by the illegal regime.

It has gone further, in making arrangements for the permanent redirection of all its external trade away from Rhodesia. This can be achieved only at great cost and national effort, and it is vitally important that the Government should be ready to assist Zambia by all practical means to tighten the sanctions net around the rebel regime, just as we assisted Zambia in the early days of sanctions by participating in the British airlift. When the special UN mission to Zambia has reported on the needs, the United States should be ready to contribute toward the assistance given without delay.

We should not forget, however, that in allowing American business interests to import Southern Rhodesian commodities, especially ferrochrome—which is helping to depress domestic ferrochrome production—chrome and nickel, the United States is rendering worthless all the sacrifices made by Zambia and other poor countries in Africa in their observance of mandatory United Nations sanctions against the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia.

It is vitally important that the U.S. Congress should repeal the notorious Byrd amendment, section 503 of the Military Procurement Act, and that the administration should throw its full weight behind this move. With the Byrd amendment on the books, the United States is seen in the international arena as a saboteur of a major collective security operation, at a point where the effects are becoming increasingly evident in Southern Rhodesia and exerting great pressure on the regime. The crisis situation on the Zambesi is in large part a panic response by the illegal regime to the economic pressures, combined with the resurgence of the liberation struggle inside the territory.

To clarify the gravity of this situation, we should take special note of the statements made at the meeting of the United Nations Security Council on the Rhodesian confrontation, January 29 through February 1, especially the following excerpts from the statements of the Zambian representative, Mr. Paul Lusaka, and the U.S. Representative, Mr. Christopher Phillips.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following excerpts from Mr. Lusaka's statement for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ZAMBIA BEFORE THE SECURITY COUNCIL, JANUARY 29, 1973

This august body is meeting to consider an extremely dangerous situation which now threatens the whole of southern Africa. On 9 January this year the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia closed its border with Zambia, demanding that my country abandon its support for the struggle of the oppressed majority to which Zimbabwe rightly belongs. That was an act of aggression carried out by a rebel régime which has no legal status or power, whose racist policies have been repeatedly condemned by the community of nations and against which the United Nations has imposed mandatory economic sanctions.

I am sure that the members of this Council will appreciate the seriousness of the aggressive acts which have been committed against Zambia. The illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia has declared an economic war against Zambia and supports this war with incidents of the nature of military aggression. It is using economic pressure to hold Zambia to ransom.

By closing the border the Smith régime hoped to inflict serious damage to our economy. The move was an act of desperation to undermine the Zambian economy in order to induce the Zambian people to surrender their rights and freedom and to submit to the authority of a rebel régime. My Government regards the action of the rebels as a siege designed to gain political concessions, that is to say, to stop Zambia from supporting the liberation movement and reduce it to the status of a puppet government.

The Smith régime has for some years faced internal trouble from the 5 million people of Zimbabwe. In 1967, 1968 and 1969 the struggle for independence in Zimbabwe was intensified. The lull in 1970 and 1971 was mistaken by the Smith régime as a defeat of the liberation forces, but the Pearce Commission rekindled nationalism and the people of Zimbabwe have shown their preparedness to make more sacrifices after shedding blood for their liberty during the Pearce Commission's visit.

There is a further and more ominous dimension to this crisis. The collusion of the Salisbury and Pretoria racist and fascist régimes is well known to the members of this Council. Since UDI in 1965, Zambia has warned that the southern African crisis is a threat to international peace and security. Indeed, in 1967 South Africa troops moved into Southern Rhodesia and have since remained there as an occupation force. Tension has been rising. Vorster has issued threats against Zambia; Smith has issued threats against Zambia; and both of them, that is Pretoria and Salisbury, have from time to time committed acts of aggression against Zambia, including violations of our territory by land, air and water. They have laid land mines on our side of the border and have engaged in acts of sabotage and subversion. Since 1964 some 45 agents of minority régimes have been arrested, tried and convicted by Zambia for espionage. Twenty-three of these were in 1972 alone. That is the picture that has emerged from the presence of South Africa forces in Southern Rhodesia.

Vorster himself has not denied the presence of South African forces in Southern Rhodesia. The Council will recall that Vorster has consistently declared and only recently reiterated that when a neighbour's house is on fire, one does not need an agreement to help that neighbour. I might add that the Smith régime has also confirmed this fact by admitting the death of at least two so-called South African policemen and a number of others injured during a confrontation with freedom-fighters inside Southern Rhodesia.

To date, and during this month alone, we have four Zambians killed by land mine explosions and several seriously injured. The numbers are likely to rise since there are land mines still undetected.

Those incidents are the most recent acts of aggression against my country. They are deliberately designed to augment the present siege, thereby creating a new and very dangerous situation.

This danger is in the logic of the situation. The real reason for the moves taken by South Africa and the Smith régime is to stem nationalist feeling which is sweeping through all the oppressed countries of southern Africa. Indeed in Southern Rhodesia it is now stronger than ever before, as the resounding "no" to the Pearce Commission clearly demonstrated in 1972. Freedom fighters have recently achieved important victories in Rhodesia, and the Smith régime has admitted that the freedom fighters are receiving unqualified support from the oppressed masses in their country. This is why it has arbitrarily introduced new and unprecedented inhuman and savage measures against individuals or communities suspected of sympathising with those who are struggling for the liberation of their motherland. What the Smith régime fears is that the liberation struggle will move from one success story to another and that it will become impossible to maintain white minority rule.

Only a few days ago, my Foreign Minister, the Hon. E.H.K. Mudenda, echoed this warning of my President when he referred to the fact that a situation very much like the one in Viet-Nam was developing in southern Africa because Southern Rhodesia and South Africa are evidently bent upon using force to maintain the *status quo*. This can bring nothing but tragedy. It would be a tragedy which could involve the whole world.

Judging by the present trends there is no reason to doubt that Southern Rhodesia would contemplate the bombing of targets in Zambia. At this point I want to make it abundantly clear that in the event of the rebels and/or their allies committing such a mad act other countries would be involved since Zambia reserves its right to call upon the assistance of friendly nations. I say this because we have a right to exist as a nation and to defend our independence and sovereignty.

Is it not obvious that as the liberation struggle gathers force these régimes will become more and more desperate? And is it not obvious that their perverted logic will drive them to even more extreme acts of violence? Southern Rhodesia and South Africa must be stopped now. The world cannot afford to allow this violence to continue.

Zambia supports the cause of majority rule in Zimbabwe. This Council and the General Assembly have passed numerous resolutions on Southern Rhodesia which explicitly support that cause. Indeed, the sanctions imposed by this Council against Southern Rhodesia—which I shall dwell upon later—were intended to bring the illegal régime to heel. Zambia's support for the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe is, needless to say, in conformity with the commitment of the United Nations. Southern Rhodesia has mounted a siege against my country because Zambia has sought to uphold the principles of the Charter. The present crisis is therefore one which directly involves the United Nations. It is therefore incumbent upon the United Nations to take effective action in order to achieve the objectives of the Charter and in conformity with the nu-

merous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and in particular the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

In the past the British Government has expressed concern about the adverse effects which comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the rebel regime in South Rhodesia would have on Zambia. Consequent upon the present siege, my Government decided once and for all to establish permanent alternative routes for its imports and exports and to abandon the southern route altogether as this route could no longer be relied upon. Thus Zambia can no longer be used as an excuse for the non-application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. There is therefore now a golden opportunity for the international community to tighten the sanctions further in order to bring the Smith regime to heel.

STATEMENT OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE MR. CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS

Turning to the complaint raised by Zambia, it is clear that, in view of the economic relationships that existed between Zambia and Southern Rhodesia prior to the illegal declaration of independence, it would have imposed a heavy economic burden for Zambia to sever all of its links with Southern Rhodesia. Despite this, Zambia has since 1965 done its best to comply with the sanctions instituted against Southern Rhodesia. If Zambia was to reduce its dependence on Southern Rhodesia it was clear at the outset that Zambia would require outside assistance. This assistance was almost immediately forthcoming. Many Member States, including the United States, responded to Zambia's request for help during the early days of sanctions. The United States, for example, was quick to respond to Zambia's appeal. During the period January through April 1966 it provided, at a cost of \$4.5 million, a comprehensive airlift for the transport of petroleum products. During that period United States planes made some 500 round trips, transporting 4 million gallons of such products from other points in Africa to Zambia—a unique, costly, but very necessary, airlift.

In addition, the United States provided some \$38 million towards the construction of the great north road, which has enabled Zambia to transport by truck its copper to Tanzania for export to other parts of the world and to transport its imports.

Additional assistance was also provided by my Government as well as by other countries. This assistance has strengthened Zambia's ability to weather the adverse effects on its economy of the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

The United States has followed Zambia's plight with close attention, and we have been in close touch with the Zambia Government since the border was closed. We are very much aware of the problems for Zambia resulting from this act. It is unfortunate that the closing of the Zambia-Southern Rhodesia border has forced Zambia to take drastic measures and to seek alternate routes for its goods. The present difficult circumstances in which Zambia finds itself obviously underscore the need to examine carefully appropriate ways in which Zambia might be assisted.

REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

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

CXIX—641—Part 8

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, President Nixon dismayed many of us by vetoing, yet again, a measure that would have meant much to the 20 million handicapped adults in our land.

I refer, of course, to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which Congress sent back to the President, this month, after he had vetoed a similar, but more expensive, bill last October.

And my distress with reference to the President's actions, Mr. Speaker, is increased as I recall eloquent testimony, before my subcommittee just a few days ago, on another measure, dealing in the education of handicapped children.

That testimony came from Dr. Frances Connor, chairman of the Department of Special Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University.

Said Dr. Connor:

I know I am not here to talk about rehabilitation. But handicapped adults in this country, Mr. Congressman, are sitting rotting their lives away.

The doorkeeper at the Lexington School for the Deaf, happens to be a 70-year old man who is working these last years of his life because he has to care for his 37-year old son, at home, who is totally unable to talk, and barely able to walk.

But that father, Mr. Chairman, who should be at home enjoying what are, I am told, the enormous benefits of the Social Security Act, is now dying of cancer. And all of a sudden he has recognized that he had better do something to enable his crippled son to take care of himself when he is on his own.

I sent him to vocational rehabilitation and they are saying there is a long waiting list and they won't be able to do anything for the 37-year old "boy" for several months. The old man, Mr. Chairman, will not live beyond a few more weeks.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the President has, once again, rejected a measure passed twice with overwhelming bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate, which might have been helpful in this tragic situation.

For the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Mr. Speaker, could have helped the 37-year-old son attain some degree of self-reliance, and, thereby, eased the pain and worry of his father's last days.

It is not my intention here, Mr. Speaker, to take issue with the astonishing message that accompanied President Nixon's veto of the Rehabilitation Act.

But I want to remind my colleagues of the appalling human problems to which this legislation addresses itself, and of the enormous significance of this bill to the millions of crippled, and otherwise disabled, Americans in this great land.

Consider that this bill:

Extends and strengthens the 52-year-old vocational rehabilitation program for disabled adults;

Provides new emphasis for the severely disabled who have not been adequately served in the past; and

Strengthens and highlights our concern for existing programs for the elderly deaf-blind, and persons suffering from spinal cord injury or serious kidney disease.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point statements by several of my distinguished colleagues who express their shock and dismay at the President's unfortunate action.

These documents include statements by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. PERKINS of Kentucky; the distinguished Senate sponsor of this measure, Senator ALAN CRANSTON of California; the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who is such an effective champion of the handicapped, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH; and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, who includes in his statement a resolution overwhelmingly approved by the Arkansas General Assembly applauding congressional passage of the Rehabilitation Act.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT BY HON. CARL D. PERKINS, OF KENTUCKY, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ON THE VETO OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

I am dismayed and deeply disappointed over the President's unjustified action in vetoing the rehabilitation Act for physically and mentally disabled Americans. In disapproving the bill, the President has done serious damage to one of the great success stories in this Nation's effort to serve its people.

The vocational rehabilitation movement has developed the best blend of public and voluntary organization service and the most effective working relationships of any program in the field of human service. This humanitarian effort which was struck down today has been the literal salvation for millions of disabled Americans.

Instead of the expanded and improved program overwhelmingly approved by the Congress, the President's action will force thousands and thousands of those now disabled to live continued lives of dependency, unproductivity and uncertainty. Today's action will be felt the hardest by those who are the most severely disabled, for the vetoed bill would have concentrated resources on those with multiple disabilities—the blind-deaf, the severely physically handicapped, the spinal cord injured, and those afflicted with end-stage renal diseases.

It is alleged that the bill is fiscally irresponsible. First, this is an authorization bill—not a spending bill. Secondly, the revised bill is \$900,000,000 less in authorizations than last year's vetoed bill—a reduction of over 25%. Finally, the FY 1973 authorization in the vetoed measure is less than the authorizations for FY 1971 and FY 1972. Measured by any standard, this is a fiscally responsible bill. The only irresponsible action taken with respect to this measure was taken earlier today.

Great hopes have been turned into bitter disappointment and grave uncertainty—but only temporarily. I trust the Congress will act to correct this serious misjudgment on the part of the Administration.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON, PRINCIPAL AUTHOR AND SENATE FLOOR MANAGER OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973 ON THE PRESIDENTIAL VETO

I share President Nixon's desire for fiscal responsibility, a ceiling on spending, no new taxes and no broader deficits. But none of

these commendable concerns have any relevance to this bill.

The President clearly hasn't read this bill and doesn't know what's in it. I suggest that he fire whoever has again advised him to veto it.

President Nixon for the second time has vetoed a bill designed to give millions of severely handicapped Americans a decent chance for a job and for a dignified, more independent way of life than dependence on government handouts.

If the President meant to include people who are crippled, paralyzed or blind when he admonished the American people to ask not what the government can do for them but rather what they can do for themselves, then the President was not only heartless, but has shown himself to be budgetarily blind.

The programs under this bill have proven to be among the most cost-effective of any in the federal government. For every one dollar spent through these programs, \$3-to-\$5 is returned to the Treasury through taxes paid by rehabilitated workers and through savings in reduced public assistance, unemployment compensation, social security and Medicaid payments.

The Congress has met the President more than half way. We cut the amount authorized to be appropriated over the next three years by \$881 million from the previously vetoed bill. The authorization we requested for fiscal 1973 is actually \$97 million less than last year's figure. But our effort at reasonable compromise did not satisfy an Administration that is more obsessed with confrontation with the Congress than it is concerned about handicapped people.

Unhappily for fiscal common sense and for the conscience of America, prospects of a Congressional override are mixed. The Senate passed its measure (S. 7) Feb. 28 by an 86-to-2 vote, and it accepted the House compromise version Mar. 15 by voice vote. So the outlook for an override in the Senate is hopeful. The situation in the House is less encouraging. Though Members passed what was the final version of the bill (H.R. 17) by a vote of 318-to-57, they had previously defeated the Administration substitute (the Landgrebe Amendment) by a vote of only 213-to-166.

Nonetheless I have faith in the right thinking of the American people and their representatives and it is my profound hope that the Congress, in the name of common sense and of common decency, will vote to reject this cruel but—for this Administration—not unusual act.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 27, 1973]

SENATOR RANDOLPH URGES OVERRIDE OF THE SECOND VETO BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, President Nixon has disapproved for the second time, the Rehabilitation Act. In doing so, he has dashed the hopes of millions of handicapped Americans who urgently need the services which would be provided by this measure.

Last October the 92d Congress unanimously approved the Rehabilitation Act, recognizing its importance in the transformation of handicapped individuals, many, many of whom are welfare recipients and drains on the tax dollar, into productive, self-sustaining, taxpaying citizens able to live in dignity, with hope and purpose in their lives. The President did not agree. He pocket vetoed the measure terming it "fiscally irresponsible."

On January 4, 1973, 19 colleagues joined me in introducing the measure again. Congress once more adopted S. 7, the Rehabilitation Act. This year, taking cognizance of the President's assertion that the act was "fiscally irresponsible," Congress reduced the level of authorizations by \$900 million over a 3-year period. We were genuinely trying to present

to the Chief Executive a bill he would approve. I believe that S. 7 as enacted by Congress would be such a bill. The authorization level for the first year is actually less than that of the existing Vocational Rehabilitation Act, which is narrower in scope.

I am very, very saddened by the action by the President on this vital measure, which has received the enthusiastic support and endorsement of every national group and organization working with handicapped individuals.

The President, in my opinion, has taken an ill-advised action in vetoing the measure. The vocational rehabilitation program has proven to be perhaps the most cost-beneficial effort in the Federal Government. For every dollar invested on rehabilitating a handicapped individual, at least \$3, and as much as \$70, is returned to the economy in reduced welfare payments, increased income, and increased tax revenues for Federal, State, and local governments.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped, and as a citizen who is concerned with how this Nation treats its handicapped citizens, I earnestly hope that both the Senate and the House of Representatives will override President Nixon's tragic veto of this most important and urgently needed legislation.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 27, 1973]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is with much regret that I have just learned of the President's veto of S. 7, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973. S. 7 is the major piece of Federal legislation affecting the handicapped and is vitally needed by the millions of our citizens who are in the unfortunate position of requiring its benefits. Quite wisely, Congress made this legislation a matter of the highest priority in the 93d Congress, following the President's veto of essentially the same bill, H.R. 8395, at the close of the last Congress.

In his veto message on S. 7 President Nixon gives fiscal irresponsibility as his principal objection to this legislation, alluding to the "big spenders who sweep aside budgetary restraints." Mr. President, as I must say again, if this administration is seriously concerned about controlling spending, it should focus on the billions of dollars which we devote annually to exotic weapons systems, foreign aid, and military bases abroad, not to mention the massive outlays in Southeast Asia typified by our bombing strikes which, I understand, are still in progress.

Recently the Arkansas General Assembly overwhelmingly approved a resolution commending the Congress for its foresight in creating and passing the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972, which were vetoed by the President, and urging repassage by the 93d Congress. This is a very good example of the encouragement I have received from my State about the value of the rehabilitation activities and the need for their continuance, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

It would be difficult, Mr. President, for me to name a legislative program more vitally needed by our people than that envisioned in S. 7, and I very much hope that my colleagues will join me in voting to override the President's ill-advised action.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16 COMMENDING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FOR ITS FORESIGHT IN CREATING AND PASSING THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972 WHICH WERE VETOED BY THE PRESIDENT AND TO URGE THE REPASSAGE THEREOF BY THE CONGRESS

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America exhibited great foresight in creat-

ing the magnificent Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972 (H.R. 17 and S. 7 which were identical to H.R. 8395) which were passed unanimously by both houses of the Congress in October, 1972; and

Whereas, this legislation was vetoed by the President of the United States; and

Whereas, the Vocational Rehabilitation program in Arkansas has provided services for years that have assisted thousands of citizens in this State in overcoming their physical, mental, and vocational handicaps, and has permitted them to lead productive lives; and

Whereas, the 1972 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as passed by the Congress, would have been new milestone legislation to continue the outstanding progress under the original Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and in addition, would have provided comprehensive services to many severely disabled who do not now receive appropriate services, including the spinal cord injured, chronic kidney diseased, and the low-achieving deaf, whose needs require specialized centers and comprehensive programs of care; and

Whereas, for the first time, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972 would have provided funds for basic research directed toward resolving problems in the field of spinal cord injured, and would have provided vitally and critically needed funds to enable the states to continue present vocational rehabilitation programs, and to initiate the new urgently needed programs for the neglected severely handicapped;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-Ninth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein: That the Arkansas General Assembly respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to reconsider and reenact the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972, and the President of the United States is urged to approve said legislation, which will continue the existing programs of vocational rehabilitation benefitting thousands of citizens of this State and Nation, and providing new programs of service and hope for the neglected severely retarded.

Be it further resolved that upon adoption of this Resolution the Secretary of State of the State of Arkansas is requested to furnish copies of this Resolution to (1) President Richard M. Nixon, Mr. Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, each of whom are urged to reconsider their position with respect to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972; and (2) each member of the Arkansas Congressional Delegation, each of whom are urged to use their influence to bring about the reenactment and ultimate approval of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972.

And I also include, Mr. Speaker, materials developed by the House Select Subcommittee on Education, and the distinguished majority whip, Mr. McFALL of California, which describe the provisions contained in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as well as the history of this measure.

[Select Subcommittee on Education, Mar. 28, 1973]

REASONS CONGRESS SHOULD OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

What the Bill Does: Extends and strengthens the existing Vocational Rehabilitation program and adds a new program for severely disabled persons, including the elderly deaf-blind, persons with spinal cord injury, and persons with serious kidney disease.

Support for the Bill: For over 50 years the Vocational Rehabilitation program has had broad bipartisan support. In 1972 both the

House and Senate passed the Rehabilitation Bill unanimously.

In 1973 the Senate (by a vote of 86-2) and the House (by a vote of 318-57) passed the Rehabilitation Bill with an authorization of over \$900 million below the amount in the 1972 vetoed bill. (The House Education and Labor Committee had reported the 1973 bill by a 33-1 vote).

Benefits of Vocational Rehabilitation: Benefits of the national rehabilitation program relative to costs are conceded by all to be extremely high. Over three million handicapped Americans have been returned to productive and meaningful lives because of assistance from the program. In fiscal year 1972 alone, the estimated annual earnings of the 326,138 individuals rehabilitated total \$1 billion, a net increase of \$750 million in earnings from the time the individuals entered the rehabilitation system.

The Rehabilitation Services Administration estimates that, in addition to this contribution to the GNP, these individuals, at a minimum, will be contributing approximately 5% of their income, or \$58 million, in taxes to Federal, state and local governments. And these figures do not reflect the approximately \$33 million in savings to Federal and State governments in 1972 caused by removal of many rehabilitated persons from the public assistance rolls.

Need for Rehabilitation Bill: There are an estimated seven to twelve million handicapped individuals in the nation who have not realized their vocational potential. With the level of funding authorized in the Rehabilitation Bill just vetoed, rehabilitation services could be provided to a total of approximately two million handicapped individuals over the next two fiscal years using today's per case cost. This would leave at least five million handicapped persons who, at today's spending level, would not be served.

The simple fact is that we have a long way to go to meet the needs of our disabled fellow citizens.

ADMINISTRATION OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS

Objection: The few opponents of the Rehabilitation Bill argue it is "fiscally irresponsible."

Answer: In order to meet Administration objections, the authorization was reduced more than \$900 million—from \$3.477 billion to \$2.6 billion—a cut of more than 25%. Furthermore, the authorization for fiscal year 1973 (\$913 million), is lower than the authorizations for FY '71 and '72 (\$1,010 and \$1,010 billion respectively).

Objection: The few opponents of the bill argue that it duplicates services already available under Medicare or Medicaid.

Answer: The types of medical services available to the handicapped vary from state to state and usually do not include the specific help which the disabled person needs. In addition, the Medicaid program does not offer a disabled client the range of rehabilitation services, such as counseling and training, which handicapped people need to move back into the work forces. Still further, Medicare payments are made only to persons covered under the Social Security law. Many handicapped persons are not covered by social security.

Objection: The few opponents of the bill argue that it diverts rehabilitation from its basically vocational objective.

Answer: By the addition of a new title (Title II), this bill merely makes explicit a commitment to persons with severe handicaps which the Administration itself expressed during committee hearings. (Note: This new Title is authorized separately and amounts to less than five percent of the total Vocational Rehabilitation program).

Many severely handicapped people covered by the new program are today refused assistance under the present program because

they are difficult to rehabilitate for employment. The vocational goal for these people has not been eliminated by this modest new program for the severely handicapped. If a vocational goal is found possible, these individuals will be transferred and provided services under the regular state program. For the few who are incapable of employment, this new program will hopefully assist them in becoming more self-sufficient, often enabling other members of the family to re-enter the work force.

Objection: The few opponents of the bill argue that it would create a proliferation of new categorical grant programs and bureaucratic structures.

Answer: The truth is that Title II programs for severely handicapped are special project programs aimed at stimulating state and local effort with the idea that they will be absorbed into the basic program at a later date.

The bill does create several national commissions, such as The National Commission on Transportation and Housing for Handicapped Individuals, as well as a voluntary system of state advisory councils on problems of the handicapped. None of these commissions are to have any Federal budgetary or administrative authority. Nearly every witness before congressional committees has stressed the need for such commissions to insure that minimum standards, such as adequate bathroom facilities for the handicapped in public buildings, are adequately met.

OFFICE OF JOHN J. McFALL, MAJORITY WHIP— HISTORY OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973 (S. 7)

ACTION BY 92D CONGRESS

Passed House March 20, 1972, unanimously (327-0).

Passed Senate September 26, 1972, unanimously (70-0).

Pocket Vetoed by President October 27, 1972, after Congress adjourned.

ACTION BY 92D CONGRESS

Reported by Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee February 26 by a 16 to 0 vote.

Reported by House Committee on Education and Labor February 27 by 33 to 1 vote.

Passed Senate February 23 by 86 to 2 vote.

Passed House March 8 by 318 to 57 vote.

Conference Report adopted by voice vote in both Houses March 16.

Sent to White House March 22.

Vetoed by President March 27.

BILL SUMMARY

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 revises, extends and improves programs for the handicapped previously authorized under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Established by Congress in 1920 and extended six times since, the vocational rehabilitation program provides a variety of services as needed to physically and mentally handicapped persons to prepare them for employment. These continuing services include, among others: hospital diagnosis and care for the handicapped; placement services to assist handicapped individuals to secure and maintain employment; maintenance and transportation as appropriate during rehabilitation.

Title II of The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 creates a new formula grant program to assist States in establishing programs for blind persons and those suffering from spinal cord injury and kidney disease who may be unemployable. Title II amounts to approximately 5% of the total authorization under the Act.

Benefits of the Act relative to costs are conceded to be high. It is estimated that the total annual earnings of the 326,138 individuals rehabilitated in fiscal year 1972 are at about \$1 billion, a net increase of \$750,000,000 of earnings from the time the individuals entered the rehabilitation system.

AUTHORIZATION LEVEL

The revised 1973 version of the bill authorizes programs of \$2.6 billion over the next three years, which is \$930 million less than the vetoed bill of \$3.5 billion, but approximately \$200 million more than the President's fiscal '74 budget request.

APPROPRIATION LEVEL

The legislation is an authorization bill only. The actual level of spending will be determined later after thorough review by the Congress in the appropriations bills. In the current year the authorization level was \$913.2 million and the appropriations totaled \$676.5 million (under a continuing resolution).

Mr. Speaker, I also insert a statement by Mr. E. B. Whitten, executive director of the National Rehabilitation Association, with reference to the President's veto of S. 7, along with a listing of the national organizations that are urging Congress to override the President's veto of this critical legislation. And I include with Mr. Whitten's material, also, Mr. Speaker, his association's analysis of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and its importance to the handicapped people of America.

The material follows:

STATEMENT OF E. B. WHITTEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION, MARCH 27, 1973

The organizations of and for the handicapped listed at the end of this release join in urging Congress to override the Presidential veto of S. 7, the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972.

Programs financed under this Act are the principal dependence of physically and mentally handicapped youth and adults who want to become employable. This legislation contains authority for the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program, rehabilitation facilities, research and training.

All of the organizations listed have appealed to the President to sign the legislation but without avail. In fact, it is not clear that the messages even got to the President.

The legislation was enacted by Congress in 1972 following lengthy hearings. The bipartisan nature of the legislation was demonstrated by the fact that it passed without a dissenting vote in either branch. The executive branch, now, seems to be attempting to make a partisan issue of legislation which has always been strictly bipartisan. The issues raised by the executive have little basis in fact. An attachment to this release will clarify these issues.

All of the organizations joining in this effort deplore the use of legislation for handicapped individuals for a confrontation with Congress, especially, since the issues have very little validity.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS URGING OVERRIDE OF PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF S. 7

American Association on Mental Deficiency.

American Council of the Blind.

American Foundation for the Blind.

American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine.

American Association of Workers for the Blind.

American Personnel & Guidance Assoc./American Rehabilitation Counseling Association.

American Speech and Hearing Association.

American Occupational Therapy Association.

American Physical Therapy Association.

Council of Rehabilitation Counselor Educators.

Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation.
 Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf.
 Council for Exceptional Children.
 Goodwill Industries of America.
 International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities.
 National Rehabilitation Association.
 National Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults.
 National Federation of the Blind.
 National Association of Hearing and Speech Agencies.
 National Association for Retarded Children.
 National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors.
 National Association of Physically Handicapped.
 National Association of the Deaf.
 National Rehabilitation Counseling Association.
 National Association of Coordinators of State Programs for Mental Retardation.
 National Recreation and Park Association.
 National Association for Mental Health.
 Professional Rehabilitation Workers With Adult Deaf.
 United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc.

S. 7, NEW REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS FEATURES NOT FOUND IN PRESENT LEGISLATION OR IN THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL

This is not an analysis of S 7 or the Administration bill. It is designed to point out specifically features of the new legislation important to the vocational rehabilitation programs which are not in existing law or in the Administration proposed legislation.

1. There has been no appropriation authority for any program financed under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act since June 30, 1972. If S 7 is not passed, there will be a long period of existence under continuing resolutions which hold expenditures to the 1972 level, which is even lower than the amount the President has recommended. The need for appropriation authority is a paramount issue.

2. \$50 million appropriated for vocational rehabilitation in 1973 in the supplemental appropriation bill passed by Congress is being held up until the new legislation is passed. The supplemental appropriation bill referred to the Rehabilitation Act of 1972, which was vetoed. It will be noted that S 7 is called the Rehabilitation Act of 1972, and this is the reason. This \$50 million will be lost to the program, if the legislation is not passed. Since states have been spending at the higher rate provided for in the appropriation that was passed, a chaotic condition will exist, if the new legislation is not passed clearing up this matter.

3. The Administration bill has authorizations that are less than the amount that the President has recommended for the program in 1973 and 1974. The authority in S 7 is reasonable, but permits growth.

4. The new bill provides for advanced funding which is badly needed by the states as well as the voluntary agencies. The failure to have appropriations passed until months after the beginning of the year for which funds are to be used is resulting in great hardship and makes intelligent planning almost impossible.

5. The bill provides for an innovation and expansion program, with half of the sums appropriated to be controlled by state priorities, the remainder by the priorities of the Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration. In present legislation, there is an innovation program, but no appropriations are being made for it. The new legislation strengthens the concept, makes clear the objectives, and will be a very useful program.

6. The new bill includes an earmarked program for providing rehabilitation services

to individuals for whom a vocational goal may not be feasible in the beginning. This will be extremely valuable to the state agencies in allowing them to accept more severely disabled persons. It will in no way dilute the emphasis on vocational rehabilitation, since the goal is that as many of these very severely disabled persons as possible will move into the regular vocational rehabilitation program. Since money for this program is earmarked, it can do no damage to the regular vocational rehabilitation program.

7. An improved definition of scope of vocational rehabilitation services and an improved and expanded definition of the handicapped individual is found in the new legislation. Although the change in these definitions is not a matter of great emergency yet, it will be very helpful.

8. The legislation provides for a Rehabilitation Services Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with a Commissioner in charge and gives the Commissioner the responsibility for the administration of Titles I, II, and III, except for Section 309, the renal disease program, where administration could be optional. This is a very important provision. It will prevent the diffusion of rehabilitation programs throughout the Department and the serious division of authority that has existed between SRS and RSA in the administration of the program.

The above items refer specifically to the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program. It must be remembered, however, that the state-federal program cannot do its job well without improved community rehabilitation programs and facilities. For this reason, the following supplementary programs provided for in S 7 are very important to the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program.

1. One section authorizes special project appropriations for rehabilitation of renal disease victims. The pressures on rehabilitation and other agencies to serve this needy group is terrific. Although rehabilitation does not assume that it has or should have full responsibility for a renal disease program, it can make a much more important contribution to the desired results.

2. One section authorizes special project programs for spinal cord injured individuals. We simply do not have at this time the facilities and personnel or money to serve this very severely disabled group of individuals. In fact, it is estimated that state agencies are not serving over one out of ten individuals that suffer spinal cord injury each year. While the rehab agencies would not get the money for such programs directly, try their success in dealing with spinal cord injured persons depends upon the adequacy of programs and facilities serving this group.

3. One section authorizes the development of special programs for the low achieving deaf. We have a liberal arts college for the deaf and a technical school for the deaf but we have no centers especially prepared to serve the run-of-the-mill deaf individuals. Secondary schools for the deaf are totally inadequate to provide the total services needed by the deaf. The state-federal vocational rehabilitation program will be improved immensely, if we can get a network of demonstration-type special centers for the low achieving deaf.

4. Two sections of the legislation authorize programs of mortgage insurance and interest subsidies to facilitate the construction of rehabilitation facilities. We have legislation for rehabilitation facilities now, but we cannot get any money for them. This legislation will facilitate communities getting loans with which they can build badly needed facilities. The state vocational rehabilitation agencies depend to a very great extent upon rehabilitation facilities to serve many of their clients.

REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS (S. 7) FACT SHEET

WHAT S. 7 IS

1. S. 7 is the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972, passed unanimously by Congress in 1972, vetoed by the President, and repassed this year by a vote of 318-57 after substantial reduction in appropriation authority.

2. This bill extends appropriation authority for programs under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for 1973, 1974, and for some programs for 1975. All appropriation authority expired July 1, 1972. \$50 million in appropriations for the current year are being held up awaiting passage.

3. The major change in the concept of rehabilitation services under this act is added emphasis on vocational rehabilitation services to the very severely disabled.

4. The bill includes special project programs to serve the older blind, spinal cord injured, renal disease victims and the deaf. It also contains authority for a national commission on architectural barriers and an architectural compliance board, which will attempt to see that housing and transportation are accessible to handicapped and older people.

WHAT S. 7 IS NOT

1. S. 7 is not a "new society program of the sixties". The first Vocational Rehabilitation Act was passed in 1920 and has been in continual operation since that time. It is the act under which over 300,000 handicapped individuals were rehabilitated into employment in 1972. Vocational rehabilitation is a successful, respected program of services to disabled people of the nation, a model of state-federal cooperation.

2. S. 7 is not a "budget busting bill". This legislation carries no appropriations at all, only appropriation authority. The budgetary and appropriation process will determine the amount actually made available. Appropriation authority is quite reasonable in relation to actual appropriations as the following table will show.

[In millions]

President's recommendation:	
1973	615
1974	660
S. 7:	
1973	700
1974	800

It will be seen that the President's recommendation for 1973 is 87% of the appropriation authority under S. 7, and for 1974 the President's recommendation is 80% of the authority under S. 7. There are relatively few pieces of legislation under which actual availability of funds is more closely related to appropriation authority. How the idea of a "budget busting bill" got started is difficult to understand. Authorizations for existing special project programs are about the same level as in the preceding legislation, and appropriation authority for the new special project programs is quite modest.

3. The bill does not launch "new categorical programs duplicating other existing programs". The sections having to do with the older blind, spinal cord injured, renal disease victim and the deaf are special project programs aimed at stimulating state and local effort with the idea that they will be absorbed into the basic program at a later date. This is an accepted approach of Congress in getting special emphasis upon difficult problems. Who could possibly resent these special emphases on programs for the blind, the spinal cord injured, renal disease victims, and the deaf.

4. The bill does not "dilute the vocational rehabilitation emphases by making it just another social service agency". Both the legislation and the report emphasizes the need for extending vocational rehabilitation services to the very severely disabled. The

small new program which permits acceptance of severely disabled individuals who may not have vocational objectives in the beginning carry separate appropriation authority, so it cannot be a substitute for a vocational rehabilitation program. Even in the new program, every possible effort is to be made to help individuals get to the point that a vocational objective is feasible.

5. This legislation is not "impossible to administer". Administrative provisions of the act make clear the intent of Congress that authority for administering programs for handicapped individuals be focused in the Rehabilitation Services Administration and that funds appropriated for vocational rehabilitation programs be expended for the specific purposes Congress has in mind. Other administrative features emphasize coordination of all programs for handicapped people within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. To say that such legislation cannot be administered is absurd.

6. This bill is not partisan legislation and efforts to make it such are a disservice to handicapped people. Rehabilitation legislation is now and always has been totally bipartisan.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (S. 7), MARCH 17, 1973

This legislation extends for three years appropriation authority for all titles of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and initiates certain new supplementary programs. Its provisions include the statutory basis for the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program and the special project programs that support its efforts and make them more effective. This memorandum is in the nature of a request to the President of the United States that he sign the legislation promptly, thus enabling the programs depending upon the legislation to begin functioning again in a normal manner.

IDENTIFICATION OF SPONSOR

The National Rehabilitation Association is an organization of 35,000 individuals and organizations, all of whom are concerned for the rehabilitation of handicapped people. Approximately one-third of its members are professionals working in various areas of rehabilitation, two-thirds are laymen with a public interest concern for the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals. The National Rehabilitation Association is the forum in which the professional, the lay citizen, and handicapped people themselves meet to identify issues and problems in connection with the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals and to plan and promote programs leading toward this end.

The National Rehabilitation Association was a sponsor of HR 8395, which was passed by Congress in October 1972, and vetoed by the President. S. 7, which is now awaiting the President's signature, is very similar to the bill vetoed last year, except that appropriation authority has been substantially reduced, this being done at the request of the Administration. The legislation finally passed by Congress is different in numerous ways from HR 8395, as it was originally introduced. In fact, some of the features most objectionable to the Administration were not in their original bill. Working on the basis that all legislation is the result of compromise, we have done our best to keep the legislation consistent with our own principles and Association policy, but we have been willing to go along with some features that others consider more important than we do. We think that all of the new parts of the legislation are potentially helpful to handicapped people, and we have supported the passage of the bill in its present form. Although the National Rehabilitation Association accepts full responsibility for its con-

tents, the statement reflects the viewpoint of numerous organizations of and for the handicapped who participated in the legislative process that resulted in the passage of the legislation.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Our considered judgment is that the departures in the legislation from Administration policies are relatively minor in their impact upon the very popular and useful program of vocational rehabilitation in the United States. Ordinarily, one would assume the signing of the bill by the President, since to do so would be consistent with his support of vocational rehabilitation programs throughout his career as a member of the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Vice Presidency, and the Presidency. In light of the President's veto of similar legislation in October 1972 and the fact that there has not been any statement issuing from the White House indicating the intent of the President with respect to the legislation just passed by Congress, these comments express our viewpoint that the legislation should be signed promptly by the President.

It appears to us that it would be a disservice to the President for anyone to recommend to him that he veto this legislation. It has the bipartisan support of Congress. It reflects the labors of many individuals inside government and outside of government. It is supported unanimously by organizations of the handicapped, for the handicapped, and many other organizations devoted to the public interest. A veto would certainly be interpreted by the media, the public generally, and by all of those who are devoted to the rehabilitation of handicapped people as an ill-humored, misguided action based upon relatively petty issues. There can be absolutely no political advantage to a veto, and it can be very hurtful to the image of the President. In the following paragraphs, we shall speak directly to some of the issues raised by the Administration in testimony before the Congress on this legislation and reasons why the legislation is in the public interest.

GOAL ORIENTED PROGRAM

The vocational rehabilitation program is widely acclaimed as one of the great successes in state-federal partnership. In fact, it is often pointed out as the most successful demonstration of an effective state-federal relationship. This fact has been confirmed by representatives of all recent Administrations, including the present one. Rehabilitation has clear-cut objectives; it has achieved these objectives in a substantial way; and it has developed a system of accountability which leaves little room for doubt about what it is trying to do, how it is trying to do it, and what it is accomplishing. This evaluation is confirmed by studies done both within the government and outside of the government.

REHABILITATION CONSISTENT WITH ADMINISTRATION OBJECTIVES

The philosophy of the rehabilitation program is consistent with the philosophy of this Administration that a prime concern of government should be to help people help themselves. The new legislation does not depart from this concept. Handicapped individuals apply for assistance in becoming employable. They are provided such assistance. Their names are removed from agency rolls when maximum self-support is attained, or when it is determined that such self-support is not feasible. No one is on a rehabilitation roll indefinitely, so no habits of dependency can be developed. Rehabilitating over 300,000 persons per annum, this program is the nation's greatest bulwark against dependency resulting from physical and mental disability.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

This program has always had bipartisan support. The most substantial program gains of recent times have come as a result of the 1954 Amendments, passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Republican President. These 1954 Amendments initiated programs of research and training and improved financial base for the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program. Substantial amendments to the Act were made in 1965 and in 1968, again with bipartisan support. The present legislation has received the same kind of enthusiastic support from members of both parties. A Presidential veto would leave the impression on many people that rehabilitation has become a partisan program.

The aspects of the legislation which are not consistent with current Administration policies are not of sufficient importance to justify serious consideration of a veto which would almost certainly be overridden. The objections expressed by Administration spokesmen are discussed in the following paragraphs.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Much has been said by Administration representatives with respect to "fiscal irresponsibility" reflected by the legislation. This argument is hard to understand and does not take into account the facts of the situation. The total appropriation for 1973, 1974, and 1975 has been reduced by about \$850,000,000 from the amount authorized by HR 8395, which was vetoed. The authorization for 1973 for the state-federal program is identical with authorization in existing legislation for 1972. The increase in authorizations for 1974 and 1975 is a reasonable amount, if the program is to continue to increase and expand its efforts to reduce dependency among the nation's handicapped citizens, which is the Number One national priority for this program.

Appropriation authority for the newly established categorical programs is extremely modest. The amounts authorized for special projects shows little increase over previous appropriation authority. The new Research and Training title does include new appropriation authority for Research and Training Centers, biomedical engineering and spinal cord injury.

Not only is the appropriation authority not excessive in light of the history of the various programs and mission given to the agencies that administer it, the Administration has not recommended nor has the Congress historically appropriated all the money authorized.

THE TRADITIONAL GOAL OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Some Administration spokesmen have insisted that new programs provided for in the legislation will divert the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program from its traditional goal of preparing disabled people for employment. This seems to refer to the comprehensive rehabilitation services provided for in Title II. Congress has emphasized in its report that it is not establishing a "new program", simply a second financing mechanism. Although a vocational goal will not have to be established as a condition to beginning services, a vocational goal will remain the ultimate goal in every case. This provision with separate financing will encourage the state vocational rehabilitation agencies to accept many more severely handicapped individuals for whom vocational goals cannot be clear at the beginning. Undoubtedly, a high proportion of these will ultimately achieve vocational rehabilitation. The accounting system will identify those whose achievements are less than vocational competence. Congress as well as the Administration is determined that the new pro-

gram will not be used to dilute the effectiveness of the vocational rehabilitation program. The authorizations for this program are separate from authorizations for the basic vocational rehabilitation program, so the new program cannot eat up the regular program. There is no difference in legislative and executive objectives, or our own.

CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS

Another objection expressed is that the legislation establishes a new series of categorical programs. This is true. This is not a new area of conflict between the legislative and executive branches. The executive branch of the government, almost traditionally, has opposed the categorical approach to the solution of problems, while the Congress has preferred categorical programs. In this legislation, the major categorical programs are those in the areas of spinal cord injury, end-stage renal disease, and the older blind. All of these are *special project programs*. Certainly, it can be argued that some of the services which will be provided under these special programs could be provided on a non-categorical basis. The truth is that services for these groups of handicapped individuals are very difficult and expensive. Services for such individuals cannot compete with services to the general disabled population without special emphasis. The renal disease program is, in the main, a stop-gap program to serve until such time as a national health insurance program can pick up the tab for comprehensive services to all victims of this malady. The situation in the area of comprehensive rehabilitation services to spinal cord injured individuals is appalling. Although we have a few good programs, enough to serve as demonstrations, less than 20% of the spinal cord injured individuals are receiving the kind of services we know how to provide. A special push is going to be required to make a significant breakthrough. The situation of the older blind is a pitiful one. Money is available for pensions but not for the kind of rehabilitative programs which are appropriate for them. Social service funds may be available theoretically, but not actually. Eventually, we hope that these programs can be absorbed into the regular rehabilitation program without the special project approach.

Incidentally, it must mean something that the American Kidney Foundation thinks that rehabilitation is the best vehicle to provide services to end-stage renal disease victims, and the Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine thinks that rehabilitation is the best vehicle for providing special project services to spinal cord injured individuals. Rehabilitation is truly a viable, flexible program human service oriented and goal oriented, operating with a minimum of red tape. Incidentally, the funds authorized for these special project programs are relatively small.

NEW BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Another objection to the legislation is that it establishes new boards and commissions, including an Office of the Handicapped in the Secretary's Office. With respect to the latter, the legislation and report make clear that this newly established office will have no budgetary or administrative authority, simply be a mechanism to be used by the Secretary of HEW to keep him informed of all programs in the Department having to do with handicapped individuals and to make recommendations to him with respect to steps to be taken in improving and coordinating these programs. The argument can be made, of course, that this office is unnecessary, and it may be. We have mixed feelings about such bodies ourselves. Potentially, it may be useful, and the restriction on its activities should prevent it becoming a nuisance.

The new boards and commissions have to do with the employment of handicapped in-

dividuals in government and in meeting housing and transportation needs of handicapped individuals. These items are addressed to extremely important problems, which we do not appear to be able to solve in the context of our present operation. It is felt that we need the prestige of distinguished people inside and outside the government to take the leadership in developing public policy which can result in their solution. A good illustration of present futility is seen in the fact that ten years of work with the authorities of the District of Columbia have not yet assured us that the District of Columbia subway system will serve individuals having to use wheelchairs. Certainly, the inclusion in the bill of these boards and commissions with limited terms and very limited financing cannot be an important factor in whether the legislation shall become law.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE SECRETARY IN ADMINISTERING THE PROGRAMS

Another objection expressed is that the legislation restricts the Secretary in the administration of the programs covered under the Act. Administrators cannot be expected to like provisions of this kind, but such language in legislation is not unusual, and is not often a great obstacle to the effective administration of a program. In fact, sometimes such restrictions prove to be quite a good thing.

The language in the Rehabilitation Act Amendments pertaining to the administration of the program was not proposed by the National Rehabilitation Association. We can understand, nevertheless, the conditions that led Congress to insert it. It is by no means just an effort on the part of Congress to spite the Administration. Under the administration of SRS, responsibility for administration of vocational rehabilitation programs has been divided between SRS and RSA at both national and regional levels. There has never been a clear expression of policy on the point as to whether SRS is to be an agency to coordinate the programs of the various bureaus, or whether it is to be an agency to actually operate these programs. While talk, generally, has indicated that SRS is a coordinator and service agency to the bureaus, actually, personnel has been drained off the bureaus to SRS, and more and more administrative and policy decisions that previously have been made by the bureaus are now made by SRS. This, in itself, would not have been so objectionable, but funds appropriated for research and training under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act have been thrown into an SRS pool and expended, often, on programs having only peripheral, if any, values to the rehabilitation programs. Officials of SRS have stated numerous times that research and training funds when appropriated become SRS funds, not rehabilitation funds, aging funds, social service funds, etc. This situation has annoyed state vocational rehabilitation agencies, members of Congress, and others who have been concerned for these programs. The confusion that has prevailed at both national and regional levels has been detrimental to programs for handicapped individuals. Since the Administration did not act to clarify this situation, Congress, upon the suggestion of those that administer the programs, did so. Congress may have gone farther than necessary in its efforts to correct this situation. Since an RSA Administrator will be selected by the Secretary of HEW and be responsible to him, we cannot imagine that these provisions are going to cause any great difficulty to the Secretary in the administration of the programs. We do not want RSA to be anywhere else except in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We do not want it administered in isolation to other HEW programs. We do want, however, monies appropriated for rehabilitation purposes to be spent on rehabilitation, and we want clear

lines of authority with respect to the administration of the programs.

ADMINISTRATION DELAYS

Finally, we must say that the Administration must bear a considerable part of the responsibility for the fact that the vocational rehabilitation legislation is inconsistent with Administration policies in several respects. Rehabilitation is a popular program with Congress, the states, and the general public. It was well known that appropriation authority for all titles of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act expired June 30, 1972. The House Committee on Education and Labor notified the Administration many months ahead of its projected hearing dates. It repeated the invitation to the Administration to appear well ahead of the hearing date set. It delayed its hearings in the hope that the Administration would make its proposals. Actually, an Administration proposal was not presented until the day before the date set to report the bill to the House floor. Then, Administration proposals did not indicate that a great deal of thought had been given to their development. Had the Administration been more alert, more prompt in its response to Congress' invitations, undoubtedly, its impact upon the legislation would have been greater. We have never sensed any effort on the part of the Committees of Congress to spite the Administration. Actually, majority and minority members of the Congress have worked in true harmony, and both House and Senate delayed their hearings this year to accommodate the Administration. Minority members will be the most disappointed, if the President does not sign the legislation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we want to say that we recognize that this is not perfect legislation. It certainly does not conform to all policies of the National Rehabilitation Association. It is the result of many compromises. On the other hand, more members of Congress have participated in this legislation than any other previous version of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in many years. Certainly, it provides a legal base for a sound and constructive advance in providing rehabilitation services for handicapped individuals. Differences of opinion on relatively minor parts of the legislation cannot be allowed to retard the progress of these constructive programs.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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, one of the most illustrious spokesmen for congressional reform, Representative MORRIS UDALL, recently addressed the issue in a discussion in Los Angeles at the Time Inc.-sponsored symposium on "The Role of Congress." The moderator of the discussion was Louis Banks, editorial director, Time Inc. I am pleased to insert the text in the RECORD.

DISCUSSION

Mr. BANKS. Congressman Morris Udall and I have a friend in common, a brilliant writer named Larry King, who has written for *Harpers*, *LIFE* and other publications, and in an article in *Harpers* in mid-1971, Larry King described, in loving detail, Mr. Udall's attempt to get reform in the House of Representatives by running against John McCormack for Speaker. Well, that didn't work. In fact, he was defeated rather brutally. But Udall represents the symbol of younger members in the House, who have hopes of changing its slow and cumbersome

processes which King characterizes as: "The seniority system, loose deceptive campaign laws, unsupervised lobbyists, general congressional anemia and harmful fuddy-duddyism."

King also notes that: "Despite Morris Udall's deceptive outward smoothness, you have to get inside his head to discover that coyotes howl in his soul."

Representative Udall of Arizona.

Representative UDALL. Thank you, Louis. Coyote lovers, fugitives from Arizona, candidates for mayor, fellow taxpayers:

Greetings from Washington, where our party is about to engage in its annual rites of purification and bloodletting. We in Arizona once had a presidential candidate—you may have remembered this trauma, some of you Republicans. I was thinking on election night when the thing was all over, what someone once said of that campaign: "Barry Goldwater's staff fought each other; he was constantly clarifying his position; everything went wrong; Barry wanted to run for President in the worst possible way. And he did." Perhaps that is what my party did this year. But don't give up on us.

You might remember the great old story in the 1930s about this Wall Street tycoon who hated Roosevelt. He would buy a paper from the boy each evening, look at the front page, curse and throw it in the trash can. After a week, the boy said: "Why do you do this, spend your money, look at it, mention the name of our Lord and Saviour in vain, and throw it in the can?"

The tycoon said: "Son, it's none of your business, but to be perfectly honest, I am looking for an obituary."

The boy said, "The obituaries are found in the back of the newspaper, not on the front page."

"Son, believe me, the obituary I am looking for will be on the front page."

Don't write the obituary of the Democratic Party, and don't write the obituary of the Congress because we are alive, and I hope that through discussions of this kind, and the attention of the American people, we can do some of the things that Bob Packwood has talked about.

If there was one thing that haunted the founding fathers 200 years ago, it was fear of concentrated power. They came from nations where executive tyrants, kings, dukes, barons of different kinds, could knock on the door, draft your sons, take your money, remove you from the land. Out of this, came a central thing in our Constitution; it is this strange, unique division of powers, a check and balance. This is the unique American division of government, and it worked pretty well for 150 or 160 years. Yes, it was inefficient. Yes, it was awkward to have different power centers contending with each other. It is more simple to have one man or one institution make decisions for the country. I think the founding fathers believed in a democracy. There are higher values than simple, cold efficiencies, and some of those values are a reconciliation and a spirit of unity and purpose among a people, which you lose when you have a very powerful leader, however noble his purposes may be. So, I say this worked rather well.

How did we get sidetracked from this system of checks and balances? If you went to Washington in the 1920's when Henry Luce started TIME, and you stopped the well-informed citizen on the sidewalk and said: "Give me the names of the 10 most powerful people in Washington," he obviously would list the President, although maybe not even first. I remember a clipping that said that there being no public business for a couple of months, President Coolidge went off to Vermont for the summer. But surely on the list of powerful people would have been the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the leader of the Senate, including powerful

committee chairmen and certainly some of the Cabinet members.

Today in most Administrations at most times, you cannot make that statement. Now, what happened? I think what happened is the convergence of two shattering convulsive events in the life of this nation—neither anticipated, both probably non-recurring over the long lifetime of a nation's existence.

In 1929 or the early '30s, we awakened to find that the great free enterprise system was in trouble, a third of the labor force out of work, half the plant capacity idle, serious questions as to whether this incentive system would work at all, serious doubt about all of this. Leading Americans thought of turning to socialism, to other economic systems that didn't have the injustices that apparently this one had. Along came Franklin Roosevelt. We said: "Give him power, he is going to do something."

There is a story that in the House of Representatives of 1933 or 1934, during the crisis of the Depression, someone held up a blank piece of paper and said the President wants a bill, so all in favor say "aye." And they sent the piece of paper to the White House where the legislation was filled in by Roosevelt.

Now, this was awkward and unwise. We were just coming out of that kind of extreme delegation of power to a President, which arose from the shattering economic experience, and Congress was beginning to reassert itself in the late 1930s, and early 1941 when, on top of this event, came World War II, probably in man's history the greatest global conflict we ever had, if we can avoid the nuclear danger that hangs over us. Here was a madman, Hitler, with strong allies trying to impose his will around the world. So we said to the President: "Whatever you want, if you want ships, you want bombers, you want power over prices, wage controls . . ." anything the President wanted, we gave him.

Necessary, yes, in that crisis situation, but out of this arose a whole generation of politicians, leaders in the Congress whose whole idea of foreign policy is to support the President.

In Lincoln's time, and again before World War I, and in the 1920s, there was nothing unpatriotic in differing with the President on foreign policy. A member of the House or Senate could have strong views, as Lincoln did in the Mexican War, against a President's foreign policy and express them without being considered unpatriotic or unwise.

But we never quite recovered from these two events—the depression and World War II—and I think a lot of the trouble the country has today is that we stumbled kind of secretly into a major Asian land war under Johnson, for reasons he thought were valid. He never came to the Congress and said: "Let's have a debate. Should we have a major Asian land war?"

Thirty billion dollars, half a million troops. We kind of slipped in, and the Congress acquiesced in this. And today I expect to be among the last to be consulted by Henry Kissinger and President Nixon, although I represent a half a million people, on the terms upon which we should get out of an Asian land war. While I am for the end of this war, and applaud what the President and Mr. Kissinger are doing in broad scope, would we have been better off if these decisions were made after debates in the Congress as the founding fathers obviously intended?

I agree with Bob Packwood. There is much to be done to revitalize Congress. The sun never goes down on Capitol Hill that a half a dozen speeches have not been made about the erosion of congressional power and cries of alarm about the extension of presidential power. And yet, as Bob said, to a large degree we have permitted this to happen.

One of the things we need in the House and Senate is strong leaders in order for there to be a check and balance. We need men with programs who will give us a focus upon which we can have power centers to oppose the President. We have had it a time or two. We had it in the 1950s, we had it when Lyndon Johnson was on the make, wanted to be President, and when Dwight Eisenhower had a landslide victory while we had a Democratic Congress. He gave a State of the Union speech and the next night Lyndon Johnson said: "Thank you, Mr. President, here's our program, here is the congressional program."

The current generation of congressional leaders would be horrified, I suppose, if someone would suggest that we have a congressional budget, that we have a congressional program, that we in the opposition party ought to come forward with the kind of documents and kind of broad scale attack that would reflect our conception of the country's needs. And that would provide an alternative to the President's report on the State of the Union and his budget message.

I leave you with these thoughts and with anticipation of exploring them further. I leave one other thought. It is my hope that the editors and publishers and people from all over the country will not ignore the role of the House. The Senate has been novelized, romanticized and glamorized. A lot of us around this country are in the House of Representatives. This was intended to be the primary legislative body. Henry Clay, 140 years ago, left the Senate to go to the House. Can anyone imagine John Tunney or Alan Cranston or Barry Goldwater giving up a Senate seat? Yet the House has the power to be, and it should be, a more important institution in the scheme of things.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BANKS. It falls to my good friend and colleague, Neil MacNeil, to provide a journalist's wrap-up of this situation. Neil has won his own weight in the ranks of scholars, for his thoughtful books and monographs, talks and TV panel shows; and if you don't have "Washington Week in Review" on Public Broadcasting, you are being shortchanged. It will be Neil's role to speak briefly, and then lead us into the panel session.

Neil MacNeil.

Mr. MACNEIL. Thank you.

I half expected Senator Packwood to say what he said. It's a familiar theme with him, and I agree with him totally. The relationship between what Dr. Polsby said in his paper and what Senator Packwood said, I suppose is a direct kind of relation.

In his paper, Dr. Polsby has properly laid emphasis on the present inadequacy of information that Congress receives in order to act with precision and decisiveness. He has made some imaginative suggestions on how this might be at least partially cured, notably by finding ways to utilize the intelligence of experts outside of Congress. I agree with Dr. Polsby that Congress doesn't know enough to legislate for the nation. This goes beyond the hesitation of Congress to spend the funds for computers, the absence of which leaves them substantial illiterates in the new language of computers.

As I see it, Congress instinctively is caught in two separate adversary relationships:

One, the President and the Executive Branch; and the other with the President and voters. It leaves Congress with a sense of helplessness and timidity. It is no secret that the President and his branch of the Government do not want intrusion on their running of the Government. Since time immemorial, Presidents have found dealing with Congress painful, perhaps best illustrated by what President Woodrow Wilson said of Senators. He said: "Senators have no use for their brains, except as knots to keep their bodies from unraveling." He didn't

like them, and he was offended by their hectoring. A similar dislike flows throughout just about every Administration, department and agency, and it results in a deliberate attempt to withhold information from Congress. The less Congress knows, the less Congressmen intrude.

In Washington, there is an old maxim on how to advise a downtown agency man about to testify before a congressional committee. It is: "Be polite, don't tell any lies, but for God's sake, don't go blabbing the truth."

With that administrative attitude, which seems pervasive in almost every administration, one wonders why Congress depends solely on information received from the Executive Branch as a basis for legislation.

This is especially true in appropriations. Until just this Congress, the appropriations committees of the Senate and the House heard no witnesses other than those from the incumbent Administration. But it is the adversary position Congress has with the President that seems to me to be largely responsible for Congress timidity in doing anything to correct its information gap.

Just the other night in Washington, I was speaking to a group of senior congressional staff aides, and one of them braced me on the nastiness of the press in pouncing on Congress for even adding a single aide to a Congressman's staff. What hope was there to get adequate staff with that kind of press attitude?

The problem, as I told him, is that when Congress wants to add a staff aide, the members try to sneak the necessary legislation through the chamber, concealing it from the press, and the gallery reporters catch them. Naturally enough, they write stories making Congress look guilty. Congress acts guilty. Congress should have the courage to make its claim for adequate staff both forthrightly and publicly.

My view is that such an open approach would be supported by the press and the voters. If nothing else, Congress can argue that Congress has a staff of only 32,000 people trying to ride herd on a huge civilian administration payroll of \$2.7 million. Congress has looked at the possibility of using computers in a meaningful way in order to match its own information capacity with that of the Executive Branch. It did so in debate on the congressional reorganization bill two years ago. Part of the failure to act at that time came from internal controversy within Congress. But a major part was the cost, a few million dollars; forgetting in the agonies of anticipated criticism as spendthrifts, that Congress is handling each year a national budget that is now over \$250 billion, and not handling it well. Congress is using a few computers, but not in such a way as to excite public confidence, using them for their own payroll, and for sending letters to constituents. This makes something less than a persuasive argument that members of Congress really are alive to the institutional needs of the Legislative Branch.

It is this attitude in Congress of helplessness and timidity that Senator Packwood was talking about. As I see it, that has in large part led to the imbalance between Congress and the Executive Branch. This is what has made President after President bolder and bolder in taking over the full operation of the Government at home and abroad. It is what has led to the total loss by Congress of the war power, and its reduced powers over the nation's business. Until the members of Congress themselves muster the will and the courage to insist on the institutional integrity of Congress, and to act to provide themselves with the proper means to do so, no set of imaginative proposals will do much to redress the balance between Congress and the President as coequals in the decisionmaking processes of the Government.

Mr. BANKS. I think I will allow you one question of each other. Then we will turn to the audience.

Mr. MACNEIL. I'd like to put a question to Congressman Udall who is an advocate of reform of the seniority system. It seems to me that even the most ideal system for determining congressional committee leadership will not solve the critical problem which we are talking about today, the nature and thrust of Congress as a viable political institution. It seems to me that the seniority issue that is now being brought forward, is something of a shadow. To me it is only a symptom of the disease, not the disease itself. A decade ago the problem was the House Rules Committee and the Senate filibuster. We were told; cure them and Congress can move along. The Rules Committee has been tamed and the filibuster has been broken. Isn't there more to the problem of Congress than the seniority system?

Representative UDALL. Those of us who advocate seniority as the key to all the difficulty ought to be a little more explicit because of the filibuster in the Senate has been broken and because we set out after the House Rules Committee, it has been changed too.

I think now we are talking about something of a different order because the evil of seniority is central to the problems of Congress, and these other difficulties you have mentioned were simply procedural.

We are concerned with the question of whether or not you can get a vote on a question. There are obstacles to voting, and as Neil says, these obstacles have been substantially removed and reduced over the last number of years. Democratic government works only because if I have power over your life, if I can draft your son, or run a freeway through your living room or raise your taxes sooner or later you are going to have a vote on whether I am to continue to have that power. But with the seniority system, we in Congress invest a limited number of public officials with the power to make national policy, a power in which they are not responsible to anybody.

Wilbur Mills, a very great American, is one of the able men in Congress. But the seniority system says to Wilbur Mills that as long as a narrow group of Americans, the 500,000 Americans of his congressional district, elect him to Congress, he is the man to make tax policy for the entire nation. In this role he is not Chairman for Little Rock. He is Chairman of Los Angeles and Long Beach and Prescott, Arizona, and for all of us. Seniority violates that fundamental system. If you had any kind of a system that said to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and the other committees: "You owe your election to George Brown and Lionel Van Deerlin, to all of the 435 members of the House of Representatives," you probably would have the same men as chairmen, but they would become politicians. The committee chairmen would be coming to the House floor to ask: "Do you think we ought to have tax-reform hearings . . . do you think we should have new hearings before the Agriculture Committee?" or whatever.

Instead, you give national power to people who are responsible to a limited constituency, and it's as though you elected a mayor of Los Angeles on the basis of picking the city councilman who happened to be the oldest and saying: "You are mayor." That fellow would go immediately to his ward and say: "Friends, put me in power. I will get the goodies. There will be street lights and pavements here, whatever happens elsewhere."

I have seen this happen. We saw it in Arizona where we re-elected Carl Hayden until he was 90 years of age—to bring home the goodies.

When I go home and talk seniority, and I

find myself doing it now, what I am really saying is: "Friends, you know if they allocated air bases and federal contracts and buildings on a national, fair and square basis, you wouldn't get some things. But you elected me so you are going to get these things that you are not otherwise entitled to."

This goes to the very heart of what is wrong with Congress.

OKEFENOKEE SWAMP

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

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman GINN and I are introducing a joint bill to designate certain portions of the Okefenokee Swamp as wilderness. The legislation would guarantee that the 373,860-acre wildlife refuge be given Federal protection against any development or other use that would damage the area.

This bill permits the vitalization of vehicles propelled by motors of 10 horsepower or less, the traditional means of transportation within the swamp. Those who have visited this vast wetland wilderness know that boats comprise a very important part of the swamp. Boats are the only means by which the swamp is accessible to visitors. Access will continue to be by way of three main entrances where boat tours, guide services, boat rentals, and fishing supplies are available.

This bill defines approximately 86 miles of existing and proposed boat trails, and it provides for the maintenance of these runs for proper management and public enjoyment. Unless these boat trails are maintained on a continuing basis, water plant growth, fallen trees, and the like would soon render these trails impassable.

This bill also recognizes the educational, scientific, and recreational values of this unique wilderness. Recreational uses include boat trips, various forms of nature study, sightseeing, and fishing. Fishing is possibly the greatest pastime in the Southeast. The Okefenokee Swamp provides an angler challenge that can be offered nowhere else in hundreds of miles.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill will protect the swamp's present and future value as an economic asset to local communities as an outstanding tourist attraction. As one of the oldest and most primitive swamps in the Nation, "The Land of the Trembling Earth," is of great economic value to the surrounding area. Okefenokee's thousands of yearly visitors acclaim its primitive beauty.

The swamp is lined with moss-draped cypress, and it encompasses vast stretches of water "prairies" and hidden swamp areas. Its varied wildlife habitat includes more than 200 species of birds, bears, white-tailed deer, and otters, among others. It contains one of the largest concentrations of alligators remaining in the country.

The swamp has been threatened through the years by attempts to drain the area for logging operations and plans to run a huge barge canal through its length. The wilderness designation would

guarantee that no such actions can take place.

Mr. Speaker, I have been working with the Department of Interior for the past 4 years in order to draft a bill that would protect and preserve this unique wilderness while allowing for its continued use as a superb recreational area. I am convinced that this bill balances both of these objectives in such a way both can be reasonably achieved.

BURKE DECRIES ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED SURGERY ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last January, President Nixon revealed in his budget message numerous proposals that I believe to be both farcical and tragic. Today, I am addressing myself to his plans for increasing the already heavy burden our senior citizens bear who are patients under medicare.

For the RECORD, I believe, I should summarize these cruel proposals. For those with plan A coverage, starting next January 1, the patient would pay the actual hospital room and board charges for the first day. After that the patient would pay 10 percent of the actual hospital charges every day. For those with plan B coverage, a patient would pay the first \$85 of his doctor bills and 25 percent of the remainder. These are a departure from the current regulations which provide that, under plan A, a patient pays \$72 the first day he stays in the hospital, \$72 being the national average, and nothing for the next 60 days. Beginning on the 61st day, he pays \$18 a day and from the 91st day, \$36 a day. For medicare plan B, a patient pays the first \$60 of his doctor bills and 20 percent of the remainder.

At first glance, Mr. Speaker, these changes seem rather minor. But in reality they represent a tremendous increase in the medical and hospital bills for our 23 million elderly and disabled, close to \$700 million a year.

These changes are necessary, the administration claims, because of the way medicare costs have risen out of control. They contend that patients are abusing the program and spending unneeded days in hospitals and running up unnecessary doctor bills. Apparently the administration is not reading the same figures I am, because it is public fact that since 1969 hospitalization rates have declined and the average length of stay for medicare patients has dropped.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said that the changes are also aimed at establishing "a cost awareness on the part of the medical care consumer which, beside its effect on overutilization, should inhibit hospital price increases."

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most ludicrous statements I have heard in my 14 years in the Congress. The implication of the statement is that our elderly and disabled are not cost-conscious at

all; rather, in fact, that they are spendthrifts who just look for the opportunity to place themselves in a hospital and run up a doctor's bill! It is beyond my understanding how someone, in these days when the facts of life are increasing food prices, rising rents, rising cost of living and a regressive tax structure, can intelligently call an elderly person, living on a fixed income of inadequate social security benefits, a spendthrift.

As for inhibiting hospital price increases, reduced utilization could raise per-patient costs in some hospitals, bringing about rate increases reflected in even higher expenses for the patient.

President Nixon takes great pride in claiming that his proposals would reduce the financial burden for those elderly struck with long-term illnesses which require hospitalization for more than 60 days. What the President neglected to say was that only 1 percent of our elderly are hospitalized longer than 60 days. The vast majority of all medicare patients would incur higher costs, since the average hospital stay for medicare beneficiaries is only about 12 days. Even Secretary Weinberger concluded, reluctantly so, that the patient's payment for the average stay would rise to \$189 from \$84, an increase of over 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this unconscionable placing of unnecessary hardship on our senior citizens is essentially a political decision. The administration feels it can, under its "unitary budget system," use money contained in trust funds, such as those for social security and medicare, to reduce the amount of the deficit shown in the budget, even though these funds cannot be spent for any other purpose than social security and medicare. This means that the budget deficit can be made to appear smaller than it actually is. I have been a protector and advocate of the elderly for many years and have seen them used as scapegoats a number of times. I had hoped that this type of activity had ceased with the legislation the Congress enacted in the 1960's. But this administration has set new records for exploiting the powerless and pampering the powerful. When the budget gets out of line and cuts have to be made, it is responsible and intelligent to eliminate waste. One of the problems with this administration, and there are many, is their distorted definition of waste. It is not waste when large enterprises and special-interest groups receive lavish subsidies from the Federal Government, and categorically mismanage the funds and receive "cost-overrun" payments. Nor is it waste when multinational corporations benefit from enormous tax loopholes and preferences, and rob the United States of productivity and its working force of jobs.

It is waste, however, when the ill and dying utilize Federal programs to cure their ailments. It is waste when the working poor file for day-care so they can keep working and retain some of their self-respect and human dignity. It is waste when our sick elderly hospitalize themselves and do not feel guilty for every day they remain there.

To the administration that is waste. But to me, Mr. Speaker, that is the prudent expenditure of Federal revenue. To

me that is the way our priorities should be oriented; toward social welfare, human prosperity and self-dignity and away from special interests and tax inequities.

It is easy to chastize the elderly for misuse of medicare benefits. The contributions they made to America have been forgotten by most. They do not make a lot of noise like so many lobby groups and special interest organizations do. All our elderly wish to do is live out their lives in peace, dignity, and comfort. But it appears the administration wants these wishes to be dependent upon the appropriations process and subject to budget-balancing pressures. The administration cites that medicare payments have gotten out of hand. But in reality medicare payments have risen, because all health costs have been on the rise, 40 percent in the last 10 years. The percentage of health costs covered by medicare has actually fallen from a peak of close to 50 percent in 1969 to 42 percent at the present time. If President Nixon's proposals are adopted it is estimated that this percentage would be reduced to a paltry 35 percent.

These proposals are clearly a step backward. When medicare was adopted in 1965, the intent was to increase the aged's access to proper medical care. Adding \$700 million a year to the elderly's health bills will only drive them away from, not to, medical care. Before we can discuss increased medicare costs to patients, we should have a long, hard look at the entire social security and health delivery and care systems. The result would be the realization that our elderly are not the spendthrifts and vagrants the administration feels they are. Older persons face significant out-of-pocket costs for their medicare benefits which must be paid from an income which is apt to be fixed or diminished. As it is, premiums on plan B alone have increased almost 200 percent since 1966. The inadequate and fixed level of social security benefits makes meeting even minimum premium payments a hardship to most of our senior citizens. Significant social security reform is long overdue. The mode of payment should be changed and the benefit level increased. My bill, H.R. 48, is a step in this direction and should be considered when any issue involving our elderly is discussed.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for an intelligent, compassionate, and responsible look at the health care needs of all Americans, young and middle-aged in addition to the elderly. The emotionalism surrounding the issue must be overcome and rational thought and consideration should prevail and not just be longed for. Health care delivery and service is highly inadequate in America today, for those of all ages. The need for a national health security plan of some sort is evident and we in the Congress should realize this and begin examining the appropriate steps necessary for attaining this goal. The administration's medicare proposals are not appropriate. They are shortsighted, backward, and oppressive. I urge all of my colleagues to stand in opposition to these proposals when they reach the Congress for debate

and consideration. Budget-balancing and fiscal responsibility are a basic need in the United States today, but I do not believe they should be achieved at the expense of the health and well-being of America's citizenry.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the Members of the House that the Committee on the Judiciary has readopted the rules of procedure governing consideration of private immigration bills. They are identical to the rules of the 92d Congress and read as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. The regular meeting day of the Subcommittee will be Thursday or upon the call of the Chairman. The regular meeting days of the Subcommittee on private bills will be the first and third Thursday of each month or upon the call of the Chairman.

2. A quorum of the Subcommittee shall consist of two members for the purpose of holding hearings on private bills and five members for the purpose of making recommendations to the Committee.

3. The introduction of a private bill does not automatically act as a stay of deportation until the Committee requests a departmental report. Requests for reports on private bills from the Departments shall be made only upon a written request addressed to the Chairman of the Subcommittee or the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary by the author of such bill. That request shall contain the following information which shall be submitted to the Committee in triplicate.

(a) In the case of aliens who are physically in the United States:

The date and place of the alien's last entry into the United States; his immigration status at that time (visitor, student, exchange student, crewman, stowaway, illegal border crosser, etc.); his age; place of birth; address in the United States; and the location of the United States Consulate at which he obtained his visa, if any.

(b) In the case of aliens who are residing outside of the United States:

The alien's age; place of birth; address; and the location of the United States Consulate before which his application for a visa is pending; and the address of and relationship to the person primarily interested in the alien's admission to the United States.

(c) In the case of aliens who are seeking expeditious naturalization:

The date the alien was admitted to the United States for permanent residence; his age; place of birth; and address in the United States.

4. The Subcommittee shall not address to the Attorney General communications designed to defer deportation of beneficiaries of private bills who have entered the United States as nonimmigrants, stowaways, in transit, deserting crewmen, or by surreptitiously entering without inspection through the land or sea borders of the United States.

Exemption from this rule may be granted by the Subcommittee in cases where the bill is designed to prevent unusual hardship. However, no such exemption may be granted unless the author of the bill has secured and filed with the Subcommittee full and complete documentary evidence in support of his request to waive this rule.

5. No private bill shall be considered if an administrative remedy exists, or where court

proceedings are pending for the purpose of adjusting or changing the immigration status of the beneficiary.

6. No favorable consideration shall be given to any private bill until the proper Department has submitted a report.

7. Upon the receipt of reports from the Departments, private bills shall be scheduled for Subcommittee consideration in the chronological order of their introduction, except that priority shall be given to bills introduced earliest in any of the previous Congresses.

8. Consideration of private bills designed to adjust the status of aliens who are in the United States shall not be deferred due to nonappearance at Subcommittee hearings of the author of the bill or person authorized to represent him.

9. Bills previously tabled shall not be reconsidered unless new evidence is introduced showing a material change of the facts known to the Committee.

I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of the House to rules 3 and 4 in particular. As many of you know, the introduction of private legislation does not have the effect of delaying an alien's departure from the United States. Under the agreement between the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Committee on the Judiciary, the Service withholds deportation if the committee requests a departmental report on a private immigration bill.

Consequently, if a Member believes a case has merit and introduces a bill, and if rule 4 is applicable, he should file with the committee documentation to support his request for a waiver of that rule. The committee will then consider such request expeditiously, but it is necessary to stress that it is incumbent upon the author of the bill to initiate such action on a private immigration bill which has been submitted to the House. If a request for a waiver of rule 4 is granted, reports on the bill will be requested from the Department of State and the Department of Justice, and the author will be so notified. If a request for a waiver of rule 4 is rejected, the bill will be sent to the full committee for tabling, but the author will also be notified in advance of such contemplated action.

After departmental reports are obtained, copies will be forwarded to the authors. Bills will then be considered by Subcommittee No. 1 on their merits in accordance with the provisions of rule 7. If the subcommittee decides to report adversely on the bill, the author will be notified in advance and given an opportunity to submit additional supporting documents or to request an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee in support of his bill.

When the subcommittee agrees to take favorable action, the author of the bill will be asked to submit a statement in support of his bill for inclusion in the committee report to the House.

Needless to say, members of the staff of Subcommittee No. 1, which has jurisdiction over immigration and nationality matters, will be happy to answer any questions the Members or staff members may have.

The subcommittee office is located in room 2139, Rayburn House Office Building—extension 55727.

IMPOUNDMENT

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the President has ordered the Office of Management and Budget to impound, without explanation, billions of dollars which Congress appropriated last year for various social and environmental programs. America's most disadvantaged groups—the young, the poor, the elderly, the sick, the mentally ill, the unemployed—will be hardest hit by the administration's new spending policies. But impoundment affects all Americans, because it involves not only our domestic priorities, but also the separation of powers inherent in the Constitution of the United States.

The first sentence of the Constitution, following the Preamble, reads as follows:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives. [Emphasis added.]

Only the Congress may enact laws, and it is the President's duty, under article II, to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." When the Congress appropriates money, the President may veto the bill; but he is not empowered to sign the bill and then substitute an amount of his own choosing for that specified in the law. Yet this is precisely what President Nixon has done; he has, quite simply, ordered the executive departments not to spend nearly \$15 billion which the Congress duly appropriated last year for programs as varied as mass transit, water pollution control, mental health facilities, higher education, job training, sewage treatment, and federally subsidized housing for low- and moderate-income families. These capricious "budgetary reserves" cannot be justified on grounds of sound fiscal management; rather, they represent a highly partisan attempt to flagrantly disregard the policies and priorities mandated by the elected representatives of the people.

In the past few years, the President has centered the Executive power in a small group of White House advisors, accountable to no one, who have taken over many of the duties of Congress, including legislative initiative, lobbying, appropriations, and oversight. In particular, Mr. Nixon has reorganized OMB into an elite cabal to run roughshod over other executive agencies. But the impoundment of funds by OMB has become an immediate and heated issue because it is a sudden and novel thrust at the "power of the purse," a prerogative which the Congress has jealously guarded even as it has allowed many of its other duties to slip into the Executive domain. James Madison, in urging ratification of the Constitution in 1788, pointed out with pride that the Congress was given sole authority over Federal spending. In the *Federalist*, No. 58, he said:

This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can

arm the immediate representatives of the people for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

Ten years ago, as part of his applications for admission to the New York bar, another future President, Richard M. Nixon, wrote an essay on his conception of the principles underlying the American form of government. He said, in part:

Above all else, the framers of the Constitution were fearful of the concentration of power in either individuals or government. The genius of their solution in this respect is that they were able to maintain a very definite but delicate balance . . . between the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government. . . .

Mr. Nixon went on to say:

Throughout American history there have been times when one or the other branches of government would seem to have gained a dominant position, but the pendulum has always swung back and the balance over the long haul maintained.

Because of my desire to restore this balance, I am today introducing legislation which would invalidate any impoundments except those specifically ratified by the Congress. The House should also give swift approval of the Senate-passed bill requiring confirmation by the Senate of the OMB director, whose power over the American economy is now second only to that of the President. Such legislation will serve as a warning that Congress will no longer tolerate executive usurpation of purely legislative functions. It will also start the pendulum moving back toward the balance of powers which is unique to our form of government and which has fostered its endurance for nearly two centuries.

CHANGING THE DATE OF THANKSGIVING

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would change the date of Thanksgiving in those years when it would normally fall on November 22. As we all know, November 22 is the date on which President John F. Kennedy was assassinated almost 10 years ago. We are still sufficiently close to that painful day that November 22 is considered a date of sorrow and mourning.

This year, for the first time since the assassination, November 22 coincides with Thanksgiving Day, which by law is celebrated on the fourth Thursday in November. My bill would provide that when the fourth Thursday falls on November 22, Thanksgiving shall be celebrated on the fifth Thursday.

The effects of this change would be felt only three times in this century after this year: in 1979, 1984, and 1990.

Thanksgiving is the most joyful holiday of the year, when families come together to feast and to give thanks for their blessings. To celebrate Thanksgiving on the anniversary of John F. Kennedy's assassination would cast a pall over the holiday which, for many Amer-

icans, would greatly diminish their enjoyment of Thanksgiving. I hope my colleagues will give prompt approval to this bill.

RENT CONTROLS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost of \$510 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 authority 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 Shep Davis, president of the Tenants Association of Florida, Inc., embodying a membership of more than 10,000 people. Mr. Davis has been a gallant and militant warrior for the protection of people who rent against excessive charges by landlords in the Greater Miami area and in Florida. Mr. Davis, in his statement, pointed out some of the grievous injustices in the excessive rents imposed upon our people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the statement of Shep Davis, together with the exhibits he presented with the statement, appear in the RECORD immediately following my remarks. Other Members will, I am sure, find conditions similar to those Mr. Davis 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.

PRESENTATION MADE BY SHEPARD W. DAVIS, PRESIDENT OF THE TENANTS ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA, INC., ON MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1973

Mr. Chairman Patman and Honorable Representatives of the Committee:

Fifteen months ago the Tenants Association of Florida, Inc., was formed to provide a voice in dealing with the landlord-tenant abuses in our area of the country. It soon became apparent that the greatest concern

of apartment renters—and the greatest cause of confusion—was runaway rent increases.

Our Association has grown to over 10,000 members due to the frustration that exists and our membership is steadily increasing at a very rapid rate.

These tenants and many thousands more throughout the State were heartened by some stabilization, as weak as it was, by the Phase II Guidelines. The arm of the law was there and if necessary, complaints of injustices and unfair practices could be filed with the Internal Revenue Service.

The guidelines permitted the landlord to raise his rent 2½ percent over a base rent, up to 8 percent a year on a one year lease. Increased taxes were added to that. Capital improvements were added to that. Too many landlords decreased services thus adding additional income to themselves.

Statistics will show that under Phase II increases range from 12½ percent to over 50 percent plus the extras.

In many cases tenants were not permitted to question these increases for fear of eviction. The Internal Revenue Service will certify that about 50 percent of the tenants seeking advice refused to give their names. Many of those that filed complaints pleaded that their names not be used. They feared retaliatory action.

The prayers of many tenants were answered on September 29, 1972, when the Cost of Living Council prepared a brochure, "Rent Watch For Social Security Beneficiaries." It stated that President Nixon ordered that everything possible be accomplished to prevent excessive and unjustified rent increases. It further stated that rents are a large part of a citizen's living costs and they will protect renters against illegal rent practices.

So during Phase II, there was Uncle Sam keeping his faith with the elderly social security recipient.

Then along came the decontrolling of rents which was as bad as the breaking of a dam where the water ran down the hill without regard as to the injury and damage sustained.

In some parts of the country rent stabilization is of little importance where there are apartments and homes available they have freedom of choice. In Dade and Broward County with less than 1% vacancy rate, there is no freedom of choice. May I say gentleman, you would not allow your dog to occupy some rooms that rent for \$125 or \$150 per month in Dade County. Rooms that smell, haven't been painted for 5 to 8 years, broken and cracked windows, bare floors, plumbing that needs attention, etc. These filthy places now will be increased in rent because of the serious shortage and no stabilization. It would take hours to present individual cases of inequities both low income, medium income and a little higher income group, and it would make you sick.

I read recently, that a landlords association has petitioned the President to reimpose rent stabilization as they, the landlords, are aware of the abuses of decontrol by some of their own members. Although Mr. Nixon may have had hopes of self regulation by the landlords, I say, "Forget it, Mr. President," you have just put a fox in a chicken coop.

Gentlemen, please, fight with the courage you possess to roll rents back to Phase II (to January 11th) and with vigorous enforcement.

I hope you can see your way clear to impose a ceiling as of January 11th. This will prevent a "Gold Rush" which occurred on January 12th, a day after the catastrophe.

RETURN RENTS, COUNCIL TELLS 12
(By Robert D. Clark)

A dozen Greater Miami firms or individuals have been ordered by the Cost of Living Council in Washington to refund the

money to tenants who complained they had been victims of Phase 2 rent control violations.

The council said the violations involved raising rents by a greater percentage than allowed, or failure to notify tenants properly of the boosts. The raises in question came before President Nixon modified rent controls Jan. 31.

Maren Apartments, 1543 Michigan Ave., Miami Beach, was ordered to refund \$112 in a case involving seven tenants.

Other landlords, the number of tenants involved, and the amount ordered refunded in that order are: Irvin Apartments, 715 Michigan Ave., Miami Beach, 12, \$694; Shady Grove Motel Apartments, 1570 NE 117th St., 10, \$955; Derreck W. Povey, Miami, seven, \$1,595; Sam O. Jalvo, Miami, four, \$103; Stanley Apartments, Miami, one, \$459; Terrace Towne Apartments, Miami 10, \$962; Miller Hotel, 229 NE First Ave., Miami, three, \$15; Garnet Hall Apartments, seven, \$176; North Shore Apartment Association, North Miami Beach, 27, \$154; Max Pulver, Miami, one, \$105; and Albert A. Hernandez, Miami, one, \$459.

Few of the landlords named by the Cost of Living Council in this area could be reached.

The only two men listed as Max Pulver and Albert A. Hernandez in Greater Miami telephone and street directories said they rent apartments to tenants, and Pulver expressed mystification over the CLC's action.

Pulver, of 1741 SW 82nd Pl., said he hasn't raised rents. He said maybe they had been raised by former owners of his rental property.

Hernandez said he had raised some rents \$5 or \$10 "but we always checked with the Internal Revenue Service" (which acted as administrator of the Phase 2 rent controls) in doing so.

He said the owner of an apartment complex he used to manage at 3114 SW 14th St. already had returned the \$459 to tenant Thomas Kittinger.

"Kittinger was a man living there 10 years and when his long lease expired the owner raised it and then the Internal Revenue (Service) people came and told him he had to return the money and he did," said Hernandez.

"Kittinger made a heck of a stink about the raise and he finally got away from it; he is still paying the \$95 a week instead of the \$150 as everybody else in that building," said Hernandez.

Several Broward landlords also were ordered to refund money to tenants, said the CLC. It listed them as Country Golf Course Club, Fort Lauderdale, 14, \$105; Isaac Lifchez, Hollywood, three, \$900; Harrison Arcade, Hollywood, one, \$88; Ramgoh Marina, Fort Lauderdale, seven, \$123; and Mike Chaley, \$90 (no tenant number available).

In Key West the El Patio Hotel was ordered to refund \$35 in a case involving one tenant, the CLC said.

Altogether, 82 Florida landlords were ordered to refund a total of more than \$57,000 on Phase Two violations.

TENANTS NEED RENT CONTROLS

To The Editor:

Under a dateline of Dec. 29, Herbert Stein, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, was credited with the statement that "prolonged rent controls have a 'negative effect' on tenants as well as landlords. We ought to be out of the rent control business."

As an interested tenant actively interested in the Tenants Association of Florida, Inc., with access to the viewpoints of senior citizens affected by the ups and downs of rent I challenge Stein's statement in the strongest terms.

A major objective of the Tenants Association is strong rent control in the state

to counter many arbitrary landlord actions contrary to all reasonable applications of the Rent Stabilization Act.

Stein's statement could be and probably will be misconstrued in the usual lobbying tactics against a state rent control law and in all fairness should be clarified.

From our vantage point it would appropriately be more proper to yell from the rooftops that rent controls are profitable to landlords and in many cases disadvantageous to tenants. Examples are loopholes in the act that apparently permitted cancellation of ongoing leases; subtle threats of dire consequences after controls are off that inhibits senior citizens and widows from protesting actions by landlords; a building moratorium because of the lack of sewage disposal facilities.

It would be of interest to tenants to know why it would not be in their best interests to treat rentals under conditions of a construction moratorium in the same manner as utility monopolies are now treated.

CHARLES NEIDELMAN,
Miami Beach.

LANDLORD QUICK TO RAISE RENT

A few days after President Nixon lifted his price controls, I received an eviction notice stating that I must vacate my apartment by Jan. 31. Inquiring as to why the notice was sent, I was told that I would be allowed to remain if I accepted a \$20 increase (approximately 11 per cent) in rent.

What good has the wage and price freeze done in the area of rent controls if a landlord can raise rents to a level that would more than make up for any loss he may have incurred during the freeze? This seems to be a good indication that the voluntary price controls will not work due to the unpatriotic and un-American attitudes of the owners.

As the rich get richer, I get poorer. Maybe that's the new definition of the "American Way."

FRANK W. ROSE.

PUBLIC HOUSING CRITICAL, DADE LEGISLATORS TOLD

(By Ronald L. Sachs)

Dade County's public housing problems are critical and need a quick state solution, Dade legislators were told at a public hearing.

Florida's recently-resigned Secretary of Community Affairs, Athalie Range, pleaded with the legislators to beef up the state's public housing funds in the meeting Friday at the Dade County Courthouse.

The meeting was attended by State Reps. Barry Kutun, Bill Lockward, Tony Fontana, Alan Becker and Marshall Harris and Sens. Kenneth Myers, George Firestone and Jack Gordon.

"One of the reasons given for federal cuts in housing funds was the supposed failure of public housing in this country," said Sidney Aronovitz, former chairman of the Little HUD Advisory Board, who resigned last December because of fund slashing by the Nixon administration.

"That's not the case here in Dade County, where our program has been highly successful and has served a very useful purpose," he told the legislators. "You don't condemn an entire program because of problems in some areas."

Aronovitz urged the delegation to entice private contractors and bankers to get involved in public housing construction by offering lower interest rates on loans to those participating in such programs.

George Reed, Aronovitz' successor, said that although some 7,300 public housing units are currently occupied in Dade and another 1,550 are either under construction or being planned, "that's not nearly sufficient to the need we have here."

"We definitely need a state program of some sort . . . We've got 64,818 people on a waiting list for housing, some who've been waiting for as long as four years," he said.

Reed said that of a \$1 million county fund for public housing land acquisition, "only \$600,000 is left."

He said it is important that land to be used for public housing be purchased now, even if construction and funds are delayed, "because land prices are rising every day."

Harris, who said any campaign in Tallahassee for housing funds must be limited in scope in order to have any chance of success, pinpointed three main areas the Legislature might act upon. They are:

Landlord-tenant relationships—Sen. Myers has a prefiled bill coming up which would enumerate rights of both parties and responsibilities of each as well.

State-enabling legislation for rent control, perhaps setting ceiling limits on rates.

Funding for housing, with emphasis on securing monies for renovating existing housing units rather than trying to totally rebuild entire communities.

"This (Dade) delegation ought to sit down before the session and decide on 10 to 15 things we want and when we get to Tallahassee, we won't come home until we get them," said Harris.

SOME 1,500 JAM MEETING AS TENANTS BEG IRS TO ENFORCE RENT CURBS

(By S. Nathan Enfield)

More than 1,500 people turned out last night to hear the Tenants Association of Florida beg the Internal Revenue Service to "enforce federal rent controls so that gouging landlords can't continue to treat us like animals."

Sheep Davis, president of the group, which claims 6,000 members, blasted the IRS for haphazard handling of tenant complaints.

Joining him in the attack were U.S. Reps. Claude Pepper, Dante Fascell and William Lehman.

A year ago, President Nixon ordered the IRS to enforce controls on rent increases as an anti-inflationary measure.

Pepper told the angry audience, "Nixon's track record in this area has been grossly inadequate from the very beginning when Congress gave him sweeping powers to fight inflation."

"Just because elderly tenants got a few extra Social Security dollars, the landlords went crazy and raised the rents sky high."

Like Pepper, who said he too recently suffered a rent increase, in Washington, most of the audience was composed of middle and upper-income tenants who had walked to the Miami Beach Playboy Plaza meeting from nearby Collins Avenue high-rises.

TAF attorney and newly elected State Rep. Alan Becker said, "I've never been so frustrated in my life as I have with the IRS red tape."

"By the time any tenant goes through the Miami-Jacksonville-Atlanta-Washington IRS treadmill, he's already been evicted."

Becker singled out for special criticism: IRS failure to act on everyday tenant complaints "unless they're backed up by threats of a militant, active building organization, a letter to Congress or a phone call to the press."

IRS sluggishness in seldom referring cases to the Justice Department "when criminal violations are open and shut."

IRS tendency to disbelieve landlord retaliation against tenants outspoken enough to complain of rent control violations.

IRS practice of shrouding valuable case information behind a "disclosure rule" which prohibits discussion on pending cases.

IRS failure to include tenants in hearings on their complaints or to notify them when a case has been closed.

"You just can't continue to let the land-

lords gouge us like we're animals," Davis exclaimed amid loud applause.

"How much longer will the landlords be allowed to force us to sign new leases seven months in advance? We live in fear of landlord reprisals if we exercise our rights and speak out," he added.

IRS Assistant District Director Ira Loeb responded to the charges, not by apologizing, but by saying his department "does a pretty fine job" but is hampered by lack of sufficient personnel.

He told the audience of the IRS record in Florida: \$250,000 in tenant refunds, \$750,000 in refused rent hikes, 338 denials of rent control exceptions saving tenants \$2.3 million, and response to 100,000 inquiries in recent months.

Loeb was interrupted by a handful of tenants who disagreed with some of his statements.

He blamed tenants' anger on "large-scale misunderstanding of federal laws," and said, "You're got to realize rents are not frozen today. Landlords are allowed to up the rents in certain situations."

Unassuaged, Becker urged the IRS "not to try and pass anything off on the public. Your words sound good, sir, until we go home and see this month's rent bill."

Becker said he and fellow Rep. Gwen Cherry plan to introduce state legislation next year to aid tenants in dealing with landlords who violate federal rent controls.

"We have spent about \$40,000 to upgrade those apartments. We have refurbished the air conditioning and replaced old and worn appliances with new ones," he said.

"We never did raise rents during the freeze because we had to calculate the capital improvements to get the increase. We were in the process of doing that when the freeze was relaxed."

Ellis acknowledges that the different rent scales for old and new tenants probably would not have been approved under the guidelines in operation before Jan. 11.

"Why shouldn't we be allowed to give a better deal to an established renter?" Kory asked.

Some landlords in the county said they believe voluntary restraint in rent increases will halt demand for new controls.

The Miami Beach Apartment Association, an organization of small apartment owners, is trying to take that tack.

At a recent executive board meeting, the association decided to urge industry leaders not to increase rents.

Eugene Weis, president of the group said "We feel it is better business to maintain a harmonious relationship with our tenants. Increased rents at this point will simply invite government controls of some kind."

"The worst thing that could happen to this industry is to have government controls."

Weiss admitted that many of the association members are inactive and that they are not bound by the executive board's recommendation.

Other leaders in the apartment rental industry have expressed an equal distaste for taking advantage of relaxed controls.

Bonded Rental Agency, managers of about 8,000 low income apartment units in Dade County's ghetto areas, has informed its clients extraordinary rent increases will not be tolerated.

Art Greene, the agency's spokesman, said: "Our general rule is that in no event will rents be increased more than \$2 a week and then only if rents were unusually low during the time the freeze went into effect."

"We just got rid of a client who told his tenants they would be getting an increase to \$25 a week on apartments renting for \$16 before the controls were lifted," he said.

Carey's Rental Agency, one of Bonded's competitors, is less demanding of its clients.

"We follow the instructions of our clients," Oswald Smith, manager of Carey's said.

"Our increases are averaging about 10 per cent. That will eventually effect 200 to 300 units. The only time we'll recommend going over 10 per cent is if the rents were below the prevailing rate when the freeze hit," Smith said.

Dixie Rental Agency, another low income property management firm, has no firm policy on increases.

"Less than half of our clients have asked for rent increases," said manager Sam Lenoir. "Most of them are asking for between \$2.50 and \$3 increases."

The same dollar increases are being asked of tenants who rent on a weekly basis as those who rent on a monthly basis, Lenoir said.

Thus, tenants renting on a weekly basis, the majority are paying increases amounting to roughly 20 per cent of their freeze level rent.

Countywide the full impact of relaxed controls won't be apparent for several months, Wolf and Euringer said.

But the impact in many cases already has been stunning.

Mrs. Dorothy Postel, a Miami Springs duplex dweller, lived in the same modest apartment for 10 years and paid a modest rent of \$90 a month. A new landlord bought her apartment during the freeze. Then it was lifted.

"He sent us a letter giving us an option to start paying \$185 a month or to get out," Mrs. Postel recalled.

"With owners of this caliber, we need some kind of inflationary controls, I think."

"None of my friends has received a \$100-a-month raise in salary and that's where the rent money comes from."

MANY DADE RENTERS GETTING SOCKED— LIFTING OF FEDERAL CONTROLS BRINGS INCREASES

(By Doug Clifton)

For six years Max Grossman, a 76-year-old retired motel manager, rested in quiet tranquility in his \$135-a-month Coconut Grove apartment. Then, a week ago, a letter came.

Move in 15 days or sign a lease and start paying \$195 a month, the note from his landlord announced.

"I got a \$30 increase in my retirement," Grossman complained. "I can't give it all to the landlord. What does he think 'Im gonna do, go out and sell bananas?"

Philip Mendick was reasonably content paying \$136 a month for his one bedroom efficiency apartment at the Parkleigh Sutton Apartments at 530 Biscayne Blvd.

Today, Mendick is heading a tenants' organization at the Parkleigh because he and dozens like him have been hit with rent increases ranging from 48 percent to 68 percent.

"In my case the increase is only 48 percent," Mendick said. "But several of our members who are now paying \$119 a month for their apartments will have to start paying \$200 a month in February."

In southwest Miami, Jose Ronderon, of 47 S.W. 78th Pl, pays \$200 a month for his duplex apartment. On Jan. 13 Ronderon got a letter from his landlord informing him that his rent would go up to \$400 a month starting Jan. 15.

"I cannot pay it," Ronderon said dejectedly. "I have no lease, no contract, no nothing. I know the government said the landlord could raise the rent—but like this?"

"I must leave."

Grossman, Mendick and Ronderon are only three of many Dade apartment dwellers notified of increased rents in the two weeks since President Nixon announced the relaxation of guidelines in effect under Phase 2 of his anti-inflation economic plan.

Precisely how many of Dade's 190,000 renters are getting socked with increases is difficult to assess. But spot checks countywide by The Herald turned up dozens of cases, with increases of from 10 to 100 percent.

In the Miami offices of the Internal Revenue Service's wage-price division, until Jan. 11 the agency charged with enforcement of wage-price guidelines, there is a constant flow of complaints about increased rents.

"While there is no machinery now established to investigate complaints of rent increases," said Holger Euringer of the IRS regional office in Jacksonville, "we still welcome tenants to file complaints with us."

"After we accumulate enough of them to tell whether there are significant increases in the Dade and Broward area," he said, "we can send them off to the Cost of Living Council in Washington where they might decide to reinstitute some forms of control."

Although many Dade landlords are raising rents, many others are not.

"We probably will not do anything to raise rents until May when there may be a new set of guidelines issued," said Louis Veal, president of the Keyes Management Co., managers of about 4,500 rental units in Dade County.

"It is our feeling that if there is a new set of guidelines, they will be retroactive to the date the President made his speech. Imposing increases now that would later have to be adjusted would present too much of a problem," he said.

Veal, whose company manages rental properties nationwide, is not surprised that many Dade County landlords have asked for increases.

Here in Dade County the vacancy factor is very low and owners of smaller properties are probably taking advantage of the fact," he said.

It is the low vacancy factor which makes Dade County's rent scale the second highest in the nation. Its rents are surpassed only by those in neighboring Broward County. Broward's median rent is \$131 a month. Dade's is \$122, or one-third more than the national median.

A median, statisticians explain, is the "middlemost" value in any group of figures. That means half of Dade County's renters pay more than \$122 a month rent and half pay less.

Averages, though deceiving in their own right, reflect a more accurate picture of rent levels in Dade County.

According to a recent survey conducted by Dr. Reinhold Wolff's economic research firm, rents for one-bedroom apartments average \$215 a month and two-bedroom apartments average \$252.

"Hidden behind the average are the considerably higher rents in the beach areas where one-bedroom apartments average at between \$231 and \$355 a month and two-bedroom apartments average at between \$316 and \$448," Wolff said.

The low vacancy factor is also what is making Benda McMurray, like Max Grossman, a tenant in the Banyan apartments in Coconut Grove, stay in her two bedroom apartment despite a 24 per cent increase in rent.

Miss McMurray, a young career woman who lives in the unfurnished apartment with her sister, was paying \$190 a month for her second floor apartment.

She was among the several dozen tenants who received eviction notices shortly after President Nixon lifted the freeze. Starting Feb. 1 Miss McMurray and her sister will begin paying \$240 a month for the apartment they have occupied for three years.

"Because we have our own furniture, the landlord agreed to make the increase \$50 instead of \$60," she explained. "We'll stay. What else can you do?"

"I looked around and found some real rat traps at \$200 a month—besides, moving is such a hassle," she said.

She confirms what apartment manager James Ellis says is the reason for the increases.

"Our rents are competitive with others in the area," said Ellis.

His company, Jamestown in the Grove, managers of 11 rental apartment complexes, is seeking to get all renters on leases.

"The increases were fair in every case and we were perfectly within the law to send eviction notices to month-to-month renters. But why not look at the other side of the coin," he argued.

"Electricity went up 13.4 per cent during the freeze too, you know."

According to Euringer of the IRS, any rent increase in excess of the 2½ per cent suggested by the Cost of Living Council continues to be inflationary.

"Landlords were entitled to 2½ per cent plus 'pass throughs' for the cost of capital improvements," he said.

At the Banyan no major capital improvements have been made but tenants who agree to stay on at the increased rates will get their apartments painted and rugs installed if they are needed, Ellis said.

At the Parkleigh Sutton where increases were as high as 68 per cent, the landlord was unavailable for comment. But the tenants said that the apartment owner had made capital improvements and was contemplating a "pass through" of those improvements during the freeze.

President Nixon's removal of controls exempted the increase from scrutiny by the IRS.

Some Dade apartment owners are increasing rents in two steps. Established tenants get small increases but new tenants pay more for the same kind of apartment.

That practice is equally inflationary, Euringer said.

"The level of rent at an apartment house was based upon the rents charged on the property, not those charged to individuals. If identical apartments were renting at \$190 a month during the freeze, rents for new tenants would have to be set in terms of rents charged to old tenants," he explained.

Using that logic, Euringer said, landlords who are giving \$10 increases to established tenants and \$20 increases to new tenants, are violating the spirit of Phase 2.

At the Red Road Town House apartments, one of eight rental properties managed by Greater Miami Realty, old tenants are getting \$10 increases and new ones must pay \$20 above the freeze level rents.

Established rent of one-bedroom apartments in the Red Road property went from \$165 a month to \$175 a month after the removal of controls. New tenants pay \$185 for the same apartment.

Old tenants got 6 per cent increases while new ones, in effect, are paying 12 per cent more for the same apartment.

Don Kory, manager of Greater Miami Realty, says the increases are fully justified.

BARTLE BULL ON RONAN'S TOMB

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues a situation in New York which involves the expenditure of a large amount of Federal funds. I am a supporter of mass transit and am urging vastly greater expenditures for that vital service. However, in my judgment, Federal funds will be wrongly spent if the MTA is able to build a facility rivaling Grand Central Station when an expanded Grand Central Station itself could be used to accomplish the purpose.

A brilliant article authored by Bartle Bull appeared in the Village Voice of March 22, 1973, which sets forth the facts

and shows an extraordinary insight into city planning on the part of the author. I recommend it to our colleagues:

[From the Village Voice, Mar. 22, 1973]

RONAN'S TOMB

(By Bartle Bull)

With Rocky, Ronan, and Moses, New Yorkers are accustomed to the extravagant appetites of our three cement pharaohs. Already they've lavished over a billion on the Albany Mall in a town of only 116,000 and \$700 million on the World Trade Center when office space is vacant across New York, not to mention millions lost on the World's Fair and hundreds more proposed for the dreaded Oyster Bay Bridge. But even taxpayers jaded by these figures may be impressed by the latest Frankenstein, a beast monstrous enough to satisfy even Nelson Rockefeller; the plan to tear up Third Avenue and spend \$342 million (just for starters) on a new railroad terminal to be crammed under Third Avenue three blocks from the largely unused tracks of Grand Central Station.

If you're surprised by this news, it's because the planning and the application for federal funds have slipped by with the maximum stealth permissible under the law. An invisible public hearing, of the type perfected years ago by master planner Donald Elliott, was held last November 20 at Hunter College. To attend, you had to be either a legal notice freak or on the increasingly exclusive guest list of Dr. William Ronan, boss of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

Not even Edward Koch was invited to the hearing. (He is not only the area's congressman, but also a member of the congressional subcommittee on Mass Transit.) The Turtle Bay Association, which has represented the area's residents for 15 years and has its headquarters 100 feet from the proposed terminal, was not invited. But one Turtle Bay member spotted a discreet legal notice for the hearing, and James Amster, Turtle Bay's Chairman, appeared and testified. The MTA reports (inaccurately) that his was the only testimony opposing the plan. The "public hearing" was apparently designed to accommodate the diversity of views you would expect at a meeting of Stalin's cabinet. Could it be that hostile testimony was not welcome since all testimony given at the hearing was required by law to accompany Dr. Ronan's application for federal funds?

MTA sought federal funds for the project in October 1970 in an application to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration of the Department of Transportation. The amended application asks UMTA for \$228 million, two-thirds of the estimated cost. The other \$114 million will be paid by New York State. The source of the inevitable cost overrun money has not been designated. The \$342 million cost estimate is already a year old, and we can expect that the figure will go the way of the 10-cent subway fare. With the public hearing out of the way, UMTA is now considering the MTA's application, and if the project is approved, the next juicy step is the solicitation of bids (if that process is not already under way) and then the newest construction bonanza will start chewing up the city.

The proposal for the terminal is set forth, at least superficially, in UMTA's Draft Environment Statement for the project. This Statement, however, itself says that it is largely "based on data provided by the applicant," i.e. by the MTA itself. The basis for the project is the argument that a new mid-Manhattan terminal is needed for Long Island Rail Road trains to "increase the capacity of commuter rail lines into Manhattan," to relieve alleged overcrowding at Penn Station, and to improve "coordination between the Long Island Rail Road and the subway routes."

The new terminal would service Long Island Rail Road trains entering Manhattan from a tunnel now being built under the East River. The tunnel, which will also be used by the New York City Transit Authority and which is not included in the project's budget, will enter Manhattan under East 63rd Street. The underground terminal concourse will run from 47th Street to 50th Street. From 63rd Street to 55th Street the route will, theoretically, be constructed by tunneling. From 55th Street to 42nd Street, one of the most congested areas in the world, the route will be constructed by what the wrecking crews refer to euphemistically as "cut and cover methods."

Not surprisingly, the few disinterested New Yorkers who are aware of this scheme are horrified. A massive 14-block pit along Third Avenue, with years of drilling, dust, construction machinery, and obstructions to pedestrian and other traffic, will give the neighborhood a sustained pounding that the residential and commercial communities do not welcome. Like many other residential areas of the city from Canarsie to Corona, the East Side has been under siege by the eviction nightmares of "Urban Relocation, Inc.," by high-powered institutional expansion, and by massive government projects. The old-fashioned stew of construction interests, real estate manipulators, willing politicians, and visionary master planners is already at work on this one. Has anyone wondered why that valuable block-long lot next to Manny Wolf's on Third Avenue and 49th has been vacant all this time?

The Turtle Bay Association (of which this writer intends to be an implacable member) and other community groups are organizing to fight the project, now known in the area as "Ronan's Tomb." Turtle Bay's James Amster reports that the community is determined to stop the terminal and argues that its construction will threaten residential living on the East Side. Opposition to the project is spreading rapidly over the East Side as people learn what Ronan has in store for them. As Romaine Well, Chairman of East Side Residential Associations and the General Glop of East Side community organization, puts it, "We must kill this wasteful project before it kills us."

The essential argument of the project's opponents is that no serious consideration has been given to adapting Grand Central Station as a Long Island Rail Road terminal. The station now operates way below full capacity, with lots of OTB and not many trains. In 1929 there were 709 trains a day at Grand Central, now there are about 400. So why, ask the critics, can't the Long Island Rail Road come down Park instead of Third, and nestle into the lower level of the Grand Central?

The answer of the MTA is that the proposed terminal "is located more nearly in the centroid of mass transportation facilities in the area" and that the Grand Central subway system would become too congested, as it already operates at peak capacity during rush hours. Since the two stations would only be three blocks apart, the "centroid" argument is a hard one to follow, and the crowding at Grand Central should be reduced by the new Second Avenue subway line, which as the Environmental Statement notes, "will relieve congestion on the Lexington Avenue line." Presumably the Second Avenue subway could be linked to Grand Central. The MTA cites other problems with Grand Central, such as underpinning necessitated by further tunneling under Park Avenue, but the Environmental Statement concedes that "there are several possible locations within Grand Central that could be set aside for Long Island use," and that "there is some surplus station capacity in Grand Central and it would be physically possible to construct a route for the Long Island into Grand Central."

Opponents of the project face not only the

problem that they are making a late start and are taking on Rocky, Ronan, UMTA, and the construction interests, but also the public relations difficulty of attacking something that is presented as a mass transit project, a project to discourage commuters from driving into the city. Fortunately, the public is not as dumb as it looks to the planners. New York's voters were able to penetrate the misleading propaganda behind the Transportation Bond issue, which claimed to have a large mass transit component, and send that project back where it belonged.

With the present boondoggle, the point is that it does not help our desperate mass transit problems to squander limited resources on redundant facilities. The entire fiscal 1973 budget of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration is \$980 million for every mass transit project in the United States. Is it worth spending 25 per cent of the total federal mass transit budget to reduce over-crowding at one subway station? And yet no estimate was made of what it would cost to adapt Grand Central instead of building a new facility.

As attorney and mass transit advocate Myron Cohen puts it, "This scheme is a damned outrage. Money for mass transit is in such short supply. Behind it all is the very close relationship between Rockefeller and the construction trades." If the argument over the terminal is going to hinge on subway crowding, Cohen, recently Chairman of New York City's Subway Watchdog Committee, is a good man to talk to, but he wasn't asked to the November 20 hearing either. Cohen may have hit a nerve with the construction trades point, because Secretary of Labor Peter Brennan (the former boss of New York's construction unions) recently intervened to help Dr. Ronan with the Long Island Rail Road's labor problems, and it doesn't take much imagination to guess whether or not Brennan thinks this project is worth at least 25 per cent of UMTA's budget.

Congressman Koch argues that the terminal will destroy the residential character of the community east of Third Avenue. Koch and Councilman Carter Burden intend to fight the proposal vigorously. Koch plans to demand that the Department of Transportation prepare a new environmental impact statement that does not rely on self-serving material fed in by the MTA. He says that "the function of these experts is to state reasons for the goal that someone else wants to reach," and that an independent study is essential.

Hopefully, as the debate over the terminal develops, the sponsors will not pretend that their opponents, like Myron Cohen, Community Planning Board 6, and the threatened communities, are against mass transit. The issues are proper consultation, the validity of a Grand Central alternative, and the misallocation of limited public resources. The consultation point is critical, because the MTA has a special exemption from the requirement to get City Planning Commission approval for all terminals. As John Zuccotti, the new CPC Chairman, puts it, "It's unfortunate that authorities like the MTA or the Urban Development Corporation can avoid certain public hearings before the CPC or local community boards and so weaken their accountability."

Mass transit money is precious. Not only would the state and federal grants on this proposal starve needed projects in this city and elsewhere, but the federal grant alone (\$228 million) represents slightly more than the entire estimated operating loss of Amtrak for fiscal 1973 and 1974, in its first year, Amtrak, which serves 350 cities with more than 24,000 miles of track, suffered an operating loss of \$153 million. This year the loss is estimated at \$128 million, and next year at under \$100 million. These relatively modest

losses are being used by the Nixon administration to justify increasing cutbacks in national rail service, thereby diverting private and commercial traffic from the railroads to the highways and so further reducing the viability of the railroads in an unending spiral.

Civilized nations from Japan to Switzerland recognize that public money must support railroads and other forms of mass transit. West Germany and Italy last year subsidized railroad deficits of \$800 million each, and this year the Japanese National Railways expect a deficit of \$1.2 billion. Despite such losses, Japan is planning more super-express trains. Italy is spending \$7 billion on railroad improvements. France is spending \$420 million on new equipment this year alone, and Germany will spend \$10 billion to develop 180-mile-an-hour trains. But in this far richer country, the Department of Transportation is cutting back mass transit research, and the new Secretary of Transportation, Claude S. Brinegar, is preparing massive rail service reductions on the grounds of economy.

Even in this context, however, it seems that the Third Avenue terminal will only be reviewed intelligently if New Yorkers mobilize to fight the proposal at every level. Only Peter Pan could dream that the Department of Transportation would make an independent judgment, let alone that Nelson Rockefeller and Dr. Ronan might hesitate from a brief sense of public accountability.

AMERICA'S ENGAGEMENT IN ASIA AND THE WORLD

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs William Porter was the principal speaker at a State Department regional foreign policy conference March 21 in my hometown of Grand Rapids, Mich., the principal city in the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan. The conference, which drew about 600 persons, was most successful.

During the conference, Porter reviewed the situation in Indochina. As part of that review, Porter revealed how the task of accounting for the 1,300 Americans listed as missing in action in Vietnam and Laos is being carried out. He said this job has been assigned top priority and spelled out the procedure being followed.

With the unanimous consent of the House, Porter's speech will appear at this point in the Record. The speech follows:

AMERICA'S ENGAGEMENT IN ASIA AND THE WORLD

(An Address by Under Secretary Porter)

The problem of giving a light luncheon speech on a weighty subject like foreign affairs is like an episode in "Tom Sawyer": Perhaps you remember that there was a sermon that droned along so monotonously and was so prosy that many a head began to nod—and even though it dealt in limitless fire and brimstone, so few remained awake among that predestined elect that they were hardly worth saving.

I can't talk to you about predestination because I have been told this distinguished audience is already a predestined elect. And I can't promise you salvation although I assume most of you have made your own arrangements. But I can make a short speech, and that I promise to do. And it will relate

to some of that international fire and brimstone that is a diplomat's stock in trade.

President Nixon opened his first inaugural address with these words: "Each moment in history is a fleeting time, precious and unique. But some stand out as moments of beginning, in which courses are set that shape decades or centuries."

The past few years have been such a moment. We are leaving the postwar world. Responding to our openings to the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, the major Communist nations are abandoning their policy of constant confrontation. New patterns of international relations are emerging.

The emergence of China, the growing strength of Japan and the collective voice of western Europe are transforming the political and economic scene. We encourage this process. We continue to support the European Community, its enlargement and strengthening. We welcome Japan's climb to the opportunities and responsibilities of a major country. We want good relations with the USSR. And the President has launched a relationship with China which both accepts and encourages its growing participation in the affairs of the international community.

NECESSITY OF ENGAGEMENT

The complexity and challenge of this more fluid environment have led some to counsel basic changes in our security and economic policies. Two developments have strengthened this view.

First, we have learned some hard lessons in international economics. Over the past two years, our imports grew by forty per cent while our exports increased only fifteen per cent—for the first time in this century the United States has a trade deficit.

And second, as Secretary Rogers recently stated, "After a long and frequently frustrating military conflict there may be some longing among Americans to withdraw from the burdens and responsibilities of an active role in world affairs. Twice before in this century our initial reaction was to pull back and concentrate on domestic issues."

After World War I, we isolated ourselves from international responsibilities, but we could not isolate ourselves from world depression and world war. After World War II, a man born in Grand Rapids exactly 89 years ago tomorrow, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, saved us from making the same mistake. He was in many ways the legislative father of those basic policies that have served us so well for the past quarter century—in 1945 the founding of the United Nations, in 1947 aid to Greece and Turkey, in 1948 the Marshall Plan, and in 1949 the establishment of NATO.

Once again our involvement in war is coming to an end. And once again a native son of this city is playing a major role in assuring that America remains realistically engaged in the world. Congressman Gerald Ford is a vigorous advocate of the view that—while we must avoid the overextension of the past—our own self-interest dictates an active American involvement in world affairs. In fact he is such a vigorous advocate, making some 200 speeches a year, that he puts cautious diplomats like me to shame.

I am undoubtedly preaching to the converted when I encourage this audience to support our continuing engagement in the world. Your very presence in a foreign policy conference indicates your opposition to an isolationist course. And while some have claimed the Middle West is a bastion of isolationists, I find quite the opposition to be the case. In the 1960's Michigan tripled its exports, which now exceed even the exports of New York. I understand from Mr. Brush that some 35 companies right here in Grand Rapids are exporting an increasing portion of their production. Naturally some 31% of all our crops and 14% of our manufactured

goods are exported. We now depend upon imports for 30% of our petroleum needs, and this dependence is growing.

TRADE LEGISLATION

Our welfare is inextricably linked with the economic health of the rest of the world. It is for that reason President Nixon has set a dual objective in economic policy this year—both to improve America's competitive position in world markets and to reform the international monetary and trade system.

Within the next few weeks the President will be submitting a request to Congress for the authority to negotiate an improvement in our trading position. For the past quarter century international trade has increased at a more rapid rate than world production—providing an essential stimulus to the most rapid global economic growth in man's history. America has shared in this growth. Our real per capita income has doubled in this period, and we are by far the most productive nation in the world today.

The recent devaluation of the dollar will greatly strengthen our competitive position. So will the lowering of European and Japanese barriers to our trade for which we are pressing. The United States is already competitive in many fields, from computers to agriculture to pharmaceuticals. Those Americans who doubt our ability to export should talk with the Japanese and Europeans, who are concerned that American goods may flood their markets. Freer trade—when reciprocated by other nations and with proper safeguards for adversely affected industries—is clearly in this nation's best interest. I hope you will all support the President's trade legislation.

DEFENSE BUDGET

Just as we must resist pressures to retreat from our outward-looking economic policies, so must we resist efforts to radically alter our national defense policies. It is the security provided by a strong national defense that has given us the confidence and ability to negotiate so successfully.

We all know the costs of maintaining a sufficient defense capability. What some people seem to forget are the greater long-term costs to ourselves and to our allies if we were to become a second-rate power militarily. Since 1969 we have reduced our armed forces by a third—from 3.5 million to 2.3 million men. The defense budget now consumes just seven per cent of our GNP, the lowest share since 1950.

The new Secretary of Defense, Elliot Richardson, has pledged to keep defense expenditures as low as is consistent with our essential needs. To go below this level of sufficiency would have seriously destabilizing effects in many parts of the world. It would prevent us from maintaining the momentum toward a more peaceful and open world so noticeable in recent years.

VIET-NAM

For my part I should like to devote the remainder of my remarks today to this problem which has occupied much of my time during the past eight years.

If all goes well, there will soon be no American combat troops in Viet-Nam for the first time since 1965. All of our known prisoners of war will have been released. By prisoners of war I mean those in Laos as well as in Viet-Nam, and we expect complete fulfillment of the promises that have been made about their release. These things will mark a day we have long awaited. We shall have reached it not by abandoning our friends but by opening the way to self-determination for all the people of South Viet-Nam.

There have been problems in Viet-Nam during these first sixty days of the peace agreement. We consider most of these problems to be a natural, almost inevitable, residue of decades of bitter conflict.

In general, the situation is stable; military activity has declined and the relative strengths of the two sides are unchanged. But it is easier to stop shooting than start talking, so solving South Viet-Nam's political problems may take place more slowly than was envisaged in the agreement. Nonetheless, the focus for both sides appears to be shifting to the political from the military.

This is the kind of evolution, if it continues, that we hoped would be a result of the cease-fire agreement and the new framework it provides for testing strengths at the polling place, rather than on the battlefield.

This can, of course, happen only if North Viet-Nam observes its undertaking to "strictly and scrupulously" fulfill the peace agreement. President Nixon has made clear our concern at North Vietnamese infiltration of large amounts of equipment into South Viet-Nam. If it continued, this infiltration could lead to serious consequences. The North Vietnamese should not lightly disregard our expressions of concern. But we hope it will not continue. Mutual restraint in the supply of arms by all outside parties, including the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, is of course an essential aspect of this situation.

A mechanism to monitor and supervise the cease-fire, the International Commission of Control and Supervision, consisting of Canada, Indonesia, Poland and Hungary, is in business. Spurred on by an energetic Canadian delegation, the Control Commission has got itself organized, deployed to the field, and has undertaken some investigations. Since Communist governments make legal arguments with politics, the Control Commission is still experiencing some difficulties. However, we believe that its performance to date has been creditable and holds the promise of greater impact as experience is gained.

We note also that high level political consultations have begun in France between the two South Vietnamese parties—this is the forum where complicated internal disagreements will be tackled and, we hope, resolved.

In South Viet-Nam morale has remained strong. President Thieu realizes the importance of the political struggle and is directing more of his Government's efforts to this area than ever before. There has been very little of the political and social unravelling that some have expected or hoped for. The Viet Cong, too, are concentrating on the political struggle which is in line with our aim of changing the nature of the struggle in that unfortunate land.

The United States will continue to support the efforts of the South Vietnamese people to achieve self-determination, as envisaged in the Peace Agreement and in the Act of the International Conference on Viet-Nam.

LAOS AND CAMBODIA

In Laos the cease-fire accords call for the withdrawal of all foreign forces and respect for the sovereignty and neutrality of the Kingdom. They were worked out and signed solely by the Lao parties. The United States respects the accords, and we very much hope that this time North Viet-Nam, and other nations, also will respect them. To achieve peace all outside parties must leave the Lao to settle their own problems. There are still cease-fire violations in Laos, although far fewer than in South Viet-Nam, but the parties are slowly working toward the formation of a provisional government to be named by March 23.

Cambodia was the last of the Indochinese states to be drawn into the Indochina conflict. It remains the only one without a cease-fire. At the time of the Viet-Nam cease-fire, President Lon Nol proclaimed a unilateral cessation of hostilities clearly designed to elicit an enemy response. After a few days of relative quiet, the answer was given in an upsurge of enemy attacks which has reached the highest level in over a year, and which

shows no sign of abating. Further efforts to open a dialogue with the insurgent leadership have received no reply except for threats of continued war. The situation in Cambodia must, therefore, be described as unsatisfactory at present.

POSTWAR AID

Throughout Indochina we must hasten the transition from the bitterness of war to the healing task of reconciliation and reconstruction. America's long tradition of humanitarian concern by itself calls for our active participation in a program of assistance. We are convinced that such a program will provide all parties a strong incentive to observe the peace. As compared to the heavy expenditure of the war, surely it is worth a small proportion of that amount to ensure that it is preserved. Preserving the peace will require a relatively modest outlay.

MIA'S

We have one other very important item on our agenda. With the return of our prisoners of war, we are giving the highest priority to the task of accounting for the 1,300 Americans listed as missing in action in Viet-Nam and Laos. This is a most serious responsibility. It is an obligation to those men and to their families who have waited for them through the long years, and we shall fulfill that obligation.

We are making a three-pronged approach to this subject:

—First, as each returning POW comes home, he is being debriefed to learn whatever information he may have on any Americans—and foreign nationals as well.

—Second, we are proceeding in the four-party Joint Military Commission composed of United States, South Vietnamese, North Vietnamese and Viet Cong representatives to secure an accounting for all our dead and missing. Article 8B of the peace agreement contains the most far-reaching language ever obligating the two sides in armed conflict to help each other to get information about the missing in action and the dead. Secretary Rogers and I raised this subject directly with North Vietnamese leaders in Paris during the international conference on Vietnam.

—And third, we have established in Thailand a Joint Casualty Resolution Center manned by American personnel solely responsible for searching for our missing in action personnel in Indochina. We will move as quickly as possible to secure the most thorough examination and reconciliation of each missing in action case.

I can bring you the assurance of this Administration that this subject of accounting for our missing in action will have the highest possible priority.

LESSONS OF NEGOTIATIONS

Let me complete this rather lengthy discussion of the situation in Indochina by sharing with you some of my thoughts about what working toward peace means. I think it is important to review the record of how we achieved a negotiated settlement in Viet-Nam and to consider some of the lessons learned along the way.

The negotiations lasted more than four years. During most of that time—through one sterile meeting after another—there was no appreciable progress toward a settlement. Early in the talks Hanoi demanded that we first withdraw all our forces unconditionally and throw out the South Vietnamese government as pre-conditions for serious negotiations. These demands were clearly unacceptable: had we withdrawn our troops, we would have had no leverage with which to pry out an agreement to release our prisoners; had we overthrown the Saigon government, we would have also sacrificed the principle of genuine self-determination by the South Vietnamese people.

Hanoi refused to alter its position, and the talks dragged on from one year to the next.

I can tell you it was not much fun. It was easy to get discouraged and, indeed, many at home did. Some critics of our policy urged our government to concede everything. Others advocated our breaking off the talks altogether.

However, the President remained dedicated to the belief that the only satisfactory way to resolve the conflict was by a settlement at the conference table and that, eventually, Hanoi would agree to undertake the serious negotiations necessary to bring this about. At the same time, the President fully understood North Vietnam's strategy of pursuing its goals by coordinated military and political actions—by fighting while talking.

He, therefore, developed and pursued a policy that would both encourage a negotiated settlement and maintain our commitment to assist the South Vietnamese people in their self-defense. By carefully keeping open the door to negotiations and by making a series of progressively forthcoming peace proposals of our own, we demonstrated our readiness to achieve a just compromise. At the same time, the President pursued the program of Vietnamization: This provided us with an alternative to the stalemated peace talks and simultaneously served as an inducement for the other side to negotiate seriously.

As you will recall, the Vietnamese communists agreed to forsake the battlefield in favor of the conference table only after their all-out invasion of the South in the spring of last year failed. In retrospect, the President's decision to resist that invasion by mining and bombing in the North was a critically important factor—indeed, perhaps the turning point—in bringing them to the negotiating table in a serious posture. The President again made clear his resolve when he resumed the bombing in December in response to Hanoi's decision to stall on reaching a final agreement. I am convinced that this action was both necessary and effective in bringing the war to an end.

I think there is an obvious, but very important point to be drawn from this experience—seemingly insurmountable obstacles to a just peace can, in fact, be overcome by the patient pursuit of policies which combine reasonableness and resolve, flexibility of approach, and firmness of purpose. These were the guidelines that enabled us to reach our goal in Viet-Nam. They should not be forgotten as we continue to move away from confrontation into an era of reconciliation both in Indochina and throughout the world.

ASIAN POLICY

In concluding, let me turn briefly to the larger problems of Asia. Why are we there and what are our objectives in the years ahead?

Some Americans still view Asia as an area of less vital concern than Europe. These are, however, certain realities which no one can question.

Half the world's people live in Asia.

Our trade with Asia now equals 85 per cent of our trade with Western Europe and is growing more rapidly.

Three times in a single generation we have been drawn into war in Asia.

Four of the world's major powers—the United States, Japan, China, and the Soviet Union—come together only in the Pacific.

We must and we will retain an active American presence in Asia. Our power there is an encouragement to our friends and is not provocative to our adversaries.

We will be guided in our approach to Asia's still uncertain future by two major policy objectives.

First, to enable our allies to assume the primary responsibility for their own security; and

Second, to persuade all Asian nations that

by not interfering in their neighbor's affairs, a new era of peace and prosperity is possible.

In 1972, we made extraordinary progress on both these fronts. The Nixon Doctrine of shared responsibilities and shared burdens is clearly succeeding. From South Vietnam to South Korea, our allies' growing military strength enables them to assume the major responsibility for their own defense. America's supporting role is rapidly becoming less onerous. Since 1969 we have reduced the number of our Armed Forces in Asia by seventy percent. In addition to the complete withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam, we have reduced our military presence by 70,000 men in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and elsewhere.

However, as we review this record of progress, we must not lose sight of the substantial problems ahead. Asia is still far from achieving the delicate transition from turmoil to stability.

The goal that we have set for ourselves is the establishment of the kind of peaceful world that the Secretary of State has described as one in which:

"Dialogue and negotiation have replaced confrontation and conflict.

"People can move freely and easily across national borders.

"The sovereignty and independence of all countries is the first principle of international relations.

"Less reliance on force as an instrument of national policy."

The Secretary of State also noted that now "for the first time since the war such a world has become a practical possibility."

Senator Vandenberg once told the Senate that Theodore Roosevelt was right to say that the United States had no choice but to play a great part in the world and that the choice was whether to play it well or badly. He went on to say that no matter how much we might crave the easier path of lesser responsibility, we were denied that privilege. We had to play our part in the world in sheer defense of our own interests.

My thesis today has been that in bringing about a still-imperfect peace in Southeast Asia, in working toward the sort of world we want, we have played our part well. With your help, ladies and gentlemen, we shall keep on striving to do so.

VETO OF THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, as a former sponsor of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act I rise to announce to all Members of this House that on Tuesday next I intend to be here on the House floor to cast my vote to override President Nixon's veto of S. 7, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973. I know I speak for all the Members of the New Jersey delegation on this side of the aisle and I hope some on the other side as well when I say that economy in Government is a good thing, but economy at the expense of handicapped Americans is false economy. And in this case there is no economy at all because this program—which has been in existence since 1920—takes people off the relief and welfare rolls and makes them taxpayers. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is what Government is all about. Can Government at any level perform a nobler and more necessary service than restoring sick and crippled people to health?

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go in this area as we have between 7 and 12 million handicapped persons in this Nation who are not yet realizing their full potential.

I intend to vote to override President Nixon's veto and I urge all Members of this House to stand with the New Jersey Democrats who are united behind the principle that economy shall not be achieved by taking away the crutches of crippled people.

OEO AGENCY—CCC—BEGAN AIM

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, once again it has come to light that OEO has become involved in activities which have little effect on the poor, are purely political in nature, and result in violence and civil disturbance.

Among its other activities, the American Indian Movement—AIM—has taken over Alcatraz Island in San Francisco causing \$30,000 in damages; the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington causing \$3 million in damages; the Crazy Horse Museum in Pine Ridge, S. Dak., causing \$50,000 in damage; and is currently holding the town of Wounded Knee, S. Dak., in a reign of fear and terror.

The current leaders of AIM are Dennis Banks and Clyde Bellecount who are both Chippewas, both urban Indians, and both ex-convicts.

AIM began to develop in 1967 when Banks and Bellecount became employees of the Citizen's Community Centers—CCC—in Minneapolis, an OEO-funded agency. In January of 1968, Matthew Eubanks, leader of the Minnesota Black Panthers, and Douglas Hall, an activist lawyer, packed a CCC board meeting with gun-carrying Black Panthers and when the meeting ended early the next morning, the director had been replaced by Matthew Eubanks. The CCC program immediately shifted from helping the poor to creating turmoil within the black community and developing hatred toward the police. At this time, Banks and Bellecount were appointed to head up a new militant Indian group within the CCC framework.

The intentions of AIM now, as then, are consistent with the radical Black Panther-dominated CCC out of which it grew.

After Banks and Bellecount took control of AIM, they took great delight in telling everyone how AIM was going to be the Indians' Black Panthers. In June of 1972, they received OEO funding totaling \$113,000, much of which was spent on Indian survival schools. These schools taught the young many of the Black Panther doctrines and developed a hatred toward all non-Indians, both black and white.

When the AIM leaders decided to come to Washington last fall to take over the Bureau of Indian Affairs—BIA—they had become more sophisticated in their tactics. They veiled their plans by stating that they were coming to Washington to hold religious and cultural ob-

servances of various national monuments and convinced the Interior Department to allow them to use the auditorium of the BIA.

The National Council of Churches and various local religious groups offered housing and food which the Indians refused, since they knew where they would spend the following nights. While they were using the BIA auditorium, someone gained entry into the main building. When this occurred, the well thought out plans of Banks and Bellecount went into action, and the Indians immediately took control of the building and did \$3 million worth of damage.

The same group is now at Wounded Knee. To repeat what I have stated before, this militant, political, extreme and violently orientated group received its initial funding and has received subsequent funding from OEO.

It was not until Howard Phillips took over at OEO that such irresponsible funding has come to a stop. I am afraid that the case with AIM is not an isolated situation, but rather an example of how Federal funds, earmarked for the poor, have been directed to extreme revolutionary groups.

I ask that the following article from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, March 19, 1973]

HALF AIM INDIANS SAID TO RECEIVE U.S. FUNDS

DETROIT, MICH., March 18.—The Detroit News reported today more than half the members of the American Indian Movement are employees of social welfare agencies financed primarily by federal grants.

The News story by John Peterson said the organization whose leaders were instrumental in the takeover of Wounded Knee, S.D., has received more than \$400,000 in federal funds since its founding in 1968 as an offshoot of a Minneapolis antipoverty program.

The News said AIM has 258 members.

The paper quoted an unnamed federal official as saying: "When AIM took over Wounded Knee three weeks ago, the Justice Department was all set to move in and make arrests."

"But then AIM leaders threatened to call a press conference and disclose exactly how much financing they've had from the federal government in recent months. That's when the Justice Department backed off."

Peterson's story said a two-week investigation disclosed that last June 21, AIM received a \$113,000 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Of that amount, Peterson said, \$60,000 was for "survival" schools in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Milwaukee to "instill American Indian culture" in grade school-age children.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I was cleaning out some old files last night and ran across an editorial which originally appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel of August 24, 1971.

Since we hear many moans and groans from the Democrats in the House about how terrible everything is, perhaps they

will enjoy reading who is really responsible for what they cry about.

FRIENDS OF POOR?

Echoing the moguls of organized labor, the Democratic National Committee charges that President Nixon's new economic program favors big business at the expense of the common people.

This is the old political line that has worked so well for the Democrats for the last four decades in keeping, with few exceptions, the Republicans in the minority and out of power.

It is quite possible that this old political canard will fool the common people again, although some signs are cropping up in the opinion polls to indicate that the public is beginning to wise up to the fact that organized labor is interested only in feathering its own nest.

Working hand in glove with the Democratic Party, the national unions have acquired monopolistic powers which, with a public be damned attitude, they have exploited to their own advantage.

George Meanywhile (to coin a phrase), labor and the Democrats have been posing as the friends of the poor. Some friends! Most of the time since the 1933, Democrats and labor have controlled both Congress and the White House and yet, by their own admission, the poor are more than ever with us.

Going by the record, about the only periods of prosperity under Democratic rule in the last 40 years came under wartime conditions—which, speaking of economic game plans, is one the nation surely can do without for the next several generations.

What have the Democrats been doing for the poor between the times of blood stained prosperity? Among others, things like passing laws to increase the minimum wage, which destroys jobs, especially for the young, particularly for blacks.

Although Mr. Nixon appears bent on outdoing them in deficit spending, it was the Democrats, by and large, who got the nation hooked on the habit of year after year spending more than we earn. This is the root cause of inflation, which is a progressive tax, i.e., the poorer you are the harder it hits you.

It is possible, as the Democrats do, to interpret features of the Nixon economic program as favoring business. It should be recalled, however, that it is the private enterprise system that supports us all. The public enterprise system, the government, doesn't have anything that it doesn't take away from the people in the first place. A hefty chunk of what the government gets, not so incidentally, comes from taking up to about half of business' profits.

In seeking to encourage private enterprise through such things as the investment tax credit, therefore, the Nixon economic program is in reality seeking to benefit all of the people, and particularly the poor, the young and the disadvantaged minorities. They are the ones who stand to profit the most from any economic recovery.

FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 6091, the administration's proposed amendments to the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. This Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 is the first and most urgent of the administration's disaster assistance propo-

sals and is compatible with forthcoming disaster program recommendations.

The President has said that he intends to make 1973 a turning point in the quality of governmental response to natural disasters. Late in the 92d Congress, I introduced H.R. 16831, which is almost identical to this bill. Because of the press of time, the bill was not acted upon prior to adjournment.

The proposed amendments to the flood insurance program were written from the lessons learned in tropical storm Agnes. We discovered that, of \$3 billion in damage from Agnes, only \$5 million was covered under the current federally subsidized flood insurance program.

We have the opportunity this year to lessen the crushing economic blows that storms such as Agnes have dealt in the past.

This bill will, for example, increase single-family residential coverage limits from \$17,500 to \$35,000 on buildings and from \$5,000 to \$10,000 on contents. Non-residential building coverage would go from \$30,000 to \$100,000.

The bill would also accelerate identification of flood-risk zones. Upon identification, a community must either solve its flood problem or participate in the flood insurance program for it to be eligible in the flood-prone area for mortgage financing, which is extended by federally insured lenders. Likewise, an individual may be required to purchase flood insurance to be eligible for similar financing in a flood-prone neighborhood.

A section-by-section summary of the bill follows:

FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

SECTION BY SECTION SUMMARY

Sec. 1. Enacting clause.

Sec. 2. Findings and declaration of purpose.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 101. Increased limits of coverage. Amends section 1306(b) of the Act to provide increased limits of coverage as follows:

	Subsidized coverage		Total coverage	
	Old limit	New limit	Old limit	New limit
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Single family residential.....	\$17,500	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$70,000
Other residential.....	30,000	100,000	60,000	200,000
Nonresidential.....	30,000	100,000	60,000	200,000
Contents, residential.....	5,000	10,000	10,000	20,000
Contents, nonresidential.....	5,000	100,000	10,000	200,000

Sec. 102. Requirement to purchase flood insurance. (a) Prohibits Federal financial assistance for acquisition or construction purposes for projects within special hazard areas previously identified by HUD and made eligible for flood insurance, unless the project will be covered by such insurance for its full development cost (less land cost) or the new limit of coverage (Col. 2 or 4 above), whichever is less. (b) Federal instrumentalities responsible for the supervision of lending institutions must direct such institutions to require flood insurance in connection with their real estate or mobile home and personal property loans in such identified areas, up to the same maximum limit or the balance of the loan, whichever is less. Both subsections would take effect July 1, 1973.

Sec. 103. Financing. Restores authority contained in 1956 Flood Insurance Act which permits Treasury borrowing authority to exceed \$250 million with the approval of the President.

Sec. 104. Increased limitation on coverage outstanding. Amends sections 1319 of the Act to raise limit on total amount of coverage outstanding from \$4 billion to \$10 billion.

Sec. 105. Flood insurance premium equalization payments. Would repeal the detailed formula for the sharing of losses between Government and industry and permit the necessary flexibility in loss-sharing to take into account longer-term loss experience trends and to compensate for the lack of precision in actuarial computations.

Sec. 201. Notification to flood-prone areas. (a) Requires HUD to public information on known flood-prone communities and to notify them within six months of their tentative identification as such. (List initially used would probably be Corps of Engineers list, based on 1960 Census data.) (b) Upon notification; community must either (1) promptly apply for participation in flood insurance program or (2) satisfy the Secretary within six months that it is no longer flood prone. A hearing may be granted to resolve disputed cases, but Secretary's decision is final unless arbitrary and capricious. (c) Additional flood-prone communities subsequently notified of their status must then meet the requirements of subsection (b) but are allowed at least one year in which to qualify for the flood insurance program before section 202 applies.

Sec. 202. Effect of non-participation in flood program. (a) Prohibits Federal financial assistance for acquisition or construction purposes within the identified flood-prone areas of communities that are not participating in the flood insurance program by July 1, 1975 (in most cases, about 18 months after the identification is made). (b) Directs Federal instrumentalities responsible for the supervision of lending institutions to prohibit such institutions from making real estate or mobile home loans after July 1, 1975, in areas identified as having special flood hazards unless the community in which the area is situated is participating in the flood insurance program.

Sec. 203. Repeals provision of existing Flood Insurance Act that would deny disaster assistance after December 31, 1973, to persons who for a period of a year or more could have purchased flood insurance but did not do so.

Sec. 204. Accelerated identification of flood risk zones. (a) Adds a new subsection (b) to section 1360 of the Act directing HUD to accelerate hazard area identification and rate studies. Specifically authorizes the Secretary to make grants, provide technical assistance, eliminate competitive bidding requirements, and make progress payments, if necessary to accomplish that objective. (b) Directs the agencies doing the technical work for HUD to give highest practicable priority to these studies, in order to assist the Secretary to meet existing August 1, 1973, statutory area identification deadline.

Sec. 205. Authority to issue regulations. Authorizes (a) the Secretary and (b) Federal agencies administering financial assistance programs and those supervising lending institutions, to issue any regulations necessary to carry out the Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING ON PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would

like to announce a subcommittee meeting, to be held next Thursday, which I think will be of special interest to a great many of my colleagues.

As chairman of the District of Columbia Committee's newly formed Subcommittee on Labor, Social Services, and the International Community, I have scheduled an initial hearing to explore the rather unique problems which face members of the international community who come to this country to live and work in our Nation's Capital.

To the best of my knowledge, there has not previously been an attempt made to address the needs of these foreign visitors in a comprehensive or systematic way. I am hopeful that my subcommittee will be able to make a positive contribution in this important area.

The specific concerns to be explored at next week's hearing and subsequent meetings have been well summarized in previous testimony developed by our distinguished committee chairman, Congressman CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.:

The District of Columbia with approximately 131 Foreign Missions, is host to the largest foreign diplomatic community of any national capital. (Heretofore) no legislative committee in the Congress (has been) responsible for the investigation, study and resolution of the myriad of non-diplomatic problems which beset members of this community.

The usual difficulties which arise in moving to a new city are complicated in this instance by language problems and cultural differences.

They involve such things as their children's education; municipal services to which they are entitled and where to go if such services are not forthcoming; dealing with local merchants; leasing and housing problems; immigration laws and customs regulations, and understanding of local criminal and civil laws and traffic regulations.

These problems are especially pressing to newly established Missions from developing countries who have not had the years of experience and background to guide them through our bureaucratic maze of agencies, departments and bureaus.

The District of Columbia is also the transitory home for a large number of members of our own Department of State Foreign Service and other Americans, as well as international organizations such as the World Bank, who share many of the same problems faced by the diplomatic community.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite any interested Members to attend our initial hearing on the problems of the international community. It will be held at 9 a.m., on Thursday, April 5, in room 1310 of the Longworth House Office Building.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. BURTON (at the request of Mr. McFALL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GUYER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. McSPADEN (at the request of Mr. McFALL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. McFALL), for today and April 2, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CULVER, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CRONIN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HEINZ, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STARK) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MINISH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CASEY of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McFALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUCKEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. EILBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HUBER, to extend his remarks following those of Mr. GROSS on the bill H.R. 5293.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CRONIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. ZION.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. KETCHUM.

Mr. ESCH in two instances.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. ARCHER in two instances.

Mr. HEINZ.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. CRONIN.

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. THONE in two instances.

Mr. ABDNOR.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STARK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NATCHER in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.
 Mr. MOSS.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. HAMILTON.
 Mr. DRINAN in four instances.
 Mr. GAYDOS in 10 instances.
 Mr. DAN DANIEL.
 Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.
 Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.
 Mr. NIX.
 Mr. LEGGETT in six instances.
 Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.
 Mr. DENHOLM.
 Mr. WALDIE in five instances.
 Mr. BRASCO.
 Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
 Mr. STUDDS.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1136. An act to extend the expiring authorities in the Public Health Service Act and the Community Mental Health Centers Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 28, 1973, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5445. An act to extend the Clean Air Act, as amended, for 1 year.

H.R. 5446. An act to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, for 1 year; and

H.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of April 23, 1973, as "Nicolaus Copernicus Week" marking the quinquacentennial of this birth.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 2, 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:

677. A letter from the President and the National Executive Director of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the 23d Annual Report of the Girl Scout organization for the period ending September 30, 1973, pursuant to section 7 of the act of March 16, 1950, as amended by Public Law 272, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 93-74); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to printed with illustrations.

678. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give effect to the International Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, signed at London under date of June 1, 1967, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

679. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 16th Annual Report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, pursuant to 70 Stat. 105; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

680. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Territorial Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Government Comptroller for Guam of the fiscal condition of the Government of Guam for the year ended June 30, 1972, pursuant to the Organic Act of Guam (as amended); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

681. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and chapter 2, title 18, United States Code, to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

682. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 3 years the programs for comprehensive State and areawide health planning, and for comprehensive public health service and health services development, and to repeal a requirement that at least 15 percent of a State's formula allotment for public health services be available only for mental health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

683. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the program of research and demonstrations relating to health facilities and services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

684. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the authority to conduct national health surveys and studies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

685. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 to modify the authorization of appropriations for the program of special project grants and contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

686. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 215, title 18, United States Code (receipt of commissions or gifts for procuring loans), to expand the institutions covered; to encompass indirect payments to bank officials; to make violation of the section a felony; and to specifically include offerors and givers of the proscribed payments; and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

687. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the unauthorized possession within any Federal penal or correctional institution, of any substance or thing designed to damage the institution or to injure any persons within or part of the institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

688. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act of 1973"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

689. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the utilization of authority to designate and rent inadequate quarters, lease family housing and hire quarters for Coast Guard personnel during the year 1972, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 475(f); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

690. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for payments by the Postal Service to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for increases in the unfunded liability of the fund due to increases in benefits for Postal Service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

691. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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. FRASER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 330. Resolution on U.S. oceans policy at the Law of the Sea Conference (Rept. No. 93-96). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 3798. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for mandatory retirement of employees upon attainment of 70 years of age and completion of 5 years of service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 6077. A bill to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees (Rept. No. 93-98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIGGS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 342. A bill to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel (Rept. No. 93-99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIGGS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4586. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association (Rept. No. 93-100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NIX, Mr. POBELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 6299. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H.R. 6300. A bill to establish rational criteria for the mandatory imposition of the

sentence of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RARICK, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SIKES, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 6301. A bill to provide Federal grants to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach moral and ethical principles; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 6302. A bill to provide for a Federal loan guarantee and grant program to enable educational institutions and individuals to purchase electronic reading aids for the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois):

H.R. 6303. A bill to promote the utilization of improved technology in federally assisted housing projects and to increase productivity in order to meet our national housing goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6304. A bill to amend section 311 (d) (2) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 6305. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for purposes of the civil service retirement system certain periods of service of civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 6306. 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. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H.R. 6307. A bill to minimize redtape in the highway program, create a special urban high density traffic program, control highway noise, evaluate public mass transportation needs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6308. A bill to repeal the bread tax on 1973 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6309. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employees receiving lump sums from tax-free pension or annuity plans on account of separation from employment shall not be taxed at the time of distribution to the extent that an equivalent amount is reinvested in another such plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit

against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 6313. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 6314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS:

H.R. 6315. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit making unsolicited commercial telephone calls to persons who have indicated they do not wish to receive such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANIELSON, (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. HOLFIELD):

H.R. 6316. A bill to create a Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation to insure the people of the United States against losses due to major natural disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DANIELSON (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McSPADEN, Mr. MARAZITI, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NIX, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REES, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. VEVSEY, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. BERGLAND, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 6317. A bill to create a Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation to insure the people of the United States against losses due to major natural disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENNIS (for himself, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. KETCHUM, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 6318. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States or of a military attack upon the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6319. 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. 6320. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with regard to renewal of broadcast licenses and services rendered by broadcast licensees; to the Commission on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 6321. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. NIX, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 6322. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to freeze food prices at levels prevailing on January 2,

1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself and Mr. ERLERBORN):

H.R. 6323. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6324. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 6325. A bill to regulate the maximum rents to be charged by landlords in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, and Mr. MARAZITI):

H.R. 6326. A bill to exempt child care services from the ceiling on expenditures for social services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 6327. A bill to designate certain lands in the Wolf Island National Wildlife Refuge, McIntosh County, Ga., a wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6328. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act with respect to the disclosure of closing costs and administrative enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6329. A bill to amend Public Law 90-553 authorizing an additional appropriation for an International Center for Foreign Chanceries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. SISK, and Mr. FAUNTROY):

H.R. 6330. A bill to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 6331. A bill to improve the quality of child development programs by attracting and training personnel for those programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. STARK, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. RIEGLE, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. FREY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. YATES, Miss JORDAN, Mr. SISK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. REES, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 6332. 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 Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6333. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who have died while employed by an air carrier or foreign air carrier after 10 or more years of such employment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 6334. A bill to provide for the uniform application of the position classification and General Schedule pay rate provisions of title 5, United States Code, to certain employees of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6335. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for grade retention benefits for certain employees whose positions are reduced in grade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6336. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that employees subject to certain pay limitations shall be credited, for civil service retirement and life insurance purposes, with the pay which would be received if such pay limitations were not applicable; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6337. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of commercially produced domestic dog and cat animal products; and to prohibit dog and cat animal products moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. JONES of Oklahoma):

H.R. 6338. A bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to provide for continuing authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 6339. A bill to amend section 101(1) (2) of the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 6340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that blood donations shall be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 6341. A bill to establish a congressional internship program for secondary school teachers of government of social studies in honor of President Lyndon Baines Johnson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 6342. A bill to designate certain lands in the Yosemite National Park, Calif., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6343. A bill to designate certain lands in the Sequoia and King's Canyon National Parks, Calif., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 6344. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to refusals to bargain; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 6345. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. LITTON):

H.R. 6346. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States

by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 6347. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6348. A bill to improve education by increasing the freedom of the Nation's teachers to change employment across State lines without substantial loss of retirement benefits through establishment of a Federal-State program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 6349. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the establishment of standards related to rear mounted lighting systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 6350. A bill to permit injured Federal employees to receive the benefits of the Federal employees compensation program not withstanding they are in receipt of military retired pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 6351. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend the time within which certain Federal-State agreements may be modified to give noncovered State and local employees under the divided retirement system procedure an additional opportunity to elect coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 6352. 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 Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 6353. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction in computing gross income for theft losses sustained by individuals, for certain amounts paid to protect against theft, for medical expenses caused by criminal conduct, and for funeral expenses of victims of crime; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 6354. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may disapprove the President's action and require him to cease such impounding; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 6355. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that Thanksgiving Day shall be observed on the fifth Thursday in November of any year in which the fourth Thursday of such month falls on November 22; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6356. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 6357. A bill to prohibit economic assistance to North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6358. A bill to amend section 10 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. WINN, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 6359. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RINALDO (for himself Mr. WON PAT, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RONCALLO of New York):

H.R. 6360. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the licensing of, and for certain other regulations with respect to, persons in the business of preparing tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia:

H.R. 6361. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 6362. A bill to extend and make technical corrections to the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York (for self, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. BOWEN, and Mr. MARAZITI):

H.R. 6363. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces and Federal employees who were prisoners of war or missing in action for any period during the Vietnam conflict may receive double credit for such period for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York (for himself, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. BOWEN, and Mr. MARAZITI):

H.R. 6364. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces and Central Intelligence Agency employees who were prisoners of war or missing in action for any period during the Vietnam conflict may receive double credit for such period for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York (for himself, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. BOWEN, and Mr. MARAZITI):

H.R. 6365. A bill to provide that employees of the Foreign Service who were prisoners of war or missing in action for any period during the Vietnam conflict may receive double credit for such period for retirement purposes.

poses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
H.R. 6366. A bill to provide that Civil Service employees who were prisoners of war or missing in action for any period during the Vietnam conflict may receive double credit for such period for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 6367. A bill to amend section 53(a) of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 so as to include snowmobiles within the \$25 ceiling imposed on overtime charges for certain services in connection with the arrival in or departure from the United States of any private aircraft or private vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6368. A bill to amend section 426 of title 33, United States Code, for the purpose of authorizing the Army Corps of Engineers to undertake emergency erosion control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6369. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 for the purpose of making clear that disaster assistance is available to those communities affected by extraordinary shoreline erosion damage; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6370. A bill to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, to prohibit depository institutions from permitting negotiable orders of withdrawal to be made with respect to any deposit or account on which any interest or dividend is paid, to authorize Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to own stock in and invest in loans to certain State housing corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 6371. A bill to provide for financing and economic development of Indians and Indian organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6372. A bill to provide for the assumption of the control and operation by Indian tribes and communities of certain programs and services provided for them by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 6373. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 6374. A bill to provide for the creation of the Indian Trust Counsel Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 6375. A bill to amend certain laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6376. A bill to amend acts entitled "an Act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States or Territories for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians, and for other purposes" and "To transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes" and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 6377. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer franchise fees re-

ceived from certain concession operations at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, in the States of Arizona and Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6378. 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 Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 6379. A bill to provide for the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a National Center on Child Development and Abuse Prevention, to provide financial assistance for a demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. MINN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 6380. A bill to provide for the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a National Center for Child Development and Abuse Prevention, to provide financial assistance for a demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

H.R. 6381. A bill to authorize release of 1965-70 stored excess wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 6382. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOUP (for himself, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. STUCKEY, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 6383. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to eliminate certain record-keeping provisions with respect to ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHOUP (for himself, Mr. BRAY, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GUNTER):

H.R. 6384. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 6385. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to extend for 1 fiscal year the programs of assistance under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself and Mr. JONES of Tennessee):

H.R. 6386. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a

forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection, development, and management by small non-industrial private and non-Federal public forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 6387. A bill to consolidate and extend the authorizations for appropriations for assistance to medical libraries, to repeal provisions for assistance for construction of facilities and for grants for training in medical library sciences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SKUBITZ, and Mr. SHOUP):

H.R. 6388. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to increase the U.S. share of allowable project costs under such act; to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 6389. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 App. U.S.C. 2401-2413) as amended, to control the export of timber from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6390. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to alleviate freight car shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. SISK, Mr. MC EWEN, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. BELL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. THONE, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. PREYER, and Mr. BUTLER):

H.R. 6391. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide additional assistance to small employers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. QUIE, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. WARE, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 6392. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide additional assistance to small employers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6393. A bill to require Federal contractors to observe practices which will preserve and enhance the environment and fisheries and wildlife resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 6394. A bill to suspend the duty on caprolactam monomer in water solution until the close of December 31, 1973; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself and Mr. GINN):

H.R. 6395. A bill to designate certain lands in the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. PRITCHARD):

H.R. 6396. A bill to amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act in order to clarify the duties of the Secretary of the Interior thereunder and to extend the authorization for appropriations to carry out such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 6397. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish programs and regulations for the protection of the fishery resources of the United States, including the fresh water and marine fish cultural industries, against the dissemination of serious diseases of fish and shellfish; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 6398. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that licenses for the operation of a broadcast station shall be issued for a term of 5 years, and to establish orderly procedure for the consideration of applications for the renewal of such licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 6399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income certain amounts of retirement benefits from public retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FISHER, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. WARE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. HINSHAW, and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia):

H.R. 6400. A bill to promote the utilization of improved technology in federally assisted housing projects and to increase productivity in order to meet our national housing goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 6401. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 6402. A bill to prohibit the exportation of grain from the United States whenever the supply of grain is not sufficient to meet domestic needs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6403. 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. WYMAN:

H.R. 6404. 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. 6405. A bill to provide that, after January 1, 1973, Memorial Day be observed on May 30 of each day and Veterans Day be observed on the 11th of November each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN (for himself and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 6406. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Georgia:

H.R. 6407. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to require community representation and participation (including proportionate representation of minorities and low-income groups), through the appointment of State and local advisory councils, in policy and decisionmaking by State and local transit agencies seeking assistance under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6408. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to require proportionate representation of minority and low-income groups on State and local transit agencies seeking assistance under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina:

H.R. 6409. A bill to extend for 5 more years the expiring provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1970; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 6410. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, to protect game and wildlife resources by prohibiting the use of lead shot for hunting in marshes and other aquatic areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.J. Res. 469. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage and assist in the distribution of the "Patient's Bill of Rights" to patients in hospitals and other health care facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.J. Res. 470. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the term of office of Members of the House

of Representatives and the eligibility of such Members to be elected to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mrs. HOLT, and Mr. TREEN):

H.J. Res. 471. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that our NATO allies should contribute more to the cost of their own defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution providing recognition for Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LOTT:

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution relating to the U.S. fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that summer youth programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 should be continued; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself and Mr. DOWNING):

H. Res. 335. Resolution maintaining U.S. sovereignty, Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

118. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to setting a starting date of the Vietnam conflict for administrative purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 6411. A bill for the relief of Murray Swartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKAY:

H.R. 6412. A bill for the relief of Monique Olive; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.R. 6413. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Hashimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 6414. A bill granting authority to the Secretary of the Army to renew the license of the Ira D. MacLachlan Post No. 3, The American Legion, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., to use a certain parcel of land in Saint Marys Falls Canal project; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE—Thursday, March 29, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

Dr. Leonard H. Cochran, Methodist minister, retired, Perry, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may those who work here as servants of the Nation humbly acknowledge their dependence upon Thee

so that we may safely depend upon them.

As a great rock arrests the drifting sand of the desert, allowing vegetation to take root and grow at its sheltered base, so may these Senators put their backs against the drifting life of this day until noble virtues and lasting qualities of life can take root and flourish in the land.

Aid them in doing that which will assure the continuance of the Nation in a glorious future.

May some one of them be able to say

what other men will take note of, and long remember. May each of them have that perception and wisdom to see and to choose the best above the good, the highest above the ordinary, and the worthy above the popular. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of