# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, January 24, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer.*—Psalms 19: 14.

Almighty God, out of the fullness of Thy grace grant unto us who need so much, who want so much, and who lack so much, strength, wisdom, and courage for the facing of these hours and the living of these days.

Thou hast given us bodies; help us to keep them as strong and as healthy to keep them as strong and as healthy as we can that we may render better

Thou hast given us minds; help us to keep them clean, our thoughts clear, and our mental processes creative that our thinking may be wholesome and our decision wise.

Thou hast given us wills; help us to use this gift of free choice that we may will to do Thy will and will that Thy will be done in us and through us for the good of our country.

As we serve our Nation in these hallowed Halls of Congress may we grow in wisdom and stature and in favor with Thee and man.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1961. An act to amend the Flood Control Act of 1938.

S. 2754. An act to prohibit all military assistance to Greece until it is determined that Greece is fulfilling its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty.

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

H.R. 10203. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10203) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. STAFFORD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

## THE D.C. BICENTENNIAL BUILDING IS AN INSULT TO AMERICA

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the D.C. Bicentennial Building is disgusting and an affront to this Nation and its people.

While we were in recess, the building was opened with a great deal of hoopla. The Mayor of Washington dedicated the office. A representative of the White House was there.

Apparently the officials didn't see, or ignored, one of the principal features of the room: a mural painted around its ceiling. This disgusting piece of trash glorifies Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Joseph Stalin, and Mao Tse-tung.

For good measure, the President of the United States is depicted wearing a mustache and clad in the costume of a movie gangster. His daughter has an Afro hairdo, and a portrait of avowed Communist Angela Davis is thrown in for no understandable reason.

It is my understanding that nothing is being done to paint over this obscene affront to the dignity and traditions of our Nation and the spirit of the Bicentennial.

The Bicentennial is to celebrate 200 years of a nation that was built by men and women who longed to be free. Down through the ages there have been men like Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Truman who built on that dream. Women like Betsy Ross, Florence Nightingale, and Clara Barton dreamed of a land where every person could live good and productive lives.

Certainly our country and its people have made mistakes. The War Between the States was one of the worst. The thing that sets us aside is that our mistakes are made known in our current journals and in the history books. We tell it like it is.

Under Communist domination, history is constantly being rewritten. Joe Stalin was idolized as a god during his lifetime, a period in history when he murdered tens of thousands of innocent Russians. History was rewritten when it was decided he should be revealed as a tyrant by another regime. His portrait is one of those looking down on the Bicentennial headquarters here, cleverly disguised with mutton chops.

Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., is not just another city. It is the Capital City of the greatest nation on the face of the Earth.

The spirit of the Bicentennial is disgraced by a hideous mural from the brush of a man who apparently feels that it is clever to insult the flag that allows him to be free. His mural defames the names of the tens of thousands of men who have given their lives in the service of this Nation for the cause of freedom.

America allows this man freedom from fear and freedom to work. His distorted sense of right and wrong is an insult to the traditions, hopes, and beliefs of every right-thinking citizen.

What is worse is that nothing is being done about removing this bathroom graffiti from the walls of an office that should serve as a model as America prepares to celebrate its Bicentennial.

I wonder at the thinking, the sensibilities, of those responsible for the building.

Mr. Speaker, action should be taken to remove this offensive garbage from the D.C. Bicentennial Building, along with any official who is responsible for its presence.

The subject has been well described in the Washington Star-News of January 15, 1974, and in an editorial in the U.S. News & World Report of January 28, 1974. I submit both for reprinting at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star-News, Jan. 15, 1974]

STRANGE SPIRIT OF '76

(By Betty James)

The D.C. Bicentennial Building opened yesterday under the gaze of Mao Tse-tung in a business suit, Joseph Stalin in muttonchop whiskers, Richard Nixon in gangster garb and Tricia Nixon Cox in a bush hairdo, all the work of a pixieish artist.

Officials at yesterday's dedication, including a White House representative and Mayor Walter E. Washington, were blissfully unaware of the joke the artist, H. H. Booker II, admitted he had played on them and on leaders of the 200th anniversary observance of the American Revolution in the Nation's Capital.

True, the black and white murals at ceiling height in the red, white and blue walk-in office at 13th and G Streets NW take a little interpretation by the artist. But only a little.

Booker, who runs the Graffiti Sign Co., Ltd., said the contractor handling redecoration of the old Jordan Building, Herbert Banham of the Fountown Sign Shop, subcontracted some of the work to him at the rate of $2.75 an hour. He said he worked 19 hours and is owed $52.25.

"It was a whole lot of fun," he recalled exuberantly as he gazed at his creations through the plate glass window yesterday.

Nobody told Booker what to draw, however. "They just said make faces," he reported.

So, in the tradition of cathedral carvers expressing themselves in gargoyles, Booker followed his whim and sketched the people who interested him.

As his work progressed some one noticed that one of the faces looked like "old Papa Joe," Booker said, so he disguised his sketch of Stalin with mutton chop whiskers.

President Nixon also is more or less disguised behind a moustache, although there's a suggestion of the famous 5 o'clock shadow. Booker expressed his opinion of the President by dressing him "like a gangster" in a dark shirt and light tie.

Although the representation of Tricia Nixon Cox in an Afro hairdo does not leap to the eye, Booker points to the Nixon nose as identification. The sketch of Mrs. Cox shares wall space with one of Angela Davis.

Booker included Frederick Douglass, the black leader, who is depicted wearing a button that says "University of Hard Knocks." He also said it reflected Karl Marx and included Friedrich Engels, the closest associate of Marx, the father of communism.

And just to show that he's not hung up on politics, Booker said, he threw in sketches of show business greats like Laurel and Hardy, Greta Garbo and Gracie Allen.

Is he a Marxist? "I guess so," Booker replied after giving the question a little thought.

Although he is being paid, Booker said he feels "the people" could and should have done the redecorating themselves.

Bicentennial workers handed out flyers on the sidewalk announcing the opening and inviting the public in for coffee, doughnuts and entertainment. But Booker said the noon hour dedication was a farce as far as working people were concerned.

"Who can come at noon?" he asked. "They don't represent the people," he said, surveying officials milling inside. "It's just like the crowd they had under George III."

---

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 28, 1974]

WORST JOKE IN 200 YEARS

(By Howard Flieger)

With varying degrees of originality, communities all across the nation are getting ready to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the United States in 1976.

In 1776, when the country was born, the population was 2.5 million.

Now it exceeds 210 million.

If you are one of those millions of American citizens, you have just been insulted.

The Bicentennial Center for the District of Columbia, the nation's capital, was dedicated on January 14 by the Mayor of Washington. A representative of the White House was there. So were other dignitaries.

Looking down on the occasion was a new mural, done for the Bicentennial office by an artist named H. H. Booker II.

Among the personages depicted—

Karl Marx, the father of Communism.

Friedrich Engels, Marx's associate.

Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union.

Mao Tse-tung of the Chinese Communists.

For extra measure, the muralist included a caricature of President Nixon wearing a mustache and clad in the costume of a movie gangster. He sketched the President's daughter, Tricia Nixon Cox, with an Afro hairdo. He included a portrait of Angela Davis.

This is Americana?

Where are Washington, Jefferson, Tom Paine, Ben Franklin and the Adams family?

Where are such symbols of American culture and uniqueness as Washington Irving, Mark Twain and Carl Sandburg? Winslow Homer, Frederic Remington and Thomas Hart Benton? Francis Scott Key and George M. Cohan? John Philip Sousa and Louis Armstrong? Samuel Gompers and Andrew Carnegie? Thomas A. Edison and Mary Bethune? Where are the pathfinders—Lewis and Clark, Charles Lindbergh and Neil Armstrong, to name a few?

The list is endless. If portraits are needed to dramatize two centuries, you can take your pick from within our own borders, including many immigrants from other lands.

Granted, the planning for the Bicentennial observance has been uneven, often halting and short of real achievement on a national scale. But hundreds of communities, many States and regions have pitched in with their own projects and are moving ahead to the anniversary with enthusiasm and pride.

Granted, too, there has been honest disagreement. One group, for example, feels that the basic aims of the American Revolution are being overlooked. But such things are legitimate dissent—which is the American way.

The mural in Washington is something else.

A member of the staff of this magazine asked an official of the District of Columbia Bicentennial Commission about the inclusion of the Communist figures. The explanation was that those people are a valid part of the American scene because "all were involved in some way with the United States over the past 200 years."

When asked what Marx, Engels, Stalin and Mao had to do with the U.S., the official, irritated, broke off the conversation.

The muralist explained to a reporter for "The Washington Star-News" that his employer told him to "make faces" on the walls, so he sketched those he considers interesting. He called it a "lot of fun" and seemed to regard the whole affair as a very clever joke.

Marx, Stalin and Mao as characters in an American panorama—this is a joke?

It is a coarse insult to the very word, a desecration of everything truly American from 1776 to today. It is high jinks of the lowest order, done in the poorest taste.

Those who had anything to do with it—whether through deliberate participation, irresponsibility, arrogance or plain ignorance—should hang their heads in shame.

---

## NO TIME FOR LOANS TO THE SOVIETS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has asked the Export-Import Bank for a $49 million loan for exploratory work in eastern Siberia for natural gas. The Export-Import Bank is not controlled by the Congress. It is an independent, federally supported institution. Nevertheless, it depends upon Congress for its existence and I consider that it would be totally irresponsible for the Bank to make such a commitment until the Congress has had an opportunity to debate and act on the question of credit to the Soviet Union.

Credit or guaranties by the Federal Government or any agency of the Federal Government to the Soviet Union for exploration or development of their oil and gas fields raises questions vital to our national security. We have problems of our own—very real problems—on energy. Our efforts and our money should be directed to development of American energy resources to the point where we will not ever again be caught dependent upon other nations for energy. Russia has consistently been a troublemaker in the family of nations, and even today in the Middle East there is no Russian participation in the work to bring a permanent peace to that troubled area. The development of Russia's resources cannot be considered a step toward world peace and understanding and should not be done at American expense.

---

## THE "UPSTART" WHO ANNOYS THE PENTAGON

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague LES ASPIN has gained much attention during his relatively short service in Congress. Not all of it has been favorable—and this could be expected for one who regularly exposes waste in the Defense Department.

This week, however, Mr. ASPIN received friendly attention from a possibly unexpected source—the staunchly promilitary Copley Press. John Pinkerman, editor of the Copley News Service, wrote a comprehensive report on the young Congressman appearing in the San Diego Evening Tribune Monday, January 21.

Mr. Pinkerman's column, entitled "A Changing World," carried a headline describing Mr. ASPIN as "The 'Upstart' Who Annoys the Pentagon." The column follows:

A new congressional voice has risen to haunt those in the Pentagon who are generous in spending taxpayer funds and the situation is a reminder of earlier times before Congress was so derelict in fulfilling its responsibilities.

This new voice belongs to sophomore Democratic Congressman Les Aspin of Wisconsin. Aspin has been particularly noisy in the last few weeks, charging up to $21 billion in defense spending excesses, but some of his critics call him self-serving and one who goes on reckless "fishing expeditions" or "fires a shotgun" in quest of publicity.

Whatever his motives, he has an impressive background in the task he has set for himself as a member of the Armed Services Committee and a look at his biography might persuade an impartial observer that he might know "where the bodies are buried" in the Pentagon, at least so far as spending money is concerned. But, is he anti-military and are his charges of military procurement and operational waste mostly in the interest of getting himself national publicity?

"Not at all," he told me in response to questioning. "I think our over-all defense budget could be reduced by billions of dollars without adversely affecting the national security. The chief responsibility of any member of the Armed Services Committee is to assure an adequate and sufficient defense at the lowest reasonable cost. It is particularly important that the Congress exercise its oversight function to insure that every taxpayer's dollar spent on national defense is used in the most cost effective and efficient manner possible."

Although only in his second term, Aspin is particularly critical of what he calls Congress' failure to fulfill the "oversight" function it was given in a 1946 act and which presumably requires it to monitor carefully all agency expenditures. A few days ago he was quoted in a news story as denouncing his own committee with these words: "The committee is not interested in anything;

it's in the pocket of the Pentagon." The committee's performance, he said, "is awful miserable."

To overcome his frustration inside the committee Aspin has issued statement after statement on his own findings. He charges a $4 billion overrun on the F–111 plane, $2.5 billion on the B–1 bomber, $2 billion on the Safeguard antimissile system, $1 billion on the Navy's A–7E jet fighter—and lots of other cost excesses.

He chastised the Navy for buying $16 million in buoys that were no good, but the Navy replied that he was wrong.

He has demanded an end to free worldwide rides on military planes by high ranking officers and retirees. He even has denounced the Air Force for not permitting one-star (brigadier) generals to eat in its "generals" dining room. And, he has gone beyond strictly military affairs in hitting at oil leaders' donations to President Nixon's political campaign and at the much criticized cheap trade loans to Russia. In the last named attack he was joined by a group of conservative congressmen, perhaps strange company for him in his generally liberal approach to government affairs.

Aspin, although only 35, has impressive credentials. He is a 1960 Yale graduate, won his master's at Oxford and his Ph.D. at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has worked on the staff of Sen. William Proxmire (and perhaps learned the tricks of being a bureaucratic critic there) and was a staff assistant on President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

He served in the Army from 1966 to 1968 and learned firsthand of Pentagon spending experiences as an economic adviser in the office of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. Next, before going to Congress in 1970, he was professor of economics at Marquette University.

He is relatively "clean" as a congressman critic, not having joined his spendthrift colleagues in trips abroad at taxpayers' expense.

It is early to assess his full impact, even his true motives, or whether he will attain the stature of other spending critics like Sen. John Williams of Delaware, Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. of Virginia, Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington, Rep. John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania and Rep. John Moss of California.

Whatever the future holds for Aspin, he will be an interesting congressman to watch. He isn't popular in the Pentagon and many in the House call him an "upstart." Those are pretty fair credentials, from a taxpayer's standpoint.

## A BIG PLUS FOR THE OIL INDUSTRY

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the President's oil tax recommendations attack oil projects with a feather duster where a big stick is needed.

The elimination of the foreign depletion allowance will produce no new tax revenue. The foreign production and refining of oil has more credits than it can use under the foreign tax credit—which should be the real target.

Recent price escalations of imported oil result substantially from taxes paid to producing countries, which multiplies the value of the foreign tax credit. For example, the Venezuelan tax of $8.17 per barrel for 100 million barrels of oil destined to the United States will provide American companies with a total tax credit of $817 million annually.

We are shocked today to learn of the tremendous profits of the oil companies which are now coming to light. The real shocker will come later this year when the American taxpayer discovers that these swollen profits of 1973 will pay Federal taxes at a lower effective rate than they did in 1972. In the oil business, there is very little relationship between high profits and taxes paid.

## TO EXEMPT TEXAS FROM EMERGENCY DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to exempt the State of Texas from provisions of the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973.

Having spent most of the last month in my district, the 15th Congressional District of Texas, I can report that the people in that south Texas area want no part of the year-round daylight saving time.

Their complaints are varied and specific.

Children are forced to leave home for school not by dawn's early light but in the black of night. This is both inconvenient and unsafe.

Working mothers are forced to drop off their children at school long before they are due there or to leave them alone at home until the schoolbus arrives.

Farmers must start their morning chores in Stygian darkness, for dairy cows and other farm animals continue to operate on their own time schedule no matter what the clock says.

In homes everywhere lights must be turned on in every room so that family members can meet the stepped-up schedule enforced by artificial time.

Daylight saving time in winter is disrupting family life, threatening the safety of our children, and inconveniencing nearly everybody, and it is the same in the summer—there is too long a period of daylight in the evening and it disrupts the whole economy.

No proof has been brought forward that daylight saving time results in any worthwhile conservation of energy. Even some officials of the Federal Energy Office concede that DST is not much more than a symbol. It is a public relations gimmick.

Bills have been introduced for outright repeal of the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act, and I will gladly support them. Meanwhile, as I have said, I have introduced my own bill, one simply exempting Texas from provisions of this law.

If other States of the Nation wish to cling to year-round daylight saving time—which I doubt—that is their right. But Texas wants out of this futile, at best, and harmful, at worst, undertaking. I hope my colleagues will support our wish in this connection.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8, on passage of H.R. 11354 providing for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, I voted "yea" under the mistaken impression that I was voting to recommit. I was in favor of recommitting the bill and meant to vote against its passage. I ask unanimous consent that this statement appear in the RECORD following the rollcall in question.

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

There was no objection.

## BUSING A MOOT ISSUE? OIL CRISIS VOIDS IT

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

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, as will be recalled, this House voted for an amendment to prohibit the use of gasoline for forced busing in order to save the millions of gasoline gallons that are daily used so wastefully. The Detroit News on January 7, 1974, ran an editorial in general support of this position. It went even a little further, however, and pointed out the probable difficulty of securing the requisite number of school buses if cross-district busing is ever put into effect in the Detroit area. The editorial follows:

BUSING A MOOT ISSUE? OIL CRISIS VOIDS IT

As the state of Michigan and numerous Detroit-area suburban school districts argue in the U.S. Supreme Court against cross-district school bussing, the energy crisis seems to be turning the question of bussing into a moot issue.

Assume that the court approved the concept of massive bussing in the tri-county metropolitan area of Detroit. Assume that the necessary buses were available. How could the courts or any public official possibly justify the use of precarious fuel to carry students away from their neighborhood schools to schools in distant places?

Unless we're living at last in Wonderland, it just won't happen.

The first assumption, that the court would approve, is by no means a strong one. In view of the trend of moderation in the Supreme Court in recent years, the foes of cross-district bussing have an excellent chance of winning this case.

The second assumption, that the buses would be available, is also very much in doubt. According to rough estimates, the tri-county area affected by U.S. District Judge Stephen Roth's sweeping integration order would need 3,000 buses to transport an estimated 300,000 students away from their local schools.

Because of the backlog of orders at the few existing assembly lines, delivery of a bus to the purchaser takes from 10 to 18 months. Competition for buses is obviously keen. When this problem was mentioned in the first throes of the busing madness, someone made the airy suggestion that the schools could always charter some of those unused DSR buses. It seems, however, that there aren't going to be any extra DSR buses lying around.

But let's suppose the schools managed by some stroke of magic to obtain the necessary buses for the cross-district bussing madness. Getting the gasoline would be quite another matter.

Amid talk of curtailing school programs because of the fuel shortage, how could schools obtain fuel for unnecessary bus trips? If such an incredible allocation were made,

there would still be the obstacle of public opinion. Any effort to pour gasoline into school buses for racial integration, while ordinary citizens scratched for a tank of gasoline or a seat on the DSR, would produce a deafening public uproar.

Massive cross-district bussing was an impractical suggestion at conception. The energy crisis underscores the impossibility of this costly and disruptive approach to the problem of school segregation.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), if he will kindly advise the Members of the House as to the program for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished acting minority leader will yield, I will be happy to reply to the request of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of January 28, 1974, is as follows:

On Monday there will be District Day, but there are no bills.

On Tuesday we may have S. 2589, the National Energy Emergency Act conference report, subject to its passage in the Senate.

Then also on Tuesday there will be H.R. 11793, the Federal Energy Administration, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week we will have H.R. 2, the Pension Reform Act, subject to a rule being granted, and H.R. 5463, Federal rules of evidence, under a modified closed rule, with 4 hours of debate. We are hopeful that the 4 hours of debate can be concluded on Thursday so that the Members may have over that weekend to submit amendments so that the amendments can be printed, and that then we may consider amendments the following week.

The state of the Union address will take place on Wednesday evening at 9 o'clock, when the President will be here in a joint session.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the Members that the leadership from both sides of the aisle met and after extensive consultation agreed that during February we will adjourn at the close of business on Thursday, February 7 until noon Wednesday, February 13 in honor of Lincoln's Birthday, which falls on Tuesday, February 12.

We agreed that on Washington's Birthday, Monday, February 18, the only business of the House will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

As all the Members know, this is an election year and all Members should be on notice that we will conduct business as usual on the 16 primary days during the year. There will be no attempts to postpone votes on those days.

We also agreed that the House will work 5-day weeks if legislation is available to be scheduled. We are into the second session and we feel that we should schedule bills for Fridays when bills are ready.

If there are any other recesses we will announce them at a later time.

Concerning the Easter recess, no decision has yet been made due to the matter now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 10203 AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10203) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROBERTS, JOHNSON of California, ANDERSON of California, ROE, HARSHA, SNYDER, and DON H. CLAUSEN.

## WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 921) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, S. 921 made some needed amendments to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This bill passed the House without opposition on December 2, 1973.

The other body chose this bill as a vehicle to attach the so-called Energy Emergency Act, which the House rejected during the waning hours of the last session.

By disagreeing to the Senate amendment, we will in effect approve the text of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act amendment as it originally passed the House and send it back to the Senate for final disposition.

My purpose is to preserve the wild and scenic rivers bill which became an innocent victim of the energy legislation controversy.

## IMPORTANCE OF FARM EXPORTS

(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 December 11 the House very wisely passed the Trade Reform Act of 1973. This bill is vital if our Nation is to have any chance of maintaining the favorable balance of international trade which has been achieved for the first time since 1970. If passed by the Senate and signed by the President, the Trade Reform Act will give our representatives in the GATT negotiations, currently underway in Geneva, valuable tools to achieve a more open trading world. It will give them a much better chance to correct the unfair discriminations against American agricultural exports which unfortunately came out of the Kennedy round. I therefore urge our colleagues in the Senate to complete favorable action on this bill as expeditiously as possible.

Our country's balance of payments would be very bleak indeed were it not for the amazing productivity of American farmers resulting in a dramatic increase in American agricultural exports in recent years. For the 11 months January through November, U.S. agricultural trade resulted in a positive balance of $8.1 billion. This more than offset the $7.5 billion deficit incurred by trade in nonagricultural products, so that the total U.S. international trade account for 11 months stood at over a half billion dollars on the positive side.

If we are to remain in the black, we must be on guard against all attempts to embargo or limit farm exports. I refer to the recent $1 a loaf bread rhetoric bouncing through our air waves and appearing in various trade publications. The Nation's housewives must not be misled by propaganda that, if export embargos are not implemented on wheat, then they will be faced with $1 a loaf bread.

Secretary Butz has effectively answered this canard by pointing out that the price of wheat would have to rise from the present $5.70 to $33 per bushel before increased wheat costs would justify a dollar a loaf for bread. Wheat used for food in the United States is a little over 500 million bushels a year. Consider also that our 1974 production of wheat is expected to top 2 billion bushels, only a little over 500 million bushels of which will be used for U.S. food consumption. And wheat supplies will be strengthened by the Soviet Union's recently announced agreement to defer taking delivery of 18.4 million bushels already contracted for until after next summer's harvest.

There is no need or justification for curbing our exports of wheat or any other agricultural product. Certainly ill-advised and short-lived, the soybean embargo of last summer serves as a vivid reminder that any such export controls will seriously damage our hard-won reputation as a reliable world supplier. The Senate can help our farmers enhance that reputation by promptly passing the Trade Reform Act of 1973. This will encourage even greater agricultural exports, improve our balance of payments, strengthen our dollar and go a long way toward meeting even the escalating cost of our foreign fuel requirements and other necessary imports.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 1974

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

adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule be dispensed with on Wednesday of next week.

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

There was no objection.

## A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE DR. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Resident Commissioner, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. BENITEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Speaker, many friends in this illustrious body have expressed already their sadness for the death of their well-remembered colleague of years passed, our former Resident Commissioner, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern. He died on the evening of Saturday, January 19, at the age of 79, in San Juan. I can well appreciate their affectionate remembrances. Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern was an exceptional man.

He came to the House of Representatives in 1946 to fill the unexpired term of Jesús T. Piñero, who was designated by President Truman to substitute the last and the best continental chief executive, Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell. Jesús T. Piñero in turn was to be Puerto Rico's first and last appointed Governor. For 1 year later, in 1947, in part due to the efforts of Resident Commissioner Fernós, the Organic Act of Puerto Rico was amended to provide for an elective governor. Luis Muñoz Mariń, the great Puerto Rican leader, was chosen to that post on November 1948. In the same general election Fernós was elected Resident Commissioner and continued as Puerto Rico's elected representative in the United States successively until 1964 when he decided not to seek reelection, after serving in nine consecutive Congresses.

Our former Resident Commissioner was a scholar, a politician, a man of letters, a public servant with over half a century of unflinching dedication to principles of government and of mankind which today, everywhere are very much in need of defense and of exemplification.

Born on May 10, 1895, in San Lorenzo, P.R., Antonio Fernós-Isern went through elementary school in the city of Caguas and then came to the mainland to finish high school in Bloomsburg, Pa.; normal school, medical preparatory course; and finally graduated as a physician from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, University of Maryland. Fernós later attended public health postgraduate courses at the School of Public Health, Columbia University, in New York.

As a physician, he had a distinguished career, not only in the private practice of his profession, but also in public office, having been appointed twice a member of the Governor's cabinet as the head of the health department. Also as a physician, he devoted part of his effort to teaching, becoming a professor at the school of tropical medicine, a joint project sponsored by the University of Puerto Rico and Columbia University.

Already by 1920, Dr. Fernós held the post of under secretary of health in Puerto Rico. I remember seeing him almost daily as he would walk to his office in Santurce and I to my grammar school, nearby. A tall, lanky, freckled-face, blond and distinguished young physician in white linens directing Puerto Rico's public struggle against tropical diseases, undernourishment and insufficient medical attention, at the age of 25. At the time, over 50 years ago, he proposed a program for universal compulsory medical attention. He was committed also to other social services programs regarded even today as too daring by the medical profession.

Later in the twenties while I was a student at Georgetown, I had occasion to see Dr. Fernós once more coming to Washington in diverse commissions to plead the cause of the ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed. With his record of service and his deep insatisfaction with immediate reality it was only natural that Fernós would become most active in the denunciation of and the struggle against social, economic, political injustices prevalent in Puerto Rico.

In the thirties he joined forces with Luis Muñoz Marín and other men of goodwill who despite multiple adversities retained their faith in the democratic process and their determination to use it as the basic instrument of social justice in Puerto Rico. The general elections of 1940 provided the takeoff stage for our collective movement of reconstruction. Luis Muñzo Marín and his recently created Popular Democratic Party achieved a one-vote majority in the legislature.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt at long last made a good apopintment to the governorship, the brilliant economist and administrator Rexford G. Tugwell. Under the joint and felicitous leadership of these two outstanding men Luis Muñoz Marín and Rexford G. Tugwell, supported in their common goals by men and women well trained and deeply motivated, the creative years in Puerto Rico's social transformation were initiated. A social revolution as yet incomplete with ups and downs, in many ways imperfect but nonetheless courageous, farsighted, pragmatic and idealistic at the same time was launched. As one of its leaders, Dr. Fernós was appointed secretary of health and was responsible for a wide expansion of our health services. It was, however, in the House of Representatives of the United States where he performed his most significant services for Puerto Rico and for the United States.

As Resident Commissioner, Dr. Fernós was very active in supporting the extension of beneficial social legislation. At the same time, with the support of his friend Wayne Aspinall and others in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, Dr. Fernós was effective in the modification of the Organic Act of 1917. Later, throughout the period 1950 to 1952, Fernós was a leading figure in the drafting,supporting, and final approval of Public Law 81–600 and other pertinent legislation I am referring to the laws which authorized the creation of the Commonwealth status in the nature of a compact between Puerto Rico and the United States. He presided, morover, at Puerto Rico's Constitutional Convention, where it was also my privilege—as well as that of the principal leaders of Puerto Rico, including former Governors Luis Muñoz Marín and Luis A. Ferre—to participate.

Commonwealth status is outstandingly a form of government which by its very nature reflects a process of permanent, voluntary continuously improving relationship of interdependence with the United States as well as of self government and autonomic relations of Puerto Rico.

The task of improving Commonwealth is still very much with us. The last significant piece of Federal legislation in which Commissioner Fernós participated was the law of 1964 creating the Joint United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. That Commission made voluminous studies and conducted extensive hearings over a period of 2 years and recommended as follows:

> The Commission's major conclusion is that all three forms of political status—The Commonwealth, Statehood, and Independence—are valid and confer upon the people of Puerto Rico equal dignity with equality of status and of national citizenship. Any choice among them is to be made by the people of Puerto Rico, and the economic, social, cultural, and security arrangements which would need to be made under each of the three status alternatives will require the mutual agreement and full cooperation of the Government of the United States. A first step toward any change in political status must be taken by the Puerto Rican people acting through constitutional processes.

The Commission further recommended a plebiscite which was held in July 1967 where the Puerto Rican electorate overwhelmingly supported the continuation of the improvement of Commonwealth status.

We are now in the midst of a renewed effort to implement and carry out those recommendaitons. Last September a Joint Advisory Group was appointed by President Nixon and by Governor Hernández-Colón charged to recommend how best to develop our present status in accordance with its fundamental principles to a maximum of self-government and self-determination within the framework of Commonwealth. This is our unfinished business and one which I trust it will be possible to achieve within the terms of my own electoral mandate.

Mr. Speaker, my tribute to Dr. Fernós has been presented in the perspective of our history which includes not only the immediate past and present but also the basic trend of events and of leadership signaling toward the future. In closing may I indicate the paradoxical nature of the office which I now occupy. Its title, Resident Commissioner, breaks with tradition and was used for the first time in 1900 to refer to the elected representative from Puerto Rico as well as from the Philippines and to distinguish both in title and implications from the designation accorded to the delegates from other territories.

It was not until this Congress that the Resident Commissioner was accorded full-fledged membership in the committee. He does not have now and probably would require a constitutional amendment to accord the right of vote on the floor. Yet in spite of this and other limitations the people of Puerto Rico have also attributed exceptional importance to the post and selected its representatives with the highest care. This is because even in our darkest moments we have believed profoundly in the value and effectiveness of moral authority holding steadfastly to the principle that given the right to speak and to do so outspokenly and fearlessly, strengthen, by right and by reason, the halls of the Congress of the United States will be responsive to the democratic aspirations and the spiritual commitments of their fellow-citizens from Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico's outstanding patriot of the 19th century Luis Muñoz Rivera, who himself was successful in achieving in the last days of the Spanish relationship our Charter of Autonomy in 1897, was elected also as Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in 1912 and the work he did in two successive Congresses was continued here by all his followers, outstandingly Dr. Fernós Isern.

No greater tribute could we pay to the memory of the past outstanding representatives of Puerto Rico in Congress than contributing to effect the free, voluntary permanent association of both Puerto Rico and the United States which they so signally helped to foster.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 19, 1974, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, one of the fathers of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth, passed away. I share the great feeling of loss at his passing.

Dr. Fernós was one of the giants of his time. A superb legislator and diplomat, he devoted the better part of his lifetime to serve the people of Puerto Rico. He, together with Munoz Marin, our colleague Jaime Benitez, and a dedicated group of patriots, worked ardently to shape the status of the commonwealth concept which evolved into the present day compact of free and permanent association with the United States.

I recall with clear sentiment his distinguished presence as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on which he and I served together for many years. Dr. Fernos was greatly admired by myself and all his colleagues for his statesmanship and political acumen which seemed to come naturally for him.

A man of great warmth and personality, he won the respect of his fellow legislators for his knowledge of, devotion to, and effectiveness in serving the needs of the people of Puerto Rico.

The aspirations of the people of Puerto Rico were Dr. Fernós' aspirations. He served them well and he will be sorely missed. I am pleased to place in the RECORD some of the thoughts of his friends in his native Puerto Rico which are succinetly expressed in the following editorials which appeared in El Mundo and the San Juan Star:

EDITORIAL IN EL MUNDO, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1974

With the death of Dr. Antonio Fernós Isern, occurred on Saturday, at the age of 78, decimation goes on of our mature civic leadership of today, that professional and political leadership which constituted, two generations back, an avant guard guiding group of our public undertakings then, and up to the present time.

Born in San Lorenzo, Fernós Isern was proud of being a true "jíbaro" (hillbilly) and knowing well the idiosyncrasy of the rural man, who was during Fernós' juvenile years more numerous and representative of our country than the vanishing peasant of today.

Like many of his contemporaries, Fernós excelled in many disciplines. He was a scientist, a physician by profession, but was irresistibly attracted by literature, the social sciences, the art of conversation and politics. He was outstanding in all those areas by the depth of his convictions, his natural ability to express himelf and his impeccable manners, not only with his friends, but with his political adversaries and dissenting professionals as well.

After leaving public service, during the decade of the thirties, Dr. Fernós was, together with Jesús Piñero, Elmer Ellsworth, Ramos Antonini, Andrés Grillasca, Father Rivera and others, one of the most ardent collaborators of Mr. Muñoz Marín in founding the Popular Democratic Party.

The position of Resident Commissioner was vacant in 1946, because the incumbent Mr. Jesús T. Piñero was appointed as the first Puerto Rican born governor of the island. He in turn made his first important designation by appointing Dr. Fernós to be his successor. Since that date—and by popular election until 1964—Dr. Frenós remained in Washington, fulfilling with great ability his duties for the political development of Puerto Rico.

During the incumbency of Dr. Fernós as Resident Commissioner, Puerto Rico attained the most notable political reforms ever achieved in the United States Congress. His great diplomatic ability was instrumental in passing in 1947 an amendment to the Jones Act, to authorize the Puerto Ricans to elect their own governor in the elections of 1948.

From then on, Dr. Fernós sought and obtained approval of Law 600, by which the Congress acknowledges the right of the Puerto Rican people to organize their government on the basis of their own constitution.

Dr. Fernós presided over the Constitutional Convention which deliberated during 50 days to draft and approve the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a political instrument which once ratified by popular vote was approved by the Congress on time to be proclaimed as the supreme law of the land on July 25, 1952. Dr. Fernós' participation was efficient, opportune, almost decisive, in all the related administrative and political proceedings.

After voluntarily stepping out as Resident Commissioner in 1964, Dr. Fernós was elected a Senator in the Puerto Rican Legislative Assembly; and when his term expired in 1968 he decided to retire from active politics.

Dr. Fernós was an aristocrat of both written and verbal expression, and the clarity of his reasoning ran parallel to the pulchritude of his personal manners. He was a gentleman and a diplomat in the true sense of these concepts. His achievements made him one of our authentic leaders during the last half century of our history. Puerto Rico is indebted to Antonio Fernós-Isern.

---

DR. FERNOS

Dr. Antonio Fernos Isern, who died late Saturday night at the age of 78, helped write the Puerto Rican history of the 1940s and 1950s that changed Puerto Rico from an agrarian society struggling for survival into one of the foremost developing societies in the world.

A physician who left his profession to labor within the ranks of the blooming Popular Democratic Party, he was for long years (1946–64) Puerto Rico's resident commissioner in Washington and, as such, Luis Munoz Marin's right arm in spreading understanding of commonwealth status in Washington and in securing federal aid programs.

His tenure in Washington was marked by many accomplishments and few failures. Among the latter was the so-called Fernos-Murray Bill, which died in Congress in 1960. This bill called for a series of changes in U.S.-Puerto Rican relations designed to give the island more autonomy.

Fernos left the post of resident commissioner in 1964 but that did not end his public service. He was elected to the Senate that same year and until 1968 he served outstandingly as an elder statesman in that branch of the Legislature.

Antonio Fernos Isern was a charming, knowledgeable man who put his wisdom and diplomacy at Puerto Rico's call for his adult life. All of Puerto Rico owes a debt of gratitude and an honored place in its memories to Dr. Fernos.

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

Mr. BENITEZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional adjournment, while on a brief visit to Puerto Rico, I had the sad duty of paying my last respects to one of the island's most distinguished leaders. Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern lived for 78 years, during which he distinguished himself in many different fields.

The title of "doctor," which is often used in Latin American countries to refer to an individual who has distinguished himself in one field or another through training and/or accomplishments, was more literally applied to Fernós-Isern, for he was a medical doctor. He graduated from the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Baltimore, Md., in 1915 and practiced medicine in Caguas, Puerto Rico, my own birthplace, for 2 years before entering the field of public health. He continued in that field for many years, although his service was interrupted once in 1933 when he went

back to private practice as a cardiologist for about 9 years. From 1942 to 1946 he was Commissioner of Health of Puerto Rico.

While it is obvious from these details that Dr. Fernós-Isern had a lengthy career and a great deal of devotion to the very important field of medicine, it was in the political realm that he will be most remembered. He was the author of Public Law 600, under which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was created and of Public Law 447, to ratify the constitution of the commonwealth. He was a true friend and close associate of the island's first popularly elected Governor, Luis Muñoz Marín, and collaborated with him in founding the popular democratic party in Puerto Rico.

In 1946 Dr. Fernós-Isern was appointed Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and served in that post until 1964, having been selected by popular vote to serve the terms which came subsequent to his initial appointment. He was a popular and competent person in Washington, working at all times for the political and social development of the island. In 1968 he finally retired from public life, having given long and devoted service to the people of Puerto Rico.

Like many great men, Antonio Fernós-Isern was skilled at many things—a scientist and physician, a student of literature and the social sciences, a politician, an eloquent speaker, as well as an individual of great depth and charm. Like the late Pablo Casals, he was noted for his impeccable manners and fine sense of humor. He was born in a rural area and took great pride in referring to himself as a "jibaro," one who was familiar with the rural ways of life and who was able to laugh at such humble beginnings as he rose to a position of prominence, loved and esteemed by all of his people.

We are deeply saddened at the loss of one of Puerto Rico's great patriots, but will remember with pride and gratitude his many years of service and his devotion to the cause of political and economic independence for Puerto Ricans.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENITEZ. I yield to the delegate from the Virgin Islands.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the death on Saturday of Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, the distinguished former Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. During his most remarkable career, Dr. Fernós was a physician author, professor, Resident Commissioner and always a statesman of uncommon abilities.

In 1946, after service in a variety of important public and private positions, Dr. Fernós was sent to Washington to fill the unexpired term of Resident Commissioner Jesus Pinero, whom President Harry S. Truman had appointed as Governor of the Commonwealth. Dr. Fernós served on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the entire 18 years he was in the Congress, and in that time was successful in securing the passage of more than 80 bills which serves the interests of his constituency.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was indeed fortunate to have the leadership of Dr. Fernós during the critical decades of 1940 and 1950 when it evolved from a largely agrarian society to one of the major developing areas in the world. He presided over the Constitutional Assembly that created Puerto Rico's Commonwealth status, and was the author of legislation in the Congress which ratified this change in the relationship with the United States.

I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Fernós when he was Resident Commissioner, and I was a member of the Virgin Islands Legislature, and will always recall his warm friendship and deep commitment to the needs of the people of the Virgin Islands. As we honor the memory of this truly great statesman, let us also draw inspiration from his humanitarian spirit and many accomplishments in the service of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENITEZ. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. It is certainly with great sadness that I learned of the passing of this distinguished statesman.

In his service in the House of Representatives representing the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico he always demonstrated a warm-hearted, considerate approach to even the most difficult of problems. His ability to discern the heart of the problem and come right to it and his fine personal attributes of friendship and understanding made it impossible to turn him down on the many things he did for America and Puerto Rico.

I came in close contact with this gentleman on many matters that came before the Congress during the years we served here together. I never found him to be other than a complete gentleman and an exponent of those things which were best for mankind and the people he represented.

It is indeed a great although a sorrowful honor to pay this tribute to this magnificent person.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENITEZ. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the contribution of Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, former Commissioner of Puerto Rico and creator of the Commonwealth government.

Dr. Fernós-Isern was one of the warmest, most compassionate, most socially involved men it has ever been my privilege to know. His service, his labor of love for the people of Puerto Rico was unending and unflagging. His long and rich life was a continual gift of love to the people of his island home, to all the peoples of the Caribbean, and to the United States.

As health commissioner, as chairman of the child welfare board, and Puerto Rican Red Cross, Acting Governor of Puerto Rico, president of the Puerto Rican Constitutional Convention, and Resident Commissioner for 8 years, Dr. Fernós-Isern has done more than any other single person to help improve the life of the people of Puerto Rico.

His life has set an example for all those in public service. He will long be remembered and loved by the people of his beautiful island. He was dedicated to the Commonwealth and its relationship to America.

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my gratitude to all the gentlemen who have been kind enough to take the occasion to remain on the floor and to express their sadness and their sorrow and their solidarity with all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I would likewise ask unanimous consent to include editorials from the Spanish paper El Mundo and from the English newspaper the San Juan Star which on the dates of January 21 and 22 expressed the sentiments of the community of Puerto Rico with regard to this great man.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EDITORIAL IN THE SPANISH NEWSPAPER EL MUNDO

With the death of Dr. Antonio Fernós Isern, occurred on Saturday, at the age of 78, decimation goes on of our mature civic leadership of today, that professional and political leadership which constituted, two generations back, an avant guard guiding group of our public undertakings then, and up to the present time.

Born in San Lorenzo, Fernós Isern was proud of being a true "jíbaro" (hillbilly) and knowing well the idiosyncrasy of the rural man, who was during Fernós' juvenile years more numerous and representative of our country than the vanishing peasant of today.

Like many of his contemporaries, Fernós excelled in many disciplines. He was a scientist, a physician by profession, but was irresistibly attracted by literature, the social sciences, the art of conversation and politics. He was outstanding in all those areas by the depth of his convictions, his natural ability to express himself and his impeccable manners, not only with his friends, but with his political adversaries and dissenting professionals as well.

After leaving public service, during the decade of the thirties, Dr. Fernós was, together with Jesús Piñero, Elmer Ellsworth, Ramos Antonini, Andrés Gillasca, Father Rivera and others, one of the most ardent collaborators of Mr. Muñoz Marín in founding the Popular Democratic Party.

The position of Resident Commissioner was vacant in 1946, because the incumbent Mr. Jesús T. Piñero was appointed as the first Puerto Rican born governor of the island. He in turn made his first important designation by appointing Dr. Fernós to be his successor. Since that date,—and by popular election until 1964—Dr. Fernós remained in Washington, fulfilling with great ability his duties for the political development of Puerto Rico.

During the incumbency of Dr. Fernós as Resident Commissioner, Puerto Rico attained the most notable political reforms ever achieved in the United States Congress. His great diplomatic ability was instrumental in passing in 1947 an amendment to the Jones Act, to authorize the Puerto Ricans to elect their own governor in the elections of 1948.

From then on, Dr. Fernós sought and obtained approval of law 600, by which the Congress acknowledges the right of the Puerto Rican people to organize their government on the basis of their own constitution.

Dr. Fernós presided the Constitutional Convention which deliberated during 50 days to draft and approve the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a political instrument which once ratified by popular vote was approved by the Congress on time to be proclaimed as the supreme law of the land on July 25, 1952. Dr. Fernós' participation was efficient, opportune, almost decisive, in all the related administrative and political proceedings.

After voluntarily stepping out as Resident Commissioner in 1964, Dr. Fernós was elected a Senator in the Puerto Rican Legislative Assembly; and when his term expired in 1968 he decided to retire from active politics.

Dr. Fernós was an aristocrat of both written and verbal expression, and the clarity of his reasoning ran parallel to the pulchritude of his personal manners. He was a gentleman and a diplomat in the true sense of these concepts. His achievements made him one of our authentic leaders during the last half century of our history. Puerto Rico is indebted to Antonio Fernós-Isern.

---

EDITORIAL IN THE ENGLISH NEWSPAPER THE SAN JUAN STAR

Dr. Antonio Fernós Isern, who died late Saturday night at the age of 78, helped write the Puerto Rican history of the 1940s and 1950s that changed Puerto Rico from an agrarian society struggling for survival into one of the foremost developing societies in the world.

A physician who left his profession to labor within the ranks of the blooming Popular Democratic Party he was for long years (1946–64) Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Washington and, as such, Luis Munoz Marin's right arms in spreading understanding of Commonwealth status in Washington and in securing federal aid programs.

His tenure in Washington was marked by many accomplishments and few failures. Among the latter was the so-called Fernós-Murray Bill, which died in Congress in 1960. This bill called for a series of changes in U.S.-Puerto Rican relations designed to give the island more autonomy.

Fernós left the post of Resident Commissioner in 1964 but that did not end his public service. He was elected to the Senate that same year and until 1968 he served outstandingly as an elder statesman in that branch of the Legislature.

Antonio Fernós Isern was a charming, knowledgeable man who put his wisdom and diplomacy at Puerto Rico's call for his adult life. All of Puerto Rico owes a debt of gratitude and an honored place in its memories to Dr. Fernós.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with much sadness that I learned of the recent passing of my friend and former colleague, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, a former Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

Together we served as members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the consideration of many significant bills in the early 1960's. I could always count on the counsel of Dr. Fernós to be valuable and informed. We have missed his presence in these halls, and are sorry to learn that he is no longer with us.

Dr. Fernós was a legend in his own time. It was he who tirelessly worked for the legislation which granted his homeland the status it enjoys today. With many hours of hard work and determined effort, Dr. Fernós gained the approval of his colleagues for the legislation creating the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

It was always a pleasure for me to work with him, for he was a man who enjoyed his work and shared this enthusiasm with others. He was always very much concerned with the legislation before the committee and contributed greatly to its consideration.

In nearly 20 years of service in the Congress, Dr. Fernós made many friends for his native land as well as for himself. We will miss his advice and counsel. Mrs. Johnson joins me in expressing our deep sympathy to his family and friends.

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I recently learned of the death of a former Member of this body and a personal friend, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, who passed away in Puerto Rico on Saturday, January 19.

Dr. Fernós left behind him a remarkable legacy of public service and compassion for his fellow Puerto Ricans. A physician who left his profession to work in politics, Dr. Fernós served as Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Washington from 1946 to 1964 with outstanding distinction.

As the San Juan Star noted in its editorial marking the passing of this great man:

His tenure in Washington was marked by many accomplishments and few failures.

Among his many accomplishments was, of course, the passage of Public Law 81–600, which authorized the creation of the Commonwealth status between Puerto Rico and the United States.

During those days, Guam, too, was working hard to improve its status within the American system. As a member of the team of Guam officials who came to Washington to work for the passage of an organic act establishing a civil government and granting U.S. citizenship to the people of Guam, I had the privilege of working closely with Dr. Fernós. His counsel and astute understanding of the congressional system and his sympathy for our cause contributed in no small way to our ultimate success.

Upon his completion of two terms as Resident Commissioner, Dr. Fernós returned to the island he so deeply loved and was elected to the Puerto Rico Senate in which he served until 1968.

All Americans, and especially those of us from the territories, owe a great deal to the efforts of Dr. Fernós to create a better understanding between his people and their fellow citizens in the States. Understanding mutual problems is the key to successful relations between all peoples, and Dr. Fernós' significant contribution to this end paved the way for increased involvement in the American way of life for all territorial Americans.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep personal regret that I received the news of the death of our former colleague and friend, the delegate from Puerto Rico, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern.

Through the years that we were colleagues in the House, I came to know and respect this very "gentle" man who, though a physician by profession, excelled in many other areas as well. All of us who worked with him were impressed with his efforts on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico, whom he served for over 50 years. It was he who authored the law creating the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the law ratifying the constitution of that Commonwealth after presiding over the Puerto Rican Constitutional Convention. All of the important legislation affecting Puerto Rico bore his handprint.

I share the sadness the people of Puerto Rico must feel and extend my sympathy to the members of his family.

---

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life of our late colleague, the Honorable Antonio Fernós-Isern.

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

There was no objection.

---

## OWNER-OPERATOR TRUCKERS' PROBLEMS

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

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, during our yearend break I had meetings with several owner-operator truckers in my district.

These people have some very serious problems that deserve the immediate attention of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Very typical of the problems of our owner-operator truckers are outlined by this letter from Mrs. Margaret Brown of Fort Worth, Tex. I would like to include her letter in the RECORD:

FORT WORTH, TEX., *January 5, 1974.*

DEAR MR. MILFORD: Would you please let me know if it is possible for me to speak before the Congress of the U.S. on the plight of the Independent Truckers situation.

Six months ago my husband was paying from 21¢ to 32¢ per gallon. The freight rates have not increased at this time. We are slowly going broke simply because we cannot continue to drive our truck.

I would like to go to Washington and present the facts to the whole senate in person.

The Independent Truckers are going to be in Washington on the 21st of January and we are going to be heard.

One man with one truck cannot make a living any more.

Hoping to hear from you.

MARGARET BROWN.

---

## ALLIED SERVICES ACT OF 1974

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Allied Services Act of 1974 with the cosponsorship of Repre-

sentatives PERKINS, ESHLEMAN, and BRADEMAS.

I believe the concept of the bill is laudable and deserves the full support of all Members. Quite simply put, the act seeks to find better ways to deliver human service programs to the people who need them most. Although I fully expect the bill to be modified by the Congress, I feel that the basic concepts are excellent. My only significant reservation is with that section which permits the transfer of up to 30 percent of funds between programs.

Generally speaking, sections of bills which state findings and a declaration of purpose are usually dry and not very descriptive. As drafted by HEW, the opening section of this bill is quite unique in telling the story of why Allied Services is important. I should like to quote from section 2 of the bill:

The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) there is a great and a growing need in the Nation today to better relate our human services programs in order to improve their effectiveness in restoring dependent individuals to a status of personal independence, dignity, and economic self-sufficiency;

(2) while much progress has been made in developing categorical service programs which can assist in achieving these goals, there are inherent, and increasingly irreconcilable, obstacles in our present approach to the effective management and provision of these services on a coordinated basis;

(3) these obstacles typically take the form of: (i) fragmentation among many service agencies and units of government of the responsibility for serving dependent individuals and families, (ii) the lack, at State and local levels, of any single locus of accountability for the effective management and delivery of services, (iii) excessive structural and fiscal rigidity within arbitrary categories of Federal, State and local service programs, (iv) conflicting sets of administrative and geographical jurisdictions across service programs, (v) inadequate means by which to match needs with available resources, (vi) only informal and ad hoc means of coordination and communication among agencies and units of government providing human services, (vii) the absence of any commonly accepted and measurable set of service goals towards which human service programs should be directed, and (viii) costly duplication of support service functions across service agencies.

(b) It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide a program to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate the utility of coordinating human services delivery through such means as new cooperative arrangements and reorganization and reassignment of functions at all levels in the system of planning, management, and provision of human services, in order to—

(1) provide appropriate institutional care for individuals for whom independent living is not feasible and for whom a high degree of care and protection is necessary;

(2) secure adequate community-based care for individuals capable of noninstitutional living but for whom self-care is not feasible;

(3) secure and maintain maximum independence and dignity in a home environment for those capable of self-care with appropriate supportive services and for whom economic independence is not feasible; and

(4) remove individual and social barriers to economic and personal independence for all individuals capable of self-support, and assist children and youth in achieving their maximum potential for eventual personal independence and self-support.



## TO ENABLE SPECIAL PROSECUTOR TO SUPPLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY WITH EVIDENCE AND INFORMATION

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, when Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski recently announced that he would be unable to provide evidence and information to the House Judiciary Committee, he effectively placed a roadblock in the path of that committee's inquiry into impeachment. No one doubts that Mr. Jaworski's motives for this action are founded on weighted legal considerations, but the initial need for an objective and expeditious investigation by the Judiciary Committee must not be ignored. Our constituents are clamoring for an immediate and responsible answer to the numerous allegations, questions, and doubts surrounding the Presidency. Only prompt congressional action in the form of an impeachment inquiry can provide that answer in the case of the President of the United States.

Mr. Jaworski's statements of last week indicated that his decision to withhold evidence was based primarily on his concern for the secrecy of pending grand jury proceedings. In my opinion, this concern was justified since rule 6E of the Rules of Criminal Procedure prohibits disclosure of matters pending before a grand jury. However, the urgent necessity for an exception on this rule in the case of a congressional inquiry into the impeachment of a President is clear. Since legitimate congressional doubts exist concerning the indictability of a President while in office, withholding vital evidence from an impeachment inquiry slows the possibility of impeachment and, in effect, places the President "above the law" until his term of office is concluded or until an additional lengthy investigation is conducted by a committee staff.

Today, therefore, I am introducing legislation which will enable the Special Prosecutor to supply the Judiciary Committee with all the evidence and information needed to conduct a fair and thorough inquiry into whether or not grounds for impeachment actually exist. In taking this action, I have no intentions of blocking any informal negotiations or judicial actions for an early release of evidence, but of insuring that such a transfer does not in fact take place. Time will not permit us to assume a position of "wait and see," when an issue as crucial to our Nation as impeachment hangs in the balance.

If implemented, this legislation will apply to all congressional inquiries into the impeachment of a President or Vice President and will make any relevant information in the possession of Federal prosecutors and investigators available to that committee of Congress having jursdiction over such inquiries. Second, it will require that such Federal officers provide a report describing the information or evidence in his possession if so requested by the chairman and ranking minority member. This measure is similar in intent to an amendment which I offered to the Special Prosecutor bill several weeks ago and which was approved by the Judiciary Committee at that time.

Events of the past several months have visibly shaken public confidence in the American governmental structure and it is our responsibility to attempt to "clear the air" and restore our constituents' confidence as quickly and fairly as possible. Without the Special Prosecutor's evidence and information, justice will be delayed and the doubts surrounding the President will be allowed to linger. The legislation I am introducing today will allow Mr. Jaworski to supply requested evidence without concern of legal restraint and the inquiry will be allowed to proceed immediately. I, therefore, respectfully urge adoption of this legislation.

## SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM DURING FISCAL YEARS 1972 AND 1973—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-203)

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Annual Reports of the Health Research Facilities Construction Program for activities during fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1974.*

## ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1972—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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I herewith transmit the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1972, in accordance with section 6 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1974.*

## SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965—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:*

I hereby transmit the seventh annual report on the implementation of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. The report contains information with respect to the United States-Canada Automotive Products Agreement, including information concerning automotive trade, production, prices, and employment in 1972. Also included is other information relating to activities under the act.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1974.*

---

## TO PROVIDE OUR CHILDREN WITH A SOUND BASIC EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93–202)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The Congress returns to Washington this week at a time when America faces many difficult challenges. Each of them will spark honest differences of opinion and generate spirited debates during the coming year.

But one goal which unites all of our people is to provide each of our children with a sound basic education. No matter what race, faith or family circumstance, each child should have equal access to a good education.

We have made substantial progress toward this goal, but we can maintain that momentum only if we commit ourselves to a continuing renewal of the educational process. During the coming legislative year, there are many proposals which I believe the Congress should enact to improve our educational system. Among the highest priorities which I would urge upon the 93rd Congress are these:

—Consolidating major grant programs for elementary and secondary, vocational and adult education and increasing decision-making authority for State and local education agencies.

—Providing advanced funding so that State and local school authorities can plan their programs with greater certainty—a new and important concept in the financing of education.

—Targeting Federal funds so that students who have the greatest need—the truly disadvantaged—are the major recipients of funds.

—Expanding the grant and loan programs for students faced with the rapidly increasing costs of postsecondary education.

—And increasing support for organizations such as the National Institute of Education, which are searching for better ways to educate more than 60 million students in the United States.

### I. A RECORD OF PROGRESS

This Administration has worked hard to expand educational opportunity for every child and we have made substantial progress:

—We have established a new program of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants to further our goal that no qualified student be denied access to postsecondary education for lack of money.

—We have provided special aid for local school districts to help them deal with the problems of desegregation.

—We have created a National Institute of Education to marshal our research skill systematically so that we can better understand how students learn and how they can be taught more effectively.

—We have provided support to develop new ways of helping children learn to read.

—We have substantially increased support to colleges serving minorities and students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

In taking these and other steps over the past five years, we have increased Federal spending for education from $5.1 billion in fiscal year 1970 to an estimated $7.6 billion in the budget I will propose next month for fiscal year 1975.

This support has helped enrich the diverse educational system and has contributed greatly to our national strength and vitality.

### II. PRINCIPLES FOR THE FUTURE

While real progress has been made, there are additional problems which must be addressed if we are to make the promise of a quality education a reality for all Americans. Americans have never been complacent about their educational system, but today they are increasingly concerned—and with reason.

—Parents of children who are not learning to read know it is becoming more difficult to lead a satisfying and productive life without this basic skill.

—Parents often see their children moving through elementary and high school without acquiring an understanding of what careers are open to them and what skills will enable them to obtain a rewarding job.

—Many families do not see how they will be able to meet the rising costs of their children's college education.

—Teachers who want to try something new or make old methods work better too often have no place to turn for reliable information about what works and why.

—Local school administrators must plan their budgets without knowing, until the last moment, what Federal aid will be available.

We all want to commit our energies to solving these problems and to making our schools better. We must now find ways to focus these energies.

To do so, I believe, we should adhere to five basic principles of constructive action:

—*First, the Federal Government should continue to support national priorities in education without seeking to control and direct State and local responses to those priorities.* Schools which must respond to detailed and elaborate Federal red tape will be hindered in responding to the demands of students, teachers and parents. A concrete application of this principle is the consolidated education grants legislation which the Congress is now considering. I again urge that this legislation be framed to achieve the maximum possible consolidation of funding authorities, so that State and local agencies can use Federal funds to meet national priorities in their own ways.

—*Second, the Federal Government must make it possible for citizens, students, parents and administrators to plan ahead.* The request I will be making in my budget for advanced funding of the consolidated education grants reflects this principle.

—*Third, to the maximum extent possible we should put the important choices in the hands of students and parents themselves.* A concrete example of this principle is the Basic Opportunity grant program which permits students to apply funds toward an education at the school of their choice.

—*Fourth, the Federal Government must play a more responsive role in funding research to find out what works in education.* My proposal for the establishment of a National Institute of Education in 1970, and the funding for the institute I will recommend in my new budget show how I believe this principle can be carried out.

—*Fifth, we must firmly insist that all Americans have an equal opportunity for education.* The legislation I am supporting, the new budget, and the enforcement of non-discrimination to which I am committed all reflect this principle.

### III. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Traditionally State and local governments have exercised primary responsibility for education in this country. States and localities provide more than 90 percent of the money for elementary and secondary education while the Federal Government provides less than 10 percent. But in the last decade the tail has wagged the dog. Federal laws, rules, and regulations have imposed an elaborate set of "do's" and "don'ts." They often prevent State and local agencies from using Federal funds to best meet their needs.

#### FORWARD FUNDING

As if the Federal red tape were not confusing enough, the Federal funding process has created a situation in which school districts develop future budgets with a diminished degree of confidence or accuracy. School districts, for instance, have been faced with three entirely different allocations of funds just since July of 1973. As one school board member put it: "When we put our budget

together, we don't know what we'll get from the Federal Government, so we have to be gamblers." School districts across the Nation will begin putting their annual budgets together next month, but unless we soon enact reforms they will not know how much their Federal funds will be until late fall.

To overcome this deficiency, which has plagued school boards in recent years, I plan to ask for supplemental appropriations for the current fiscal year of $2.85 billion. The money will be used by schools in the school year beginning this fall. If the Congress acts on this request swiftly, those who run our elementary and secondary schools as well as vocational and adult education programs would for the first time know how much Federal money they would have before the school year begins, not several months after the year has begun.

The supplemental appropriations request will be formally transmitted to the Congress as soon as acceptable authorizing legislation is enacted. It is therefore important for that authorizing legislation to be passed early this spring, so that we can provide forward funding at the earliest possible date.

CONSOLIDATING FUNDS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

In 1971 I asked the Congress to consolidate and simplify numerous Federal aid programs for education. I again urged this in 1972.

Last year, I proposed this reform under the label of the Better Schools Act. The label itself, unfortunately, became a controversial matter within the Congress. It is not the label that should concern us, however, but the children and the structure of the programs designed to help them. I am pleased that during the last session of the Congress, the executive branch and the appropriate authorizing committees began to deal more seriously with an improved program structure, and I am persuaded that with hard work and careful thought, a bill acceptable to both branches can result.

The appropriate committees of both Houses have written steps to simplify existing programs for innovation and support services into the measures they are now considering. The Senate Subcommittee on Education has initiated a further consolidation of various discretionary and categorical programs into a special projects authority, with provisions for gifted and talented children. But further consolidation is still needed. I am therefore proposing consolidation of present programs of vocational education and a merger of existing authorities in adult education.

FAIRER DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Another issue of continuing concern is the development of a better way to distribute Federal funds for disadvantaged children. The current system of reimbursement often results in school districts being paid for children who are no longer there.

A new formula for distribution of these vital funds must be adopted, targeting the available money on the greatest concentrations of disadvantaged children and on the development of basic skills. That formula should also take into account the differing costs for education in different locales. We must also adopt a definition of poverty which more accurately reflects today's conditions.

AIDING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

There is growing awareness in the Nation of the special educational needs of handicapped children. In 90 demonstration projects we are seeking to learn how to identify handicapped children earlier and give them the help they need to enter regular school when other children do.

I am now proposing that eight discretionary authorities be consolidated into four broad programs for the education of the handicapped. One of these new programs, Resource Implementation, would help teachers identify learning problems; the Professional Development program would provide teachers with special skills to overcome barriers to learning; Innovation and Development would provide new methods and materials for teaching; and Special Centers and Services would accelerate progress in aiding severely handicapped children.

PHASING OUT IMPACT AID

Another program affecting many school districts throughout the Nation is School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas—aid to districts where Federal installations bring significant enrollment increases. I am proposing 100 percent Federal funding of the program for school districts where enrollment consists of 25 percent or more of children whose parents both live and work on Federal property, and 90 percent funding for school districts where these children comprise less than 25 percent.

In the past we have also funded programs for children whose parents work on Federal property but do not live on Federal installations. Since parents of such children already contribute substantially to State and local governments to help pay educational costs, I see no reason for all American taxpayers to continue subsidizing this special group of school districts. However, a transition period is needed for districts which have depended heavily on these Federal funds. I will therefore propose that no local school district whose subsidy is being terminated will lose more than 5 percent of its total operating budget in the first year that we phase out the program. It is only fair to give school districts as much notice as possible to plan and conform their budgets to Federal financing policies.

TARGETING AID FOR DESEGREGATION

In coming weeks, I will send to the Congress a proposal for a new project grant program to aid school districts undergoing voluntary or court-ordered desegregation. This program should replace the current Emergency School Aid Act when the act expires this June.

A national formula program is no longer needed to handle this problem. What is needed is a targeted approach to solve specific problems.

As opposed to the national formula now employed under the Emergency School Aid Act, the new project grant program would target desegregation aid to solve specific programs. In addition, we will continue to provide technical assistance to local districts, helping them to meet problems relating to desegregation.

PROVIDING FOR INDIAN CHILDREN

A targeted approach is also needed to deal more effectively with the needs of Indian children. There is a special Federal responsibility to provide educational services to Indian tribes and communities, and we propose to place emphasis on project grants for this purpose.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Because of the great diversity of our Nation, we must also provide special assistance to children of families whose native language is other than English. I ask the Congress to continue support for demonstration projects which help develop better ways to provide bilingual education.

IV. POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

This Administration is committed to the goal that no qualified student should be denied a college education because of a lack of funds. Today we are in a position to accomplish a major expansion of student opportunities and choice.

An education beyond high school is a major goal of many young Americans today. In recent years, however, the cost of college or other training has threatened to price this dream beyond the means of many families.

Since 1970 I have been urging the Congress to enact and fund student aid programs that would reduce to manageable size the problem of financing higher education for all families.

EXPANDING AID TO NEEDY STUDENTS

In 1972 the Congress responded by enacting the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program, the primary vehicle for reaching the neediest students. The current program provides for an average grant of only $260 and limits eligibility to entering freshmen. The program I propose for FY 1975—totaling $1.3 billion—would provide a grant of up to $1,400 depending on need.

Supplementing this Basic Grant program is a Guaranteed Student Loan program designed to increase access to loans. This program is both for needy students receiving Basic Grants, and for students who are not eligible for Basic Grants but who need or wish to spread the costs of postsecondary education over time.

Over the past year, some students who have sought loans have found it difficult or impossible to locate lenders willing to make federally guaranteed loans.

To remedy this problem I have instructed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Treasury Department to contact the major lending institutions and to request that they reaffirm their commitment to our Nation's educational needs by making adequate funds available for student loans. If, as the progress of this program is reviewed, additional changes appear to be necessary, I will propose them.

The Basic Grant and Guaranteed Student Loan programs, supplemented by

the College Work Study program, expand opportunities for postsecondary education. My budget request for these programs would provide more such opportunities than ever before. Building on Basic Grants, students can rely on work, loans, and family resources, plus State, local and private forms of assistance to meet the remainder of their financial needs.

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

I will request funding of the full authorization for the Developing Institutions program—an authorization that is four times the funding level when I took office. This program helps to strengthen the capabilities of colleges which are serving Black, Spanish-American, and American Indian students as well as students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds—a special concern of my Administration.

V. INNOVATION AND REFORM

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

An essential element in our effort to provide every American an equal and increasing opportunity for education is the development and dissemination of alternative educational approaches through research. For too long we threw money at educational problems, feeling that bigger would mean better.

To strengthen support for education research and development, the National Institute of Education was created with strong bipartisan support. The institute is now beginning to provide the leadership in educational research and development that is needed.

In 1975 it will continue to concentrate on several major tasks:

—finding answers to the problems that students have in learning essential skills such as reading and mathematics;

—improving State and local capability to solve the educational problems of their youth;

—increasing the educational benefits to students through improving the productivity of our schools;

—and assisting students to better understand the relationship between the school and the world of work.

Through this latter activity, the National Institute of Education has taken on the responsibility to carry out the Career Education objectives I set forth in my 1972 message. The institute is developing new ways to introduce young people to various career opportunities and is experimenting with new methods of preparing them to get and keep jobs that pay well and offer opportunities for advancement.

Education research is not a luxury but a necessity if Americans are to get the education they want for their children at a sensible cost. Accordingly, I would like to emphasize most strongly the need for adequate funding of the institute.

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education constitutes another important new Federal initiative to achieve needed innovation and reform. The fund was created to support exemplary activities and new directions which promise to increase the quality, effectiveness, and diversity of postsecondary educational opportunities. The fund is now providing support for the development and demonstration of more effective approaches to college education.

RIGHT TO READ

The Right to Read effort is well on its way to becoming a prime example of the way that a Federal, State and local partnership can achieve positive results. Under this program, we are now on the way toward achieving a 1980 goal of eliminating functional illiteracy among 90 percent of those 16 years and older and 99 percent of the youth of America. I ask the Congress to continue giving this program its full support.

LIBRARY PARTNERSHIP ACT

While I continue to believe that State and local authorities bear the primary responsibility for the maintenance of public libraries, I also believe that the Federal Government has a responsible role to play. One of my new initiatives for 1975 is the Library Partnership Act. This legislation would encourage the establishment of reference and information services on a demonstration basis and could lead to significant improvements in public library services across the United States.

HEAD START

During 1975, the Head Start program will reach 282,000 children on a year-round basis and some 78,000 pre-schoolers in the summer. It will also extend its activities to include handicapped students. My 1975 budget will increase operating funds for this program and will provide funds to ensure that all children participating in Head Start can obtain a nourishing breakfast and lunch.

VI. THE NEED FOR COMMITMENT

The proposals I have outlined above are designed to address the educational challenges of tomorrow. They are designed to enhance the effectiveness of the Federal dollar. They are designed to facilitate the operations of our State and local school systems.

For the necessary reforms and rejuvenation of our schools to occur, however, it will take more than Federal programs and more than Federal money. It will require that each of us commit ourselves, with money, time and attention, to that process. Only with individual commitment, with the commitment of State and local school administrators and teachers, with the commitment of parents and students, and with the commitment of the Federal Government, can we obtain a revitalized and rewarding American educational system.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1974.*

## SPEAKING UP FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we Americans have received more than our fair share of criticism in recent years—from sources both here and abroad. Despite our very real and pressing problems, however, the overwhelming majority of Americans recognize that, as one east Texan put it, "There's a whole lot more right about America than there is wrong." It took a stirring editorial by a Canadian, Mr. Gordon Sinclair, to crystallize this widespread pride in our own history and in our continuing record of free, democratic government and commitment to humanitarian principles. Mr. Sinclair's editorial "A Canadian Talks About Americans" has generated an immensely enthusiastic response from millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the eloquent presentation by Mr. Sinclair has given us a lift when it was sorely needed and has helped maintain public confidence in basic American principles. In recognition of this contribution, the Texas Legislature has approved House Concurrent Resolution 10 which well expresses the appreciation of the people of Texas for our able friend and defender in Toronto.

Let me express my firm hope that 1974 will see more Americans speaking up for our great Nation. Certainly, we have our problems and shortcomings, and it is only by facing up to them squarely that we can hope to change things for the better. Frank and honest self-appraisal is essential to self-improvement, but when carried to an extreme it can sometimes produce corrosive and crippling self-doubt. We should never forget that we have good cause to be proud of America—that we can hold our heads high among the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the members of our Texas Legislature that Gordon Sinclair has performed a great service to our Nation by giving us the courage and inspiration to continue on our way. He richly deserves our sincere thanks.

The text of Texas House Concurrent Resolution 10 follows:

Whereas, Texas is always anxious to find and recognize a new friend and the state is especially delighted to name as a special friend, Mr. Gordon Sinclair of Toronto, Canada. Mr. Sinclair, by speaking his mind, has without a doubt won innumerable friends throughout Texas and the nation; and

Whereas, On June 5, 1973, on Radio Station CFRB, Toronto, Canada Mr. Gordon Sinclair presented an editorial entitled "A Canadian Talks About Americans." His words described a perspective of the United States that is often overlooked or forgotten in troubled times; and

Whereas Mr. Sinclair, in his editorial, essentially, listed many of the good things America and its people have done for other countries in their times of need and hardship. He then pointed out that no other country has come to the aid of the United States when it has faced significant national disasters and internal turbulence; and

Whereas, Rather, he described the other nation's tendencies to criticize and vilify the United States during its troubles, such as the dollar devaluation and war difficulties. American citizens are aware of all that Mr. Sinclair said, for he did not announce anything new, it was his point of view and the combination of his facts that were enlightening; and

Whereas, What is remarkable is that it took a Canadian, a man from another country, to remind us of the positive in America that is so often neglected in this day of self-doubt

and self-criticism. What is even more remarkable is that he took the time and trouble to do it; and

Whereas, Americans are quite capable of praising themselves as well as finding fault with their country. But when a neighbor speaks out and stands up for the good that we have done and defends us in the face of popular international criticism, then he honestly embodies all the many qualities of a true friend and neighbor; and

Whereas, His words on our behalf mean infinitely more, coming from him and his country than they would coming from our own frequently biased editorialists. It is a sincerely heartwarming experience to look beyond national boundaries and find a friend and defender, someone who is willing to recognize our strong points in spite of our weaknesses. Friends such as Mr. Sinclair give us the courage and inspiration to continue on our way; and

Whereas, Mr. Sinclair honestly deserves our gratitude and appreciation, not just for his complimentary remarks, but also for reminding us of the value of good neighbors and especially of our good and great neighbor to the north, Canada; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 63rd Legislature, the Senate concurring, That Texas recognize, commend and sincerely thank Mr. Gordon Sinclair of Toronto, Canada, for his editorial on behalf of the United States; and that the 63rd Legislature officially deem it appropriate that Mr. Gordon Sinclair be named an honorary citizen of the great state of Texas; and, be it further

Resolved, That an official copy of this Resolution be prepared for Mr. Gordon Sinclair as an expression of sincerest regard and closest friendship by the 63rd Legislature of the State of Texas; and, be it further

Resolved, That official copies of this Resolution be prepared and forwarded to the President of the United States and to members of the Texas delegation in the Congress, with the request that this Resolution be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Daniel, Adams, Agnich, Allen of Harris, Allen of Gregg, Allred, Atwell, Bailey, Baker, Bales, Barnhart, Bigham.

Bird, Blake, Blythe, Bock, Boone, Bowers, Bynum, Caldwell, Calhoun, Canales, Cates, Clark, Clayton.

Cobb, Cole, Coleman, Coody, Cooke, Craddick, Davis, Denson, Denton, Donaldson, Doran, Doyle.

Dramberger, Earle, Edwards, Evans, Finnell, Finney, Foreman, Fox, Garcia, Gaston, Geiger, Grant, Green of Navarro.

Green of Harris, Hale, Hall of Harris, Hall of Webb, Hanna, Harris, Head, Heatly, Henderson, Hendricks, Hernandez, Hilliard.

Hoestenbach, Hollowell, Howard, Hubenak, Hudson, Hutchison, Johnson, Jones of Harris, Jones of El Paso, Kaster, Korioth, Kubiak, Laney.

Lary, Lee, Leland, Lewis, Lombardino, McAlister, McDonald of Hidalgo, McDonald of Dallas, Madla, Maloney, Martin, Massey.

Mattox, Menefee, Miller, Montoya, Munson, Murray, Nabers, Newton, Nichols, Nowlin, Nugent, Olson, Parker of Jefferson.

Parker of Denton, Pentony, Peveto, Poerner, Poff, Powers, Presnal, Preston, Ragsdale, Reyes, Reynolds, Rodriguez.

Rosson, Russell, Sage, Salem, Sanchez, Schieffer, Scoggins, Semos, Sherman, Short, Simmons, Slack.

Spurlock, Sullivant, Sutton, Tarbox, Temple, Thompson, Truan, Tupper, Uher, Vale, Vecchio, Vick.

Von Dohlen, Washington, Waters, Watson, Weddington, Whitehead, Whitmire, Wieting, Williams, Williamson, Willis, Wilson, Wyatt.

W. P. HOBBY,
*President of the Senate.*
PRICE DANIEL, Jr.,
*Speaker of the House.*

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman on that excellent statement rendered by our legislature in Texas, and I associate myself with him and commend the gentleman from Texas on behalf of all of us in the Texas delegation for placing that in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS), from Dallas.

---

## FOREIGN AIR CARRIER SECURITY

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the massacre of innocent civilians at the Rome Airport on December 17, 1973, will be remembered as the worst of a long chain of terrorist attacks on U.S. civil air commerce. Thirty-one people were killed when Arab terrorists threw grenades into a Pan Am jet and then killed hostages and innocent bystanders. It is all too likely that such terrorist acts will continue to occur, despite the improved prospects for a Middle East peace settlement, and the need for decisive action continues.

On December 18, 1973, I urged Secretary of State Henry Kissinger to direct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to put the question of combating Arab terrorism before the U.N. General Assembly at the earliest possible time, even if this should require a special session of the Assembly early this year. Mr. Marshall Wright, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations responded to that letter on January 2, 1974, by rejecting the suggestion and emphasizing our Government's efforts to use other international channels, such as the International Civil Aviation Organization—ICAO—to combat terrorism.

I am not convinced that these other channels will produce effective protection for air travelers in the near future. Instead, I foresee continuing delay in implementing international air security precautions.

In September 1972 the DOT had issued a notice of proposed rulemaking in response to the rash of air piracies that year, but later reversed itself and chose instead to work toward worldwide security standards through the ICAO channels. While I firmly believe that multilateral cooperative efforts are necessary to achieve worldwide air security, the prospects for prompt and effective action are not good. The U.S. representative to the ICAO is currently pressing for passage of an agreement requiring all member nations to adopt some security provisions for international air carriers and passengers, and to identify some authority responsible for setting that nation's security standards. This proposal was defeated by the ICAO council last month, and if reproposed will not be considered by the ICAO again until February. Even if the council passes it, this is a weak measure. The security measures are to be set by the country from which the plane is departing, but there are no provisions in the ICAO proposal requiring any screening of passengers. Unfortunately, the normal rulemaking procedure is equally slow and ponderous. An emergency regulation, such as I have suggested, could go into effect immediately while protecting affected persons by allowing the submission of comments for consideration by the DOT in determining whether modification of the rule is justified.

The present situation is unacceptable. The terrorists who shot up Rome airport reached their target by commercial airliner from Madrid, Spain, where security precautions are nonexistent. If the security measures called for in my bill are not adopted, it would be possible for any number of Arab terrorists to fly from Madrid, for example, to JFK International Airport butchering many innocent Americans.

The world community has an obligation to protect civilian air travelers, and the ICAO is not the only body empowered to achieve the desired goal. The Congress has the constitutional authority to act in this matter, therefore, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to require each foreign air carrier landing in the United States to implement an air security program. Foreign air carriers would be required to screen passengers and check baggage prior to embarkation aboard flights destined for U.S. ports of entry. The screening system employed would not be acceptable if it were less stringent than that which is in use at U.S. airports.

My bill would go a long way to stop future massacres of innocent international air travelers. However, if we are to reach international accord on the treatment of pirates and saboteurs, the House should also act favorably on H.R. 3858, the Antihijacking Act of 1973, introduced by Chairman STAGGERS of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which would fully implement the Hague and Montreal Conventions. The Hague Convention obliges signatory nations to: First, establish jurisdiction over hijackers; second, make hijacking an offense punishable by severe penalties; and third, submit any hijacker found in their territory to the competent authorities for prosecution or extradition. The Montreal Convention deals with sabotage and armed attacks against international civil aviation facilities and generally would create similar obligations with respect to saboteurs as the Hague Convention would create for hijacking. This legislation has already received Senate approval. I believe these two bills would provide the changes to Federal law necessary to satisfy not only U.S. obligations under these treaties but also our responsibility to provide the

safest possible environment for Americans traveling abroad.

## GUN WAR AGAINST THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Americans are no longer dying in Indochina, but everyday dozens of Americans are dying in another war that has been going on for decades. Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and President John Kennedy have been some of the most famous casualties of this war. But tens of thousands of lesser known but no less important Americans have been attacked, wounded, or killed in a relentless procession of accidents, murders, and suicides committed with firearms.

The Library of Congress has just reported that in 1972, firearms were used to commit 12,257 murders, 93,328 aggravated assaults and 155,815 robberies. These latest figures show a constant increase in the rate per 100,000 population of crimes committed with firearms. Based on the appalling but reasonable assumption that this trend will continue unchecked, the Library of Congress has projected the number of these crimes which will be committed with firearms in the years 1980 and 2000.

The results are astounding. In the year 2000, as many Americans will be murdered in 12 months by firearms as were killed in all the years of the Indochina war—45,239.

We cannot allow this carnage to continue. Strict gun control is an indispensable part of the response to these statistics of death. Without it, hundreds of thousands of American citizens will be wounded or killed by firearms in the years ahead.

I include the complete projections by the Library of Congress at this point in my remarks:

During the period 1963–1972 (latest year for which figures are available) there has been a relatively constant increase in the rate per 100,000 population of certain crimes (murder, aggravated assault, robbery) committed with firearms. Based on the assumption that this trend will continue in the future as it has in the past, we have projected the rate of these crimes committed with guns for the years 1980 and 2000. Using these projected rates and Bureau of Census population projections for those years, we have arrived at the following:

| Crime | Projected rate (per 100,000 population) | Projected number |
|---|---|---|
| Year: 1980 (estimated population 224,132,000): | | |
| Murder | 9.10 | 20,393 |
| Aggravated assault | 81.92 | 183,582 |
| Robbery | 137.64 | 308,451 |
| Year: 2000 (estimated population 264,435,000): | | |
| Murder | 17.11 | 45,239 |
| Aggravated assault | 166.35 | 439,829 |
| Robbery | 284.93 | 753,355 |

By way of comparison these same figures for 1972, based on a population of 208,232,000, are as follows:

| Crime | Rate (per 100,000 population) | Number |
|---|---|---|
| Murder | 5.88 | 12,257 |
| Aggravated assault | 47.22 | 98,328 |
| Robbery | 74.83 | 155,815 |

## PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, when Congress reconvened this week, I was absent on official business, and so missed three rollcall votes. I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present and voting I would have voted "yea" on the following three bills:

January 21, 1974, roll No. 2, passage of H.R. 11387.

January 22, 1974, roll No. 4, passage of H.R. 11537.

January 22, 1974, roll No. 5, passage of H.R. 11809.

## FIGHTING GASOLINE SHORTAGES—A SENSIBLE APPROACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no sense in going to rationing or queuing up at gasoline stations across the land, if there is a responsible way to find additional billions of gallons of gasoline. There is such a way and this Congress owes it to the American people to adopt a sensible approach on automobile emissions controls without another day's delay.

The ripple effect of gasoline shortages is an economic catastophe in the automobile industry from manufacturer to dealer. It is the same for tourism and recreation and related enterprises. If the gasoline shortage is said to be in the vicinity of 20 percent of 1973 availabilities, removal of emissions controls requirements on automobiles registered to persons who live in those parts of the United States that have no air pollution problem from automobile exhausts would—to quote no less an authority than the president of General Motors—produce a savings on the order of 6 billion gallons of gasoline per year.

What is the sense of requiring emissions controls on cars except in those parts of the country having a genuine auto emissions related air pollution problem? Not only do such controls cost car buyers money, but they result in lower gasoline mileage and rapid engine deterioration. It is a fact that in better than 90 percent of the geographical area of this country there is no real need for automobile emissions controls for clean air. Most of the separate States in their entirety have no air pollution problem from cars that adversely impacts on the health of the residents of that State. New Hampshire is one such area. Similarly Florida, Maine, Vermont, North Dakota, Wyoming, and so forth for most of the Nation. It is asinine to persist in requiring emissions controls on cars in these areas at the expense of millions of gallons of gasoline wasted each and every day—materially contributing to the gasoline shortages that cause suffering and inconvenience to millions of Americans at this time.

Responsible studies show present emissions controls—1974 standards—impair gas mileage on the order of 17 to 20 percent on a weight-adjusted basis. The computation of gasoline losses in this extra consumption is simple arithmetic in terms of multiplying out the number of miles driven in an average year times the gas mileage available, to say nothing of the mounting cost of a gallon of gasoline at the pump.

On Monday next, January 28, I shall introduce a bill to suspend emissions requirements for cars registered to residents of those parts of this country that have no significant auto-related air pollution. The bill will provide such a suspension until June 30, 1977, or until the President declares that petroleum shortages no longer exist, whichever occurs later. It will permit the removal or modification of emissions controls on existing vehicles by competent mechanics including dealer-furnished services, in the interest of improving the efficiency and mileage capability of the cars he services and sells. It will permit from this an immediate and startling improvement in gas mileage at the option of individual owners on cars of model 1970 forward. It will save millions of dollars in costs for new models and in their operation.

Persons who reside in air quality control regions, so designated by EPA Administrator under the bill, will continue to be required to operate emissions controlled vehicles, but these areas are significantly restricted in size, and are specified in the bill.

Now, one asks, "What happens if I have a car that is registered to me in, say, Nevada, and I want to drive into Los Angeles where there is an auto pollution problem?"

Office of Science and Technology studies show that the in-and-out migration of automobiles not owned by residents of the problem areas varies to the order of 1.5 to 5 percent, and conclude that this would not materially adversely impact on the ambient air quality of those areas.

Enactment of this proposal would establish a "two-car policy" more closely tailored to the country's environmental needs than the present wasteful, "shotgun" approach. This approach is not new. The State of California has had more stringent auto emission standards since the mid-1960's, and Detroit has altered the production lines to produce cars to meet those tougher standards with little or no difficulty. The plain truth of the matter is that there is simply no need to require that the entire country adopt emissions standards designed to solve air pollution problems of a New York City or Washington, D.C.

Placing auto emission standards on a two-tier basis would neither emasculate the Clean Air Act, nor would it material-

ly increase pollution levels in impacted areas. A dual standard merely recognizes that only a few parts of the country have a serious air quality problem. It would make no sense to quarantine residents of all 50 States because of the outbreak of a contagious disease in Los Angeles or Chicago. Neither does it make sense for drivers in rural areas to be required to purchase cars designed to clean the air over urban areas.

Nor will lifting the auto emissions standards in the less populous areas cause a marked deterrent to the ambient air quality in densely populated areas. While there is evidence of some drift by pollutants, the inherent ability of the atmoswhere to cleanse itself should prevent a marked addition to the pollution in impacted areas except under extraordinary meteorological conditions. Vegetation, water bodies, rainfall, and normal air turbulance, all act to filter out and break down pollutants. A buildup occurs only when this natural cleansing ability is saturated, as in the case in the 13 areas designated as significantly polluted by this legislation, and for which emissions controls would be required. Pollution levels over the bulk of the Nation are low enough to allow the atmosphere to cleanse itself of most pollutants before drift would significantly impact on heavily polluted areas.

Further protection against the remote possibility of fringe areas suffering from drift is provided through an annual review of air quality levels. This will provide early warning of any increase in pollutants for whatever reason.

We have undertaken Sunday gas station closings, reduced speed limits, voluntary driving restraints, and even contemplate the specter of rationing, but if we want to do something to really help meet the oil and gasoline shortage in this country, we should end the overkill in the current clean air act requirements by ending, at least during the shortage, automobile emissions controls that defy both commonsense and responsibility. The hard fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that we overdid it a few years back, and the overdoing of it is now beginning to show—at a cost that is far too dear.

Claims of a 16-percent fuel saving by requiring catalytic converters are misleading—even if the converters perform as expected. The anticipated "saving" is but 16 percent of the impairment of gasoline mileage existing on 1974 model cars as a result of required emissions controls. The impairment is said to vary between 13 to 20 percent. Thus, the actual saving due to converters—with a unit cost in excess of $200—would amount to slightly over 1 percent. Chances are this would be further reduced or eliminated through fouling of the converter under normal use. Moreover, catalytic converters require unleaded gasoline and you get markedly less gallonage of unleaded gas from a barrel of crude. This helps make matters worse rather than better.

Make no mistake about it, the people back home are up in arms about this gas situation, and about the lack of need for automobile emissions controls in most of this country. They are angry. They are asking what is the sense of imposing a 20-percent fuel penalty on residents of the nine-tenths of the country lacking a significant air pollution problem at a time of acute gasoline shortage?

I shall reintroduce this legislation next month and will urge my colleagues to join with me in restoring balance to Federal energy policy during the energy crunch. To do less is to ignore the needs and desires of our constituents.

The text of my bill and a related table follow:

H.R. —

A bill to temporarily suspend required emissions controls on automobiles registered in certain parts of the United States, and for other purposes

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

SECTION 1. It is the purpose of the amendments made by this Act to suspend emissions controls on certain motor vehicles and engines in continental United States except vehicles registered to residents of certain designated air quality regions, until June 30, 1977, or sixty days after the President determines there is no significant shortage of petroleum fuels, whichever is later.

SEC. 2. Section 203 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857f–2) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) During and after the period of partial suspension of emission standards (as defined in paragraph (3) (A)—

"(A) it shall be unlawful for any person to register within an area designated in paragraph (3) (B) a motor vehicle which is manufactured during the period of partial suspension of emission standards and which is not labelled or tagged as covered by a certificate of conformity under this part, and

"(B) no State shall permit any person to register a motor vehicle in violation of subparagraph (A).

"(d) (2) During the period of partial suspension of emission standards

"(A) subsections (a) (1) and (4) of this section shall be inapplicable;

"(B) it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer to sell, offer to sell, or introduce or deliver for introduction into commerce (or for any person except as provided in regulations of the Administrator, to import into the United States), and vehicle which is labeled or tagged as covered by a certificate of compliance unless such vehicle is covered by a certificate of compliance issued (and in effect) under this part;

"(C) subsection (a) (3) shall not apply to any motor vehicle or engine attached thereto which is registered outside an area described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection;

"(D) it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer (i) to sell or lease any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine which is labelled or tagged as covered by a certificate of compliance unless such manufacturer has complied with the requirements of sections 207 (a) and (b), or (ii) to fail to comply with subsection (c) or (d) of section 207 insofar as such sections apply to motor vehicles or motor vehicle engines to which subsection (a) (1) of this section applies or applied or which are labelled or tagged as covered by a certificate of conformity;

"(E) it shall be unlawful for any dealer to sell any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine to an ultimate purchaser unless such purchaser provides such dealer with a signed statement that such purchaser will not register such vehicle in an area designated under paragraph (3) (B), and

"(F) it shall be unlawful for any ultimate purchaser to provide a statement described in subparagraph (E) knowing such statement to be false.

"(d) (3) (A) For purposes of this subsection and section 209(C) the term 'period of partial suspension of emission standards' means the period beginning sixty days after enactment and ending on the later of June 30, 1977, or 60 days after the date on which the President determines that there is no longer any significant shortage of petroleum fuels in the United States. Any such determination shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(B) Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall designate, subject to the limitations set forth in this subparagraph, geographic areas of the United States in which there is significant auto emissions related air pollution. The Administrator shall not designate as such area without subsequent legislative authorization, any part of the United States outside the following air quality control regions as defined by the Administrator as of the date of enactment of this paragraph:

"(i) Phoenix-Tucson, intrastate.

"(ii) Metropolitan Los Angeles, intrastate.

"(iii) San Francisco Bay Area, intrastate.

"(iv) Sacramento Valley, intrastate.

"(v) San Diego, intrastate.

"(vi) San Joaquin Valley (Calif.), intrastate.

"(vii) Hartford-New Haven (Conn.)-Springfield (Mass.), interstate.

"(viii) National Capital (D.C.-Md.-Va.), interstate.

"(ix) Metropolitan Baltimore, intrastate.

"(x) New Jersey-New York-Connecticut, interstate.

"(xi) Metropolitan Philadelphia (Penn.-N.J.-Del.), interstate.

"(xii) Metropolitan Chicago (Ill. & Ind.), interstate.

"(xiii) Metropolitan Boston, intrastate.

"For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'significant air pollution' means the presence of air pollutants from automobile emissions at such levels and for such durations as to cause a demonstrable and substantial adverse impact upon public health.

"(C) For purposes of this subsection and Section 209(c) a motor vehicle shall be considered to be registered in a geographic area—

"(i) in the case of a motor vehicle registered by an individual if the individual's principal place of abode is in that area, or

"(ii) in the case of a motor vehicle registered by a person other than an individual, if the State of registration determines that such vehicle will be principally operated in such area.

"(D) Each State shall not later than 60 days following enactment of this Act, submit to the Administrator a plan for implementing subsection (d) (1) (B) of this section. Such plan shall contain provisions which give assurance that such State has one or more adequately financed agencies with sufficient legal authority to enforce such subsection (d) (1) (B) as determined in accordance with regulations of the Administrator."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act is amended by inserting "and section 203(d)" after "subsection (b)".

(b) (1) Section 203(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "The following" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in subsection (d) of this section, the following.".

(2) Section 203(b) (2) of such Act is amended by inserting "or (d) (2) (A)" after "subsection (a)".

(c) Section 204(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period the following: "or section 203(d)".

(d) Section 205 of such Act is amended

by inserting "(a)" after "sec. 205.", by inserting "or paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of section 203(d)" after "section 203(a)", and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) If a State fails to submit a plan under section 203(d) or if the Administrator determines (after notice and opportunity for hearing) that such State is not adequately enforcing such a plan, then such State (including any political subdivision thereof) shall lose its entitlement to and may not thereafter receive any Federal grant or loan assistance under this Act or under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act."

(e) Section 206(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "being manufactured by a manufacturer" and inserting in lieu thereof "which are being manufactured by a manufacturer and which are covered by a certificate of conformity."

(f) The second sentence of section 209(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "No State" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in sections 203(d)(1)(B) and 203(a), no State".

(g) Section 209(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "Nothing" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, nothing"; and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph: "(d) During the period of partial suspension of emission standards (as defined in section 203(d)(3)(A)—

"(1) no State may (in an applicable implementation plan or otherwise) adopt or attempt to enforce any standard relating to the control of emissions of motor vehicles (including engines attached thereto) registered outside of any area designated under section 203(d)(3)(B), and

"(2) no State may (in an applicable implementation plan or otherwise) adopt or attempt to enforce any law or regulation prohibiting any person from removing or rendering inoperative any device or element of design installed in compliance with regulations under this title in or on a motor vehicle (including any engine attached thereto) which is registered outside of any area designated under section 203(d)(3)(B), and

"(3) the Administrator may not promulgate any implementation plan which contains a provision prohibited by paragraph (1) or (2)."

SEC. 4. Willful and deliberate violation of any provision of this Act shall be punishable by a fine of up to one thousand ($1,000.00) dollars, or imprisonment up to one year, or both.

SEC. 5. Motor vehicles registered in areas other than those designated in Paragraph 3 (B) herein on the date of expiration of this Act shall not be required to be retrofitted with emissions control devices nor to comply with emissions control standards or regulations issued pursuant to the Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1857f) as amended, as long as said vehicle remains registered in such areas.

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect 60 days after passage.

---

EXCERPT FROM "FINAL REPORT EXAMINATION OF ISSUES RELATED TO 2-CAR REGIONAL EMISSION CONTROL STRATEGIES," AEROSPACE CORP.

CAR MOVEMENT SUMMARY

| Air quality control region | Daily car miles per capita | Percent of daily trips external | Percent of car in migration [1] |
|---|---|---|---|
| California | 17.1 | ---------- | 2.2 |
| South coast (Los Angeles) | 15.0 | 0.67 | 2.5 |
| Houston | 16.5 | 1.5 | 3.7 |
| Phoenix-Tucson | 13.5 | 2.7 | 5.1 |
| St. Louis-Texas | 6.1 | ---------- | 2.7 |
| San Francisco | 13.8 | 1.7 | 3.0 |
| Boston | 11.1 | 8.5 | 2.3 |
| San Diego | 13.8 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Philadelphia | 8.2 | 10.0 | 1.5 |
| Portland | 8.2 | 9.0 | 4.0 |
| Sacramento | 15.1 | 7.5 | 3.2 |
| Fairbanks | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Baltimore | 9.5 | <10.0 | 2.7 |
| New York | 7.4 | 5.0 | 2.5 |
| Spokane | 12.0 | <9.0 | 5.4 |
| Denver | 11.3 | 6.4 | 4.0 |
| Washington | 12.0 | 8.0 | 2.3 |
| Pittsburgh | 8.8 | <9.0 | 1.6 |
| Seattle | 13.5 | 7.0 | 5.0 |
| Minneapolis-St. Paul | 14.0 | 3.8 | 2.4 |
| Salt Lake City | 15.8 | 8.5 | 5.1 |

[1] Out-of-State registrations.

---

## ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOMEBUILDERS

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, new hopes and help for homebuilder and home buyer alike; more housing and substantially better opportunities to buy it; plus thousands of new jobs generated from a healthy housing market.

These are the predictable benefits of the administration's new initiatives in the housing field, announced in Houston by HUD Secretary James Lynn at the homebuilders' convention.

Reduced interest rates on federally insured or guaranteed loans, coupled with a revised and expanded tandem plan answer many problems faced by the lagging housing industry: the money situation, inflation generally, the suspended housing subsidy programs, "no-growth" problems, and most of all, economic uncertainty. They recognize, and are designed to fulfill, the dream of a new home for other millions of Americans now unable to find housing they can afford.

I herewith enclose a copy of Secretary Lynn's remarks before the annual convention of the National Association of Home Builders in Houston. I urge all of my colleagues to review this statement.

The statement follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES T. LYNN, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

I welcome this opportunity to be with you. Still, I am reminded of Al Capp's reaction when he was invited to speak at a Harvard commencement in the heyday of campus unrest. The politically conservative cartoonist agreed to appear—but only if the university would give him an extra thousand dollars "combat pay" to face the dissident students.

For a great many of you, these are rough times. I could try to console you by making something of the fact that, in the decade of the 1960s, average housing starts did not even reach the one-and-a-half million mark. But it would just recall to your minds that old division of statisticians into three categories: liars, damned liars, and statisticians. You might even be tempted to add a fourth category—government officials with rose-tinted vision.

I don't want to play that game. It wouldn't be honest, and it wouldn't be productive. It wouldn't win me any new friends; it might even cost me those I have. And it would not help the home builders or the home buyers, two groups whose well-being is of great concern to me.

You have certainly done your part. Over the past few years, especially, you have proved again the capacity of the private sector to respond to the needs and demands of our people. Your flexibility and resourcefulness were shown in a spectacular way when you boosted residential construction from the 1970 level of 1,469,000 starts to the 1972 record of 2,378,500, a 62-percent increase in just two years.

And it wasn't easy. To cite just two examples, first-rate craftsmen in sufficient numbers aren't easy to come by, and materials are sometimes impossible to buy at any price. But, to quote Colonel Pickering in *My Fair Lady*, "By George, you did it!"

On January 21, 1974, however—that's today—no one could fault many of you for asking yourself, "How did a nice guy like me get into a business like this? Here I am" (you might say) "with organization, people and investment geared to a market of two million-plus units a year, and suddenly the bottom drops out. What happened? And even more important, what will happen next?"

Before getting into a discussion of the problems and what can be done about them, I want to make something very clear: I do give a damn. I care about providing housing that will realize the dreams as well as meet the basic needs of our people. I care about the thousands upon thousands of jobs a healthy housing market can generate, both directly and indirectly. And I care about the fate of the home builders who make all this possible.

This isn't just my feeling. Let me read the message the President gave me last Thursday to deliver to you personally:

"It is the firm belief of my Administration that the housing industry is a key factor in our national economy and the essential element in the ultimate attainment of the goal first established in the Housing Act of 1949: a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. In this spirit I greet the members of the National Association of Home Builders at your annual convention.

"I am pleased that Secretary Lynn will be with you on this occasion to reaffirm first hand our sustained commitment to the objectives of my housing message of last September 19. We are more determined than ever to increase the availability of mortgage credit in the current market, to improve the overall credit picture for the long term and to find a sensible way to help meet the housing needs of families with low incomes.

"The constant new developments affecting the housing situation make it imperative that we have the flexibility to deal with each new change. This flexibility will surely be most effectively achieved if we have a healthy housing industry. May your deliberations provide useful direction and incentive for your members to meet their challenge in this critical task."

He—and, in fact, everyone in the Administration who is involved in housing—recognizes that you face a host of problems. Among these most surely are: the money situation; inflation generally; for some, the suspension of the subsidy programs; environmental problems; "no-growth" policies; the energy crisis, my friend Bill Simon's domain; and last but not least, economic uncertainty. Now I can't cover all of these extensively today, but I will spend a fair amount of time on some and at least touch on the others.

First and foremost among your problems has been money. For a while, the problem of the shortage of construction and mortgage loan money at practically any price. Money flowed out of the savings and loan associations. Now that it's flowing back in—for example, S&Ls gained $3.1 billion in deposits in December—the shortage of funds for lending has been easing, but interest rates on home loans are still considerably above those of a year ago—in most cases more than 100 basis points.

The economic gurus look into their crystal balls or computers and predict that although interest rates on long-term debt (which includes mortgages, of course) may come down somewhat in the months ahead, they will not come down much. So be it—I don't envy those who have to make their livings making such predictions—but I am firmly convinced that HUD should set an example for the rest of the market wherever it can.

Accordingly, I am pleased to announce, on behalf of myself and Don Johnson, the head of the Veterans Administration that effective tomorrow the maximum interest rate for FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans is being reduced from 8½ percent to 8¼ percent. And I assure you that if market adjustments to the new 8¼ percent ceiling and the interest rate outlook in the period ahead appear to make further reduction feasible, we'll do it without hesitation. My objective is to have FHA "lead a little."

Frankly, as the President points out in his September message on housing, the law should be amended to let the FHA and VA rates float and eliminate "points," the prepaid interest that actually hurts the buyer and certainly doesn't benefit the seller. But as long as we must operate under the present archaic system requiring the FHA and the VA to guess constantly as to what markets will do and peg an interest rate, I'll do my best to make it work.

Let me move on to Tandem. You will recall that in his message last Fall President Nixon announced a revived GNMA Tandem Plan to provide assured financing on FHA and VA insured loans bearing an 8½ percent stated interest rate for up to 100,000 units of new residential construction. We haven't done much business under that program. But the slow response proved an important point: the then shortage of funds for residential lending was only a part of the problem. Tandem assured the funds. But at the 8½ percent rate, there were relatively few takers. This says to me that through Tandem we've got to offer a better interest rate—substantially better.

Therefore, I am even more pleased to announce that effective tomorrow a revised and expanded Tandem Plan will authorize GNMA to commit up to $6.6 billion to purchase at 96 FHA and VA-insured mortgages on 200,000 units of newly-constructed single and multi-family dwellings, bearing a stated interest rate of 7¾ percent.

I don't have to tell you what a significant commitment this is . . . There will be real punishment on resale of these mortgages by GNMA if the mortgage money trends are the wrong way. Given the present slump in the housing market, however, we have little choice. It makes sense, and it must be done, both to help the home builder and the home buyer alike.

How effective will this new program be? I hope, I expect, indeed I am convinced that it will do substantial good. If Congress were to act promptly to remove some related constraints on the statute books, the new Tandem Plan could be assured of success. I am referring to the FHA ceiling on mortgage amounts and the loan-to-equity ratio limits. These provisions, however well advised they were when the law was last changed in 1968, just aren't realistic in 1974. As the President's September housing message states, these limits must be increased immediately.

What else can be done on this interest problem? For the months immediately ahead, I think the answer is "not much," but over the long term, "a lot." The key is to give housing funds a competitive edge against other demands for long-term money.

How do we do it?

One proposal would give depositors in savings and loan associations a tax break on interest earned. But this would only increase the reliance of housing on one sector of the financial market.

Don't get me wrong. Over the years, the S&Ls have done a good job of providing funds for housing; their health and growth are vital to the home buyer and the housing industry. And the President's proposals for financial institution reform aim to ensure that health and growth, including certain needed flexibility in making construction loans and achieving financial balance.

But what I want to see—and what I know all of you want to see—are effective ways of tapping every long-term credit source available, particularly when money is tight. That means opening a competitive wedge in all markets, not just with the savings and loan depositor.

The mortgage interest tax credit proposed to the Congress by the President would do just that. Under this proposal, the larger the proportion of total assets invested in residential mortgages, the higher the tax credit, up to 3½ percent when the mortgage proportion of the assets reaches 70 percent. If, for example, a bank already holds 8 percent of its total assets in residential mortgages, an increase of only 2 percent will give the bank a 1½ percent tax credit on the entire 10 percent, which results in a significantly higher yield on the incremental investment. That's quite an incentive.

Such a tax credit would also apply to pools of mortgages put together in the private sector. With the credit, such pools would have a substantial advantage in issuing their notes in the secondary market.

I know it sounds complicated. But it should work. Incidentally, it's not cheap. Preliminary estimates indicate that even if mortgages do not rise above the level, of, say, 1972, the subsidy involved, in lost revenues to the Treasury would be near $200 million, and the potential revenue loss is much more.

Moreover, the whole scheme would function without government bureaucrats. I can't say the same for other proposals I've heard—like the one that the Federal Government should restrict consumer credit for purchases other than housing, or restrict business credit, both for the purpose of forcing investment into housing. Who is the genius in Washington who would fine-tune such regulation? Is it really fair to the consumer to say Uncle Sam knows best? To say you really shouldn't buy as many home appliances or vacation trips, so enough money will be freed for housing?

Is it really in the best interest of the housing industry to restrict the credit needed by our industrial sector to conduct research or to improve productivity by investment in new plants and equipment? These things are vital to the better jobs and higher real incomes necessary to pay for better housing.

This brings me to the second problem I mentioned at the outset: inflation. Lenders feel they need higher interest rates to compensate for expected diminished purchasing power of the dollar when the principal comes back years later. Yet inflation affects not only interest rates but everything else too—land, materials and labor.

Equally important, inflation saps the demand for better housing when the potential home buyer has to spend more of his pay check for food, gasoline and practically everything else. We can and we must get inflation under better control. How?

As you know, food costs have been the biggest single culprit. The Administration has taken a number of steps that we expect to increase supply and moderate price hikes.

The soaring cost of fuel is another, newer culprit.

To hold down inflation, Federal spending must conform to reasonable limits. Easy to say yet almost five years in government have taught me how hard it is.

Every group, it seems, has its own cause—very often a perfectly legitimate one. But there is simply no way to give all groups the money they want without raising taxes or printing money, which simply means more inflation.

So we must establish priorities and set limits. That's what this annual budget battle is all about.

Incidentally, I just can't buy the proposition that an easy way out is available to us—that all we have to do is cut defense.

Without a strong defense, mutual reduction of arms is a pipe dream. Without a strong defense position the free community of nations will not endure. Freedom, liberty, can too easily be taken for granted, especially when we have had it as long as we have. And I've sat in enough Cabinet meetings to know that we have whacked as much out of the defense budget as possible in favor of domestic program priorities. It's not a pleasant prospect—particularly when you have the job I have or Cap Weinberger's job at HEW—but we will need more money for defense than Congress appropriated last year, not less.

While we are on the subject of budget allocations, I would like to talk a little on the issue of subsidized housing for lower-income families. Whether we look at the decade of the '60s or go back to the '50s, it is clear that as a nation we have made remarkable progress toward the goal—first articulated by the Congress in 1949 and reconfirmed in the President's September housing message—of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. The main reason for our success is the growth in jobs—higher real incomes—coupled with a strong housing industry and credit availability.

Notwithstanding this progress, however, many families still live in housing that by any standard is substandard.

The issue is how to overcome this problem. This is what the housing study we completed in September is all about.

I'm not going to try to explain in detail here why we concluded that we don't stand a chance of achieving our national housing goal for substantially all those still without decent shelter through the old programs. Chapter Four of the book incorporating the results of the study, a volume called *Housing in the Seventies*, does that better than I could here.

Suffice it to say that even if all the other negative factors were ignored, solving the housing problems of all those eligible under the old subsidy programs for lower-income families would cost, we estimate, some $34 billion a year. Allocating that much of the Federal budget to these needs just isn't possible. New approaches are necessary.

The Administration is committing some $200 million to the housing allowance—direct cash assistance—experiments. In this and other ways, we are attempting to devise a practical program to get at the basic problem—lack of sufficient income to pay for decent, safe and sanitary existing housing.

Even though this cash assistance approach would make maximum use of existing housing, the expenditure involved would be far greater than anything this Nation has seen before—an estimated $1½ billion for the first phase, covering the elderly poor, and an estimated $9 to $11 billion annually when the program is fully operative. But the difference is we would be helping the vast majority of the poor get better housing rather than helping a relatively small proportion get new housing while the rest are left to wait and wait.

This doesn't mean that we are standing dead in the water pending final decision on direct cash assistance, a decision scheduled for the end of this year or maybe early next year.

In addition to the 100 thousand-plus units under the old programs that are still being processed, another 200,000 units of subsidized housing were announced in the President's September housing message.

Approximately 70,000 of this 200,000 are allocated to meet bona fide commitments under the old programs. The balance, about 130,000, are earmarked for our revised Section 23 leasing program—50,000 units of existing housing and 80,000 of new construction.

In devising these new Section 23 programs, Assistant Secretary and FHA Commissioner Lubar and his people have been in contact with developers and others knowledgeable about subsidized housing.

And the regulations will be published for comment tomorrow. These new programs, refined as we gain experience, and hopefully improved by the legislation we seek from Congress to modify them further, should avoid many of the flaws in the old programs and provide a sound interim approach while the work on better long-term approaches proceeds.

The budget for fiscal 1975, to be published shortly, will seek authority for an additional number of units for these new Section 23 programs. But the programs simply won't work without you. We need your help.

I have discussed tight money, high interest rates, inflation and helping the poor. Before I close, just a few words on the other problems I mentioned.

FHA processing. Once and for all, let me state it flatly: There will be a need for FHA for a long, long time. The private mortgage insurers perform an important function, and I will do all I can to foster the service they give. But for the foreseeable future, there will always be good mortgage risks that require FHA assistance.

One of my top priorities for the period immediately ahead is once again to provide timely FHA processing service in the offices that fail to do so. We know from the good performance of some offices that FHA can provide prompt service without sacrificing the important social goals built into the law, such as equal opportunity and environmental protection. Accordingly, on direct authority from me signed last Friday, Shel Lubar is putting together teams of experts—including representation from better offices—who, in coordination with the regional offices, will, in the weeks ahead, go directly into the area and insuring offices that appear to need the help and do what needs to be done.

For the longer term, Congressional adoption of some of the President's other proposals will also greatly assist and help streamline FHA operations. Co-insurance, the practicability of which was proved by VA long ago, will help. And it goes almost without saying that the greater your own sense of responsibility in selecting the projects you offer, the better your own work in the application process and in meeting your commitments, the easier it will be for us to streamline our own procedures.

The environment. We have been working closely with the Environmental Protection Agency to get a better handle on the facts, to separate the real problems from the illusions and address them. And as expected, the NAHB staff has welcomed our overture to work with your organization along the same lines.

No growth. Some of the communities moving toward growth restriction have legitimate reasons. But others don't. Whether they like it or not, the baby boom of the post-World War II period is now becoming the family formation boom of the Seventies and early Eighties. These people must have homes where the jobs are, and we at HUD will work with you toward achievement of that goal.

Energy. I know the problems you face—the effect of the energy crisis on availability of materials, on fuel for construction, on Sunday driving to inspect homes, on the willingness of customers to buy while question marks hang over such things as heating and gasoline supply.

That's why I have brought Doug Parker on board to be my Assistant for Energy Affairs. I hope as many of you as possible get to meet and know him while we are here in Houston. Doug will work closely with Bill Simon's shop, with you and with others to reduce as much as possible the impact of the energy crisis on housing.

Let me close with what I said in my first line. I welcome the opportunity to be with you. I chose those words carefully. I didn't say the usual "It's a great pleasure to be with you." In the sense of satisfaction with the current state of housing affairs, it cannot be a pleasure—surely not for you and certainly not for me.

But I do welcome the opportunity to be with you.

I wanted to hear about your concerns at first hand. I wanted to discuss specific problems and predictions with you directly. And I wanted to present in person a partial solution at least to one of your principal current difficulties—interest rates.

There are, amidst the serious problems, some good signs. When I look at those family formations on the charts, at the basic strength of our economy, at its capacity to create more and better jobs (with all that means to the prospects for better housing) and at your demonstrated ability to provide that housing, I perceive promise for a high level of housing construction, not just for the balance of this decade, but also into the 1980s. And I pledge to the people of this country, and to you today, that as Secretary of HUD, I will do my utmost to help.

---

## REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FINANCING OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of my colleagues a report which promises to have, in my estimation, a significant effect on how decisions are made with respect to the financing of postsecondary education in the United States.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the final report of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, "Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States," which was made public today.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the National Commission, on which I was privileged to serve, will, I believe, be of immense help to all of those with responsibility for making decisions about financing our institutions of postsecondary education and assisting the students who attend them.

Before I comment on the report, I should like to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague from Oregon, the Honorable JOHN DELLENBACK, who also served on the Commission. For he brought to the Commission's deliberations a wealth of experience with respect to the problems of postsecondary education and provided many constructive suggestions for the consideration of the Commission.

I should also, in this regard, pay tribute to the work of our distinguished colleagues from the other body, the Senator from Maine, the Honorable WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, and the Senator from Maryland, the Honorable J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., who labored long and hard to help complete the Commission's work.

Let me also, Mr. Speaker, cite particularly Donald E. Leonard, of Lincoln, Nebr., who worked diligently and tirelessly as Chairman of the Commission over the past 14 months.

Each of the other members of the Commission, also, Mr. Speaker, contributed invaluable suggestions during the progress of our work.

The other Commissioners, Mr. Speaker, included Vice Chairman Marian W. LaFollette, a member of the board of trustees of Los Angeles Community Colleges; Ernest L. Boyer, chancellor of the State University of New York; and Winfield Dunn, the Governor of Tennessee.

Also members of the Commission were Tim R. Engen, student body president of Bradley University; George Kaludis, vice chancellor of Vanderbilt University; Dan M. Martin, president of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest; Walter C. Mercer, president of the Ohio Bank of Columbus; and Peter P. Muirhead, Deputy U.S. Commissioner of Education for Higher Education.

Other Commissioners, Mr. Speaker, were John W. Porter, Michigan superintendent of public instruction; Louis P. Rodriguez, administrative assistant, Phoenix Elementary School District, Ariz.; Sister Jane Scully, president of Carlow College; and Ruth C. Silva, professor of political science at Pennsylvania State University.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, a Commission such as ours cannot accomplish its work effectively without the assistance of a dedicated and talented staff.

We were fortunate to have such a staff under the remarkable leadership of Executive Director Dr. Ben Lawrence of Boulder, Colo., and Research Director Dr. George Weathersby.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to our former colleague in the House of Representatives, a member of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. James Scheuer of New York, who first proposed the legislative provision which resulted in the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me pay a special word of commendation to two members of the staff of the House Committee on Education and Labor whose diligence and ability contributed significantly to the report of the Commission—Mr. James Harvey, assistant staff director of the Select Education Subcommittee, and Dr. Robert Andringa, minority staff director of the committee.

CONGRESSIONAL CHARGE

Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education was created by the 92d Congress as part of the Education Amendments of 1972—Public Law 92-318—and was charged with analyzing existing programs of aid to postsecondary institutions; the costs, advantages, and disadvantages of alternative financial pro-

posals; as well as the extent to which various financial proposals would advance the national goal of making postsecondary education accessible to all individuals with the desire and ability to continue their education.

This clearly was a challenging responsibility. For postsecondary education in the United States is a large enterprise including more than 2,900 traditional collegiate institutions serving 9.3 million students, and an additional 7,000 noncollegiate technical, vocational, and proprietary institutions serving approximately 1.6 million students.

To support this complex enterprise, Mr. Speaker, postsecondary education institutions received income in fiscal year 1972 of $30 billion from students and parents, local, State, and national governments, and other private and public sources.

To repeat, Mr. Speaker, the Commission was faced with a difficult charge, to which, I believe, the Commissioners have responded imaginatively and well.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

For the Commission, Mr. Speaker, has provided a tool which decisionmakers concerned with postsecondary education have long needed: a comprehensive analytical framework with which to evaluate the benefits and disadvantages of a variety of alternative programs for financing postsecondary education.

At the outset of our discussions, Mr. Speaker, the Commission decided against trying to draw up a laundry list of bills Congress should pass to aid postsecondary education. Rather we decided that the development of a comprehensive analytical framework would be our primary contribution to solving the complex issues involved in financing postsecondary education.

For we felt that Senators, Congressmen, Governors, State legislators, university administrators, and other policymakers did not need a new financial prescription aimed at curing the ills of postsecondary education—for we do not lack thoughtful proposals in this regard.

What policymakers needed was an appropriate methodology, a framework, for analyzing the potential benefits and disadvantages of the variety of plans offered to finance postsecondary education.

Indeed, in the absence of such a framework, policymakers have simply been unable to determine whether or not various financing plans could actually achieve the results which their sponsors claimed.

The Commission has provided the first such framework developed, although we are, of course, aware that the framework we have produced is, at this state of its development, in many respects limited and requires further development.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to tell my colleagues of the process we followed in developing this analytical framework, for I believe we pursued our task in a most logical manner.

We first agreed upon a number of national objectives, such as student access and institutional diversity, which we believed represent the broad goals toward which the postsecondary education enterprise in the United States should strive.

We then developed several measures to assess the extent to which we have achieved these objectives. For example, the number of students from low-income families attending postsecondary education institutions was one measure of accomplishing the objective of student access.

Then, Mr. Speaker, with the help of the most complete data base ever compiled on postsecondary education, and utilizing a mathematical construct—described in the final report as an "analytical model"—to simulate the impact of various financing plans, we evaluated a large number of alternative plans in terms of how each of them would help achieve the national objectives we had selected.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the development of this analytical framework to be of profound consequence for the work of all those with responsibility—whether at local, State, or National levels, in public or private institutions—concerned with the financing of postsecondary education.

Such a framework means that, for the first time, it will be possible, subject to the limitations the report sets forth, objectively to assess the likely results of implementing various proposals for financing postsecondary education.

But in addition to the development of this framework, Mr. Speaker, the Commission has also, as a result of its research, been able to make worthwhile contributions in a number of other areas.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I should mention the following aspects of the Commission's work:

An analysis of the degree to which we are, today, accomplishing national objectives for postsecondary education;

An analysis of the nature and causes of "financial distress" in institutions of higher education; and

The development of interim national uniform standards for developing annual per-student costs.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, say just a word about each of these areas.

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Mr. Speaker, data alone cannot, of course, assure us that national objectives with respect to postsecondary education are, or are not, being met.

But the data indicating how much we have accomplished with respect to national objectives, left several of the members of the Commission, including me, deeply troubled.

With regard to student access, for example, Mr. Speaker, we found that the objective of making postsecondary education available to all who have the ability and the desire to continue their education has not been accomplished.

Consider:

That the participation rates of students in the 18–24 year age bracket from families with incomes above $10,000 annually, is twice that of students in the same age bracket from families with incomes below $10,000;

That the participation rates of students from several racial and ethnic minorities are far below the participation rates of other Americans; and

That rigid high school tracking—which is to say the curriculum students begin to follow when they are 14 or 15 years old—is the most significant determinant of whether those students will enroll in college-level study.

FINANCIAL DISTRESS

Or let us turn, Mr. Speaker, to the Commission's findings with respect to financial distress in institutions of higher education.

Although the Commission found that the financial status of the postsecondary education enterprise is not, insofar as we were able to determine, jeopardizing the achievement of postsecondary education objectives, we also discovered that several postsecondary institutions are already in financial distress.

Indeed, the Commission concluded:

If present patterns and conditions of financing continue, there is a high probability that such distress will occur in several sectors of postsecondary education.

UNIFORM STANDARDS FOR PER-STUDENT COSTS

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just touch on what was one of the most troublesome and vexing of the questions to which the Commission addressed itself.

I refer to the difficulties involved in determining accurately the costs of educating each individual student within a college or university setting.

Let me first explain that the determination of per-student costs cannot rest solely upon dividing an institution's operating budget by the number of students enrolled at the institution.

For some of the students are enrolled full-time and some of them are enrolled on a part-time basis.

Still another complication is that a significant number of activities in education result in what is termed a "joint product." That is to say, the costs of supporting one activity, for example, research, might justifiably be assigned to several other outcomes, such as improved teaching, or public service.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, complicated technical matters are at issue in discussing the question of per-student costs.

Nevertheless, the Commission has produced a set of interim national uniform standards for developing per-student costs and the Commissioner of Education is required to comment on these standards within 60 days. I believe the Commission has broken new ground in this important area.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of the National Commission on Postsecondary Education are, in my estimation, important contributions which will help to shape the debate about the financing of postsecondary education in the years to come.

The contributions, to reiterate, will be important not only to Congress and the

executive branch of the Federal Government, but also to policymakers concerned with postsecondary education at all levels—in State and local government—and to educators.

Let me also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the problems identified by the Commission will, if we are to be able responsibly to address them, require the most thoughtful consideration, based upon the best data and analytical techniques available.

And while our efforts with respect to gathering and organizing the necessary data as well as developing useful analytical tools with which to make policy for financing postsecondary education are not the final word, they are, in my opinion, an indispensable beginning in this crucial task.

## SUMMARY OF TAX RECORDS

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today releasing a personal financial statement and a summary of my tax records for the years that I have been in Congress, and I ask that these documents be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

*Financial statement of Congressman John C. Culver, December 31, 1973*

| | |
|---|---|
| Assets: | |
| Demand and saving deposits | $4,250.15 |
| Real property* | 210,500.00 |
| Personal property | 25,000.00 |
| Personal contribution to the Federal retirement fund | 25,334.64 |
| Cash value, life insurance policies | 3,481.09 |
| Less policy loans outstanding | (3,481.09) |
| Total assets | 265,084.79 |
| Liabilities: | |
| Mortgages, real property | 149,960.00 |
| Total liabilities | 149,960.00 |
| Net worth | 115,124.79 |

*Includes Cedar Rapids commercial property (inherited one-tenth interest), McGregor Home, McGregor Building Restoration, and Washington residence.

SUMMARY OF TAXES PAID DURING PREVIOUS YEARS AS PUBLIC OFFICIAL, THE HONORABLE JOHN CULVER

1972. Mr. Culver's gross income was $43,313.60, of which $42,500.00 was his salary as a Member of Congress and the remainder was income from dividends, interest and sale of securities. He was eligible for $6,863.99 in itemized deductions on his federal income tax return and $5,053.76 on his Iowa income tax return. He paid $7,470.34 in federal income tax and $1,365.81 in Iowa state income tax. He paid $626.16 in Clayton county, Iowa property taxes.

1971. Mr. Culver's gross income was $46,400.72, including $3,900.72 in income from dividends, interest and the sale of securities. He was eligible for $6,687.85 in itemized deductions on his federal income tax return and $5,407.64 on his Iowa income tax return. He paid $9,278.62 in federal income tax and $1,410.23 in Iowa state income tax. He paid $479.89 in Clayton county, Iowa property taxes.

1970. Mr. Culver's gross income was $60,610.56, including $18,110.56 in income from interest, the sale of securities and a trust created family partnership. He was eligible for $10,597.36 in itemized deductions on his federal income tax and $8,583.13 on his Iowa income tax return. He paid $15,043.28 in federal income tax and $1,632.21 in Iowa state income tax. He paid $178.68 in Clayton county, Iowa property taxes.

1969. Mr. Culver's gross income was $57,442.66, including $18,067.68 in income from interest, the sale of securities, and a small amount of miscellaneous income. He was eligible for $10,650.94 in itemized deductions on his federal income tax return and $9,205.99 on his Iowa income tax return. He paid $15,039.23 in federal income tax and $1,762.23 in Iowa state income tax.

1968. Mr. Culver's gross income was $34,659.91, of which $30,000 was his salary as a Member of Congress and the remainder was income from interest, sale of securities, and small miscellaneous sources. He was eligible for $4,516.87 in itemized deductions on his federal income tax return and $3,683.48 on his Iowa income tax return. He paid $5,799.22 in federal income tax and $892.95 in Iowa state income tax.

1967. Mr. Culver's gross income was $33,808.49, including $3,808.49 in income from interest, sale of securities and miscellaneous small sources. He was eligible for $7,616.38 in itemized deductions on his federal income tax return and $6,796.87 on his Iowa income tax return. He paid $5,209.48 in federal income tax and $833.39 in Iowa state income tax.

1966. Mr. Culver's gross income was $34,564.99, including $4,564.99 in income from dividends, interest, a trust created partnership, and sale of securities. He was eligible for $3,768.43 in itemized deductions on his federal income tax returns and $6,327.07 on his Iowa income tax return, (the larger amount resulting from a difference in computation of deductions for state and federal returns that year). He paid $5,407.43 in federal income tax and $810.25 in Iowa state income tax.

1965. A copy of Mr. Culver's 1965 Tax Returns was being obtained at the time of preparation of this summary and will be available later. After 1965, Mr. Culver's tax returns were prepared by his attorney in Cedar Rapids and facts presented here were provided by the attorney.

Mr. Culver, an attorney, discontinued the practice of law following his first election to Congress in 1964. He has not been an officer or director in any business corporation.

## NEEDED: A NATIONAL FOOD POLICY

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, the American dinner table is set today in an atmosphere of bountiful bliss. While in transit on January 21, 1974, I read an article in the New York Times by Tony Dechant, national president of the Farmers Union, who argues for a national food policy. In answering the question: do we have a food policy, whatever we find will be controversial. Is what we have now a controversial nonpolicy, or a healthy political controversy?

I submit a copy of the article for the consideration of my colleagues.

NEEDED: A NATIONAL FOOD POLICY

(By Tony Dechant)

Our country desperately needs a national food policy. The United States today is dangerously short of food. What is worse, we are dangerously short even of farmers. We are dangerously short of farming capacity—of machinery and breeding stock and production supplies. We are dangerously short, above all, of morale among our farm people. All this portends that our danger will grow worse unless we correct its cause.

In just a few short years, the regime of President Nixon and Secretary of Agriculture Butz has wrecked our national farm programs, built with bipartisan support and leadership during the past forty years. This has brought the nation, and farmers and consumers together, to the food crisis.

The first major blow was enactment of the 1970 Farm Act after a bitter fight in Congress. This legislation was engineered by the White House with ruthless use of the veto threat. It empowered the Administration to further erode farm prices and to complete the wrecking of two indispensable features of an adequate farm program:

It wrecked the "ever-normal-granary" machinery for building and managing reserves of basic farm commodities, by forcing commodity-loan rates far below the level of viable returns to producers, and by "dumping" the last remaining Commodity Credit Corporation-owned stocks onto the market in a ruthless effort to break farm prices.

It wrecked the Government's capability to manage supplies of storable commodities so as to keep reserves at reasonable levels at costs that would be reasonable and acceptable.

The next step was the recruitment by President Nixon of Earl L. Butz, a long-time agribusiness politician, as Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Butz set out with flamboyant vigor to exploit the programs of the Department of Agriculture to further the Nixon election campaign.

It is fair to wonder what a long-time enemy of farm programs, as Mr. Butz has been, would find to do during an election year that would be helpful to the Administration's cause among farmers who overwhelmingly believe in farm programs. But Earl Butz showed that he is not a man to be swayed by principle when he has a political motive to satisfy.

In the 1972 election year, Mr. Butz spent more money than any Secretary of Agriculture in history to pay farmers to idle the biggest acreage of land ever kept out of production under Government programs.

The extent of today's food shortage is being understated and covered up by the Department of Agriculture.

The department continues in public to uphold its estimate of 250 million bushels as the total amount of wheat that will be left over at the end of this marketing year next July 1. This would be the smallest reserve since the world food emergency at the end of World War II. But then America's and the world's populations were far smaller.

A careful search and review of the Government's own reports on wheat production, wheat stocks, domestic consumption estimates, shipments already made overseas, and reports of overseas sales shows that the total wheat supply in the United States will be down to the vanishing point by the end of this marketing year. Indeed, these detailed reports show that the entire United States supply of three of the five major types of wheat have already been oversold, and this includes our main bread-wheat type.

The total carry-over that is indicated by these Government figures is around fifty million bushels. This would be by far the smallest ever recorded in the United States. It is less than the practical minimum, beyond the point at which the trade and processors' "pipelines" can really be cleaned out.

A short grain crop anywhere on earth—or a natural disaster anywhere on earth—or an international military crisis anywhere on earth—would catch America short of one of its most valuable resources. A world grain

crop like that of 1972 would doom millions to starvation.

## ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been told by their President that he is unable to do anything about the current energy crisis until the Congress gives him the necessary authority. For over 2 years Senators JACKSON and STEVENSON have been trying to give the President the necessary authority to deal with this matter, but have been thwarted at every turn. Now that the crisis is an actuality, numerous bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate in attempts to alleviate its most serious effects. One suggestion has been an increase in coal production.

A month and a half ago, the Department of the Interior's Mine Enforcement and Safety Administration reported that 11 coal mines had been forced to decrease production, because of a lack of steel roof bolt plates and bolts. Last week Governor Schapp of Pennsylvania wrote to the President asking him to have amended the Defense Production Act of 1950 in order to expedite the domestic production of these items; the shortage of which is due to the low profit margin that steel companies make from the manufacture of these products. Yesterday, three mines in Ohio closed, because they no longer have any steel roof bolt plates and bolts.

To help remedy this situation I have, today, introduced legislation which would amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 App. U.S.C. 2091–2094) authorizing and directing the President to use his authority for the purpose of expediting the domestic production and delivery of steel roof bolt plates and bolts. I hope that this legislation will be taken under consideration immediately.

## TAX REFORM—1974

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1974, my Committee on Ways and Means will begin what undoubtedly will be many months devoted to the revision of the Internal Revenue Code. While the hearings on February 4 will be directed to the various proposals related to windfall profits, the majority of our time this spring will be devoted to a more broad-based effort at general tax revision.

As a result of the 45 days of public hearings held during the first session of this Congress, the committee is quite well prepared to tackle the most complex issues of tax reform. I personally feel that the first session's hearings clearly demonstrated a need for substantive reform in at least two areas, and the need for redirection in a third. It is for this reason that I have today introduced three separate pieces of legislation designed to alter the taxation of single taxpayers, small businesses, and certain businesses in the recycling industry.

The treatment of single persons in the Internal Revenue Code has been increasingly criticized in recent years. There is much justification to this criticism. In the past, I have advocated reform in this area and now I am convinced that this is the year that legislation will finally be enacted. The legislation that I am introducing is not new to Members of this body. Its introduction today, however, is a positive commitment on my part to insure that tax equity for single persons is one of the key elements of any tax legislation reported by my committee to the full House.

A second area where there was demonstrated much need for reform during our tax hearings was in the area of small business taxation. There is need for much simplification and elimination of discrimination in this area of the code. While broad reform has been embodied in legislation introduced by the chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, and by the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, Senator BIBLE, my bill deals solely with the treatment of small business corporations that qualify for subchapter S of the code.

My legislation is derived from a joint U.S. Treasury-American Bar Association study from 1966–69. While this proposal was transmitted to the Congress in narrative form in 1969, it has not been formally considered by the Congress.

As my colleagues know, subchapter "S" of the code contained provisions which allow small businesses to operate in the corporate form, with all its nontax advantages, without the burden of being double-taxed as are most corporations. This section of the code, while having done much to encourage the growth of small independent businesses, is replete with hazards of the unwary—and even at times to those extremely knowledgeable in the complexities of our tax system. My legislation would expand the applicability of the subchapter "S" provisions and remove some of their harsher technical traps.

The third bill that I am introducing today would go a long way to stimulate the use of recycled material in an industry that has most recently been plagued by shortages—the paper industry. My legislation would provide a tax credit of $10 for each ton of postconsumer wastepaper a company processes into new commercially marketable pulp paper, paperboard, or other similar product.

Cities, towns, and counties are struggling to cope with a mountain of solid waste and many are running out of landfill and incinerator capacity. It is a problem that is national in scope and covers communities of all sizes.

National policy is to conserve vital natural resources, to encourage recycling of products that can be converted into useful new products and to assist communities in their struggle with solid waste. Encouraging greater use of paper and paper products that have gone to the consumer and been used once, offers the easiest and least expensive way of meeting these national goals.

Yet, recycling of paper is a declining enterprise. Thirty years ago, 36 percent of the paper and paperboard used in the United States came from recycled materials. Last year, 21 percent came from these sources. By 1985, unless new production facilities are developed, Midwest Research Institute estimates the recycling percentage will drop to 17.

To reverse this trend, I believe that it is necessary to provide an adequate financial incentive to promote the use of recycled material in this area. When the tax credits have served their purpose and the recycling of paper is again a growing and viable industry, they can be phased out. The credit would be a flat amount in order to encourage the greater use of cheaper grades of paper that now only clog municipal waste systems. Also, the credit would only be applied to postconsumer waste, because this is the hardest type to recycle and is what is creating most of our national solid waste problem.

The use of such an incentive will help plants in the industry get more waste, expand capacity, and be more competitive with increasingly scarce virgin paper products.

This legislation would, in my opinion, help reverse a long standing trend in our tax system. It would reward those who worked to preserve our resources rather than reward those who work to deplete them.

## MADISON, WIS., COMMON COUNCIL FIRST IN URGING HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BEGIN IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the news media has credited the Akron, Ohio, City Council, in its adoption this week of a resolution urging the House of Representatives "to proceed with the impeachment of Richard M. Nixon at the earliest possible moment" with being the first legislative body of any city in the country to take such action.

Just to set the record straight, to the best of my knowledge, the first city council in the Nation to adopt a resolution recommending that impeachment proceedings against the President be commenced was the Common Council of the City of Madison, Wis., the largest city in my congressional district, which passed its resolution on October 23, 1973, 3 months before the Akron, Ohio, City Council acted on this issue. As in other instances, the Madison, Wis., Common Council has taken the leadership on questions of national importance.

Mr. Speaker, the Madison Common Council resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, that the Madison Common Council recommends to the members of the House of Representatives from the State of Wisconsin that impeachment proceedings

against President Richard Milhous Nixon be commenced.

Be it further resolved, that the action of the Madison Common Council be forwarded to members of the House of Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

Be it further resolved, that Congressman Kastenmeier and Senators Nelson and Proxmire are requested to immediately convene a public hearing in Madison, Wisconsin, to receive public input.

Be it still further resolved, that the Common Council memorializes Madison residents to petition their federal representatives in support of this resolution.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, this week, on account of illness.

## 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. COCHRAN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYMAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RAILSBACK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. COCHRAN), for 10 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GROSS, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COCHRAN), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. LANDGREBE in two instances.

Mr. KEMP in three instances.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York in three instances.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. ASHBROOK in four instances.

Mr. BAKER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSE in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.

Mr. OWENS in 10 instances.

Mr. ROY.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mrs. BOGGS.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio in three instances.

Mr. RANGEL in five instances.

Mr. BRASCO in six instances.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. BADILLO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILFORD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. FULTON.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. MELCHER.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1961. An act to amend the Flood Control Act of 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2754. An act to prohibit all military assistance to Greece until it is determined that Greece is fulfilling its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1070. An act to implement the International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 1969.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 28, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1765. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on the number of cases reviewed and the number of exemplary rehabilitation certificates issued during calendar year 1973, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 606; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1766. A letter from the Director, District of Columbia Bail Agency, transmitting the annual report of the agency, covering the period ended May 31, 1973, pursuant to 23 District of Columbia Code 1307; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1767. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, transmitting the final report of the Commission, pursuant to section 140 (d) of Public Law 92–318; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1768. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 74–10 authorizing the provision to Spain of military and security supporting assistance in fiscal year 1974 without regard to the requirements of section 620(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, pursuant to section 614(a) of the act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1769. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report on deliveries of excess defense articles during the first quarter of fiscal year 1974, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2321b (d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1770. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to permit interest on loans under section 1810 of the chapter to be as agreed upon by the lender and borrower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11873. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research (Rept. No. 93–766). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 787. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5463. A bill to establish rules of evidence for certain courts and proceedings. (Rept. No. 93–767). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 788. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11793. A bill to reorganize and consolidate certain functions of the Federal Government in a new Federal Energy Administration in order to promote more efficient management of such functions (Rept. No. 93–768). 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. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12273. A bill to amend title XII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that each foreign air carrier shall maintain and administer security measures with respect to foreign air transportation equal to security measures applicable to air carriers operating in interstate air transportation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 12274. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make more equitable the procedures for determining eligibility for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12275. A bill to reform the present system of escrow accounts used in connection with some real estate mortgages by requiring lenders to offer a plan under which escrow

payments are applied to the balance due on the mortgage loan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 12276. A bill to expedite the domestic production of steel roof bolts and steel roof bolt plates used in coal mining operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. (for himself and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 12277. A bill to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 12278. A bill to provide that the State of Texas shall be exempt from the provisions of the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLYNT (for himself, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 12279. A bill to repeal the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. DIGGS):

H.R. 12280. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 12281. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1975, the suspension of duties on certain forms of copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12282. A bill to establish a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12283. A bill to establish a National Energy Information System, to authorize the Department of the Interior to undertake an inventory of U.S. energy resources on public lands and elsewhere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. GUYER):

H.R. 12284. A bill to permit the legislature or Governor of any State to exempt the State from daylight saving time on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ESHLEMAN, and Mr. BRADEMAS):

H.R. 12285. A bill to encourage and assist States and localities to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate means of improving the utilization and effectiveness of human services through integrated planning, management, and delivery of those services in order to achieve the objectives of personal independence and individual and family economic self-sufficiency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 12286. A bill to provide for appropriate access by the Congress to information required in connection with proceedings relating to the impeachment of the President or the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 12287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification and reform of the provisions relating to subchapter S corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax incentives to improve the economics of recycling waste paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12289. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by unmarried individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself and Mr. FUQUA):

H.R. 12290. A bill to declare a portion of the Wakulla River, Fla., as a non-navigable water of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER (for himself, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. WYMAN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 12291. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to provide for the extension thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming):

H.R. 12292. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the authority of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases in order to advance the national attack on diabetes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 12293. A bill to prohibit for a temporary period the exportation of ferrous scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Ms. CHISHOLM, Ms. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HUNGATE, and Mr. KETCHUM):

H. Res. 785. A resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the role of the oil and gas industry in contributing to the current energy crisis; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H. Res. 786. A resolution providing funds for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the second session of the 93d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

# SENATE—*Thursday, January 24, 1974*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we lift our noonday prayer to Thee for strength and wisdom sufficient for our duties, great or small, seen or unseen. Equip us that we may be Thy ministers in the service of the Nation. Keep us clean and true. Spare us from being surprised by sin or trapped by unexpected evil. Give us stout hearts to bear our own burdens, willing hearts to bear the burdens of others, and believing hearts to cast our burden upon Thee. Guide us through all the stresses and strains of our troubled times to the time of Thy coming kingdom.

We pray in the name of the great Burden Bearer. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 23, 1974, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, attended the session of the Senate today.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER WITH RESPECT TO YEA-AND-NAY VOTES TODAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no rollcall votes occur today on the unfinished business, H.R. 8214, or on any other matter prior to the hour of 2:30 p.m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes that are ordered today on any matter prior to the hour of 2:30 p.m. begin at the hour of 2:30 p.m., and that the votes, then, if more than one is indicated, occur in sequence on the basis on which they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TODAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the execution of the two orders that were entered on yesterday for the recognition of Senators GRIFFIN and ROBERT C. BYRD, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business today for not to exceed 45 minutes, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 243—ELECTION OF WILLIAM F. HILDENBRAND AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the