

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 9, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.—Matthew 5: 16.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, breathe through the heats of our desires Thy coolness and Thy balm as we face the demands and the duties of another day. Lift the burden from our heavy hearts, calm the anxieties of our baffled minds, renew our faith in the goodness of life and the greatness of our country that we may meet with fortitude whatever this day may bring.

Bless our President, guide our Speaker, direct our Representatives, that with wisdom and courage, they may be great enough to master the gigantic forces which are endeavoring to change the face of the globe. Help them and all of us to join hands with persons of good will anywhere and everywhere that peace and justice and freedom may come to all the people on this planet.

In the spirit of Him who is the light of the world we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 394) entitled "An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. DOLE 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. 929. A act to amend the Par Value Modification Act, to insure the separation of Federal powers and to protect the legislative function by requiring the President to notify the Congress whenever he, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the head of any department or agency of the United States, or any officer or employee of

the United States, impounds, orders the impounding, or permits the impounding of budget authority, to provide a procedure under which the Senate and the House of Representatives may approve the impounding action, in whole or in part, or require the President, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the department or agency of the United States, or the officer or employee of the United States, to cease such action, in whole or in part, as directed by Congress, and to establish a spending ceiling for one fiscal year 1974.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 85-474, appointed Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. COOK, and Mr. STAFFORD to attend, on the part of the Senate, the Interparliamentary Union Meeting to be held at Abidjan, Ivory Coast, April 22 to 28, 1973.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

APRIL 6, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully request that you accept my resignation as a member of the FDR Memorial Commission.

I have served on the Commission for many years and regret my inability to continue. My Subcommittee duties and my intention to devote a lot of time to my new position as a member of the Steering Committee make it impossible for me to continue the FDR Commission responsibilities.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HOWARD, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS TO MEET ON MONDAY, TUESDAY, AND WEDNESDAY DURING HOUSE SESSIONS

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is holding hearings today, tomorrow, and Wednesday on the situation at Wounded Knee. We will have some out-of-town witnesses scheduled to testify on those 3 days. I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be permitted to meet during sessions of the House on those 3 days.

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

There was no objection.

THE \$76,000 TOWNHOUSES FOR "POOR"

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I asked the General Accounting Office to take a look at certain so-called urban renewal projects in the District of Columbia.

These projects included the Shaw urban renewal area where the taxpayers are being forced to construct townhouses for the poor that a year ago were estimated to cost \$76,000 each and now—because of continuing inflation—may well cost far more.

Included was a block of land known as square 515, site of what was once the Wax Museum, on which the urban planners want to build a high-rise apartment which will have a maximum of 30 percent of its units allotted to low rent, subsidized public housing, while the remaining 70 percent of the units can be as luxurious as the traffic will bear.

The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, with the full blessing of spendthrift bureaucrats in the Department of Housing and Development, paid \$8.2 million of the public's money for property in square 515, with the knowledge that they could resell it for no more than \$2.5 million.

These sordid and irresponsible deals, and the urban renewal legislation and regulations that permitted them to be made, should make every American taxpayer's blood hit the boiling point.

The GAO has just issued its report and it confirms the information I presented to the House last year.

The report is evidence enough that the monumental urban renewal boondoggle should be halted and the entire program drastically changed to force the bureaucrats who make decisions in this area to employ some plain, old-fashioned commonsense.

Because I believe every Member of Congress should have an opportunity to read the GAO report, I have asked Comptroller General Staats to provide a copy to each of the Members of the House and to the Members of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT IN 1972—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Presi-

dent of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the International Coffee Agreement Act, as extended and amended, I transmit herewith the annual report on the operations of the International Coffee Agreement in 1972.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1973.

ANNUAL REPORT ON ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act as amended (P.L. 87-297), I herewith transmit the Annual Report of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The year covered by this report has been the most rewarding in the twelve-year history of the agency. Agreements reached with the Soviet Union in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks testify to the determination of this Administration to move away from the dangers and burdens of unrestrained arms competition and toward a stable and constructive international relationship.

The negotiations have resulted not in concession: by the two parties, one to the other, but in mutual arrangements to insure mutual security. For the first time, the United States and the Soviet Union have been substantial steps in concert to reduce the threat of nuclear war. The current round of SALT negotiations will concentrate on achieving a definitive treaty on the limitation of offensive weapons systems.

The past year has also seen continued progress in other areas of arms control.

Four years after the initial NATO proposal, positive planning has begun for a conference on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions in Central Europe. The Convention banning biological weapons and calling for the destruction of existing stockpiles was opened for signature on April 10, 1972. At the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, the problems associated with control of chemical warfare through international law were subjected to patient and careful examination. The number of nations adhering to the Nonproliferation Treaty has now reached 76 and successful negotiations on safeguard arrangements have paved the way for ratification by key European countries.

Much has been accomplished, but much remains to be done. With the beginning of my second term in office, I rededicate my Administration to the goal of bringing the instruments of warfare under effective and verifiable control.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1973.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. 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. 78]

Addabbo	Ford,	Mills, Md.
Alexander	William D.	Minish
Andrews, N.C.	Frey	Mitchell, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Gilman	Mizell
Ashley	Goldwater	Moorhead, Pa.
Aspin	Grasso	Nix
Badillo	Gray	O'Neill
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	Owens
Bell	Griffiths	Parris
Biaggi	Grover	Passman
Bingham	Hanley	Patten
Blatnik	Hanrahan	Pettis
Bolling	Hansen, Idaho	Pickle
Brademas	Harrington	Price, Tex.
Buchanan	Harvey	Pritchard
Burke, Calif.	Hawkins	Rarick
Carey, N.Y.	Hays	Riegle
Chisholm	Hébert	Rogers
Clark	Helstoski	Roncallo, N.Y.
Coyers	Holifield	Rooney, N.Y.
Crane	Hudnut	Rostenkowski
Davis, Wis.	Ichord	Roy
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Denholm	Jones, Tenn.	Shipley
Dennis	Karsh	Steiger, Wis.
Dent	Kemp	Taylor, Mo.
Derwinski	King	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Koch	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	Landrum	Tierman
Drinan	Lent	Ullman
Dulski	Litton	Waggoner
du Pont	McCloskey	Walsh
Eckhardt	McEwen	Ware
Edwards, Calif.	McKay	Wilson, Bob
Eshleman	McKinney	Wolf
Fish	Macdonald	Wylder
Flynt	Mailhard	Young, S.C.
	Maraziti	

Mr. SPEAKER. On this rollcall 321 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

TO INCORPORATE THE NATIONAL INCONVENIENCED SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 4586) to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Douglas Pringle, Daniel McPherson, and Jim Winthers, the present directors and officers of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association (a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California),

and their associates and successors, are created in the District of Columbia a body corporate by the name of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this Act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act, acting in person or by written proxy, are authorized to do whatever acts as may be necessary to complete the organization of the corporation.

PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 3. (a) The purposes of the corporation shall be—

(1) to provide veterans and others who are inconvenienced persons an opportunity to experience sports as a recreational activity in which they may participate;

(2) to afford a frequent natural sports environment for inconvenienced persons which has positive psychological and therapeutic results; and

(3) to develop a nucleus of sports programs and competent instructors to carry the program throughout the Nation.

(b) As used in this section the term "inconvenienced persons" includes amputees, blind persons, and persons who are neurologically damaged.

POWERS OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 4. (a) Subject to all applicable laws of the United States, and of any State in which the corporation operates, the corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal for the sole and exclusive use of the corporation;

(3) to adopt, alter, or amend bylaws not inconsistent with this charter;

(4) to contract and be contracted with;

(5) to acquire, control, hold, lease, and dispose of such real, personal, or mixed property as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes;

(6) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes; and

(7) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the corporate purposes.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be set forth in the bylaws of the corporation.

GOVERNING AUTHORITY OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 6. (a) The corporation shall have a national board of directors as may be provided for in the bylaws of the corporation.

(b) Qualifications of directors on any national board of directors created for the corporation, the manner of selection of such directors, terms of office of directors on the board, and the powers and responsibilities of the board and its directors shall be set forth in the bylaws of the corporation.

OFFICERS OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation shall be those provided for in the bylaws of the corporation. Such officers shall be elected in such manner, for such terms, and with such powers and responsibilities, as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 8. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be in Sacramento, California, or in such other place as may later be determined by the corporation, but the activities of the corporation shall not be

confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the United States and all other locations as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept services of process for the corporation. Service upon, or notice mailed to the business address of, such agent shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

USE OF INCOME; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the assets or income of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director or be distributable to any such person during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its members, officers, directors, or employees.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation and its officers and directors as such shall not contribute to, support, or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST THE ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having authority under the board of directors, and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law" approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1102, 1103), shall apply with respect to the corporation.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation may be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with this Act, the bylaws of the corporation, and all other Federal and State laws, and the laws of the District of Columbia applicable thereto.

TRANSFER OF ASSETS

SEC. 16. The corporation may acquire the assets of the existing organization of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association, a nonprofit corporation chartered in the State of California upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all the liabilities of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of California applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF THE RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

The purpose of the bill H.R. 4586, as set forth in House Report No. 93-100, is to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association.

The following are the principal provisions of this bill:

Declares that there shall be a body corporate in the District of Columbia by the name of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association.

Authorizes certain persons to complete the organization of the corporation.

States that the purposes of the corporation shall be: First, to provide veterans and other inconvenienced persons an opportunity to participate in sports as a recreational activity; second, to afford such persons a frequent natural sports environment which has positive psychological and therapeutic results; and third, to develop a nucleus of sports programs and competent instructors to carry the program throughout the Nation.

Defines the term "inconvenienced persons" to include amputees, blind persons, and persons who are neurologically damaged.

Sets forth the powers of the corporation, including the powers to: First, sue and be sued; second, adopt and use a corporate seal; third, adopt and amend bylaws not inconsistent with this charter; fourth, contract and be contracted with; fifth, acquire, control, and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes; sixth, choose officers, agents, and employees as may be necessary; and seventh, do any and all acts necessary and proper to carry out the corporate purposes.

In addition, the bill provides the usual requirements for incorporating, membership and the like, as set forth in detail in the bill and in the committee report.

NEED FOR THIS LEGISLATION

There is no question as to the need for this work done by the associates. The committee is informed that about 10,800,000 American citizens suffer disabling injuries every year. Of this number, at least 400,000 result in some degree of permanent impairment, ranging from partial loss of the use of limbs to blindness or complete crippling. In addition, the Korean and Vietnam wars have produced approximately 35,000 amputees; 4,500 blind; 3,000 deaf; and 3,000 neurologically damaged.

At this time, while substantial effort is expended in hospitals and Government agencies to get the amputee or other inconvenienced person physically well enough to leave the hospital, once that man or woman is discharged, there is no real coordinated program to continue the crucial therapeutic process toward incorporating that person back into the mainstream of life, into a life style approaching normalcy. There are varied programs emerging across the country designed to help inconvenienced people experience sports, but they are generally fragmented and all lack the kind of national coordination crucial to bringing sports activities to all those who could benefit. Such a nationally recognized or-

ganization alone could substantially widen and further develop the life styles of what heretofore has been basically a wasteland of humanity, several million people who have been captivated by their inconvenience and who need the help of their fellows to escape its bonds.

The National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association has been useful to the U.S. Army as a valuable adjunct to their program of rehabilitating those servicemen who are severely wounded or injured as a result of military service. The Army thus is interested in this organization, and will continue to support to the extent of the law those functions of the organization as they are applied to members of the military service who are still on active duty but are undergoing programs of rehabilitation. A spokesman for the Army advised our committee that in the event a congressional charter is granted the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association, the support of the Army and of the other services will assume a much greater potential, in that facilities, equipment, and other forms of support will become permissible under the law.

There are also practical and economic reasons why a national effort in this direction is needed. It is evident that if we are to continue to grow as a nation, we must maximize the potential of all our people. Thus, we can ill afford to allow members of our society who have become handicapped for any reason to be lost to the Nation from the standpoint of full productivity.

Because of the magnitude of this problem, there is a great need for the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association to grow and to remain viable, and to this end national recognition is necessary. A congressional charter for this organization will reflect the interest of the Congress as the local legislator for the District in helping restore handicapped persons to useful pursuits, and will allow not only Government agencies but also private organizations and well-known sports personalities to support the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association actively.

HISTORY

Legislation identical to H.R. 4586 was reported unanimously by the committee to the House in the 92d Congress (H.R. 15453, H. Rept. 92-1495) and passed the House by unanimous consent on October 14, 1972. However, it was not reached for consideration by the other body before adjournment.

A public hearing was held on this proposed legislation on March 26, 1973, by the Judiciary Subcommittee, at which time testimony in favor thereof was submitted by Members of Congress, and spokesmen on behalf of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports; the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association; the Department of the Army; and from the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. No opposition was expressed to the legislation.

COST

No cost to the Federal or District of Columbia Government will result from the enactment of this legislation.

COMMITTEE VOTE

The pending bill, H.R. 4586, was ordered reported by voice vote of the committee members present.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a short statement on behalf of my bill, H.R. 4586, to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association.

The need for a nationwide therapeutic sportsmen's program to help rehabilitate persons who suffer from various handicaps is a great one. There is no Federal funding related to this bill, yet the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association needs the kind of national coordination that the chartering by Congress provided for in this bill will give it.

I have a young lady from my own congressional district in Windom, Minn., Mrs. James S. Thompson, who is a member of the National Amputee Skiers Association. This young lady was handicapped by reason of an airplane accident. Therefore, she was a fine skier, and since the onset of her handicap, she has continued to be an enthusiastic member of the National Amputee Skiers Association.

Turning for the moment to the background and history of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association.

The program to which this organization is devoted originated in 1953, when one man decided to help some of his friends from the 10th Mountain Division develop techniques so that they could ski again, despite their loss of limbs. From that humble beginning on a remote ski hill in the Sierra Nevadas, the group grew to include six other chapters around the country. In 1967, the organization was chartered as a nonprofit corporation in the State of California, under the name of The National Amputee Skiers Association. In 1969, the organization enlarged its scope and added a summer program, thus providing a year-round program of recreation and rehabilitation. Simultaneously, this group began working with other types of handicapped persons, and polio victims and blind students begin to join their ranks.

Last spring, three other similar organizations combined to form the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association. This has brought the total number of chapters to nine, and the membership to several thousand people.

The purposes for which the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association was formed are to provide handicapped veterans and other persons an opportunity to experience sports as recreation activity in which they may participate, to afford a natural environment which has psychological, therapeutic, and positive results, and to develop a nucleus of competent instructors to carry this program throughout the Nation.

Aside from all emotional factors, there are practical and economic reasons why a national effort in this direction is needed. It is evident that if we are to continue to grow as a nation, we must maximize the potential of all our people. Thus, we can ill afford to allow members of our society who have become handicapped for any reason to be lost to the

nation from the standpoint of full productivity. For no matter how great a disability may be, there is always some remaining ability which can contribute in some measure to the well-being of this Nation. The motivation must be stimulated, however, if this remaining potential is to be developed and utilized.

The National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association can provide a portion of this stimulation, as can no other existing organization, by making recreational programs available to persons who otherwise would fail to achieve total rehabilitation.

Because of the magnitude of this problem, there is a great need for the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association to grow and to remain viable, and to this end congressional recognition is necessary. A District of Columbia charter for this organization will reflect the interest of the Congress in helping restore handicapped persons to useful pursuits.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the next to the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I note on page 5 of the report that there would be no cost to the Federal Government or the District of Columbia government which would result from the enactment of this legislation. I would like to ask the Delegate from the District of Columbia if this language means precisely what it says?

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, without question it means exactly what it says, as the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota reported also.

Mr. GROSS. And the Delegate from the District of Columbia will not be back here in a year or so, or at anytime in the future asking for funds for this organization.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Not for this, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I would only add the comment that this is a red letter day in the history of the Congress when a District bill passes the House that does not try to chisel out some money for the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman for commenting on this.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to disappoint my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, and vote against this legislation, but I do think it is important that the House know what it is doing. This is a very miserable procedure under which we are considering, once again, the chartering of a national corporation.

Under the customary procedures, Mr. Speaker, the requests for charters are referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee has not acted favorably on any of these requests for nearly 6 or 7 years, following a Presidential veto in 1965. At that time President Johnson called to the attention of the Congress the most unsatisfactory procedure for the chartering of these so-called national corporations.

The vice, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no body of national law regulating Federal corporations. There is in the States, and the corporations there are subject to appropriate regulation, but there is no Federal corporate law to supervise these

corporations. What we do instead is require that they file an annual report. They file an annual report of their income and expenses with the Speaker. We all have great respect for the Speaker but let me say the Speaker is not equipped to supervise the conduct of these corporations. He in turn passes the report to the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee is not equipped to supervise them. The procedure is a bad one.

Mr. Speaker, this matter of chartering Federal corporations ought to be dealt with by general law. If we are going to charter them on the Federal level, then we ought to have a body of Federal law supervising these corporations. In the District of Columbia they are relatively unregulated.

The National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association, Mr. Speaker, is an ongoing corporation which is chartered in the State of California. It is subject to all the controls, which are rather extensive and I think enlightened, dealing with nonprofit corporations in the State of California; but this corporation seeks to remove itself from these laws and get itself a Federal charter. Many of the corporations seeking national charters in the past have said their motive for doing so is just to escape State regulation.

Let me say I do not wish to make an issue out of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association. It is obviously a desirable corporation, but the Congress should address itself to the general problem of incorporating national corporations. We should not continue to deal with them on an ad hoc basis.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, certainly first of all we understand the gentleman's position, but let me make clear this is not a Federal charter. It is a congressional authorization for a District of Columbia charter. There is a slight difference there.

Mr. WIGGINS. I will say that this corporation can come into the District of Columbia without going to Congress and qualify as a nonprofit corporation if it wishes to do so, but it does not wish to do so.

I am advised by the people downtown in the District that if we respond by approving this congressional authorization, thereafter they lose control of this corporation. That is not in the national interest.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that the Committee on the Judiciary has studied that question for that reason. Our subcommittee is, in fact, right now studying this whole question of private incorporation. I hope that we make recommendations to the full committee in the very near future as to how and where we should handle it.

However, as I indicated, it is a congressionally authorized District charter. I long for the day when the Congress will not have to deal with matters that will be in the jurisdiction of local authorities, but this bill was brought up even though we are in the process of reviewing this question ourselves because of the high merit of the organizations, particularly since the Congress of the United States perhaps is not as concerned about the handicapped as the Members feel that we are.

Mr. WIGGINS. I appreciate the inter-

est of the gentleman and of his committee. I commend them for that.

I would hope that he would exercise great restraint in approving these charters in the future.

In this legislation today we are creating by act of Congress a corporation, and it is going to be very difficult, if not legally impossible, for a State to regulate the activities of that corporation by reason of its national charter.

One of these days, I might say to the gentleman from the District of Columbia, as a result of that absence of regulation, there will be a national scandal.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4586, and I wish to identify myself with the remarks of Congressman ANCHER NELSEN, the ranking minority member of the House District Committee, of which I am a member.

I, myself, introduced a bill, H.R. 3770, that would grant a District of Columbia charter to the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association, and I wish to take this opportunity to point out some reasons why I believe this bill should be passed by the House today.

The basic philosophy and spirit of this organization is reflected by their motto. "If I can do this, I can do anything." Their spokesmen contend that many of the so-called handicapped, such as amputees, postpolio victims, and the neurologically damaged, are in truth only psychologically handicapped, and that their physical problems are better characterized by the term "inconvenienced," rather than "handicapped." Basically, this organization seeks to open the way for such persons to a fuller and more active life through experiencing sports.

There is no question as to the need for this work done by the associates. The District of Columbia Committee is informed that about 10,800,000 American citizens suffer disabling injuries every year. Of this number, at least 400,000 result in some degree of permanent impairment, ranging from partial loss of the use of limbs to blindness or complete crippling. In addition, the Korean and Vietnam wars have produced approximately 35,000 amputees; 4,500 blind; 3,000 deaf; and 3,000 neurologically damaged.

As much as 20 years ago, there was no organization whose sole purpose was to help the disabled to overcome their disabilities in that aspect of their lives which was not directly associated with economic security and social acceptance. Yet those areas encompass only about one-half of a person's life, and unless he finds some way to fulfill the other half, he must necessarily lead only a partial life. Participation in sports is a vitally important key to the enjoyment of a full life by those with physical handicaps.

Today, the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association is both the catalyst and the means by which handicapped young men and women need not be denied the world of sports participation; and this is particularly true for those who have suffered as a result of military service. For many such veterans and other handicapped persons, it's the road back, for theirs is a hard path indeed to follow. They must overcome not only the physical disability, but also the

mental disability which results from the realization of their burden.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 2538 to incorporate the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association in the District of Columbia because we badly need a nationally coordinated effort to help develop the skills, abilities, and life fulfillment of persons who are disabled by mental or physical problems. Today we are considering an identical bill, H.R. 4586, which I support and ask my colleagues to support. A large number of organizations are currently working with small segments of the total disabled population, mostly staging one-time-only athletic events or serving to get together people with like disabilities. Few really go out to get disabled persons into the mainstream of American life. As a consequence a substantial segment of our society is not living up to its potential.

I would like to pass along to you some comments by Jim Redmond, my former press aide. Jim is an ardent skier, a member of the Professional Ski Instructors of America, a former ski school director and an active member of the NISA. He has had the rewarding experience of having taught amputees the joy of skiing and has a thorough understanding of the problems of the inconvenienced:

For all of us there is an inconvenience. It may be mental or physical, a drinking problem or a bad temper, but it is there. If we are strong enough we do not let it rule our lives. When a serious inconvenience is present we need the strength and understanding of others to keep us on the right track.

Substantial efforts are being expended in hospitals and government agencies to get the amputee or otherwise inconvenienced person physically well enough to leave the hospital. Once discharged, however, the individual has no coordinated process that would provide him with needed therapy. There are varied programs designed to help the inconvenienced to experience sports but they are fragmented and lack national coordination. The result is very often a hodgepodge of effort, often confused and terribly frustrating to both participants and instructors alike.

I urge that this bill be passed by the House for one essential reason. It will greatly simplify our efforts to help the millions of people in this country who would greatly improve their daily lives through sports activity, but for whom there is no real national coordination to accomplish the special organizational and instructional activities necessary.

T. S. Elliot, in one of his works, said:

I moaned because my shoes
were too small. . .
And then I met a man
who had no feet.

When we meet a man with no feet in this country of ours, we must make some feet for him and then show him how to use them. They will not be as fine a pair of feet as God could have made, but they can at least help him stand and bring him some degree of joy by making it possible for that man to get up, and to walk, and to appreciate the world we live in rather than wasting in a well of depression.

My colleagues, the support I ask for today is not financial. Your affirmative vote will lend support to the efforts of this most worthwhile volunteer organization.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRASER. 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 (H.R. 4586) to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. 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 328, nays 0, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—328

Abdnor	Clawson, Del	Ginn
Abzug	Clay	Gonzalez
Adams	Cleveland	Goodling
Anderson,	Cochran	Green, Pa.
Calif.	Cohen	Griffiths
Anderson, III.	Collier	Gross
Andrews,	Collins	Gubser
N. Dak.	Conable	Gude
Annuzio	Conlan	Gunter
Archer	Conte	Guyer
Arends	Corman	Haley
Armstrong	Cotter	Hamilton
Bafalis	Coughlin	Hammer-
Baker	Cronin	schmidt
Beard	Culver	Hanna
Bennett	Daniel, Dan	Hansen, Wash.
Bergland	Daniel, Robert	Harsha
Bevill	W., Jr.	Hastings
Blester	Daniels,	Hechler, W. Va.
Blackburn	Dominick V.	Heckler, Mass.
Boggs	Danielson	Heinz
Boland	Davis, S.C.	Helstoski
Bowen	de la Garza	Henderson
Brasco	Dellenback	Hicks
Bray	Dellums	Hillis
Breaux	Devine	Hinshaw
Breckinridge	Dickinson	Hogan
Brinkley	Donohue	Holt
Brooks	Dorn	Holtzman
Broomfield	Downing	Horton
Brotzman	Duncan	Hosmer
Brown, Calif.	Eckhardt	Howard
Brown, Mich.	Edwards, Ala.	Huber
Brown, Ohio	Ellberg	Hungate
Broyhill, N.C.	Erlenborn	Hunt
Broyhill, Va.	Esch	Hutchinson
Burgener	Evans, Colo.	Jarman
Burke, Fla.	Evins, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.
Burke, Mass.	Fascell	Johnson, Colo.
Burleson, Tex.	Findley	Johnson, N.C.
Burlison, Mo.	Fisher	Jones, Okla.
Burton	Flood	Jordan
Butler	Flowers	Karth
Byron	Foley	Kastenmeier
Camp	Ford, Gerald R.	Keating
Carey, N.Y.	Fountain	Ketchum
Carney, Ohio	Fraser	Kluczynski
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Kuykendall
Casey, Tex.	Frenzel	Kyros
Cederberg	Fröhlich	Landgrebe
Chamberlain	Fulton	Latta
Chappell	Fuqua	Leggett
Clancy	Gaydos	Lehman
Clark	Gettys	Long, La.
Clausen,	Gialmo	
Don H.	Gibbons	

Long, Md.
Lott
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McFall
McSpadden
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinisky
Milford
Miller
Mills, Ark.
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
Patman
Perkins
Peyser
Pike
Poage
Podell
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rarick
Rees
Regula
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Roush
Roussellot
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Sebellus
Seiberling
Shoup
Shriver
Shuster
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton
J. William
Stanton,
James V.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—105

Addabbo
Alexander
Andrews, N.C.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Barrett
Bell
Biaggi
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Buchanan
Burke, Calif.
Chisholm
Conyers
Crane
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wls.
Delaney
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Drinan
Dulski
du Pont
Edwards, Calif.
Eshleman
Fish
Flynt
Ford
William D.
Forsythe
Frey
Gilman
Goldwater
Grasso
Gray
Green, Ore.
Grover
Hanley
Hanrahan
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harvey
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hollfield
Hudnut
Ichord
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Kemp
King
Koch
Landrum
Lent
Litton
McEwen
McKay
McKinney
Mailliard
Maraziti
Mills, Md.
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell

Stark
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Towell, Nev.
Treen
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

Mr. Hays with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Grover.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Mitchell of New York.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Mills of Maryland.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. King.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. du Pont.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Koch.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Hanrahan.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Parris.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Buchanan.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Dennis.
Mr. Aspin with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Drinan with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Gilman.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Rogers with Mr. Pritchard.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Ware.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Rotenkowski with Mr. Young of South Carolina.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Roy with Mrs. Burke of California.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Forsythe.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hudnut.
Mr. Price of Texas with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Saylor with Mr. Vander Jagt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 79, on H.R. 4586, to incorporate the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association, I was unavoidably detained; I was at the time taking care of a problem for a constituent downtown. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea." I would like to have the RECORD so show.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall No. 79, on H.R. 4586, to incorporate the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association. I would like to have the RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted "yea." I ask that this personal explanation be printed in the RECORD after the vote on the bill, H.R. 4586

INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON THE QUALIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 342) to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 342

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to enter into and execute on behalf of the District of Columbia an agreement with any State or States legally joining therein in the form substantially as follows:

"THE INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON QUALIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL"

"ARTICLE I—Purpose, Findings, and Policy

"1. The States party to this Agreement, desiring by common action to improve their respective school systems by utilizing the teacher or other professional educational person wherever educated, declare that it is the policy of each of them, on the basis of cooperation with one another, to take advantage of the preparation and experience of such persons wherever gained, thereby serving the best interests of society, of education, and of the teaching profession. It is the purpose of this Agreement to provide for the development and execution of such programs of cooperation as will facilitate the movement of teachers and other professional educational personnel among the States party to it, and to authorize specific interstate educational personnel contracts to achieve that end.

"2. The party States find that included in the large movement of population among all sections of the Nation are many qualified educational personnel who move for family and other personal reasons but who are hindered in using their professional skill and experience in their new locations. Variations from State to State in requirements for qualifying educational personnel discourage such personnel from taking the steps necessary to qualify in other States. As a consequence, a significant number of professionally prepared and experienced educators is lost to our school systems. Facilitating the employment of qualified educational personnel, without reference to their States of origin, can increase the available educational resources. Participation in this Agreement can increase the availability of educational manpower.

"ARTICLE II—Definitions

"As used in this Agreement and contract made pursuant to it, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

"1. 'Educational personnel' means persons who must meet requirements pursuant to State law as a condition of employment in educational programs.

"2. 'Designated State official' means the education official of a State selected by that State to negotiate and enter into, on behalf of his State, contracts pursuant to this Agreement.

"3. 'Accept', or any variant thereof, means to recognize and give effect to one or more determinations of another State relating to the qualifications of educational personnel

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Pettis,

in lieu of making or requiring a like determination that would otherwise be required by or pursuant to the laws of a receiving State.

"4. 'State' means a State, territory, or possession of the United States; the District of Columbia; or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"5. 'Originating State' means a State (and the subdivision thereof, if any) whose determination that certain educational personnel are qualified to be employed for specific duties in schools is acceptable in accordance with the terms of a contract made pursuant to Article III.

"6. 'Receiving State' means a State (and the subdivisions thereof) which accept educational personnel in accordance with the terms of a contract made pursuant to Article III.

"ARTICLE III—Interstate Educational Personnel Contracts

"1. The designated State official of a party State may make one or more contracts in behalf of his State with one or more other party States providing for the acceptance of educational personnel. Any such contract for the period of its duration shall be applicable to and binding on the States whose designated State officials enter into it, and the subdivisions of those States, with the same force and effect as if incorporated in this Agreement. A designated State official may enter into a contract pursuant to this Article only with States in which he finds that there are programs of education, certification standards or other acceptable qualifications that assure preparation or qualification of educational personnel on basis sufficiently comparable, even though not identical to that prevailing in his own State.

"2. Any such contract shall provide for:

"(a) Its duration.

"(b) The criteria to be applied by an originating State in qualifying educational personnel for acceptance by a receiving State.

"(c) Such waivers, substitutions, and conditional acceptances as shall aid the practical effectuation of the contract without sacrifice of basic educational standards.

"(d) Any other necessary matters.

"3. No contract made pursuant to this Agreement shall be for a term longer than five years by any such contract may be renewed for like or lesser periods.

"4. Any contract dealing with acceptance of educational personnel on the basis of their having completed an educational program shall specify the earliest date or dates on which originating State approval of the program or programs involved can have occurred. No contract made pursuant to this Agreement shall require acceptance by a receiving State of any person qualified because of successful completion of a program prior to January 1, 1954.

"5. The certification or other acceptance of a person who has been accepted pursuant to the terms of a contract shall not be revoked or otherwise impaired because the contract has expired or been terminated. However, any certificate or other qualifying document may be revoked or suspended on any ground which would be sufficient for revocation or suspension of a certificate or other qualifying document initially granted or approved in the receiving State.

"6. A contract committee composed of the designated State officials of the contracting States or their representatives shall keep the contract under continuous review, study means of improving its administration, and report no less frequently than once a year to the heads of the appropriate education agencies of the contracting States.

"ARTICLE IV—Approved and Accepted Programs

"1. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to repeal or otherwise modify any law or regulation of a party State relating

to the approval of programs of educational preparation having effect solely on the qualification of educational personnel within that State.

"2. To the extent that contracts made pursuant to this Agreement deal with the educational requirements for the proper qualification of educational personnel, acceptance of a program of educational preparation shall be in accordance with such procedures and requirements as may be provided in the applicable contract.

"ARTICLE V—Interstate Cooperation

"The party States agree that:

"1. They will, so far as practicable, prefer the making of multi-lateral contracts pursuant to Article III of this Agreement.

"2. They will facilitate and strengthen cooperation in interstate certification and other elements of educational personnel qualification and for this purpose shall cooperate with agencies, organizations, and associations interested in certification and other elements of educational personnel qualification.

"ARTICLE VI—Agreement Evaluation

"The designated State officials of any party States may meet from time to time as a group to evaluate progress under the Agreement, and to formulate recommendations for changes.

"ARTICLE VII—Other Arrangements

"Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to prevent or inhibit other arrangements or practices of any party State or States to facilitate the interchange of educational personnel.

"ARTICLE VIII—Effect and Withdrawal

"1. This Agreement shall become effective when enacted into law by two States. Thereafter it shall become effective as to any State upon its enactment of this Agreement.

"2. Any party State may withdraw from this Agreement by enacting a statute repealing the same, but no such withdrawal shall take effect until one year after the Governor of the withdrawing State has given notice in writing of the withdrawal to the Governors of all other party States.

"3. No withdrawal shall relieve the withdrawing State of any obligation imposed upon it by a contract to which it is a party. The duration of contracts and the methods and conditions of withdrawal therefrom shall be those specified in their terms.

"ARTICLE IX—Construction and Severability

"This Agreement shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this Agreement shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this Agreement is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States, or the application thereof to any Government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Agreement and the applicability thereof to any Government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this Agreement shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating therein, the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters."

Sec. 2. The "designated State Official" for the District of Columbia shall be the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia. The Superintendent shall enter into contracts pursuant to Article III of the Agreement only with the approval of the specific text thereof by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 3. True copies of all contracts made on behalf of the District of Columbia pursuant to the Agreement shall be kept on file in the office of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia and in the office of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia. The Superintendent of Schools shall publish all such contracts in convenient form.

Sec. 4. As used in the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel, the term "Governor" when used with reference to the District of Columbia shall mean the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks in explanation of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation—which is requested by the Government of the District of Columbia—is to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel, which has already been adopted by 29 States.

This will allow the District to enter into contracts with such member States, which will reduce or eliminate the duplication of administrative effort in checking teacher qualification records that have already been evaluated by competent authorities in other States, in connection with teachers and other educational personnel who are licensed in these other States and who apply for employment in the District of Columbia public school system, or vice versa. Consequently, faster processing of such teacher applications and more rapid identification of qualified applicants will result, thus increasing the available supply of qualified educational personnel. As many of the District's educational personnel come from other jurisdictions, this bill will facilitate the certification process and thereby improve as well as expedite the city's recruitment procedures.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

As the committee report (H. Rept. 93-99) states, certification and licensing of teachers already licensed or certified in other jurisdictions has always been a time-consuming, complicated, and cumbersome process both for the teacher and the certification officer. The re-evaluation of teacher records which have been evaluated already by competent authorities in other jurisdictions with similar standards is wasteful of the administrator's and teacher's time, energies, and skills.

Each State has its own system of laws and administrative practices governing the training, licensing, and certification of school personnel. As a result, all too often an experienced, fully certified teacher upon moving to another State will find that he or she fails to meet some technical certification specification in the new State. For example, the course taken in State A's teachers college entitled "Teaching in the Elementary Schools" may not meet State B's requirement of a course in "Methods of Teaching in the Elementary Schools," or the course may be only a 3-hour instead of a 4-hour course.

In concentrating on minor technicali-

ties, a school system's officials frequently must overlook the larger picture. The fact that the teacher applicant may have 10 years of successful experience and a master's degree in her field from a fully accredited teachers' college all too often cannot be considered. This is utterly unrealistic, in view of the fact that, generally speaking, the teaching of mathematics in California or New York requires substantially the same skills as teaching mathematics in Pennsylvania or the District of Columbia; and a properly trained school librarian in Nebraska is able to function just as ably in Idaho or Wisconsin. In short, the fact is that with only very limited exceptions, a person who is adequately prepared as a teacher or other school professional in one State should be capable of meeting the minimum skills and training required in another State.

INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON QUALIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

In 1966, a nationwide interstate certification project was begun, and a national plan was developed which would allow States, pursuant to enabling legislation, to enter into mutual agreements with other States regarding the acceptance of license or certification of educational personnel.

After intensive study and consultation among officials from State departments of education and other policymaking State officials, including substantial representation from various State legislatures, the interstate agreement was developed in its present form. This developmental process took 2 years to accomplish, and the first States enacted this interstate agreement in 1968. Today, 29 States are parties to this agreement, and many others have it under active consideration. Even though the benefits of this interstate agreement are nationwide as well as regional, it is important to note that all the District of Columbia's neighboring jurisdictions have enacted the measure.

The 29 States which have adopted the interstate agreement are the following: Alaska, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill is patterned directly from the interstate agreement. It is legally similar to many other enabling statutes allowing interstate agreements in other fields of State government responsibility. However, the provisions of H.R. 342 are less elaborate than those of many other interstate compacts. It sets up no new administrative body and requires no additional appropriation of funds to become effective. Its sole function is to provide the necessary legal authority for District of Columbia officials to contract with other State public education agencies regarding the mutual acceptance of out-of-State certification and licensing decisions regarding educational personnel.

The interstate agreement includes

safeguards to insure that it will not produce interstate acceptance of substandard educational personnel. Section 1 of article 3 of the agreement states that:

A designated State official may enter into a contract pursuant to this article only with States in which he finds that there are programs of education, certification standards, or other acceptable qualifications that assure preparation or qualification of education personnel on a basis sufficiently comparable, even though not identical, to that prevailing in his own State.

The contracts entered into under the agreement have the weight of law, and prescribe the methods under which the teacher qualifications of a signatory State can be accepted by other party States without the necessity for reexamination of such qualifications. The agreement specifies the minimum contents of such contracts in such a way as to assure the contracting States that standards employed for passing on such qualifications will remain at a high professional level.

HISTORY

Legislation identical to H.R. 342 was reported by this committee to the House in the 92d Congress (H.R. 8407, H. Rept. 92-332), and passed the House by vote of 324 to 4 on July 12, 1971.

This legislation was thereafter included in an omnibus bill, S. 1998, (S. Rept. 92-245), which passed the Senate on April 13, 1972, but the entire Senate package was not approved by your committee; and no hearings were held on the new Senate provisions added to the House provisions.

COSTS

No cost to the District of Columbia government will accrue as a result of the enactment of this legislation.

COMMITTEE VOTE

H.R. 342 was approved and ordered favorably reported to the House by voice vote of the committee members present.

HEARINGS

A public hearing on H.R. 342 was conducted on March 22, 1973, by the Subcommittee on Education, at which time testimony in favor of the legislation was submitted by spokesmen for the District of Columbia government, the District of Columbia public school system, and the Washington Teachers' Union. No opposition to the measure was expressed.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to my colleagues the bill H.R. 342, of which I am the author, and which will be of material assistance to the District of Columbia Board of Education in the matter of certifying and licensing teachers and other educational personnel who are licensed in other school jurisdictions and who wish to be employed in the District of Columbia public school system.

At present, in evaluating the qualifications of an applicant from another school system for certification and licensing in the District of Columbia public schools, the District of Columbia school administration must pursue a lengthy tedious, and somewhat costly process wherein the applicant's entire educational background must be measured against the

District's requirements for certification, in detail. This procedure includes an examination of detailed descriptions of academic course requirements which are part of teacher training programs, as well as a miscellaneous list of other statutory and administrative requirements. As a matter of fact, until about 5 years ago this long and laborious process was used in all State educational systems in evaluating teacher applicants from other State systems.

While the requirements for teacher certification and licensing in the various States and the District of Columbia do vary in some details, the main body of principles utilized in such evaluation is generally agreed upon by all school systems in determining teacher qualification. For this reason, it is a fact that with only a very few and limited exceptions, a person who is properly trained and adequately prepared as a teacher or other school professional employee in one State is equally qualified to perform satisfactorily in any other State system as well.

In recognition of this fact, a nationwide project was started in 1966, with a view toward developing a national plan of teacher certification which would allow the States, subject to enabling legislation, to enter into agreements with other States with respect to the mutual acceptance of certification of teachers and other educational personnel. After a developmental process which took 2 years of intensive study and consultation involving officials of many State departments of education and also other policymaking State officials, the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel was completed in its present form.

The first States entered into this agreement in 1968, and today 29 States have subscribed to this pact, including my own State of Virginia and the neighboring State of Maryland.

The contracts which this agreement authorizes between the member States have the force of law, and are required to spell out the methods and conditions under which teacher qualification standards of one State may be accepted by another State without the necessity of a reexamination and evaluation of such qualifications.

It is important to note that the agreement specifies the minimum contents of these interstate compacts so as to assure that the standards of mutual acceptance will be such as to assure the maintenance of high standards of teacher qualification in all member States.

H.R. 342 is simply enabling legislation, which will permit the District of Columbia to enter into contracts with the member States through the interstate agreement, and thus enable the District of Columbia Board of Education for the first time to recognize decisions on teacher qualification which have already been made by competent educational authorities in the party States. And, at the same time, as I have pointed out, safeguards are provided which will assure that such procedures will not lead the District to accept substandard educational personnel.

This legislation will involve no addi-

tional expense to the District of Columbia government. On the contrary, some saving will undoubtedly result from the elimination of the present detailed and lengthy procedure with respect to evaluating teacher applicants who are licensed in other school systems.

I sponsored an identical bill in the last Congress (H.R. 8407), which was approved by this body on December 22, 1971, by a rollcall vote of 324 to 4. However, this measure was incorporated into an omnibus Senate bill subsequent to that time, which our committee did not have time to consider properly prior to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on this proposed legislation, which will provide the means by which the District of Columbia public school system may join this nationwide movement to standardize the procedure of evaluating teacher applicants who are licensed elsewhere, to the benefit of all concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last six words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) a question, but first let me give a little background.

In the past it has been represented to the House of Representatives that some 35 to 37 percent of the teachers of the District of Columbia were teaching with temporary certificates.

Will this bill have anything to do with altering that situation, which appears to me to be a rather sad one? In other words, will this bill change the number of teachers who are teaching in the District of Columbia on temporary certificates?

Mr. DELLUMS. I would only suggest to my distinguished colleague from Iowa that all this would do, if the District of Columbia entered into these agreements, would speed up the licensing and certification process; but with respect to the direct question the gentleman asked, the answer is "No."

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman from California is correct that this bill does not change the standards one iota. It does not require the District government to enter into these agreements, but does permit them to enter into the agreements if the standards of the other systems are at least equivalent to those of the District of Columbia; so it makes no change whatsoever insofar as the qualifications of the teachers are concerned.

Mr. GROSS. This would not mean, then, that the teachers in the District of Columbia, in the numbers that have been teaching on temporary certificates, unable to qualify for permanent certificates, could be unloaded on the State of Virginia? It would not mean that; would it?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That would be up to the State of Virginia if they wanted to enter into an agreement with the District of Columbia to accept the qualifications of their educational system as being the minimum qualifications for the State of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

There was no objection.

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.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. 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 331, nays 1, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—331

Abdnor	Coughlin	Hillis
Abzug	Cronin	Hinshaw
Adams	Culver	Hogan
Alexander	Daniel, Dan	Holt
Anderson	Daniel, Robert	Holtzman
Calif.	W., Jr.	Horton
Anderson, Ill.	Danielson	Hosmer
Andrews	Davis, Ga.	Howard
N. Dak.	Davis, S.C.	Huber
Annunzio	de la Garza	Hudnut
Arends	Dellenback	Hungate
Armstrong	Dellums	Hunt
Bafalis	Dent	Hutchinson
Baker	Devine	Jarman
Beard	Dickinson	Johnson, Calif.
Bennett	Donohue	Johnson, Colo.
Bergland	Dorn	Johnson, Pa.
Bevill	Downing	Jones, N.C.
Blester	Duncan	Jones, Okla.
Blackburn	Eckhardt	Jordan
Boggs	Edwards, Ala.	Karth
Boland	Ellberg	Kastenmeier
Bowen	Erlenborn	Kazen
Brasco	Esch	Keating
Bray	Evans, Colo.	Ketchum
Breaux	Fascell	Kluczynski
Breckinridge	Findley	Kuykendall
Brinkley	Fisher	Kyros
Brooks	Flood	Landgrebe
Broomfield	Flowers	Latta
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Leggett
Brown, Mich.	Ford, Gerald R.	Lehman
Brown, Ohio	Forsythe	Long, La.
Broyhill, N.C.	Fountain	Long, Md.
Broyhill, Va.	Fraser	Lott
Burgener	Frelinghuysen	Lujan
Burke, Fla.	Frenzel	McClary
Burke, Mass.	Freelich	McCloskey
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton	McCollister
Burlison, Mo.	Fuqua	McCormack
Burton	Gaydos	McDade
Butler	Gettys	McFall
Byron	Gialmo	McSpadden
Camp	Gibbons	Macdonald
Carey, N.Y.	Ginn	Madden
Carney, Ohio	Gonzalez	Madigan
Carter	Goodling	Mahon
Casey, Tex.	Green, Pa.	Mann
Cederberg	Griffiths	Martin, Nebr.
Chamberlain	Gross	Martin, N.C.
Chappell	Gubser	Mathias, Calif.
Ciancy	Gude	Mathis, Ga.
Clark	Gunter	Matsunaga
Clausen	Guyer	Mayne
Don H.	Haley	Mazzoli
Clawson, Del	Hamilton	Meeds
Clay	Hammer-	Melcher
Cleveland	schmidt	Metcalfe
Cochran	Hanna	Mezvisky
Cohen	Hansen, Wash.	Michel
Collier	Harsha	Milford
Collins	Hastings	Miller
Conable	Heckler, W. Va.	Mills, Ark.
Conlan	Heckler, Mass.	Minish
Corn	Heinz	Mink
Corman	Helstoski	Mitchell, Md.
Cotter	Henderson	Moakley
	Hicks	Mollohan

Montgomery	Rooney, Pa.	Studds
Moorhead,	Rose	Sullivan
Calif.	Rosenthal	Symington
Morgan	Roush	Symms
Mosher	Roussetot	Talcott
Moss	Roybal	Taylor, N.C.
Murphy, Ill.	Runnels	Teague, Calif.
Murphy, N.Y.	Ruppe	Thomson, Wis.
Myers	Ruth	Thone
Natcher	Ryan	Thornton
Nedzi	St Germain	Towell, Nev.
Nelsen	Sandman	Treen
Nichols	Sarasin	Udall
Ober	Sarbanes	Vander Jagt
O'Brien	Satterfield	Vank
O'Hara	Saylor	Veysey
Patman	Scherle	Vigorito
Pepper	Schneebell	Waldie
Perkins	Schroeder	Wampler
Peyser	Sebelius	Whalen
Pike	Seiberling	White
Poage	Shoup	Whitehurst
Podell	Shriver	Whitten
Powell, Ohio	Shuster	Widnall
Preyer	Sikes	Wiggins
Price, Ill.	Sisk	Williams
Price, Tex.	Skubitz	Wilson
Quie	Slack	Charles H., Calif.
Quillen	Smith, Iowa	Wilson, Calif.
Rallsback	Smith, N.Y.	Charles, Tex.
Randall	Snyder	Winn
Rangel	Spence	Wright
Rees	Staggers	Wyatt
Regula	Stanton,	Wyllie
Reid	J. William	Wyman
Reuss	Stanton,	Yates
Rhodes	James V.	Yatron
Riegle	Stark	Young, Alaska
Rinaldo	Steele	Young, Fla.
Roberts	Steelman	Young, Ga.
Robinson, Va.	Steiger, Ariz.	Young, Ill.
Robison, N.Y.	Stephens	Young, Tex.
Rodino	Stokes	Zablocki
Roe	Stratton	Zion
Roncalio, Wyo.	Stubblefield	Zwack
Roncallo, N.Y.	Stuckey	

NAYS—1

Rarick

NOT VOTING—101

Addabbo	Flynt	Minshall, Ohio
Andrews, N.C.	Ford	Mitchell, N.Y.
Archer	William D.	Mizell
Ashbrook	Frey	Moorhead, Pa.
Ashley	Gilman	Nix
Aspin	Goldwater	O'Neill
Badillo	Grasso	Owens
Barrett	Gray	Parris
Bell	Green, Oreg.	Passman
Blaggi	Grover	Patten
Bingham	Hanley	Pettis
Blatnik	Hanrahan	Pickle
Bolling	Hansen, Idaho	Pritchard
Brademas	Harrington	Rogers
Buchanan	Harvey	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Calif.	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Chisholm	Hays	Roy
Conyers	Hébert	Shipley
Crane	Hollifield	Steed
Daniels	Ichord	Steiger, Wis.
Dominick V.	Jones, Ala.	Taylor, Mo.
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Tenn.	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	Kemp	Thompson, N.J.
Denholm	King	Tiernan
Dennis	Koch	Ullman
Derwinski	Landrum	Van Derlin
Diggs	Lent	Waggoner
Dingell	Litton	Walsh
Drinan	McEwen	Ware
Dulski	McKay	Wilson, Bob
du Pont	McKinney	Wolf
Edwards, Calif.	Mailliard	Wydler
Eshleman	Mallory	Young, S.C.
Evins, Tenn.	Maraziti	
Fish	Mills, Md.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Grover.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Mitchell of New York.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Mills of Maryland.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. King.

Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Lent.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Crane.

Mr. Patten with Mr. Maraziti.
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. du Pont.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Koch.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Hanrahan.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. McKay with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Denholm with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Litton with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Mizell.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Parris.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Owens.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Edwards of California.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Dennis.
 Mr. Aspin with Mr. McKinney.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Kemp.
 Mr. Drinan with Mr. William D. Ford.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Mailliard.
 Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Gilman.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Rogers with Mr. Pritchard.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.
 Mr. Waggoner with Mr. Walsh.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Ware.
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Young of South Carolina.
 Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Bingham.
 Mr. Wolff with Mr. Wyder.
 Mr. Roy with Mrs. Burke of California.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Archer.
 Mr. Evans of Tennessee with Mr. Mallary.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Van Deerlin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECRETARY ROGERS ADDRESSES OAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Organization of American States is presently holding its third regular general assembly session here in Washington. As a congressional member of the U.S. delegation, I was pleased to be present Friday to hear the head of the U.S. delegation, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, speak on behalf of the United States.

As many in Congress are aware, there is increasing concern in Latin America over U.S. policy toward the area and over the future of the OAS. In his speech, Secretary Rogers spoke forcefully and candidly of this Nation's hopes and concerns for future hemisphere cooperation.

Because of the importance of Secretary Rogers' remarks, I want to call the speech to the attention of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, APRIL 6, 1973

Mr. President, Distinguished Ministers, Mr. Secretary General, members of delegations, observers and advisers: On behalf of President Nixon, the members of my delegation and myself, I wish to extend to you, Mr. President, our sincerest congratulations

on your election as President of this Assembly. We are fortunate to have a man of your experience and wisdom to guide our efforts, and I join all of my colleagues in underscoring what they said about how fortunate we are to have you as our President at this important meeting.

This year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the Organization of American States. Twenty-five years is perhaps a short period in the life of nations which have enjoyed over a century and a half of productive relations.

We all are aware, nevertheless, as has been mentioned here this morning and yesterday, of how profoundly the world has changed in those twenty-five years. The hostilities and rigidities that characterized international relations then are being left behind. The restructuring of world politics has been accompanied by an even more profound change in the world economy. Europe and Japan have recovered economically and are very strong now. Many nations in the developing world, including nations in Latin America, have achieved both substantial economic growth and self-confidence.

These are changes which have an effect on all members of this Organization. My nation has been deeply involved in many of them. The nations of Latin America have broadened their global economic and political involvement. Today, more than ever, we are all influenced by the broad currents of world development.

It was in this context that in 1969 President Nixon enunciated a new United States policy for Latin America. That policy reflected, we believe, the changes in global and hemispheric relations which had already begun. It anticipated other changes in global economics and politics to come. As the President described it in his Foreign Policy Report last year, the Policy reflected four positive themes. They are:

"A wider sharing of ideas and responsibility in hemispheric collaboration;

"A mature United States response to political diversity and Nationalism;

"A practical and concrete United States contribution to economic and social development; and

"A humanitarian concern for the quality of life in the hemisphere."

And, as President Nixon said in his letter to the President of the General Assembly the other day, we are moving away, we have moved away, from a policy of paternalism. Now, it is inevitable, I suppose, that in this change of policy—which we think is desirable, and which I believe all of you think is desirable—it may seem to some that we are less interested in the affairs of the hemisphere. That is not the case. We remain just as interested as ever, but we are trying to be sure that we do not overstate what we can do; because, as has been said here this morning and on several other occasions, it is undoubtedly true that we did represent that we could do more than we were able to do.

Secondly, as the nations of Latin America become more interested in global affairs, it is only natural that there will be differences among us.

The policy that we are speaking of is in keeping with our desire for continued close association with the hemisphere and with the less intrusive international role we have adopted and that the people of the United States have endorsed. It is a policy which reflects Latin America's claim and capacity to a greater voice in hemispheric affairs, and I think it is very healthy to have the discussion we have been having here the last two days, to see the initiatives that are being taken by member states about how we can improve this Organization. We welcome that.

It is a policy, we are convinced, that outlines a constructive approach to sound relations. With progress made toward a more peaceful world generally, we are now in a po-

sition to give our relations with you more constant attention, more consistent attention.

Over the next four years we will continue to work closely with you on the many issues before the global community in which the United States and Latin America might develop convergent interests; we will concentrate within the hemisphere on building upon areas of cooperation; we will maintain our support of your efforts to bring a better life to your citizens, channeling the bulk of our assistance through multilateral institutions while at the same time seeking to expand Latin America's access to trade and investment opportunities; we will approach our bilateral relations on the basis of how you conduct your relations with us—that is maturity in international affairs—and not on how you structure your societies internally. We fully accept that proposition, but we also point out that nations naturally react to how other nations treat them. That is maturity in international affairs.

Close cooperation between us on global issues could be particularly constructive. Many of the opportunities and challenges before us can no longer be met in the hemisphere alone. Solutions must be found in the world community. On many such issues, United States and Latin American interests tend to converge; on some they coincide.

Latin America and the United States, can, in particular, be of assistance to each other in improving the world monetary system—that has been mentioned here—and trading systems, to assure that trade and capital move with a minimum of restrictions and that all nations share equitably in an expanding world economy.

President Nixon will shortly be proposing to the Congress broad new trade legislation which will include the authority we need to carry out a policy of expanded and more equitable world trade in the talks which start this fall.

During those talks, we believe that United States and Latin American delegations should establish a system of liaison, for we believe we share a number of common purposes which we can promote together. We should, for example, be able to cooperate on a number of concrete issues:

We both will want to reduce barriers to agricultural trade. Latin America relies on agriculture for over half of its export earnings. The United States, unique among the industrialized nations, exports 31 per cent of its crop. The removal of restrictive practices against agricultural exports would benefit us all.

We share an interest in the elimination of preferential arrangements which discriminate against one group of developing countries in favor of another or in favor of a few industrialized countries. Such exclusive arrangements have already prejudiced some exports from this hemisphere. Their extension will prejudice others. Neither Latin America nor the United States wants a Western Hemisphere trading bloc, nor have we ever found any bloc system to be a beneficial approach to our roles in international trade.

We would all benefit from a reduction or an elimination of administrative barriers—trade barriers, non-tariff barriers, if you will—which are used to impede artificially the growth of imports.

I should add that it is important that the GATT session be a time of serious negotiation and not of confrontation. We will approach it in that way, and will seek to ensure that the needs of developing countries are taken fully into account. We recognize, of course, that the countries of Latin America will share many trade interests in these talks with other developing nations—and of you and of us—will diverge at some points. We will have differences on those points. But it is essential that these differences not be allowed to deteriorate into the kind of sterile

disputes that characterized the last meeting of UNCTAD. Latin American countries could provide leadership at the GATT session by encouraging all states to concentrate upon the achievement of concrete economic results and to avoid political issues more appropriate to other forums.

The trade negotiations must, of course, take place in a single forum—the GATT. But we believe that joint participation there could be made more effective through further discussion among us on trade issues in the Special Committee for Consultation and Negotiation.

In other words, we believe that there is a great opportunity to work together on matters of trade, because in most areas our interests are the same. We will have some differences, as all of you will have differences among yourselves, but we have many common interests, and these negotiations on trade this fall therefore provide us with a real, practical way of improving trade which will benefit this hemisphere.

Let me talk for a minute about monetary matters.

As the recent meeting of the Finance Ministers of the Committee of Twenty has shown, the United States and the States of Latin America also share a number of convergent interests in world monetary talks. We worked closely with Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico in those talks, and we expect to continue to work with the nations of Latin America to seek a monetary system that will: foster balance-of-payments adjustments by all countries, surplus and deficit, large and small; make Special Drawing Rights the principal reserve instrument and the common denominator in the system; and recognize the interdependence of domestic and international economic policies, including the critical role of inflation control. And we are pleased, as you undoubtedly know, that we have been able to keep our inflation at the lowest rate of any of the industrialized nations.

The law of the sea is another international issue where we can cooperate to achieve concrete and constructive results. Speaking in 1970 on the law of the sea, President Nixon said that if it is not modernized by common action, unilateral actions and international conflict are inevitable. Three years have further confirmed that we must reach an international agreement.

Nations in Latin America, as elsewhere in the world, have adopted diverse stands on many of the issues involved. This diversity reflects such factors as whether or not they are coastal states, whether they have a large or small continental shelf, whether they possess significant maritime interests, whether they have extensive or limited resources adjacent to their coasts. That is natural. But while interests are diverse, we earnestly hope that all the nations of the world, including most especially those of this hemisphere, can concur that each nation's interests ultimately can be protected only by international agreement. And we hope that we all will be prepared to make the accommodations necessary to build a broadly-based international agreement.

In our opinion, an international, consensus is emerging on many of the issues involved. Certainly it is our hope that most states would be able at an early date to agree on:

(1) A broad, coastal-state economic jurisdiction, beyond a twelve-mile territorial sea, in which freedom of navigation and overflight would continue;

(2) The right of free transit through and over international straits;

(3) An international agreement, including machinery for the deep-seabed area; and international standards, together with compulsory settlement of disputes, for areas under coastal-state economic jurisdiction.

Some states of the hemisphere favor a territorial sea broader than twelve miles. However, we hope that the common interest in

freedom of navigation and a common recognition of the economic and security needs of coastal states and the international community would lead all of us to agreement on a twelve-mile territorial sea. We then could concentrate on the extent and nature of a coastal-state economic jurisdiction which would accommodate the interests of all states. In other words, we believe that is the area where a settlement can be achieved that will certainly take into account the interests of the states around this table.

If this is the case, we believe that it should be possible for the nations of this hemisphere to make a major contribution to an agreement which can be widely accepted, which will benefit us all, and which will eliminate present and potential conflicts. As we approach the Law of the Sea Conference we would hope to intensify our consultations with each of you to help advance the international consensus we believe is emerging.

Let me turn now to the subject of terrorism. The Inter-American System has often led the international community in devising agreed approaches to common problems. The OAS Convention on acts of terrorism of international significance was the first important international development or effort to prevent and punish crimes of violence against the representatives of states and international organizations. The United States Senate has approved the Convention, and we will be in a position to deposit our instrument of ratification as soon as the implementing legislation is passed by our Congress. We hope other signatory nations will act promptly to ratify it and that the OAS members which have not yet signed will be able to give their support.

Having led the way as we did in arriving at an international approach to confronting terrorism, the Americas, we hope, can now actively cooperate in similar efforts to provide a broader international consensus. We see three areas where we can exert constructive leadership together:

By making civil aviation safer by agreeing at this summer's Civil Aviation Conference to deny refuge to those who commit terrorist acts against international civil aviation;

By protecting diplomats through opening for signature at the next United Nations General Assembly a convention based on the draft articles submitted by the International Law Commission; and

By thwarting the spread of terrorism through assuring that the *ad hoc* United Nations Committee recommends to the next United Nations General Assembly an international convention providing for extradition or punishment in cases of international terrorism.

I hope that our delegations can all be instructed to work together toward these important objectives.

I would like to turn now to two areas in which cooperation within the hemisphere itself remains important. I refer to Inter-American cooperation for development and to the status of inter-American institutions.

We are all aware of how central economic relationships are to the health of our cooperation. In programs directed to the hemisphere we will continue our support for efforts to bring a better life to the citizens of your countries.

In recent years, I believe we all have come to the conclusion that development demands a comprehensive approach which includes dimensions other than official assistance. We now are specifically directing our own efforts to ensure that all aspects of the development process are taken into account. Thus, I have asked our new Under Secretary for Economic Affairs to coordinate a comprehensive development policy—including development assistance, international investment, debt relief, trade expansion and population growth—so that the United States may better support a more rapid *per capita* economic growth in the developing world.

We concur in the view expressed in the re-

cent meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Special Council, that expanded trade can be the most important element in this process. In fact, the document that emerged from the Bogotá meeting contained many important ideas which we support.

Particularly because of our support for accelerated development in Latin America, we will also include in the trade bill we are submitting to the Congress next week a request for authority to extend generalized tariff preferences for developing countries. It is important for us to note that, while it was necessary for us to delay action on generalized tariff preferences, our imports from Latin America nevertheless have been growing substantially for a number of years and last year rose 18 per cent.

I am not today in a position to tell you the details of the trade bill until it is presented to our Congress next week. However, I will be pleased to make myself available to any of you who would like to talk about it, and I will have our Under Secretary for Economic Affairs available to describe to you all aspects of this legislative proposal.

Foreign private investment can also make a major contribution to development. The United States benefited from it during our own development, and we expect increasing European and Japanese investment in our economy over the next few years. Today, as never before, other countries in this hemisphere which seek such investment can also draw it not only from the United States but also from Europe and Japan. We welcome that trend.

Countries must, of course, decide for themselves whether they want to attract such investment and how much, and in what forms; and of course you will set for yourselves the rules under which the investor operates. I have heard of many statements here that sounded to me a bit as if you felt that we had some reservations about that. We have none at all. Obviously, that is the way it should be. Every sovereign nation should decide for itself whether it wants foreign investments, how much, and in what manner, and what rules should be applied to the foreign investments. We fully accept that. We think it is highly desirable for everybody to understand it. Because we believe private capital can be a major contribution to development and because we know it will move freely only if there is confidence that the agreements will be observed. We hope that when rules are established they will be lived up to. That is why we continue to insist on just compensation in cases of nationalization in accordance with the policy announced last January. At the same time, the United States government is committed to the pacific settlement of disputes by the procedures set forth in Article 24 of the Charter and will cooperate fully with any government that wishes to solve a problem on fair terms that respect the interests of both sides. In most cases, various procedures are possible, but the point of departure for any solution is good-faith negotiation in a spirit of compromise.

Grant and loan assistance also continues to have an important role in development. We intend to carry out our bilateral and multilateral assistance commitments. Thus, we are proceeding this spring with a request to our Congress for the next installment of \$693 million in our contribution to the replenishment of the Inter-American Development Bank. Though it is unrealistic to project increases, we will make every effort to maintain our total assistance flows to Latin America at their present levels. It is often overlooked that total development assistance commitments to Latin America from the United States bilateral programs, the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank have increased from \$900 million in 1964 to \$1.8 billion in 1972. I would like to say that again, we have doubled assistance in eight years.

Perhaps the most easily controlled variable in accelerating the growth of *per capita*

income is the rate of population increase. Latin America's population is still expanding at approximately 2.8 per cent a year, the highest rate in the world. Thus, despite the fact that the area's gross product has recently been expanding at over 6 per cent a year, increases in population have cut the per capita gains to just over 3 per cent. This is an area where we believe more rapid progress can be made.

Not all nations of the hemisphere share our deep concern for the effects of too rapid population growth. But we can all be pleased that the former Foreign Secretary of Mexico, Dr. Carrillo Flores, will be the executive director of the United Nations World Population Year in 1974. And we were encouraged to see that at the recent meeting of the Latin American Ministers of Health, agreement was reached that governments should provide family-planning services and information wherever national policies permit.

The changes that have taken place in global economics and politics have also brought us to a new period in inter-American relations. In the immediate future we will all be reassessing the multilateral structures through which they are conducted.

In this connection, some of you see an anomaly in the static nature of our relations with Cuba at a time when we are moving in such positive directions with Moscow and Peking. There is an anomaly, but we believe it lies in Cuba's attitudes, not in United States policy. The dramatic progress in our relations with China and the dramatic progress in our relations with the Soviet Union could not have come about except as a result of mutuality. Thus far, we perceive no change in Cuba's basic position. At a time when the world is putting enmity behind it, Cuba continues to place an antagonistic and interventionist attitude at the center of its policy. Its military ties remain.

Though there have been shifts in Cuba's behavior in the hemisphere, the changes do not seem to us now to reflect a modification of its basic policies towards other American states. We are aware that while many in this organization take a similar view, others have different opinions. But we have so far seen no evidence of change in Cuban policies sufficient to convince us that the OAS economic and diplomatic measures toward Cuba should be altered.

For all these reasons, our policy toward Cuba remains unchanged, as does our commitment to act only in concert with other members of the OAS.

Indeed, our intention is to work in concert with the OAS whenever possible. That is why we attach significance to the important items 9 and 10 on our agenda. Those items, proposed by the Secretary General of this Organization and by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Venezuela, reflect a desire to move away from the unproductive atmosphere which has recently been too frequent and to move toward means of working for common purposes. This is also evident in the mission undertaken by the President of CIAP.

As we seek together to expand our collaboration and minimize contention between us, we are prepared to work with all member states to improve the OAS: We will study any suggestions made here or in the committee which may be established, and we will have some suggestions of our own.

But ultimately, the success of this or any other organization will be defined not by its structure but by the attitudes brought to it by its membership. Thus, in examining the OAS we will in fact be studying the "spirit of the hemisphere". The United States does not believe that this spirit implies an obligation to agree to all issues. But it does believe that the spirit must take into account certain realities: the reality that many issues cannot be resolved within the Inter-American framework; the reality that there are practical limits to new United States

commitments; the reality that most problems within a country must be solved by the country itself; that a beneficial, cooperative relationship among nations requires mutual respect. We will work cooperatively with each nation in this Organization on the basis of mutuality; I promise you that. The United States believes that the spirit that brings us together in this room must rest on the proposition that honest differences can and should be negotiated. It is the attitude of cooperation, accommodation and reciprocal adjustment that has made our association fruitful in the past; it is an attitude that can enable us to reap new benefits in the future.

The United States thus welcomes the opportunity to enter into a constructive review of hemispheric relations. We see 1973 as a year of building. Now that the world is a safer place, there are energies, talents, and resources that can be turned to other purposes. Latin America will have a high place on our agenda. I will participate personally in this effort and expect in the next few months to fulfill my long-standing desire to visit Latin America, and to exchange points of view with many of you in your own capitals. In taking that trip I will be motivated by a constructive desire to make our association as firm, as realistic, and as equitable as friends can make it.

This meeting of the OAS General Assembly could have a decisive influence on the future of our community. If that influence is to be constructive, we should concentrate on areas where our interests converge. If we do so we will find it easier to resolve those issues on which we have differences. Over the years, our community has shown both flexibility and imagination in meeting the changed demands of changing times. It is the hope of my government that this meeting and what follows it will reaffirm and strengthen the ties between us so that we can continue to realize the benefits that derive from our association in this significant Organization of American States.

WELFARE BENEFITS

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday, April 1, edition of the Washington Post, the Parade magazine intelligence report carried an article entitled "The Truth About Welfare." This article was based upon information supplied by COPE—Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO. I was quite surprised to see that a national publication would base an article about the welfare system on a source whose ideological and political inclination has always been toward the expansion of the welfare system.

In examining the article, I readily ascertained that the figures were based upon erroneous information which had been issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare during 1971. On December 1, 1971, I wrote to the Comptroller General of the United States, Elmer Staats, requesting that he review the information as found in HEW's publication "Welfare Myths Versus Facts." The information carried in the pamphlet is similar, if not identical, to that in Parade's article.

At this time, I would like to point out

several inaccuracies and flaws found in the article.

First. The article stated that—

Less than 1 percent—about 150,000—of the welfare recipients are able-bodied employable males.

GAO reported to me:

HEW stated in the pamphlet that the terms "welfare" referred to the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. The 13-million figure, however, refers to recipients of all types of public assistance authorized by the Social Security Act—aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, as well as AFDC. If only the April 1971 AFDC figure (10.2 million) were used, the percentage of able-bodied unemployed males would be 1.2 percent. According to HEW estimates the 126,000 able-bodied unemployed males represent about 38.8 percent of the total number of males (323,000) who received federally supported AFDC public assistance in April 1971. In HEW's opinion the remaining males (197,000) were incapacitated and were not fit for work. We believe that this information gives the reader a better perspective to judge the employment problem of male welfare recipients.

Second. The article stated:

Cheating and fraud in welfare are minimal. . . . But the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates there is cheating among fewer than one percent of welfare cases. Add to this another two to three percent on the rolls due to misunderstanding or technical-bureaucratic error, and there is an upper range of four to five percent receiving benefits who are either completely or partially ineligible.

With regard to fraud or misrepresentation, GAO stated:

The HEW rate of four-tenths of 1 percent applies to all public assistance programs—not just to AFDC. HEW's percentage rate for fraud for the AFDC program was six-tenths of 1 percent during fiscal year 1970 the six-tenths of 1 percent represented cases that not only were suspected of fraud but also were supported by facts sufficient to raise questions of fraud. In addition, eight-tenths of 1 percent of the cases were suspected of fraud but the facts were insufficient to pursue fraud proceedings. Since the pamphlet uses the words "suspected incidents," it appears that it would have been appropriate to combine the two percentage rates and to state that the suspected fraud rate for the AFDC program was 1.4 percent.

They went on to state:

Although we did not evaluate the data used by HEW to arrive at the 1 to 2 percent cited in the pamphlet, HEW experience has indicated that State reports on ineligibility have not represented valid statistical findings regarding total case-load ineligibility. Therefore HEW was not able to accurately project nationwide ineligibility rates. Data released by HEW on January 3, 1972, indicate that approximately 5.6 percent of the Nation's AFDC families and 4.9 percent of the aged, blind, and disabled were ineligible for the payments they received in April 1971. Although HEW did not have this information available at the time the pamphlet was prepared, we believe that these data present a more accurate picture of the ineligibility rates existing today than do the percentage rates cited in the pamphlet.

Third. The article stated:

A government study shows more than 80 percent want to work, rather than draw welfare.

GAO stated:

The HEW statement clearly implies that 80 percent of all able-bodied unemployed males in the Nation who receive public as-

assistance want to work. The supporting data, however, were taken from a statistical study of only three metropolitan areas—Camden, New Jersey; Los Angeles, California; and Milwaukee, Wisconsin—and should not be used to imply nationwide attitudes. The HEW statement therefore may convey an incorrect impression.

Fourth. The article stated:

More than 48 percent of welfare families are white; about 43 percent are black.

The GAO statement said:

According to HEW data the correct percentage of white AFDC families is 48, rather than 49 percent. We believe that the general impression conveyed by the HEW statement is that the majority of AFDC recipients are white. According to the 1969 data, however, 46.6 percent of all AFDC recipients were black, 46.2 percent were white, and 7.2 percent were of other races or their races were not shown. We believe that the reader would have a better understanding of the racial composition of the AFDC case load if HEW had used the statistics for recipients and for families. (Emphasis supplied).

Fifth. The article stated:

There is no evidence to sustain the belief that welfare is necessarily habit-forming, that is that "once on welfare, always on welfare." Half the families on welfare have been on the rolls 20 months or less; two thirds have been on the rolls less than three years.

GAO stated:

The term "about two years" can be misleading. The 2-year figure is a median—meaning that as many families were on welfare for more than 2 years as were on welfare for less than 2 years—and is not an appropriate average. If a weighted mean—in our opinion a more typical average—were used, the average AFDC family would be on welfare for 42 months from the time that it last began receiving assistance. Many recipients, however, have received assistance for longer periods of time. HEW statistics show that about 40 percent of all AFDC recipients had been on welfare prior to their most recent return to the rolls. Statistics are not available to indicate how long these recipients were on welfare prior to their most recent receipt of assistance. Thus we believe that the statement "about two years" tends to mislead an uninformed reader. HEW officials advised us that the pamphlet would be revised to clarify the statement regarding the number of months a recipient was on welfare.

Then went on to state:

The term "23 months" can be misleading because the 23-month figure is a median. Our earlier discussion concerning the use of a median, rather than the use of a weighted mean, applies also to this HEW statement. This should be clarified.

Sixth. The article stated:

Nearly 70 percent of all children in welfare families are legitimate.

With regard to legitimate children, the GAO report stated:

According to the data used in the 1969 AFDC study, the 68-percent figure is correct. The same data, however, show that 55 percent of all AFDC families have no illegitimate children. We believe that the reader would have gained a better perspective of the illegitimacy issue if, in addition to pointing out the number of children, the pamphlet had mentioned the number of AFDC families that had no illegitimate children. HEW data also indicates that there were about 5 million children in welfare families in 1969—when the illegitimacy rate used in the pamphlet was developed. The 7-million figure in the pamphlet is an April 1971 figure. HEW officials advised us that the 7-million figure had been used to convey a more up-

to-date picture of the case load. Since the legitimacy percentage (68 percent) was based on 1969 data, we believe that it would have been more correct to use the 5-million figure and to point out that it represented the situation in 1969.

Seventh. The article stated:

Maximum payments for a family of four range from \$700 a year in Mississippi to \$3,600+ in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

Recent studies by Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, show that the figures are misleading. When computing the total welfare benefits one should include the fact that welfare families receive their food at approximately one-tenth of the cost paid by an average family and their housing at about one-fourth of the cost paid by an average family. Considering that the average American family spends about 45 percent of its income for food and shelter, this fact in itself is significant. Furthermore, many welfare families receive free medical care, free breakfasts and lunches for their children, and compensation for uniforms and travel to and from work.

Some States distribute even more benefits than this. An excellent example is reported by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee: A couple in an eastern city supporting a young child and the wife's teenaged brother receive benefits from six sources: \$21 per month AFDC, \$83 per month general assistance, \$34 per month in food stamps, \$123 per month Medicaid, \$106 per month for public housing, \$18 per month for neighborhood youth corps. These benefits total to \$385 per month, and with the family's earning for the month of \$429, we obtain a grand total for this family on welfare of \$814 per month.

The article in the Washington Post implies that welfare recipients receive meager allotments from the States and many can barely make ends meet. However, a study prepared by the Union County Welfare Board of New Jersey shows what a welfare family can receive. This study stated:

Under the "Financial Assistance Manual" which provides for the monetary standards and rates in the public assistance categorical programs, the allowances are based on family size; therefore, the allowance for one adult and ten children is \$627. This is an all-inclusive figure which covers shelter and utilities as well as the basic and personal items. In addition thereto, this particular family, in participating in the Food Stamp Program, has a purchase requirement of \$130 per month. They receive \$212 a month in food stamps which grants them a bonus of \$82 per month. The public assistance figure of \$627 times 12 equals \$7,524 and with the bonus of \$82 a month for food stamps times 12 months, we arrive at a figure of \$984; therefore, the total for both these items is \$8,508. In addition, medical services are provided to all recipients of public assistance through the Division of Medical Assistance and Health Services (Medicaid). It is difficult to approximate on each individual case exactly what the medical costs are monthly or even annually, but I would assume it is a safe guess that at least \$2,000 a year are spent when you have a family size of eleven.

I might also point out that those wel-

fare families that have some form of income still receive a very generous amount from the welfare agencies. The welfare inspector general of the State of New York has recently compiled figures on various cases showing the amount received by these welfare families. Let me bring to your attention a few:

Case A: Family composition—family is composed of client and her two children. Client's basic needs are: Flat grant for mother and two children—\$161; Shelter—\$165; and adding child care which amounts to \$110, this amounts to \$436.

Following are the exemptions from earned income computed on monthly basis:

Gross earned income	\$455.00
Allowable exemption under ADC	171.00
(First 30 plus 1/2 of remainder)	
Deductions, social security, taxes	144.36
Lunch	21.66
Total expenses relating to employment	425.82
Net income	29.18
Basic needs	326.00
Support	65.00
Net income	29.18
Total income	231.82
Gross earned income	455.00
Monthly grant	231.82
Support	65.00
Child care (per month)	110.00
Total	861.82
Total yearly income	10,508.00

Case B: Family composition—family is composed of client and four children. Client's basic needs are: Flat grant for mother and four children—\$256; Shelter—\$150; Fuel for heating—\$16; Water and garbage—\$7.20; and adding child care which amounts to \$195, this amounts to \$624.80. Following are the exemptions from earned income computed on a monthly basis:

Gross earned income	\$367.12
Allowable exemption under ADC	142.37
(First 30 plus 1/2 of remainder) Deductions, social Security, taxes	21.40
Union dues	6.00
Transportation at 12 cents a mile	40.32
Lunch	21.67
Total expenses related to employment	231.76
Net Income	135.36
Basic needs	429.80
Earned income (—135.36)	135.36
Grant	294.44
Monthly income:	
Gross earned income	367.12
Child Care	195.00
DSS grant	294.44
Total	856.56
Total yearly income	10,278.72

In conclusion, I think the American people should not be misled regarding the scope of welfare in this country and I certainly hope Parade magazine will

immediately print a correction of this article.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF RURAL WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow we will be called upon to vote for or against the President's veto of any aid for our rural water and sewer systems.

During my more than 36 years in this Congress, it has been my honor and privilege to serve under six Presidents. Never have I agreed with all the policies nor on all the issues of any of these men, but I have always respected their office, their opinions, their intentions, and, in most cases, their ultimate goals. I have always tried, as my record will indicate, to place partisan politics in its proper perspective when the interests of all our people was involved. I hope I can review the present situation fairly and impartially.

Even the President in his veto message of H.R. 3298 says that a "grave constitutional question" is involved. On that point I agree with him, but certainly not from the same point of view. He contends that the provisions of the bill which mandate a restoration of the water and sewer program conflicts with the Executive powers allocated him by the Constitution. To me this is an erroneous interpretation of the Constitution, which I believe clearly vests in the legislative branch of Government the responsibility for enactment of laws and determination of priorities in expenditures.

What we have here, from a practical point of view, is the decision whether to continue a program that has raised the standard of living of millions of Americans since it went into effect in 1966, bringing them running water and flush toilets—conveniences that most of us have taken for granted for so long that we have forgotten there are still communities in this country which do not have them.

Since the beginning of this program, the Farmers Home Administration—which carries it out, has made 8,544 loans totaling \$1.6 billion, and 3,363 grants totaling \$243 million. These funds have aided projects giving service to 1,250,000 families.

As I am sure most everyone of you know, this program has been of a bipartisan character from its beginning. The law authorizing it dates back to 1965 and is sometimes called the Poage-Aiken Act because the esteemed Vermont Senator joined with me in sponsoring its passage.

Ever since that time it has had bipartisan support, and I hardly need to remind you that only last year our Republican colleague, Congressman DELBERT LATTI, offered the amendment to the Rural Development Act to increase the old authorization of \$100 million annually to \$500 million. The House approved his amendment, but in conference with the Senate the amount was reduced to \$300 million, and that is the figure which stayed in the law. The actual appropriation was only \$150 million

or about what the President is now asking that we provide for international organizations and conferences.

Now the President himself must have thought that was pretty good legislation. He signed it. What could have happened in just a few months time to cause him to change his mind? His speech writers, I think, must have been listening only to uninformed or ill-informed budget officials when they put down certain words in that veto message. In it the President refers to the recently terminated water and sewer program, and say, and I quote:

For many years, local communities have proudly financed and built their own water and sewer facilities.

Then adds:

Resurrection of the rural water and sewer program would serve only to undercut that tradition.

I think that this gives an unfair picture, but I ask, Was this not just as true last summer when the President praised and approved the bill as it is today?

As I read the veto message, it saddens me to think that we may have reached a time in our history when representative government is so casually repudiated; a time when the President's unidentified advisers seem to think that it is fashionable to insult the intelligence and integrity of not only this great body, but also of the American people; a time when a handful of men, no matter how intelligent or capable—but unknown to and unelected by the people—act as if they alone were ordained to determine the priorities of our Republic; and that, really, is what we are talking about—that is the real issue. Shall ours continue to be a representative democracy, or shall it be possibly a more efficient, but completely totalitarian government?

It is totally inconceivable to me that an administration which ran up a greater deficit in 5 years than the 4 preceding administrations did in 25 years, could come to this Congress and talk about fiscal responsibility as if the meaning of the phrase had just been discovered. Fiscal responsibility is not a concept discovered by the Nixon administration. Oh, I admit that if you look at the President's last four budget requests, you can readily understand that maybe it is a new concept for them, but many of us have been preaching fiscal responsibility in these Chambers before Richard Nixon was ever elected to the Congress. This Congress, or at least a great preponderance of it that has been here since 1968, has itself denied the President some \$30,000,000,000 in his four previous budget requests. But now, when it is time to pay the piper, when even the most simple-minded should know that there is not enough existing tax revenue to finance all our needs, this administration is working day and night to sell the American people on the totally erroneous premise that it is the Congress who is at fault; it is the Congress that has been irresponsible; it is the Congress that will cause an increase in taxes; and that it is the Congress who is playing partisan politics. This bill of goods, my friends, is a hoax—it is simply not the truth. I have often felt that I and my colleagues might be spending money unwisely. But that is

not the question. The people can change their Representatives at the end of 2 years if they do not like the way we handle their business. They know who we are. They can see how we vote. They do not know who is making decisions in the Office of Management and Budget, and neither do I and neither do you. This, my friends, is not representative government.

The President says, in this veto message, that he asks one simple question in considering this bill:

Would this program justify an increase in taxes in order to pay for it?

Now this sounds like a noble yardstick, but did the administration ask this same question on the \$6 billion revenue sharing bill that is already proving to be the hoax that many of us predicted it would be? Did the President use this same yardstick when he obviously committed several billion dollars of our hard-earned tax dollars to the North Vietnamese Communists? Did he use the same yardstick when he authorized the purchase of 17 new helicopters at a cost of \$34,000,000 to replace a fleet of 18-month-old copters for his staff to flit around in? Would not money spent on Presidential helicopters have the same effect on the need for taxes that money for rural water systems will have?

I submit to you, my friends, that these are only a few of the glaring examples of hypocrisy. It is high time that we expose completely to the American people the real truth; and that, plainly and simply is—Who is going to determine priorities in this Government—the Congress or the President? The President's veto message has much to say about constitutional authority, and I speak to that question as I have to that of fiscal responsibility—I do not believe that this Congress needs to be told what the Constitution charges it to do—I believe we know to the individual, what that charge is, and if the President will stop using every roadblock in the book to hinder the deliberations of this body, we will discharge this responsibility; and, I think, discharge it well.

I can't help but wonder if there is some kind of double standard invoked in this veto. In the same period that the Department of Agriculture was allocating \$243 million in grants under this program, the Department of Housing and Urban Development allocated a total of \$1.1 billion to our cities for water and sewer grants. Surely I have no objection to help for our cities. I voted for it. But why apply a different standard?

Now in this controversy, as in the others caused by the Presidential orders terminating or drastically curtailing some long-standing and truly worthwhile farm programs—such as REAP and REA—I wonder what kind of sense of values prevails these days down at the White House.

Here, while issuing an order depriving millions of Americans a chance to improve their living conditions, the President's budget recommendations for 1974 come up to us with a requested increase in appropriations for the cultural accoutrements of our society. Here are figures taken right out of the fiscal 1974 budget: For the sport fisheries and wild-

life \$163 million. That is \$43 million more than is involved in this vote. Certainly, I am not suggesting that we should be denied sporting opportunities, but will not this expenditure have the same effect on the need for taxes as will a similar expenditure for sanitary sewers in Smalltown, Ohio?

I feel I must now refer to one other rather minor point which I think should not go unchallenged.

The veto said this program singles out a "relatively small group of people to receive Federal grants" to help build water and sewer lines.

Is it such a small group of people who are affected by this legislation?

The act authorizes aid to communities of up to 10,000 population. Do you know how many Americans live in rural America as defined by the Library of Congress—that is, on farms and in towns of up to 10,000. The total, as recorded by the 1970 census, is 68,146,764—or a third of our national population. But regardless of their number, these rural and small town people are entitled to the same opportunities and the same aid which we accord to other people. This veto denies them this equal treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I have said on many occasions, many of you have said; and yes, Richard Nixon has said that we cannot begin to solve our urban problems until we first give rural America a chance to retain population. If we fail to recognize this, my friends, we have failed not only rural America, but all Americans of all ages, all races, and all social levels. We have been guilty of using hypocritical reasoning to save them money by compounding their already insurmountable problems.

I have to believe; in fact, I must believe that the President himself has been totally misinformed about the absolute basic needs of rural America. I simply cannot believe that he is as completely insensitive as this veto message indicates. Furthermore, I cannot possibly conceive that this Congress, for purely partisan political reasons, or any other reasons, could turn its back on these needs or, for that matter, turn its back on its own recorded views of just a few days ago. The time has come for the Congress to exert its own will—as evidenced by our previous vote in this House of 5½ to 1 in favor of this program. The time has come to stop playing a game of tainted rhetoric and face up to our responsibilities. Yes, the time has come for this Congress to affirm, loud and clear, to the people and to the administration that it is the people's elected Representatives who will control the purposes for which the tax dollars of this country shall be spent.

There are scores of problems in our Nation today that need the immediate attention of this Congress; yet, we have spent the first quarter of this session trying to reassert what we, with the specific approval of the President, have already legally done in prior sessions. Our people cannot afford this kind of inefficiency—this kind of childish game.

If the President feels he should veto acts of Congress, he has that right, but his veto should be within the time speci-

fied by the Constitution, and under no circumstances should he praise and sign a bill, before the election, as he did, in this case, and then after the election exonerate and repudiate the very program he had so recently endorsed.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC TUNAS

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, at the request of the administration, which gives effect to the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas. A draft of this bill came with an executive communication from the State Department which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs referred to the subcommittee I chair, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.

I place into the RECORD the executive communication from the State Department dated March 16, 1973, along with the text of the bill I am introducing. The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has scheduled a public hearing to consider this bill on Tuesday, April 17. The material follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., March 16, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill, "To give effect to the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, signed at Rio de Janeiro May 14, 1966, by the United States of America and Other Countries, and for other purposes". We recommend that it be enacted.

The International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, signed at Rio de Janeiro May 14, 1966, and hereinafter referred to as "the Convention", entered into force March 21, 1969, after being ratified or adhered to by seven countries, including the United States. The countries now party to the Convention are Brazil, Canada, France, Ghana, Japan, Korea, Morocco, Portugal, Senegal, South Africa, Spain and the United States. The Dominican Republic, Gabon and Venezuela have signed the Convention but have not yet ratified it. The Convention remains open to adherence by any Government which is a member of the United Nations or of any of its specialized agencies.

The Convention was a response to the rapidly increasing exploitation of Atlantic Ocean tuna resources by fishermen of a large number of nations of Europe, Africa, the Americas and Asia. It reflects the conviction of the fishery experts of those nations that there is danger of overfishing and a decline in the productivity of the stocks of tunas and tuna-like fishes unless an effective program of international cooperation in research and conservation is implemented.

The Convention establishes an International Commission for Conservation of the Atlantic Tunas to coordinate, and if necessary carry out, scientific research on the Atlantic tunas and recommend joint measures to maintain the populations at levels which will permit the maximum sustainable catch. The Convention obliges the Contracting Parties to be represented by Delegates on the Commission, to furnish statistical and biological information for the Commission's use, to apply the duly adopted recommendations

of the Commission, and to take necessary action to enforce the Convention, including collaboration in setting up an international enforcement system. Since its first meeting in December 1969, the Commission has been in its organizational stages. This process is now essentially completed, and the Commission has made its first regulatory recommendations in November 1972.

Although the United States has ratified the Convention, new legislation is required to carry out its provisions. In addition to authorization for appointment of Commissioners to represent it on the Commission and authorization for the Commissioners to appoint an advisory committee, legislation is required to receive and accept or object to conservation recommendations made by the Commission under the Convention, promulgate and enforce such regulations as may be necessary to ensure compliance by U.S. fishermen with the duly accepted conservation measures recommended by the Commission, and cooperate in carrying out the scientific and other programs of the Commission. The proposed bill provides the specific legislative authority needed for the discharge of these treaty obligation by the United States. Many of these provisions are substantially similar to like provisions in other statutes implementing fishery agreements, such as the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950, as amended, and the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950, as amended.

Section 1 of the bill gives a short title for the proposed legislation.

Section 2 defines certain terms used in the bill.

Section 3 authorizes the President to appoint three Commissioners, the maximum number of representatives permitted each country by the Convention, stipulates that they shall receive no compensation for their services, and establishes certain criteria for their selection to ensure that they will be representative of the interested public and Government sectors.

Section 4 authorizes the Commissioners to appoint an advisory committee of from five to twenty persons representative of the various groups concerned with Atlantic tuna fisheries, to serve without compensation. The rights and functions of the advisers are prescribed and are the same as those of members of similar advisory committees provided by statute for other international fishery commissions.

The classification of Commissioners and members of the advisory committee as special or regular government employees, and their relationship to the conflict of interest laws, is covered under existing law, at 18 USC 202-209.

Subsection 5(a) authorizes the Secretary of State, on behalf of the United States, to receive and deal appropriately with communications from the Commission, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce and, with respect to enforcement, the concurrence of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation. The purpose of the procedure authorized is to ensure that conservation measures recommended by the Commission shall not be applied to U.S. fishermen if their rejection by another Contracting Party or other Parties would make their application ineffective for accomplishing the purposes of the Convention.

Subsection 5(b) authorizes the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, to enter into international agreements for the purpose of implementing regulations binding on the Parties. Such implementation may include enforcement which could involve inspection of U.S. vessels and catches by foreign enforcement officers as well as by U.S. enforcement officers. This provision relates specifically to Article IX, paragraph 3 of the Convention, which

calls the international collaboration for the implementation and enforcement of Convention provisions.

Subsection 6(a) prescribes the procedures for promulgation of regulations by the Secretary of Commerce for the purpose of carrying out recommendations of the Commission that are effective for the United States. This subsection also empowers the Secretary of Commerce to designate officers and employees of the States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and authorize them to function as Federal law enforcement agents for the purpose of carrying out enforcement activities under the Act. The enforcement activities of such State officers in regard to foreign flag vessels will be limited to the fisheries zone. Subsection 6(b) places enforcement responsibility primarily with the Coast Guard, and authorizes regulations for procedures and methods of enforcement. Publication of proposed regulations in the Federal Register and a public hearing are provided for generally under the requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553. This Section does not contain an import embargo provision similar to that in subsection 6(c) of the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950. The Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 as amended by Public Law 92-219 contains a general embargo provision which is applicable to situations arising under the Convention.

Subsection 7(a) makes it unlawful for any person in charge of a fishing vessel of the United States to fish in violation of any regulation adopted pursuant to this Act or for any person knowingly to deal in or be in possession of fish taken in violation of such regulations.

Subsections 7(b) and 7(c) make it unlawful for persons aboard any fishing vessel of the United States to fail to keep records and make reports required by regulations adopted pursuant to this Act or to refuse to stop and show such records, catch, equipment to a duly authorized official and permit interrogation of persons on board the vessel.

Subsections 7(d) and 7(e) prescribe maximum fines of \$25,000 for a first violation and \$50,000 for subsequent violation of subsection (a), and \$5,000 for a first violation and \$15,000 for subsequent violations of subsection (b). Subsection 7(f) prescribes maximum penalties of \$5,000 fine and six months imprisonment for a first violation, and \$15,000 fine and one year imprisonment for subsequent violations of subsection (c). Subsection 7(g) provides that all fish taken or retained in violation of subsection (a) or the monetary value of such fish may be forfeited.

Subsection 7(h) makes all provisions of law relating to seizure, judicial forfeiture and condemnation of a cargo for violation of the customs law applicable to seizures and forfeitures under the provisions of this Act.

Subsection 8(a) prescribes how enforcement shall be carried out. It states that any person authorized to carry out enforcement activities under the Act may board and inspect any vessel and its catch in the waters of the Convention area; arrest, with or without a warrant, any person who violates the provisions of the Act or regulations issued thereunder; execute warrants and processes; and seize any fish found aboard a vessel in violation of the Act or regulations issued under the Act. Subsection 8(b) provides authority for duly authorized officials of either the United States or another Contracting Party to carry out enforcement activities with respect to persons or vessels subject to the jurisdiction of the other party to the extent authorized under the Convention or by agreements concluded pursuant to subsection 5(b). This provision insures that the United States can participate in systems of international enforcement established in accord with Article IX, paragraph 3, of the Convention, which calls for international collaboration for the implementation and enforcement of Convention provisions. Sub-

section 8(c) provides that execution of any warrant or process or seizure of any fish under the provisions of the Act shall be stayed upon posting of a sufficient bond by the accused.

Subsection 9(a) authorizes the United States Commissioners through the Secretary of State, to arrange for the cooperation of agencies of Federal, State and private institutions and organizations in carrying out the research function of the Commission under Article IV of the Convention. Subsection 9(b) authorizes all agencies of the Federal Government to cooperate in scientific and other programs upon request of the Commission. Subsection (c) provides that none of the prohibitions deriving from the Act, or those contained in the laws or regulations of any State, shall prevent the Commission from carrying out or authorizing fishing operations and biological experiments for purposes of its scientific investigations or discharging any other duties prescribed by the Convention. Subsection 9(d) states that the Act does not alter the existing sovereignty of the several States within their presently defined territorial waters.

Section 10 authorizes appropriation of the sums necessary for carrying out the purposes and provisions of the Act, including necessary travel expenses of the Commissioners and the United States share of the joint expenses of the Commission, as provided in Article X of the Convention.

Section 11 is a standard separability clause. The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of the proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

A letter similar in content is being sent to the President of the Senate.

Yours sincerely,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

WHY DID IT COST \$300 MILLION TO SELL WHEAT ABROAD WHEN UNITED STATES HAD CORNER ON WORLD WHEAT MARKET?

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

Mr. MELCHER. The United States had a corner on the world wheat market last summer, but it still cost the American taxpayer \$300 million to sell American wheat abroad. Although no dishonesty has been demonstrated, there was unbelievable mismanagement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The United States has used an export subsidy for wheat to promote foreign sales when our domestic price is above the world price. Was that the situation last summer? No, it was not. The Canadian Wheat Board let it be known that they had no more wheat to sell after transacting sales with the Russians in March. By July, after a severe drought in Russia, and droughts in India and China, and with poor crop prospects in Australia and Argentina, the United States held only available stocks of wheat. Our domestic market therefore became the focal point to establish the world price for any foreign sales. If demand developed, a normal market would respond with increased prices and therefore no need for the export subsidy—the purchaser pays and the U.S. taxpayer saves.

The Australian and Canadian Wheat Boards were concerned with the USDA's continuation of its export subsidy policy and alarmed that the Department sought to maintain a low world wheat price. The Australian Wheat Board on July 24 advised the USDA in strong language:

It is our positive and unequivocal view that because of the marked, albeit, unexpected change in the world demand and world supply situation there is no longer any justification or logical reason why prices should not be advanced.

The Australians noted the Russian demand for wheat, their own poor crops, the Canadian situation of no wheat to sell and protested the upward trend in U.S. export subsidy to maintain net prices at about unchanged levels. The Australian Wheat Board continued:

Frankly, we cannot envision any more propitious circumstances than exist at present for an increase in world price levels.

The Canadian Wheat Board agreed, writing to the USDA:

We urge you, therefore, to reflect your market strength under export price rather than counteracting the market increase through additional subsidy.

They said let the world price seek its own level—do not subsidize it.

Nevertheless, the USDA persisted in raising the export subsidy until the first of September when it peaked at 47 cents per bushel, and only abandoned it on September 22, 1972, by which time the Treasury was obligated to pay to grain exporting companies \$300 million. Despite Canadian and Australian warnings, and urging by the European Common Market Community to let the world price of wheat seek its own level at a more realistic price, the Department continually assured grain exporting firms during June, July, and August that the export subsidy would be raised when needed, promising them that any foreign wheat sales would be guaranteed at \$1.63 per bushel. Of course, this gave the Russians and any other foreign purchasers a bargain price below what would be the normal market price and the U.S. taxpayer made up the difference through the U.S. export subsidy.

The subsidy went to the grain exporting companies and the foreign country benefited. Later when dollar devaluations followed, the Russians on two-thirds of their purchase received another 10-percent windfall.

This single-minded attitude on the part of Department officials led them into a series of goofs.

First. Although agricultural attaché representatives' reports to the Department portrayed the drastic Russian drought, little publicity, and even less evaluation was given by the Department to the strong position of U.S. foreign wheat sales. It is also notable that the warnings from the Australian and Canadian Wheat Boards were not revealed and were kept secret as if they were subject to diplomatic immunity rather than significant documents of market conditions which wheat producers and all the grain trade as well as the public were entitled to know.

Second. When the world's record sale of wheat was made on July 5 by Conti-

mental Grain Co. to Russia—146 million bushels—no public announcement was made. The Department claimed they had no knowledge of the sale at that time, but Continental later told me they had informed the Department of the sale and the amount prior to signing the contract to make certain the export subsidy would be allowed to increase as necessary to assure that the \$1.63 per bushel, Russian contract price, would be protected for them.

Third. Pronouncements from the Department during this period continued to hold that the world price of wheat was \$1.63 despite all evidence to the contrary. Their August 1 price and demand situation report told farmers they should expect about the same price for their wheat as the year before when it was apparent to USDA officials and other insiders that when the knowledge of the huge Russian sales became public the wheat market would boom. It advanced 50 percent within 30 days.

Fourth. While sales by grain companies in addition to Continental were being made to Russia in July and early August, the Department continued to assure exporting companies that the U.S. subsidy would be increased as needed, and it was. By late August, after warnings by other administration officials that the export subsidy could not be justified, the Department called a meeting of the grain exporting firms and announced an unprecedented week-long period of increasing export subsidy allowances to protect the \$1.63 per bushel price. They rose to a peak of 47 cents per bushel that week.

This all set in motion a series of transactions provided by USDA regulations that permit grain exporting firms other consideration for foreign wheat sales. During the past several years changes in export regulations seem to have been beneficial to the grain firms. For instance, it is not necessary to make a sale to register for the export subsidy. As an example, here is the effect in five cases where the cost of export subsidy totaled \$581,632. Had exporters been required to register on the date of the sales, cost of the export subsidy would have been \$225,576 or \$326,056 less.

Grain companies can and do trade in the subsidy contracts by giving waivers of subsidy entitlement from one company to another, a type of speculation which may provide a neat margin of profit to a grain company without increasing sales.

In addition to the basic subsidy, the Department's Commodity Credit Corporation pays exporters a carrying charge increment to cover the estimated costs of owning wheat for delivery in future periods. CCC pays 1/20 of a cent per bushel per day for winter wheat, and two exporting companies estimate they gained additional revenues of about 5 cents per bushel through this means for the wheat they sold to Russia.

On August 31, 1972, the Department's CCC sold 60 million bushels of wheat to Continental Grain Co. at \$2.08 per bushel delivered to the gulf on the same day that the Department's Export Marketing Service set a domestic price for subsidy compensation at \$2.11½ per bushel. There is, Department officials state, additional costs for the exporting

company to load the wheat on a ship at the gulf. However, I do not believe it takes up all of the difference between the two prices. There are other similar sales from CCC stocks with this type of arrangement, one of which on the same date CCC sold 7 million bushels at \$2.07 providing an additional 1-cent margin than that was granted for Continental's 60 million bushels.

The Department's export subsidy policy early last July only slightly fractured the Treasury. Having made commitments to guarantee the exporting companies increases in the export subsidy, they found themselves in a rapidly developing web and they were reluctant to cut themselves free.

But the fractures became serious as the subsidy, despite all the objections of the Australian and Canadian Wheat Boards, was raised in denial of Yankee commonsense giving Russia a bargain and American taxpayers a gouge. This Treasury fracture was compounded by carrying charge increments and other allowances made for grain exporting firms under circumstances that were supposed to help them. However, this all occurred when our domestic price was the world price and, therefore, did not require the export subsidy nor the other fringe benefits to encourage foreign sales.

The Department has not evaluated the operation and effectiveness of the wheat export subsidy program for 24 years. Who runs it? A group of chefs has their spoons in the soup stirring and tasting and at times there is a great lack of coordination. It may be happenstance, but the number of USDA grain officials acquired from private grain firms or leaving the Department to become grain company officials reflects a compatibility that leads to an extremely friendly understanding.

There are a great number of loose ends that need to be sorted out. Apologists for the policies of the Department claim that while erratic and uncoordinated, they only look bad now from the advantage of hindsight. A fair, objective assessment would cite the events leading up to the July warnings by the Australian and Canadian Wheat Boards and the previous reports of agricultural attachés, and then conclude that the Department's bullheaded persistence in increasing the export subsidy was peculiar policy.

For continued unraveling and for evaluation of deeper motivations than just "erratic" or "peculiar policy" on the part of Department officials, an in-depth study by an appropriate congressional committee is clearly in order.

While the same set of circumstances may not face us now, the mismanagement of \$300 million cannot be shrugged off as highjinks finance that taxpayers appreciate.

PRICE ROLLBACK MUST BE DEFEATED

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Banking and Currency Committee voted to roll back all prices, rents,

and interest rates to the level of January 10, the day phase II ended. The vote was 26 to 12 with 22 of 23 Democrats supporting the rollback. This drastic proposal has received wide publicity and caused deep concern among citizens who fear the House might, just might be irresponsible and ill-informed enough to let it stand.

I want to appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but particularly to those Democratic Members who have an awareness of the problems of agriculture and a knowledge of economics not to let this ill-conceived and ruinous proposal move any further through the legislative process. The country has a right to expect us to turn from the headline hunting and sensationalism of recent days and again tackle the problems of inflation with a little reasonableness and commonsense.

A rollback to January 10 would be counter to every sound economic principle and would seriously jeopardize our urgent efforts to correct the present imbalance between supply and demand. I will leave it to others to discuss the damaging impact of such a rollback on those in other walks of life. But as far as the Nation's livestock industry is concerned, it is no exaggeration to say that it would be a terrible disaster. It would also be a complete breach of faith with farmers who have been urged not only by the legislative and executive branches of their Government, but also by organized labor and consumer groups to do everything in their power to increase production.

Livestock feeders have in good faith taken up this challenge by maintaining and expanding the number of cattle on feed, even though the price of replacement feeder cattle to them have gone up sharply since January 10, like all other costs of livestock production. To make it impossible for them to recover their actual costs through a rollback would not only stifle all incentive to increase production but would in fact provoke sharp cutbacks. It would also have a crippling effect on the livestock industry's long-range capability to feed the American people by forcing many smaller producers out of business.

Since the committee's action I have talked with many independent farmers who run small- and medium-sized livestock feeding operations in my State of Iowa. They tell me a January 10 rollback would inflict such heavy losses upon them that many would have to withdraw from livestock feeding and perhaps from farming altogether. After 20 years of low prices they simply have been unable to build sufficient financial reserves to withstand such losses.

Now that they are finally beginning to get an adequate return, the Banking and Currency Committee would not only deny them the fruits of their labor and investment, but hit them with staggering losses to boot. Surely we will not let this gross injustice be perpetrated on livestock farmers who, after struggling along for so many years at submarginal prices, have recently demonstrated their ability to move increased supplies to market if given reasonable price incentives.

I can think of nothing better calculated to drive our family farmers from the

livestock business than a rollback which would block them from recovering increased costs and, of course, any chance for profit. They at present provide healthy competition for the big producers which is very definitely in the consumer's interest. If you think meat prices are high now, just wait until independent, family-sized operators are squeezed out and the consuming public is left to the tender mercies of the giant corporate-owned feedlots.

I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle not to let this happen to the American people. Let us unite in making sure the rollback proposed by the committee is promptly and decisively defeated.

THE GAMBLING CRAZE—AN IRRESPONSIBLE APPROACH TO REVENUE RAISING

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, the craze of gambling as an easy road to enrich the public coffers is gaining favor throughout the Nation.

This is a tragic development.

The Nation's leaders—both in and out of government—have been negligent in their failure to speak up and denounce this move to place legal sanctions behind a variety of gambling schemes.

These schemes—whether they provide for betting on horses, numbers, lotteries, or sports events—are being packaged in typical Madison Avenue style. We are told that a little gambling—backed by the State—will help educate children and provide other social benefits. We are led to believe that education and social services will go by the boards if we do not promote lotteries and State-operated gambling parlors.

This is the purest form of hogwash. Gambling and education have nothing in common and it is sad indeed to see State officials hide these gambling operations behind the legitimate needs of schoolchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to stand here and say that I am morally opposed to gambling whether it has the imprint of the State or whether it is operated by some gangster element. I do not believe that we have sunk to the point where gambling is our only resort when additional funds are needed to provide State and local governmental services.

We are told that these schemes should be allowed because we already have—in many areas—illegal gambling. Yes, I am sure that there is a great deal of illegal gambling in many of our States. But this seems a poor—a pitifully weak—argument for State-operated gaming institutions. Surely we are not saying that the State should start operating—for the purpose of raising revenue—those things which now flourish illegally under organized crime.

If we are to take this criteria, then we are going to hear suggestions for the legalization of prostitution which undoubtedly would raise additional revenue for the States and I suppose there are some who would tell us that this activity—if run by the State—would benefit

schoolchildren. We are well aware that a great deal of illegal drug traffic exists in our major cities and I hope we are not approaching the day where someone suggests that we raise revenue through State-operated drug dispensaries.

No, my colleagues, we cannot use the fact that there is a great deal of illegal gambling existing in this country as an excuse for the State entering into the activity. This makes no sense—common, book, or horse.

But my objections, Mr. Speaker, go well beyond the question of morality. Gambling as a means of raising revenue is a "cop-out" of great magnitude.

Actually, these gambling schemes are designed to pick the pockets of the poor and the unsuspecting while the big boys—the rich—continue to enjoy low tax rates and a multitude of tax loopholes. It is easier to devise a scheme for a little legal gambling operation than to face up to the huge lobbies which protect and maintain the tax loopholes for the banks, the corporations, and the wealthy.

These State-operated lotteries are a regressive form of taxation. We do not see the big sleek Cadillacs pulling up to the front doors of these government-operated betting parlors. It is the little man who hopes that he can convert his weekly grocery money into some grandiose sweepstakes winning that will put him on easy street for the rest of his life.

Week after week, it is this little guy who shells out the money which keeps the lottery—the off-track betting parlors—the parimutuel horseracing—going. Meanwhile, the wealthy go about their business while the State exacts this additional toll on the less well-to-do.

Gambling is of course very appealing to many people who exist on limited means and who have little to brighten their daily lives. They hope that somehow their bets can change their entire life. But the odds—as the States well know—are heavily weighted against them and many of these people sink large percentages of their wages into these long-shot wagers.

It often means that families do without food and clothing because these State-operated and city-operated gambling institutions have drained away their funds.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a theoretical possibility. Take the example which recently came to light in New York City where a grand jury returned an indictment for grand larceny against a man who had been charged with stealing \$81,000 from his employer to make bets—not with some illegal bookie—but with the city-operated off-track betting parlors.

The newspapers have also carried stories in recent months of a Government official who lost his position because of huge gambling losses apparently incurred in parimutuel betting at race-tracks operated under the sanction of the State of Maryland.

There are many cases, of course, which never receive the glare of publicity. These involve the great masses of silent losers who gamble away their wages and savings in search of some pie-in-the-sky. This something-for-nothing philosophy plays on basic human weaknesses and it

is highly regrettable that any government—Federal, State, or local—trades on this weakness.

We are often told that gambling—if operated by the local or State governments—will be clean and aboveboard and will drive away the bookies and other illegal types who traditionally feed on this human desire to gamble. But what has happened is that members of bookmaking syndicates have moved right in and have been benefited by illegal gambling operations.

Earlier this year, nine members of a bookmaking syndicate were arrested in New York and charged with taking illegal bets on horseracing and other sports from customers at off-track betting parlors—betting parlors operated by the city of New York.

Howard Samuels, chairman of the Off-Track Betting Corp., described the situation in this manner:

They have been approaching our customers in our offices, telling them they don't have to wait in line to bet with them and offering quick service in placing and collecting wagers.

They have also taken bets from them on football, basketball, and hockey—sports action which we are not permitted to handle. They have also offered credit.

So in the words of the man who operates New York City's gambling operations, the bookies have been moving right in with their old customers.

No one knows how widespread this situation is, but it is the height of absurdity to think that the simple legalization of gambling will eliminate its draw for organized crime. In my opinion, organized crime is helped when the State puts its stamp of approval on gambling.

These betting parlors apparently are something less than garden spots in the community. There have been reports of debris piling up in the shops while winos, panhandlers, and derelicts wander through the parlors.

One guard in a New York off-track betting parlor described his work situation in this manner:

Every day, I have to throw out a few winos or guys using bad language. Sometimes I have to break up a fight, and once I had to call the cops to get a drug addict out. He said he was playing horses but all he was doing was nodding.

Mr. Speaker, the Kefauver Committee debunked the idea that legalized gambling would drive out the gangster element. In a report filed in the 81st Congress, Senator Kefauver stated:

The legalization of gambling would not terminate the widespread predatory activities of criminal gangs and syndicates. The history of legalized gambling in Nevada and in other parts of the country gives no assurance that mobsters and racketeers can be converted into responsible businessmen through the simple process of obtaining State and local licenses for their gambling enterprises. Gambling, moreover, historically has been associated with cheating and corruption.

The Committee has not seen any workable proposal for controlled gambling which would eliminate the gangster or the corruption.

The Christian Science Monitor surveyed Great Britain and called attention to the gangster element that has moved

in with the legalizing of gambling in that nation.

In an April 11, 1970, edition, the Monitor said:

In 1960 that was changed. Gaming was legalized, betting (it was hoped) reformed. The wheel of the giddy permissive society was set spinning.

It was a gamble that did not pay off. Britain was left wide open to the gangster.

Organized sport has been very concerned—and rightfully so—about gambling. The leaders of professional sports have traditionally taken strong measures to keep gambling as far away from the sporting events as possible. They have been successful and they have been extremely prompt in applying severe penalties to anyone with even the remotest connection with gambling.

But the proposals to legalize gambling threaten the fine record of professional sport. Bowie Kuhn, the commissioner of baseball, is a strong opponent of gambling in all forms—legalized or otherwise.

Mr. Kuhn, writing in the Prosecutor, the national journal of the District Attorneys Association, had this to say:

With respect to organized crime it is my very strong conviction that legalization would lead to greatly increased gambling on baseball both in terms of the dollar volume and the number of bettors. As I will discuss later, I believe this because in my judgment legalization with the attendant government sanction it implies would open up the avenues of gambling to the scores of millions of team sports' fans who presently have no interest in gambling. Remember that most people in this country do not gamble. That is the fallacy of the oft heard argument that you might as well legalize gambling because people are going to do it anyway. Maybe a small percentage will but not the vast majority who are not gamblers.

Under the circumstances it is naive to think that legalization would eliminate or even substantially diminish the substantial volume of illegal gambling on baseball. By introducing gambling to the non-gambling majority, legalization would open the doors for organized crime to a vast array of people they could not otherwise have interested.

The National District Attorneys Association is made up of prosecutors from jurisdictions in the 50 States. This association, like Mr. Kuhn, has firmly denounced the legalization of gambling. They are the people who are engaged in law enforcement efforts on a day-to-day basis. They are right on the firing line and their opinions certainly ought to be given the greatest weight.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from part of a resolution adopted by the National District Attorneys Association last summer:

Whereas, it is believed that the extension and further legalization of gambling on the outcome of sporting events will be detrimental both to the sport involved and to the public ethic.

Now therefore, be it resolved by the National District Attorneys Association . . . that said Association oppose the extension and legalization of gambling on the outcome of sporting events . . .

Mr. Speaker, many of our church leaders have spoken out against the social and moral problems created by gambling. These are church leaders from many differing religious groups. For example, Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Billy Graham recently wrote in his newspaper column

about the problems of gambling as viewed by a national religious leader:

[From the Shreveport Times, Dec. 28, 1972]

DISAPPROVAL IS DESERVED BY GAMBLING

(By Billy Graham)

In New York City, legalized betting (OTB) is spreading. What do you think of gambling as a bonus for the individual, and simultaneously, a source of revenue for the state?—E.R.T.

There are now four states (Connecticut is the last) that have legalized gambling, and more are looking at the matter with a green gleam in their eye.

New York magazine, with obvious tongue in cheek, said of the New York situation, "Now you can lose your money in any one of 42 local off-track-betting parlors. By the end of 1972, another 60 are planned." Such is man's propensity for getting something for nothing. In this, of course, he never really succeeds.

The whole business of lotteries is not new. Even the famous Washington monument was funded through lotteries, but it cost the public seven times the actual construction costs.

I think the National Observer last year put it well when it said "legalized gambling is, in truth, a monumental cop-out."

The crux of the matter is that the believer in Christ doesn't have to regard life as a gamble. He has a heavenly Father who, as Jesus said, knew when the sparrow fell, and hence certainly knew of and provided for the needs of His children. Matthew 6:26. Faith and lady luck have nothing in common.

When you also recognize the crime that attends gambling and the economic disservice it brings, gambling deserves our disapproval in any form.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to place in the RECORD a copy of a very thoughtful letter which I received from the Reverend Thomas G. Wilbanks, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Mesquite, Tex.:

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Mesquite, Tex., February 28, 1972.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: For several months I have intended to write you and express appreciation and support for your comments in the House about "legalized gambling schemes." It does seem unfortunate that so many people—and a number of states—are falling for the old cliché that a vice suddenly becomes all right as long as it is legalized and tax revenue is received from it—regardless of how many people suffer or are affected adversely because of it.

I appreciate your comments that increased legalized gambling is "a dangerous trend" which "Congress must carefully watch" and that "If necessary, Congress should consider legislation which will control—if not stop—some of the more outlandish schemes to raise public monies through gambling."

One of the best books on the problems of gambling that I ever read was "A Two Dollar Bet Means Murder," by Fred J. Cook. In the book he makes this telling indictment. He says that the well-documented history of "America's disastrous experience with gambling in all its forms is a record that says that gambling is essentially a racket—a falsely alluring 'something-for-nothing' business" and "that every oasis of legal gambling inevitably becomes fouled in a mire of rackets, destitution, and corruption."

I was interested in a recent statement by a member of Gamblers Anonymous who indicated that more than six million Americans are "gambling away their lives and their wives and their fortunes and their families." Even aside from the corruption involved, it does seem unfortunate that gambling takes

money from the weak who can neither resist its lure, nor afford the losses. And it seems to me to be a poor commentary that a number of states have gone this route and in essence are preying on the weakness of their citizens in order to finance state programs. It seems hard to get around the fact that gambling is a system for distributing money which almost uniformly makes the poor poorer and the professionals happier. Thank you again for your concern on this matter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS G. WILBANKS.

I have also received a letter from Pastor Earl E. Hosea of the First Baptist Church of Omaha, Tex., who agrees with my stand that the poor will suffer the most from Government-supported gambling.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Omaha, Tex.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for your stand on the gambling issue. It is a sad day indeed when governments must prey on the weaknesses of men to secure finances to support itself. I heartily agree that it will be the poor who will suffer the most.

You have my prayerful support as you take your stand for right and righteousness in the government of our nation.

Sincerely,

EARL E. HOSEA.

In New York City, where gambling has become an integral part of the State and municipal governments, religious leaders continue to have the courage to speak out against this form of revenue raising. The Reverend William H. Hudnut, Jr., interim pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church recently wrote the New York Times and in his letter he noted:

Gambling is a predatory rather than a productive business. It becomes an addiction with many, preys on people's pocket-books and on legitimate business, makes poor consumers, and erodes prosperity instead of creating it.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of one's opinions about the moral issues involved in legalizing gambling, the fact is it is a poor source of revenue. The total overhead costs—including the prizes which must be passed out—are extremely high, much higher than they would be on any straight taxation program.

In fact, it appears that most jurisdictions do extremely well if they are able to use as much as 50 percent of the gambling take for education or other public purposes. The other half goes to the gamblers and to administrative costs.

For example, in the last fiscal year, the New York State lottery brought in \$77 million. Initially, \$4.5 million was paid in commissions to sales agents, leaving \$72.5 million. Then the State subtracted \$7 million for administration, and followed this by chopping off \$30.5 million for the lottery prize account. After all of these payouts, education the purpose for which the lottery was created—got \$34.5 million—well under half of what the State had exacted from its people in the lottery.

In New Hampshire, which has the questionable distinction of starting the new wave of lotteries 8 years ago, only \$15.6 million has been earned for the State.

In New Jersey, the State lottery took

away \$210 million from the people in the first 18 months of operation—through last June 30—and allocated only \$102 million to State institutions and educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, today more than half of the States permit parimutuel betting on horse and/or dog racing. A number of States have legalized bingo and similar games of chance. New York and Nevada are the only States which permit off-track betting, but a number of other States are thinking about moving into this area. Nevada remains the only State which legally operates gambling casinos, but with the new craze underway, I would not be surprised to see others joining in this effort.

At the present time, seven States are operating lotteries and this seems to be the most widespread and popular new form of legalized gambling. New Hampshire's lottery is the oldest, having started in 1964, followed by New York in 1967 and New Jersey in 1971. Connecticut, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania all began early last year and Michigan began in November of 1972.

Maryland and the State of Washington are scheduled to begin their lotteries sometime this year.

In short, legalized gambling is spreading and spreading rapidly. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the voters in the other States take a hard look before they jump into what seems to be a soft and easy method of raising revenue.

I hope that none of them fall for the tired, old cliché that legalizing gambling will make it clean.

The role of government is to fight crime, not to accommodate it.

THE AMSTERDAM CONFERENCE

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago today a most interesting 3-day meeting began in Amsterdam. As I indicated in my letter to all members of the House last week, more than 300 prominent Americans, Canadians, and Europeans were in attendance. I was the only member of the House or Senate actually to attend, though invitations were extended to several other Members.

Because of the likelihood of an imminent debate in the House on House Joint Resolution 205, the "Atlantic Union" resolution, I am making an initial report on the Amsterdam meeting to the entire House membership, rather than to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as would be customary.

Mr. Speaker, the basic themes of the Amsterdam meeting were the present—and future—relationships between North America and Western Europe. Sponsors of the meeting were the International European Movement, in response to a proposal by the British European movement. The American delegation was organized by, and had as its chairman, Eugene Rostow, presently a professor of law at Yale University and formerly

Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs under President Johnson. Four private American organizations cooperated in setting up the meeting—the Atlantic Council of the United States, the National Planning Association, the AFL-CIO, and the National Security Information Center.

The American delegation had many experienced and well-known public figures, though there was no one now involved actively in the executive branch of our Government—and as I have said, I was the only legislator. One prominent elected official did appear briefly, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. He spoke at the plenary session the first morning, urging Western Europeans to unite politically, and then left.

There were over 90 Americans in Amsterdam. The exact number was difficult to determine, as some who accepted did not come—Senator JAVITS of New York, for example—and others were apparently invited too late to be included on the official list of delegates. Among those present were David Packard, former Secretary of Defense; George Ball, former Under Secretary of State; Robert Ellsworth, our former colleague in the House and former U.S. Ambassador to NATO; W. Randolph Burgess, also a former Ambassador to NATO and former Under Secretary of the Treasury; Henry Fowler, former Secretary of the Treasury; Lane Kirkland, vice president of the AFL-CIO; Prof. Z. Brzezinski of Columbia University; Harvey Brooks, dean of engineering and applied physics at Harvard, as well as many other eminent citizens. Dean Rusk, former Secretary of State, was scheduled to make a major speech but unfortunately he could not attend because of illness.

There was no shortage of prominent Europeans—though the French delegation had few "big names." The conference was welcomed by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. It was presided over by Prof. Walter Hallstein. It was addressed by Dr. Sicco Mansholt, former president of the European Commission; by M. Raymond Aron, the French journalist; and by Roy Jenkins, a Labor Member of Parliament. The former Danish Prime Minister, Jens Otto Krag, was a participant, as was the Right Honorable Michael Stewart, former British Foreign Secretary. The Secretary General of NATO, Mr. Joseph Luns, gave a moving address at one of the lunch sessions.

Mr. Speaker, some may ask how so many participants spent the 3 days. In reply, let me say that we met in plenary sessions, at the beginning and at the end of the conference; during lunch hours we were also all together. More detailed discussions were held in three groups—military-security, political and economic. The common theme was how to cope with the rapid changes in all these areas, and the probable shape of things to come. There was broad recognition of the fact of growing interdependence between the Atlantic nations, and between other nations, too, such as Japan, Australia and New Zealand, Israel and Iran.

Perhaps of more interest than the for-

mat of the discussion in Amsterdam, Mr. Speaker, was the reason for the conference, and the extent to which what was said and done measured up to expectations. Its goal was to review American and European relationships in the light of rapidly changing conditions, to develop understanding of different points of view, but not to seek solutions. Above all, as it was pointed out to me when I was invited to participate, the hope was to "help renew the political determination of our governments and peoples to cooperate in fulfilling shared goals which can only be achieved together."

This theme—the need for increased cooperation and collaboration, of better communication between our peoples—was indeed heard repeatedly throughout the conference. There was considerable discussion of the ties—and the problems—which bind us together. Security and trade, energy, the environment, and the importance of more formal mechanisms to help us more easily to exchange views and to resolve problems—all these were discussed.

However, perhaps the most significant aspect of this meeting, Mr. Speaker, was what was not discussed. No one proposed "Atlantic union" as a feasible, or even possible, contribution to the goal of greater understanding and closer cooperation. Since many American participants had long supported the concept of "Atlantic union," I was expecting the subject at least would be broached.

Frequently, it is true, the importance of "institution building" was emphasized. One speaker, for example, spoke of the importance of "institutions for interdependence," but the Europeans made it clear that the basic institution which they had in mind was the European community, not union with the United States and Canada.

Not only did no participant advocate a federal union, but many spoke of the deterioration in relations between Europe and America. Max Kohnstamm, director of the European Community Institute for University Studies in Brussels, for instance, declared that—

The prevailing mood in the Atlantic world is one of growing unease and recrimination.

Former Under Secretary of State George Ball was even more forthright, and more pessimistic. He detects in Europe today "a growing resentment" of America. As he puts it, "Europe is eyeing America with a jaundiced eye." Even more serious, Mr. Ball believes, is the growing preoccupation of Europeans with their own affairs. Europe is becoming "parochial," in his opinion, and "exerts little more than a regional influence."

Many speakers were concerned also about the change in attitudes in the United States toward Europe. Mr. Ball spoke of growing mistrust and disenchantment in the United States, and a "trend toward unilateralism" which could be dangerous.

The mood of the conference, in brief, was somber. It was full of "elder statesmen," somewhat nostalgic of the "good old days." Most speakers recognized the dangers of emerging centrifugal forces, and the threat which a weakening of transatlantic ties would represent. Vir-

tually everybody recommended that we all, on both sides of the Atlantic, "mend our fences." While most felt that further economic, and eventual political, integration of Europe would be a helpful development in this respect, no one—I repeat, no one—spoke of a single federal government as a goal for the Atlantic nations.

About the only flareup during the entire 3 days, Mr. Speaker, occurred during the final plenary session. The steering committee had labored mightily to develop a resolution summing up the significance of the meeting. Optimists had originally suggested such a resolution might be called the Declaration of Amsterdam. In the minds of some, in other words, was the hope that the meeting in Amsterdam might merit a niche in the history of international relations.

What was finally agreed upon was a masterpiece in its own way—so full of platitudes, according to one delegate, that it would be better for the conference to pass no formal resolution at all. Others objected strenuously to the language proposed—including especially several British Members of Parliament—because the importance of Japan was not recognized, even inferentially.

The resolution agreed upon described why the conference had met—to exchange views and express common concern—pointed out that the world is changing, and emphasized the importance of cooperation and of open and continuing discussions.

Because of the importance of continuing dialog—both private and between the official organs of the countries concerned—the resolution "invites" the European movement and the Atlantic Councils of the United States and Canada "to determine the most suitable structure" for such a dialog between both sides of the Atlantic.

The exact meaning of this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, may be clearer in the French translation than in English. Whatever its meaning, I doubt if it should give much heart to "Atlantic Unionists." No one will argue that old friends should find ways to see each other frequently, and to talk, if the ties of friendship are to remain strong. But discussions of union and federation can only distract us from the serious problems which lie ahead.

DECREASE IN SERIOUS CRIME

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Justice announced the first decrease in serious crime in the United States in 17 years.

This, of course, was welcome news to all of us. Hopefully this will mark a turning point in the fight against rising crime and we can look forward to a period of greater success in our efforts.

Certainly this reduction is due in no small part to the strong efforts of law enforcement officers throughout the Nation.

At this point I would like to include in the Record the figures released by the Department of Justice and a statement by the President regarding the report:

RELEASE

Serious crime in the United States declined 3 percent in 1972, the first actual decrease in crime in 17 years, Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst announced today.

The downturn in the volume of crime was disclosed in preliminary year-end statistics tabulated by the FBI and released today.

"This is a day that we have been looking forward to for many years," the Attorney General said. "It is an important milestone in the fight to reduce crime and is directly attributable to the strong efforts of law enforcement officers throughout the nation to turn back the wave of crime that rolled upward in the 1960's."

During 1972, 94 major cities reported actual decreases in serious crime, Mr. Kleindienst said, compared with 53 cities in 1971, 22 cities in 1970, and 17 cities in 1969.

Nationally, serious crime declined 8 percent in the final quarter of the year, after registering a 1 percent increase through the first nine months of 1972.

The last measurable decrease in serious crime—2 percent—was recorded in 1955, according to FBI crime records.

The crime spiral peaked in 1968 when serious crime rose 17 percent above the previous year. In 1969 and 1970, serious crime increased 11 percent, while in 1971, the increase was 6 percent.

"We enter this new period with an acute awareness that crime is still unacceptably high," Mr. Kleindienst said. "We pledge to renew our determination and efforts to make our communities safer places in which to live."

The preliminary figures are contained in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports, a collection of nationwide police statistics supplied voluntarily by local, county, and state law enforcement agencies. The figures were released today by FBI Acting Director L. Patrick Gray, III.

Violent crime increased by 1 percent in 1972, compared with a 9 percent increase the year before. Robberies, however, which make up the largest number of crimes in the violent category, showed a 4 percent decrease in 1972. Murder was up 4 percent in 1972, aggravated assault increased 6 percent, and forcible rape increased 11 percent over the previous year.

Property crime decreased 3 percent, compared with a 6 percent increase in 1971. Auto theft declined 7 percent, larceny \$50 and over dropped 3 percent, and burglary was down 2 percent.

Cities over 100,000 population reported an average decrease of 7 percent in the volume of Crime Index offenses. Crime in suburban areas increased 2 percent, compared to an 11 percent increase in 1971, while crime in rural areas went up 4 percent compared to a 6 percent rise in the previous period.

Serious crime in Washington, D.C., continued to decline. The 1972 decrease was 26.9 percent, compared with the 1971 decrease of 13 percent.

The nation's capital registered fewer crimes in every category, except for a 16 percent increase in rape. Auto theft decreased 33 percent, burglary decreased 32 percent, robbery decreased 31 percent, larceny \$50 and over decreased 18 percent, murder decreased 11 percent, and aggravated assault decreased 2 percent.

A copy of the preliminary crime figures for 1972 is attached. Final crime figures and crime rates per unit of population will be available in the detailed Uniform Crime Reports scheduled for release this summer.

Also attached is a list of the 94 major cities reporting crime decreases.

Cities with decrease in crime index, January to December 1972 against 1971

Agency	Index percent decrease
Akron, Ohio	9.5
Albany, N.Y.	23.8
Alexandria, Va.	2.1
Allentown, Pa.	15.4
Arlington, Va.	15.4
Austin, Tex.	3.7
Baltimore, Md.	6.5
Beaumont, Tex.	1.6
Berkeley, Calif.	2.7
Boston, Mass.	8.8
Bridgeport, Conn.	14.6
Buffalo, N.Y.	6.7
Cambridge, Mass.	7.7
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	3.8
Charlotte, N.C.	11.8
Chicago, Ill.	4.1
Cincinnati, Ohio	5.0
Cleveland, Ohio	11.3
Columbia, S.C.	16.6
Columbus, Ga.	3.0
Columbus, Ohio	9.5
Corpus Christi, Tex.	.8
Dallas, Tex.	2.6
Dearborn, Mich.	8.8
Des Moines, Iowa	9.1
Detroit, Mich.	15.8
Duluth, Minn.	6.8
Elizabeth, N.J.	4.2
El Paso, Tex.	16.5
Erie, Pa.	.1
Evansville, Ind.	13.4
Fall River, Mass.	14.2
Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	4.2
Fort Worth, Tex.	5.6
Gary, Ind.	3.7
Glendale, Calif.	5.8
Hammond, Ind.	2.3
Hampton, Va.	6.9
Hartford, Conn.	19.8
Hialeah, Fla.	8.2
Hollywood, Fla.	7.5
Honolulu, Hawaii	15.3
Huntsville, Ala.	19.9
Indianapolis, Ind.	16.0
Jacksonville, Fla.	4.9
Jersey City, N.J.	8.3
Kansas City, Mo.	13.2
Lansing, Mich.	6.3
Lexington, Ky.	6.5
Los Angeles, Calif.	3.8
Louisville, Ky.	11.3
Lubbock, Tex.	11.0
Macon, Ga.	3.1
Miami, Fla.	9.9
Milwaukee, Wis.	3.9
Mobile, Ala.	15.2
Montgomery, Ala.	3.2
Nashville, Tenn.	18.0
Newark, N.J.	10.2
New Bedford, Mass.	20.3
New Haven, Conn.	9.7
New Orleans, La.	15.2
New York, N.Y.	18.0
Norfolk, Va.	18.1
Oakland, Calif.	3.4
Orlando, Fla.	10.7
Parma, Ohio	9.7
Pasadena, Calif.	1.6
Philadelphia, Pa.	4.5
Pittsburgh, Pa.	11.0
Portsmouth, Va.	2.0
Providence, R.I.	13.5
Raleigh, N.C.	5.0
Richmond, Va.	11.8
Rochester, N.Y.	8.6
St. Louis, Mo.	4.1
Salt Lake City, Utah	10.0
San Francisco, Calif.	19.0
Savannah, Ga.	13.8
Scranton, Pa.	27.0
Seattle, Wash.	3.8
Shreveport, La.	8.4
Spokane, Wash.	2.3
Stamford, Conn.	27.6
Syracuse, N.Y.	11.1
Topeka, Kans.	15.2
Torrance, Calif.	5.2
Trenton, N.J.	7.7

Warren, Mich.	2.8
Washington, D.C.	26.9
Waterbury, Conn.	7.7
Wichita, Kans.	7
Yonkers, N.Y.	11.7
Youngstown, Ohio	11.9

UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING—1972 PRELIMINARY ANNUAL RELEASE

Crime in the United States, as measured by the Crime Index offenses, declined three percent during calendar year 1972 over 1971. The

violent crimes as a group increased one percent. Forcible rape was up eleven percent, aggravated assault six percent, and murder four percent, while the crime of robbery declined four percent. The property crimes of burglary, larceny \$50 and over, and auto theft decreased three percent as a group. Auto theft decreased seven percent, larceny \$50 and over three percent, and burglary two percent. Cities with 250,000 or more inhabitants reported an average decrease of eight percent in the volume of Crime Index of-

fenses. Cities with over 100,000 inhabitants reported an average decrease of seven percent. The suburban areas surrounding large core cities reported an increase of two percent and the rural areas were up four percent (Table 1).

Geographically, the Western States reported a two percent rise in the volume of Crime Index offense. The Southern States reported a decrease of two percent, the North Central States three percent, and the Northeastern States eight percent (Table 2).

TABLE 1.—CRIME INDEX TRENDS

[Percent change 1972 over 1971, offenses known to the police]

Population group and area	Number of agencies	Population in thousands	Total	Violent	Property	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny \$50 and over	Auto theft
Total all agencies	5,821	164,859	-3	+1	-3	+4	+11	-4	+6	-2	-3	-7
Cities over 25,000	841	89,497	-5	-1	-6	+4	+10	-5	+4	-4	-6	-9
Suburban area	2,295	52,857	+2	+13	+1	+11	+19	+9	+14	+2	+1	-1
Rural area	1,221	18,953	+4	+9	+4	-2	+1	+10	+11	+4	+5	-3
Over 1,000,000	6	18,805	-12	-4	-14	-4	+12	-9	+4	-11	-19	-14
500,000 to 1,000,000	21	13,728	-7	-6	-7	-2	+3	-10	-2	-6	-7	-11
250,000 to 500,000	31	10,788	-2	+2	-3	+4	+12	+3	-1	-1	-3	-4
100,000 to 250,000	93	13,418	-2	+3	-3	+5	+4	+2	+4	-2	-3	-5
50,000 to 100,000	240	16,937	+1	+9	-	+8	+14	+7	+11	+1	-	-2
25,000 to 50,000	450	15,822	+1	+13	-	+3	+26	+8	+17	+2	-1	-2
10,000 to 25,000	1,104	17,636	+4	+9	+4	+4	+21	+10	+8	+4	+4	-1
Under 10,000	2,357	11,069	+5	+4	+5	-9	+19	+11	+2	+3	+6	+2

TABLE 2.—CRIME INDEX TRENDS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION (1972 OVER 1971)

Region	Total	Violent	Property	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny \$50 and over	Auto theft
Northeastern States	-8	-1	-10	+6	+19	-8	+9	-8	-11	-10
North Central States	-3	-1	-3	-2	+7	-5	+5	-3	-1	-7
Southern States	-2	+1	-2	+4	+6	-	+1	+1	-2	-8
Western States	+2	+7	+1	+11	+13	+3	+9	+3	-	-3

TABLE 3.—CRIME INDEX TRENDS

[Percent change 1966-71, each year over previous year]

Years	Total	Violent	Property	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny \$50 and over	Auto theft
1967/1966	+16	+15	+16	+13	+8	+27	+8	+16	+16	+17
1968/1967	+17	+19	+17	+14	+15	+30	+11	+13	+21	+18
1969/1968	+11	+11	+11	+7	+16	+13	+8	+6	+21	+12
1970/1969	+11	+12	+10	+8	+2	+17	+7	+10	+14	+5
1971/1970	+6	+9	+6	+10	+9	+10	+8	+8	+5	+1

Note: Issued by L. Patrick Gray, III, Acting Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20535. Advisory: Committee on Uniform Crime Records International Association of Chiefs of Police.

TABLE 4.—OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE, 1971 AND 1972

[Cities over 100,000 population]

	Crime Index total	Murder, non-negligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary, breaking or entering	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft		Crime Index total	Murder, non-negligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary, breaking or entering	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Akron, Ohio:																	
1971	12,670	38	100	772	362	4,386	4,102	2,910	Austin, Tex.:								
1972	11,472	31	105	758	400	4,136	3,608	2,434	1971	8,307	27	66	372	1,119	4,334	1,336	1,053
Albany, N.Y.:									1972	8,003	38	62	285	966	4,046	1,625	981
1971	3,678	6	17	282	111	2,012	390	860	Baltimore, Md.:								
1972	2,803	6	17	223	97	1,377	445	638	1971	54,449	323	537	9,480	6,556	18,481	10,134	8,938
Albuquerque, N. Mex.:									1972	50,937	330	465	9,584	6,365	16,986	8,857	8,350
1971	16,540	31	103	667	988	6,232	6,531	1,988	Baton Rouge, La.:								
1972	17,475	23	154	857	1,159	7,023	6,554	1,705	1971	9,054	22	46	301	767	3,769	2,692	1,457
Alexandria, Va.:									1972	10,486	21	74	411	948	4,535	3,190	1,307
1971	5,899	9	51	490	424	1,864	2,186	875	Beaumont, Tex.:								
1972	5,777	17	30	435	483	1,861	2,309	642	1971	4,042	20	6	207	617	1,886	1,018	288
Allentown, Pa.:									1972	3,979	17	13	164	654	1,765	1,065	301
1971	3,134	5	22	137	178	1,238	1,252	302	Berkeley, Calif.:								
1972	2,652	4	17	162	106	1,036	986	341	1971	7,138	11	78	528	256	4,147	886	1,232
Amarillo, Tex.:									1972	6,946	10	104	567	251	3,896	1,080	1,038
1971	4,129	9	18	91	174	1,664	1,752	421	Birmingham, Ala.:								
1972	4,197	9	18	65	200	1,638	1,860	407	1971	14,152	82	98	465	1,470	4,857	4,286	2,894
Anaheim, Calif.:									1972	14,178	76	103	757	1,310	5,189	4,334	2,409
1971	8,519	5	56	223	165	4,118	3,097	855	Boston, Mass.:								
1972	9,772	14	78	249	321	4,661	3,589	860	1971	42,514	116	235	4,735	1,907	12,439	7,055	16,027
Arlington, Va.:									1972	38,763	104	262	5,037	2,015	10,173	5,609	15,563
1971	5,127	7	45	245	101	1,468	2,431	830	Bridgeport, Conn.:								
1972	4,336	2	30	181	89	1,230	2,124	680	1971	11,154	18	20	572	207	3,494	3,101	3,742
Atlanta, Ga.:									1972	9,525	18	13	512	155	2,720	2,995	3,112
1971	30,056	230	268	2,207	1,935	13,726	7,656	4,034	Buffalo, N.Y.:								
1972	33,213	255	256	3,074	2,143	14,676	8,659	4,150	1971	20,226	76	134	2,207	812	6,287	6,016	4,694
									1972	18,881	62	176	1,991	712	6,156	5,390	4,394

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE, 1971 AND 1972—Continued

[Cities over 100,000 population]

	Crime Index total	Murder, non- negligent slaughter	Forc- ible rape	Rob- bery	Aggra- vated assault	Bur- glary, break- ing or enter- ing	Lar- ceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Cambridge, Mass.:								
1971	7,177	5	42	355	243	1,978	1,315	3,239
1972	6,624	13	32	329	238	1,711	1,039	3,262
Camden, N.J.:								
1971	7,233	15	57	682	413	2,958	986	2,122
1972	8,157	26	48	695	551	3,457	1,102	2,278
Canton, Ohio:								
1971	3,902	11	15	327	137	1,265	565	615
1972	4,000	14	24	297	240	1,288	1,522	615
Cedar Rapids, Iowa:								
1971	1,932	5	10	34	15	683	842	343
1972	1,859	3	8	31	22	625	769	401
Charlotte, N.C.:								
1971	11,271	54	98	573	1,246	4,938	3,276	1,086
1972	9,945	60	78	603	1,172	4,324	2,811	897
Chattanooga, Tenn.:								
1971	6,805	35	55	421	575	2,670	1,643	1,406
1972	6,805	35	55	421	575	2,670	1,643	1,406
Chicago, Ill.:								
1971	126,854	824	1,549	24,012	11,285	38,385	15,593	35,206
1972	121,707	711	1,529	23,531	11,154	36,630	15,853	32,299
Cincinnati, Ohio:								
1971	21,880	79	189	1,749	819	9,751	6,144	3,149
1972	20,783	69	239	1,733	761	9,729	5,272	2,980
Cleveland, Ohio:								
1971	46,295	270	428	5,987	2,004	11,780	5,971	19,855
1972	41,055	307	462	5,639	1,988	10,446	4,687	17,526
Colorado Springs, Colo.:								
1971	5,895	9	70	183	198	2,183	2,558	694
1972	6,879	18	103	342	209	2,633	2,751	823
Columbia, S.C.:								
1971	5,456	32	37	264	353	2,650	1,490	630
1972	4,551	17	48	149	288	2,347	1,130	572
Columbus, Ga.:								
1971	4,025	22	14	200	158	1,779	1,167	685
1972	3,906	29	22	245	182	1,808	969	651
Columbus, Ohio:								
1971	26,579	69	269	1,873	943	10,023	8,176	5,226
1972	24,049	59	292	1,464	890	9,641	7,647	4,056
Corpus Christi, Tex.:								
1971	9,653	33	59	256	872	3,970	3,355	1,108
1972	9,573	29	71	324	765	4,462	2,998	924
Dallas, Tex.:								
1971	46,400	207	585	2,861	5,282	18,322	12,229	6,914
1972	45,213	192	533	2,616	4,529	21,475	10,481	5,387
Dearborn, Mich.:								
1971	3,360	8	13	148	73	1,090	1,310	718
1972	3,066	6	7	175	55	1,009	1,109	705
Denver, Colo.:								
1971	37,706	82	434	2,167	2,050	15,228	10,657	7,088
1972	38,945	89	368	2,014	1,927	16,750	10,136	7,661
Des Moines, Iowa:								
1971	6,561	11	66	361	159	1,885	3,301	778
1972	5,961	14	44	277	98	1,920	2,848	760
Detroit, Mich.:								
1971	127,245	577	853	20,753	5,400	51,531	25,361	22,770
1972	107,199	601	818	17,170	6,120	42,563	19,405	20,522
Duluth, Minn.:								
1971	2,765	3	14	40	24	1,090	1,081	513
1972	2,578	2	13	68	29	1,120	948	398
Elizabeth, N.J.:								
1971	5,530	10	28	475	314	2,067	1,113	1,523
1972	5,296	12	32	542	348	2,107	921	1,334
El Paso, Tex.:								
1971	13,074	16	75	398	588	7,621	2,240	2,136
1972	10,911	11	91	514	655	4,994	2,067	2,579
Erie, Pa.:								
1971	3,248	7	21	273	141	1,400	939	467
1972	3,246	11	26	325	137	1,500	763	484
Evansville, Ind.:								
1971	5,459	9	59	261	565	1,980	1,881	704
1972	4,726	8	54	187	599	1,471	1,970	437
Fall River, Mass.:								
1971	6,454	3	16	129	108	3,052	1,395	1,751
1972	5,535	8	11	203	149	2,321	1,356	1,487
Flint, Mich.:								
1971	11,068	33	81	635	1,258	4,214	3,517	1,330
1972	11,321	45	101	820	1,232	4,519	3,467	1,137
Fort Lauderdale, Fla.:								
1971	8,515	13	53	412	263	3,643	2,902	1,229
1972	8,155	28	61	385	260	3,712	2,694	1,015
Fort Wayne, Ind.:								
1971	7,383	6	46	343	102	2,391	3,876	619
1972	7,508	9	46	413	75	2,304	3,889	772
Fort Worth, Tex.:								
1971	13,948	102	88	917	549	6,615	2,816	2,861
1972	13,161	99	66	791	516	6,557	2,564	2,568
Fremont, Calif.:								
1971	3,936	1	26	56	98	1,942	1,370	443
1972	4,944	2	31	64	155	2,015	2,249	428
Fresno, Calif.:								
1971	11,568	19	35	386	226	4,562	4,152	2,188
1972	12,282	20	41	425	229	4,647	4,420	2,500
Garden Grove, Calif.:								
1971	5,504	3	29	153	113	2,044	2,756	397
1972	5,711	12	43	143	147	2,586	2,356	424
Gary, Ind.:								
1971	11,716	52	87	1,396	436	4,723	2,040	2,982
1972	11,284	81	90	1,253	519	4,673	1,909	2,759
Glendale, Calif.:								
1971	4,546	1	19	169	116	1,905	1,532	804
1972	4,283	5	11	108	98	1,851	1,530	680
Grand Rapids, Mich.:								
1971	6,663	17	71	262	510	3,601	1,610	592
1972	6,992	9	61	393	499	3,313	2,183	534
Greensboro, N.C.:								
1971	4,980	14	24	166	1,134	1,527	1,642	473
1972	5,563	17	40	270	1,239	1,822	1,714	461
Hammond, Ind.:								
1971	4,986	7	49	298	172	1,044	1,947	1,469
1972	4,872	8	28	271	146	1,285	2,160	974
Hampton, Va.:								
1971	2,698	6	20	78	120	1,232	1,004	238
1972	2,512	13	29	88	94	1,258	780	250
Hartford, Conn.:								
1971	8,225	23	40	574	662	2,507	1,777	2,642
1972	6,597	15	27	423	573	2,280	1,649	1,630
Hialeah, Fla.:								
1971	4,669	8	12	190	199	1,484	2,126	650
1972	4,287	5	17	178	214	1,221	1,943	709
Hollywood, Fla.:								
1971	5,686	2	23	232	249	2,204	2,105	871
1972	5,260	7	33	242	243	1,950	1,978	807
Honolulu, Hawaii:								
1971	24,530	31	124	715	381	9,599	9,426	4,254
1972	20,782	44	149	428	366	8,998	7,792	3,005
Houston, Tex.:								
1971	58,819	303	530	5,127	2,877	26,219	10,993	12,770
1972	60,366	294	483	5,117	2,169	29,411	11,801	11,091
Huntington Beach, Calif.:								
1971	4,933	7	47	83	156	1,867	2,349	424
1972	5,034	4	49	86	179	1,915	2,327	474
Huntsville, Ala.:								
1971	5,195	21	27	106	267	2,159	2,007	608
1972	4,160	4	32	103	236	1,542	1,718	525
Independence, Mo.:								
1971	2,018	4	15	50	155	868	713	213
1972	2,232	3	27	42	230	860	784	286
Indianapolis, Ind.:								
1971	22,874	60	264	2,109	927	9,480	5,537	4,497
1972	19,207	66	275	1,398	726	8,267	4,817	3,658
Jackson, Miss.:								
1971	4,635	29	68	185	280	1,998	1,435	640
1972	5,011	42	20	169	168	2,022	1,808	782
Jacksonville, Fla.:								
1971	24,171	82	254	1,264	1,941	12,035	6,048	2,547
1972	22,975	96	293	1,426	2,474	10,619	6,099	1,968
Jersey City, N.J.:								
1971	11,214	40	51	1,629	442	3,146	803	5,103
1972	10,281	47	67	1,373	464	2,865	925	4,540
Kansas City, Kans.:								
1971	7,330	34	85	461	572	3,618	923	1,637
1972	7,374	21	83	571	457	3,712	1,015	1,515
Kansas City, Mo.:								
1971	27,864	103	371	2,473	1,805	11,550	6,154	5,408
1972	24,188	71	344	2,092	1,961	9,472	6,327	3,921
Knoxville, Tenn.:								
1971	5,044	20	18	182	254	2,242	787	1,541
1972	5,044	20	18	182	254	2,242	787	1,541
Lansing, Mich.:								
1971	8,278	4	33	274	270	3,977	3,074	646
1972	7,759	7	46	422	299	3,405	2,843	737
Las Vegas, Nev.:								
1971	4,697	21	23	326	195	2,140	1,064	928
1972	5,139	29	47	389	145	2,312	1,293	924
Lexington								

	Crime index total	Murder, non-negligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary, breaking or entering	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Minneapolis, Minn.: 1971.....	23,865	35	228	1,646	1,037	10,039	5,884	4,996
1972.....	24,294	39	308	1,908	1,358	10,495	4,960	5,226
Mobile, Ala.: 1971.....	8,852	37	85	456	441	5,158	1,604	1,071
1972.....	7,508	26	81	360	443	4,299	1,537	762
Montgomery, Ala.: 1971.....	4,458	34	40	211	99	1,715	1,821	538
1972.....	4,316	28	47	146	74	1,806	1,636	579
Nashville, Tenn.: 1971.....	20,746	73	157	1,176	2,174	8,216	5,525	3,425
1972.....	17,017	68	104	1,097	1,616	6,569	4,877	2,686
Newark, N.J.: 1971.....	34,762	131	312	5,529	2,641	13,466	5,754	6,929
1972.....	31,213	148	325	4,788	2,583	11,040	4,274	8,055
New Bedford, Mass.: 1971.....	5,603	2	12	169	119	2,566	1,488	1,247
1972.....	4,468	3	21	214	150	1,926	1,130	1,024
New Haven, Conn.: 1971.....	7,934	18	52	251	334	2,977	1,835	2,467
1972.....	7,166	9	47	248	327	2,332	1,718	2,485
New Orleans, La.: 1971.....	35,375	116	325	3,391	2,109	10,705	10,381	8,348
1972.....	30,000	163	261	3,001	2,040	8,428	8,984	7,123
Newport News, Va.: 1971.....	3,693	12	28	216	427	1,332	1,372	306
1972.....	4,277	22	28	238	538	1,465	1,530	456
New York, N.Y.: 1971.....	529,447	1,466	2,415	88,994	33,865	181,331	124,752	96,624
1972.....	434,303	1,691	3,271	78,202	37,130	148,046	90,098	75,865
Norfolk, Va.: 1971.....	13,939	35	122	821	1,229	4,912	5,217	1,603
1972.....	11,411	46	144	823	1,251	3,983	3,870	1,294
Oakland, Calif.: 1971.....	25,664	89	220	2,932	1,224	14,311	4,193	5,395
1972.....	24,804	78	261	2,907	1,646	13,080	1,413	5,419
Oklahoma City, Okla.: 1971.....	12,959	45	144	521	1,142	6,314	2,136	2,657
1972.....	13,201	43	133	671	787	7,220	1,629	2,718
Omaha, Nebr.: 1971.....	11,408	24	122	482	1,085	3,706	3,097	2,892
1972.....	13,234	24	125	692	1,092	4,064	4,237	3,000
Orlando, Fla.: 1971.....	6,127	21	30	301	989	2,389	1,941	456
1972.....	5,469	19	37	325	414	2,283	1,892	499
Parma, Ohio: 1971.....	1,605	3	4	25	59	513	616	385
1972.....	1,449	3	3	27	64	613	446	296
Pasadena, Calif.: 1971.....	8,078	11	111	527	458	3,677	2,117	1,177
1972.....	7,949	18	89	524	386	3,765	1,673	1,494
Paterson, N.J.: 1971.....	8,521	20	41	918	977	3,177	936	2,452
1972.....	9,453	23	23	1,110	1,018	3,657	1,097	2,525
Philadelphia, Pa.: 1971.....	61,340	435	546	9,243	4,970	20,914	7,387	17,845
1972.....	58,584	413	588	9,710	4,603	21,182	6,048	16,040
Phoenix, Ariz.: 1971.....	30,546	55	216	1,304	2,326	13,348	8,965	4,332
1972.....	33,365	83	256	1,292	2,643	15,359	9,621	4,111
Pittsburgh, Pa.: 1971.....	26,467	65	279	2,556	1,910	9,489	5,636	6,532
1972.....	23,550	49	298	2,646	1,827	7,824	4,778	6,128
Portland, Oreg.: 1971.....	26,459	15	144	1,797	1,127	10,794	8,845	3,737
1972.....	26,530	37	169	1,715	1,344	11,034	8,743	3,558
Portsmouth, Va.: 1971.....	5,079	21	52	489	269	2,276	1,329	643
1972.....	4,978	23	48	487	360	2,286	1,006	768
Providence, R.I.: 1971.....	11,977	12	21	625	525	4,176	894	5,724
1972.....	10,355	6	21	534	443	3,793	758	4,800
Raleigh, N.C.: 1971.....	4,956	12	22	191	452	1,308	2,638	333
1972.....	4,707	25	31	135	583	1,446	2,085	402
Richmond, Va.: 1971.....	15,306	72	131	1,286	786	6,191	4,143	2,697
1972.....	13,507	87	164	1,453	812	5,152	3,655	2,184
Riverside, Calif.: 1971.....	8,713	14	63	255	465	4,036	3,056	824
1972.....	8,943	8	52	247	641	4,270	2,993	732
Rochester, N.Y.: 1971.....	11,160	31	54	728	458	4,664	3,927	1,298
1972.....	10,196	29	55	726	389	4,651	3,001	1,345
Rockford, Ill.: 1971.....	3,525	13	8	149	187	1,353	1,349	466
1972.....	3,825	9	27	128	229	1,645	1,328	459
Sacramento, Calif.: 1971.....	13,410	33	84	783	565	5,509	3,745	2,691
1972.....	15,314	51	110	886	634	6,889	4,102	2,642
St. Louis, Mo.: 1971.....	44,409	220	498	4,956	3,231	18,876	4,763	11,865
1972.....	42,580	205	512	4,844	3,216	17,577	4,947	11,279
St. Paul, Minn.: 1971.....	14,417	20	79	892	488	5,919	3,998	3,011
1972.....	14,773	16	90	838	558	6,693	3,746	2,832
St. Petersburg, Fla.: 1971.....	8,661	29	52	633	671	4,487	2,337	452
1972.....	9,578	21	60	652	580	5,231	2,566	468
Salt Lake City, Utah: 1971.....	11,179	16	64	409	292	4,159	4,387	1,852
1972.....	10,057	12	79	446	350	3,935	4,035	1,200
San Antonio, Tex.: 1971.....	26,703	96	217	911	2,091	10,579	8,008	4,801
1972.....	27,492	104	256	1,200	1,854	12,038	7,820	4,220
San Bernardino, Calif.: 1971.....	7,204	7	34	400	278	3,040	2,391	1,054
1972.....	7,323	14	56	447	355	2,675	2,670	1,106
San Diego, Calif.: 1971.....	25,495	37	142	1,106	806	8,670	11,050	3,684
1972.....	28,039	31	165	1,225	992	9,957	11,629	4,040
San Francisco, Calif.: 1971.....	57,538	102	512	6,584	3,101	18,264	16,130	12,845
1972.....	46,620	81	505	4,573	2,665	14,519	13,201	11,076
San Jose, Calif.: 1971.....	17,880	16	170	497	743	8,190	4,643	3,621
1972.....	20,230	27	173	687	822	9,603	4,738	4,183
Santa Ana, Calif.: 1971.....	6,716	4	83	276	282	3,719	1,508	844
1972.....	7,291	8	81	260	366	4,267	1,528	781
Savannah, Ga.: 1971.....	7,109	22	86	393	414	3,372	2,106	716
1972.....	6,127	27	68	424	696	2,629	1,644	639
Scranton, Pa.: 1971.....	2,237	1	7	68	144	795	770	452
1972.....	1,632	9	37	37	162	609	568	247
Seattle, Wash.: 1971.....	26,967	42	208	1,801	1,093	12,455	7,858	3,510
1972.....	25,952	42	278	1,564	949	11,339	8,340	3,440
Shreveport, La.: 1971.....	5,472	40	25	186	585	2,595	1,272	769
1972.....	5,014	31	23	188	495	2,288	1,429	560
South Bend, Ind.: 1971.....	4,793	17	26	463	132	1,843	1,466	846
1972.....	5,750	15	27	470	143	2,141	1,874	1,080
Spokane, Wash.: 1971.....	5,977	9	18	181	168	2,645	2,208	748
1972.....	5,840	6	10	173	203	2,686	1,885	877
Springfield, Mass.: 1971.....	10,273	12	10	407	325	4,358	2,011	3,150
1972.....	11,504	8	30	430	791	4,565	3,051	2,629
Springfield, Mo.: 1971.....	3,963	4	5	64	77	1,831	1,665	317
1972.....	4,148	6	19	78	119	1,860	1,725	341
Stamford, Conn.: 1971.....	3,815	5	16	150	91	2,331	522	704
1972.....	2,762	1	13	137	83	1,553	460	511
Stockton, Calif.: 1971.....	7,546	20	34	474	256	3,452	1,973	1,337
1972.....	8,635	21	28	559	327	3,831	2,364	1,505
Syracuse, N.Y.: 1971.....	6,869	5	38	528	284	2,968	2,382	664
1972.....	6,109	10	24	374	299	2,825	2,050	527
Tacoma, Wash.: 1971.....	6,005	10	44	310	297	2,493	1,930	921
1972.....	6,226	12	47	325	315	2,571	2,207	749
Tampa, Fla.: 1971.....	13,824	54	68	951	1,143	6,346	3,893	1,369
1972.....	14,699	62	77	996	1,138	6,713	4,145	1,568
Toledo, Ohio: 1971.....	13,821	29	118	1,081	457	5,227	5,149	1,760
1972.....	14,703	34	131	1,180	500	5,227	6,093	1,438
Topeka, Kans.: 1971.....	4,586	7	40	202	442	1,583	1,956	355
1972.....	3,889	9	41	144	347	1,421	1,721	206
Torrance, Calif.: 1971.....	6,059	6	39	155	121	2,459	2,372	907
1972.....	5,744	2	32	214	145	2,017	2,398	936
Trenton, N.J.: 1971.....	7,085	16	22	913	300	3,378	1,816	1,316
1972.....	7,204	21	34	912	548	2,957	1,240	1,492
Tucson, Ariz.: 1971.....	8,465	19	91	383	465	3,704	2,450	1,353
1972.....	9,622	12	102	481	412	4,324	2,882	1,409
Tulsa, Okla.: 1971.....	12,432	33	73	459	838	5,113	3,922	1,994
1972.....	12,611	31	118	463	831	5,334	4,242	1,592
Virginia Beach, Va.: 1971.....	4,194	5	28	63	192	1,205	2,495	205
1972.....	4,368	5	31	71	174	1,419	2,394	274
Warren, Mich.: 1971.....	5,874	2	37	241	199	1,902	2,644	849
1972.....	5,709	5	34	215	252	1,829	2,517	857
Washington, D.C.: 1971.....	51,256	275	615	11,222	3,972	18,818	7,622	8,732
1972.....	37,446	245	714	7,751	3,897	12,801	6,217	5,821
Waterbury, Conn.: 1971.....	3,887	5	10	175	128	1,499	960	1,110
1972.....	3,589	8	4	223	135	1,453	823	943
Wichita, Kans.: 1971.....	10,689	14	57	374	400	4,388	3,829	1,627
1972.....	10,616	17	46	343	391	4,347	3,745	1,727
Winston-Salem, N.C.: 1971.....	5,403	33	43	199	1,019	2,242	1,459	408
1972.....	5,679	33	40	230	1,129	2,379	1,358	510
Worcester, Mass.: 1971.....	12,559	12	33	452	207	5,110	2,356	4,389
1972.....	12,894	7	32	501	275	5,179	1,827	5,073
Yonkers, N.Y.: 1971.....	7,252	11	9	485	196	2,507	2,287	1,757
1972.....	6,							

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The crime figures released today by the Department of Justice are very heartening. The FBI's Uniform Crime Reports indicate that for the first time in 17 years, America has experienced an absolute decrease in serious crime.

In 1972, serious crime decreased by 3 percent over 1971. In the last quarter of 1972, there was a full 8 percent decrease.

Reflected in these figures is a pattern of steady progress over the past four years. In 1968, serious crime increased by 17 percent, the largest rate of increase in the last quarter century. Gradually that rate of increase has been reduced, coming down to 11 percent in 1970, 6 percent in 1971, and finally to this complete reversal in 1972.

These results are a tribute to the men and women in the front lines of the war against crime—our law enforcement officers. Public opinion is untangling their hands and they are once again being given the public support they deserve in their efforts to insure that we match public support with all the financial, legislative, and judicial support our police need.

We can turn the tide of crime in America. These statistics demonstrate that we are well on our way. Now we must have the tools we need to finish the job. I call upon the Congress to act quickly on this Administration's proposals for law enforcement legislation so that we can advance the work of providing the safe and secure country our citizens want and deserve so much.

RURAL WATER AND SEWER ACT SHOULD NOT BE VETOED

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 3298, an act to restore the rural water and sewer grant program. I shall do so regretfully because as a Republican representing a Republican congressional district in a State that has been staunchly Republican, it is no easy matter to not support my Republican President. I do so not out of malice or spite, nor in a spirit of confrontation.

I do so, Mr. Speaker, because this latest veto simply proves that those who advise our President, those who sit in places of power today are out of touch with reality. They have never faced an electorate; they have no sense of human kinship; they deal in statistics and computers are their gods. The idols before which they cast themselves are Madison Avenue dogma and cost per thousand.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that when this Congress passed the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act 8 years ago, it sought to deal with a critical problem that faced the smaller rural communities—a situation that had become increasingly impossible due to an eroding tax base, higher interest rates, and inability to float their own bond issues.

Today, after 8 years of operation, and with only \$150 million having been appropriated in fiscal 1973 for the program, 1,685 small rural communities throughout this land await action on their applications for matching grants. Many of these communities, with faith that the Federal Government will not let them down, already have voted bonds to meet their obligations under the law.

But on January 10 of this year, with scarcely 20 percent of the \$150 million

expended, the Department of Agriculture announced peremptorily that it was "terminating" planning and development grants for water and waste disposal programs in rural small towns because such termination would, forsooth, contribute to the success of the administration's plan to reduce Federal spending.

Regard at whose expense we are asked to reduce Federal spending. We are not asked to reduce Federal spending at the expense of North Vietnam. We are not asked to save a half billion dollars that this administration has promised the head of state of South Vietnam who recently graced us with his presence. We are not asked to save the \$3 to \$4 billion that it costs our taxpayers annually to maintain a military presence in Europe. We are not asked to cut back on the near \$1 billion we spend in Korea to maintain 40,000 American troops and for economic aid and military assistance.

I divert here to point out that we are bamboozled with the threat that unilateral withdrawal in Europe is dangerous; it will leave us with no bargaining weapon with our newfound friends in Soviet Russia. Are not Germany and France and Holland and Belgium and the others able to finance this military presence? Certainly their coinage is stronger and their fiscal and economic situation is better than our own at this moment. Where is it written that we must continue to bear a responsibility for some 13 nations in Europe whose combined populations and wealth far exceed our own. If they fear the Russian bear, let them equip themselves to meet the burden of that fear. Obviously our own Government no longer clings to the philosophy that its most articulate spokesmen not so long ago held about international communism.

Mr. Speaker, we are asked to sustain a veto of an authorization bill whose proposed total cost for the 1973 fiscal year was less than the cost of a single new bomber now being planned. We are being told that \$150 million will break the line and compel new taxes. We are being sold a Madison Avenue line of propaganda that will not stand analysis.

Many local communities for many years, the veto message tells us, have proudly financed their own water and sewer facilities. Of course they have. The question is—can they continue to do so today? The answer is "No."

A large percentage of such rural communities are shells of what they were years ago as farming became more and more a corporate business, as the young people moved to the cities, as homes decayed and tax revenues barely met the absolute necessities of community life. Wall Street, the securities houses, would not even rate most of their proposed bond offerings, much less buy and attempt to distribute them.

Meanwhile, water systems a century old and sewer systems inadequate to begin with, deteriorated. I know of small rural communities where sewage flowed in open streams in the street and into an adjacent river. No wonder sickness prevails. Indeed we are fortunate that we have not experienced typhoid and smallpox epidemics in some of these areas.

Of course these communities would be proud to build their own facilities. I know

of many in my own congressional district that would like nothing better than to avoid Federal largesse. They despise the bowing and scraping and hat-in-hand kowtowing that has become a part and parcel of dealing with the Federal Government. But they have no choice, unfortunately. If they are to continue to exist as communities, if they are to afford their residents even the minimum amenities, they need help from other sources.

They are the victims of a changing economic way of life, a changing society, that has left so many small rural towns in a backwash. They struggle desperately to hang on; their mayors and county commissioners eagerly seek some small enterprise to move in and bring a few new job opportunities. Their residents believe, as do I, that they have something to offer America, something deeply and uniquely American that we should not give up.

The veto message admits, Mr. Speaker, that despite the promised help through other programs, and here I quote:

Some rural communities in need of sewer assistance may still have financing difficulties because of their inability to borrow at reasonable rates.

What mathematical wizard, what financial expert, I ask, composed that sentence? What is "some" rural communities? A hundred, 500, a thousand? How meaningful is the phrase "reasonable interest rates" when in many cases a bond is not marketable at any interest cost because the existing property tax is already so burdensome that the residents cannot defray any additional tax rate?

Note also that the quoted sentence conveniently omits any reference to water requirements. Where existing water supplies are brackish, or are so heavily polluted from ancient cesspools, or where the water table has dropped so that a supply is no longer available; in these circumstances what are the people to do for water? Of course, those who write these veto messages know nothing of such facts. They glibly explain that in these few cases we have other programs that will do the job.

They point to the 1974 budget where \$345 million has been provided in loan funds through the Rural Development Act. This will permit, the message assures us, borrowing at favorable rates. What good is a loan program when a community simply cannot afford to borrow the full cost of a water and sewer project? I am high in praise of the Rural Development Act and the great job that has been done in Kansas and in my congressional district by its administrator. But I know, and every Member here knows full well, that when the allocation of the \$345 million in that program is over, precious little will be left for disbursement to 1,500 to 1,600 truly rural communities whose applications are now pending for matching grants.

The veto message also raises a constitutional question. The lawyers in the Justice Department have advised the President, he says, that the Congress has no right to write into law a requirement that he must expend the funds specifically appropriated for a program.

I part company with those constitutional experts who insist that only the

Executive has the right, the duty, the constitutional power to impose a spending limit by fiat. I disagree that the Executive has the authority to order the expenditure of appropriated funds at his discretion. When the Congress grants the President discretion in a spending bill, when it uses a "may" clause instead of a "shall" clause, he has the clear and unequivocal right to impound such funds as he deems fit.

But when the Congress by law declares that the funds it appropriates "shall" be expended as the law directs, impoundment by the Executive becomes, in my judgment, an unconstitutional act. To charge, as the President's lawyers do in his veto message, that a mandate by the Congress violates article II stretches the credulity of any reasonable legal scholar, I believe.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to suggest that a poor country lawyer from Kansas could begin to match learning with those Harvard and Yale and Duke law school graduates who today try to tell the Congress what is constitutional and what is not.

But I have a strong feeling that all too frequently these interpretations furnished our President are matters of convenience; when it suits the administration purpose, it is constitutional; when it conflicts with an administration aim, it is unconstitutional.

As a fiscal conservative, I have voted against giveaway programs and wasteful spending. I did this long before the present occupant at the White House moved in. I have regretted the spending policies of his predecessors and have opposed many of them. I have continued that policy these past 4 years.

In my judgment this country cannot long withstand \$30 billion annual deficits nor indeed the promised \$12 to \$15 billion deficit in fiscal 1974. I do not believe we can go on with \$12 billion imbalances in foreign trade. I do not believe that we should be proud that it has been necessary to devalue our dollar twice in short span. I am unhappy that we have been unable to halt the inflationary spiral, that the Consumer Price Index has jumped at the greatest rate in more than 20 years; that the wholesale commodity index continues to rise forecasting even higher retail costs later on.

I cite these facts and their ominous forebodings to emphasize that I am acutely conscious of the evil of Federal overspending. I agree that a prudent spending ceiling is essential. I subscribe to the fiscal 1974 spending ceiling of \$268 billion the President has suggested. Indeed I wish it could be lower because it forecasts another substantial deficit.

But I want the Congress to set that spending ceiling. More important, I insist that it is the prerogative of the Congress to establish the priorities of spending within that budget framework. Simply because Congress modifies, changes, or shifts the priorities in spending does not warrant a cry of alarm that spending has gone amok, or that the ceiling has blown off.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree that the Constitution vests in the President the power to arrogate to himself the imposition of taxes and the spending thereof. I cling to the belief that the Congress enjoys

these powers by constitutional right and that it, and only it, may determine by law how much money shall be spent and for what purposes. If its Members take fiscally irresponsible actions, the people of this land have the power to remove them from office.

We tread on dangerous ground, Mr. Speaker, when the people are led to believe that their only hope of fiscal sanity lies in a surrender of the purpose to one man—be he Republican or Democrat. Unfortunately, no one man has the knowledge or the wisdom to make such decisions. He must rely on his chosen assistants—men who have never been elected to office, and therefore are not responsible to the people. When all power vests in one man and his chosen assistants, the people will have lost their Republic. That way lies chaos and the end of constitutional government.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to override the veto on H.R. 3298.

EMISSION MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS ON FOSSIL FUEL ELECTRIC POWER-PLANTS

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

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to place strict emission monitoring and reporting requirements on fossil fuel electric power-plants.

My legislation would make mandatory precise measurements of individual emissions. It would require that those measurements be reported in detail and that the reports be made available to the public.

Mr. Speaker, one of the glaring weaknesses in our war on air pollution is an inexcusable void in sophisticated, analytical information about smog and its components. We have a wealth of information, but much of it is contradictory and confounding. Further, the credibility gap in air pollution analysis is appalling.

This legislation is aimed at establishing direction and credibility in our system of analyzing smog from stationary electricity producing sources. This is an area where careful monitoring and reporting of emissions can make a significant, immediate contribution to our efforts to better understand and eventually eliminate our smog problem.

Without a better understanding, and without reliable, credible breakdowns of data on the components of smog and their respective evils, we will never make the progress necessary to clean up the air.

BUDGET CUT HEARINGS IN STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

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, my colleague from Massachusetts, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, recently held hearings on the effect of the proposed budget cuts on his congressional district. He will, as

chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Budget of the Massachusetts Delegation, be holding hearings across the entire State. We are deeply grateful to him for his efforts in Massachusetts.

Mr. HARRINGTON has been generous enough to make available in the RECORD (February 28, pp. 1417-8; March 19, pp. 1633-4) for the use of all Members his analysis and a description of the methodology he used in preparing the statistics on the local impact of the budget.

Mr. Speaker, because of the considerable interest demonstrated by other Members, I am inserting today, on behalf of Mr. HARRINGTON, the following questionnaire he used to gather detailed information from State and local officials:

QUESTIONNAIRE SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL HARRINGTON

If we are to explain the real effects of the budget cuts to the public, we must have detailed information on what these proposed cuts would mean to every city and town in the Commonwealth. The people must know that the President's budget does not hurt only a small minority of people, but will damage the economy of their cities and towns and of the entire region. We must illustrate that the programs terminated and cut back by the Nixon Budget are programs that serve every person in the state.

In order to obtain information we need volunteers to go into the cities and towns, talk with municipal officials, and find out what the cuts will mean in local areas.

For this purpose we have prepared a list of programs terminated by the Nixon Budget programs that have been utilized in the Commonwealth during the past. We hope to illustrate that the loss of these programs will endanger the progress we have made thus far in serving the people and in providing basic and necessary services.

We have also prepared a questionnaire to assist the volunteer in finding these programs on the local level.

We need to know how many people are served by each program, the amount of funding that has been received in the past and was anticipated in the future, and what local officials see as the impact of the loss of these programs and funds.

Of course, we would like as much supplementary information as possible—what effect these cuts will have on the tax rate, the future growth of the localities, the basic services provided by the government—but the questionnaire should provide us with the basic information we need.

If we are to gain support for the continuation or reinstatement of vital programs, we must illustrate their worth to the great majority of people, those who do not now feel directly affected by the budget cuts. We must show that the cuts in education, health, environmental improvement, housing and other programs, will adversely affect all people.

This description list and questionnaire are meant to aid you in your work. They are not complete in themselves; only inquiry and follow-up can provide us with the necessary information without which we can not hope to save these vital programs.

The superintendent of schools in your city or town is usually the best source of information on federal funding under education. In most cases he will be able to give you hard figures, people figures, and give you worthwhile comments on effects, etc. In some cases he may lead you to other people and groups that can help you. For example, under Environmental Education he may have knowledge of a local ecology club which takes advantage of federal funds. Please do not hesitate to ask him for leads and then follow them up.

The following questions should be asked of the superintendent of the school system:

1. What is the total student enrollment of your school?
2. What is the total number of full time/part time teachers?

TITLE I—EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under E.S.E.A. Title I (Educationally deprived children) in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many children were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. Can you estimate the income of families of children served by Title I?
5. How many people were employed under Title I in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
6. What effects will the termination of this program have on these children and the community?

TITLE II—LIBRARY RESOURCES

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under E.S.E.A. Title II (Library Resources) in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. Are there any special groups or special students served under this program aside from the general student body?
4. How many new books and/or other library materials did your school receive in F.Y. 1973?
5. How many new books and/or other library materials will your school receive in F.Y. 1974?
6. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students?

TITLE III—AID TO INNOVATIVE EDUCATION

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under E.S.E.A. Title III (Aid to Innovative Education) in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. What is the total number of people or groups supplemented by Title III?
4. How many people are employed under Title III?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students or groups?

TITLE IV—EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under E.S.E.A. Title IV (Education Research and Demonstration) in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. What effects will the termination of this program have on the school(s), students and the community?

TITLE VI—HANDICAPPED RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION

1. How much did your school(s) receive under E.S.E.C. Title VI (Handicapped Research and Demonstration) in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many children were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people are employed under Title IV? Full time? Part time?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these children?

TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Please list languages used:

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under E.S.E.A. Title VII (Bilingual Education) in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people are employed under Title VII? Full Time? Part Time?
5. What effects will the termination of

this program have on these students and the community?

TITLE VIII—DROPOUT PREVENTION

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under E.S.E.A. Title VIII (Dropout Prevention) in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this title in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people are employed under this title? Full time? Part time?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students?

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the environmental education program in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students/people were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973?
5. What effect will the termination of this program have on these students/people?

NUTRITION AND HEALTH

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under Nutrition and Health in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students?

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under drug abuse education in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many people/students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on the students and the community?

FOLLOW THROUGH

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the Follow Through program in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

OCCUPATIONAL, VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

These educational programs can exist in either secondary or vocational schools. The superintendent of the secondary school system will have information on vocational education in secondary schools and/or the programs in vocational schools. If information for vocational programs is not available, contact the principal/director of the local vocational school.

TITLE I—PART B, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—SPECIAL NEEDS

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the Vocational Education Special Needs program in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much

do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
5. Can you describe the financial profile of these students' families?
6. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

TITLE I—PART F, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKER

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the Vocational Education—Consumer and Homemaking Program in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

TITLE I—PART H, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—WORK STUDY

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the Vocational Education—Work Study Program in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
5. Can you describe the financial situation of these students' families?
6. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

TITLE I—PART G, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATION

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under Vocational Education—Co-operative Education in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

TITLE III—ADULT EDUCATION—GRANTS TO STATES

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under Title III Adult Education—Grants to States in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?
5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the School Assistance in Federally Impacted Areas Program in F.Y. 1973?
2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?
3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?
4. How many people were employed under

this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM (DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE)

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the Special Milk Program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

6. Do/Does your school(s) have a breakfast and/or hot lunch program? Yes? No? Both?

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the Education for the Handicapped Program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973. Full time? Part time?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on the handicapped in the community?

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT TITLE III AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the National Defense Education Act, Title III Audio-Visual Equipment Program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on the students and the community?

TITLE 5A—GUIDANCE

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under the Guidance Program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on these students and the community?

H.U.D.—See Housing Authority or other appropriate official.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future? If yes, please explain.

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future? If yes, please explain.

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

NONPROFIT SPONSOR ASSISTANCE

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Urban Renewal

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

BASIC WATER AND SEWER

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

OPEN SPACE

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

REHABILITATION LOANS

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

COLLEGE HOUSING

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

MODEL CITIES

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

NEW COMMUNITIES ASSISTANCE

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRAINING AND URBAN FELLOWSHIPS

1. How much federal monies did your city/town receive in F.Y. 1973 under this program?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 1973?

4. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 1974 or near future?

5. Was an application ever filed in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

6. What effects will the termination of this program have on the community?

NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOANS—DIRECT LOAN CONTRIBUTIONS—P.L. 85-864

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under this program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. What effects will the termination of this program have on the students and the college/university community?

WORK STUDY PROGRAM—P.L. 88-452

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under this program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. How many students were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on the students and the college/university community?

HIGHER EDUCATION—LAND GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES—P.L. 132

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under this program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on the students and the college/university community?

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS, P.L. 89-329

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under this program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. What effects will the termination of this program have on the students and the college/university community?

HIGHER EDUCATION ACADEMIC FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION—PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under this program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on the students and the college/university community?

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY SERVICE—GRANTS TO STATES—P.L. 92-820

1. How much in federal monies did your school(s) receive under this program in F.Y. 1973?

2. If there is no termination of this program, how much do you anticipate in federal funds to continue this program in F.Y. 1974?

3. How many students were served under this program in F.Y. 1973?

4. How many people were employed under this program in F.Y. 1973? Full time? Part time?

5. What effects will the termination of this program have on the students and the college/university community?

PUBLIC HEALTH AND MENTAL HEALTH

Hospital Administrators are the best source of information for health care and services and mental health information.

Hill-Burton program (hospital construction)

1. Did your hospital receive any money under Hill-Burton for hospital construction in F.Y. 73? How much? For what purpose?

2. Were you planning on federal funds in F.Y. 74 or near future? How much? For what purpose?

3. Was an application ever filed; in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

4. What effect will the termination of Hill-Burton Construction aid have on the hospital and the community?

Nursing capitation grants

1. Do you have a nursing school or program? Yes? No?

2. How much in federal funds from nursing capitation grants did your hospital receive in F.Y. 73?

3. How many students received grants in F.Y. 73?

4. How much in federal funds, if there is no termination, do you anticipate in F.Y. 74?

5. How many students, if there were no termination, would receive grants in F.Y. 74?

6. What effects will a termination of this program have on the hospital, the students, or the community?

Advance funds to hospitals or medicare clients

(Must be returned by July 1)

1. Does your hospital take advantage of these advanced funds?

2. How much will you have to return to the federal government?

Mental health

1. Did you have plans for construction or staffing federal grants for a community mental health center? How much?

2. Was an application ever filed; in serious or final stages; in initial planning stages, or discussion? If yes, please explain.

3. What effect will the termination of mental health staffing and construction grants have on the hospital and the community?

Are there any other areas where you will have problems, lose money, and be adversely affected because of cuts in the federal budget?

THE CHIEF LIBRARIAN IN THE LOCAL LIBRARY IS THE BEST SOURCE OF INFORMATION FOR THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Title I—(Grants for public libraries)

1. How much in federal monies did your library receive under Title I LSCA (Grants for Public Libraries) in F.Y. 73?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds in F.Y. 74?

3. How many people were served in F.Y. 73?

4. Was an application ever filed, in serious or final planning stages; in initial planning stage, or discussion. If yes, please explain.

5. What effects will the termination of this program have in the community?

Title II—(Construction of public libraries)

1. How much in federal monies did your library receive under Title II (Construction of Public Libraries) in F.Y. 73?

2. If there is no termination, how much do you anticipate in federal funds in F.Y. 74?

3. Was an application ever filed; in serious or final stages, in initial planning stages, or discussion. If yes, please explain.

4. What effect will the termination of this program have on the community?

PROTECTION OF THE U.S. SUGAR QUOTAS OF FRIENDLY COUNTRIES: AN URGENT NEED

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the recent antihijacking agreement concluded between the United States and Cuba has raised the possibility of the reestablishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and Havana in the relatively near future. There are two schools of thought on this subject. One asserts that such a move would be a natural part of the current trend toward normalization of relations with the Communist world. The other maintains that recognition of Castro Cuba is a special case because of the potentially damaging effects on the political and social infrastructures of other Latin American countries which could result from conferring diplomatic recognition to Castro prior to the establishment of a democratic system in Cuba. The relative merits of the arguments of these two schools of thought should be subjected to widespread rational debate.

Neither school of thought has yet put into proper perspective one of the most important aspects of the problem, the U.S. sugar quota. This aspect has global implications for U.S. foreign policy.

Until 1961 Cuba was the major supplier of cane sugar to the U.S. market. In 1960 the Cuban sugar quota was 2,419,655 tons, representing 48.08 percent of U.S. sugar imports. Since 1961 this quota has been reapportioned among many other countries. A consequence of this reapportionment has been an impetus to the growth of the sugar industry in these countries.

If the United States should reestablish diplomatic relations with Cuba, the rationale of normalization of relations would imply the ultimate restoration of Cuba's sugar quota. The prospect of this could lead to drastic dislocations in the economies of the diverse nations presently sharing a part of the former Cuban sugar quota. These economic dislocations in turn could prove so politically disruptive that the United States, in normalizing relations with one country, could as a consequence contribute to the creation of diplomatic and economic complications with, and in some cases

grave difficulties for, nearly 30 countries. Prudence would dictate that the United States should act responsibly toward the friendly countries concerned before, rather than after, problems should arise.

The following tables from the Department of Agriculture showing the 1960 and 1972 sugar quotas in tonnage and percentage of the total U.S. sugar quota indicate the countries which could be

damaged by the restoration of Cuba's sugar quota.

Firm assurances to these friendly countries from both the executive and legislative branches of the United States Government that any possible reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Castro Cuba would in no way lead to a reduction of their present sugar quotas is an urgent need.

Country	1960 quota		1972 quota	
	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
Cuba.....	2,419,655	48.08	0	0
Philippines.....	1,156,426	22.98	1,431,761	26.31
Argentina.....	0	0	87,908	1.62
Australia.....	0	0	210,896	3.88
Brazil.....	100,347	1.99	635,498	11.68
British Honduras.....	0	0	39,144	.72
British West Indies.....	90,765	1.84	177,288	3.26
China (Republic of).....	10,476	.21	87,804	1.61
Colombia.....	0	0	78,287	1.44
Costa Rica.....	10,469	.21	101,597	1.86
Dominican Republic.....	452,814	9.00	736,807	13.54
Ecuador.....	0	0	93,827	1.72
El Salvador.....	6,000	.12	49,723	.91
Fiji Islands.....	0	0	46,212	.85
Guatemala.....	6,000	.12	85,707	1.53

Country	1960		1972	
	Quota (tons)	Per cent	Quota (tons)	Per cent
Philippines.....	1,156,426	22.98	1,431,761	26.31
Argentina.....	0	0	87,908	1.62
Australia.....	0	0	210,896	3.88
Brazil.....	100,347	1.99	635,498	11.68
British Honduras.....	0	0	39,144	.72
British West Indies.....	90,765	1.84	177,288	3.26

Country	1960 quota		1972 quota	
	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
Honduras.....	0	0	17,495	0.32
India.....	0	0	84,168	1.55
Ireland.....	0	0	5,551	.10
Malagasy Republic.....	0	0	12,603	.23
Mauritius.....	0	0	31,089	.57
Mexico.....	400,437	7.96	651,615	11.98
Nicaragua.....	41,766	.83	74,586	1.37
Panama.....	10,476	.21	41,933	.77
Paraguay.....	0	0	7,484	.14
Peru.....	273,807	5.44	449,662	8.26
South Africa.....	0	0	59,656	1.10
Swaziland.....	0	0	31,089	.57
Thailand.....	0	0	19,325	.36
Venezuela.....	0	0	70,210	1.29

Source: Prepared by Quota and Allotment Branch, Sugar Division, ASCS—USDA.

BILL TO EXPEDITE CLEANUP OF PRIVATE PROPERTY AFTER OIL SPILLS

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in less than 2 years, my district has suffered three major oil spills. This problem is not a local problem, but one which affects every coastal district in the United States. As the United States' need for oil grows and its need for imported oil grows even faster, additional and more serious oil spills are inevitable.

Under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Coast Guard has the primary responsibility for cleaning up oil spills. I have found that the Coast Guard generally does a commendable job in quickly removing free-floating oil from the water, and oil from public lands. However, the Water Pollution Control Act does not authorize the Coast Guard, or any other Federal agency, to assist the owners of private beachfronts, boats, floats, docks, and other items of private property in the case of a spill. The private party has to work out his problems with the party who is responsible for the spill.

While private property owners often have no problems in arranging for the removal of oil from their property, and getting compensation from the negligent party for their losses, this is not always the case.

The legislation I am introducing today will assure that the removal of oil from private property will proceed expeditiously.

It authorizes the Coast Guard to prescribe standards for the removal of discharged oil from private property. When a spill occurs, the Coast Guard must draw up a timetable for the cleanup of private property by the party responsible for the spill.

If the party does not remove the oil from private property within the time frame deemed reasonable by the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard then is authorized to arrange for the removal of the oil, and to assess all clean up costs against the negligent party.

In addition, the negligent party becomes liable for fines of up to \$1,000 a day for not cleaning up private property within the time frame specified by the Coast Guard.

Finally, the bill contains a provision which makes the owner, and operator, of an oil tanker or facility equally liable in the case of an accident. Often, a facility is owned by one corporation, and leased to another. If a spill occurs, and each party disavows negligence, then the case must be settled in court, to the detriment of the owners of damaged property who may have to wait years before receiving compensation for their damages. The equal liability provision not only will expedite cleanup and compensation, but also should act as a self-policing mechanism to minimize the chance of spills.

If a company knows in advance that it will be held liable for any damage incurred by equipment or facilities it leases or rents—regardless of who is to blame for the failure of the equipment—it will have a built-in incentive to rent or lease equipment in top operating condition. Likewise, a company is unlikely to lease its tankers or facilities to an unqualified operator if it knows that it will be held liable for the mistakes of its lessee.

As this country's need for energy grows, so will the number of accidents and spills. Beachfront property and boat owners should be protected from negligent polluters. My bill strengthens the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit the government to offer that protection.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reprint below the text of the bill.

H.R. 6718

A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to impose an additional liability upon owners and operators of vessels, on-shore facilities, and offshore facilities for the discharge oil onto private property, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 311 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 92-500; 86 Stat. 816 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(q) (1) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the "Secretary") to prescribe standards for the removal of discharged oil from private property consistent with the National Contingency Plan required by subsection (c) (2) of this section and regulations issued under subsection (j) (1) of this section.

"(2) In the case of oil discharged from a vessel, onshore facility, or offshore facility into or upon the navigable waters of the United States, adjoining shorelines, or into or upon the waters of the contiguous zone which, as a result of such discharge, affects private property (including, but not limited to shorelines, beaches, boats, moorings, floats and docks), the Secretary shall notify the persons owning or operating any such vessel, onshore facility, or offshore facility from which oil is discharged, to remove such oil in accordance with standards prescribed under paragraph (1) of this subsection and shall prescribe in such notification a reasonable period of time (beginning with the date of the discharge) within which the oil should be removed.

"(3) In any case where an owner or operator of a vessel, of an onshore facility or of an offshore facility from which oil is discharged into or upon the navigable waters of the United States, adjoining shorelines or into or upon the waters of the contiguous zone, which discharge affects private property and such owner or operator fails to remove such oil in violation of this subsection, the Secretary is authorized to act to remove or arrange for the removal of such oil. Except as provided by paragraph (5), all cleanup costs incurred pursuant to this

paragraph shall be assessed against such owner.

"(4) If at the end of the time so specified in the Secretary's notification the removal so required has not been completed, the persons owning or operating such vessel, onshore facility, or offshore facility shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty established by such Secretary of not more than \$1,000 for any oil discharge of 100,000 barrels or more and \$500 for any oil discharge under 100,000 barrels. In addition such persons shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty established by the Secretary of not more than \$1,000 per day in the case of an oil discharge of 100,000 barrels or more and \$500 per day in the case of an oil discharge under 100,000 barrels, for each day after the expiration of the time period, such oil is not removed.

"(5) In any case where the owner and operator are two separate persons bound by a contractual agreement (rental or lease), the owner shall be liable for 50 percent of all cleanup costs and penalties under this subsection and the operator shall be liable for 50 percent of all cleanup costs and penalties under this subsection.

"(6) No civil penalty shall be assessed under this subsection unless the owner or operator alleged to have violated this subsection shall have been given notice and opportunity for a hearing. Any such penalty may be compromised by the Secretary. In determining the amount of the penalty, or the amount agreed upon in the compromise, the appropriateness of such penalty to the size of the business of the owner or operator charged, the effect on the owner or operator's ability to continue in business, and the gravity of the violation shall be considered by such Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury shall withhold, at the request of the Secretary, the clearance required by section 4197 of the Revised Statute of the United States, as amended (46 U.S.C. 91), of any vessel the owner or operator of which is subject to the foregoing penalty. Clearance may be granted in such cases upon the filing of a bond or other surety satisfactory to the Secretary.

"(7) In any case where an owner or operator of a vessel, of an offshore facility, or of an offshore facility, from which oil is discharged can prove that a discharge was caused solely by (A) and act of God, (B) an act of war, (C) negligence on the part of the United States Government, or (D) an act or omission of a third party without regard to whether any such act or omission was or was not negligent, or any combination of the foregoing clauses, such owner or operator shall not be liable for any civil penalty or cleanup cost under this subsection.

"(8) Nothing in this subsection shall affect or modify in any way the obligations of any owner or operator of any onshore facility or offshore facility to any person or agency under any provision of law for damages to any publicly-owned or privately-owned property resulting from a discharge of any oil or from the removal of any such oil."

THE "DELTA QUEEN," A LIVING MUSEUM, MUST BE PRESERVED

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, as the country approaches its bicentennial celebration, and the Mississippi River nears its tricentennial birthday, organizations and citizens across the Nation scramble to prepare pageants, monuments and

other suitable historical tributes to a great land and her greatest river.

However, just as the river was important in bringing together two segments of a vast continent, the riverboat was responsible for tying together the towns along the river. Yet, at the same time we are working so diligently to preserve in museums and memorials bits and pieces of our culture and heritage, we are preparing to let die one of the last operating reminders of our river heritage in this Nation. The *Delta Queen*, the last remaining operating member of that family of colorful and infamous riverboats that carried their cargo, gamblers and riverboat queens up and down the rivers of our country, will be banished from the Mississippi and her tributaries unless we in the Congress act soon.

The *Delta Queen* is a living museum of fine riverboat design and engineering—impossible to duplicate in our day and age. For this reason, I, along with other Representatives, have sponsored legislation in the past which granted this vessel temporary reprieves from her fate. Her latest reprieve expires on November 1, 1973.

I think we should again adopt legislation which would exempt the *Delta Queen* from the fire standards established for deep-water vessels and today I am introducing legislation to this effect. The *Queen* does not have the steel superstructure required of deep sea vessels. However, she is not an ocean-going vessel and is never more than 4 minutes from land. And, since the enactment of the Safety at Sea Regulations, her owners have spent more than \$1.5 million in safety equipment.

I think Los Angeles Times writer Jenkin Lloyd Jones aptly summed up the situation in this way:

To knock off the *Delta Queen* because of a law designed for ocean liners would be like pulling down the Tower of London because it doesn't meet city fire escape regulations for public places.

The exemption we ask for is not a permanent one. In 5 years a new \$15.5 million passenger riverboat is scheduled for completion by the owners of the *Delta Queen*. It is financially vital to the building of this new vessel that the *Delta Queen* be allowed to continue operation until her replacement is ready.

Although editorial writers from all over the country have written reams on why the *Delta Queen* should be saved, I think a letter which I received from a young boy, Mark Rogers, from West Helena, Ark., most eloquently expresses the sentiment of river lovers everywhere. I would like to share Mark's letter with you at this point. After all, it is for the future generations that we preserve such history.

April 9, 1973.

BILL ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress,

DEAR SIR: I am a boy 15 years old and am writing in behalf of the *Delta Queen*. I have grown up on the river in Helena, Arkansas and have become very interested in "Steamboats" mainly the *Delta Queen*. I have been keeping up with her since she was here last year, this time on tour. I have collected information and have filled a scrapbook of mine

to the edges. I've had the privilege to tour the *Queen* and from then on I have wanted to ride her. Some day my ambition to fill is to pilot a towboat on the Mississippi River and would give anything to ride the *Queen*, but it is very costly. It is supposed to be halted from its cruises in November 1973 and now there is no possible way I can ever ride her. Even though my dreams are broken, I would like other kids to see the beauty in a lone steamboat plying down the river at sunset or hear the lonely moanful whistle echoing round the bend or the excitement of a close steamboat race. If you were one who voted her off the river, I challenge you to tour her, ride her, you could never have a more historic remembrance. She's a living monument of all the steamboats that built our country to the greatness it is today. If she's put away so many people'll never see a steamboat. They can never relive, ride, remember the great steamboats' era's last segment.

Sincerely,

MARK ROGERS.

ISAAC SHKOLNIK

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the trial of Isaac Shkolnik, a Soviet Jew, will conclude this week in Vinnitsa, Ukraine S.S.R. Mr. Shkolnik has been charged with anti-Soviet propaganda and industrial sabotage. These offenses were alleged to have been committed in 1966 and 1967 but it was not until after Mr. Shkolnik applied for permission to immigrate to Israel that he was arrested in July 1972.

Mr. Shkolnik's trial is a closed military tribunal. His state-appointed defense counsel has less than a good reputation in his handling of similar cases.

At a time, Mr. Speaker, when there are discernible thaws in Soviet-American relations, when we are discussing freer trade between our two nations, trials such as the Shkolnik trial do nothing to foster this good will. In fact, they hamper progress toward freer trade relations.

The Shkolnik trial is but a focal point for the broader issue of the treatment of Soviet Jews who wish to immigrate to Israel. For 5 years, Mr. Shkolnik followed his trade as a mechanic after the alleged violations of Soviet law took place. He was not charged until after he had made his desires to go to Israel known to Soviet officials.

I take this opportunity to make known to the Members of the House and to those who will read this RECORD that this one Member of the House feels that the Soviet policy toward its Jewish citizens, and the Shkolnik trial in particular, aggravates the possibility of trade between the United States and the Soviet Union.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, several distinguished Members of the Congress and astute observers of our National Legislature tackled the budgetary issues facing Congress in a panel discussion spon-

sored by Time, Inc., in its "The Role of Congress" symposia series. Mr. Hedley Donovan, Time, Inc., served as moderator. Their discussion follows in today's RECORD:

To start the discussion with the panel, I'd like to ask both Senators to respond, if they will, to a key point in Dr. Fenno's paper, which is how do you make a Congressman concerned and to act on that concern about the institutional integrity of Congress. Senator Ribicoff?

Senator RIBICOFF. There is no way you can make him do so as long as the voters are indifferent as to what kind of Congressmen you have. Dr. Fenno claims that all a Congressman has to do is to do the local errands for his constituents. This is an important part of his job; and if he works hard at it, he can succeed.

But I believe that if you get a Congressman or a Senator who is willing to take care of his chores and still is willing to tackle the tough issues, to become an educator in his constituency, this type of Congressman and Senator can have support and can achieve re-election too. How do you get a Congressman to do so? I pass the buck right back to the people.

People get the type of Congressman or Senator they deserve. So it becomes very important to make the voter aware of the various elements of a Congressman's duties and to let the public demand that a Congressman fulfill all of them.

Senator MATHIAS. Well, I would agree with Senator Ribicoff that the ultimate test of how a Congressman has got to behave is probably the kind of test that is imposed on him by the people who send him to Washington. In the 19th century there were some political philosophers who speculated on how you affect Congressional behavior; and one of the most famous of these said the way you affect the Congressman, the way you change a Congressman's judgment, is to hit him on the snout. And this was illustrated when appropriate cartoons in *Harper's*, or whatever predecessor of *TIME* carried this particular political philosophy, hit him on the snout.

Well, I don't think it is quite that bad here in the latter two-thirds of the 20th century. I don't think you have to hit Congressmen on the snout. I'd like to say one word for the bona fides of Congress. I think most members of Congress want to do the right thing, both by their constituents and by the country. They want to do the right thing by the Congress as one of the constitutional instruments for governing the country.

The problem is that many specific cases that are brought to them for decision are sometimes not set in the kind of dramatic background where they can view this as a great constitutional watershed. Now, there is an element of leadership. It is an element of leadership on the part of the Executive, which may have a sort of hostile interest, and it is an element of leadership on the part of other members of the Congress. And it is one of the elements of national life that I think we ought to start examining very closely.

This is good place and a good time to do it because you do need that kind of leadership that helps to underscore when you have reached a watershed, when you are at a Rubicon, when you are making a decision that is going to be of enormous constitutional importance.

Now, I think clearly the decision that the Senate made a month or two ago—when it said to the President: "We are not going to give you the power to make every appropriation, to decide the size of every appropriation, to in effect become the appropriating power notwithstanding the constitution,"—that was one of those watershed decisions. But the House of Representatives passed it

as if it was an ordinary housekeeping item that wasn't important.

This is one of the ways in which I think Congress can address itself to those institutionalized questions that make the difference.

Professor FENNO. I might just comment on the last item Neil MacNeil and Senator Mathias and Senator Ribicoff talked about, the spending ceiling. I just want to use this as an example of something that I heard when I traveled around this fall. Half the Congressmen I traveled with berated the House of Representatives for being so spineless that they gave away the purse strings to the President. The other half berated the Congress for being so spineless in exercising the power of the purse strings in the first place that the President had to act.

These are two different positions both taken before very supportive audiences, both in a way illustrating the point I was making that sometimes the Congressman runs against the Congress. Now, the answer to one person is, well, once the President threw down the gauntlet why didn't the House of Representatives stand up and defend the purse strings? Another answer is to the other fellow. If most people agree that a spending ceiling was desirable, why didn't Congress take the bull by the horns in the first place and cut the necessary appropriations itself?

I think there are two answers. There is one answer to each side of the puzzle. One answer is that the Congress does not have, as Senator Mathias pointed out, the institutional machinery for taking an overview of the budget; and that is why they didn't go ahead and decide on what spending level ought to be arrived at and then do some cutting of their own, setting priorities of their own. The other answer to the other side is that it looked like the election was awful close and instead of reacting as an institution, House members acted as individuals and broke along somewhat philosophical or partisan lines with each man trying to secure re-election for himself.

And the problem in both cases is to get these people to think institutionally, on the basis of machinery for every day, and on the basis of the institution when, in fact, it is threatened.

Senator RIBICOFF. Along that line, if I may remark, Neil, the action of the Senate in turning down the President's request was one of the most significant in modern times. What was meaningful to me is that Senators—North, South, East, and West—Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, middle of the roaders, all were of one mind, that this was a basic challenge to the institution of Congress. And the quality of the debate in the Senate of the U.S. was as high as you could find in a great constitutional crisis.

The next constitutional crisis of similar impact will come if the President, as he has indicated he will do, seeks to reorganize the Federal Government by Executive action. The Congress of the U.S. has the power and authority to set up what the Executive Branch should be and how it should be constituted. The President has a right to make changes within a department, but once you change the structure and form of the Executive Branch, this is within the power of the Congress of the U.S.

And should the President try to reorganize the Federal Government by Executive action, you will then have the next confrontation between the Executive Branch and the Congress.

Mr. MACNEIL. One point I noticed in reference to what Dr. Fenno has said, that on this vote, as on so many votes, there is always within the Congress a confusion of the actual issues; and the confusion comes in two terms. One is on a party basis. Democrats v. Republicans, and the other is on ideology. The decision in the Senate differed from the decision of the House. The House went along.

A great part of the House vote, I think, was because the House is a more conservative body. The members were concerned about the size of the national budget, and they saw no other way to reduce spending except by going along with this extraordinary request by the President. In the Senate those who supported the President—it was not a unanimous vote in the Senate by any means—those who supported the President in essence supported the kind of cuts they anticipated from him.

Senator Mondale said recently that he talked to some of the men who supported the President on this issue to allow the President this unprecedented power. Mondale asked them how they would have voted if they could have assumed that George McGovern would be President. The only thing they could say was in that case they would have had to repeal that particular law because he would have had other criteria. And this to me has always been a problem: the problem in Congress of members winking at the constitutional incursions of the President of their own party.

I think it applies to both Democrats and Republicans. There is a famous story about a Congressman from New York many years ago approaching President Cleveland on a minor bill which President Cleveland believed, in the traditional sense of vetoing a bill, that it was unconstitutional. He put his arm around the President's shoulder and he said: "What's the Constitution between friends?"

Mr. DONOVAN. Well, I wonder if we might not open this up to general conversation, questioning and argument from the floor. Dr. George Kistiakowsky told me before dinner he might have something to say. Would you like to?

Dr. KISTIAKOWSKY. Thank you very much Mr. Donovan. It is really quite unfair because after all of these really high-level, overall issues that were discussed by the members of the panel, I'd like to bring up an issue which is of a very definitely lower level.

It is that we are today very much a technological society. An overwhelming fraction of the legislation that comes before Congress involves very complex technological issues. And yet I feel that Congress has not organized itself to understand these issues. I submit that there has to be a mechanism within Congress to explain to the legislators what these technological issues are, and they very seldom are black or white.

I would submit that an infusion of new blood, new sources of information are necessary. I think that the new Office of Technology Assessment will be very helpful. But something more than that is needed. The staffs of the Senate and House committees must have expert knowledge on technological matters so that the legislators themselves can get a much more balanced view of what is involved in these complex matters.

Senator MATHIAS. Let me say that I agree completely that the Congress needs to equip itself with a kind of technical advice that we don't have today. And to do that we don't have to attempt to duplicate the six million people who are now on the Executive Branch payroll. We can have small, highly educated, highly qualified, highly analytical and critical staffs, and we need to do this.

The reason we haven't done it in my judgment is because we are too lily-livered. And to this extent I am in Dr. Fenno's camp because I think we haven't really had the courage to go out and recruit the people and pay the price to get the kind of expert advice that we need. Now, we are moving in that direction and I think we are going to do better than we have before. But heretofore we have been a little sensitive to public criticism about the size of the congressional budget, the size of our staffs, and what we are spending on Capitol Hill.

I hope that through this kind of meeting we can make people understand that these are not moneys that are spent for our own aggrandizement, for our own prestige, for our own social status, but it is really in order to do the job.

Senator RIBICOFF. May I comment, Doctor, I agree with you, and to this end I held a series of hearings as chairman of the Committee on Executive Reorganization. As a result of those hearings we drafted, passed in committee, and in the U.S. Senate a proposal to give to the General Accounting Office, which is really an arm of the Congress, the authority to employ the necessary staff and to hold the responsibility for evaluating proposals coming to us from the Executive Branch. The evaluation would be available not only to committee chairmen, but to every member of Congress. It would be available on the highly technical, complex problem facing a modern society, and on matters which Congress itself does not now have the technical competence to handle.

Recognizing that we did not want to create a staff as large as the staffs in the Executive Branch, we gave authority to the GAO to hire consultants and experts on highly technical problems on a case by case basis, paying them the going fee. Unfortunately, like a lot of good legislation that passes the Senate, it died in the House.

So I am glad that we have with us the next majority leader of the House of Representatives. And I am willing to undertake with Senator Mathias' help to try to pass that GAO authorization bill again to enlarge the authority of the GAO, in order to give us the knowledge that we need. I am positive that we can pass this in the Senate, so will you see your Congressman, Mr. O'Neill, and see if you can get some help from him in the House?

Mr. DONOVAN. I wonder if I could ask a question of both the Senators and perhaps any of the Representatives who would be willing to comment, a question which, I suppose, comes under the general chapter heading of "Presidents I Have Known." I am struck, as this subject and problem has developed, by the fact that of the last five Presidents starting with Harry Truman, all but one of whom—General Eisenhower—had experience in one or both houses of Congress.

Yet in each of these presidencies, we seem to come sooner or later to this problem of the apparent isolation of the President from congressional advice, the feeling on the part of many members of Congress that the presidency is growing at their expense, that the Congress is not sufficiently listened to, taken heed of.

What is the dynamic at work in the presidency that seems to bring Presidents of such different backgrounds, temperaments, of both parties and all previous conditions of experience, to this state of relationship with the Congress? Senator Mathias, do you have any views on that?

Senator MATHIAS. Senator Ribicoff with his experience as a member of the Cabinet probably has a greater depth of insight here. But it does seem to me you have to go back beyond Harry Truman. You have to go back really to Theodore Roosevelt, who is one of my heroes as an American statesman. But he is the first man who began to invade the congressional area with his legislative program, the Fair Deal.

He began for the first time to state a legislative blueprint that he expected the Congress to adopt. This was the first time that the President became a lawmaker instead of simply an administrator. And from that time on it's been downhill, really, for the Congress. First it was very low key, the Fair Deal was just an idea. But by the time you got around to the New Deal, you had an executive scheme in which you enlisted congressional agents to help put it across.

And, of course, by the time you got to

President Kennedy you had not only legislative agents, but you had people publicly acknowledged on the payroll as the President's lobbyists. And we have them today. So you have a long slide here. Now, to answer your question specifically, Hedley, I think it is really because Presidents are conscientious men who perceive things that have to be done and they feel that Congress is not equipped to get those things done.

And I think that's the whole purpose of what we have to do now, which is to equip the Congress to do the things that make it an equal partner, not just for some theoretical historical balance, but an equal partner in getting the things done that the nation has to perform.

Senator RIBICOFF. May I make a comment. I have served in various ways with Presidents Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. I was Governor when President Eisenhower was President. If I can be blunt, to all the Presidents I have known Congress has been a pain in the neck. They haven't respected Congress too much.

The reason they haven't respected Congress too much is because they are very well aware of the fact that Pennsylvania Avenue has become a one-way street. And the legislative process has become completely the orbit of the Executive Branch. All that Congress did and still does is basically to react one way or another to a legislative program of the President.

So the presidency has assumed almost the entire burden of the legislative process. The press and Congress keep a box score of presidential successes and failures, as to what bills a President proposes and are passed, are basically altered or rejected. So TIME magazine and the New York Times and the Boston Globe will say that the President proposed 30 pieces of legislation, 10 were adopted; therefore, the President was batting .300% and isn't this awful.

Consequently, the President feels that the burden of the legislative process and the failure of Congress to react is a frustration because the press, the country, and Congress expects the President to come up with proposals, fight for them, and see that they are passed.

My feeling is that if Congress assumed its basic burden and responsibility in the legislative process given to it by the Constitution, the relationship between the presidency and the Congress would be one of mutual respect. They would have an opportunity to work together. The President would feel that the Congress was assuming part of the burden and responsibility in solving the basic problems facing this nation. And if we did that, we would have a happy Government and a more constructive Government.

And this, Hedley, is what I think the basic problem is. Until Congress assumes its responsibility, the Presidency will soar and grow and become all the more powerful, and Congress will deteriorate to a mere sounding board.

Representative O'NEILL. Let me give you a bit of review of actually what happened last year when the President came in and asked for the \$250 billion spending ceiling and the right to spend that money where he saw fit. It was approved by the Ways and Means Committee with, I believe, all of the Republicans and a few of the Democrats favoring it.

I remember Charlie Vanek came to the Democratic whip organization and explained the legislation. It was a unanimous vote by the whip organization that we would oppose it as a party because the President was usurping the constitutional right of the Congress.

The whip organization then met with Wilbur Mills and the leadership, and it was agreed we were going to drop it. Now, tremendous pressure came from the White

House, particularly from Mr. Walker, who was Under Secretary of the Treasury; from Dick Cook, who is the modern Larry O'Brien, and, lo and behold!, instead of dropping it, the committee brought it forth. And when we made whip counts, it looked as though we were going to overwhelmingly defeat this piece of legislation. But the pressure of the White House was put on the conservative bloc of the Democratic side and on the bloc of 18 to 25 Republican liberals that we normally can depend upon. They stayed with the Republicans. So the White House used a tremendous amount of pressure.

Now, I must admit, Senator Mathias and Senator Ribicoff, that Senate rejection of the proposal was one of the few stable acts I have seen the Senate of the U.S. do in the last couple of years.

I can give you, however, an example of the Senate not acting responsibly. It was on the environmental bill that passed the Senate this year. It was written by committee staff members. The only Senators on the floor were Muskie and Church, there was nobody else. They offered amendment after amendment passed to them by the staff members who wanted to clean up all the streams, all air pollution and everything else at once. And the figure was that it was going to cost by 1985, \$3 trillion. And that is what the Senate passed. Now, how ridiculous can you be? You Senators add everything that comes along until finally, when we get the bill in joint Senate-House conference, it is the stability of the House conferees that saves the nation. Perhaps it would be in the best interests of the nation, if Senators reported to the voters every two years just like the House does.

Now, the truth of the matter is that the White House sends tons and tons of legislation to the Congress. It comes from the Office of Management and Budget. I am of the opinion that we should have some kind of joint House-Senate committee before which the Office of Management and Budget would have to justify everything in the budget, instead of Congress just acting on budget matters because the White House sends it over.

A REGRETTABLE TURN FOR THE FBI

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of sadness and regret that I received the news of the withdrawal of L. Patrick Gray III, from nomination for Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I am convinced that my feeling was shared by millions of Americans throughout the land, although, doubtlessly, the fact that I spent more than 5 years as special agent in the FBI intensified my personal emotion.

For me, there was the feeling that the FBI has been somehow diminished—and that I have been diminished along with it. There was also the uneasy sensation that America has lost something important.

The sad thing is that the spectacle which we have watched during the past several weeks need never have happened and should never have happened. It was caused by the manner in which the President selected an Acting Director to succeed J. Edgar Hoover, and then proceeded to misuse his nominee's sense of loyalty and the facilities of the FBI during the months that followed.

As a person who has a deep and intimate affection for the Bureau, I can state that there is no place in the FBI for partisan politics and there is no place in partisan politics for the FBI. Those were basic principles of the FBI during the nearly 50 years that it was directed by J. Edgar Hoover. They were never spoken but always understood.

America badly needs an organization such as the FBI always was until last summer. An investigative branch of the Government should perform its duties in a professional manner—thoroughly, and without compromising any of its principles for political expedience.

I also regret that the President selected L. Patrick Gray as the Acting Director and proposed Director. I met and talked with Mr. Gray on a few occasions and I am satisfied that he is a very able man as well as a good and decent man. But he was not the type of person who should have been selected for the very special and difficult job of Director of the FBI.

A professional Navy officer, Gray has been indoctrinated with and has lived by the military principle of following the chain of command—without question. That is an admirable quality in a military officer, but does not fit at all as a qualification for the Director of the FBI.

Even in his parting words the other night, Mr. Gray referred to the FBI as "a great and unique American institution of vital service to the President and to the American people."

Even after weeks of hearings before the Senate committee, and comment in the press, he apparently still felt that the FBI was an arm of the President. That is not true at all—and it should never be true. The FBI is an agency which must serve all of the American people, impartially, fairly, and with a fine disregard for whatever political implications might arise. The Watergate burglary was doubtfully a delicate matter for the Director of the FBI, but the confidence of investigative reports should not be breached, even at the cost of not following the chain of command—especially if some of the links in that chain tend to be suspect.

I hope sincerely that when the President selects a new nominee for that office, he will select someone who has a true understanding and abiding faith in our basic Government principles of separation of powers and divided responsibilities. He must be someone who will not feel that any one branch of the Government is superior to any other branch. He must be someone who will realize that his duties can be fulfilled only if they are discharged with total impartiality and free from partisan involvement.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide fiscal year 1974 authorizations for the international security program.

The bill is based entirely on the President's budget proposals for the coming fiscal year. As such, it deals only with authorization levels, not with program content.

My action this day should not be interpreted as an endorsement of the President's budget request. I shall reserve my opinion about the amounts to be authorized until after the Committee on Foreign Affairs has full opportunity to study this legislation.

I have notified the President last week of my readiness to meet with executive branch officials to discuss final arrangements for hearings. I also urged him to expedite the submission of program details and draft legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership has stressed the need for examining the full scope of legislation involving obligations for the coming year. International security assistance plays a major role in the field of foreign policy. As such, it must be considered by our committee together with all other foreign policy undertakings on which we must act before the end of the current fiscal year.

THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT AND THE SMALL INDEPENDENT BANKS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been growing concern since the passage of the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970 about the rapid growth of large statewide banking systems which are put together through holding company acquisitions of small independent banks. This trend has almost reached alarming proportions in many States of the Union and threatens the very existence of community-minded independent banks.

This problem is very forcefully and clearly set forth in an article by Donald M. Carlson, present of the Elmhurst National Bank, Elmhurst, Ill. Mr. Carlson is also immediate past president of the Independent Bankers Association of America. This article, entitled "Hunting License for the Giants," appears in the January 1973 issues of the Independent Bankers magazine.

I believe the article raises some very serious fundamental questions about the changing structure of banking in this country and should be read most carefully. I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

A 1970 BANK HOLDING COMPANY LAW: HUNTING LICENSE FOR THE GIANTS

(By Donald M. Carlson)

As an "independent" banker, I find the current trend of Federal Reserve Board actions threatening to accomplish through agency action what Congress thought it had stopped by law. The climate in which independent banking finds itself today tolerable. I would go so far as to say that unless some drastic changes take place, the environment created for independent banking by the Federal Reserve Board's interpretation of the new act is going to be unlivable.

Traditionally the small, independent, grass-roots banks have been the financial

institutions that helped build this nation and are still the financial backbone of most U.S. communities. But, Washington sees it differently. Although misdirected, the Washington concept is gathering strength every day. Washington administrators do not see American communities, their financial needs and their future as we do. They believe banking at a community level is a thing of the past. I do not.

HOLDING COMPANIES TODAY

The Bank Holding Company act of 1970 was designed as restrictive legislation. It was aimed at preventing the growth of giant concentrations of economic power reaching into every facet of our national life. But, the Federal Reserve Board has chosen to view the legislation as a licensing mechanism opening the way to development of the very cartels that are unwanted by Congress, by you and me, and by all thoughtful Americans.

The Fed recently provided us with some numbers that we can use to sketch a pretty complete profile of the Bigs. It is a profile that causes me grave concern. These figures are based on registration statements required by the 1970 amendments to the Holding Company Act. Prior to this, only those companies with two or more banks were required to register with the Fed.

Only 121 bank holding companies met their requirements to register in 1970, but in 1971, 1,567 bank holding companies registered. These 1,500-odd bank holding companies owned 2,420 banks and controlled considerably more than half of all the deposits in the commercial banking system.

Since the end of last year, the Fed approved formation of 38 additional bank holding companies, bringing the current total to slightly over 1,600. Bank holding company affiliates at the end of last year had assets of \$362 billion and operated 10,832 branches.

MORE TO COME

As part of its profile, the Fed has released a 170-page computer printout which lists all banking affiliates of the holding companies. The agency is currently working on a similar list which also will show the nonbanking affiliates of the nation's bank holding companies.

When released, a really full-faced image of bank holding company expansion and power is going to emerge, and I think that it is going to frighten some people into taking another long, hard look at the wisdom of permitting giant bank holding companies to step from the metropolitan limits of their home offices to smaller communities.

We have to keep in mind, also, that in assessing these statistics, many of these holding companies are family trusts and similar vehicles designed to make life a little easier for the small town banker. If we take the several hundred or so of these out of Fed figures, the concentration of dollar assets in the hands of a few hundred big banks would prove to be even more alarming.

We have yet to be told what the total is in assets of mortgage companies, leasing companies, finance companies, data processing firms and the like—all protected under the umbrella of the Bigs. Be assured their assets run into the billions—many billions of dollars. And, 1971 was only the beginning. The big boys have only been testing the water. Wait until they jump in with both feet—a lot of people are going to get badly splashed, and a lot of people are going to have to get out of the pool, whether they like it or not.

Holding company spread beyond state boundaries means that states no longer have control of their own financial structures. The ownership of major financial institutions—the mortgage, leasing, data processing and factoring firms—by major out-of-state holding companies will mean decisions taken out of the community and made in New York,

San Francisco, Chicago and wherever the Bigs make their home.

Allowing holding companies to spread beyond their state boundaries means that wherever they touch down, business is going to be done on the basis of what is best for the company and all its widely dispersed offices and not what's best for the community.

Local businessmen will be subject to subtle pressures to shift their business to the affiliates of giant holding companies, rather than continue dealing with established community firms. More and more services will be tied up by the Bigs at the local level, and they will grow bigger through the absorption.

Section 4(c) (12) of the Bank Holding Company Act is designed to eliminate this kind of pressure, but we cannot underestimate the Bigs, can we? Look at their growth. Look at their power. Look at their ability to reach across state boundaries and laws that were initially designed to contain such encroachment. Power feeds on power; that is how it gains strength.

PERFORMANCE AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Of paramount importance to me is the public interest. I believe as strongly as you that the interests of our depositors—our borrowers—our communities—our employees—are just as important as our stockholders. My personal economic well-being is tied to the future of the Elmhurst National Bank. Each of the "public" interests named is of great importance to our stockholders. Proper attention to these interests will help to perpetuate my bank and your bank.

Advocates of holding company expansion in the banking system talk as though they believe this corporate device is the greatest invention since money. Here are some citations on this point that I hope you will find interesting and informative.

Samuel H. Talley, staff member of the Board of Governors, said in his paper entitled, "The Effect of Holding Company Acquisitions on Bank Performance":

Holding company acquisitions, however, did not result in statistically significant changes in the capital prices, expenses or profitability of acquired banks. Therefore, it appears that holding company acquisitions do not have a broad impact on the performance of acquired banks.

Robert J. Lawrence, while an economist on the staff of the Board of Governors, Division of Research and Statistics, found no significant difference in the average interest rate charged on loans and the average interest rate paid on time deposits between holding company affiliates and independent competitor banks. However, he did find holding company affiliates imposed significantly higher service charges on demand deposits.

We can all be sure that managements of viable, aggressive, competitive, independent community banks will do more for their communities, their depositors, their borrowers than will those institutions controlled by an organization many miles distant.

Both Talley and Lawrence state that net earnings of holding company subsidiaries show no significant difference from independent banks. Dividends are a matter of director policy, so we need not discuss that. I admit that prices of holding company stock are selling at a higher multiple of earnings than smaller independent banks. Yet in the stock market crunch some holding company stocks lost all the profit that a merging banker acquired, but most independent bank stocks and prices did not even waver.

Of course there are very "good" reasons for a bank or other approved business firm to become acquired by a holding company. There is a tax break for merging shareholders, and a tax break for the holding company. What is the tax break? Merging shareholders pay no tax on the new shares received until they sell them, and they pay then only if there is a profit. Holding com-

panies, if they own 85 per cent of the stock of the merging bank, receive their dividends completely tax free. Aged management or lack of qualified successor management might dictate such a move. Also, some "problem" banks have been acquired by holding companies.

There are other reasons also, but like these they are primarily "pocketbook" or selfish reasons and not necessarily those in the public interest. Banks are service organizations. Let's not forget that. Their reason for being is to serve the general public, to safeguard their funds, to lend them money in times of need, to support local business and help it to grow. A great deal of attention must be paid to that local business, not the interests of a bank or other business firm far removed from the local scene.

The inroad of bank holding company expansion on competition is already evident. Just take a look at Fed statistics: New York State—which had only one holding company several years ago—now has the largest amount of bank deposits in holding companies. Forty-seven holding companies control \$85.8 billion in deposits or about 90 per cent of all commercial bank deposits in the state.

NEW DANGERS AHEAD

Sometime soon those Federal Reserve Board members who are so smitten with expansionary powers will have found out that they have gotten as much mileage as possible out of the Bank Holding Company Act. Fortunately for them—and adding to our distress—the new vehicle they will be seeking is ready to roll onto the Congressional assembly line.

This year's model is the work of the President's Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation, known as the Hunt Commission after its chairman, Reed O. Hunt. Instead of what we were told would be an objective look at the way money moves in our economy, what we got from this supposedly "Blue Ribbon" panel as a collection of proposals so blatantly self-serving that they give the appearance of a conscious effort to "divvy up" the financial business with a little bit for everybody.

Excuse me—that's a little bit for everybody except the small commercial bankers. For example, to most of the members of our association, agriculture is a significant component of their business. Yet, the Presidential Commission discussing the credit structure of our nation did not deem agriculture worthy of a single word in its voluminous report.

Despite the obvious bias of the Commission's recommendations, the Administration is going ahead full tilt with plans to get these proposals enacted into law. What would it mean? It would mean new powers for everyone who competes with small commercial banks. It would mean an easing of the restrictions on the international business of the biggest banks and it would permit them to get right into the mutual fund business. But the smaller banks which serve the communities of America would receive nothing but another reduction in their business.

It is my opinion that the Hunt Commission report offers a blueprint for weakening and perhaps the eventual demise of state-chartered banks.

For a number of years now, top officials of the federal government have made numerous statements about their objective of keeping decision-making power closer to the people. My estimate is that the exact opposite is happening, and I see in the Hunt Commission report another example of the push for more power in Washington.

WHAT WE MUST DO

To prevent this encroachment will require concerted action on the part of bankers in unit banking states, or in states like Lou-

isiana which has sensible statutes restricting branching to local areas. We have to demonstrate that community banking actually works—demonstrate it to Congress and to the federal agencies which have joined with the big banks in chipping away at the state's rights to determine the structure of banking within its domains.

While the job is national in scope, we have to start at the state level. Statewide organizations of association members working together are going to be our frontline. Once we have fought the good fight at the state level, then we can go to Washington and press our case to the regulatory authorities there.

We cannot afford to repeat some of the mistakes that we have made in the past in our attitudes toward holding companies and their potential threat. We no longer can afford to play the ostrich and hide our heads in the sand. But we cannot afford to make any mistakes in our role as independent bankers dealing with this threat. If we do, independent banking will be in a weaker, more vulnerable position in regard to encroachment of the "Bigs" than ever before.

We are going to have to work, and work hard to prevent this threat to our independent banking system. It is a threat that can be met successfully, but it is up to us whether we want to meet the challenge. How much you are willing to commit of your time, talent and resources to fight is up to your own conscience.

GOOD MORNING, MR. PRESIDENT, WHAT IS TODAY'S GAME PLAN?

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the massive inflationary conditions and high unemployment that beset the people of this Nation are largely if not entirely due to the confused and confusing economic policies of President Nixon and his whirling circle of advisers.

Some of the basic items that have produced what can only be viewed as our ongoing economic crisis are described in a brief article, "Nixonomics, the Jumbled Science," written by Samuel Bristol of Vista, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, I think that all Members of Congress—for that matter all interested persons—should have the opportunity to read this article in order to view President Nixon and his administration in the proper if perplexing perspective. For this reason, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

NIXONOMICS, THE JUMBLED SCIENCE

How free is American "Free Enterprise"? Is the business establishment of the USA, with its administered pricing by monopolists, the authentic heir apparent of the laissez faire doctrines of Adam Smith? Or are these newcomers mere opportunists claiming kinship with the free enterprise doctrines which they constantly thwart and undermine? Inasmuch as business seems to hold the balance of power in Washington today, maybe a closer look at that brand of free enterprise is in order.

In chapter 10 of his monumental work "An Inquiry Into The Nature and Causes of The Wealth of Nations", Adam Smith, best known of the classical economists, made a very significant and timely statement—"People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public or in some contrivance to raise prices."

This was written in 1776, nearly 200 years ago. Yet today the same tendency is evident in the annual meetings of the plumbers, the electricians, the carpenters, the steel workers, the longshoremen and even the medical men. Corporate stockholders reveal similar tendencies. The central theme at these gatherings is always higher prices and more profits.

Following this sage comment Smith pointed out the inherent danger in such conspiracies. He showed how any interference with free competition would make it difficult to maintain fair prices. Since buying power lies almost entirely within the bounds of the prime costs of production, any collusion among competitors would create a price structure based upon pure profits and one that would not be matched with purchasing power in the market. What Adam Smith believed and what has been confirmed by later economists was simply this—that pure profits should not be permitted and would not be created in a system that remained competitive, and allowed the play of the market to determine prices.

This, in the opinion of reputable economists, is the cardinal principle of the free economy and its moral justification. Yet any examination of American economic history will show how this principle has been persistently defied. American business has from the beginning been supported by tariffs, patents, embargoes and other devices all devised to maintain high prices. One of the first acts of the congress of 1789 was a ten percent import tariff designed to "protect our infant industries."

Administered pricing has now become standard practice among most basic industries of the United States. Through corporate mergers and new stock issues American corporations have been dominating business. They have been aided by an ill-controlled flow of fractional reserve checkbook money, usually available in abundance to wealthy borrowers.

New money to facilitate the growth of the nation's economy is not created by congress, as the constitution provides. It is created by some 14,000 stout-hearted bankers, each armed with a 12 or 14 percent reserve privilege and a fountain pen. Each dollar may thus expand into seven or eight new checkbook dollars for the customer's use. Furthermore, by the Glass-Steagall Act, the banks now purchase U.S. securities with this kind of "money" and immediately transfer them into the cash account. Thus the operation, like blowing bubbles, can continue ad infinitum. The greedy and inept direction of this limitless flow of credit money by bankers is one of the main factors in the destruction of the free, competitive economy envisioned by the classical economists.

Even our tax laws favor the rich, thus taking buying power away from those most in need of it. How the wealthy folk rail against the graduated income tax, the most inequitable tax ever devised. How they love the sales tax, one of the most regressive and inequitable of all taxes. They also hate and fear the cooperatives, the credit unions and all state municipal enterprises—in a word all those which seek to maintain competitive or yardstick pricing. President Nixon was recently sending out feelers on the possibility of enacting a federal transactions tax, the final step in creating wild, uncontrolled inflation. Yet these same affluent people all claim sponsorship of "The American Way", which with total lack of humor they call "Free Enterprise." Some even try to identify this savage creed with Christianity, which in a Christian nation seems almost sacrilegious.

Against this brief background let us consider that set of ideological obsessions held by Richard Nixon, which have come to be known among scholars and news media as "Nixonomics." The President has not acknowledged the existence of this creed, but the elements of his beliefs have appeared in

his executive orders, his "game plans", his vetoes and his rare news conferences.

It is no accident that Richard Nixon early became enamored of the American business system which is dominated by corporate monopolies, joined with the privately operated Federal Reserve Banking System, creators of the nation's money supply. The bankers, especially the group which operated in the old 12th congressional district of California, are the men who put Nixon where he is today and are still among his chief supporters. It is a reasonable assumption that the banking group who picked him as their candidate in 1945, a year before the congressional elections hired his public relations men and paid for his lavish smear campaign against Jerry Voorhis in 1946, represent his most enduring loyalty. He will not abandon them because he dares not do so. They know too much. As one Whittier banker, commenting on the \$18,000 secret fund scandal of 1952, remarked, "That was only peanuts compared with the money we shelled out for his campaign."

An opportunity to test this banker tieup came a little more than a year ago, after the country had suffered through two years of Nixon's high-interest depression. The congress authorized the president to order a reduction in the Federal Reserve's prime interest rate, which at one time had reached 8½ percent (the highest rate in the history of that institution). This, Nixon declared, he would never do. He accompanied his statement with another outburst of Nixonomics theology and a declaration of his unalterable devotion to private banking. Does anyone now doubt where Dick Nixon's heart lies?

Nixon early pledged a balanced national budget, but during his last two years in office, 1971 and 1972, his budgets had deficits of 25 billions and 28 billions. The current '72-'73 budget will undoubtedly be higher with further deficits. Incidentally current spending has been skillfully distributed with an eye on the votes of defense workers.

Nixon was against inflation but his usury-loving friends, William McChesney Martin and later Dr. Arthur Burns of the F.R. board of governors, by setting exorbitant interest rates, created the phenomenon of national unemployment and uncontrolled inflation simultaneously. Nixon put the wage clamps on working people, while corporate profits in many cases soared to new highs. He became positively niggardly in reducing welfare funds to needy unemployed and school lunch money for hungry children, as well as social security increases for the aged. It was noted however that the next social security checks bore the significant statement that the 20 percent increase (which Nixon had vigorously opposed) had just been signed into law by President Nixon.

The president's response to defense department requests was entirely different. Whenever the Pentagon men wanted more billions for "national defense" in southeast Asia—more money for planes, bombs, napalm or missiles to lay waste the countryside—the generosity of the president knew no bounds.

President Nixon has offered the American radio and TV audiences his quaint homily about his "work ethic" and the "welfare ethic", the latter term invented to express his opinion of welfare recipients. If I might break in on this bit of presidential sophistry, I would like to ask Mr. Nixon to explain the increase in the nation's unemployment rate from three percent to nearly six percent during his administration.

Nixon's economic convictions, if he ever had any, have changed during the past two years from orthodox to extremely heterodox. Early in 1971 this disciple of frugal laissez faire orthodoxy had apparently become a follower of the tax-and-spend philosophy of

David Cushman Coyle. Nobody seems to know where he will eventually land.

I believe the most accurate assessment of Nixon's behavior was made by Jerry Voorhis in his recent book "The Strange Case of Richard Milhous Nixon". Voorhis' quotation follows:

"To one practice Richard Milhous Nixon has been faithful. He has done whatever at any given time would advance his political fortunes. This alone explains the strange gyrations of his strange case."

It is important to remember that America's economic plight is in an area in which Richard Nixon's talents are not notably evident. This nation does not lack productive capacity, a fact which apparently has not been recognized by the president's economic advisers. We suffer from a breakdown of distribution, where deprivation and even hunger exist alongside vast concentrations of wealth. It is becoming increasingly evident that President Nixon has no answers to this problem. He has lost his way. Ending the war in southeast Asia—if indeed the peace endures—will not solve this problem. It may grow worse.

Maldistribution in America is mainly the result of administered pricing by monopolists and the creation of an unscientific and ill-controlled flow of bank credit money through the privately operated Federal Reserve System. Working together in unholy collusion these two giants of American business increase inflation, perpetuate deficit financing and are mainly responsible for an almost incalculable debt. This debt and the accompanying over-capitalization of business have become an increasing burden on the economy, both at home and abroad.

The tragic part of this situation is that it has become almost endemic in the American economy, like a cancerous growth that feeds on its host. The staggering debt of the American people—national, state, and local government, as well as institutional and private debt—constitute a continuing drain on production. Every householder knows that his interest on the home or the business must be paid before he fills that cart at the super market or buys shoes or clothing for the children. Most small businesses expand and grow with borrowed capital. Increased interest charges must be added to their costs and the cycle of inflation rolls on, with sales resistance at home and loss of export sales abroad.

As a result of these forces American producers are faced with a hopeless dilemma. Without monopoly pricing they can scarcely carry the overhead of debt and high taxes needed to continue welfare for the victims of our folly. If they try to maintain monopoly prices they are automatically priced out of the export market. This is the dilemma of the richest and most powerful nation on earth. Are we going to be content in this situation to be led by politicians who repeat the foolish, outworn clichés of the 18th or 19th century?

This is the paramount issue in the present governmental struggle. Mr. Nixon is disliked by many who regard him as a political delinquent or an scurrilous partisan. But these are personal judgments often considerably tinged with politics. The real issue with President Nixon, it seems to this writer, is his combination of ruthless, self-seeking power, coupled with Nixonomics, a complex of outdated economic mythology that spells total confusion in the business world of 1973.

DOLLAR OUTFLOWS AND DEVALUATION: U.S. BANKS PROFIT AT EXPENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a recent speech delivered by Andrew F. Brimmer, a member of the Federal Reserve Board. Governor Brimmer has performed a valuable service in pointing out the failure of the voluntary foreign credit restraint program during both the recent international dollar crisis and the crisis of August 1971 which he discussed in a speech in March 1972. In describing the outflows of dollars through the U.S. banking system and their role in the two devaluations which have occurred, he provides an implicit warning of what will happen if the current controls, inadequate though they may be, are removed altogether in December 1974 as the administration proposes.

The proposal to phase out foreign lending restraints casts additional light on the administration's opposition to the provision adopted by the Banking and Currency Committee to impose ceilings on interest rates. Without such restraints, interest rates must rise—and rise very high—to prevent even more massive outflows of dollars. Interest rate levels imposed by international events will have far more draconic effects on the American economy, as I think Governor Brimmer realizes, than does foreign lending restraints on the international operations of U.S. banks. The result of freeing the banks from these restraints was anticipated in an article last month in the *London Economist*. The article predicts:

It is very probable that the boom industry of the next two decades will be a new sort of international banking: the devising of ways of transferring both managerial and technological knowhow to areas where lower wage rates and more willing manufacturing labour forces mean that they can be most profitably used . . .

American labor leaders have already discovered the cynicism in the code which couples "lower wage rates" and "more willing manufacturing labor forces." It is clear that very few Americans will benefit from such a "boom industry." Further, a policy of high interest rates and increased dollar outflows will literally gut the American economy, creating at once unemployment and inflation on a scale not yet experienced in our history.

But what I would like to point out here is that this development is not just a distant prospect. It has already occurred. The three largest banks in the United States—Bank of America, Chase Manhattan, and First National City—already have a combined total of 667 offices overseas and, if the overseas offices of foreign banks with which they are affiliated are included, the total rises to 2,829. The total amount of deposits at their own foreign offices was more than \$30 billion in June 1972. The annual report of First National City Corp. for 1972 states:

For the first time in our history, more than half of our net income—54 percent, to be exact—came from overseas operations. In total, we earned \$110 million from this source, more than the entire corporation earned as recently as five years ago.

But it is not only the top three U.S. banks—or the top 20, with \$60 billion in deposits overseas and one-fifth to one-third of net operating income derived

from overseas operations—that contributed to our recent international financial problems. As of December 31, 1971, there were 57 U.S. banks that had only one overseas branch located in Nassau. When Dr. Burns appeared before the Joint Economic Committee on February 20, I asked him to comment on this phenomenon. Given the fact that the Federal Reserve Act specifically authorizes the establishment of overseas branches "for the furtherance of the foreign commerce of the United States," I asked Dr. Burns to explain why the Federal Reserve Board of Governors had approved so many branches in a country with which there is so little trade.

He replied, in effect, that these "shell" branches have been approved to permit more banks to participate in the lucrative Eurodollar market. In other words, it is a form of democracy for banks, to give the little fellows who cannot afford the outlay necessary to establish a full-fledged branch in London, Paris, or Tokyo a piece of the action. Governor Brimmer adds that the rapid expansion of branches in the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands in recent years "has been motivated more by a quest for a tax haven than because of the presence of economic and financial connections normally expected in principal banking centers."

I submit that such a policy on the part of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has made a mockery of the concept of regulatory authority. It has put bank profits before the public interest and seriously eroded the principles of commercial banking embodied in American law. It has created a monster—the multinational financial institution—whose operations are beyond the control not only of the Board but of any Government agency, domestic or foreign. Nevertheless, these institutions command resources which, if not controlled, can undermine and negate the financial and economic policies of any government.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an account of Governor Brimmer's speech from the April 3 edition of the *New York Times* and an editorial of the same date from the *Wall Street Journal* which provides additional information and support for the views of those concerned about the implications of U.S. bank operations overseas:

[From the *New York Times*, Apr. 3, 1973]
DOLLAR OUTFLOW CALLED "SERIOUS"—BRIMMER SAYS TOTAL DURING MONETARY TURMOIL THIS YEAR WAS \$2.5 BILLION

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—The outflow of dollars from United States banks during international monetary turmoil this year was about \$2.5-billion, but the bulk of it was in loans to foreign banks that drew on existing lines of credit, a member of the Federal Reserve Board reported today.

Andrew F. Brimmer, the board member, said there was only a "modest" outflow of dollars over which the United States banks had control—their balances with foreign banks. And even these increases, he said, were "primarily in dollars," not in foreign currencies.

Nonetheless, Mr. Brimmer concluded that there was a "serious problem" of large capital outflows from this country through the banking system, even though it stemmed mainly from "influences originating abroad."

PRESENTED IN FLORIDA

Mr. Brimmer touched on this and other issues connected with United States international banking in a lengthy paper presented at the Bankers' Association for Foreign Trade in Boca Raton, Fla. The text was made available here.

Mr. Brimmer's figures showed that from Jan. 3 to March 14 foreign banks drew \$1.8-billion on their United States lines of credit. There was also a \$500-million increase in this period in loans to foreign businesses, which can include foreign subsidiaries of United States corporations. But Mr. Brimmer said this figure "cannot cast much light" on the issue of whether these corporations engaged in heavy currency speculation.

The sharp increase in foreign lending carried some banks briefly over their ceilings under the Federal Reserve's foreign-lending restraint program, Mr. Brimmer said. This program is to be dropped by the end of next year.

Apart from the \$2.5-billion outflow from United States banks, Mr. Brimmer said there was an outflow of \$12-billion in February from foreign banks' agencies and branches in the United States. He called this "an even more striking picture of outflows than that relating to United States banks" because proportionately it was much larger.

GUIDELINES UNDER REVIEW

Setting foreign lending guidelines for these United States agencies and branches of foreign banks "has been especially troublesome," Mr. Brimmer said, and remains "under review."

Mr. Brimmer proposed no controls or other measures to check the rise in United States bank loans to foreign banks and corporations in connection with the currency crisis. He called the outflow this year "quite reminiscent of the outflows which occurred during May and August of 1971" and that led up to the first devaluation of the dollar.

Speaking of drawing by foreign banks on their lines of credit at United States banks, Mr. Brimmer said, "It seems clear" that much of this was done "in order to place the funds in the Eurodollar market," where interest rates shot higher during the monetary crisis. He added:

"Moreover, these relative rate spreads still favor holding such funds in the Eurodollar market, and that may explain the failure of a reflow to develop to date."

TAX HAVENS CITED

In his paper, Mr. Brimmer recited the rapid growth of foreign banking by United States banks in the last decade, including a rapid expansion in the last few years in the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands, which, he said, "has been motivated more by a quest for a tax haven than because of the presence of economic and financial connections normally expected in principal banking centers."

A major conclusion drawn by Mr. Brimmer was "the rate of profit which the banks can earn on the resources of their foreign branches appears to be remarkably thin."

He said, "These low profit margins seem to be one of the basic reasons [that] one encounters such persistent concern about the prospects for some of the United States banks currently operating foreign branches."

He expects to see "a winnowing out of individual participants as the currents of competition in the provision of international banking services strain managerial talent and erode profit margins," he said, adding that he found the future of American banking abroad "by no means pessimistic—but neither is it aglow with promises of universal prosperity."

COMPETITIVE EDGE SEEN

It is likely that "the competitive edge in this unfolding rivalry will be held by the largest banks," he said.

As a result of the present review by the Federal Reserve of overseas banking, he said, he hopes "the range of opportunities open to United States banks will be broadened considerably."

"I also hope," Mr. Brimmer said, "that the prospective changes will yield substantial equality of treatment in this country of domestic and foreign-headquartered banks operating here—since the latter currently have a number of advantages over United States institutions."

In another speech, Walter H. Page, president of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, urged the removal of Federal Reserve regulations that, he said, hinder efforts by American banks to attract foreign deposits.

Specifically, Mr. Page would do away with Regulations D, Q and M—rules that impose reserve requirements on foreign-source deposits and on banks here that take deposits from their branches abroad, and that place ceilings on interest rates paid on foreigners' deposits.

TO REDUCE OVERHANG

Removing these regulations, Mr. Page said, "would strengthen the dollar by reducing the huge overhang of dollars" in what he called the "Euro pool."

According to Mr. Page, the removal of controls on foreign lending by American banks "will not in itself free the domestic offices of United States banks to take over all the business now being done by their foreign branches."

Mr. Page noted that these voluntary credit restraints, which he described as "President Johnson's draconian measures on behalf of the balance of payments," shifted to overseas offices a large part of the international business of American banks. The credit restraints were imposed eight years ago and are scheduled to be lifted at Dec. 31, 1974.

WIDE OPTIONS FAVORED

"An international bank," Mr. Page contended, "in order to compete effectively, needs to have the widest possible options as to where to do a particular piece of business—at its head office, in an overseas branch, or through a subsidiary or affiliate."

Besides urging the removal of Regulations D, M and Q, Mr. Page also spoke out against imposing a Federal withholding tax on interest paid to foreigners by United States banks. Legislation now on the books calls for such taxation to begin in 1976.

"In the competitive banking environment of the 1970's our United States institutions can't afford such disadvantages," Mr. Page said.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 3, 1973]
A NICE PIECE OF CHANGE

We see that the foreign exchange operations of major New York banks came through the international currency crisis unscathed and even picked up a nice piece of change in the process. Several of them, including Chase Manhattan, First National City and Chemical New York have announced that their first quarter earnings include net trading profits made in the foreign exchange markets. Andrew F. Brimmer, a governor of the Federal Reserve System, yesterday said U.S. commercial banks in this period "contributed on balance some \$2.5 billion to the volume of funds which moved abroad in connection with the exchange rate speculation."

Similarly, the financial officers of the U.S. multinational corporations apparently protested themselves nicely during the crisis by getting out of dollars and into stronger currencies. Both the multinational banks and the MNC's, incidentally, also enjoyed a surge in the dollar value of their capital employed in foreign branches, subsidiaries, and affiliates. That won't look bad on the balance sheets either.

Was all this proper? George Stahl, pub-

lisher of Green's Market Commodity Comments, observes that the banks could only have made money in foreign exchange in the first quarter by betting against the dollar with dollars deposited with their banks, "thereby causing a loss to the international value as well as domestic purchasing power of their customers' dollars."

Donald C. Platten, Chemical's chairman, argued recently that it was unfair to accuse banks of speculating in the foreign exchange markets, that "We have a large foreign exchange trading department" to serve the needs of the bank's customers. In other words, whatever profits the banks made in the recent period derived from the legitimate accommodation of their customers.

To the extent the banks limited their trading to serving their customers' needs, and refrained from trading on their own hook, Mr. Platten's defense is of course impeccable. So too is the rationale of the MNCs in betting against the dollar, that because they have made purchases or sales of goods abroad they are forced to hedge in order to avoid a currency risk. To the extent they limited their hedging to cover legitimate commercial transactions, they are of course on solid footing.

A question of propriety is genuinely raised, though, in the report from London last week by our Richard F. Janssen, who finds that "American corporations no longer look on their 'cash managers' as mere custodians of foreign exchange. 'They consider them to be profit centers now,' one banker reports. So when a currency starts moving up on the market, cash managers are under home office pressure not only to switch existing funds but to tap their lines of credit at banks so they can buy more and make bigger gains."

It's only natural, considering the billions of dollars to be made on foreign exchanges these past three years. A corporate financial officer would not have lasted if he failed to cash in on the "sure things" that occurred in the foreign exchange markets. And his bank would risk losing a good customer if it quibbled about the uses to which lines of credit were being put.

Obviously, though, the situation has not been a healthy one. The dollar has lost international value and purchasing power, partly as a direct result of this form of cash management by U.S. multinationals. And while U.S. banks and multinationals regularly declaim against government controls on capital movements, this kind of private cash management may produce economic distortions just as perverse.

When an MNC taps its credit line at home, for example, doesn't this dry up lendable funds for domestic purposes? When it's done for legitimate purposes, we defend the system as the most efficient means of allocating international credit and capital. When it's done merely for quick speculative profits, though, the credit and capital may wind up being channeled into loans abroad that are less desirable and chancier than those available domestically. How many of the dollars that flowed abroad for speculative gains, in other words, resulted in relatively marginal foreign loans? The Fed's Mr. Brimmer also claims there has been a "relaxation of credit terms and a shaving of lending margins" in the activities of U.S. banks overseas. Tsk, tsk.

In a world of floating currencies, a large part of this problem may disappear, there being far fewer "sure things" on the foreign exchange markets. But while the principle of floating rates is a sound one, it is not yet certain that monetary authorities will refrain from unneeded and excessive tinkering with the markets, through further capital movement restrictions and other forms of intervention.

It is then with more than academic interest that we await the findings of a small

army of Federal Reserve Board examiners tracking down the dollar flows that precipitated the latest monetary turmoil. If they find that the multinational banks and corporations did in fact contribute heavily to the turmoil—by chasing a fast buck, not just hedging, the news will do little to further the cause of liberal national policies toward capital movements. Over the long pull, that nice piece of change could end up in the debit column.

HANOI TOURISTS

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, columnist Smith Hempstone had some well chosen words in Saturday's edition of the Washington Star-News concerning those steadfast friends and admirers of Hanoi, Jane Fonda and Ramsey Clark, and I include his column for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

THE HANOI TOURISTS, POW'S AND REALITY (By Smith Hempstone)

Over the long years during which this nation was involved in conflict with North Vietnam, America's self-proclaimed best and brightest made their guilt-laden pilgrimage to Hanoi, the New Jerusalem of the New Left.

They were all there: Ramsey Clark, Jane Fonda, Tom Hayden, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Joan Baez, Telford Taylor, Michael Allen, Barry Romo. Even Pierre Salinger got into the act obliquely by conferring with a couple of North Vietnamese representatives in Paris.

One recalls the braless Ms. Fonda (or is it Ms. Hayden, now that she and the anti-war activist are linked in some sort of matrimonial coalition?), posturing in a steel helmet beside the crew of North Vietnamese anti-aircraft missile. One also recalls what Ms. Fonda, who evidently picked up her method-acting from Tokyo Rose, had to say about the treatment of American prisoners of war by Hanoi.

The prisoners, she said, "assured me they were in good health. When I asked them if they were brainwashed, they all laughed. Without exception, they expressed shame at what they had done."

Now one can—and must—make allowances for Jane Fonda: Her mother was a suicide, she has one broken marriage behind her, she became a radical at age 32 after five years on a psychiatrist's couch. If an element of fantasy and make-believe intrudes on her life and words, one can understand it. Truth, as perceived by Ms. Fonda, necessarily can have only a fortuitous relationship to reality.

But comes now upon the scene Ramsey Clark, lawyer, author and former attorney general of the United States. How did Clark evaluate the treatment of American prisoners of war when he was in Hanoi last August?

Clark described the POW camp which he visited as having windows in every bedroom (with no bars), a movie theater, bridge tournaments, basketball court and paperback books. The POWs' health, he said, was "better than mine, and I am a healthy man." Clark, playing Lord Haw-Haw to Ms. Fonda's Tokyo Rose, said he was "particularly touched" by the hygienic conditions at the POW camp.

Did it ever occur to Clark, who was in Hanoi under the auspices of the Communist-infiltrated Stockholm-based International Committee of Inquiry into U.S. War Crimes in Indochina, that he might have been duped? Apparently it did not, although it did occur to him to cast aspersions on the motives of those who suggested it was just

possible that, as some of the prisoners released earlier had testified, the POWs were being brutally treated.

Now the prisoners of war, freed at last, are having their say. And there is precious little talk of unbarred windows, movies and bridge tournaments. Instead, there are tales of torture, beatings, starvation and months—sometimes years—in shackled solitary confinement. In contrast to the hygienic conditions which so touched Clark, many report having had to lie in chains in their own filth for weeks on end.

Each of the former POWs has made it clear that he can speak only of his own experience, that he cannot generalize. But the mosaic that their individual testimonies forms is one of both casual and calculated brutality on the part of their North Vietnamese captors. The principal purpose of this, aside from humiliating and degrading the Americans, was to wring from them statements which could be used for propaganda purposes to the anti-war movement in the United States.

That the North Vietnamese Communists should employ torture against helpless prisoners of war should come as no surprise to anyone with more than a fourth-grade education. There is not a single Communist state in the world that does not use physical torture, psychosurgery and forcibly induced drugs against those it considers its enemies. Testimony to this effect reaches the West from the underground every day.

But the Fondas and the Clarks will believe what they want to believe and say what they want to say, no matter what the burden of evidence. And it is too much to expect any of them to admit now that they might have been wrong, that they might have been used by Hanoi, that their prattling had the net effect of prolonging the war, not shortening it.

No, they have to find, a rationale for what they said and did. And Hayden has come up with the most logical one (to his warped mind): The freed POWs are "liars, hypocrites and pawns of President Nixon."

Hayden lacks the decency and common sense to understand the disgust a statement like that induces among decent men and women. He, like Fonda, Clark and some of the others, probably could be prosecuted under the Logan Act (Section 953 of Title 18, U.S. Criminal Code) of 1799, which prohibits any citizen from "correspondence or intercourse" with any foreign government in dispute with the U.S. But it is doubtful if that would serve any useful purpose.

The most fitting punishment is that they should have to live with their own bad consciences for the rest of their lives, and that they should never be taken seriously again.

MISMANAGEMENT OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, we have been facing severe disruptions in the supply of refined petroleum products. Last winter it was fuel oil. This spring and summer it will be gasoline as well. The common denominator of these shortages is the gross mismanagement of our petroleum resources arising from poor judgment in both Government and industry.

Today we are on the verge of seeing another instance in which the public interest is trampled by insensitive, callous policy. According to the Oil Daily of April 4, 1973, the White House has "but-toned up" its new import policy toward petroleum. The primary architect of this new policy has been the Oil Policy Com-

mittee, a cabinet-level advisory group headed by Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, William Simons.

A new import policy is long overdue. The American consumers have been paying an estimated \$5 to \$7 billion in inflated fuel costs annually due to quota restrictions on cheaper foreign crude. The Presidential task force on oil import control recommended the abolition of the quota system, but up to now the President has ignored these recommendations. The fact that the administration is finally showing some movement in this area is encouraging, but I am concerned by the direction of what appears to be the new policy and by the way in which it is being formulated.

For the past several months, the OPC and its subsidiary working group has been working on a new mechanism to control the importation of petroleum. These deliberations have been off the record and not open to the public. The March 23 Oil Daily reported that the committee's recommendations had been submitted to the White House. Subsequent reports have provided revealing detail into the proposed alternative.

Under the OPC proposal the present quota system would, in theory, be abolished and a tariff system would be substituted. The present volume of imports would be maintained, however, with imports up to that level subject to present duty rates. Imports above that level would have to pay "national security fees." These "fees" would be high tariffs which would have the impact of limiting importation above the present quota level. In short, under the OPC proposed plan the quota system—with all its inequities—would be reimposed under the guise of a tariff system.

Inland refiners suffered last winter for a lack of crude oil. For over a decade import controls have inflated domestic prices and made a wealthy welfare case out of the petroleum industry. The present proposal before the President does nothing to remove these imbalances. Policy made behind closed doors away from the light of public scrutiny is too often poisoned by entrenched special interests.

I have today forwarded the following letter to Mr. William Simons, Deputy Secretary, Department of Treasury, chairman of the administration's oil policy committee:

APRIL 9, 1973.

Mr. WILLIAM SIMONS,
Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMONS: As chairman of the Oil Policy Committee, you have direct responsibility for the formulation of a new import control system for petroleum. The abolition of our present system is essential to the formulation of a national energy policy which truly reflects the needs of the consuming public.

I am concerned, however, by the way in which the new import policy is being formulated. Within the OPC and its subsidiary working group, deliberations are off the record and closed to the public. However, industry representatives have been providing significant input in the formulation of policy.

The policy your committee has recommended to the President would maintain the present quota system—with all of its in-

equities—under the guise of a tariff. A ceiling on imports will be maintained. Beyond that ceiling "national security fees" would be imposed. Although there is some flexibility in this arrangement, a high license fee could effectively discourage imports above the quota. Moreover, the system which allocates imports to the refiners would, I understand, be continued.

With your committee recommendations, the President will soon issue a proclamation to alter import policy under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. In other words, there is no stage in this process at which the public interest has been or will be represented.

The privileged access of special interests to those who establish policy destroys public confidence and sacrifices the public welfare. For too long, petroleum policy has been formulated in the back rooms of government, hidden from the public welfare.

I urge you as chairman of the OPC to seek a wider representation of the American consumer. It is the consumer that has had to pay the annual bill of 5 to 7 billion dollars for our present, ill-conceived import quota system. It is the consumer that has had to pay for the shortages of fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline that have been brought about by gross mismanagement of our Nation's petroleum resources.

I hope that you can assure that consumer interests are not trampled again by insensitive policies which do not truly reflect the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill on behalf of myself that will permit the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline. This extremely important project for the Nation will require congressional authorization if it is to be started this year.

Unfortunately, the project has been mired in litigation for several years. The project has been pending before the executive branch since 1969. Over \$400 million has been expended on it thus far. The environmental impact statement alone has cost the American taxpayers \$9 million.

The adverse ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will have disastrous effects on the project unless Congress acts now. Because that decision was based on the narrowest technical grounds of section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 185), the earliest a final decision could be reached by the courts is probably over a year away. And that is over a year after Congress acts to satisfy the technical portion of the decision. Additionally, construction on the pipeline will take 3 years. If construction is begun this year, the cost will be approximately \$3 billion. The annual rise in cost will be \$200 to \$300 million per year for each year the project is delayed.

These costs, as most such costs, must unfortunately be borne by consumers across the country. The demand for energy is projected to increase nationwide twofold by 1985. Consumers in many States are already feeling the pinch. Several States have already experienced

serious fuel oil shortages. States governments across the country have called on Congress to solve the crisis.

Our bill will do that. Section 3 of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act of 1973, which we are introducing, will authorize the construction of the pipeline and all related facilities. It declares all permit application and related documents to be in accordance with applicable Federal laws. It further authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to issue all the necessary documents and grant the necessary real property interests for the pipeline and related facilities.

Section 4 of the bill declares that the environmental impact statement is in accord with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Section 5 declares that any Federal administrative decision on actions under this legislation shall not be subject to judicial review. The Federal courts would be divested of jurisdiction over the trans-Alaska pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, the critical shortage of petroleum today, coupled with the uncertainty of foreign supplies, and the fact that other power sources, such as nuclear power and oil shale are possibilities only in the distant future, make congressional approval of the pipeline an immediate necessity. I intend to urge congressional enactment of this bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we realize full well that this is a bill which goes to the extreme. It goes to the extreme to meet an extreme necessity—one that will bring to the United States domestic oil for domestic markets, and eliminate the problem of the continual deficit in our balance of payments caused by purchasing ever-increasing amounts of foreign oil.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 6756

A bill to deal with the current energy crisis and the serious shortages of petroleum products facing the Nation and to authorize construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Trans-Alaskan Pipeline Authorization Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(a) the United States is currently experiencing a critical shortage of petroleum supplies;

(b) this shortage has resulted in the closure of schools and factories, created unemployment in many regions of the country, and disrupted truck, rail, and air transportation systems;

(c) reliance upon imported oil products to fill the growing gap between domestic supply and increasing demand is not in best interests of the United States and is creating a critical imbalance in the Nation's balance of payments;

(d) the action of Canada in restricting crude oil imports into the United States and the announced policy of other exporting nations to limit oil production makes clear that the United States must take immediate action to increase domestic petroleum sources and provide the necessary transportation systems to bring domestic oil to the American consumer.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the trans-Alaska pipeline (as set forth in the right-of-way permit application or applications submitted to the Secretary of the Interior by Alyeska Pipeline Corporation and all related documents) is hereby authorized, and such permit application and related documents are deemed to be in accordance with applicable Federal law. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, in accordance with such permit application or applications, a right-of-way permit granting such easements, rights, and interests as are necessary for the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline.

SEC. 4. The Congress finds and declares that the statement prepared by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 102(2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to the granting of a permit for the trans-Alaska pipeline meets the requirements of such Act.

SEC. 5. Any finding, determination, or decision of the Secretary of the Interior, or any other Federal official of any agency, with respect to the legal authority to permit the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline, shall be final and shall not be subject to review in any court of the United States.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue such regulations as he may determine necessary to enable him to carry out the provisions of this Act.

IMPACT OF THE NIXON BUDGET ON OUR COMMUNITIES AND HOW TO DEAL WITH IT

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the attack launched by President Nixon upon the poor and working families of America represents a completely distorted view of the priorities faced by this Nation today and clearly indicates the narrow and absurd direction being taken by this administration.

The President has opened a full-scale campaign against the majority of American families, and I believe it imperative that we here in the Congress—and more importantly, for the millions of persons in communities all across America—to know fully the real and total impact of what Nixon asks for and how the Nixon proposals can be defeated.

I believe we can defeat the President—because he and his whole notion of where our country is and is going is wrong.

Because information on the impact of Nixon's budget and how to combat it is not readily available, over the past weeks I have compiled a number of important studies and analyses. I think these are critical studies and, for that reason, I now submit them for the RECORD:

I.—THE FEDERAL BUDGET 1974 PERCENTAGE CUTS

Program	1974 percent cut outlays	1974 percent change budget authority
Department of Agriculture:		
Animal and plant inspection service....	9.0	11.6
Agriculture stabilization and conservation, S+E.....	10.2	10.2
Cropland adjustment program.....	1.1	1.1
Conservation reserve.....	100.0	100.0
Dairy and beekeeper indemnity.....	62.5	100.0
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	20.6	43.4
Resource conservation and development.....	7.8	69.1

Program	1974 percent cut outlays	1974 percent change budget authority
Agriculture Land and Water Resources Fund.....	1.6	(?)
Special school milk.....	59.6	74.3
Forest protection and utilization.....	18.9	14.7
Department of Commerce:		
EDA.....	13.7	100.0
Promote and develop fishery products.....	6.7	32.9
HEW:		
NIH: Arthritis.....	3.9	6.5
NIH: Allergy.....	1.5	3.9
NIH: General medical science.....	7.4	10.1
Eye institute.....	20.9	6.7
General research grants.....	100.0	(?)
Health manpower—Health professions.....	46.6	46.6
Health manpower—Nursing.....	59.1	59.1
Service and supply fund.....	100.0	(?)
Office of Education:		
Elementary and secondary education.....	70.2	95.7
SAFA.....	72.0	86.0
Education for the handicapped.....	21.0	28.5
Occupational, vocational, and adult education.....	44.9	93.0
Social and Rehabilitation Service:		
Public assistance.....	9.9	17.2
Social and individual services.....	22.7	23.8
Benefits: Disabled coal miners.....	35.0	36.6
Assistance to refugees in United States.....	28.1	37.9
HUD:		
Low- and moderate-income housing aid.....	9.0	(?)
Sewer facilities.....	5.6	100.0
Department of the Interior:		
Migratory bird conservation.....	33.3	100.0
Saline water research.....	47.0	98.6
Department of Labor:		
S+E, labor and management.....	3.3	3.9
EEA.....	47.2	100.0
Federal unemployment benefits.....	23.1	23.2
Department of State:		
Buildings abroad.....	18.7	21.6
Working capital fund.....	100.0	110.0
Department of Transportation:		
Natural gas pipelines.....	8.6	(?)
FAA: A/R Trust Fund.....	100.0	100.0
FAA: Operations A/R Trust Fund.....	83.6	85.0
R.R. research.....	2.4	25.6
Department of Treasury:		
Bureau of Engraving and Printing Fund.....	83.9	100.0
IRS: S+E.....	.8	.1
Secret Service: S+E.....	.8	.5

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

EDA: Operations, research and facilities.....	39.4	100.0
GSA:		
Sites and expenses, public building projects.....	26.8	92.1
Building management fund.....	231.0	(?)
Trust fund: National Archives.....	165.2	(?)
Automatic data processing.....	31.2	(?)
VA:		
Veterans insurance benefits.....	30.5	100.0
General operating expenses.....	1.8	1.8
Construction of hospitals and domiciliary.....	51.2	(?)
Construction of State extended care facilities.....	10.0	100.0
Readjustment benefits.....	.8	.6
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES		
ACTION: Peace Corps.....	6.8	4.8
CRS:		
S+E.....	3.8	0
Intergovernmental personal assistance.....	3.7	33.3
Farm credit administration: Revolving fund for administrative expenses.....	100.0	100.0
Federal Home Bank Board:		
Interest adjustment and payment.....	12.4	(?)
Revolving fund.....	42.1	(?)
Selective Service: S+E.....	40.4	34.0
SBA: Disaster loans.....	87.4	100.0
TVA: TVA fund.....	18.2	33.1
USIA: International exhibitions.....	11.1	18.0
HEW Health-regional medical program.....		100.0
Education: ESEA:		
Education deprived children.....		100.0
Library resources.....		100.0
Equipment and minor remodeling.....		100.0
Planning and evaluation.....		100.0
HUD:		
Urban renewal.....		90.5
Model cities.....		100.0
Open space programs.....		100.0
DOL:		
Advances for extended unemployment.....	100.0	100.0
Executive offices.....	56.6	100.0
OEO.....		

1 Up.
2 No change.
3 No figures.

II. EFFECT OF PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS ON THE WORKING AND MIDDLE INCOME

Although the major emphasis of the cuts in the budget have been on programs de-

signed to serve the poor and disadvantaged, many programs also will effect the working and middle class.

Health Services—The Regional Medical Programs, Hill Burton C Hospital Construction, Community Mental Health Clinics—all serve middle class as well as the poor. The sharp cutback in medical research (NIH funds) effects all people equally, disease being no respecter of economic class.

Funds for *Open Spaces* in urban areas and *Outdoor Recreation* in rural areas will reduce facilities used traditionally by middle class groups.

The freezing of funds for HUD *Water and Sewer Projects* will most acutely effect suburban communities, particularly in new developments. If these communities are unable to obtain federal funds, it may require that the cost of new housing be raised because the developers will have to pay the costs, or taxes will have to be raised in order for the community to pay the costs.

The cutback on *Housing* will eliminate at least as many new middle income as low income housing and in addition will seriously effect the workers employed in the construction industry, already suffering from a 9.7% unemployment rate, one of the highest rates of unemployment nationally. The impact of construction workers unemployment will in turn effect employment in the service industries in residential areas with a high concentration of construction workers. Such areas are frequently middle income areas of cities or middle income suburbs. Anywhere from 1 to 2 million man years of work will be removed from the local economy. Cut backs in *professional training programs*—Health Manpower and the Education Professional Development Act (EPDA)—will decrease opportunities for the children of families in the middle income brackets from obtaining a professional education. *Student Assistant loans* offer no substitute since they are designed mainly for low income students, leave a residue of debt to be paid off, and have maximum levels not adequate to cover the cost of a long term educational investment.

The emphasis on student assistance without the corollary of funds available to colleges and universities will increase the tuition of all students attending college. The increased cost of higher education will have to be borne either by the state (more taxes?) or by the individual student.

One third of those employed by the *Emergency Employment Act* (EEA) are disadvantaged but two thirds are middle income people many of whom were only temporarily unemployed.

The cut backs to the *Environmental Protection Agency* to eliminate water pollution, air and noise pollution, and the handling of solid waste effects everyone equally; however, if the cities are to conform to the new standards established by the Environmental Quality Control Act without being able to obtain federal funds to build new treatment plants the source of money is likely to be new local taxes effecting middle income home owners (property taxes) or consumers (sales taxes).

Funds available through the *Economic Development Act* (EDA) have provided capital to depressed areas, not necessarily depressed people. Most of the jobs created by EDA have gone to middle income people.

Although Urban Renewal was designed as a program to benefit the poor, in actual practice it has benefitted the investors who have built in the industrial parks on the cleared properties, and the middle and upper income apartment dwellers who have occupied the apartment units that have replaced the slum dwellings.

OMBE has served minority business, but those served have been middle class minority members and although OMBE has an increase in funds, if OEO-Economic Development funds are added to fiscal year 1973 OMBE funds, the total amount of funds available for minority business firms is less

than fiscal year 1974 than in fiscal year 1973. The lack of funds authorized under the Rural Development Act, intended to be available for industrial parks and similar developments, will hurt the businessmen who would have occupied the industrial parks, more than the poor who may or may not find jobs in them. Lack of funds for rural waste disposal and water and sewer in rural areas hurt everyone certainly not just the poor.

Although funds for *Medicare* are up, these are for increased numbers who can now qualify, and all persons over 65 will be required to pay a share of all medical services, a burden on the aged whether they be poor or middle income. Although the elderly will be required to pay more, there is no efforts to reduce the benefits to the rich—the doctors and the hospital administrators.

III. YOUR FAIR SHARE OF REVENUE SHARING: A COMMUNITY GUIDE TO GENERAL REVENUE SHARING: FACTS, IMPLICATIONS, ACTION Movement for Economic Justice, 1609 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009, Phone: (202) 462-4200

INTRODUCTION

On October 20, 1972 the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, more commonly known as *General Revenue Sharing*, became law. The Revenue Sharing Act provides for a total of \$30.2 billion to be divided automatically among state and local governments over the next five years, beginning with 1972. The chart below indicates the amount to be distributed each year:

	Billions
1972	\$5.3
1973	6.0
1974	6.1
1975	6.3
1976	6.4

The first checks, covering the period from January through June 1972 were sent out in December. During January 1973, checks covering the second half of 1972 were mailed. The first quarterly payments for 1973 will go out soon. This means that state and local governments will actually have two years worth of General Revenue Sharing allotments this year. Some states have already spent or budgeted substantial portions of their share, but most have not. They have two years to spend the money but not much time to plan the spending of it. Neither do you have much time to plan how you can affect the spending.

The Revenue Sharing Law and the Treasury Department regulations governing its implementation don't require any citizen participation in deciding how the money will be spent. (Neither do they prohibit citizen participation.) So, it is up to you to make your needs, issues, and priorities heard and acted upon.

First you must educate yourselves about revenue sharing in general, and particularly about revenue sharing in your city or town, county and state. Then you can begin to make a plan based on your own situation.

What follows is a discussion of some of the major components and issues around revenue sharing. The information is divided into facts about General Revenue Sharing, implications for community groups, and suggested actions for community groups. The order in which the topics are discussed coincides with the order of topics outlined on the enclosed general revenue sharing checklist so that you can see topic-by-topic how to use the checklist.

I. GENERAL REVENUE SHARING (GRS) ALLOCATIONS FACTS

The amount of general revenue sharing funds received by a state is based on either of two formulas—whichever produces the greater amount of funds. These formulas are:

The five factor formula which takes into

account population, urban population, inverse capita income, general tax effort, and the existence of a local income tax.

The three factor formula which only considers population, relative per capita income, and general tax effort.

The reason there are two formulas is because in designing the bill, the House/Senate Conference could not reach a compromise between the more urban oriented House's five factors and the Senate's three factors.

The state government receives one-third of the total allocation for the state. Local governments receive the remaining two-thirds.

The two-thirds for local governments is divided among the units of local government within the state in this way:

Allocations for each county are determined on the basis of population, inverse per capita income and tax effort.

Finally funds are divided among the towns and cities and other localities within the county on the basis of population, inverse per capita income and tax effort.

Implications

Knowing how money is distributed under the GRS act and knowing how much money your state and local governments receive is not very important by itself. But with this knowledge you'll begin to get an overall picture of general revenue sharing in your area which is essential if you are going to proceed with a local general revenue sharing strategy.

Facts

After one and a half years, any state may change the weight of any of the three factors considered in the allocation formula. This change must be made through a single piece of legislation and will remain in effect for the full five years of the GRS Act. The change in the allocation formula must not decrease the allotment of any particular local government by more than 25% or increase it by more than 40%.

Implications

Changing the allotment formula may be either harmful or beneficial to you. You should determine what change would increase your locality's share and what changes would decrease it.

Action

Find out what, if any, proposals to change the formula are coming up in the state legislature. Lobby against any formula that would decrease your locality's share of the funds and work to have the formula changed to your advantage.

Facts

The allocation formula depends on the Census Bureau for population and per capita income statistics. Also, starting with 1972, a special section on the federal income tax return will be used to count heads for revenue sharing purposes.

Implications

Census statistics generally undercount the poor and the new tax return method of counting totally ignores the poor who aren't required to file returns.

Action

You can contest your state, county or locality's allotment on the basis of inaccurate population or income statistics. This requires very thorough documentation, however, and may not in fact provide any direct benefit to you since any extra money your work might obtain would still be in the hands of your local officials.

II. OTHER ALLOCATIONS RELATED TO THE USE AND IMPACT OF GRS FUNDS

Facts

Title III of the revenue sharing act set a ceiling of \$25 billion on HEW's formerly open-minded social services programs. The \$25 billion is distributed among the states on the basis of population. Twenty-three states and DC will receive fewer federal dol-

lars under the new disbursement formula than they had previously estimated spending in fiscal 1973.

The Nixon budget for fiscal year 1974 calls for substantial cuts in many areas of federal spending and already, as you know only too well, funding for OEO and other programs has been eliminated or curtailed.

Implications

There won't be much more money available to the states than there was before general revenue sharing was enacted.

Action

Start analyzing and documenting the impact of both the social services ceiling and the Nixon budget cuts in your area. The Movement for Economic Justice along with other organizations, is now formulating a nationwide, but localized, strategy to combat the budget cuts and you'll be hearing more about it very soon. Right NOW start working on the other specifically revenue sharing ACTIONS suggested in this pamphlet.

III. LOCAL EXPENDITURES FROM GRS FUNDS

Facts

Local governments must submit to the Secretary of the Treasury, at the beginning of each entitlement period a report indicating what amounts of their GRS funds will be spent for what purposes. These reports must be made public by publishing them in a local newspaper with general circulation and by making it available to the news media and the public-at-large.

Local governments must also submit a report to the Secretary of the Treasury at the end of each entitlement period indicating the amounts and purposes for which general revenue sharing funds were actually spent. These reports must be made public as indicated above.

Implications

None of these reports need be extensive and they needn't show the effectiveness of the programs nor the beneficiaries. And there is only a very vague system for periodic audits. Therefore, it is up to citizens to demand more thorough reporting and to do the monitoring.

Action

Insist on ready public access to all reports. Insist that these reports be comprehensive—that they analyze who benefits from the expenditures, etc.

Also do your own analyses using the Revenue Sharing Checklist as a guide to the kinds of questions that must be addressed.

Facts

State governments can spend their share of the general revenue sharing funds virtually without restriction. Two exceptions are that GRS funds cannot be used as the matching grant necessary to obtain other federal grants and GRS funds cannot be used to reduce current state assistance or state revenue sharing with local governments.

Local governments must spend their GRS funds in certain "priority areas". These are:

1. Ordinary and necessary maintenance and operating expenses for:
 - Public safety (police, fire departments, building code protection).
 - Environmental safety (waste disposal, pollution abatement, sanitation).
 - Libraries.
 - Public transportation.
 - Health.
 - Recreation.
 - Social services for poor or aged.
 - Financial administration.
2. Ordinary and necessary capital expenditures authorized by law.

The general response to a survey of mayors of cities with population over 10,000, conducted by Senator Muskie's Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, indicated that local governments planned to use their GRS funds for capital improvements,

public safety, and salary adjustments, including hiring new personnel. Somewhat less frequently mentioned were various forms of tax relief and environmental improvement. Only a small minority indicated they would use any General Revenue Sharing money for social services to poor and aged.

Implications

Given the priority areas as listed above, local officials will choose the ones they think are most politically important—most often, sewers for the suburbs, law and order, and tax relief. It should be noted however that the Muskie survey was conducted before Nixon's budget for fiscal year 1974 was announced and before local officials had any indication that they were expected to use Revenue Sharing funds to replace federal money cut from social programs. Now they may reconsider how to allocate the funds—it is up to you to make them reconsider. You must convince your local officials that community groups are to be taken seriously—that you are politically important.

Action

See the next section on Priority-Setting for an Action plan.

Facts

Local officials will be tempted to use book-keeping tricks to shift revenue sharing funds into areas not included on the "priority areas" list.

Implications

If revenue sharing money is spent on things that aren't included on the list of allowable "priority areas," it simply means less money to spend on those areas that are listed—including your community programs.

Action

Examine your local government's budget very closely. Look for sharp increases in non-priority areas and find out how they are being financed. See if comparable amounts of revenue sharing funds have been put into general administrative funds. If you come across such discrepancies, publicly demand an explanation from your local officials.

IV. PRIORITY-SETTING PROCESS FOR THE USE OF GRS FUNDS

Facts

There is absolutely no requirement in either the Revenue Sharing law or the Treasury Department regulations for citizen participation in deciding how revenue sharing money will be spent. (Neither is citizen participation prohibited.)

Implications

The implications of this fact are all too obvious—citizens are left out of the priority-setting process. This means that your needs and priorities are not taken into consideration.

Action

Demand citizen involvement!

Demand a clear policy of citizen involvement that includes representation of all sectors of the community.

Demand public hearings as a forum for all interested members of the community to raise issues and make their priorities known.

Demand that the process of citizen participation be widely publicized so that no one is excluded.

Demand a real voice and a concrete role for the community-at-large in determining how its revenue sharing money should be spent.

Be sure to make use of your general revenue sharing checklist in planning the details of your strategy for citizen participation. Be armed with the facts about how your local government planned to set priorities without consulting you.

Don't mount the fight alone. Contact other interested community groups and build a strong coalition committed to common priorities and needs.

Also many towns and cities have old, little-known regulations on the books that require citizen participation in such decision-making through hearings or town meetings or referendums. Have your lawyer investigate this possibility. With such a statute on your side your fight for citizen-participation will be won.

V. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROVISIONS

Facts

"No person in the United States shall, on ground of race, color, national origin, or sex, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part" with General Revenue Sharing funds.

If a recipient government does not comply with this civil rights provision the Secretary of the Treasury will request compliance. If, within a reasonable amount of time, not to exceed 60 days, the locality does not comply, the Secretary of the Treasury may refer the matter to the Attorney General or exercise the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or bring civil action in a U.S. Court. (All attempts are made to persuade the government to comply before a penalty is imposed.)

Implications

The Civil Rights provisions have been improved in the new Treasury Department regulations issued February 22, 1973 but are still weak in enforcement. There is no strong or reliable auditing procedure to detect non-compliance. Thus, it is up to you to monitor revenue sharing expenditures with an eye toward civil rights and equal employment.

Action

In monitoring expenditures for non-compliance with the civil rights provisions don't just look for cases of job discrimination. Look for exclusion from benefits. For instance, revenue sharing funds being spent on sewers in an all white section of town may constitute discriminatory spending. Pursue with your lawyer the possibility of stopping such expenditures through litigation on the basis of denial of benefits due to race (or national origin or sex).

VI. LOCAL TAXATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF GRS FUNDS

Facts

Many local governments look forward to revenue sharing as a way to hold down local taxes. (This is allowed under the area of financial administration.)

Implications

At first it may seem that using revenue sharing to reduce taxes is contrary to the interests of poor and low income people. But who benefits depends on how the taxes are changed. Current systems of taxation are most unjust for poor and low income people. The combination of federal, state and local income taxes, sales taxes and other taxes means that low income people are generally taxed at a rate of 50%! If state and local governments use revenue sharing money to hold down taxes and take advantage of the breathing space to make some substantive reforms of the tax system, poor and low income people will benefit.

Most often revenue sharing money will be used to hold down property taxes. Although poor people don't usually pay much property tax this could still be a beneficial use of the funds. For example, if while holding down property taxes your local government finds new ways of financing education which equalize educational opportunity, you will benefit.

Action

If you decide that it is to your advantage to raise the issue of taxes or if your state or local government or other groups are moving to hold down taxes by using revenue

sharing funds—push for real and comprehensive tax reform.

The Movement for Economic Justice's Tax Justice Project will help you with technical information and strategies and put you in touch with other people working on state and local tax reform.

VII. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF GRS FUNDS

Facts

State and local governments must report to the Secretary of the Treasury on how they spent their revenue sharing funds. These reports must be published and made available to the public. But these reports needn't be very thorough. They needn't analyze the impact or effectiveness of the programs.

Implication

Since the governments are not required to assess the impact and effectiveness of GRS funds, they won't bother to do it.

Action

Demand that your state and local governments prepare and make available substantive analyses of the benefits and shortcomings of programs or projects funded by revenue sharing money.

But also prepare and make public your own assessment. The General Revenue Sharing Checklist will give you an idea of what factors to consider in your analysis. In doing the assessment you might uncover new issues to raise to the community and to organize around.

VIII. YOUR CITY OR TOWN'S NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

Facts

Revenue Sharing funds and expenditures are just a small part of your city or town's budget. There is obviously a relationship between budget priorities as a whole and priorities for Revenue Sharing funds.

Implications

Your chances of getting funds for community programs will be better if you understand your city or town's entire budget and become involved in setting budget priorities.

Action

Take the same kind of action for opening budget priorities to the community as you do for opening revenue sharing priorities to the community. Devise your own counter-budget and present it at a public meeting of members of the community who also want a part in setting the budget's priorities.

CONCLUSION

The actions outlined here are by no means guaranteed to get your community group an immediate piece of the revenue sharing money. But we do know of groups that have succeeded.

However, even if you don't get a program grant right away your activities will be very important. By analyzing and publicizing the shortcomings of general revenue sharing you can affect the way funds are spent in the future. You will gain visibility and prove to your local officials that community groups must be taken seriously in the debate over how priorities are set and how money is spent.

Keep in mind that there is widespread ignorance among local officials about revenue sharing and its implementation. Remember that the Treasury Department's Office of Revenue Sharing will have a maximum staff of only sixty people. At full strength it will have no more than twenty auditors to examine the reports and accounts of some 38,000 units of government. This means that no one will be holding public officials accountable if you don't.

Recognize the fact that revenue sharing means that state and local officials will increasingly be responsible for the financing of your areas of concern. Nixon's budget for Fiscal Year 1974 calls for the consolidation of

seventy federal categorical programs, in the areas of education, manpower training, urban renewal, and Model Cities; under a new Special Revenue Sharing. It is time to start building new relationships with state and local officials and to make them the primary target of your actions.

Revenue Sharing has been billed as the great cure for urban problems and as the way to return control to the people. But we are skeptical of revenue sharing's ability to solve these problems, especially problems which are national in scope.

Remember that although the President would have us believe that revenue sharing is here to stay, if we can prove to Congress that revenue sharing does not work for poor and low income people—that community programs are being eliminated or cut as a result of revenue sharing—and that community people are not going to stand for it—revenue sharing can be stopped or redesigned to directly benefit you.

Good luck with your actions. Keep in touch with the Movement for Economic Justice and let us know of your successes or problems. We will help you in any way we can.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING CHECKLIST

A preliminary checklist of information needed for monitoring and evaluating general revenue sharing funds in your city/town:

I. GENERAL REVENUE—GRS—ALLOCATIONS

1. How much money was directly allocated to your city or town?
2. How much additional money does your city or town get from your state's share of GRS funds?

II. OTHER ALLOCATIONS RELATED TO THE USE AND IMPACT OF GRS FUNDS

1. How much money did your city or town receive for Social Services (under amendment of Title X of the Social Security Act)?
2. Was this amount more or less than last year's funds for social services?
3. Did this amount meet the minimum need for social services in your city/town?
4. Were any federal categorical program grants to your city or town cut or eliminated this year?
5. If there were cuts, how much was the reduction and in what areas?
6. Are any federal categorical program grants scheduled for cuts or elimination?
7. If so, how much will be cut and in what general areas?

III. LOCAL EXPENDITURES FROM GRS FUNDS

(a) Use of Funds:

1. What plans were announced for the use of GRS funds?
2. How have GRS funds actually been spent?
3. To what extent did the actual use of funds match the announced plans?

(b) Types of Expenditures:

1. How much GRS money was spent on capital expenditures?—Where was construction located?—Are locations accessible to various constituencies?
2. How much GRS money was spent on recurring operational expenses?
3. How much GRS money was spent on programs and projects—such as public safety, environmental protection, recreation, or social services?—How much was spent on social services in particular?—how much was spent on each program or project?

(c) Non-GRS expenditures potentially related to GRS expenditures:

1. Were there or will there be any sizable increases in your city or town's expenditures in areas not considered priority for the allocation of GRS funds (such as education)?
2. What areas or projects were or will be increased? By how much?
3. How were or will these increases be financed?

IV. PRIORITY-SETTING PROCESS FOR THE USE OF GRS FUNDS

(a) The Present Situation:

1. Have GRS funds already been budgeted and spent? How were priorities, if any, established?
2. If GRS funds have not yet been budgeted or spent, at what stage is the priority-setting process for the use of these funds?
3. Is the priority-setting process being publicized?

(b) Community Involvement:

1. What is the extent of community involvement in the priority-setting process?
2. Is this involvement at the invitation of your local government or the result of community pressure?
3. What community groups are most interested and involved?
4. What is the process or means of community involvement—public hearings, testimony in City Council meetings?

(c) Priority-Setting Process within your Local Government:

1. What is the extent of debate and deliberation within your local government?
2. What is the timetable for setting priorities?
3. What department or individuals are responsible for coordinating the priority-setting process?

(d) Role of the Media:

1. How much attention is paid to local government reports on the planned and actual use of GRS funds by the media?
2. To what extent does the media encourage public debate about priorities?
3. What editorial positions have the media taken?

V. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROVISIONS

(a) Equal Employment Opportunities:

1. Have women and minorities been discriminated against in hiring for programs or projects funded by GRS funds?
2. Have women and minorities been discriminated against in top and middle administrative positions?

(b) Capital Expenditures:

Have minority contractors and workers been utilized for these projects?

VI. LOCAL TAXATION EFFORT AND GRS FUNDS

1. Has there been any reduction of local tax effort as a result of GRS? What specific taxes have been reduced? By how much?
2. Have any planned increases in local taxes been eliminated as a result of GRS? Which taxes were to have been increased?
3. Who benefits from the reduced local tax efforts?
4. Have any efforts been made by the state legislature to alter the tax effort factor in the GRS formula for allocating state GRS funds to cities and towns?

VII. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF GRS FUNDS

(a) Beneficiaries:

1. What constituencies benefitted most from GRS program and capital expenditures?
2. What constituencies benefitted least from program and capital expenditures?
3. What specific benefits were there for poor, near poor and minorities from the major categories of expenditures?
4. Compare the benefits for poor, near poor and minorities with the benefits for other constituencies. (For instance, if additional policemen were hired, were they hired for inner city or suburban fringe areas?)

(b) Program Effectiveness:

1. What quantitative and qualitative improvements have there been in programs receiving GRS money?
2. Were there any priority areas that received GRS funds but did not reveal any real increased level of effort, activity or performance?
3. Were funds channelled to meet the greatest needs . . . bringing greatest good

to the greatest number or resources to the neediest?

4. Has there been any scandal, corruption or illegality in the use of GRS funds?

(c) Jobs Created:

1. How many professional and non-professional jobs were created and at what levels?

2. What new career opportunities were created?

3. How many administrative jobs (typists, clerks, accountants, etc.) were created versus direct social services jobs (bus drivers, garbage collectors, social aids, policemen, etc.)?

(d) Evaluation of GRS Expenditures:

1. Has your local government evaluated its GRS expenditures? What mechanisms and personnel were involved in the evaluation?

2. What private community groups have evaluated the GRS expenditures?

3. What public process has been used in evaluating GRS expenditures—public hearings, media publicity, none?

VIII. YOUR CITY OR TOWN'S NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

(a) Community Assessment of city needs and priorities:

1. What analyses of your city or town's needs or *Counterbudgets* are planned or underway? Who is doing it?

2. What analyses of the city or town's budget processes in relation to setting priorities for the use of GRS funds are planned or underway? Who is doing it?

(b) Comparison of Existing Budget Priorities with Priorities Determined by Community Groups:

1. Do GRS funds reinforce existing priorities?

2. Are GRS funds enabling your local government to begin to move into new priority areas?

3. Can GRS funds be better used to meet community-determined priorities and needs?

(c) Local Budget-Setting Processes:

1. What is the process by which the budget is set in your city or town?

2. What is the extent of community participation in the process?

3. Is the process publicized?

REVENUE SHARING AND THE STATES

The table below shows the amount or GRS money that will flow to each state in 1973. In each case, the state govt. keeps $\frac{1}{3}$ of the amount and $\frac{2}{3}$ is divided among the counties and localities within the state:

	Amount of GRS funds	Percent of total GRS funds	State population	Revenue sharing dollars, per capita		Amount of GRS funds	Percent of total GRS funds	State population	Revenue sharing dollars, per capita
Alabama.....	\$116,100,000	2.2	3,444,165	\$33.70	Montana.....	\$20,600,000	0.4	694,409	\$29.66
Alaska.....	6,300,000	.1	300,382	20.97	Nebraska.....	42,900,000	.8	1,483,493	28.91
Arizona.....	50,200,000	.9	1,770,900	28.35	Nevada.....	11,100,000	.2	488,783	22.71
Arkansas.....	55,000,000	1.0	1,923,295	28.59	New Hampshire.....	15,200,000	.3	737,681	20.60
California.....	556,100,000	10.5	19,953,134	27.87	New Jersey.....	163,600,000	3.1	7,168,164	22.82
Colorado.....	54,600,000	1.0	2,207,259	24.73	New Mexico.....	33,200,000	.6	1,016,000	32.67
Connecticut.....	66,200,000	1.2	3,031,709	21.84	New York.....	591,400,000	11.2	18,236,967	32.42
Delaware.....	15,800,000	.3	548,104	28.59	North Carolina.....	135,500,000	2.6	5,082,059	26.66
District of Columbia.....	23,600,000	.4	765,510	31.26	North Dakota.....	19,700,000	.4	617,761	31.88
Florida.....	146,000,000	2.8	6,789,443	21.50	Ohio.....	207,000,000	3.9	10,652,017	19.43
Georgia.....	109,900,000	2.1	4,589,575	23.94	Oklahoma.....	59,200,000	1.1	2,559,229	23.21
Hawaii.....	23,800,000	.4	768,561	30.96	Oregon.....	56,200,000	1.1	2,091,385	26.87
Idaho.....	19,900,000	.4	712,567	27.92	Pennsylvania.....	274,000,000	5.2	11,793,909	23.23
Illinois.....	274,700,000	5.2	11,113,976	24.71	Rhode Island.....	23,600,000	.4	946,725	24.92
Indiana.....	104,300,000	2.0	5,193,669	20.08	South Carolina.....	81,500,000	1.5	2,590,516	31.46
Iowa.....	77,000,000	1.5	2,824,376	27.26	South Dakota.....	25,100,000	.5	665,507	37.71
Kansas.....	52,800,000	1.0	2,246,578	23.50	Tennessee.....	98,400,000	1.9	3,923,687	25.07
Kentucky.....	87,300,000	1.6	3,218,706	27.12	Texas.....	244,500,000	4.6	11,196,730	21.83
Louisiana.....	113,600,000	2.1	3,641,306	31.19	Utah.....	31,400,000	.6	1,059,273	29.64
Maine.....	31,100,000	.6	992,048	31.34	Vermont.....	14,800,000	.3	444,330	33.30
Maryland.....	107,000,000	2.0	3,922,399	27.27	Virginia.....	105,200,000	2.0	4,648,494	22.63
Massachusetts.....	163,000,000	3.1	5,689,170	28.65	Washington.....	84,100,000	1.6	3,409,169	24.66
Michigan.....	221,900,000	4.2	8,875,083	25.00	West Virginia.....	52,300,000	.9	1,744,237	29.98
Minnesota.....	103,900,000	2.0	3,804,971	27.30	Wisconsin.....	133,900,000	2.5	4,417,731	30.30
Mississippi.....	90,700,000	1.7	2,216,912	40.91	Wyoming.....	9,700,000	.2	332,416	29.18
Missouri.....	98,800,000	1.9	4,467,501	21.12					

Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; Census Bureau.

IV. JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES PUBLIC POLICY SERIES: THE BLACK COMMUNITY AND REVENUE SHARING, JANUARY, 1973

This study was prepared for the Joint Center for Political Studies by Dorothy Williamson, Kenneth S. Colburn and Dr. Pamela Kacer.

The Joint Center for Political Studies is a private, non-partisan organization, funded by the Ford Foundation. It provides research, technical assistance, and educational services for black and other minority group elected officials, and other groups and individuals representing minority group interests.

The Center also publishes reports and studies on topics related to minority group interests and political involvement of minorities. For a publications list, see the inside back cover.

Additional copies of this paper may be ordered for 50 cents each, or 35 cents per copy on orders of ten or more. Address requests to:

Publications: Joint Center for Political Studies, 1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 926, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 638-4477.

Reprinting of this material is permitted and encouraged. Please credit the Joint Center for Political Studies.

PREFACE

This is the third in a series of occasional background papers on public policy issues of special interest to minority elected officials and others concerned with minority groups.

The first background paper, entitled "Federal Drug Abuse Programs" was published by the Joint Center, in cooperation with U.S. Representative Charles B. Rangel, in December, 1972. The second, also published in December, was "Children and Lead Poisoning".

These occasional papers briefly summarize and analyze relevant issues on contemporary problems. They also suggest additional resources to aid the reader in developing more extensive knowledge. With this knowledge, the reader will be better prepared to take appropriate action on these issues.

With the inauguration of this new series, the Joint Center is expanding its services to its constituents.

EDDIE N. WILLIAMS,
President.

JANUARY 1973.

REVENUE SHARING

On October 20, 1972, the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, more commonly known as revenue sharing, was signed into law. Its basic purpose is to return federal funds directly to state and local governments with few strings attached. While the concept is simple, the implications of this measure are enormous. The Joint Center has prepared this booklet to describe the essentials of revenue sharing and to begin to look at its implications for minority elected officials and their constituents.

I. What is revenue sharing?

The Revenue Sharing Act provides for a total of \$30.2 billion to be distributed automatically to state and local governments during the next five years. Funds are being sent out to these governments under a formula based on population, tax effort, and relative per capita income, adopted by the U.S. Congress. Allocations to each state and locality were computed automatically based on the formula.¹

¹ A five-factor formula was used for 16 states under a compromise between the House and Senate. Calculations were done automatically by computer.

The first checks, sent out in December 1972 covered the period January 1-June 30, 1972. During the first week of January 1973, checks covering the last half of 1972 were mailed by the U.S. Treasury Department. Then, beginning in April 1973, checks will be mailed on a quarterly basis (July, October, January and April) through January of 1977.

The philosophy behind revenue sharing is that local governments are more knowledgeable about and more responsive to the needs of their residents. This means a radical shift in who determines spending priorities. Traditionally, federal categorical grants and block grants are made for specific purposes with specific restrictions laid down by Congress and enforced by federal agencies. Under revenue sharing the governors, state legislatures, mayors, county executives and city and county councilmen will determine how federal revenue sharing funds will be used.

As of January 1973, the Treasury Department was operating under interim regulations for the first two payments. Interim regulations are the more detailed rules under which a program is operated until a federal agency issues permanent regulations. It was expected that proposed permanent regulations will be issued early in 1973. At that time there is to be an opportunity for individuals, organizations and governmental bodies to comment to the Treasury Department before the regulations are made final.

The Revenue Sharing Act also places a limit of \$2.5 billion on federal outlays for social services, and permits the federal government, at each state's discretion, to collect state individual income taxes and return them to each respective state. In 1972, some Congressmen expressed concern when they found that, in an apparent loophole, social services funds under the Social Security Act were available to states on an open-ended

basis. The \$2.5 billion ceiling on the categorical grants authorized in that Act was inserted in the revenue sharing bill as a tactical maneuver to assist passage. The facts which follow are based on the law and on the preliminary regulations.

II. How the funds are distributed

The allocation of funds to the states and localities is determined on the basis of a formula set forth in the law as passed by the Congress. The total sum available for the period is first broken down by the basis of the formula.

One third of the allocation for each state goes to the state government. The remaining two thirds is then divided by county according to the basic three-factor formula.

The county share, in turn, is then divided into three parts: for the county government, for the municipal governments as a group, and for the townships as a group in proportion to the taxes each collects.

Finally, the municipalities and the townships subdivide the money allocated to them as a group. The share of each is determined by the basic formula, population times tax effort times inverse relative per capita income. The basic formula for subdividing shares to the county is the product of each county's population times its tax effort times the inverse of its relative per capita income. In the application of this formula, population is based on the 1970 census. Tax effort as used in the formula is the relationship between the taxes ("adjusted taxes")² collected by a jurisdiction and the aggregate of the jurisdiction's income. The purpose of this element in the formula is to benefit those jurisdictions that are taxing themselves heavily, that is, using a large portion of their taxable capacity. Localities that use revenue sharing payments to reduce taxes may also cut their tax effort, and hence their future revenue sharing payments.

Inverse relative per capita income is included in the formula to benefit the poorer jurisdictions, though, as noted later, it remains to be seen how effective this factor will be for that purpose. As calculated for municipalities the factor would be:

Per capita income of county/per capita income of individual municipality.

If the particular municipality has a below average per capita income, this factor will be greater than one, leading to an increased share.

The funds going to each unit of government are based on a predetermined formula and calculations are made by the Treasury's computer. The only factor that can affect the amount of these initial allocations is the data from each locality which is put into the formula.

Chart I illustrates how funds are distributed within each state. Note the limitations on amounts a government may receive, listed on the bottom of Chart I (not reproduced in the RECORD).

Changes in Formula

An important provision of the law gives each state legislature *once* during the five-year period the opportunity to change the weights given to each of the factors in the formula for distribution of funds within the state.

That is, a change may be made which will affect the relative amounts communities within a state will receive.

An alternative state formula will be based on relative weight, from zero per cent to 100 per cent, given to each of two factors:

² Adjusted taxes is defined as the compulsory taxes collected by the municipality (other than employee assessments and contributions) to finance retirement and social insurance systems, and other than special assessments, utility fees and user charges minus that portion of the taxes which is properly allocable to school facilities.

(1) Population x tax effort.

(2) Population x inverse relative per capita income.

Thus, population times tax effort may be given a weight of 20 per cent and population x relative per capita income 80 per cent or any combination adding to 100 per cent.

The per capita income factor would seem to be the best indicator of a local government's relative poverty. However, this factor may cause the difference in poverty among medium and larger sized cities to be obscured if the richer areas in a city balance out the poorer. It may be that the tax effort factor will be a more precise criterion. Minority elected officials will have to study the particulars of their state's situation carefully before determining whether to favor a change in the allocation formula.

III. How the funds can be used

Despite the general absence of federal requirements for revenue sharing fund use, several limitations do exist.

Local Share

Revenue Sharing Funds received directly by local governments ($\frac{1}{3}$ of the total amount going to a state) must be used within one of the following areas:

(1) Ordinary and necessary maintenance and operating expenses for:

(a) Public safety (including law enforcement, fire protection, and building code enforcement).

(b) Environmental protection (including sewage disposal, sanitation, and pollution abatement).

(c) Public transportation (including transit systems and streets and roads).

(d) Health.

(e) Recreation.

(f) Libraries.

(g) Social services for the poor and aged.

(h) Financial administration.

(2) Ordinary and necessary capital expenditures authorized by law:

State Share

Revenue sharing funds which go directly to the states (the remaining $\frac{2}{3}$ of a state's allocation) are not restricted to the eight categories listed above. However, there is a limitation which applies to the states only: state governments are required to maintain the same level of aid to local governments as they have during fiscal year 1972. Under this "maintenance of effort" provision, if a state reduces its aid to localities below that level, the Treasury Department will reduce the state's share of revenue sharing funds by the same amount.

Both Local and State Shares

Both revenue sharing funds going directly to localities and those going to the states may not be used, directly or indirectly, to meet the matching requirements of federal grant-in-aid programs. However, revenue sharing funds can be used to supplement other federal funds.

Within these broad categories are many uses which minority elected officials will find to benefit to their constituents. As expressed earlier, decision-making in the state and local appropriations process will be of crucial importance in determining the actual revenue sharing fund use.

It is worthwhile keeping in mind that, at the moment, revenue sharing is only a five-year program. It may be prudent to invest these funds in non-recurring projects—for instance capital expenditures where other funds are available for maintenance—in order to guard against the possible end of revenue sharing in 1976. In other cases operating expenses may be so overwhelming as to demand use of revenue sharing funds for that purpose.

IV. Special requirements

To see that revenue sharing operates fairly and effectively, certain special protections have been written into the law. These special

protections are not self-enforcing, and require the vigilance of local officials and citizens to be effective.

The Plan

Perhaps the most important lever for minority elected officials in seeing that revenue sharing is used for the benefit of minorities is "The Plan" for use of revenue sharing funds. Under the law, each state and locality which expects to receive the funds must submit a report to the Secretary of the Treasury which spells out the amounts and purposes for which the funds will be used. The plan must be submitted for each entitlement period (each fiscal year after the first three payments). The chief executive of the state, county, city or township is responsible for preparing the plan.

The preparation of this plan is an opportunity for minority elected officials to have uses of benefit to their constituents written into the plan.

However, there is at this time no provision for open hearings or submission by the community as to uses they desire. By calling for such hearings or forums, the elected official may better be able to see his community's views represented.

Assurances to the Secretary

In order to be eligible for revenue sharing funds, a unit of government must submit to the Secretary of the Treasury certain assurances that the requirements of the law will be met. Localities must also submit these assurances to the governor. These assurances are that:

(1) Revenue sharing funds that are not immediately spent will be kept in a trust fund, and interest from the account will be deposited;

(2) The funds will be used within two years from the time of issuance;

(3) Funds will be used only for purposes permitted by the act;

(4) Expenditures will be made in accordance with state and local laws and procedures;

(5) Fiscal, accounting and audit procedures will follow Treasury Department guidelines;

(6) The Secretary of the Treasury and Comptroller General shall have access to relevant books and records;

(7) Annual and interim reports required by the Secretary shall be made;

(8) Employees will be paid wages out of general revenue sharing funds (if 25 per cent or more of an occupational group is paid from these funds) at the same rates paid other employees in similar occupations, and

(9) Laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on a project funded in part (25 per cent or more) with general revenue sharing funds will be paid according to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Reports to the Secretary

At the end of each entitlement period, each governmental unit receiving funds must submit a report to the Secretary of the Treasury detailing actual use of funds.

Publication of Reports

Both the report showing planned use of revenue sharing funds and that showing actual use of revenue sharing funds must be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the governmental unit.

V. Civil rights

Of major concern to minority elected officials is the extent to which revenue sharing may lessen the civil rights protections which have been built into the federal grants system. There is the possibility that without the detailed federal civil rights protections, states and localities will be unwilling or unable to avoid racial discrimination where revenue sharing funds are involved.

The Revenue Sharing Act has a single civil rights provision, a repetition of Title

VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI is a broad prohibition on use of federal funds for projects in which racial discrimination is practiced. The revenue sharing act extends the prohibition to sexual discrimination as well.

Absent are the detailed laws and administration enforcement procedures applicable under other federal civil rights laws, such as the Fair Housing Act and the Equal Employment Opportunities Act. The details of enforcement now fall largely to the states and localities which generally have fewer laws, less effective enforcement mechanisms, and in some cases a lack of will to avoid racial discrimination.

Further, under revenue sharing, discrimination can be accomplished by the nature of fund uses as well as by outright discrimination in programs. For instance, a municipality may apply its funds to beautifying a golf course used almost exclusively by whites rather than for paving roads in low-income areas. A local government might also use revenue sharing funds for a non-discriminatory purpose, but the effect will be to free funds for a discriminatory program such as funding local housing in a locality with no local fair housing law.

These potential loopholes have been of concern to a number of individuals and groups. A task force of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has submitted a letter to the Treasury Department calling for certain provisions in the permanent regulations to be used. That letter suggests:

(1) The recipient must give an assurance that non-discrimination requirements have been complied with;

(2) The recipient must set forth facts showing the planned use does not and will not result in racial discrimination;

(3) There should be language defining the equal opportunity responsibility and explaining the standard of performance expected;

(4) The revenue sharing regulations should incorporate by reference all appropriate Title VI regulations;

(5) Detailed explanation should be given of compliance procedures to be used, including a requirement of data submission on race, ethnicity and sex of program beneficiaries;

(6) The governor, who has initial responsibility for enforcing the non-discrimination clause, should submit a plan for enforcement to the Treasury Department;

(7) The Secretary of the Treasury should have sanctions, including fund termination, for non-compliance with civil rights provisions, and

(8) All plans should be distributed widely in each community before they are forwarded to the Treasury Department.

Regulations changes may serve to strengthen the act's civil rights provisions, but only monitoring by local individuals and national groups can see that there is no discrimination. The National Urban Coalition and the Brookings Institution, among others, will be doing revenue sharing monitoring generally.

VI. Implications of revenue sharing for minority communities

Revenue sharing as a new form of federal funding to states and localities may produce a major change in the workings of government and its effect on various groups of citizens. There has been little experience with revenue sharing and its potential effects are not yet clear. But some preliminary observations and cautions may be pointed out.

Changes in Federal Funding

While revenue sharing represents additional funds for localities, there is the possibility that it will be followed by cutbacks in categorical grant programs, initiated either by the Congress or by the Executive Branch.

Elected officials will want to guard against the possibility that such cutbacks will result in a net loss for minority communities. This might happen, for instance, if revenue sharing funds were used for libraries throughout a city, while soon afterwards manpower funds going mainly to the minority community were cut back. The check list prepared by the National Urban Coalition, included as Appendix B, is useful in monitoring such changes.

Changes in the Levers of Power

As outlined earlier, revenue sharing will change the key point of decisionmaking for these federal funds from various federal agency officials to state and local chief executives and legislators. Elected officials must become totally familiar with the appropriations at the state and local levels, looking not only at the specific use of revenue sharing proceeds but at resulting changes in the use of other funds as well.

Use of Funds

Greater attention will have to be given to new ways in which uses of public funds will be helpful or harmful to minority communities. For instance, property tax, as a local matter, could be affected by decisions made at the local level. The effect of lowering property taxes with revenue sharing funds may well be to the benefit of property owners. Similarly, substituting revenue sharing or other funds for federal programs where federal civil rights laws have been effective and state or local civil rights laws have been absent or ineffective could result in greater discrimination.

Civil Rights

In addition to monitoring or seeking to strengthen the weak civil rights provisions of the revenue sharing regulations, minority groups should take a closer look at state and local civil rights laws and enforcement procedures.

Investment of Local Funds

Some states and localities are unable to use revenue sharing funds immediately and may put them in banks or invest them, possibly in bonds. Investments must be made in accordance with local laws and procedures. Minority officials will want to watch whether such funds are placed in minority-owned banks and assess the extent to which they are invested in areas which benefit minorities.

Incorporation

Because revenue sharing funds can only go to general purpose governments, local officials, particularly in the South, may want to consider the advisability of creating general purpose incorporated governments in areas that are now without municipal or township governments.

Change in State Formula

A change in the state formula, as described earlier, may affect the extent of funds going to minority communities. Such a change can be made by the state legislature. Minority elected officials will want to be alert to proposed formula changes, to study the benefits of the alternatives, and make their views known.

Community Participation

The plan for use of revenue sharing funds is the crucial point at which a community can make input into revenue fund use. The focus of citizen participation efforts will have to be changed, to some extent, to have a direct effect on the plan and the local appropriations process.

Data Collection in Black Communities

In the past, some question has been raised as to the accuracy of data about black communities, particularly in the Census. Revenue sharing funds will be distributed on the basis of data obtained from the 1970 Census, special Census Bureau surveys, and Internal Revenue Service records. Officials will want

to see that such data is accurate, to obtain the fullest benefit for their communities.

Congressional Oversight

Finally, revenue sharing is an experimental program, which could be vastly expanded or scrapped entirely. The Congress will be watching to see how the program works, how funds are used, whether discrimination and fraud occur, or whether local communities are moved to help their residents, particularly those who need it most. Monitoring, documentation, discussion and public exposure of shortcomings by minority community leaders will help to accomplish the purpose. Elected officials can play a key role in monitoring by keeping accurate records of revenue sharing fund use.

In the 93rd Congress (1973-1974), Special Revenue Sharing, which is distinct from General Revenue Sharing discussed in this pamphlet, will most likely be under renewed consideration. Special revenue sharing would give additional federal funds, again with few limitations, to states and localities for more specific subject areas, indirectly substituting for existing federal grant programs. Special Revenue Sharing is likely to be proposed for such areas as community development and manpower. This and other changes will be the subjects of future Joint Center publications.

For further information contact Research Department, Joint Center for Political Studies, 1426 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

APPENDIX: GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

A preliminary checklist of information needed for the monitoring and evaluation of these funds, prepared by Pablo Eisenberg, National Urban Coalition:

I. GENERAL REVENUE SHARING (GRS) ALLOCATIONS

A. Amount of money allocated directly to cities and/or other localities.

B. Additional funds diverted to cities and/or other localities by the states from the states' share of GRS.

II. OTHER ALLOCATIONS RELATED TO THE USE AND IMPACT OF GRS FUNDS

A. Allocations for Social Services (Amendment of Title XI of Social Security Act):

1. Amount received by city and/or other localities.

2. Amount by which this year's allocations exceeded or was less than last year's funds for social services.

3. Did this year's allocations for social services meet the minimum need for such services?

B. Federal categorical programs:

1. Were there any federal categorical program grants eliminated or cut this year?

(a) How much was the reduction?

(b) In which general areas?

2. Are any federal categorical program grants scheduled for elimination or reduction?

(a) How much will the reduction be?

(b) In which general areas?

III. LOCAL EXPENDITURES FROM GRS FUNDS

A. Use of funds:

1. Announced plans for the use of GRS funds.

2. Actual use of GRS funds.

3. Extent to which actual use matched announced planned use of GRS funds.

B. Types of expenditures:

1. Amount spent on capital expenditures:

(a) Location of construction

(b) Accessibility to locations by various constituencies

2. Amount spent on recurring, operational expenditures.

C. Programs areas and projects on which GRS funds spent:

1. Look into police, social services, fire stations, etc.

2. Specific amounts spent.

D. Non-GRS local expenditures potentially related to GRS expenditures:

1. Were there or will there be any sizeable increases in local expenditures in areas not considered priority for the allocation of GRS funds, e.g., education?

(a) What areas or projects?

(b) How much was the increase?

2. How were these increased expenditures financed?

3. Were there any priority areas that received GRS funds but did not reveal any real increased level of effort, activity or performance?

IV. PRIORITY-SETTING PROCESS FOR USE OF GRS FUNDS

A. Have GRS funds already been budgeted and spent?

1. How were priorities, if any, established?

2. If GRS funds have not yet been budgeted or spent, at what stage is the priority-setting process for the use of these funds?

3. Is the priority-setting process being publicized?

B. Community involvement:

1. Extent of community involvement.

2. Community groups most interested and involved.

3. Process of community involvement:

(a) Public hearings.

(b) Testimony in City Council meetings.

(c) Other.

C. Within local government:

1. Extent of debate and deliberation within local government.

2. Time involved in setting priorities.

3. Department or individuals responsible for coordinating process within local government.

D. Role of the media:

1. Attention paid to local government reports on the planned and actual use of GRS funds.

2. Degree of encouragement of public debate by the media.

3. Editorial policies.

V. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROVISIONS

A. Equal employment opportunity:

1. Minorities and women.

2. Top and middle echelon administrative positions.

B. Capital expenditures:

1. Utilization of minority contractors and workers.

VI. LOCAL TAXATION EFFORT AND GENERAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS

A. Any reduction of local tax effort as result of GRS?

1. Specific taxes.

B. Elimination of planned increases in local tax effort as a result of GRS?

1. Specific taxes.

C. Primary beneficiaries of reduced local tax efforts.

D. Any efforts by State legislatures to alter tax effort factor in GRS formula allocating funds to localities?

VII. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF GRS FUNDS

A. Beneficiaries:

1. What constituencies benefitted most from program and capital expenditures?

2. What constituencies benefitted least from program and capital expenditures?

C. Within local government:

1. Extent of debate and deliberation within local government.

2. Time involved in setting priorities.

3. Department or individuals responsible for coordinating process within local government.

D. Role of the media:

1. Attention paid to local government reports on the planned and actual use of GRS funds.

2. Degree of encouragement of public debate by the media.

3. Editorial policies.

V. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROVISIONS

A. Equal employment opportunity:

1. Minorities and women.

2. Top and middle echelon administrative positions.

B. Capital expenditures:

1. Utilization of minority contractors and workers.

VI. LOCAL TAXATION EFFORT AND GENERAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS

A. Any reduction of local tax effort as results of GRS:

1. Specific taxes.

B. Elimination of planned increases in local tax effort as a result of GRS:

1. Specific taxes.

C. Primary beneficiaries of reduced local tax efforts.

D. Any efforts by State legislatures to alter tax effort factor in GRS formula allocating funds to localities?

VII. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF GRS FUNDS

A. Beneficiaries:

1. What constituencies benefitted most from program and capital expenditures?

2. What constituencies benefitted least from program and capital expenditures?

C. Local budget-setting processes:

1. Extent of community participation.

2. Information and publicity about process.

JCPS PUBLICATIONS

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

No. 1. *Federal Drug Abuse Programs*. December, 1972. 75 cents; 60 cents per copy on orders of 10 or more.

No. 2. *Children and Lead Poisoning: A Guide for Local Action*. December, 1972. 50 cents; 35 cents per copy or orders of 10 or more.

No. 3. *The Black Community and Revenue Sharing*. January, 1973. 50 cents; 35 cents per copy on orders of 10 or more.

PAMPHLETS

Baltimore's Failure to Elect a Black Mayor in 1971, by G. James Fleming. March, 1972. 50 cents per copy.

Black Politics in Gary: Problems and Prospects, by William E. Nelson, Jr. March, 1972. 60 cents per copy.

The Construction Industry: A Black Perspective, by Dennis Derryck. May, 1972. 50 cents per copy.

Implications, Impact and Prospects of Nixon's New Economic Policy, by Thaddeus H. Spratlen and Robert S. Browne. September, 1971. 50 cents per copy.

The Making of a Black Mayor: A Study of Campaign Organization, Strategies and Techniques in Prichard, Alabama, by John Dean. January, 1973. \$2.50 per copy.

Metropolitan Government: A Black Analytical Perspective, by Tobe Johnson. May, 1972. 50 cents per copy.

REPRINTS

Blacks and Metro Politics. Contains "The Black Role in Urban Politics," by Richard Hatcher, and "Black Rule in the Urban South," by Lee Sloan and Robert French. No charge.

DIRECTORIES

National Roster of Black Officials, March 1971, and *Supplement*, March, 1972. \$2.50 for each volume.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Guide to Black Politics '72—Part I: The Democratic National Convention, and Part II: The Republican National Convention. No charge.

To order, write: Publications, Joint Center for Political Studies, 1426 H Street, NW., Suite 926, Washington, D.C. 20005.

V. STRATEGY TO COUNTER THE NIXON BUDGET CUTS/IMPOUNDMENTS

The following is a local action plan for fighting the Nixon budget cuts and impound-

ments. It has been discussed with the Congressional Black Caucus and many other people and groups. It has been adopted as an action plan by a coalition of more than 80 National Organizations which met on March 5th. It is designed to be a majority strategy in which blacks and other minorities work in coalition with whites who are adversely affected by the budget cuts.

The strategy relies heavily on local organizing and local action in congressional districts, coupled with a well-thought out, well-organized legislative strategy on Capitol Hill.

ELEMENTS OF A LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY

The legislative strategy must be simple in its basic design and bold and sweeping in its purpose. It must transcend the day-to-day intricacies of the normal legislative process if local constituencies are to effectively participate. The National strategy must have a clear focus, such as a major bill or congressional resolution whose progress can be easily followed by local constituencies. (It could be more than one bill but the fewer the better.) There must be adequate lead time between the initiation of the legislative strategy and the local actions to allow citizens to be identified, informed and mobilized to lobby on the issue. There should be a predictable time when the bill or resolution will come to a vote to facilitate local planning and organizing around it. And, it must be of a nature that will allow the broadest possible constituency to coalesce around it.

LOCAL ACTION PLAN

The local strategy would have three focal points:

Fact-finding hearings would be held by members of Congress in their home districts during the Easter Congressional Recess. In cases where Congresspersons are unwilling to hold hearings, local coalitions might use petition drives or other forms of citizen actions to persuade or pressure their attendance. If a Congressperson refuses to hold the hearing, the local coalition should sponsor its own. The hearings would be important in beginning to develop the coalition but their major importance would be in airing the specific impact that the budget has had (or will have) on people in Congressional districts across the country.

Town meetings would be held the last week in May or the first week in June. Sponsored by a more fully organized coalition of local groups and individuals, these meetings would be designed to rally the broadest public interest and support for the congressional initiative against the budget cuts/impoundments. Ideally, these would be timed to fall a week or two before the major legislative initiative would be acted upon by the House.

A series of rallies and/or actions would be scheduled for June 30th and July 1st at federal buildings or other key sites in local districts to usher in the new fiscal year. The rallies could take the form of victory celebrations, or planning for further coalition action if the congressional initiatives have been successful against Nixon's cuts, or could feature heavier forms of direct action and escalated confrontation if Nixon's cuts and impoundments have not been reversed.

These proposals are meant to form a framework and general time table. A variety of other actions could be fitted into it.

The Movement for Economic Justice is willing to provide coordination and assistance to local groups that are interested in participating.

GEORGE A. WILEY,
National Coordinator.

VI. NATIONAL PRIORITIES VOTING CHECKLIST BY "THE MARCH FIFTH COALITION"

Over the past two years, Members of the House of Representatives voted on many

questions concerning budget priorities and programs designed to aid lower income and disadvantaged citizens. From those many votes, we have selected 38 which we believe present an adequate perspective for the judgment of how any one Member of the House is likely to vote in the future on similar issues.

The following list of those 38 votes includes the issue in question, date of the vote, which page it can found in the Congressional Record, and the position on that vote which favors re-adjusting national priorities to-

wards those Americans most in need and away from the corporate-military complex.

Since every Member of Congress can cite a myriad of reasons why they "could not" vote for a specific bill or amendment, we do not suggest that any one percentage of voting "right" separates the good from the bad; however, if the Member you are researching votes "right" less than 75% of the time, there is need for intense local lobbying pressure to insure that that Member will support proposals to retain and increase social programs.

For your information, Congressional Records are maintained by most library systems and by what are termed Federal Depository Libraries and every congressional district is entitled to two such libraries; your Congressman's office will tell you where they are in your District.

(NOTE.—Because of the technical nature of congressional procedure, what is termed the "right" position on some of these votes may not agree with the description of the issue being considered; however, the position shown is, indeed, the correct position.)

Rollcall No. and issue	Right position	Date	Page No.	Rollcall No. and issue	Right position	Date	Page No.
Teller 31: Cut funds for the supersonic transport.....	Y	Mar. 18, 1971	H1748	Rollcall 27: Food programs for the elderly.....	Y	Feb. 27, 1972	H784
Teller 52: Increase appropriations for education.....	Y	Apr. 7, 1971	H2588	Rollcall 37: Increase public debt limit level.....	Y	Feb. 9, 1972	H986
Rollcall 66: Eliminate public works programs in areas of high unemployment.....	N	Apr. 22, 1971	H2711	Rollcall 46: Extend poverty programs 2 years.....	Y	Feb. 17, 1972	H1235
Rollcall 98: Allow substitution of a weaker emergency employment program.....	N	May 18, 1971	H4059	Rollcall 45: Substitute weaker poverty program.....	N	do.....	H1221
Teller 113: Substitution of weaker emergency employment bill.....	N	June 2, 1971	H4539	Teller 271: Limit emergency community facilities programs.....	N	July 19, 1972	H6694
Teller 140: 10 percent cut in defense budget.....	Y	June 16, 1971	H5300	Rollcall 273: Passage of emergency community facilities bill.....	Y	do.....	H6699
Rollcall 142: Increase appropriations for education.....	N	June 17, 1971	H5440	Rollcall 285: Expansion of rural development programs.....	Y	July 27, 1972	H6979
Teller 159: Limit farm payments to \$20,000.....	Y	June 23, 1971	H5774	Rollcall 290: Minimum wage increase.....	Y	Aug. 1, 1972	H7036
Teller 207: Increase health funds.....	Y	July 27, 1971	H7246	Rollcall 309: Increase health and education funds.....	Y	Aug. 9, 1972	H7413
Teller 208: Increase rehabilitation program funds.....	Y	do.....	H7254	Teller 330: Lower unemployment benefits.....	N	Aug. 16, 1972	H7733
Teller 209: Increase child welfare services funds.....	Y	do.....	H7259	Rollcall 333: Override President veto on Labor/HEW funds.....	Y	do.....	H7743
Rollcall 227: Loan guarantees for Lockheed Corp.....	N	July 30, 1971	H7519	Teller 339: Increase funds for poor schools.....	Y	Aug. 17, 1972	H7846
Teller 237: Extension of Federal child care programs.....	Y	Sept. 30, 1971	H8903	Rollcall 351: Compromise poverty program bill.....	Y	Sept. 5, 1972	H8068
Teller 275: Eliminate Legal Services Corporation.....	N	do.....	H8921	Teller 371: Increase funds for bilingual education.....	Y	Sept. 19, 1972	H8547
Rollcall 277: Restrict day care services.....	N	do.....	H8939	Rollcall 398: Emergency medical services act.....	Y	Oct. 2, 1972	H8980
Rollcall 278: Extension of Economic Opportunity Act.....	Y	do.....	H8939	Rollcall 404: Minimum wage increase.....	Y	Oct. 3, 1972	H9061
Teller 401: Cut defense budget by 2 percent.....	Y	Nov. 17, 1971	H11201	Teller 420: Allow President alone to cut spending.....	Y	Oct. 10, 1972	H9401
Rollcall 438: Conference report on OEO Act.....	Y	Dec. 7, 1971	H11940	Rollcall 443: Limit social services expenditures.....	N	Oct. 12, 1972	H9769
				Rollcall 440: Labor/HEW funds.....	Y	Oct. 13, 1972	H9844
				Rollcall 456: Spending level limit.....	N	Oct. 17, 1972	H10232

MORE BACKGROUND ON THE WEST FRONT EXTENSION

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, already we are beginning to see in the press and to read in our daily mail expressions of grassroots sentiment on the historic issue of extending the west front of the Capitol at the fantastic cost of \$368 per square foot for hideaway office space, almost seven times the cost of space in the Rayburn Office Building, until now the most costly office space ever constructed.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it behooves us to listen to these grassroots voices. Surely, Mr. Speaker, at a time of grave budget crisis, at a time when milk is being cut off for children in schools, when hospital care is being denied our senior citizens, when Congress is being challenged on all sides to reassert its leadership in the control of the purse strings and in the setting of national spending priorities, surely, Mr. Speaker, we in the House cannot possibly, in our first official action on the vital spending priorities of the 1974 budget, vote to spend \$60 million for a few hideaway offices for our own personal convenience, and at the staggering alltime cost of \$368 a square foot.

Here is a sample of some of that grassroots sentiment: An editorial from today's Washington Post; an editorial from the Schenectady, N.Y., Gazette of March 23, 1973; and a syndicated article by Virginia Payette which also appeared in the Schenectady Gazette of the same date.

I am sure that all of my colleagues who sincerely believe that a dollar saved is a dollar earned will find these editorials and this article of great interest:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1973] CAPITOL PHANTASMAGORIA

The House Appropriations Committee voted in closed session last Thursday to spend \$58 million for an extension of the historic west front of the U.S. Capitol. Closing the session to the public (by a 32 to 13 vote) is contrary to the recent legislative reforms which limit secret congressional deliberations to matters of national defense and personnel. The proposed \$58 million expenditure is contrary to prudent use of public funds.

The congressional leadership's extension phantasmagoria, secret sessions and all, has been around for over a decade. As Rep. Samuel S. Stratton (D-N.Y.) has put it, "The action of the House Appropriations Committee was completely expected. They are in the same rut and will stay there until the House and Senate membership forcibly eject them from it."

The House, according to present plans, will have its chance to do just that in another week. The issue is relatively simple: The central sandstone portion of the west front, built in the days of President George Washington, has been allowed to deteriorate and is in need of repair. A congressionally commissioned engineering study (the Praeger Report) has found that restoration is entirely feasible and would cost \$15 million. It would have the advantage of preserving the historic integrity of the building.

The congressional leadership (represented in toto on the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol) rejects restoration, however, and wants the building extended by as much as 80 feet. This would drastically alter the building, hide the historic facade, destroy the magnificent terraces and stairway down to the Mall and cost \$58 million. Like all phantasmagoria, it has no plausible advantage at all.

The arguments in favor of extension, faithfully supported by successive Architects of the Capitol, have shifted over the years. At first we were told that repair of the original facade was not feasible. This was refuted by the engineering study. Next we were told that

additional space was essentially needed for tourist facilities. This is obviated by the conversion of Union Station into a visitor's center. Now the extension is to be justified by "an urgent need for space."

But the space needs, however urgent, have never been specified. There is no public plan for the arrangement and purposes of the proposed offices and other spaces. Capitol Architect George White has testified that it is inappropriate to call them "hide-away" offices. What he has in mind, he said, are spaces where legislators can escape the pressure and tension on Capitol Hill—"some place where we can close the door, not have a phone and just sit there and think."

Mr. White, we agree, needs a place where he can escape the pressure and think about precisely what he is going to offer Congress for \$58 million besides a new marble facade. And the House and Senate should at least insist that before they approve this expenditure, the Architect submit the same kind of masterplan Congress demands before funds are granted for interstate highways, model cities and other development programs. The plan should include an inventory of space utilization of present buildings and proposals for the long-range development of Capitol Hill. If such a study finds that additional space for thought is indeed needed in the Capitol itself, it could, as the American Institute of Architects has pointed out, be more cheaply and easily provided by building invisible underground facilities into the slope on the south and north side of the building.

First and foremost, however, it is time for Congress to get out of the extension rut and vote for restoration rather than alteration of the national Capitol.

[From the Schenectady (N.Y.) Gazette, Mar. 23, 1973]

THE WEST FRONT STORY

On several occasions in the past, we have commented on the persistence of some veteran legislators on Capitol Hill in seeking congressional approval of a project that, at last estimation, would cost \$60 million to

renovate and extend the west front of the Capitol.

We have also commended the efforts and equal persistence of Congressman Sam Stratton in leading the seven-year fight against the plan on the basis that it is totally unnecessary, would cost entirely too much in taxpayer dollars and, more importantly, that the money could be put to much wiser use elsewhere.

On this page today, we heartily recommend to our readers the column by Virginia Payette, who delves into the West Front Story with her usual vim and directness. She makes an especially pointed observation that perhaps the best answer to the constant cry for more office space in the Capitol is to "get rid of a few of those thousands of boards, commissions and advisory councils" which occupy so many offices and spend so much money.

Shoring up any weakened walls and properly maintaining our nation's historic Capitol is a responsibility not to be confused with renovation projects designed to build plush new offices for bureaucrats.

[From the Schenectady (N.Y.) Gazette,
Mar. 23, 1973]

WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL (By Virginia Payette)

If Congress is really serious about not spending all our money (that's what they keep telling the President, anyway), let us encourage them in that noble purpose by offering to get along without \$60 million worth of new toilets, restaurants and offices in the Capitol.

It may be only a drop in the bucket to the spending machine in Washington, but it's a lot of money to tourists, who also happen to be taxpayers. To save that much we'd be willing to suffer a little.

Forget about more office space, gentlemen, and we'll promise to take care of the other matter before we line up to tour your building. We don't need two new tourist restaurants, either. We can always pack a lunch or something.

This sacrificial offer is made directly to the commission that wants to spend \$60 million to rebuild and extend the west front of the Capitol.

It's falling down, say commission members. And instead of simply restoring it, they might as well go ahead and enlarge the Capitol to provide more tourist facilities and (this is not an afterthought) more private offices.

We've been down this road before. Every year or two somebody decides it's time to expand. And each time architects and conservationists set up a howl over knocking down the only remaining section of the original building.

But the latest gimmick is that the hundreds of thousands of tourists who swarm to Washington every year need more rest rooms. "What," argues one of the backers, "is a mother to tell her little boy?"

She can do what mothers do in similar situations everywhere. Congressman. She can tell him to hold it. She can also limit his intake of soft drinks, which is one more reason we don't need two fancy new restaurants.

Besides, says Rep. Samuel Stratton, who has fought the plan since 1966, that argument about needing more space is a lot of bunk, "a wasteful, extravagant, destructive boondoggle."

Rep. Andrew Jacobs agrees. "If we extend the Capitol on the basis that tourists need more facilities," he comments, "it will be the most expensive pay toilet in the history of the world."

Nevertheless, House Speaker Carl Albert is all for going ahead. There just aren't, he says, enough offices to go around anymore.

Which brings up another possibility. Instead of spending \$60 million to take care of all the Congressmen and their staffs and

boards and commissions and advisory councils, why not tackle the problem a different way? Let's get rid of a few of those thousands of boards, commissions and advisory councils.

Fewer bureaucrats mean fewer salaries, right? And if they empty out enough offices they won't need an expensive new office wing. We might even, in the long run, save more than \$60 million.

Obviously, that's too simple. Because Congress is already going ahead to reactivate bills that will not only cost billions of dollars; they will also create new boards, commissions, advisory councils, etc.

Several of them (the Older Americans Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Plant Program) also duplicate programs already being run by commissions in Health, Education and Welfare, Labor and the Environmental Protection Agency.

And it's already too late to do anything about that \$1.5 million the Senate is spending to build itself a national shrine by restoring the old Senate chamber and the 100-year-old Supreme Court room where Thomas Jefferson was twice sworn in as President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. BURLESON of Texas), from April 9 through April 15, on account of health.

Mr. PETTIS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from April 9 through April 12, 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. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FROELICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOGAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. VEYSEY, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUNTER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCFALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIELSON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MORGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DELLUMS, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 7½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,275.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. FROELICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUIE in two instances.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. FINDLEY in three instances.

Mr. SHOUP.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. HUBER.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. GOLDWATER in three instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. ABDNOR.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUNTER) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. FLOOD in two instances.

Mr. WON PAT.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mrs. CHISHOLM in five instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in 10 instances.

Mr. HANNA in five instances.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia in six instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1972, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 972; 50 U.S.C.

1431-35), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to Rule XL of that House.

During calendar year 1972, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, acting through its Contract Adjustment Board, utilized the authority of the above-cited statute as follows:

a. Under date of February 29, 1972, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract with Aero-Spacelines, Inc., for providing an airlift capability for outsized cargoes to NASA for a 12-month period. The adjustment was granted on the basis that the Company incurred a loss as a result of the Government's action in delaying the effective date of the contract for one month, while at the same time, the Government kept the Company in a position whereby it had to maintain its capability to furnish the services called for by the contract. The amount of the adjustment was \$149,284.

b. Under date of October 30, 1972, the Board authorized a partial adjustment of a fixed-price contract with J. A. Maurer, Inc., calling for a 16 mm sequential camera for Project Gemini. The adjustment was granted on the basis that the contract required the use of a specified connector on the camera power cable which was not available commercially. The exact amount of adjustment, which will be the difference between the cost of the specified connector (if available) and the cost of the connector used, has not yet been determined by the Contracting Officer.

c. Under date of December 27, 1972, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract with Thiokol Chemical Corp., calling for the production of TX-354-5 rocket motors. The adjustment was granted on the basis that Thiokol was entitled to receive the royalties that would have been payable if the Government procuring agency for the motors had not been changed from the Air Force to NASA. The change in the procuring agency was a Government action over which Thiokol had no control. The amount of the adjustment was \$69,266.88.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. FLETCHER,
Administrator.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

728. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1973 (H. Doc. No. 93-79); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

729. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report of receipts and disbursements pertaining to the disposal of surplus military supplies, equipment, and material, and for expenses involving the production of lumber and timber products, covering the second quarter of fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 712 of Public Law 92-570; to the Committee on Appropriations.

730. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report that no use was made of funds appropriated in the 1973 Department of Defense or Military Construction Appropriation Acts during the 6 months ended December 31, 1972, to make payments under contracts for any program, project, or activity in a foreign country except where, after consultation with a designee of the Secretary of the Treasury, it was determined that

no excess foreign currencies of the country involved were available, pursuant to sections 736 and 109 of Public Laws 92-570 and 92-547, respectively; to the Committee on Appropriations.

731. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the 25th Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 80-883; to the Committee on Armed Services.

732. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of various construction projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

733. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of transportation for Administration, transmitting a report on Coast Guard purchases and contracts negotiated under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(11) during the period October 31, 1972, through March 31, 1973, and a statement that no contracts were negotiated under section 2304(a)(16) during that period, pursuant to section 2304(e) of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

734. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize further adjustments in the amount of silver certificates outstanding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

735. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 411(b)(4) of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

736. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the U.S. Postal Service to continue to receive the fee of \$2 for execution of an application for a passport; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

737. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 20th Annual Report of the Department of State on its activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, covering calendar year 1972, pursuant to section 404(d) of the Act (Public Law 81-152), and the 1972 report of the Department on its lend-lease activities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

738. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a fund for activating authorized agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

739. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering calendar year 1972 on the anthracite mine water control and mine sealing and filling program, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 575; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

740. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on negotiated sales contracts for the disposal of materials during the 6 months ended December 31, 1972, under Public Law 87-689 (79 Stat. 587); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

741. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, to provide a monetary penalty for the transportation of merchandise in violation of the coastwise laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

742. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; transmitting a report on adjustments to national defense contracts during calendar year 1972 by NASA, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1434; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

743. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the authorization of means other than stamps on containers of distilled spirits as evidence of tax payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

744. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on how the Federal Government participates in activities affecting the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

745. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on economies available through improved management of Navy shipboard inventories; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. A report on conversion of worthless securities into cash (Rept. No. 93-110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MEEDS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3867. A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing for Federal acquisition of that part of the tribal lands described herein, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MEEDS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4967. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Indian Claims Commission for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 93-112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 348. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 205. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation (Rept. No. 93-113); Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 6692. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program providing for the inspection of fish produced on fish farms in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6693. A bill to extend until November 1, 1978, the existing exemption of the steamboat *Delta Queen* from certain vessel laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr.

ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 6694. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue rights-of-way and special land use permits for the construction of pipelines in the State of Alaska under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 6695. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to provide food stamps to certain narcotics addicts and certain organizations and institutions conducting drug treatment and rehabilitation programs for narcotics addicts, and to authorize certain narcotics addicts to purchase meals with food stamps; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 6696. A bill to incorporate the 82d Airborne Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 6697. A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 6698. A bill to amend the Communication Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 6699. A bill to establish the Cabinet Committee for Asian American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6700. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to establish within the Bureau of the Census a Voter Registration Administration to carry out a program of financial assistance to encourage and assist the States and local governments in registering voters; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 6701. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6702. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for waiver of excludability for certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6703. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide visas for parents of permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6704. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate U.S. citizenship requirements with respect to employment of personnel by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6705. A bill to repeal the bread tax on 1973 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6706. 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. CORMAN:

H.R. 6707. A bill to amend section 451 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a special rule for the inclusion in income of magazine sales for display purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. KETCHUM, and Mr. BAFALIS):

H.R. 6708. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to exclude from coverage by the act every household which has a member who is on strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6709. A bill to provide for the environmental regulation by the Environmental Protection Agency of mining activities, for the restoration by the Corps of Engineers of abandoned mined areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 6710. A bill to assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work and to make available the education and training needed by any person to qualify for employment consistent with his highest potential and capability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6711. A bill to improve quality of child development programs by attracting and training personnel for those programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. BROVHILL of North Carolina, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STEELMAN, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 6712. 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. FAUNTROY (by request):

H.R. 6713. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Election Act regarding the times for filing certain petitions, regulating the primary election for Delegate from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6714. A bill to give effect to the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, signed at Rio de Janeiro May 14, 1966, by the United States of America and other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 6715. A bill to provide that certain changes in the loan and purchase program for the 1973 peanut crop which the Department of Agriculture is contemplating shall not be made; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6716. A bill to authorize bank protection works along the Ohio River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURLISON of Texas, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 6717. A bill to amend section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 6718. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to impose an additional liability upon owners and operators of vessels, onshore facilities, and offshore facilities for the discharge of oil onto private property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6719. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress of any impoundment of funds ordered authorized, or approved by the Executive, to provide a procedure for congressional review of the President's action; and to establish an expenditure ceiling for the fiscal year 1974; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 6720. 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. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. MINISH, Mr. GUYER, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. HICKS):

H.R. 6721. 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. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY) (by request):

H.R. 6722. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1974 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 6723. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to make more equitable the manner in which deductions for readjustment pay are made from retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6724. A bill to establish a joint Committee on National Security; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 6725. A bill to provide a procedure for the exercise of congressional and executive powers over the use of any Armed Forces of the United States in military hostilities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 6726. A bill to amend the Federal, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself and Mr. BIESTER):

H.R. 6727. A bill to authorize the President, through the temporary Vietnam Children's Care Agency, to enter into arrangements with the Government of South Vietnam to provide assistance in improving the welfare of children in South Vietnam and to facilitate the adoption of orphaned or abandoned Vietnamese children, particularly children of U.S. fathers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 6728. A bill to amend certain provisions of Federal law relating to explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6729. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6730. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 6731. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 6732. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 6733. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest shall be paid to individual taxpayers on the calendar-year basis who file their returns before March 1, if the refund check is not mailed out within 30 days after the return is filed, and to require the Internal Revenue Service to give certain information when making refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6734. A bill to encourage earlier retirement by permitting Federal employees to purchase into the civil service retirement system benefits unduplicated in any other retirement system based on employment in Federal programs operated by State and local governments under Federal funding and supervision; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6735. A bill to repeal section 411(b) (4) of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 6736. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit bribery of State and local law enforcement officers and other elected or appointed officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 6737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, to allow a deduction to tenants of houses, apartments, or other dwelling units used as their principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 6738. A bill to implement the constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities of the legislative branch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 6739. A bill to provide for first amendment protection of the free press; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 6740. A bill to amend section 922 of title 18 of the United States Code to permit policemen under 21 years of age to purchase handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 6741. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to direct the President to establish a Rent Control Board which, through the establishment of a cost justification formula, will control the level of rent with respect to residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6742. A bill to strengthen and improve the protections and interests of participants and beneficiaries of employee pension and welfare benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6743. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6744. A bill to establish a national program of Federal insurance against natural disaster; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6745. A bill to provide that persons who are confined in Federal, State, and local correctional and mental health institutions and who are employed while so confined shall be paid for their employment at wages not less than the highest minimum wage rate in effect under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6746. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for civil service retirement annuity increases for retired former employees based on increases in pay rates of employees in active service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6747. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program (through State agreements) of certain services performed by inmates of State and local penal and mental institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOUP (for himself, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. STUCKEY, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 6748. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to lower certain age limits from 21 to 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 6749. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 6750. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Defense to utilize the Department of Defense resources for the purpose of providing helicopter medical emergency transportation services to civilians; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 6751. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to modify the provisions relating to emergency loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. POBELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 6752. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to establish a program to assist municipalities and businesses in urban industrial development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 6753. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the heads of the respective executive agencies to provide the Congress with advance notice of certain planned organizational and other changes or actions which would affect Federal civilian employment, and other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOWELL of Nevada:

H.R. 6754. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 6755. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require monitoring of emissions of certain air pollutants emitted by fossil fuel steam generators operated by public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6756. A bill to deal with the current energy crisis and the serious shortages of petroleum products facing the Nation and to authorize construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 6757. A bill to provide equity in the feed grain set-aside program by allowing participants in plan B to switch to plan A; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. REES, Mr. KOCH, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. STOKES):

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.J. Res. 493. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.J. Res. 494. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 495. Joint resolution to amend title 5, United States Code, in order to designate November 11 of each year as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PEPPER, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. THOMPSON of Wisconsin, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr.

HANNA, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. MARAZITI, and Mr. HINSHAW):

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution authorizing and directing the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control to report legislation to the Congress no later than June 1, 1973, providing procedures for improving congressional control of budgetary outlay and receipt totals, the operation of a limitation on expenditures and net lending commencing with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, and for limiting the authority of the President to impound or otherwise withhold funds authorized and appropriated by the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. REES, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. QUITE, Ms. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. O'BRIEN):

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution authorizing and directing the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control to report legislation to the Congress no later than June 1, 1973, providing procedures for improving congressional control of budgetary outlay and receipt totals, the operation of a limitation on expenditures and net lending commencing with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, and for limiting the authority of the President to impound or otherwise withhold funds authorized and appropriated by the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim June 21 through 24, 1973, as "National Jeep Search and Rescue Days"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUCKEY, and Mr. WON PAT):

H. Res. 345. Resolution to establish a congressional internship program for secondary school teachers of government or social studies in honor of President Lyndon Baines Johnson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REID:

H. Res. 346. Resolution requiring certain information on social service regulations from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 347. Resolution providing pay comparability adjustments for certain House employees whose pay rates are specifically fixed by House resolutions; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

130. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the

Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the transfer of lands not necessary to the national defense to the Government of Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

131. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the meat boycott; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

132. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to assistance to North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

133. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to no-fault insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

134. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of voluntary prayer in the public school system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the assignment of students to public schools on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to assistance to North Vietnam and to veterans of the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

137. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to East-West trade relations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

138. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Federal grants to Hawaii for public assistance payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

139. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to inadequacies in grants of social security and supplemental benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 6758. A bill to permit the Capital Yacht Club of the District of Columbia to borrow money without regard to the usury laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 6759. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Korhonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

129. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Suffolk County Legislature, Riverhead, N.Y., relative to the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District; to the Committee on Agriculture.

130. Also, petition of the city council, Seward, Alaska, relative to leasing offshore tracts in the Gulf of Alaska for oil and gas exploration;

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

131. Also, petition of the legislature of Erie County, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to continuing the community mental health centers program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

132. Also, petition of Clarence Johnson, Coolidge, Ariz., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

133. Also, petition of John D. Baggett, and others, Tucson, Ariz., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

134. Also, petition of Louis Mira, San Luis Obispo, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. Also, petition of Clarence Morton, Washington, D.C., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. Also, petition of Robert Reichs, and others, Alpena, Mich., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

137. Also, petition of George W. Andrews, Harvey Cedars, N.J., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. Also, petition of Harry H. Michalis, Trenton, N.J., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

139. Also, petition of Alfred M. Martens, Baldwin, N.Y., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

140. Also, petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., relative to direct petitioning of Federal grand juries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

141. Also, petition of Herman Stiles, Jackson, Ohio, and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

142. Also, petition of Ronald R. Soto, and others, Lorain, Ohio, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. Also, petition of Barbara Schmitter, and others, Carnegie, Pa., relative to protection for the law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. Also, petition of William L. Eckart, Aspinwall, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. Also, petition of Gerald M. Reardon, Coatesville, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

146. Also, petition of Ralph J. Rizzo, North Hills, Pa., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

147. Also, petition of Samuel L. Kulp, Northampton, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. Also, petition of Nelda D. Boetcher, Rhinelander, Wis., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.