

Cleveland, firms to engage in international trade. In the course of this research I had a discussion with a leading member of Mayor Perk's Advisory Council on International Trade shortly before the latter left on a propaganda mission to the Far East, including Japan.

The planned sales pitch was stated simply as "Ohio, and particularly Cleveland's, people are superior human beings as evidenced by having produced John Glenn, the first American in orbit." When I somewhat incredulously asked whether this approach might not be less than useful, since interorbital feats seem hardly related to international trade and that, moreover, Asians might possibly consider this boast to contain a racial slur, I was met with a nonplussed smile and a suggestion that I could not be serious—or worse, that something might be wrong with my patriotism.

One indicator of the effectiveness of this approach emerged in an interview with Mr. T. Izuchi, of the Osaka Chamber of Commerce, who recently was quoted to have said: "For reasons unknown, we in Osaka have been less concerned with Ohio, and Cleveland in particular, in relations to trade . . . (I) had known Cleveland only because of the Cleveland Orchestra."

The essence of the interview unmistakably implied that Cleveland is being ignored as a major market for Japanese investment. I am as proud as anyone of the magnificent Cleveland Orchestra and of John Glenn's accomplishment in orbit. However, it seems rather obvious that these able musicians as well as Glenn as astronaut can do precious little to promote international trade for our industry.

I then extended my inquiry to the Ohio Department of Economic and Community Development. I received a curt reply stating that "Our office is not aware of any survey of methods encouraging northeastern Ohio firms to export their products. We recommend that you contact the executive director of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association since he may know of such a survey." Following the suggestion, I contacted the association and was successively shunted among three executives, none of whom was aware of any such research, nor for that matter the need for it.

Shortly thereafter, I received an official report on International and Interstate Commerce in Ohio. The report stated in its introductory pages that "Certain regions or states in the United States rely more heavily

on international exports than does the nation as a whole. Ohio is one of these states in that the industries basic to its economy are more export-oriented relative to the industries basic to the United States. Development in international trade agreements are therefore of considerable significance to the Ohio economy."

Having made this point, the report provides a series of statistical tables and concludes by issuing a warning against pursuing efforts. It states:

"While international exports are significant for economic development and expansion, there are some inherent drawbacks of an economy heavily relying on foreign markets. The economy is made dependent on economic conditions abroad. Changes in these conditions will affect demand from abroad and therefore the economic activity of the economy in question. The greater the concentration of industries and the higher the export-manufacture ratio, the more vulnerable is the economy to instability in comparison to the East-North Central Region and the nation as a whole."

Considering the present domestic energy crisis, this bit of conventional wisdom could, of course, be equally applicable to the domestic business of these firms. One wonders what it is which this official Ohio state department wishes to warn business against. Perhaps a cardinal reality of business has escaped its attention—that business always operates under uncertainty and that this uncertainty represents one of the major reasons for legitimizing business' pursuits of profits.

Experiences of two students enrolled in my course on international trade tend to further enhance the suspicion that the various official organizations concerned with Ohio's exports might be less than well prepared for discharging their assumed responsibilities.

One student, a senior executive of a major Cleveland firm engaged in marketing and manufacturing precision tools, wanted to gather information related to his firm's intention to extend its marketing operation to Europe's Common Market countries. His experience in contact with the relevant Cleveland and Ohio agencies evokes reminiscences of the film *Rashomon*. In describing some rather exasperating encounters with a number of senior officials of these agencies whose right of existence is to provide information services for firms such as his, he summarized by stating: "Too many

different organizations compete in advising Ohio's industry about international trade and their advice tends to be all too often mutually contradictory and, worse, inadequate for the degree of detailed knowledge of markets and products which we and other firms in our industry need to know."

The other student, a middle-level manager of an industrial firm, wanting to obtain information about market conditions related to a popular household appliance in a major Latin-American country, approached the Greater Cleveland Growth Association. He could not get beyond a receptionist who, after listening to his request, "called someone in the office who advised me that my best bet would be to consult publications in Cleveland's public library."

Desirous of improving academic offerings on international trade at Cleveland State University by stressing special area studies important to Cleveland and Ohio industries, I also contacted the Greater Cleveland Growth Association. I was given a barrage of vagaries, more or less covering the globe but lacking the specificity of their importance to the present or potential future.

These experiences, among others, give cause for concern for the usefulness of the various organizations supposed to promote Ohio and Cleveland in international trade. It is impossible to ignore the conclusion that these officials are groping blindly in a maze of fantasy assumptions, rather than working with well-developed programs based on research into successful and unsuccessful trade strategies and the needs and attitudes of potential foreign partners in trade. It was alarming to learn that no one interviewed has sought to know the reasons for lack of success. They uniformly stressed their costly efforts to "put Ohio and Cleveland on the map of international trade." Yet, none of their sales campaigns was based on anything that can remotely be called systematic research designed for a reasonable chance of success.

It is time for Ohio government and industry to decide whether they are serious about promoting international trade; and if so, to engage in the necessary market and attitudinal research based on social and behavioral concepts tested in marketing research which will arm effective officials with essential information.

It is time, in other words, for Ohio and Cleveland to fish or cut bait in the matter of capturing world markets for the abundance of its industrial and agricultural product.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 23, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.—II Timothy 4: 7.

O God, our Father, we thank Thee for Thy mercies which are new every morning, fresh every day and for this quiet moment when we may be still and know that Thou art God.

We thank Thee for the coming of another Memorial Day and for the sacred memories of valiant men and women who fought the good fight, who finished their course, and who kept the faith—all in the interest of the welfare of our country.

Give us valiant men and women today who will live and labor for peace, for justice, and for righteousness in our land and in our world. May a new spirit of

good will so come to life in our age that wars may cease, peace may come, and cooperation be established among the nations on our planet.

Grant us rest during this weekend and may we return renewed in body, mind, and spirit.

In Thy holy name 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

cated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 21, 1974, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5035. An act to amend Public Law 90-335 (82 Stat. 174) relating to the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Spokane Indian Reservation; and

H.R. 5525. An act to declare that certain mineral interests are held by the United States in trust for the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, Mont.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for greater and more effective efforts in research and public education with regard to diabetes

mellitus," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PELL, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. BEALL, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. STAFFORD, to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2893) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the national cancer program and to authorize appropriations for such program for the next 3 fiscal years," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PELL, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. BEALL, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. STAFFORD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2957) entitled "An act relating to the activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. JAVITS to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 17, 1974.

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

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 201 of Public Law 89-298, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on May 9, 1974, adopted Committee resolutions authorizing the following water resources development projects:

Port Everglades Harbor, Florida
St. Lucie Inlet, Florida
With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 22, 1974.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered and unanimously approved the following work plans for watershed projects:

PROJECT AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION
Hurricane Creek, Tennessee, 2188, 93rd Congress.
North Fork Nolin River, Kentucky, 2188, 93rd Congress.
Red Bolling Springs, Tennessee, 2188, 93rd Congress.
Upper Castleton River, Vermont, 2188, 93rd Congress.

Attached are Committee resolutions with respect to these projects.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD—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 transmit herewith the annual report on the operation of the Alaska Railroad as required by the Alaska Railroad Act of March 12, 1914.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 1974.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14354, AMENDING NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14354) to amend the National School Lunch Act, to authorize the use of certain funds to purchase agricultural commodities for distribution to schools, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, MEEDS, FORD, HAWKINS, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Messrs. BIAGGI, MAZZOLI, BADILLO, LEHMAN, ANDREWS of North Carolina, QUIE, BELL, ASHBROOK, FORSYTHE, PEYSER, STEIGER of Wisconsin, and TOWELL of Nevada.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, our Congress is a strong legislative

body, reportedly the most powerful in the world, yet it does not work well today because the committees have not been changed since 1946. It took more than a year of hard work for the Select Committee on Committees, a bipartisan group of 10 members with broad experience, to work out all the aspects of jurisdictional change required to make the Congress more efficient.

The select committee had to make many hard decisions and they were made always with an eye on the House as an institution and the way it would work. The report was unanimous although, of course, many accommodations were necessary.

The Hansen committee of the Democratic caucus which is reviewing House Resolution 988 is composed of many outspoken critics of real congressional reform, and is only a charade. Their goal is to kill congressional reform and protect their own self-interest and cozy relationship with outside groups.

TWO BILLION DOLLAR GIVEAWAY TO INDIA

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

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, recent news reports have borne out my outrage at the \$2 billion giveaway to India. No wonder they need U.S. welfare. While our money feeds their people, they have spent their money developing a nuclear bomb

Somehow, that just does not make sense. But that is not all—while this was going on, the administration has seen fit to loan \$180 million to the Soviet Union to build fertilizer plants. Now, my colleagues, when interest rates in this country are skyrocketing and we are deeply in debt, I am forced to wonder aloud, "What about us here at home?"

One, why are we loaning money to an unfriendly nation?

And, two, even a 12th grade chemistry student knows that a fertilizer plant, with a little modification, becomes a gunpowder factory.

Remember the scrap metal we sent Japan? I do, and I remember how it came back.

LOW-INTEREST GOVERNMENT LOAN TO SOVIET UNION

(Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the U.S. Export-Import Bank has approved the largest low-interest Government loan to date for American equipment sales to the Soviet Union.

How can the United States loan over \$180,000,000 at an interest rate of only 6 percent when in Virginia the prevailing interest rate is nearly double that?

On Tuesday, members of the Virginia Home Builders Association, told me that they must now pay up to 15 percent in-

terest on homebuilding loans in my State. While many hard-working Americans are finding it almost impossible to find new homes for their families because of high interest rates, we are taxing these same hard-working people to finance a \$400 million deal to supply eight ammonia fertilizer plants, chemical storage facilities, pumping stations, railroad tank cars and a 1,200-mile pipeline for the Soviet Union.

AVIATION CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1974

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12670) to amend section 301 of title 37, United States Code, relating to incentive pay, to attract and retain volunteers for aviation crewmember duties, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "inserting 'enlisted' before 'crew member'" and insert: "striking out 'a crew member' and inserting in lieu thereof 'an enlisted crew member'."

Page 2, strike out all after line 3 over to and including line 21 on page 3 and insert:

"(a) (1) Subject to regulations prescribed by the President, a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to basic pay is also entitled to aviation career incentive pay in the amount set forth in subsection (b) of this section for the frequent and regular performance of operational or proficiency flying duty required by orders.

"(2) Aviation career incentive pay shall be restricted to regular and reserve officers who hold, or are in training leading to, an aeronautical rating or designation and who engage and remain in aviation service on a career basis.

"(3) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, or the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to members under their respective jurisdiction, an officer (except a flight surgeon or other medical officer) who is entitled to basic pay, holds an aeronautical rating or designation, and is qualified for aviation service under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, is entitled to continuous monthly incentive pay in the amount set forth in subsection (b) of this section that is applicable to him. A flight surgeon or other medical officer who is entitled to basic pay, holds an aeronautical rating or designation, and is qualified for aviation service under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, is not entitled to continuous monthly incentive pay but is entitled to monthly incentive pay in the amounts set forth in subsection (b) of this section for the frequent and regular performance of operational flying duty.

"(4) To be entitled to continuous monthly incentive pay, an officer must perform the prescribed operational flying duties (including flight training but excluding proficiency flying) for 6 of the first 12, and 11 of the first 18, years of his aviation service. However, if an officer performs the prescribed operational flying duties (including flight training but excluding proficiency flying) for at least 9 but less than 11 of the first 18 years of his aviation service, he will be entitled to con-

tinuous monthly incentive pay for the first 22 years of his officer service.

"(5) If upon completion of either 12 or 18 years of aviation service it is determined that an officer has failed to perform the minimum prescribed operational flying duty requirements during the prescribed periods of time, his entitlement to continuous monthly incentive pay ceases. If at the completion of 12 years of aviation service entitlement to continuous monthly incentive pay ceases, entitlement to that pay may again commence at the completion of 18 years of aviation service upon completion of the minimum operational flying duty requirements, such pay to continue for a period of time as prescribed in accordance with this section. However, if entitlement to continuous monthly incentive pay ceases in the case of any officer at the completion of either 12 or 18 years of aviation service, such officer remains entitled to monthly incentive pay for the performance of subsequent operational or proficiency flying duties up to the maximum period of time prescribed in accordance with this section.

"(6) For the purposes of this section, the term—

Page 3, line 22, strike out "(1)" and insert "(A)".

Page 4, lines 3 and 4, strike out "training, that" and insert "training that".

Page 4, line 6, strike out "(2)" and insert "(B)".

Page 5, strike out all after the fifth line following line 18 over to and including line 3 on page 6 and insert: "For the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection, the term 'aviation service' means the service performed, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, by an officer, and the years of aviation service are computed beginning with the effective date of the initial order to perform aviation service."

Page 6, line 7, strike out "the" where it appears the second time.

Page 6, line 16, strike out "grade" and insert: "years of aviation or officer service, as appropriate."

Page 6, line 16, strike out "He" and insert: "Such member".

Page 7, line 4, strike out "have 12, or 18, years of aviation services" and insert: "have 12 or 18 years of aviation service".

Page 7, line 23, strike out "6, or less" and insert: "6 or less".

Page 8, line 15, strike out "amended" and insert: "added".

Page 8, line 17, strike out "amended" and insert: "added".

Page 8, line 19, strike out "O-7, or above," and insert: "O-7 or above".

Page 8, line 22, strike out "grade prior" and insert: "grade, as appropriate, prior".

Page 8, line 22, strike out all after "1973." over to and including line 3 on page 9.

Page 9, line 6, strike out "service," and insert: "service".

Page 9, line 9, strike out "that" and insert: "as added by this Act, that".

Page 9, line 12, strike out "title with" and insert: "title, as added by this Act, with".

Page 9, line 14, after "flying)." insert: "However, under this clause, an officer who is assigned to the pay grade O-7 on the effective date of this Act, or is promoted to the pay grade O-7 during the 36-month period following the effective date of this Act, may not receive more than \$160 per month while assigned to that grade."

Page 9, line 15, strike out "However, the" and insert: "The".

Page 9, line 15, after "officer" insert: "who is entitled to compensation under section 206 of title 37, United States Code."

Page 9, line 17, strike out "title 37, United States Code" and insert: "that title, as added by this Act".

Page 9, after line 17, insert:

"Sec. 5. A yearly report containing such

data as necessary to monitor the progress of this bill shall be made by the Department of Defense in cooperation with the Senate and House Armed Services Committees and released publicly."

Page 9, line 18, strike out "5." and insert: "6."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this action have the concurrence of the minority?

I see none of the minority members of the Committee on Armed Services on the floor.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman that this proposed action was unanimously approved by the Committee on Armed Services this morning. I was instructed to request the approval of the House so that the bill could go directly to the White House for signature and thereby avoid a conference.

The Senate has accepted the House bill almost intact. There are a series of technical amendments and two minor amendments which were added to the bill and, therefore, there is no need for a conference.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says there are two technical amendments. I know nothing about them. Will the gentleman please explain those to us?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there were, as I have said, a series of technical amendments added by the other body, all designed to conform the language of the bill to that used in title 37, United States Code. In addition, two minor substantive amendments were added which make no significant change in our bill. The first of these corrected what amounted to an error in our bill. The Senate amendment provides that brigadier generals and rear admirals, lower half, cannot receive more than \$160 a month flight pay, which is actually their present rate, under the saved-pay provisions of the bill. Our bill had provided for an increase to \$165 a month, but that was not really our intention.

The other amendment, which was added on the floor of the Senate, provides that "a yearly report containing such data as necessary to monitor the progress of this bill shall be made by the Department of Defense in cooperation with Senate and House Armed Services committees and released publicly." Our House bill contained requirements for annual reports to be made by the Department of Defense, and those reports, of course, normally would have been public anyway.

So our committee saw no objection to accepting that other Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman if there is some urgency with respect to this measure?

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly a year since this entire mat-

ter of aviation pay was raised by the action of the House in shutting off aviation pay for certain officers. This legislation is basically an incentive measure, and so if we are going to provide incentives for young men to remain in an aviation career in the armed services, we must have some legislation signed into law as soon as possible that would stabilize the situation and give our service personnel something they can count on and plan on the basis of.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the gentleman is saying that the Committee on Armed Services met this morning and, with a quorum present, approved this procedure?

Mr. STRATTON. That is absolutely correct. And that meeting included the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), I might say.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 24, 1974, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12565, APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT FOR ARMED FORCES, 1974

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight, Friday, May 24, 1974, to file a conference report on H.R. 12565, to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1974 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize construction at certain installations, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 243]

Bevill	Clay	Drinan
Blackburn	Collins, Ill.	Eckhardt
Blatnik	Conlan	Esch
Burke, Calif.	Conyers	Evans, Colo.
Camp	Daniels	Flynt
Carey, N.Y.	Dominick V.	Foley
Cederberg	Davis, Ga.	Gaydos
Chisholm	de la Garza	Goldwater
Clark	Dennis	Gray
Clawson, Del.	Diggs	Green, Oreg.

Harsha	Latta	Rhodes
Hays	McCloskey	Rodino
Eébert	Maraziti	Rooney, N.Y.
Helstoski	Mayne	Runnels
Hinshaw	Meeds	Seiberling
Hogan	Metcalfe	Shipley
Hollifield	Mollohan	Skubitz
Hutchinson	Morgan	Steiger, Wis.
Jarman	Murphy, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Johnson, Pa.	Nix	Teague
Jones, Ala.	O'Brien	Williams
Jones, Okla.	O'Hara	Wyatt
Jordan	Preyer	Young, Alaska
Kluczynski	Rallsback	Young, Ga.
Kuykendall	Reid	Zablocki

On this rollcall 359 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Monday, May 20, 1974, when roll No. 20 was taken on House Resolution 1112, the rule for the consideration of H.R. 14592, the military procurement authorization. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING A 10-YEAR DELIMITING PERIOD FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR VETERANS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the Senate bill (S. 3398) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 10-year delimiting period for the pursuit of educational programs by veterans, wives, and widows, with a Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendments, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House engrossed amendment to the text of the bill insert:

"That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the eight-year delimiting date for pursuit of educational programs under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, eligible veterans discharged or released from active duty between January 31, 1955, and September 1, 1966 (except for those veterans whose discharges are subject to the provisions of section 1662(b) of such chapter, or who are pursuing courses of farm cooperative training, apprenticeship or other training on the job, or flight training under such chapter), shall run from July 1, 1966."

Mr. Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not plan to object, I take this time to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to explain his request.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment is germane to the bill.

The Members will recall that last February the House acted favorably on a bill to provide a reasonable cost-of-living increase in the various rates of educational allowances for veterans and certain of

their dependents in training under the GI bill. That measure also increased from 8 to 10 years the period available to the trainee for his education and training.

In view of the fact that the 8-year period will expire May 31 with respect to about 300,000 veterans who were discharged prior to June 1, 1966, last week the other body passed a bill which proposed merely to authorize a 2-year extension and contained no provision for cost-of-living increases which are so vitally needed. In view of the latter factor, the House amended the bill by inserting the complete text of our originally passed education bill which included the 2-year extension as well as increased rates.

May 21, the Senate gave further consideration to this measure and has now returned it to the House with a substitute amendment which, in effect, merely extends for 30 days the present May 31 expiration date. In explanation of this temporary and emergency measure, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs assured his colleagues that the committee is currently giving high priority to a full comprehensive GI educational measure. In fact, on May 22, that committee ordered favorably reported a major education bill. Chairman HARTKE recognizes however that agreement with this body on such a measure will obviously not be reached prior to May 31. The belief was expressed however that agreement can be reached prior to the end of June. I am sure the chairman is speaking in all good faith and will take every reasonable step to assure that if the House acts on the separate temporary extension as proposed in the Senate amendment before us, that House-Senate agreement on the major bill will not be unduly postponed.

In the debate on this bill in the House May 15, there was considerable colloquy among the Members and a unanimous expression of hope that the adverse effects of the present expiration date should be avoided if at all possible.

Although the House on two previous occasions has approved a full 2-year extension, it now appears that our further objective of increased rates may be achieved in the near future and I assure the Members that your committee will make every effort toward that end. Under these circumstances, I recommend concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to S. 3398.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation and I support the gentleman in his unanimous-consent request.

This action if approved, Mr. Speaker, will put the House in agreement with the other body on a temporary 30-day extension of the 8-year period during which educational benefits must be utilized. Let me assure my colleagues that we have no intention of letting the educational entitlement of the substantial group of veterans separated between 1955 and 1966 expire.

The bill that passed the House on February 19 contains a 2-year extension of the delimiting date. Yesterday the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs

ordered reported a measure containing a 2-year extension. So Mr. Speaker, there is no disagreement over the 2-year extension.

In order that veterans whose entitlement would expire on May 31 may remain in school beyond that date while other differences in the House and Senate versions of the comprehensive bill are being reconciled, the temporary day extension authorized by the Senate amendment is necessary.

Let me make extremely clear, Mr. Speaker, my position on the comprehensive education bill. I think I also reflect the views of most of my colleagues on the committee. We are dedicated to the 2-year extension of the delimiting date. We are equally dedicated, to the expeditious approval of an increase in monthly payments to veterans, dependents, and survivors participating in the educational benefit programs. Our every action has been motivated by this consideration.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I have read with interest the remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would support his request "to bring only the 2-year extension up under suspension." I must say to the gentleman that he is in error and I categorically deny any such commitment. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I informed the gentleman from New York that I was committed to an increase in monthly educational allowances at the earliest possible date for the millions of veterans participating in GI bill education and could not in good conscience divorce this important provision from the 2-year extension. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that differences in the major bill can quickly be resolved. I urge the approval of the gentleman's request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the gentleman is reporting the bill in the manner he did in connection with this bill, but it seems entirely dilatory in nature.

The House and Senate each passed a bill containing a 2-year extension which was included in a total package of benefits. The Senate just last week passed a bill which provided a simple 2-year extension. I have had a bill with this language in the committee for some weeks now dealing with a simple 2-year extension.

We had colloquy on the 15th of May and I was assured by the Representative of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLIN TEAGUE), that the benefits for those veterans would be preserved. Now we say let us provide a 30-day extension. A 30-day extension gives veterans no real comfort or solace that their benefits will continue.

What the chairman has stated this morning is that there is some movement

at last. I am gratified for this. Perhaps it took some prodding, the type of prodding I offered; but I would like to ask the chairman several questions.

One, in the absence of substantial movement, in the absence of enactment of the legislation during the ensuing 30 days, what then will be the course of the committee?

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Well, we would extend it again for 30 days.

I would like to assure my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, that after consultation and long staff meetings with the committee, I am reasonably assured that this increase in the GI cost-of-living educational benefit will be accomplished before the expiration of the 30 days. The immediate measure before this body now, and I think it is urgent, is to adopt the 30-day extension.

Mr. BIAGGI. I would not quarrel with that if I had the confidence that both bodies will move effectively and without further delay. Each day of delay creates a sense of apprehension on the part of the veteran beneficiaries. The veterans of our Nation are concerned. They do not know, they do not have the confidence that the gentleman and I may have in this thing. All they know is that this Congress is not moving. They are waiting for some response and they are disillusioned. They have a right to be disillusioned. Since we acted in the early part of the session there has been a substantial and inordinate amount of delay in achieving further action especially with respect to do extension of veterans' education benefits. There is no reason for this. It has been suggested that if we are not successful in pursuing the objective that we desire, we will then extend it another 30 days. With this I disagree.

This piecemeal approach should be replaced by decisive action on a problem that is confronting both Houses.

I frankly do not agree with the suggestion. I would prefer to suggest that rather than another 30-day extension that we deal exclusively with a 2-year bill. I would like the chairman's comments on that.

Mr. DORN. The chairman of the committee would like to say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, that I agree with everything he has said on the floor today. It is a fact, that the other body did not act on our original proposal. The vote here was 382 to 0.

By not acting on this measure, it has cost the veterans of this country about \$50 million a month.

I can assure the gentleman that members of this committee will continue to do everything humanly possible to reach an agreement. In fact, on yesterday the committee in the other body did report a bill calling for comprehensive increases in the GI benefits. Therefore, I have reasonable assurance that action is imminent and will be taken between the two bodies on the increase in the cost-of-living rates.

I do point out again, and I agree with

the gentleman that there has been unnecessary delay over there which has cost the veteran, and we are tired of it on this side of the Capitol Building, but I say that the only alternative now is to accept this amendment and pass the 30-day extension. Then, we will immediately work on the increase, which is urgent.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, first let me compliment the gentleman from New York for his tenacity in seeing to it that this problem is brought to the floor and resolved. The problem we are faced with now is one of immediacy, and one that cannot be resolved by attempting to do anything else but pass this 30-day extension.

I would join with the gentleman in opposing a further 30-day extension, however, if the Senate does not bring in its bill. However, I have been assured by the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the other body that the committee has already passed out a bill which is substantially the same as ours, and there should be no reason for any further disagreement. Therefore, we will be able to extend to the Vietnam veterans not only the 2-year extension which is necessary for them, but as well the increased benefits to which they are entitled.

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

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as an emergency, stopgap measure, I want to plead for prompt consideration and passage today of S. 3398, a bill which will extend Vietnam veterans' education benefits for another month while the House and Senate work to compromise their differences.

This action is absolutely critical. It makes no sense to debate how to improve the benefits if we allow them to lapse.

Yet 8 days from today, on May 31, the educational benefits for 300,000 of our Nation's veterans will be terminated, and many will be forced to drop out of school.

The House in two separate votes has agreed that the eligibility period should be extended from 8 to 10 years, and has agreed that the level of benefits should be increased.

Each day we delay causes further anguish for hundreds of thousands of young men and women who have earned these benefits through service to their country.

We must extend the eligibility for another 30 days, and then move ahead rapidly to the real job of expanding and improving the GI bill to bring it closer to par with what World War II veterans received.

These veterans are not asking for special treatment—all they seek is more of the benefits a grateful Nation accorded those who served in World War II. They deserve no less. I am pacified by the temporary extension which we pass today but will not be satisfied or quieted until the full extension and just educational benefits are received by our Vietnam veterans.

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

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to this body that it is with extreme reluctance that I find that I must yield to another 30-day delay to get educational benefit payments to the veterans of our country. We passed this long ago, in February. The Senate has delayed and delayed and delayed it. It is now asking us for another 30-day delay. This has gone on too long, and our veterans, indeed, deserve a better response than that from the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the House committee for the work which it has done. Certainly, we will do everything we can to see that the veterans not only get this extension, but also get increased educational benefits at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the committee's proposal for a 30-day emergency extension of veterans' education and rehabilitation benefits. I compliment the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee (Mr. DORN) for his efforts in bringing this measure to the floor and I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) for focusing attention on the dire fiscal needs of our veterans.

While this measure is a step in the right direction, we must further address ourselves to fully correcting the deficiencies and disparities in veterans' educational benefits.

The future of more than 300,000 Vietnam veterans is in jeopardy as we consider this measure. Their GI educational benefits are due to expire next week. Unless we act swiftly many deserving veterans will be left without any benefits for education.

How are these men to know whether to enroll in school or not? How are they to know whether any additional checks will be forthcoming?

We must not allow this to happen. These men have selflessly sacrificed several years of their lives in the service of their country when they might have been normally pursuing their education and careers. While our Nation owes them a debt that can never be fully repaid, they ask only for the opportunity to make up for lost time.

As we continue to debate the attributes of longer-term legislation dealing with veterans' benefits, we must first make certain that we do not allow these benefits to lapse while we talk. Accordingly let us take these interim steps to protect these benefits which are important to so many of our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Veterans' Affairs Committee to give this measure due expeditious consideration. We can do no less for these men who have given so much.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I strongly support this emergency extension provided in the measure before us today.

I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), the chairman of the committee, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) for their leadership in trying to make sure that our Vietnam veterans are not discriminated against as some of them surely will be if their entitlement is permitted to expire at the end of this month, because Congress has failed to act.

This bill before us today is truly emergency legislation. The Senate has failed to finalize action on a bill comparable to the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974 which passed the House on February 19, 1974. Now it is essential that we approve the 30-day extension of the delimiting date so that education benefits checks will not run out for thousands of veterans at the end of this month.

I also strongly urge members of both the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees to act decisively in working out the remaining differences in veterans' education bills. Such action is urgently needed to allow veterans increases in their education benefits and a 2-year extension of the delimiting date.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I would like to join with my distinguished colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee in complimenting the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for bringing this matter up.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should understand before we leave here today, that the delay and the inaction on the part of the other body means that the veterans of the Vietnam era and those in school at the present time are going to suffer a real hardship because of this delay. I, too, am disturbed that we have to vote for a 30-day extension.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call the attention of this body to the fact that there are many, many things that have to be done with the veterans education bill. I would urge the chairman, when we return after this recess, that we get on with the important provisions that the members are working for in this committee to provide the extension of 2 years, similar to what we are doing today, but most of all, to eliminate the hardship that the veterans now face in school with respect to tuition. That is absolutely necessary if we are going to continue to give these kids the education they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the chairman—and I know he will—will bring the tuition bill to the attention of the entire House very soon.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendments was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS ACT OF 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3072), an act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans; to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for their survivors; and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House engrossed amendment insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Veterans Disability Compensation and Survivor Benefits Act of 1974".

TITLE I—VETERANS DISABILITY COMPENSATION

SEC. 101. (a) Section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking out "\$28" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$32";
 - (2) by striking out "\$51" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$59";
 - (3) by striking out "\$77" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$89";
 - (4) by striking out "\$106" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$122";
 - (5) by striking out "\$149" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$171";
 - (6) by striking out "\$179" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$211";
 - (7) by striking out "\$212" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250";
 - (8) by striking out "\$245" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$289";
 - (9) by striking out "\$275" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$325";
 - (10) by striking out "\$495" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$584";
 - (11) by striking out "\$47" and "\$616" and "\$862" in subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$52" and "\$727" and "\$1,017", respectively;
 - (12) by striking out "\$616" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$727";
 - (13) by striking out "\$678" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$800";
 - (14) by striking out "\$770" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$909";
 - (15) by striking out "\$862" in subsections (o) and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,017";
 - (16) by striking out "\$370" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$437"; and
 - (17) by striking out "\$554" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$654".
- (b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this sec-

tion, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

Sec. 102. Section 315(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking out “\$31” in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$36”;
- (2) by striking out “\$53” in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$61”;
- (3) by striking out “\$67” in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$77”;
- (4) by striking out “\$83” and “\$15” in subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$95” and “\$17”, respectively;
- (5) by striking out “\$21” in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$24”;
- (6) by striking out “\$36” in subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$41”;
- (7) by striking out “\$53” and “\$15” in subparagraph (G) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$61” and “\$17”, respectively;
- (8) by striking out “\$25” in subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$29”;
- (9) by striking out “\$48” in subparagraph (I) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$55”.

TITLE II—SURVIVORS DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION

Sec. 201. Section 411 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) Dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid to a widow, based on the pay grade of her deceased husband, at monthly rates set forth in the following table:

Pay grade	Monthly rate
E-1	\$215
E-2	221
E-3	228
E-4	241
E-5	\$248
E-6	254
E-7	266
E-8	281
E-9	294
W-1	271
W-2	282
W-3	291
W-4	307
O-1	271
O-2	281
O-3	301
O-4	318
O-5	350
O-6	394
O-7	427
O-8	467
O-9	502
O-10	\$549

“(b) If the veteran served as sergeant major of the Army, senior enlisted advisor of the Navy, chief master sergeant of the Air Force, sergeant major of the Marine Corps, or master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by sec. 402 of this title, the widow's rate shall be \$316.

“(c) If the veteran served as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, at the applicable time designated by sec. 402 of this title, the widow's rate shall be \$589.

“(d) If there is a widow with one or more children below the age of eighteen of a deceased veteran, the dependency and indemnity compensation paid monthly to the widow shall be increased by \$26 for each such child.

“(e) The monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to the widow shall be increased by \$64 if she is (1) a patient in a nursing home or (2) helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person.”

Sec. 202. Section 413 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“Whenever there is no widow of a deceased veteran entitled to dependency and indemnity compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid in equal shares to the children of the deceased veteran at the following monthly rates:

- (1) One child, \$108.
- (2) Two children, \$156.
- (3) Three children, \$201.
- (4) More than three children, \$201, plus \$40 for each child in excess of three.”

Sec. 203. (a) Subsection (a) of section 414 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out “\$55” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$64”.

(b) Subsection (b) of section 414 of such title is amended by striking out “\$92” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$108”.

(c) Subsection (c) of section 414 of such title is amended by striking out “\$47” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$55”.

Sec. 204. Section 322(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) The monthly rate of death compensation payable to a widow or dependent parent under subsection (a) of this section shall be increased by \$64 if the payee is (1) a patient in a nursing home or (2) helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person.”

Sec. 205. Section 337 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “January 31, 1955” and inserting in lieu thereof “December 31, 1946”.

Sec. 206. (a) Section 342 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out “equal” and all that follows down through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof “those specified in section 322 of this title”.

(b) Section 343 of such title is hereby repealed.

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter V of chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

“343. Conditions under which wartime rates are payable.”

Sec. 207. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall make a detailed study of claims for dependency and indemnity compensation relating to veterans, as defined in section 101(2), title 38, United States Code, who at time of death within six months prior to the date of enactment of this Act were receiving disability compensation from the Veterans' Administration based upon a rating total and permanent in nature.

(b) The report of such study shall include (1) the number of the described cases, (2) the number of cases in which the specified benefit was denied, (3) an analysis of the reasons for each such denial, (4) an analysis of any difficulty which may have been encountered by the claimant in attempting to establish that the death of the veteran concerned was connected with his or her military, naval, or air service in the Armed Forces of the United States, and (5) data regarding the current financial status of the widow, widower, children, and parents in each case of denial.

(c) The report together with such comments and recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate not more than thirty days after the beginning of the Ninety-fourth Congress.

TITLE III—PAYMENT OF BENEFITS TO PERSONS UNDER LEGAL DISABILITY

Sec. 301. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3202 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) Where it appears to the Administrator that the interest of the beneficiary would be served thereby, payment of benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration may be made directly to the

beneficiary or to a relative or some other person for the use and benefit of the beneficiary, regardless of any legal disability on the part of the beneficiary. Where, in the opinion of the Administrator, any fiduciary receiving funds on behalf of a Veterans' Administration beneficiary is acting in such a number of cases as to make it impracticable to conserve properly the estates or to supervise the persons of the beneficiaries, the Administrator may refuse to make future payments in such cases as he may deem proper.”

(b) Subsection (c) of section 3202 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the phrase “guardian, curator, conservator, or other person legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate”, following the word “any” and inserting “fiduciary or other person for the purpose of payment of benefits payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration” and by deleting the word “estates” and inserting the word “benefits”.

(c) Subsection (e) of section 3202 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the phrase “guardian, curator, conservator, or person legally vested with the care of the beneficiary or his estate”, following the words “hands of a”, and inserting in lieu thereof the words “fiduciary appointed by a State court or the Veterans' Administration” and by deleting the phrase “guardian, curator, conservator, or person legally vested with the care of the beneficiary or his estate”, following the word “such”, and inserting in lieu thereof the word “fiduciary”.

(d) Subsections (f) and (g) of section 3202 of title 38, United States Code, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 302. Subsection (a) (4) of section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) The term ‘guardian’ includes a fiduciary legally appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction or any other person who has been appointed by the Administrator under section 3202 of this title to receive payment of benefits for the use and benefit of the eligible person.”

TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATES

Sec. 401. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on May 1, 1974, except that title III shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following enactment.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not plan to object, I would like to yield to our distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ask him to give us an explanation on his request.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment is germane to the bill and the cost of the bill as amended by the Senate represents a relatively modest increase over the cost of the House-passed bill.

The basic objectives of each version of the bill are substantially identical with the exception of very slight increases in the new rates proposed by the Senate for veterans rated 10, 20, and 30 percent disabled. The balance of all disability compensation rates, the additional allowances for dependents payable to service-disabled veterans who are rated 50 percent or more disabled, and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for widows and children of deceased veterans whose deaths were from serv-

ice-connected causes are increased identically in each version.

The Senate amendment includes a new provision providing for the equalization of the rates of death compensation to the survivors of peacetime and wartime service where death occurred before January 1, 1957; thereby eliminating the distinction between the two periods of service. The Senate also proposes to authorize a study to be conducted by the VA, to be submitted to the Congress at the beginning of the 94th Congress, of applications for dependency and indemnity compensation by widows of veterans who had a disability rated total and permanent at the time of death. We have examined these two provisions and find them unobjectionable.

The Senate amendment also includes a proposal submitted by the Veterans' Administration which would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make monetary benefit payments to the beneficiary upon the determination that the interest of the beneficiary would be served thereby, notwithstanding that a fiduciary has been appointed and regardless of any legal disability on the part of the beneficiary.

Finally, the Senate amendment includes a House provision which would extend to certain cases the longstanding presumption of service-connection for wartime veterans to those veterans who served between the end of World War II, December 31, 1946, and before June 25, 1950, the beginning of the Korean conflict period.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with benefits to those groups of veterans and their survivors to whom the Nation owes its highest obligation. In view of the increasing economic problems they are all facing, I feel that this legislation is fully justified and should be enacted into law at the earliest possible date. Accordingly, I urge that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman's motion to agree to the Senate amendments to S. 3072 with House amendments thereto.

Both Houses, Mr. Speaker, previously passed this measure in slightly different form. The other body has now embraced provisions that were contained in the House bill only. The motion of the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of our committee, will put the two versions of the measure in agreement, thus clearing the bill for approval by the President.

In substance, the gentleman's motion will increase the rates of monthly compensation payable for service-connected disability in amounts ranging from a minimum 15 percent to a maximum 18 percent instead of from 10.7 to 18 percent.

It will authorize a comprehensive study by the Veterans' Administration of applications for dependency and indemnity compensation by widows of veterans who at the time of their death had a disability rated permanent and total in nature.

It will permit survivors of veterans who died prior to January 1, 1957, to receive the same rate of death compensation, whether or not the death occurred during peacetime or wartime service.

Finally, it will permit the Veterans' Administration to pay a beneficiary who is under legal disability notwithstanding the fact that a fiduciary has been appointed.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments are germane and I will support the gentleman's motion.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3072, the Veterans Disability Compensation and Survivors Benefits Act of 1974, which will increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for their survivors.

I strongly support the provisions in the bill which provide for a 15 percent increase in disability compensation benefits to veterans who are 50 percent or less disabled and an 18 percent increase to veterans who are between 60 and 100 percent disabled.

Payments to widows and orphans of veterans will be increased across-the-board by 17 percent and the allowance paid for the dependents of veterans rated as 50 percent disabled or more will be advanced by 15 percent.

The rates of compensation were last increased effective August 1, 1972, and the dependency and indemnity compensation has not been increased since January 1, 1972. When the average American wage earner can barely keep up with the current cost-of-living increases, it is almost a sure bet that a disabled veteran receiving compensation based on the same rates as on August of 1972 is barely making ends meet, if at all.

Inflation is hitting the pockets of all Americans—food costs have risen by over 20 percent within the past year, gasoline sells on an average of about 55 cents per gallon, and rents and utilities have skyrocketed—creating a severe financial squeeze for millions of Americans.

The situation is doubly serious for the veteran who has come home to a devastating economic situation, a high rate of unemployment, and inadequate compensation to insure him a decent living standard and the chance for professional advancement.

But what happens when the veteran is disabled—and cannot find employment because of severe service-connected disabilities? As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I have listened to many hours of testimony and have read many letters from disabled veterans and their dependents. Their story is not a happy one.

It is incumbent upon us to support our disabled veterans by making certain that compensation is adequate to meet with increased costs of living. We owe a

decent level of financial assistance to the hundreds of thousands of men who fought bravely in Southeast Asia. Now it is our turn to see that these men and their families and widows receive what is necessary to maintain the living standard which they expect and deserve.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the two pieces of legislation just passed by the House.

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

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF TEMPORARY LIMIT ON PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1141 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1141

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14832) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy concerning this rule. It is an open rule providing for 2 hours of general debate.

I, therefore, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri explained, this resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of debate on the bill H.R. 14832, a bill to increase the temporary debt limit.

I approve the rule and urge its adoption.

I know of no opposition to the rule. However, I would like to point out that during the hearings before the Committee on Rules the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means pointed out that the interest on our national debt in the coming fiscal year would amount to \$32 billion. As I figure it, that means during the last minute I have been speaking to you we have just spent, as a nation, approximately \$60,000.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am a little disappointed that the two gentlemen who head the congressional reformation committee did not somehow or other outlaw further debt ceilings among the other things they gave attention to. Is there some reason why you did not outlaw debt ceilings? That would have been greeted with a warm reception by some people.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I can say to the gentleman from Iowa that according to the original resolution adopted on January 30, 1973, which authorized the establishment of the Select Committee on Committees, we do not have any authority in that resolution to do what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the bill presently before us would provide yet another increase in the national debt ceiling. It would raise the temporary ceiling to \$495 billion, which is \$95 billion above the so-called permanent ceiling.

Undoubtedly it is arguable that, in view of the situation presently confronting us, such an increase offers a convenient expedient and at least a temporary palliative to permit us an immediate escape from the strictures of the legally established ceiling. All of this may be well and good for the moment.

But surely nobody would argue that it represents sound long-range policy to yield repeatedly to the siren song of debt. Surely nobody would argue that we are doing anything herein to halt the inexorable upward spiral of inflation. Surely it must be clear that continuing to increase the debt merely fans the flames of inflation.

In 1946 the permanent ceiling on the national debt was established at \$275 billion. Since that time, six adjustments have raised the permanent ceiling to \$400 billion. A large number of presumably temporary increases have permitted the greater escalation which we have experienced. All of this has been done in a time of relative prosperity when presumably we could have been making some payments on the national debt.

The history of the past 25 years should divest us of any self-delusion that any increase in the national debt ceiling can be accurately described as temporary in the commonly accepted sense of that term.

Expedient, convenient, and comfortable though it may seem, increasing the national debt is the wrong thing to do. While recognizing that such a gesture may appear quixotic to many, I must ex-

press my opposition to this practice on the ground of basic principle. I shall not vote for this bill.

THE MENACE OF INFLATION

Undoubtedly the most critical domestic problem confronting the Nation today is inflation—the rapid recent rise in the cost of living. During the first months of 1974, the Consumer Price Index was rising at an annual rate of approximately 11 percent, dipping a heavy hidden hand into the pocket of every American family.

Some among the President's Council of Economic Advisors were taking the view that, if let alone, the disease would run its course and abate. That is fine for a common cold, but no good for pneumonia—and the present rate of inflation is clearly assuming the dimensions of the latter.

Others were sticking doggedly to the discredited snake oil of higher interest rates. And that is like pouring gasoline on the flames. It simply adds an extra layer of cost to every community in the marketplace.

The average rate of interest has inched upward to almost exactly twice the level of 5 short years ago. And every time the interest rate has been allowed to rise, the cost of living has risen with it.

High interest has not discouraged people from going into debt. It has just made it almost impossible for anybody ever to get out of debt. Today a young family trying to buy a \$25,000 home must commit itself to pay out approximately \$75,000—3 times the value of the property—if it ever is to pay off the mortgage.

THE CONSEQUENCE OF DEBT

Debt itself is the common enemy, and the principal cause of inflation. Individually and collectively—in our private lives and in our governmental life—Americans have been on a credit card binge.

The effect has been to compound the pressures on prices. We are using not just the money in our pockets but money we do not yet have—next month's and next year's income—to bid up today's prices.

Private installment debt—not counting public debt—stands today at \$250 billion, 10 times the total of 20 years ago. When you add mortgage debt, the American people will shell out this year a total of \$54 billion in interest charges on delayed payments.

Is it any wonder that in many homes there is scarcely enough left over for groceries? And is it any wonder that government—which is no more than a composite reflection of the public—has come to institutionalize and expect an annual increase in the national debt?

The President last year submitted to Congress a proposed budget for fiscal 1974 which called for a \$12.7 billion deficit—in other words, for adding that much to the national debt.

Congress reduced the total outgo, principally by cutting about \$5 billion from military and foreign aid. In all, the deficit forecast has been diminished by some \$8 billion, and it now appears that we

will end the fiscal year going only some \$4.7 billion in the red.

But that is exactly \$4.7 billion too much.

Simply put, the inflationary impact of spending—both public and private—is not mainly in how much we spend. It is in how much we spend that we do not have.

If the Government were to spend \$2 billion less than it took in and apply that \$2 billion to a reduction in the national debt, as a few of us have repeatedly urged, the effect would be deflationary.

And if the general public were encouraged to pay off \$2 billion of its current \$150 billion of outstanding installment debt this year instead of adding to it, the combined effect of these two actions would predictably begin to bring prices back down.

Debt is like a narcotic. It eases the pain temporarily, but it is habit forming. As an ever bigger bite comes out for interest, it leaves less for current expenses, thus encouraging the delusive excuse that we must borrow more.

This year the Federal Government is paying \$27.8 billion in interest on the national debt. That means, of course, that you and I and the rest of the American taxpayers are paying this much this year as a penalty for having borrowed in previous years.

THE ONE WAY OUT

There is only one way to reverse this self-destructive trend. It will not be easy, because it goes against the grain of established habit. But it is, in my judgment, absolutely necessary if we are to return prices to the world of reality.

First, the Government must commit itself not only to stop creating deficits but to budget a definite amount each year as a payment on the national debt. With enactment of the budget reform act, now passed by both Houses of Congress and awaiting final action in a conference committee, Congress for the first time will have a positive vehicle by which to accomplish that objective.

This bill, which I spoke for and actively supported when it passed the House, provides for the establishment at the beginning of each Congress of a definite expenditure ceiling. If total appropriations should exceed this ceiling, each Government program would be automatically cut by the same percentage—that necessary to bring total spending back down to the established ceiling.

By simply budgeting in a specific amount for debt reduction, Congress finally would be in a position to guarantee some annual progress on this long-deferred and increasingly imperative goal.

Second, Congress also should demonstrate the firm leadership to reinstitute immediately a system of consumer credit regulations similar to those which worked quite effectively during the Korean period—requiring a minimum downpayment of perhaps 30 percent on most durable goods.

The effect of this would be to make it harder for people to get into debt, but easier to get out of debt. In the long run,

this would be enormously less costly to the average American family, and infinitely more effective as an anti-inflation device, than continuing to raise interest rates.

Third, if these two things were done, Government then would be in a position to demand, as conscious public policy, that interest rates be systematically reduced—say by one-half a percentage point every 6 months until the prime rate returns to a healthy normal level of not more than 6 percent.

Accomplishing that one objective would save the American people, at our present level of public and private indebtedness, an almost unbelievable \$24.4 billion in interest payments.

And releasing that much actual sound money back into the hands of American families—without relying upon the false stimulus of debt—would be a far more effective hedge against recession than a tax cut or further deficit spending.

Right now, we are drifting toward the double danger of both inflation and recession. Either is abhorrent enough. The coexistence of the two in the same economy would be completely intolerable.

There is a way back, I am convinced, to economic health and sanity. It is the road I have outlined above. It is not the path of soporific ease and self-delusion. It may even require some degree of sacrifice on the part of Government and public alike.

But it will be much less painful than the consequences of inaction. And those consequences could be made harsher by every month we delay.

Manifestly, inflation is our gravest immediate domestic problem. Clearly, the way to combat it is not by continuing to increase the national debt.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 330, nays 44, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—330

Abzug	Barrett	Bray
Adams	Bell	Breaux
Addabbo	Bennett	Breckinridge
Alexander	Bergland	Brooks
Anderson, Ill.	Blaggi	Broomfield
Andrews, N.C.	Blester	Brotzman
Andrews,	Bingham	Brown, Mich.
N. Dak.	Blatnik	Brown, Ohio
Annunzio	Boggs	Broyhill, N.C.
Archer	Boland	Broyhill, Va.
Arends	Bolling	Buchanan
Ashley	Bowen	Burke, Calif.
Aspin	Brademas	Burke, Fla.
Badillo	Brasco	Burleson, Tex.

Burlison, Mo.	Holt	Rangel
Burton	Holtzman	Rees
Butler	Horton	Regula
Carney, Ohio	Hosmer	Reuss
Carter	Howard	Riegler
Casey, Tex.	Huber	Rinaldo
Chamberlain	Hudnut	Roberts
Chappell	Hungate	Robinson, Va.
Clausen,	Hunt	Robison, N.Y.
Don H.	Ichord	Rodino
Cleveland	Jarman	Roe
Cochran	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers
Cohen	Johnson, Colo.	Roncallo, Wyo.
Collier	Jones, N.C.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Conable	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
Conte	Jordan	Rose
Corman	Karth	Rosenthal
Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Cronin	Kazen	Roush
Culver	Kemp	Roybal
Daniel, Dan	Ketchum	Ruppe
Daniel, Robert	King	Ruth
W., Jr.	Koch	Ryan
Daniels,	Kuykendall	St Germain
Dominick V.	Kyros	Sandman
Danielson	Landrum	Sarasin
Davis, S.C.	Lehman	Sarbanes
Davis, Wis.	Lent	Satterfield
Delaney	Litton	Schneebell
Dellenback	Long, La.	Schroeder
Dellums	Long, Md.	Sebelius
Denholm	Lott	Seiberling
Dennis	Luken	Shoup
Derwinski	McClary	Shriver
Dickinson	McCollister	Sikes
Diggs	McCormack	Sisk
Dingell	McDade	Slack
Donohue	McEwen	Smith, Iowa
Dorn	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Downing	McKay	Spence
Drinan	McKinney	Staggers
Dulski	McSpadden	Stanton,
Duncan	Macdonald	J. William
du Pont	Madden	Stanton,
Edwards, Ala.	Mahon	James V.
Edwards, Calif.	Mallary	Stark
Elberg	Mann	Steed
Erlenborn	Martin, Nebr.	Steele
Esch	Martin, N.C.	Steelman
Eshleman	Mathias, Calif.	Steiger, Ariz.
Evins, Tenn.	Mathias, Ga.	Steiger, Wis.
Fascell	Mayne	Stephens
Findley	Mazzoli	Stokes
Fish	Melcher	Stratton
Fisher	Mezvisky	Studds
Flood	Michel	Sullivan
Flowers	Milford	Symington
Foley	Mills	Talcott
Ford	Minish	Taylor, N.C.
Forsythe	Mink	Thomson, Wis.
Fountain	Minshall, Ohio	Thone
Fraser	Mitchell, N.Y.	Thornton
Frelinghuysen	Moakley	Tiernan
Frenzel	Montgomery	Towell, Nev.
Frey	Moorhead,	Traxler
Froehlich	Calif.	Treen
Fulton	Moorhead, Pa.	Udall
Fuqua	Mosher	Ullman
Gettys	Moss	Van Deerlin
Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.	Vander Jagt
Gibbons	Murphy, N.Y.	Vander Veen
Gilman	Murtha	Vanik
Gonzalez	Myers	Veysey
Goodling	Natcher	Vigorito
Grasso	Nedzi	Waggonner
Gray	Nichols	Waldie
Green, Oreg.	Obey	Walsh
Green, Pa.	O'Brien	Wampler
Grover	O'Hara	Ware
Gude	O'Neill	Whalen
Gunter	Owens	White
Guyer	Parris	Whitehurst
Haley	Passman	Whitten
Hamilton	Patten	Widnall
Hammer-	Pepper	Wiggins
schmidt	Perkins	Wilson, Bob
Hanley	Pettis	Wilson,
Hansen, Idaho	Peyster	Charles, Tex.
Hansen, Wash.	Pickle	Winn
Hawkins	Pike	Wolf
Hébert	Poage	Wylder
Hechler, W. Va.	Podell	Wyman
Heckler, Mass.	Preyer	Yates
Helms	Price, Ill.	Yatron
Henderson	Price, Tex.	Young, Ill.
Hicks	Pritchard	Young, S.C.
Hillis	Quie	Young, Tex.
Hogan	Quillen	Zion
Hollifield	Randall	Zwach

NAYS—44

Anderson,	Cotter	Maraziti
Calif.	Crane	Miller
Armstrong	Dent	Mizell
Ashbrook	Devine	Powell, Ohio
Bafalis	Gaydos	Rarick
Baker	Ginn	Rousselot
Bauman	Gross	Roy
Beard	Hanrahan	Scherle
Brinkley	Harrington	Shuster
Brown, Calif.	Harsha	Snyder
Burgener	Lagomarsino	Symms
Burke, Mass.	Landgrebe	Taylor, Mo.
Byron	Leggett	Wright
Ciancy	Lujan	Wylie
Collins, Tex.	Madigan	Young, Fla.

NOT VOTING—59

Abdnor	Hanna	Rallsback
Bevill	Hastings	Reid
Blackburn	Hays	Rhodes
Camp	Helstoski	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Hinshaw	Runnels
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Shipley
Chisholm	Johnson, Pa.	Skubitz
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Stubblefield
Clawson, Del	Jones, Okla.	Stuckey
Clay	Kluczynski	Teague
Collins, Ill.	Latta	Thompson, N.J.
Conlan	McCloskey	Williams
Conyers	Matsunaga	Wilson,
Davis, Ga.	Meeds	Charles H.,
de la Garza	Metcalfe	Calif.
Eckhardt	Mitchell, Md.	Wyatt
Evans, Colo.	Mollohan	Young, Alaska
Flynt	Morgan	Young, Ga.
Goldwater	Nelsen	Zablocki
Griffiths	Nix	
Gubser	Patman	

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Runnels.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Helstoski with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Young of Georgia.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Abdnor.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Nelsen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14832) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14832, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of June 30 the present limitation on the total outstanding public debt obligation will fall from a temporary level of \$475.7 billion to the permanent level of \$400 billion. As of June 30 next, the public debt is expected to be approximately \$474 billion.

The Treasury Department operating cash balance at that time is projected to be approximately \$6 billion.

The administration recently recommended to the Committee on Ways and Means an increase in the temporary debt limit to make a total of \$505 billion for the next fiscal year, that is through June 30, 1975. That level of limitation was desired to meet the estimated peak level of public debt expected on May 31, 1975. This estimate includes a provision for the traditional \$6 billion operating cash balance, the usual \$3 billion allowance for contingencies and an additional \$3 billion contingency allowance available if the Federal Government should find it necessary to lend to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to provide additional reserves to savings institutions in order to stimulate the housing industry, which is not progressing, as all of us know, as we want it to.

Below the peak debt level, the next two highest estimates during the course of the fiscal year occur in March and June with highs in the outstanding debt of \$501 billion and \$500 billion, respectively. Again both estimates include the \$6 billion cash balance and the contingencies.

The latest budget estimates show that the administration now expects a unified budget deficit of \$11.4 billion for the fiscal year 1975. That is the year that ends June 30 next. Now, this represents receipts of \$294 billion. It also represents outlays of \$304.5 billion.

The deficit in Federal funds is now estimated at \$20 billion. This is the figure that we use and the budget that we use in arriving at the debt limit needs. Adding to this \$20 billion the \$6 billion in contingency allowances and \$5 billion to meet peak debt needs next year, we find that the estimated need in the debt increase, according to the Treasury is \$31 billion. Adjusting this total by the differences between the debt limit and the expected yearend total accounts for the increase of debt limit requested by the administration from \$475.7 billion to \$505 billion.

The uncertainty in the present outlook has convinced the committee that the

most prudent fiscal action it can recommend now is an increase in the debt limit just enough to carry the administration through the remainder of 1974 and enough of 1975 to give it and Congress a chance to examine and act on the public debt limit again. March 31, 1975, is a reasonably early target next year, and the \$495 billion debt limit which the committee recommends provides the Treasury Department with a \$6 billion operating cash balance in addition to its estimate of its debt needs.

If in the meanwhile it should be determined that this is not enough at any earlier time, Congress will return during the first week of January 1975, and there will be ample opportunity for early action on the debt limit if that would become necessary.

Those Members who may be thinking of providing a smaller increase in the debt limit should be warned that there are dangers in carrying out such a step.

The reasons for caution are that the economy presently is experiencing a most unusual economic policy dilemma. On the one hand, the level of real output as measured by gross national product fell last quarter by 6.3 percent—in seasonally adjusted annual rates—from the last quarter of 1973. Normally, a decline in output causes a decrease in receipts and an increase in those categories of budget outlays that are associated with higher unemployment and related forms of personal economic distress.

On the other hand, prices are rising at historically high rates. The report on the economy's performance in the first quarter that was released last Friday showed revised figures for the rate of price increase, and these were raised from a 10.8 percent annual rate to an 11.5 percent annual rate. Rising prices usually are reflected in higher levels of receipts and higher outlays.

At the present time, it is very difficult to make a confident economic or budget forecast about how these economic cross-currents will act during the next 9 or 10 months. Too much interaction of these opposing forces could create considerably more economic turbulence than we have experienced recently. The increase in the debt limit that is made available in this bill is based on very cautious projections of the economic performance over the next 9 or 10 months. It is believed that a tight margin has been made available. This is an increase in the public debt limit which is stringent and makes no provision for unbudgeted spending, but, at the same time, it provides sufficient margin for reasonable management of the public debt. Any effort to slice this margin even thinner runs the risk of fiscal danger.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that when I came here as a new Member on January 3, 1939, I never would have expected to live to see the time when a budget would require \$304.5 billion of expenditures; or even when Federal revenues would reach the level of approximately \$295 billion. I think if anyone would have suggested to me that I would live to see the time when any administration would request a debt limit ceiling of \$500 billion, I certainly would not have believed it.

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, would the chairman indicate the amount of money that will be borrowed from the trust funds in order to carry on the regular functions of the Government, which is of course not counted in the unified budget deficit? What is that estimated figure for fiscal 1975? Is it about \$8½ billion?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the table before me.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may reply?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the table on page 3 of the report indicates that the amount of borrowing from the trust funds is \$8.5 billion in 1975. That is the current estimate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further? In borrowing these trust funds, as I understand it and of course as the gentleman from Arkansas understands it, they have to be repaid with interest.

Can the chairman advise the House approximately what interest rate the Federal Government pays when it borrows these unused trust funds for the purpose of carrying on the regular functions of the Government?

Mr. MILLS. It pays the average prevailing rate at the time of the borrowing.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, that translates into slightly over 7.5 percent. I would also point out to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that for 1974 the borrowing from the trust funds amounted to \$14 billion. As I indicated previously, it is expected to be somewhat lower in 1975.

Mr. MILLS. That is due to the increase in the outflow from the social security trust fund.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and the committee for their critical examination of our fiscal situation as it applies to our national debt. It is regrettable that this legislation is required but of course, we must support it because it is necessary.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's commendation, but I do not think any of us are to be commended—perhaps not condemned, but certainly not to be commended—about the way we are running our fiscal affairs. I am not criticizing my friend from Texas, but I do think all of us have to share in the blame.

Any time we take in \$294 billion in a fiscal year and then have to borrow from future generations in order to satisfy the appetite of today's citizenry—or at least what the Congress thinks that appetite is—we run a very serious risk; when we are in periods of almost full employment, as we have been in the past on many occasions, and still cannot live within our revenues; when we cannot live within what they now refer to as the

unified budget; when we spend more money than that full employment budget would require.

That is what we are doing, and we are not doing a thing in the world except jumping the rate of inflation from 6 to 12 percent. Nobody knows what it will be next year, but at the rate we are going, it would appear that will be much more next year, in my opinion, than it is this year.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman and distinguished chairman, that from the report the figures indicate that the total debt limit from 1947 to 1954 was \$275 billion, and in 1968 it was up to \$358 billion, which indicates that over a period of 20 years the debt limit increased by \$83 billion. Is that true?

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Then I would like to ask the gentleman further, is it not true that during the past 4½ years, after an \$83 billion increase in 20 years, the debt ceiling has increased in 4½ years by \$117 billion?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct.

I remember I was a member of the committee and here in Congress, of course, at the end of the war. We thought it would be possible to fix a permanent debt ceiling of \$275 billion, and perhaps we could live with that in perpetuity.

It was possible for us to live with that \$275 billion ceiling from the time we established it in 1947, I believe it was, up to 1955, which was quite a record. We have not been able to emulate that record in some time.

If the Members will look at this table that my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, referred to, on page 2, table 1, the Members will see that since that time on occasions during the same fiscal year we appeared before the House and asked to increase the debt ceiling on as many as three times.

Mr. Chairman, that is all back history. We now have the future to consider.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. If I have followed the gentleman in this matter, do I understand that the bill increases the present temporary debt limit of \$475,700,000,000 to \$495 billion, or an increase of \$19.3 billion? Is that the purpose of this bill?

Mr. MILLS. To answer the gentleman, actually the bill does increase the figure up to \$495 billion. That figure could lead to a little bit of a misunderstanding. I think my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, is the least naive of all of us in understanding the permanent debt. Does the gentleman from Iowa understand that the permanent debt is \$400 billion?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, as brilliant as he is, to explain to me what

a temporary debt is, which amounts to \$95 billion?

Mr. GROSS. That is precisely what I am trying to get at. The permanent debt is \$400 billion, and the bill provides for a temporary increase to \$495 billion. Who is kidding whom and why?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) and his constituents know, and I and my constituents in Arkansas know that we are just using words. There is no sense in saying, "Here is a temporary debt."

In practice it is a permanent debt of \$495 billion, and I wish I could tell my friend when we will begin to reduce it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wish the gentleman would tell us why the President and Congress go through this charade of considering it a temporary debt and increasing it as such.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, there are certain medicines that must be taken, but if we put a little sugar coating on them, they become more palatable. Apparently it is more palatable in this instance to refer to something as being "temporary" rather than "permanent."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills) has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman may have stated this, although I did not hear it, and I tried to follow the gentleman.

Does the gentleman think that this increase will carry the Treasury through fiscal year 1975?

Mr. MILLS. No, it will not, on the basis of the administration's estimates. If the Congress enacts the budget, just as submitted by the President and his estimates are all correct, we will have to come back before the Members next year. I am awfully sorry that my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) will not be here at that time. In any event we will have to come back before the Congress some time in February or March since the limit provided here only carries us through March 31, 1975. We will need further action to carry us through the remainder of the fiscal year which ends on June 30, 1975.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently, if we do not have the courage to vote up or down a debt increase for the foreseeable future here today?

Mr. MILLS. No. I am going into that, as to why we did not do it in the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have one more question, and then I will try not to interrupt the gentleman again.

Does the gentleman say that we will have a \$31 billion deficit at the end of the 1975 fiscal year? Did I understand the gentleman to say that?

Mr. MILLS. My own judgment is that debt requirements could be more than that.

Mr. GROSS. More than \$31 billion?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. This budget of \$304 billion—

Mr. MILLS. No, let me clarify that. I am not referring to the deficit alone, but to the combination of contingencies and cash on hand, plus the deficit which could be greater than \$31 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman use the figure, then, of \$20 billion in relation to the deficit?

Mr. MILLS. Actually we should look at the table that was referred to here in the report.

Mr. GROSS. What page is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. MILLS. The table on page 3 of the report.

If the gentleman will look at, not the January budget estimates, but the current estimate, he will notice that the Federal funds deficit, which is the deficit that affects our debt ceiling, for fiscal year 1974 is \$17.5 billion.

Now, if the gentleman will look at 1975, the current estimate there is a \$19.9 billion deficit.

However, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that historically practically all of the administration's estimates have overestimated revenue and underestimated expenditures, with the result that the revised estimates of the deficit have usually been at variance with the original estimate set forth in the budget. So I am not satisfied that the deficit, on these assumptions, is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is incomprehensible to me, I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas, that the President would send to Congress a record \$304 billion budget for the next fiscal year, with a built-in deficit of some \$9 billion, when apparently everyone who is knowledgeable concerning Federal fiscal affairs, including the gentleman from Arkansas, tells us the deficit may be double that amount, or even more.

How can this be possible and why is it continued? Why should those responsible be allowed to continue to mislead the public?

Mr. MILLS. Let me explain that. Let us look at it from the point of view of the White House. If the White House knew that we were going to have a downturn in business, do you think it would be advisable for the White House to show corporate profits would be about \$10 billion less than they were the year before? I have never known of a budget or a President or anybody at the White House who has ever accentuated the situation by spelling out specifically that there should be a business downturn.

The gentleman knows and I know that there are slackening areas within our economy. New housing starts are way under what they were last year, and they are expected to remain that way. No one I know of in the automobile industry expects us to produce and to sell here in the United States as many automobiles as we produced and sold in 1973.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I could go on and on and on and point

out danger spots. On top of all of that we know that there is this rising rate of inflation. Inflation alone has a tremendous bearing on the cost of Government. When you are spending \$300 billion and you add to it just a 1-percent increase in rate of inflation, you have added \$3 billion to the cost of your Government. Now, if prices are going up 12 percent and you predicate your budget on 5 or 6 percent, how much difference does that make?

All of these are factors that tend to throw budget estimates off, but let me point something else out to the gentleman if I may.

Mr. ULLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. An additional factor is—and I am sure my chairman would agree with me—that we made a mistake when we moved from a Federal funding budget to a unified budget concept, which is extremely deceptive. We are using the surpluses in the trust funds to deceive the American people into thinking that we have a balance in our Federal budget. However, in fact the debt relates to Federal funding and does not relate to the unified budget concept.

The President estimates that there will be a \$10 billion deficit, but he has nearly \$10 billion in there of surpluses in the trust funds that he is using to counter a much larger deficit.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman agrees with me, and that is not unusual. We should make it clear that when we are relating to total activity, including activity with the Federal Government, we should use the Federal funds budget. I do not have any quarrel with the unified budget concept if we use it properly. I very firmly believe what we should be concerned about here in the Government is what we borrow from the so-called public, from individuals and institutions. We should be less concerned about what we borrow from the trust funds, because in each instance, social security, unemployment compensation, railroad retirement, civil service, the only place they can invest those surpluses of money is in Government securities. You can look at the fact that of this total amount of debt about \$131 billion is owed to the trust funds, leaving about \$340 billion held either by the Federal Reserve or by the public.

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (Mr. MILLS) in his exchange with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) mentioned the increased amount of debt that we will probably be looking at next January, February, or March, over the planned deficit, and I would ask the gentleman from Arkansas what effect will this have on the appropriation bills that will be coming out as, for example, Health, Education, and Welfare, if that should be a half billion dollars or a billion dollars over the budget?

Mr. MILLS. I would make it quite clear,

and I think my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, has heard me say so, that this ceiling that we are establishing, we hope it will carry us into March, but it does not make any allowances whatsoever for any increase over the total budgeted amount. The Congress can shift dollars from here to there, but if the Congress adds on dollars then we will probably be back here in December asking for a further increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. MICHEL. Will the gentleman yield further?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will this have any inhibiting effect at all on the actions of the House in trying to hold these figures at the budgeted level? And will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means be willing at that time to point out to the Members of the House exactly what we are up against here by continually voting to increase the amounts in the bills that come out in our appropriation bills?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman from Illinois would not think I was just wishfully whistling in the dark, I would be glad to do it.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas has said that part of the problem in massive deficit financing at the Federal level comes in part because of borrowing from various trust funds. Is it not also true that when the Treasury has to go to these trust funds to borrow money, that the Treasury pays the current market rate of, say, 7, 8, or 9 percent, and that increases the eventual problem of funding the debt, because it is obviously at a higher level of interest charges?

Mr. MILLS. We do not pay it; all we do is roll it over. When a note comes due then we give somebody the interest and give them another note, and that person continues to hold that note, and we continue to pay interest on it.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Some day, some place, somebody is going to have to pay for it.

Mr. MILLS. When?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I suppose our children or the next generation of taxpayers. That is why the Congress is being called on to increase this debt ceiling to accommodate that factor.

Mr. MILLS. If we ever get into a depression we will have a deficit of anywhere from \$50 to \$75 billion.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Maybe this is where we ought to stop. Possibly this is the time to send out the message not to increase the deficit, whether we call it temporary or not is evading the real question. I agree with the gentleman from Arkansas that it is not temporary debt; it is permanent.

Mr. MILLS. Do not misunderstand me. It is not only our fault, it is our fault and the fault of the people downtown, together. We are at fault principally because we do not have the qualified people

to examine the budget. How many people have they got downtown?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. We do not have the guts to turn down appropriations that are over and above anticipated revenues. And if the gentleman will yield still further, what I was trying to say is that if we would not constantly increase the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations, we could curb Federal spending right here in this House, we could stop this deficit foolishness right now.

Mr. MILLS. It is a game we play, it always is, and it is not just this administration, but every administration has its own priorities, and priorities are a matter of politics.

If they do not like something, they do not include it in the budget. If they like something, they include it in the budget. Maybe they do not like something that the Congress thinks is very important. So the Congress does not take out what they have included; the Congress just adds, then, in addition, what the Congress thinks is important.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And at the end of the year we approve substantial supplemental appropriations that only add more to the same problem.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman, I am sure, knows that at this point we are facing whatever sins we may have committed in the past. Either we do what we are asked to do here today—allow the Treasury to borrow additional money to pay obligations that we have created—

Mr. ROUSSELOT. In the past.

Mr. MILLS. In the past, or the Treasury has to say we cannot pay those obligations. I, frankly, do not know what the situation would be if ever it came to the point that the Secretary of the Treasury would have to say, I cannot pay these obligations. What would happen, I do not know.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Maybe we ought to send a message today. The Congress by voting "no," could send a message to the American taxpayers that we have had enough of deficit financing. This is a good time to check it.

Mr. MILLS. No, I do not want to run that risk.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I see.

Yesterday during the debate on amendments to the military procurement authorization bill (H.R. 14592), I made the point that if the 386 Members who voted for the Budget Impoundment Control Act of 1973 last December are truly concerned about budget control, then they must demonstrate that concern now by responsible action to grasp control of budget outlays. As all the Members here today know, we are now awaiting action on the budget control measure by the conference committee.

The budget control legislation that finally comes out of conference will, hopefully, be a strong bill that will mandate overall spending limitations, and will give us the procedures necessary to control inflation. But, just because this bill has not yet come out of conference is no reason why we cannot start practicing, on our own initiative, budgetary limitations.

To date, this House has acted on only

one of the regularly scheduled appropriations bills for fiscal year 1975, and we have acted on a special appropriations bill for energy research for fiscal year 1975. We have recently been advised that the remaining appropriations bills for fiscal year 1975 will be scheduled in rapid succession in June and early July.

I believe that an increase in the debt limitation by \$19.3 billion as recommended by the Ways and Means Committee will actually encourage us to over-appropriate funds, rather than trim spending for this coming fiscal year.

Federal deficit spending is the root cause of inflation, and one of the primary reasons is that pressure is put on the Federal Reserve to finance the deficits by increasing the money supply. Figures released by the Federal Reserve Board on May 16 show that the money supply—currency plus demand deposits—has grown at a rate of 6.4 percent over the last year, but the growth over the last 6 months would annualize at a rate of 7.5 percent, and the growth over the last quarter in the money supply would annualize at a dangerously high rate of 10.7 percent.

I believe the vote on this bill gives us the opportunity to demonstrate to the Nation that we are willing to take the actions necessary to control inflation. I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting down this legislation.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the gentleman in the well, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for the forthright response to the questions which have been propounded with respect to our fiscal situation and what he anticipates it will be. Some time back we had quite a bit of debate here on the floor of the House, and we passed a Budget Control Act. I understand the Senate has done likewise, and that that legislation is in conference.

The question I should like to ask is this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. If we pass a responsible Budget Control Act and live up to it, will that in any way enable us to avoid some of this deficit spending, to which we have alluded?

Mr. MILLS. It will give us an opportunity to plan ahead of time. That is, I think, the failure of our whole situation. We do it piecemeal. We never look at the whole of it. Downtown they look at the whole of it. They submit a budget, but we look at it piecemeal, and we take it up piecemeal.

The Committee on Appropriations operates in 10 or 12 subcommittees. Of course, they come back to the full committee for final approval. There is no coordination, no effort to relate the amount that has been spent with the

amount that we in our committee think that we can raise, or that existing law raises. Certainly we need such a budget committee. I have said this publicly. I would want such a committee established. I would want, too, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to give to that committee this entire responsibility of managing the public debt and fixing the debt ceiling. Let that committee plan its rate of spending; let that committee know what revenues are coming in; let that committee fix that rate of borrowing and the ceiling on the debt. Do it on a permanent basis, and let us stay with it.

The only way in the world to stop people from spending money is to tell them we just have not any more to spend.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Will the distinguished chairman relate to the committee the discussion we had in committee concerning the issuance of the Federal debt obligations in denominations which would make it possible for the smallest saver to participate more readily in the Federal debt? At the present time the high-interest notes and bonds are selling at 8½ percent. The Treasury bills are much higher. Under present regulations, a person would have to have \$10,000 to get a high-interest yield, and it forces the general public into low interest rates, while the banks generally monopolize the higher interest field in the Federal debt.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Ohio, I think, has raised a very important matter, and I appreciate the fact that he raised it in the committee. As a result of the conversations he has had in the committee, and which others have had, the Department of the Treasury made certain commitments, and I recall we put those commitments in the report itself in order to avoid any necessity for legislation.

But let us go back to the history of it just briefly, if I may. In recent years the Treasury Department has increased the minimum denomination of its bills and notes substantially above their previous level of \$1,000. The minimum denomination in which bills have been issued in recent years is \$10,000. This step was taken in recognition of what the money market has been buying and the higher cost to the Treasury of issuing smaller bills. Recently the Treasury also issued notes—which are debts with maturities between 1 year and 7 years—in minimum denominations of \$5,000. Bonds are still issued in denominations as low as \$1,000.

The committee believes—the gentleman is largely responsible, I must say, for our decision—that the present failure to issue smaller denominations in the case of these notes works to the disadvantage of persons with modest savings. These people pay high interest rates when they borrow money but in practice are foreclosed from buying anything but long-term obligations if the shorter term debt is issued only in large denominations.

In view of the unfairness of this to individual savers of modest means, the committee has requested—we have demanded in fact—of the Treasury that it make available issues of notes and bonds in denominations of as low as \$1,000, unless of course it is convinced that this will result in a serious dislocation for the various institutions representing the savings market.

Representatives of the Treasury Department said they would follow this request of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the bill will be passed.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14832, which would increase the statutory debt ceiling from \$457.7 billion to \$495 billion from June 30 of this year through March 31 of 1975.

As pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, this proposed new ceiling is based on the estimate of the budget deficit provided by the executive branch. Some of us feel that the deficit may be even greater than that which is presently estimated, and it will be greater if the Congress follows its general pattern of authorizing and appropriating funds in excess of those requested by the executive branch.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that whenever we bring to the floor of the House a bill for an increase in the debt ceiling, that it gives each of our colleagues an opportunity to cast one big vote for economy, even though a colleague may have voted for every appropriation increase and every authorization increase throughout the year. A Member can cast that alleged vote for economy without having to be blamed for cutting any particular project, especially one in his own congressional district.

I realize, of course, Mr. Chairman, that many of our colleagues will do everything they possibly can to cut Federal expenditures, voting for reductions in authorizations and appropriations, and that they do feel sincerely that when we bring up a bill for extending the debt ceiling, it gives them one more opportunity to reduce Federal expenditures.

But that, Mr. Chairman, is somewhat like locking the stable after the horse is gone, because regardless of efforts to cut authorizations and appropriations, the funds have been authorized, and appropriated.

Some of us even have criticized the President for his efforts to cut back on expenditures by vetoing some spending bills and by considering the impoundment of some of the funds which have been appropriated.

But that is history now, Mr. Chairman. We are faced today with an accomplished fact. And the legislation before us simply will enable the Government to pay the bills that will be coming due because of our past actions.

H.R. 14832 does not create any programs, it does not authorize the expenditure of any funds, it does not appropriate any money. It merely permits the Treasury to borrow money to meet ob-

ligations which came about because we have been authorizing and appropriating in excess of our receipts.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that our colleagues resent being told they have to do something. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we really have no choice on this matter if we are going to be responsible. If we do not act favorably on this bill or one like it, we are going to have fiscal chaos after June 30 this year. The statutory limit on our borrowing authority will drop abruptly after midnight that day to its permanent ceiling of \$400 billion—which would be approximately \$75 billion less than the actual level of the debt at that time.

I do not believe I need to recite the entire litany of chaotic conditions which would prevail should the debt subject to limitation exceed the statutory ceiling, even for a brief period of time. But it might be helpful to list a few of the problems that could arise.

The Treasury would have to stop selling United States saving bonds. Securities reaching maturity could not be redeemed and would have to be redeemed with cash. The Treasury's cash balance would have to be reduced and other monetary assets and receipts from taxes would have to be used in order to redeem maturing debt securities and to pay the Government's other bills as they came due.

The Secretary of the Treasury has no authority to set priorities on meeting governmental obligations, so they would have to be met on a first-come, first-served basis. When the money ran out, bills could not be paid and our economic stability, as well as the economic credibility of the Government, would be impaired.

H.R. 14832 would resolve that looming potential crisis by increasing the temporary limit on the debt to \$495 billion through March 31 of 1975. The administration originally had asked for a limit of \$505 billion to cover the rest of the fiscal year.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe our committee could have produced a responsible bill with a tighter ceiling. The Treasury Department has estimated that the debt subject to limitation will rise to \$495 billion as of March 31, 1975, without taking into account the customary \$3 billion margin for contingencies or the additional \$3 billion allowance for Federal home loan bank borrowing.

Clearly, H.R. 14832 does not allow Treasury officials the fiscal leeway they would like, for as long a period as they would prefer. But, I do believe it gives them a debt management climate in which they can live—albeit not too comfortably—until next April. Hopefully by that time, the 94th Congress will have had an opportunity to review the debt situation and take whatever action it deems appropriate and necessary.

As my colleagues know, I have been reluctant at times in the past to support increases in the public debt ceiling. I have not opposed responsible increases, but I have opposed increases which I felt were excessive in amount or duration. I have done so in those instances because the debt limit is one tool which we

have—however crude a tool it may be—to encourage fiscal responsibility.

But I also have recognized, and have pointed out on such occasions, that the real responsibility for the public debt lies right here.

Perhaps the most effective fiscal responsibility tool of all is our ability to say "no" to programs of questionable need but of unquestioned high cost.

Fortunately, help is on the way, in the form of the budget control legislation which both Houses of the Congress have passed and which is now awaiting conference action. In the past, we have allowed our legislative budgetary procedure to be fragmented and uncoordinated. We have handled spending authority piecemeal, often bypassing the established appropriations process. We have not related the parts to the whole until it was too late to do anything about it but lament.

The new program, which I hope becomes operational soon, holds great promise. It offers us a chance to do a fiscal "about face"—but only if we exercise true restraint and let the control mechanism really work.

Not until we accept the ultimate responsibility and actually limit the money which the executive can spend, will the public debt really be under control.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, we have no other responsible course than to provide the Treasury with the borrowing latitude which it absolutely must have in order to operate efficiently.

Therefore, I urge, Mr. Chairman, that our colleagues do approve this bill today, and approve it overwhelmingly.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill to increase the public debt limit. I recognize we have a \$400 billion debt ceiling with temporary increases bringing this to \$476 billion by the end of this fiscal year. I also recognize the current level of Government spending means a bigger debt is needed to provide more money.

The problem here is not the level of the debt. The problem here is America is not just drastically increasing the debt, but increasing it to the point where the average American cannot possibly comprehend what has happened to the country's finances. If I ran my own budget on this philosophy of "borrow now, never pay back," I would become a person of absolutely no willpower. I would have no reason to train my children to be frugal because I would have no reason to say "no" to any of their requests.

Most of us have leafed through a Sears & Roebuck catalog. Just exactly how would you explain your own reactions to yourself if you knew you could just borrow to buy anything in the catalog?

If we all had unlimited borrowing capacity and never had to pay back the principal, would we then carefully consider the merits of every charity which asked us for money? If you had such an unlimited source of funds, would you competitively price all goods so you would get the best value for the least money?

This country has to wake up; this Congress has to wake up. We can no longer afford to price ourselves out of existence. We must begin to separate our money problems from politics. This bill authorizes a temporary debt increase of \$95 billion on top of the permanent \$400 billion. I appeal to my colleagues—stop for a moment and think what this really means. This means that the United States has a debt of almost half a trillion dollars. During the next fiscal year the United States will be paying an estimated \$30.5 billion in interest on this amount. This is just plain too much and this bill would be a good place to draw the line.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14832, increasing the debt limit to \$495 billion through March 31 of next year.

The task of raising the debt limit is a responsibility none of us can feel comfortable about. But, it is a responsibility we must nevertheless meet if the credit of the Federal Government is to remain intact. As I have said in the past, the time to vote for economy is when the authorization and appropriation bills come before the House, not when obligations have already been incurred pursuant to action taken by the Congress.

Hopefully, we will in the near future have new legislative tools to introduce fiscal discipline into the budgetary deliberations of Congress. Under the present procedures, we focus myopically on the parts of the budget, never looking at the different parts as a cohesive whole. The budget control bill that has now been passed by both Houses and is presently in conference will provide a mechanism for establishing the appropriate level of aggregate Federal expenditures and enable us to fit the component parts of the Federal budget into the aggregate totals.

The budget control bill may be one of the most important pieces of legislation that Congress has ever considered and the progress has been heartening. The need to promptly finish legislative work on the budget control bill is made clear by the current legislation necessitating still another increase in the statutory debt limit.

In developing this bill, the committee recognized that until the budget control bill is enacted, the debt limit provides one of the only tools for imposing some overall fiscal restraint on the administration. Admittedly, it has been a crude tool and far less effective than we would have wished, but it does have a modest salutary impact that we should preserve.

In this spirit, the committee reduced the administration's request for borrowing authority by \$10 billion and provided that the extension granted would expire on March 31, rather than go through the entire fiscal year. The projections indicate that early next year, the Treasury will be right up against the debt ceiling with a minimum cash balance and the usual contingency allowance. This is without regard to the \$3 billion of borrowing by the Federal Home Loan Bank

to support the housing market announced by the President on May 10.

In addition to limiting the administration's latitude, this bill will insure that Congress will again review the entire matter shortly after reconvening next year.

I have always felt, Mr. Chairman, that we should provide needed but not excessive increases in the debt limit required to manage the Nation's fiscal affairs in a responsible way. The amount the committee has provided is the minimum needed to avoid dislocations and disruptions in Government finances that could end up increasing our costs in the long run.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the necessity of acting responsibly on this bill and join me in its support.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill before us and in opposition to the increase in the temporary national public debt limit which it would authorize of \$495 billion until March 31, 1975. Believe it or not an increase of \$20 billion, and for only 10 months.

I have spoken in this Chamber on numerous occasions on the calamity which we invite by continually participating in the promulgation of disastrous economic policies. I have spoken of the vast increases in the national public debt—the debt borne on the shoulders of each and everyone of us, of our children, and of our grandchildren—of the issuance of more and more paper money without additional productivity to stand behind it, and of the vicious, ever-spiraling upwardly tax-and-spend-and-tax cycle which we seem to be on.

All of this is contributing to the erosion of our economic stability and to double-digit inflation which robs each of us of our purchasing power especially those least able to afford it. What's more it is a charade, this isn't temporary debt—it's permanent debt and unfair to the American people.

There is, however, another dimension to this debate on our economic condition which is seldom mentioned, yet it is at the very core of the problem. I speak of the clear failure of leadership among elected officials in Washington on this issue.

This failure of leadership on this issue is manifest, and it is corrosive to the faith in the ability of institutions requisite to maintaining economic stability.

I speak of the failure of the President and his administration to submit balanced budgets to the Congress. Of their failure to recommend to the Congress that ineffective programs be either trimmed, revamped, or eliminated. Of their failure to instruct agency heads to cut costs and to get the greatest benefits for the least costs. Of their failure to instruct the Federal Reserve Board to hold down the expansion of the money supply, a principal factor in fueling the fires of inflation. Listen to this, the President wanted to raise this limit to \$505

billion. That is right, \$505 billion and I predict they will be back in February 1975 asking for more.

I want to speak also of the failure of the Congress and its committees to hold the line on spending. Of their failure to establish a total spending ceiling at the beginning of each session beyond which they will not go and within which they will establish priorities. Of their failure to devise mechanisms to phase out program failures, to say, "No," to funding just because they have been funded before. Of their failure to enact meaningful reforms of the way in which Congress addresses itself to the Federal budget and establishing priorities. The budget control bill now languishing in conference should be our highest priority.

I speak of the failure of both the executive and the Congress to stop increasing the national public debt. The very existence before us today of a bill to increase the public debt for the seventh time in less than 4 years—an increase in that period of nearly 35 percent in the total debt outstanding—attests to this joint failure of leadership.

It is time that elected officials begin paying more attention to the next generation, instead of the next election. It is time that elected officials learn to say, "No," to the never-ending special interests who want the Federal treasury to take care of "their" problems, most often failing to look at the impact of such collective treasury drains on our economic health.

When one considers the facts—inflation projected at 10 to 14 percent for this calendar year, an increase in the debt of 35 percent in 4 years, an issuance of paper money at a rate of 7 to 10 percent—one cannot come to any conclusion other than our financial integrity may collapse and bankruptcy ensue unless leadership is shown by the President and this Congress.

The situation today is so closely analogous to the late 1920's as to be startling. I, for one, want no role in policies which invite a repeat of 1929 and all which followed. The people will most certainly hold fully accountable all those elected officials whose lack of individual courage on economic issues contributed to bringing about such a calamity.

Let us get hold of ourselves and of our economic policies. Let us start building economic strength, instead of court-judging economic disaster.

We have a chance, today, to start that process.

We can say, "No," to the increase requested in the public debt ceiling. We can say to the administration and to the Congress itself, "You must hold spending down to the level of income. It should rightly be done at the time of appropriation but we must send a message. We are tired of putting a greater burden on the people from whom all Government revenues must ultimately come."

Let us do that. We will not regret it, we must strike a blow for fiscal monetary restraint and discipline.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we are called upon to vote to increase the present temporary debt limit from \$475 billion to \$495 billion through March 31, 1975. No change is made in the permanent debt limit of \$400 billion. The President has requested an increase in the temporary debt limit to \$505 billion through June 30, 1975.

I share the views of the Ways and Means Committee that the majority of the Members of Congress are obligated to extend the debt limit to \$495 billion.

It would be utterly irresponsible for the majority of this Congress to refuse to permit this increase, since it was the same majority of this Congress that has continually been authorizing and appropriating the spending of moneys in excess of projected revenues.

In a real sense, Congress has no alternative but to provide for this increase. It is important, however, that in the debate on this bill, we review the fiscal trend of the United States as reflected in the votes of this Congress.

In 1960, our debt limit was \$295 billion. In 1965, it had risen to \$324 billion. In 1970, it had escalated to \$377 billion, and through March 30 of 1975, we will raise it to \$495 billion. During the last 10 years, the Congress has approved \$130 billion of deficit financing.

This debate also serves to call attention to the public of the deceptiveness of the term "unified budget."

In 1975, we proposed to use trust fund surpluses of \$8.5 billion to decrease a \$19.9 billion deficit. In 1974, we used \$14 billion of trust fund surpluses to decrease a \$17.5 billion deficit. The trust funds include social security, unemployment compensation, railroad retirement, and civil service retirement.

While in one sense the U.S. Treasurer is borrowing from certain "pockets" of Federal funds, in a real sense, these borrowed funds are additional "deficit" financing.

To be responsible, the Congress must stop excessive spending. Admittedly, thus far, excessive spending has not forced the United States into bankruptcy. On the other hand, what will be the consequences if Congress continues deficit spending and the rubberband finally breaks? What will happen to this country on the day the U.S. Treasurer says, "I am sorry but I cannot pay the bills that are due?"

Hopefully, the new Budget Control and Impoundment Act to be enacted will cause Congress to be fiscally responsible and set a ceiling on spending which will exceed projected income, or Congress will have the political courage to vote the necessary taxes to pay for all of the spending.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, when I was 10 years of age, my father told me: "Everything in this life is about as square as an orange. A lot of things are not on the level."

Mr. Chairman, I was attending a Ways and Means Committee meeting the other day when the administration proposal

was read, a request to increase the temporary debt ceiling from \$475 billion up to \$505 billion. It was such a shock to the committee that Members on both sides of the aisle informed the administration on the same day that if that bill came before the Congress, it would be clobbered. They were seeking to increase the debt to \$505 billion, one of the most outrageous and brazen requests ever made in the history of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, they did not need this \$505 billion, but with all the publicity in the newspapers covering other subjects, it was a nice time to come in with that request because it got very little publicity in the press throughout the country. A \$30 billion request increasing the debt ceiling?

Mr. Chairman, I remember back during the years of 1966 and 1967. If the Members take a look at page 2 in the report, they will see those areas where we used to have to come in here every 3 months to increase the debt ceiling by a few billions of dollars.

During the years of President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson, the entire debt ceiling was increased approximately \$83 billion. And during the administration of our present President, with this request, if it is granted, the debt is going to be increased \$137 billion, which means that this man at the White House is a bigger spender than those four Presidents combined in 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, this is a reckless administration, and I am shocked when I see the Members on the other side of the aisle sitting there very complacent, very complacent, and very happy with this request to increase this debt to \$495 billion.

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Yes, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that \$29 billion of the increase in this year's budget was attributable to what we voted for in this Congress to increase Federal spending. The gentleman cannot, in good conscience, lay all that blame down the street when we have been a party to this thing, having, frankly, voted for this particular increase ourselves.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. To respond to the gentleman, we spent less than the President requested. Is the gentleman trying to give the impression that the President has lost his power of veto?

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have not yielded to the gentleman. I have only a few minutes of time here, and I am not going to let a few Members here encroach upon my time too much.

My good friend over here realizes that the President has the power, and he did not exercise it. My good friend realizes that we appropriated less money than what the President requested. Now, the spending is done at the other end, and there has been no justification by the administration before the Committee on Ways and Means to increase this debt to \$495 billion.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. No, I will not yield any further.

I have a good bit to say, and—

Mr. MICHEL. The President cannot spend unless the Congress authorizes it.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. MICHEL. All right. Then the gentleman's statement belies his own argument.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the President has the power to veto, and he does not possess the courage to veto when he finds a bill down there that calls for too much spending. That is his fault.

I would like to put some of the speeches that were made previously in the RECORD. In fact, I think the gentleman who just addressed this House, if I recall correctly, attacked the raising of the debt ceiling.

My good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL)—and I love him; he and I get along well together—made some great speeches in those days. Let me tell the Members who were not here, they were "corkers." The Members should read them.

In fact, I think almost every Member on this side of the aisle who was in the House in those days came in here and insisted on fiscal responsibility and pointed out this was the only way to control spending.

This is the only vehicle we have. This is the only tool we have. I remember, even during Lyndon Johnson's days, that they came in here with an expenditures control amendment, and I tried to reduce it from \$6 billion to \$4 billion. I got "clobbered." I was able to get only 140 votes in the House to decrease the spending by \$2 billion.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will my good friend yield to me?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Yes. I am always happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it may be true that my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has caught me with my hands in the cookie jar at times. I will confess that there have been occasions when I have yielded to the temptation to vote for a little higher expenditure than that which was requested by the executive branch, perhaps to benefit the people I represent.

Will the gentleman from Massachusetts make that same confession?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I doubt it very much.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to embarrass all my friends on the Republican side and put in all the speeches they delivered in those days. Those were golden days.

I used to sit over here and admire them. There were times when I said:

There is a Member over there who will not allow a dime to be wasted. He is fighting with all the courage he possesses. He stands up here and speaks against expenditures.

What do we see today? We see the biggest flip-flop in history.

Why, this is \$495 billion. This is outrageous.

The testimony of the administration before the Committee on Ways and Means indicates that the debt did not have to go above \$491 billion. Why do we give them this cushion, and why do we give them the other \$12 billion cushion? We are not just taking a risk of \$3 billion here. There is a big, fat cushion in this bill of \$12 billion.

I will admit that I am one of the "spenders" in the House. I will admit it, that is right. I voted to support that budget control bill.

But this is the only vehicle we have now, and I say that I, just as every other Member in the House, need to have a little restraint. It is not only I, but the other 434 Members in the House need some restraint.

If the Members are honest and sincere about this, they will vote down the \$495 billion ceiling and reduce it to a sensible figure.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to bring this Government to a grinding halt. I want to be reasonable with the administration. They could very well live with a debt ceiling of \$491 billion. If they want to make it \$492 billion, all right; that will give them an additional cushion.

But \$495 billion? Why, this is outrageous. It is outrageous, and any Member of this House who votes for this \$495 billion figure should be ashamed of himself.

There is another thing I would like to remind you of. During 1972 we heard a lot about tax reform. Where are the tax reformers today? Take a look. Where are they? The seats are empty. You do not hear them; they are not around. They are not going to vote, they said, for any debt ceiling bill until a reform bill is passed through this House and signed into law. Today the Chamber is silent. We do not hear anything about tax reform. Where are these reformers who were galloping throughout the country speaking on the campuses of our universities and saying that they would not let this or that happen until a tax reform bill is passed? They are among the missing today.

I say to you that is why I always paid attention to my father when I was 10 years of age when he said that in this life everything is as square as an orange.

I am telling you, putting this bill through for \$495 billion is only giving an incentive an encouragement to those in the executive branch to spend money that they do not have to spend.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would you describe in a little greater detail this \$12 billion cushion that you say is in this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. If you take a look at page 2—

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Did I hear the gentleman correctly? A \$12 billion cushion?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Yes, \$12 billion. On page 2 of the report it says:

The Under Secretary of the Treasury in his recent testimony indicated that he expected the outstanding debt on March 31, 1975, to be \$501 billion, given a \$6 billion cash balance, a \$3 billion margin for contingencies and an additional \$3 billion allowance for contingencies for possible additional borrowing for the Home Loan Bank Board.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So the gentleman is saying on the basis of the committee report, in his opinion, there is roughly a \$12 billion cushion in this bill?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. If they borrow \$3 billion from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the honesty of the gentleman in bringing that important point out. In other words we could properly vote this bill down.

Mr. MILLS. I hesitate to ask the gentleman to interrupt his very factual statement, but will he yield to me?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I am happy to yield to my good and close friend.

Mr. MILLS. It should be borne in mind when we talk about a \$12 billion cushion we are talking about the administration's estimated level of \$501 billion on March 31, 1975, and not the \$495 billion we provide in this bill.

Mr. PATTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. PATTEN. How much increase is the interest on the Federal debt currently?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. According to the testimony of our distinguished chairman, I believe they expect to pay \$32 billion in interest rates next year, and if that takes place and goes on 10 years more, there will be \$300 billion added on in the next decade.

Mr. PATTEN. We know the Federal Reserve is buying surplus dollars so that they will not be floating around so that they can maintain the 11-percent prime bank interest rate.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Well, the Federal Reserve is doing a lot of unusual things today, like the Federal Government.

Mr. PATTEN. The biggest cause of inflation is the raising of the interest rate.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

Mr. LANDGREBE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to speak against just this bill. I am here to speak against a philosophy that has been running rampant through our country for the last 40 years or so.

I would ask the members of the committee to turn to page 12 of the report and take a quick look at the debt limitations as they stood in 1936 compared with 1974. With just a little bit of arithmetic—and I do not want to boggle your minds with any more figures, because you have had too much already—you can see that it took 162 years to arrive at a national debt of \$36 billion. That included the First World War, the Civil War, the Mexican War, the Cuban War, and a war on everything else. So in 162

years we arrived at a national debt of \$36 billion.

Now, during the good old Roosevelt days it was discovered that we had a pretty good inheritance from our forefathers who cut down the forests, tilled the soil and built the factories—those people who could not even read or write but they could pay their own way.

And with that new theory of borrow, spend, and elect—and reelect—we have continued that irresponsible practice through peace time and war.

Now, I must plead with you, my colleagues, to realize that we were spending \$34 billion a year on the Vietnam war, that war is over, however, we are still spending slightly over one bill to help those people to hold the fort. But that \$30 billion has all evaporated into these new social programs and Federal agencies that we have developed, programs to train people and to reimburse many able-bodied people for not working when there are jobs in the marketplace waiting for a willing hand. Thousands of those jobs are waiting today.

This country has never had the prosperity it has today, never, never, never, and certainly not in peace time.

There have been some very generous statements made here that we are all to blame for it, and that the President is also to blame. The President's real problem started when he vetoed some big spending bills and began impounding funds hoping to cool our devastating inflation. Many of us hungry boys started worrying about losing those funds and perhaps a few votes and we began to pick on the President—of course, no one suggested impeaching President Nixon for bringing the boys home from the war.

Now we have spent many millions of dollars to bring charges against him for impeachment when we ourselves have not the guts to vote down any big spending bill.

And in the little, old District of Columbia bill through which we gave them their freedom, and they accepted it very graciously and why not, with a \$106 million annual gift from Uncle Sam on top of what we have already given them. You can hardly blame them for taking it, that extra payment of only \$106 million represents approximately the total annual receipts from 106 truck lines such as mine. Just what we are doling out to these people. They have got 45,000 people on their city payroll already.

Is it not about time that this Congress reversed the thinking of those Harvard eggheads, or whatever it was that got this Nation started on this deficit spending binge and return some fiscal restraints and responsibility to this country?

I did not have an opportunity to go to college, so I did not get to study under any of these great economists. The old-fashioned, tight-fisted real estate operator that I worked for during the depression, and incidentally, he always managed to make a couple of bucks during that depression, and always paid me what he agreed to—preached and preached to me, "always stay on good terms with your billfold."

I came to this Congress with two major concerns in mind. One was to get the

war over, and with an honorable settlement, if at all possible, and as soon as possible. The other was to stop this practice that we have been engaging in and which is the greatest threat to the security of this country, the practice of deficit spending. The interest on the national debt has doubled since what seems like only yesterday when I came here, and after 5 years I am only a freshman Member in comparison to those people with 40 years of service, increasing from \$14.6 billion to \$29.1 billion. Unless this Congress accepts its responsibility soon the interest on our national debt, one decade from now will be \$100 billion, with an annual interest rate somewhere between 15 to 20 percent. Unfortunately there is no indication that we desire nor intend to change our habits one iota. Every bill must be inflated, every bill must be escalated by millions and billions. Yes, including the cancer bill. What did we do with the vocational rehabilitation bill this week? We put it back in the form, or worse form, it was when the President vetoed it, and gave us a substitute, stripped out \$1 billion and ended up with better care for our crippled and handicapped people, but you great statesmen would not listen to me on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. We put that bill back in its original form that it was when the President vetoed it; in fact, it is worse than the original bill—which means we put back in another billion dollars worth of worthless bureaucracy. Of course, nobody in this Congress dare vote against a vocational rehabilitation bill in an election year, except, and I say with humility, yours truly.

This is just an example of the silly things that we do here, day by day.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with the Members of this House to accept their responsibility even in spite of the fact that they receive a lot of mail. Almost the entire education establishment of our country is sold on the idea of borrowing and spending. They become angry at me. They ask me for more millions, but I say to them: Where are we going to get it?

Of course, they used to say, Well, take it out of the military.

Should we just end our military? We have reduced the expenditure of the Vietnam war by over \$30 billion, we are pouring into social legislation, education, and health programs, yet we cannot satisfy them. They always demand more and more and more. We are going to have to start doing a little educating ourselves, because we have taken oaths to protect this country—every one of us, the President included. We have taken oaths to protect this country from enemies from without and within. This deficit spending cancer is the greatest threat to the freedom of this country and the future of this country. We are headed for absolute chaos if we do not take the reins in our hands, put our feet on the brakes, and get back to respon-

sibility in legislating in these Congressional Halls.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to set the record straight on what we are doing here with respect to increasing the debt and the amount of contingencies that we are talking about. There is some misconception that we are talking about \$12 billion of contingencies which, of course, is not true. We have a budget sent up by the President that calls for a \$20 billion Federal funds deficit. We have a present debt of close to \$475 billion, and with a \$20 billion deficit, that brings it to \$495 billion, with no contingencies. So the figure of \$495 billion is the actual increase in indebtedness from the present debt with no contingencies involved.

The President asked for a debt ceiling large enough to allow a \$6 billion cash balance and \$6 billion for contingencies, including a normal contingency and a housing contingency. We disallowed him those \$6 billion in contingency borrowing power. For that reason I think it would be very unwise for this body to lower the amount that we have requested, unless we anticipate the possibility of coming back before the end of the year. I do not think anybody in this body wants to do that.

Let me change my focus just briefly to say that the debt ceiling is not a meaningful control device. We all know that. But it is the only opportunity that we have to stop, look, and listen, to analyze the budget, to analyze our spending and our deficit position so that we can, in fact, implement policies to shift gears. What we are seeing today is a Nation in trouble. We have talked about it time after time in years past. I have heard the oratory of my friend, the gentleman over here, when we had Democratic administrations, and that is understandable. Sometimes we do a little bit of that ourselves, but on this particular subject, not so often.

The Nation has never in its long history faced the dilemma it faces today. Here we are at about a 12 percent prime interest rate, an inflation rate that runs from 10 to 12 percent, and with no hope of turning it around. We have invented a new procedure under this administration where we can go into a recession and still come out of it with increased inflation, and that is what we are seeing today.

And in addition to that we have built-in inflationary factors that are totally uncontrollable at this point. We see an inevitable increase in the price of raw products, in commodities, and in metals. It is here, and there is nothing we can do about it.

I see nothing in the national picture to turn this high inflation around. We are relying almost exclusively on monetary policy to do it. This is a trap we have been in in the past. Here we are with interest rates at 12 percent, with our whole fiscal establishment in disarray. Our institutions are in trouble, because whenever the Government pays 9 percent, as it has been doing, for 6 months bills, how do we expect people to put money in other

institutions? How do we expect the money to go into housing? Presently in my area people are paying 9 percent or more for mortgages with prospects for interest rates going only higher.

The one bright spot in this whole horizon is the fact that this House has acted responsibly in passing a budget control bill. The other body has also passed it. I call upon the conferees for both the House and the Senate to move as expeditiously as they possibly can to put the two bills together and bring us back a final bill so that we can enact it into law and start establishing the procedures and start establishing the staff to implement the procedures so that by next year we can have a new tool and a new mechanism built into the procedures of the House so that we can face up to this problem of budgeting. I have been concerned as to the time it is taking the conferees to get ready for this conference. I think it is time to get ahead with the job.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman in the well, who was instrumental in development of the legislative budget control mechanism. One of the finest things this House has done in many, many years was done through the leadership of the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania who was also a member of that committee and who worked so diligently on it, but I want to say that will be meaningless unless we get it enacted. It is going to be tough to put the staff together and get this worked into the operations of the House. It is something every Member of the House is going to have to work on to make it effective, but in the whole gamut of public affairs this I think is the brightest hope we have of recapturing here in the Congress the power of the purse, and this is where the Constitution intended it to be, so that for the first time in our long history we will have procedures where we will annualize our budget and look at the whole package and fit everything together and establish our own priorities.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in commending the gentleman in the well for his leadership on the important budget control bill. I support the remarks of the gentleman but I want to point out, and I do not want to differ with my friend, that if we are going to do anything before that control of the budget takes effect, until that day, we will just be spinning our wheels around.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that again we have no alternative but to vote this bill out. This is a minimum that the country can get by on for the period of time that we are covering in the bill.

I am urging all of my colleagues to move in full support of establishing this congressional budget which, as I said, is the one bright hope that we have.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) who preceded me in the well here for making the point that this debt ceiling legislation certainly is no means for controlling Federal spending. It is not the mechanism at all. It does simply raise the caution flag from time to time as to where we are headed.

It does offer a great opportunity for Members to decry spending, deficit financing, borrowing, and interest rates. For some it is a field day.

Normally I would not take the floor, because I think the able members of the Committee on Ways and Means are capable of presenting all sides of their case. They have had difficult times in every administration in making their case; but when a Member gets carried away, as did my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, a few moments ago, I am compelled to ask him, for example, which one of the 13 general appropriation bills in this last Congress has the gentleman opposed and voted against?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. If the gentleman wants to look at the record, he will see where I voted for cuts and if he examines my record in the 16 years I have been in the Congress, he will see that I have voted for cuts totaling over \$30 billion. I am not going to take the time now to look through the record and cite them; but I will be happy to get them dug up by one of my legislative staff members to show my good friend and the Members for their edification.

I am merely saying here that I wish the gentleman that is giving this talk here today had said the same things back in 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968.

I think if he examines the record he will find that his speeches were different than they are today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman is not referring to this Member on the strength of the voting record I have in this House. What I am saying is the gentleman from Massachusetts has not voted against one general appropriation bill in the last Congress and when new authorizations of \$29 billion—most of which he supported—is added on how can he stand here in good conscience and say he is going to default the payments on those obligations for which he voted appropriations?

Now, he just cannot do that in good conscience. I have prided myself as being a fiscal conservative in this House. The record is here to speak for itself and most Members will attest to it. How many times have I taken the well to

speak against amendments increasing our appropriation bills—and on some very popular items in the fields of health, education, agriculture, and the environment.

I have taken a great deal of heat, but what wrangles me most is that those of us who have consistently supported lower figures on appropriations are the same ones who have to cast the responsible vote to raise the debt ceiling lest the Government default on its obligations.

It should be the other way around but as I said its a great day for demagoguery.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, surely.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows, he is one of the most experienced Congressmen we have here—

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is very kind; I appreciate his comments.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows I have voted for cut after cut. I have been in here on teller votes and standing votes and rollcall votes voting for one cut after the other; but if he thinks I am going to go along and vote for a bandwagon when it carries a price tag like this, that I am going to be one of those dogs barking at shadows, he does not understand legislation.

I have always voted for cuts where I felt they were right and I will continue to do so.

I admit I voted for some spending bills; but I say this. I need restraints like everybody else and this is what this debt ceiling can do. If we can hold it down, it will restrain all of us; not only the gentleman from Massachusetts, JIM BURKE, but the gentleman from Virginia, JOEL BROYHILL, and a few other spenders around here.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I am sure we could probably find in the record a matching vote to increase for every one of those votes to reduce spending, too.

Of course, the gentleman is going to have a good opportunity next month, particularly when all but three of these general appropriation bills will be on the floor of this House.

The gentleman well knows the pressures that are brought to bear on the Members from around the country, the special interest groups that will make their appeal for increases of what they think is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for his indulgence.

I simply rose to make the point that this is a good field day for making all kinds of wild claims; but I commend the members of the Committee on Ways and Means for taking on the tough task as they have to do every 6 months or so.

My additional concern here is with respect to the temporary nature of the raise of the ceiling as against permanent increase. This temporary mechanism is used, particularly over in the other body, to attach extraneous pieces of legisla-

tion. Then the debt ceiling bill is held hostage, more or less, to foisting upon the Congress some piece of legislation which frankly, if the majority were given an opportunity for full debate, would not take. For that reason, I would therefore prefer our taking the permanent route rather than the temporary one.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would stop getting lost in the wheat fields and wheat deals and a few of those other things, we might be able to discuss this debt.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, I have not been straying from the subject of the debate here, but if the gentleman would like to take a waltz through the wheat fields, as he suggests I have been doing, let me take the occasion to set a few facts straight with respect to some of the erroneous information being peddled these days about the terms of that Soviet wheat sale. Most of this sale was for cash dollars paid directly to our independent grain dealers on the dealers' terms, and I should add that any subsidy involved was provided for in authorizing legislation by this Congress.

The balance of the sale that was not paid in cash was sold through a letter-of-credit system backed by U.S. banks under which our Commodity Credit Corporation charges the Soviets the going rate of interest on the balance due, and the last time I checked in April, that was at 9½ percent, with the payments being up-to-date.

This was a big sale, but not nearly so large as our regular agricultural sales to other countries. During the same 1972-73 period, when this sale was made, our farm exports to Japan were double the value of our exports to Russia, and our farm exports to the European community were three times the value of our exports to Russia. Altogether in 1972-73 we sold some \$13 billion worth of farm products overseas, and the U.S.S.R. took \$1.2 billion of it.

So, not only did we treat the Soviet Union like any other customer for U.S. goods, selling to them on terms favorable to us, but we also were able to use the dollars generated from that sale and from our other farm exports to offset a very serious U.S. trade deficit in nonagricultural items. We had an agricultural trade surplus of \$9.3 billion that wiped out a deficit of \$7.6 billion in nonagricultural trade, and had it not been for this, we might very well be faced here today with an even higher request for the debt ceiling.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote "yea" today on H.R. 14832 to provide another "temporary" increase in the public debt limit, this time to \$495 billion. I will cast this vote reluctantly, but I will vote "yea," because I think it is the only responsible thing to do. As I see it, we really have no choice. The Treasury must have this authority for additional borrowing to pay debts which the Federal Government has already incurred and made binding commitments to pay.

But before I cast my vote, I want to register once again my strong objections to the kind of deficit spending practices which are the real culprits and which have put us in this position of being virtually forced to pass this legislation.

The word "temporary" is beginning to have a tinge of irony to it when it is attached to "increase in the public debt." Since the last increase in the permanent debt ceiling, which was to \$400 billion in 1971, Congress has had to enact temporary increases in the debt ceiling six different times. Including today's bill, it will be seven "temporary" increases in 3 years, with the ceiling going higher and higher each time as Federal spending continues to escalate.

This trend must be reversed by Congress developing long overdue sound and effective budget controls and then proceeding to cut excessive Federal Government spending. Unless we succeed in that goal, our problem is going to grow progressively worse.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. MALLARY).

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time. I fully recognize the necessity of extending the debt limit. We have to do it in some form.

My distress at this particular time is caused by the fact that we are again raising the temporary debt limit rather than the permanent debt limit. Presumably, the original purpose of providing a limitation on issuable Federal debt was in order to provide some sort of limitation upon total spending. This is certainly no longer a meaningful way of limitation.

I am delighted that we are moving ahead with the legislative processes leading to a budget control and anti-impoundment act. I hope we will pass it in the near future.

The temporary debt has risen since 1969 when it was \$7 billion compared to the present recommended \$95 billion temporary debt. The word "temporary," as has been pointed out, is clearly fictitious.

The gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Oregon have clearly pointed out that we have no choice but to raise the debt limit. They say it is not responsible to do anything other than to vote for this bill because otherwise the Government cannot pay its bills and will collapse fiscally. I think we should ask the question: Why are we asking for a temporary debt limit increase at this time? Why are we not asking for a permanent debt limit increase?

I find there are three reasons. First, a temporary debt limit increase does not provide meaningful control of expenditures. The second reason, of course, is that this bill provides a vehicle for non-germane amendments being offered in the other body. As the gentleman from Illinois clearly pointed out, we are annually or periodically held hostage with this bill and asked to accept non-germane amendments coming back from the Senate. We are told at the last minute that we have no choice but to accept them or permit Government to stop. I remind

the Members that probably by June 30 we will be dealing with some kind of nongermane amendments attached to this bill and we will all beat our breasts about this undesirable procedure before we pass them.

The third reason the debt limit remains partly temporary is that this provides a veto-proof bill for additional amendments to be offered. The gentleman from Arkansas said that we continue to have a temporary rather than permanent debt limit increase because it is sugar coating for a bitter pill. I would suggest to the Members that there are rather more serious reasons why we do not change it to a permanent limit. Last year, when we dealt with this matter, I attempted to make the limit permanent with an amendment. I had very little visible support for that particular amendment.

I am personally prepared to vote responsibly for an increase in the debt ceiling when it becomes necessary to keep the Government functioning. I do not however, feel it is responsible for us to continue the fiction of temporary debt limit and provide this legislation as an opportunity for legislative blackmail on a regular basis. Therefore, this time I intend to vote no on the bill in the hope that if it fails, the committee will come back with permanent debt limit increase and not this temporary bill.

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

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman on the statement he has made. I think he has greatly crystallized one of the most important problems we have. We will be more responsible in running up this huge debt time after time, year after year. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman has made.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, to close the debate, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN).

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I did want to call to the committee's attention the speed with which we have gone into debt. My colleague, Mr. LANDGREBE, has done that in part, but I thought the Members might like to look at the deficits in the Federal funds budgets since the end of World War II. Remember that is the Federal spending which affects the debt. Social security and other trust funds are not included in the Federal funds budget.

Looking just at the Federal funds budgets after World War II, first for fiscal year 1947 through fiscal year 1969, that total deficit was \$109 billion. That was during all of the reconstruction and foreign aid programs following World War II, the Korean war, and much of the war in Vietnam. Twenty-three years—\$109 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the budgets from 1970 through 1974, or the Nixon budgets, have had a total deficit of \$114.6 billion. Five years—\$114.6 billion. We are going into debt much more rapidly under this ad-

ministration than under the four previous ones.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL, who serves on the Committee on Appropriations, was chastising us about expenditures and how we increase the President's budget.

Again, pointing out that the appropriations are the principal expenditures that control the debt, we have decreased every year the appropriations requested by the President.

The Appropriations Committee staff has just given me the following report on how substantial those cuts have been:

<i>Reductions in appropriation bills</i>	
(Does not include the 2d Suppl. 1974 in conference)	
Fiscal year 1974.....	-\$3,020,236,266
Fiscal year 1973.....	-5,564,865,284
Fiscal year 1972.....	-2,211,242,087
Fiscal year 1971.....	-2,617,098,137
Fiscal year 1970.....	-8,216,572,287

It is true that we have spent more money than the President wanted us to out of the trust funds, but that had nothing to do with the debt ceiling and with the budget deficits. That merely decreased the amount the President can borrow from those trust funds.

Mr. Chairman, I have hopes that the new Budget Control Committee will be able to reduce those deficits. I would hope that we get some recommendations from the executive branch in their budget—that would help us in that respect.

I suggest to the Members that there is an additional way to reduce budget deficits and that is to tax ourselves more. I tell the Members sincerely, I believe we must do that.

First of all, as we know, every expenditure has the support of the majority of this House. It is true that different Members among us vote against different kinds of spending. My economy record went up by over \$1 billion yesterday because I voted for several of the amendments that would have cut that much from the defense budget. But, of course, I was on the losing side every time.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the next time we have an education appropriations bill before this Committee, some of my colleagues who were on the winning side yesterday will be casting their economy votes. I hope and expect it will be their turn to lose.

I might point out, while I am on the Federal aid to education, that President Nixon has threatened to veto this year's bill unless the Congress joins him in his effort to deny American schoolchildren their constitutional right. What a foolish way to save money. What a tragic way to exercise Presidential leadership.

As to the status of our tax system, it is a fact that there are substantial amounts of income in this country that go untaxed. If we tax them, we will increase this Nation's revenue, and we will be able to more nearly balance the budget. I suggest to you that there, in part, lies the answer to the problem.

We ought to cut spending. For instance, revenue sharing. After hearing the siren call from the mayors at home,

we added between \$5 billion and \$6 billion a year to our deficit spending. That is unfortunate.

But we have critical, unmet public needs in this Nation. We are polluting our waters; we are polluting our air; we have no public transportation system in our urban areas. All of these things and more are going to require expenditures of money.

Certainly, we ought to shift our priorities. But I doubt that we are spending more money than we ought to, and I am certain we will not cut spending significantly. I hope we can be honest with ourselves and with our constituents and tell them we must have more revenue. I believe they will agree with that when and if they believe that our priorities are reasonable and in the public interest and that our tax system is fair.

They do not believe that our tax system is fair now and they are right. If people can have \$100,000 or \$200,000 or \$300,000 a year in income and escape Federal taxation, that is not fair. It is not fair to the people who make \$10,000 a year and pay \$1,600 of it in Federal income and social security taxes.

The Ways and Means Committee is now grappling with tax reform. I hope that out of that bill we can find greater equity among the taxpayers. I hope we can give some relief to the taxpayers who are living on the borderline of poverty. I hope we can tax everybody fairly and at the same time get enough money to meet the reasonable needs of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, in the face of our present fiscal condition, passage of this debt ceiling increase is essential. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, today we will vote for an extension and increase in our national debt limit. Despite the fact that the committee reduced the requested ceiling from \$505 billion to \$495 billion, our national debt is now a half a trillion.

If one writes a trillion, it takes 12 zeroes. One half a trillion is only a little less than half our GNP. The interest on that amount in one year is \$32 billion.

This Congress has been totally unwilling to match its spending appetite with its income, or with its willingness to raise revenue. Even in good years—and this is not one of our best years—we spend more than we raise.

The lesson is clear. Congress must now use the fiscal tools it possesses, but refuses to employ, to help in the fight against inflation. Fiscal responsibility cannot do the job alone, but it will surely help. Now we have abandoned the inflation fight, and left the Federal Reserve to fight alone. The Federal cannot do it alone.

When the Treasury sells its obligations, it has to outbid other obligations to raise the money necessary to pay our bills. Its operations simply force up the cost of interest even further.

But, since we have danced, we have to pay the piper. I must reluctantly support the debt increase, even though my

support of appropriations reductions shows I favor less spending. I believe the only responsible course is to vote for this increase. It is not wholly responsible to vote for all the spending that caused it.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, once again, I must rise in opposition to increasing the public debt. The Congress shows no fiscal responsibility by continuing to authorize these supposedly temporary increases—temporary increases that over the years become permanent. They are inflationary, reckless, and a hoax on the taxpaying public.

Every American attempts to keep his budget in line. This does not preclude borrowing, but it does preclude amassing more and more debt, year after year. How can we expect each and every American to be fiscally responsible if his Government is hell-bent on running up a debt obligation of almost a half trillion dollars?

This body needs a bit more fiscal fortitude. Now is the time to say "no" to the administration's request for additional increases in the public debt. Unless we stop this continued escalation there will be no incentive to the administration to balance its budget and perhaps even obtain a small surplus. Ah yes, a surplus. What a pleasant sounding word. In this year of shortages, it would be nice to have a surplus somewhere and I can think of no better place than in the Federal budget.

Over the years, I have advocated that the Congress put a ceiling on appropriations at least equal to the amount of revenues expected for a particular fiscal year. Then all appropriations should be kept within that ceiling. This would permit a stabilization of the public debt and an eventual reduction.

Congress, however, is more content to criticize the administration for its budget deficits, while it continues to appropriate more money than we have tax dollars necessitating periodic increases in the debt limit authorization.

This year, 1974, we are experiencing one of the worst levels of inflation known in this country. Interest rates are at an all-time high. Food, fuel, housing, and other basic items for living are costing more than ever. There is inflation fever rampant in the country. People and businesses are into the "buy now" syndrome fearing that if they wait until next month or next year the price of the product they want will be even higher. All this is fueling a price spiral that shows no sign of abating.

If we continue to escalate the public debt, the only alternative will be to raise taxes. The public is already overburdened with taxes, paying a third of their income to Federal, State, and local governments and getting less services for their money.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to start breaking the runaway inflation of 1974. Let us restore some semblance of fiscal responsibility to the Federal budget. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this bill and holding the line on further escalation of the public debt. I, for one, will not be

a party to bankrupting the Federal Treasury.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if we ever hope to get a handle on the skyrocketing inflation and to curb the ever-increasing cost of living, we must control Federal spending.

But, instead, the Government continues to spend more money than it receives in taxes, thus creating a debt currently totaling more than \$475 billion.

And now the administration is asking us to go even further in debt and permit them to increase this debt level to \$505 billion. To pay for the interest alone on the current debt, the taxpayer is being asked to chip in \$31.5 billion this year.

In other words, due to a wreckless fiscal policy that has let spending get out of hand, about 10 cents of every tax dollar is being used to pay off the interest on this nearly half trillion dollar debt. In addition, the inflation caused by this scheme is robbing each and every person of an ever-increasing portion of their paycheck.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of 1968, our Federal debt was \$350.7 billion, and now 5½ years later, after the debt has been increased already by \$124.3 billion, the administration is requesting permission to borrow another \$30 billion. This would represent a total increase of 44 percent since 1968.

At this point, I would like to insert a chart which shows the kind of spending spree the Federal Government is on and how we got in this situation:

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year:	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus/deficit
1969	\$187.8	\$184.5	+\$3.2
1970	193.7	196.6	-2.8
1971	188.4	211.4	-23.0
1972	208.6	231.9	-23.2
1973	232.2	245.5	-14.3
1974	270.0	274.7	-4.7
1975 (estimate)	294.0	305.4	-11.4

Now, Mr. Chairman, this chart makes the situation look better than it actually is, because under "receipts" we consider those moneys collected in trust funds, such as the social security trust fund, the highway trust fund, and the airport and airways development trust fund.

For example, in 1973, we collected \$92.2 billion in the various trust funds, but we spent only \$81.4 billion from these funds, thus showing a surplus of \$10.8 billion. But when this \$10.8 billion surplus is thrown in with the \$25 billion deficit from general purpose revenues, we show a deficit of only \$14.3 billion. Yet, in addition to the \$14.3 billion deficit for 1973, we also owe the trust funds \$10.8 billion.

And, in total, we owe the various trust funds \$142.5 billion.

Inflation is our No. 1 domestic problem. It not only eats away the family budget, it also threatens to make a shambles of our economy.

A balanced Federal budget could help curb inflation, and a balanced budget can be achieved—but only by fiscal restraint and responsibility.

The place to start is by discontinuing

this policy of "spend now—pay later," by cutting unnecessary programs, and by refusing to permit an increase in the Federal debt.

The committee wisely rejected the administration request to increase the Federal debt to \$505 billion, and instead, authorized an increase from \$475 billion to \$495 billion—which is still too much.

I urge my colleagues to take the initiative in fiscal restraint by rejecting this proposal which would authorize the administration to spend even more of the taxpayer's money that has not even been collected.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 14832, increasing the temporary debt ceiling from the current \$78 billion to \$95 billion, and bringing the total combined national debt ceiling to \$495 billion.

The taxpayers of this Nation suffer from our relentless inflation. Our senior citizens are forced to live hand-to-mouth as their retirement dollars buy less and less. The budgets of State and local governments soar ever upward in an effort to keep up with Federal spending, and their taxation increases accordingly. The interest alone on our national debt would fund the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a full year.

Yet we are being asked today to approve legislation which will worsen our already disastrous inflation, allow even greater Federal overspending, and push our national debt past the \$30 billion mark.

We have got to draw the line somewhere. We cannot go on with this ruinous policy of mortgaging our Nation's future for spending which only damages further our current economy. Inflation is the single greatest problem we face today, and Federal overspending and indebtedness is the single greatest cause of inflation. It is a simple equation, unpopular with some, but nevertheless accurate. Slow Federal spending and reduce our indebtedness, and we will slow inflation.

I intend to vote against this bill, as I have voted against all such debt ceiling increases since my election to the House. I urge my colleagues to consider the consequences of the bill and do likewise.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my opposition to H.R. 14832, legislation to temporarily increase the public debt ceiling. I am opposed to this bill, because neither the Congress nor the administration has taken any real action to bring the Federal deficit in balance.

From the testimony given to the Ways and Means Committee, the substantial fall-off in Federal revenues occurred in the sector of corporate taxation where the administration's estimate of potential revenues from corporate taxpayers was almost \$2.5 billion beyond actual corporate tax payments.

The individual taxpayer, as usual, is doing more than his share. In contrast to corporations, the sector of individual collections was substantially in accord with administration estimates of revenue collections.

Budget deficits are caused by many factors. First, we have suffered from food inflation resulting from the

arbitrary and ridiculous policies of Secretary Butz who has put the interests of big corporate farmers ahead of the American people. These policies have focused on export programs encouraged with huge subsidies at the very moment when American agricultural commodities were available at bargain basement prices due to dollar devaluation.

The inflationary spiral that contributed to our deficit is also the result of White House policies which continue to coddle the oil industry. Mr. Simon's policies of arbitrary oil price fixing have increased the value of American oil already discovered—largely through the use of taxpayer subsidies—by almost \$33 billion over the past year.

Third, the inflationary spiral is being prodded on by White House concurrence with monetary policies which have permitted interest rates to accelerate beyond all reason. This fact has added to the cost of living, the cost of doing business, and the cost of carrying our immense Federal debt.

Finally, the imbalance between Federal revenues and expenditures has been considerably affected by recent tax policies. These policies have permitted American corporations to enjoy one of the most profitable years in history, while at the same time corporate contributions to the public Treasury have fallen drastically because of the many tax preferences available to these corporations. These preferences include accelerated depreciation, the investment tax credit, depletion allowances, capital gains, and a whole host of special privileges which divert huge amounts of corporate revenue away from the Treasury.

To support such a policy does violence to the desire of the American people for a genuine partnership between individuals and the business community in the support of our Government and in the conduct of our national affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the remarks that have been made this afternoon concerning this bill to again increase the Federal debt ceiling.

One fact above all others seems to emerge—that neither Congress nor the executive branch of Government has the courage or the decency to tell the American people that Federal spending is out of control.

To a question of why a President would send to Congress an alltime record spending budget for 1 year of \$304 billion, with an admitted deficit of some \$9 billion when all the evidence clearly indicated a deficit of more than double that amount, the answer seems to be that the financial facts of life are deliberately withheld from the public.

And to the question of why Congress continues to spend far beyond tax revenues, thus joining in creating huge inflation breeding deficits, the answer seems to be that Congress has its own set of spending priorities.

The end result is that the people of this country can place no credibility in either branch of Government, and the lethal, inevitable result is financial disaster for the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill to increase the

fraudulent temporary debt ceiling is but one more resort to gimmickry, both on the part of the President and Congress. It is a temporary shelter behind which the cowardly will hide while passing on to the children of today and the generation to come a terrible burden of debt they can never liquidate by orderly means.

In all conscience we here today should have the courage and the decency to vote down this bill and force a showdown.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on March 31, 1975, the public debt limit set forth in the first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757b) shall be temporarily increased by \$95,000,000,000.

Sec. 2. Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the first section of the Act of December 3, 1973, providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit for a period ending June 30, 1974 (Public Law 93-173), is hereby repealed.

Mr. MILLS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14832) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, pursuant to House Resolution 1141, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 190, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

YEAS—191

Addabbo	Arends	Bennett
Albert	Ashley	Bergland
Alexander	Aspin	Biester
Anderson, Ill.	Barrett	Bingham
Annunzio	Bell	Blatnik

Boggs	Gibbons	Pettis
Boland	Gonzalez	Peyster
Bolling	Gray	Pickle
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Poage
Brasco	Gubser	Preyer
Bray	Gude	Price, Ill.
Breaux	Hamilton	Quillen
Breckinridge	Hammer-	Rallsback
Brooks	schmidt	Rangel
Broomfield	Hanley	Rees
Brotzman	Hanna	Reuss
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Wash.	Robison, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hawkins	Rodino
Broyhill, Va.	Hébert	Roncallo, N.Y.
Buchanan	Hicks	Rostenkowski
Burke, Calif.	Holifield	Roush
Burleson, Tex.	Horton	Ruppe
Butler	Hosmer	St Germain
Carter	Jarman	Schneebeil
Casey, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Sebelius
Chamberlain	Jordan	Shriver
Cohen	Karh	Sisk
Collier	Kazen	Slack
Conable	Koch	Smith, Iowa
Conte	Lehman	Smith, N.Y.
Corman	Lent	Staggers
Cotter	Long, La.	Stanton,
Coughlin	McClary	J. William
Culver	McCormack	Stanton,
Daniels,	McDade	James V.
Dominick V.	McEwen	Steed
Davis, Ga.	McFall	Steiger, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McKay	Stephens
Delaney	McKinney	Stokes
Dellenback	Macdonald	Stratton
Dennis	Madden	Stuckey
Derwinski	Mahon	Symington
Donohue	Martin, Nebr.	Talcott
Downing	Mathias, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Matsunaga	Thompson, Wis.
Duncan	Mayne	Thornton
du Pont	Melcher	Tiernan
Edwards, Ala.	Mezvinsky	Udall
Edwards, Calif.	Michel	Ullman
Ellberg	Milford	Van Deerin
Erlenborn	Mills	Vander Veen
Esch	Minish	Vigoro
Fascell	Minshall, Ohio	Waggoner
Flindley	Moorhead, Pa.	Walsh
Fisher	Mosher	Ware
Flood	Murphy, Ill.	Whalen
Foley	Natcher	Whitehurst
Forsythe	Nedzi	Widnall
Fraser	Nelsen	Wiggins
Frelinghuysen	O'Brien	Wilson, Bob
Frenzel	O'Hara	Winn
Fulton	O'Neill	Wylder
Fuqua	Patman	Yates
Gettys	Patten	Young, Ill.
Gialimo	Perkins	Young, Tex.

NAYS—190

Abzug	Dellums	Hunt
Adams	Denholm	Ichord
Anderson,	Dent	Johnson, Colo.
Calif.	Devine	Jones, N.C.
Andrews, N.C.	Dickinson	Jones, Tenn.
Andrews,	Dingell	Kastenmeier
N. Dak.	Dorn	Kemp
Archer	Drinan	Ketchum
Armstrong	Eshleman	Kling
Ashbrook	Evins, Tenn.	Kyros
Badillo	Fish	Lagomarsino
Bafalis	Flowers	Landgrebe
Baker	Ford	Landrum
Bauman	Fountain	Leggett
Beard	Frey	Litton
Bevill	Froehlich	Long, Md.
Blaggi	Gaydos	Lott
Bowen	Gilman	Lujan
Brinkley	Ginn	Luken
Brown, Calif.	Goodling	McCollister
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Oreg.	McSpadden
Burgener	Gross	Madigan
Burke, Fla.	Grover	Mallary
Burke, Mass.	Gunter	Mann
Burlison, Mo.	Guyer	Maraziti
Burton	Haley	Martin, N.C.
Byron	Hanrahan	Mathis, Ga.
Carney, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Mazzoli
Chappell	Harrington	Miller
Clancy	Harsha	Mink
Clark	Hastings	Mitchell, Md.
Clausen,	Hechler, W. Va.	Mitchell, N.Y.
Don H.	Heckler, Mass.	Mizell
Cleveland	Heinz	Moakley
Cochran	Henderson	Montgomery
Collins, Tex.	Hillis	Moorhead,
Crane	Hogan	Calif.
Cronin	Holt	Moss
Daniel, Dan	Holtzman	Murphy, N.Y.
Daniel, Robert	Howard	Murtha
W., Jr.	Huber	Myers
Danielson	Hudnut	Nichols
Davis, S.C.	Hungate	Owens

Farris	Ryan	Traxler
Pike	Sandman	Treen
Podell	Sarasin	Vander Jagt
Powell, Ohio	Sarbanes	Vanik
Price, Tex.	Satterfield	Veysek
Pritchard	Scherle	Waldie
Quile	Schroeder	Wampler
Randall	Seiberling	White
Rarick	Shoup	Whitten
Regula	Shuster	Wilson,
Riegle	Sikes	Charles H.,
Rinaldo	Snyder	Calif.
Roberts	Spence	Wilson,
Robinson, Va.	Stark	Charles, Tex.
Roe	Steele	Wolf
Rogers	Steelman	Wright
Roncallo, Wyo.	Steiger, Ariz.	Wylie
Rose	Studds	Wyman
Rosenthal	Sullivan	Yatron
Rousselot	Taylor, Mo.	Young, Fla.
Roy	Taylor, N.C.	Young, S.C.
Roybal	Thone	Zion
Ruth	Towell, Nev.	Zwach

NOT VOTING—53

Abdnor	Griffiths	Passman
Blackburn	Hays	Pepper
Camp	Helstoski	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Hinshaw	Rhodes
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Johnson, Pa.	Rooney, Pa.
Clawson, Del	Jones, Ala.	Runnels
Clay	Jones, Okla.	Shibley
Collins, Ill.	Kluczynski	Skubitz
Conlan	Kuykendall	Stubblefield
Conyers	Latta	Symms
de la Garza	McCloskey	Teague
Diggs	Meeds	Williams
Eckhardt	Metcalf	Wyatt
Evans, Colo.	Mollohan	Young, Alaska
Flynt	Morgan	Young, Ga.
Goldwater	Nix	Zablocki
Grasso	Obey	

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that he votes "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

- Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Shipley against.
- Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Flynt against.
- Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Runnels against.
- Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
- Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Conyers against.
- Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.
- Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Latta against.
- Mr. Helstoski for, with Mr. Hinshaw against.
- Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Symms against.
- Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Camp against.
- Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Abdnor against.
- Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Goldwater against.
- Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Conlan against.
- Mr. Rhodes for, with Mr. Obey against.
- Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. de la Garza against.
- Mr. Clay for, with Mr. Hutchinson against.
- Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Skubitz against.
- Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Williams against.

Until further notice:

- Mr. Eckhardt with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.
- Mr. Meeds with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. Metcalf with Mr. Carey of New York.
- Mr. Diggs with Mr. Reid.
- Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Blackburn.
- Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Jones of Oklahoma.
- Mr. McCloskey with Mr. Young of Alaska.
- Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Kuykendall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chair announced the bill was passed. This Member is under the impression that it is a tie vote, and the bill should be rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair voted "aye." The Chair announced that all time had expired. Then the Chair voted "aye" and then announced the vote and that the bill had passed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 14832) just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REPRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY MATERIAL"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-1059) on the resolution (H. Res. 1072) authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the committee print entitled "Procedures for Handling Impeachment Inquiry Material," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1072

Resolved, That there shall be reprinted for use of the House Committee on the Judiciary one thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Procedures for Handling Impeachment Inquiry Material".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, in lieu of "one", insert "five".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "WORK OF THE IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY STAFF AS OF FEBRUARY 5, 1974"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-1060) on the resolution (H. Res. 1073) authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the committee print entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of February 5, 1974," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1073

Resolved, That there shall be reprinted for use of the House Committee on the Judiciary one thousand additional copies of the

committee print entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of February 5, 1974".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "WORK OF THE IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY STAFF AS OF MARCH 1, 1974"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-1061) on the resolution (H. Res. 1074) authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the committee print entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of March 1, 1974," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1074

Resolved, That there shall be reprinted for use in the House Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of March 1, 1974."

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Was not the previous resolution dated February 5 and for the same purpose?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is correct, and the resolution that is presently under consideration is in respect to the committee print that is entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of March 1, 1974."

Mr. GROSS. The other one was exactly the same title, was it not?

Mr. BRADEMAS. No. The one previously agreed to, House Resolution 1073, was the result of the work of the impeachment inquiry staff as of February 5, 1974.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; only the date is changed.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If I may respond to the gentleman's request, the subject matter differs in one from the other in view of the fact that work had been completed between February 5 and March 1, 1974.

Mr. GROSS. I see. I thank the gentleman.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF SUMMARIES OF VETERANS LEGISLATION REPORTED IN HOUSE AND SENATE DURING 93D CONGRESS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-1062) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 415) authorizing the printing of summaries of veterans legislation reported in the House and Senate during the 93d Congress, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 415

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That after the conclusion of the Ninety-third Congress there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives fifty-six thousand one hundred copies of a publication entitled "Summary of Veterans Legislation Reported, Ninety-third Congress", with an additional forty-four thousand two hundred copies for the use of Members of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. After the conclusion of the Ninety-third Congress there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the United States twenty thousand copies of a publication similar to that authorized by the first section of this concurrent resolution, but with emphasis upon matters relating to veterans' affairs considered by the Senate or by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SURGEON GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-1063) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Surgeon General's Report by the Scientific Advisory Committee, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 83

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Commerce one thousand additional copies of its hearings of the Ninety-second Congress, second session, entitled "Surgeon General's Report by the Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior."

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) if he will advise us of the program for the rest of the week, of any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of May 27, 1974, is as follows:

Monday is Memorial Day. The House will be in recess.

On Tuesday we will consider H.R. 14449, the Community Services Act, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate, general debate only.

On Wednesday we will consider further H.R. 14449, the Community Services Act with votes on amendments and the bill.

We will then consider H.R. 10337, the Hopi-Navajo land partition, with an open rule, and 1 hour of debate.

On Thursday and the balance of the week, the House will take up H.R. 10265, audits of Federal Reserve Board, with an open rule, and 1 hour of debate.

This will be followed by H.R. 13678, coverage of nonprofit hospitals under NLRB, subject to a rule being granted.

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

I am sure that the gentleman is aware that we have passed a resolution that when we adjourn today, the House will stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, Tuesday next, May 28, 1974.

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 on Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

DELAY IN WATER POLLUTION PROGRAM: EPA'S ANSWER

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Public Works' Subcommittee on Investigations and Review has recently held hearings on the problems holding up the grant program for construction of municipal wastewater treatment facilities. These hearings brought out the fact that our massive program to clean up the Nation's rivers and streams has been bogged down considerably by bureaucratic redtape including a proliferation of paperwork and in some cases duplication of effort by State and Federal officials. A more detailed description of problems brought out by the hearings has already been documented in my remarks for the Record of February 13, 1974 (page H794).

At this point, therefore, I would like to allow EPA its chance for rebuttal in the form of a progress report by John R. Quarles, Jr., Deputy Administrator. As Mr. Quarles points out, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 is a complex piece of legislation with its magnitude and diversity of statutory directives. However, the complexity of EPA's administrative handling of allocations has even further compounded the problem. Mr. Quarles' report is encouraging inasmuch as it reflects EPA's awareness of the problems and in fact outlines

specific areas of particular confusion which are receiving attention. I am confident, therefore, that this willingness to improve the program will carry through and that Congress, particularly our Investigations and Review Subcommittee, will continue its careful evaluation and prodding in order to keep things moving.

I commend to my colleagues the following statement by John Quarles, EPA Deputy Administrator:

WATER POLLUTION CONTROLS 18 MONTHS OF PROGRESS

(Remarks of John R. Quarles, Jr.)

I am happy to have been asked to be the keynote speaker at your Annual Conference. I would like to talk with you this morning about some of the Environmental Protection Agency's experiences in implementing the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972.

At the conclusion of its thirty-nine executive sessions, a Congressional Conference Committee presented EPA and the nation with what must certainly rank as one of the longest, most detailed, and most emphatic pieces of legislation ever written. It took a long time just to read through its 88 pages and 78 sections. It has taken a longer time to understand it, to explain it, and to implement it.

I have spoken on earlier occasions about the difficulties EPA has had in getting the program moving. So have others—most notably the House Public Works Committee and municipal officials who appeared before it at oversight hearings a few weeks ago. Many of the criticisms are deserved. But I would like to suggest that for a moment we look at what we had to deal with, and also at what has been accomplished.

The statute is in some respects excruciatingly explicit. It specifies firm levels of control that must be achieved, and sets mandatory duties for achieving them. Repeatedly, the statute mandates certain steps that must be taken along the way. In a great many cases the specific directives riveted into place by enforceable statutory language do not fit together in a logical manner. In its marathon series of executive sessions the Conference Committee dealt with a jumble of conflicting objectives, and as the summer of 1972 wore thin, many disputes were papered over with statutory language reflecting a compromise which everyone finally agreed to, though sometimes no one really knew how it would work.

Even more overwhelming than certain inconsistencies was the sheer magnitude and diversity of the statutory directives. Everything popping off at once, always with tight deadlines, never allowing adequate time to think, to explain, and to plan.

But my purpose today is not to extend the debate on the difficulties of the statute or its implementation. I have already done my bit at trying to show the benefits that can be achieved from constructive criticism. Today I wish to put this debate into a larger perspective, one which points out the pluses as well as the minuses. On the balance, it has always been clear that the 1972 Water Act would be—and is—the vehicle for a tremendous step forward in this country's effort to achieve clean water. I believe it is important to emphasize something that is in danger of not being fully recognized: that this country is achieving enormous progress in implementing this Act. Considering the scope of the transition required, it is truly remarkable how much has been accomplished.

Very early in the game, EPA realized that we would need help in interpreting the law and that participation of those who would be affected would be essential to success in implementing the law. In December 1972, then-Administrator Ruckelshaus established the so-called "Group of Ten," composed

of one representative from each of EPA's regions. These men meet regularly with the Administrator and other EPA officials to discuss matters of immediate interest in the areas of planning, construction grants and permits, and to examine the long-range implications of activities undertaken by EPA and the States to implement the law. In addition, smaller task groups have been established, and literally hundreds of meetings have been held to thrash out specific problems.

EPA officials have also met frequently with Senators and Members of Congress and the staffs of the two Public Works Committees, to explain what we are doing, to receive their assessments of whether or not we are following the legislative intent, and to get suggestions on what could be done to improve the implementation of the Act. These consultations still continue.

I want to focus now on some of the individual programs called for by the 1972 Act, to outline a few of the problems we have encountered, but more importantly to state clearly the progress that has been made.

1. Construction grants:

Let me first address the construction grants program. It is on its way to becoming the biggest public works program in the country. It has enormous importance to the entire national pollution control effort. And it has been a source of considerable controversy and criticism.

We have been required to resolve an unusually large number of difficulties in implementing the construction grants program authorized by the 1972 Act. The chief ones can be summarized as follows:

(a) Industrial user charges and cost recovery. The statute required that no grant could be made after March 1, 1973 unless the recipient municipality established a user charge system to require that each industrial user pay "its proportionate share" of the costs of operating the waste treatment system. The purpose of this requirement was praiseworthy—to require polluters to pay for the costs of their pollution—both as an incentive to reducing their discharges and to establish economic independence of the municipal waste treatment systems. That worthy objective, however, raised a horrendous potential conflict with existing user charge systems, which are often based on the *ad valorem* property tax structure. After extensive analysis of the legal requirements and the practicalities of administration, we and several of the major municipal sanitary district commissions have developed an approach which we believe will fulfill the statutory purpose, comply with the law, and not unduly upset intelligent existing administrative systems.

(b) Priorities. Another critical part of the foundation for implementing the 1972 Act has been the process of developing a better priority system to assure that the projects of greatest water quality importance will be given first priority for available construction funds. In view of the current Needs Survey of \$60 billion, the essential importance of tackling first things first is obvious. This has required enormous effort by EPA and state agencies, and is now substantially completed.

(c) Infiltration inflow. The statute required that no grant could be made after July 1, 1973, if the municipal system was subject to excessive infiltration (which means leakage of ground water into the sewer lines enlarging the total flow that must be handled at the treatment plant). Careful judgment has been required to develop intelligent administrative procedures to accomplish the Congressional goal, without overburdening the administrative structure with unnecessary studies and red tape. We believe we have accomplished this objective in our current regulations promulgated in February.

(d) Mixing of funds. Many projects initiated under the old law have experienced sizable cost overruns which could not be covered within funds available under the old law. This caused major concern over whether the additional Federal funding which is appropriate in such cases could be provided out of funds authorized by the new law. Though EPA initially indicated that this procedure could not be followed, we recently have re-evaluated this issue and have decided to allow this practice. We believe this approach should avoid severe hardship for a sizeable number of municipalities.

(e) Basic ground rules. The entire construction grants program authorized by the 1972 Act, with its many specific statutory requirements, necessitated the development of a completely new set of basic administrative regulations. In the course of this process literally dozens of vital technical, legal, and administrative issues generated by the new statute had to be thrashed out. EPA promulgated interim regulations in February 1973 and, after extensive review and close work with state officials, promulgated final regulations in February of this year. We believe the new regulations have answered nearly all of the hard questions and we now have a foundation for running the construction grants program that will be workable and effective.

(f) Achievements during the transition. Predictably, the transition to the new statute and the new regulations has been difficult. The pace of new obligations has been exceedingly irregular. As a result, it has appeared to some that the construction grants program has bogged down during this interim period. In point of fact, however, the construction grants program has moved ahead with encouraging progress during this time. We have now obligated \$1.9 billion under the new law and expect to obligate another billion dollars in the next few months. We must compare this level of obligation to the levels in prior years. For the last three fiscal years prior to enactment of the 1972 Act, total obligations were as follows: \$872 million in FY 1972, \$1.167 billion in 1971 and \$437 million in 1970.

To appreciate these figures in a true perspective, we must also recognize a profound change in the method of obligation. Under the prior law, we often obligated all of the funds for a project before the basic planning was done meaning that actual construction might be several years away. We now do not obligate construction funds until plans and specifications have been completed and approved. Therefore, obligation of funds under the new law is tied closely to construction and more accurately reflects actual progress. As a result of this change-over, obligation figures understate the full level of progress in the program during the transition period.

The actual pace of progress in building municipal treatment works is shown best by outlays. Outlay figures for the last several years show a rising trend:

Fiscal year 1970.....	\$176,377,000
Fiscal year 1971.....	478,366,000
Fiscal year 1972.....	413,407,888
Fiscal year 1973.....	684,400,479

We expect that outlays for the current 1974 fiscal year will be approximately \$2 billion, and we project outlays for FY 1975 at approximately \$3 billion. These enormous jumps in anticipated outlays reflect vigorous growth in the construction program.

Thus, to the basic question of whether the construction grants program has been slowed by the new statute or has been bogged down by red tape in implementing it, the short answer is "No". Without question, the process of thrashing out new statutory requirements and developing new regulations has held back many individual projects, but on an aggregate nationwide

basis the program has moved through the transition period without losing momentum. In fact, it has gained momentum. The Federal waste treatment construction grants program is moving ahead now more vigorously than it ever has in the past.

(g) Payment of reimbursement. The 1972 Act also provides for a form of retroactive construction grant aid through reimbursement for the Federal share of previously constructed projects. Since the January 31 deadline set by Congress for submitting reimbursement applications, EPA has carried out an intensive, high-priority effort to process applications and make payments as rapidly as we possibly can. By the middle of this month, EPA had paid \$568 million to more than 2880 communities and had made aggregate grant increases which total \$1.1 billion.

Although awarding construction grants is the most visible and most expensive aspect of the Environmental Protection Agency's activities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, it is only one of our tasks. There are many others.

2. Planning:

The 1972 Act changed and expanded the statutory requirements for planning. In response, EPA has developed new procedures for total program management planning under section 106, for river basin planning under section 303(e), and for areawide waste treatment management planning under section 208. Every single state has now established an EPA-approved continuous planning process under section 303(e). We are also now receiving a large number of applications for section 208 grants, and two weeks ago the Administrator, Russell Train, announced the award of the first grant for this purpose to Durham, N.C.

3. Revision of water quality standards:

The new statute required that all existing interstate water quality standards be reviewed and, in many cases, revised. It also required that new water quality standards be adopted by the States and approved by EPA for all intrastate waters. This entire effort has now been completed. Moreover, in 1973 and this year, EPA has spent about \$5.4 million for contracts and payment to States to collect additional water quality data, in order to make waste load allocations. These allocations are now being completed in nearly all river basins throughout the country for use in drafting permit conditions that will meet water quality requirements.

4. Promulgation of efficient guidelines:

The Act required EPA to promulgate effluent limitations guidelines for specific industrial categories, setting forth best practicable control technology currently available, and best available technology economically achievable. We were also required to promulgate new source standards for at least 27 industrial categories or subcategories, and pretreatment standards. To carry out this mandate, EPA has undertaken the most extensive effort ever made in this country to evaluate the levels of pollution control that can be achieved for specific industries. We have proposed a total of 121 separate standards, covering parts or all of 30 industrial categories, and we have now promulgated standards in twenty-four of those industries. We have also issued detailed documents describing the technology available for pollution control.

5. Permits:

A major component of the 1972 Act is the new National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. This permit program is moving ahead. Of the 2300 major industrial dischargers in the country, regulatory permits already have been issued to nearly 1,000. Permits also have been issued to about 3,700 additional industrial dischargers. In the municipal facilities area, permits have been issued to about 75 major facilities and 1,725 smaller plants. In addition to these permits

already issued, a large number of proposed permits have been drafted and are being processed.

This progress in the issuance of permits has been achieved despite the fact that approval of state programs to issue permits has not gone ahead nearly as fast as everyone had hoped. We have to date approved permit programs in 9 states, and many more are well on the way. New legislation has been enacted in over 30 states to enable those states to qualify for approval of their permit programs and to strengthen the basis for operating future water pollution control efforts.

6. Advanced data processing system:

Under the new Act and all of the requirements it has established, enormous amounts of information will be generated and must be handled efficiently. EPA recently put into effect a computerized information system, known as the General Point Source File, or GPSF. As this data bank is expanded, it will enable EPA and states to track critical information on all point source dischargers.

7. Regulations:

As already indicated, EPA has issued a tremendous number of regulations to implement various parts of the newly expanded and far more sophisticated national water pollution control effort spelled out by the 1972 Act. Much of this material went through numerous drafts, and often it was extremely controversial. Many people in EPA, States, municipalities and elsewhere burned the midnight oil debating and considering these proposed regulations. It has not been easy, and the difficulty in resolving hard issues has often confused or delayed certain actions with the program. But this work was essential to lay the foundation for the new program. I also wish to point out, emphatically, that virtually every regulation that this Agency has promulgated is specifically required by statute, and is not the product of EPA's idle imagination.

During the past 18 months, we all have learned a lesson or two. We appreciate now more fully the need to allow a more lengthy transition period in undertaking these kinds of wrenching changes in established program operations. We also appreciate more deeply the importance of giving discretion to officials at the working level, so that within general guidelines they can make decisions that will most appropriately advance pollution control in a cost-effective manner and in harmony with common sense.

I am privileged to be speaking today to you as a knowledgeable audience of professionals who have committed your lives to water pollution control. I share the frustration you have felt during the uncertainties and some of the delays involved in this transition phase. I know your desire is to get on with the job. That is our desire too, and that is what is happening.

The strict regulatory permits that are being issued in large numbers nail down standards for pollution control that industry must—and will—be required to meet. Expanded research and planning are in full swing. The construction grants program is moving ahead. The entire program is picking up speed. We have reached a milestone on the road to success under the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act. We have virtually completed the shakedown cruise. Though we face difficulties ahead, they are smaller than the difficulties we have overcome.

All of this work comes to bear on the ultimate question—is pollution being abated and is the water getting cleaner? This is what the public wants to know. This will be the final test of our success.

We can be encouraged by scattered indications that our water is becoming less polluted. But let's be honest and acknowledge that any actual improvement in water qual-

ity today must be credited to completion of abatement efforts undertaken before the 1972 Act was passed. The hard fact is that abatement programs take time. This may be regrettable, but it is inexorably true. As professionals in the field you and I know that well, though this often is not understood or appreciated by the general public. In a program of this scope it takes a year or two to make the plans and set out the requirements, and then it takes another year or two or three for actual construction or installation. In sum it takes several years before the first visible benefits from a law like the 1972 Water Act can be expected to appear. We should not apologize for these basic facts of life, though we can regret that they are not more widely understood.

The institutions of government are under fire. Public suspicion abounds that government does not produce results. In water pollution we face an immense challenge to get the job done. We need not be in panic, but we must act with an urgent determination to make the system work.

We labor under the handicap that the public has been promised immediate results, and we cannot produce a miracle. We have to go one step at a time. But we are buoyed by confidence that the objective of clean water in this country is an achievable goal. Within the Environmental Protection Agency and within the entire national water pollution control effort, we can feel certain that these past 18 months have been a most productive period. We have rolled up a record of immense achievement, and we have made unmistakable progress toward our goal.

We are going to need to carry on the battle against pollution for years and years ahead. Final victory is not just around the corner. Strong public support throughout the next entire decade will be a prerequisite to real success. Heavy government funding for the construction grants program in particular will be required for the next 10 to 15 years.

We therefore face a long challenge ahead. But we can take confidence and pride in what has been achieved to date. Not only have we developed the ground rules under the new Act, but we have also kept the program moving ahead and gaining momentum all the time. We have established a solid basis to carry forward a program that can deserve the respect and support of the public, a program that will give the taxpayers their money's worth, and a program that will make our water clean.

COMMITTEE REFORM AMENDMENTS AND THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Congress is attempting to reestablish its proper balance of power with the executive, and at a time when reform, openness, freedom of information, and full disclosure are attempting to make their way into the daily workings of the Congress, it is deplorable that the majority party has seen fit to abuse each of those goals by their recent action in burying committee reform.

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Mr. STEELMAN of Texas, and I have requested this special order to bring to the attention of all the Members of the House, and to the public, what we believe has been a breach of the public trust.

On the 9th of May the majority

party, on a secret vote, in a secret caucus, sent the committee reform amendments of 1974, embodied in House Resolution 988, to the Hansen committee for further study, thereby sidetracking the fruit of the labor of the Bolling-Martin committee's 14 months of work.

This incredible move, particularly in the face of the Congress low status with the American people, would represent, if it were not for Watergate, one of the most serious breaches of the public trust by the Congress in the past 2 years. Fortunately for the majority party, however, Watergate does exist, and it is therefore counting on that fact to obscure their own astonishing action.

The caucus fiasco has drawn the harsh fire not only of Republicans, but many Democrats who participated in the caucus as well. Further, the duplicitous act did not go unchallenged by either Common Cause or the Americans for Democratic Action. As Common Cause so aptly put it in their recent editorial memorandum:

The action raises serious doubts about the House Democrat's commitment to raise the prestige of Congress from its current bottom-of-the-barrel status with the public.

I want to include in the RECORD a letter Mr. STEELMAN and I received from Chairman George Bush expressing his desire to see brought to the floor of the House for a vote the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974:

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,

May 22, 1974.

HON. JACK F. KEMP,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: Congratulations on your Special Order of May 23 demanding that the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974 be brought to the floor of the House so they can be debated before the American public.

For 14 months the American public has waited for the report of the bipartisan Select Committee on Committees' report on committee reform. During this time, confidence in the overwhelmingly Democratically controlled Congress has declined to just above 20 per cent. Now, in a high-handed manner, the same Democrat leadership that has been in charge during this decline in public confidence attempted to bury the first substantive Congressional reform proposal in 28 years, by means of a secret vote in a closed caucus. This move to keep the merits of the proposal from being debated publicly before the American people belies all the speeches and press statements made by the Democrats who purport to stand for reform, openness, freedom of information, and full disclosure.

It is commendable that you and your Republican colleagues are leading the fight to open up the effort of Congressional reform to the American people. The people have long known who is responsible for the decline of the Legislative branch. Now they are aware that the Republican Party is in the forefront of reestablishing the balance of powers.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE BUSH.

It should be pointed out that the committee restructuring amendments came out of the hard work of the Select Committee on Committees, a creation originally suggested by Speaker ALBERT, and supported by then Minority Leader GERALD FORD. The committee was headed by Representative RICHARD BOLLING, Democ-

crat of Missouri and DAVE MARTIN, Republican of Nebraska. Other committee members included PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican of New Jersey; CHARLES WIGGINS, Republican of California; WILLIAM STEIGER, Republican of Wisconsin; C. W. "BILL" YOUNG, Republican of Florida; ROBERT STEPHENS, JR., Democrat of Georgia; JOHN CULVER, Democrat of Iowa; LLOYD MEEDS, Democrat of Washington; and PAUL S. SARBANES, Democrat of Maryland.

The basis of the recommendations was a draft proposal of our distinguished colleague, the vice chairman of the Select Committee on Committees, DAVE MARTIN of Nebraska.

But this special order was not taken to point up the strengths or shortcomings of the committee reform recommendations as to insist that the recommendations be brought to the floor of the House so that we can consider them, debate them, and vote on them. After all, we have an obligation to see to it that we make our actions visible to the public, so that the public might gain a new insight and respect for the Nation's legislature.

The delaying tactic of the majority, sending the reform recommendations to the Hansen committee, is antithetical to the spirit of reform itself—a spirit on which the majority prides itself. We have seen again the mistakes that flow from secret action which prevents accountability of the people.

To reverse this duplicitous act, those of us participating in this special order enlist the support of our colleagues for House Resolution 1145, which seeks to bring the reform amendments to the floor for debate and a vote:

RESOLUTION

Resolution. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 988), a resolution to reform the structure, jurisdiction, and procedures of the committees of the House of Representatives by amending rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Committees, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

We are grateful for the participation of our colleagues. Moreover, we are hopeful that this is only the first in a series of efforts to encourage the Rules Committee to swiftly vote House Resolution 988 a rule.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS BLOCKS COMMITTEE REFORM AMENDMENTS

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

man from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) and I have asked for this time in order to give Members the opportunity to speak out against the intolerable delaying tactics of the Democratic Caucus in blocking immediate consideration of the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the special order taken today.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Democratic Caucus, in a secret vote, postponed the chance for the first internal congressional committee reform in 28 years—reform that the American public has been demanding. Fourteen months of hard work and compromise by a Bipartisan Select Committee on Committees had resulted in a document of minimal, but necessary, reforms. In one fell swoop, the Democrat Caucus wiped out these months of effort—putting self-interest and pressure politics before the public good. No wonder the American people have had their confidence in government eroded to an alltime low.

We cannot allow this to stand without an effort to get these reform measures to the floor for an open and public debate. Forty-nine of my colleagues have joined in cosponsoring a resolution to indicate to the Rules Committee that it is in the best interest of this body and the American public to bring this matter into the open and debate its merits on the floor of the House, and I hope we can soon see this much-needed committee reform enacted.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that nothing is certain in life except change. I would like to modify that statement. Apparently nothing in life is certain but change—unless it is the resistance of the Democrat leadership to it.

It is regrettable—and it will be indefensible before the American people—that the bipartisan, progressive piece of legislation reported out unanimously by the Bolling-Martin committee has been shunted aside. The action taken by the majority caucus on May 9 was, in my judgment, an incredible miscarriage of leadership on the part of the Democrats.

The Bolling-Martin recommendations were brought about through a bipartisan special committee-directed by this Congress to study the committee system, probe weaknesses, and make proposals for constructive change. The five Republicans and five Democrats assigned to this task worked very hard and directed an extensive and thorough review by the bipartisan staff. The recommendations were made only after intensive research and study of just how Congress is functioning and how the committee structure could be changed to operate more effectively.

It is regrettable that shallow, partisan action was taken on this wide-sweeping proposal. Petty politics has brushed aside the opportunity for this Congress to make a historical record of progress. It is little wonder that 70 percent of those questioned in a recent poll said they thought

Congress was doing a bad job. The recent example of the Bolling-Martin proposal bears out their estimation.

Change can only be made by those with open minds who are willing to search for better ways. As public servants, we owe those who sent us here that kind of thinking. We owe them our efforts to upgrade Congress and make it more efficient to serve them better.

Jeremy Bentham once wrote:

It is the greatest good to the greatest number which is the measure of right and wrong.

The Bolling action taken by the Democrats on the Bolling-Martin proposal was wrong.

It is ironic that the majority party, which claims stridently that it is the party of change and progress, should be the perpetrator of this monumental case of reactionary timidity. The American people, I am sure, will recognize that much of their claim to the progressive label is only rhetoric. They have been tried in the breach, and found wanting.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Democratic Caucus succeeded in dragging Congress back into the nineteenth century.

Let us call a spade a spade. The caucus decided to bury committee reform; a mere 30 percent of the entire membership of this House decided for the other 70 percent that committee reform was not to be debated by this body. What makes this tragically ironic is that many of these same members are attacking the President for his stealth and lack of openness, but see no reason to deal with reform proposals openly.

What is doubly disappointing about the action of the Democratic Caucus is that the reforms proposed by the Bolling-Martin committee are relatively modest.

The report is more noteworthy for what it neglected to do than for what it actually did. The report failed to address itself to the serious problems—such as strict adherence to the rule of germaneness, vote trading, and other essential procedural reforms. As a matter of fact, there are 44 rules of the House, and the select committee was formulated to deal with only two—rules X and XI.

Reform of the other 42 rules is also long overdue, and should be considered by this Congress as well.

But even the modest proposals of the Bolling-Martin committee have been torpedoed by the Democratic Caucus, in secrecy behind closed doors. No one can even tell who favored and who opposed reform. This action wiped out a year of hard work by a distinguished bipartisan committee, and is scarcely representative of the Congress of the United States.

Personally, I feel a number of amendments are necessary, but to have the proposals disposed of by such a high-handed, arrogant process is a throwback to 19th century politics.

If there are defects in the suggested reforms, then the select committee's recommendations should be presented to the full House, amended, and voted upon, with the votes open to public scrutiny and comment.

There have been many years of clamor for fundamental reform of the House,

and yet, after a year of work, the whole issue has been swept under the carpet.

This is wrong. It is ill-considered and a blot on the reputation of the House of Representatives.

So I join my colleagues in requesting the Rules Committee act to bring the committee recommendations to the floor. This is the only way to resolve the situation, the right thing to do, both for us, and for those who elected us.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. STEELMAN for taking this special order so that those of us who are interested in working toward improvement of the legislative process and reestablishment of the credibility of this body in the eyes of the public can publicly take action in support of our avowed intention to move this body toward open government and procedural efficiency.

I cosponsored this resolution to move the Select Committee on Committee's report regarding congressional reform to the House floor for debate and decision. As we are all aware, the House Democratic Caucus voted 111 to 95 to send the reform proposal to a caucus subcommittee greatly diminishing the possibility of committee overhaul this Congress.

Since the last major committee reorganization shortly after World War II, the problems facing the Nation have changed markedly. The old committee structure simply is not equipped to deal with current needs. For example, as many as 17 different committees have jurisdiction over some aspect of the energy situation. The Bolling-Martin resolution, a product of over 1 year's diligent work, has been strongly endorsed by both House Republicans and the Democratic leadership. The action of the Democrat Caucus is probably one of the greatest setbacks of the 93d Congress. And the dangers and potential delays flowing from that action may work to postpone the valuable congressional budget reform which has recently passed the House of Representatives.

During this time of spiraling inflation and of waning credibility in our governmental institution, the Congress cannot afford—the Nation cannot afford to wait for action. Just as inflation makes the creation of the House passed budget committee vitally important, the need for legislative leadership makes it imperative that Congress "bite the bullet" and reform its committee structure.

The following editorial published on May 20 clearly sets forth the opinion of the Canton Repository, one of the leading papers in the 16th Congressional District of Ohio:

HOUSE CAUCUS DUMPS REFORM

Behind closed doors, the House Democratic Caucus has taken a step that virtually assures the death of proposed congressional committee reform this session.

Democrats voted to send the resolution to a subcommittee which means it will be thoroughly gutted or merely left to die on the vine for lack of action.

To be sure this is a controversial proposal with its share of warts along with beauty marks. But it represents a solid effort to

bring about needed committee structure reform in the overall attempt to shape a more effective congressional action process.

Labor lobbyists, business interests and some Democrat liberals—who want action postponed until next session when they think their ranks will be swelled and they will have more clout—all opposed the resolution.

Representative RICHARD BOLLING, Democrat of Missouri, headed the bipartisan panel which worked 13 months to draft the committee reorganization plan and called it a badly needed program for an outmoded and inefficient institution.

The plan had the support of many Members of the House who saw it not only as a method for improving the operations of the legislative body, but also as a means of reestablishing public credibility in Congress.

In his response to the Secret Democrat caucus vote, Representative RALPH REGULA, Republican Navarre, said:

"In recent years Congress has made considerable progress toward making its operations more open. I have often called for and worked for "open government." In my mind that means open committee meetings, recorded votes and other ways to assure public scrutiny and participation. The fact that this setback to congressional reform occurred in a closed-door party caucus and by secret ballot demonstrates the lack of commitment for true congressional reform by those present."

Powerful committee chairmen lobbied against the proposal because they did not want to lose jurisdiction over some areas or be limited to serving on a single major committee.

Some criticism was aimed at Representative BOLLING for not proposing changes for the Rules Committee of which he is a member. There is some merit in the position that changes are in order for the Rules Committee because of the way it effectively blocks legislation from the House floor. But this could have been thrashed out when the proposal was presented to the full House for a vote. Amendments could have been attached at that time.

As it now stands, the full House will not even get a chance to vote for or against the proposal.

Is this the way the House is going to proceed with the job of restoring public confidence in the legislative process?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, this body assigned 10 of its Members the task of working out ways to streamline our committee system.

Under the able leadership of Mr. BOLLING and Mr. MARTIN, the committee has done its job—and done a good job, I might add.

Now it looks as if their work was just an exercise in futility. Instead of sending the proposals to the House for consideration, the Democratic Caucus has taken it upon itself to send them to a Review Committee and directed majority members of the Rules Committee to delay action until the review is completed in July.

This is a thinly disguised effort to kill the measure. Not only is the task force stacked with reform opponents but the July deadline is perfectly timed to make action by the House difficult if not impossible this session.

By the time the review is finished, it will be time for the August recess. After that, we will most probably be deeply

engaged in finishing other business and by then it will be election time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to these delaying tactics and urge members of the Rules Committee to take up the reform amendments immediately.

It has been 28 years since the committee structure was last overhauled and heaven knows it needs it now. The system is unwieldy and has rendered Congress less able to respond quickly and effectively to national problems.

As a result, our image has fallen to a new low in the public eye and it is no wonder. The source of opposition to committee reform is no secret. The proposed changes would not only reduce the power held by a few committee and subcommittee chairmen but would also break up some cozy relationships between lobbyists and various committee members.

This legislation is important to all of Members of Congress, not just one party. Each of us has a right to expect that at the very least, we will be given a chance to debate its merits on the floor. If it is to be passed or defeated, it should be done in public where the vote of each Member can be recorded and not in a secret caucus meeting.

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, today we hear cries in the Halls of Congress as to the incompetence of the President. Members point authoritatively to national polls which show the President's popularity among citizens at 30 and 35 percent. From this, they determine that the Nation feels the President should be impeached and removed from office.

Interestingly enough, however, these same polls show that only 21 percent of the people in this Nation feel that the Congress is doing a good job—21 percent. Following the same line of logic presented by these Members regarding the President, should this not prove conclusively that the Congress is no longer capable of handling its responsibilities.

It seems, however, that some Members have been able to sweep this logic aside. They feel they can condemn the President from now till doomsday, however, they could never—I repeat, never—ask for any changes from the Congress.

In my mind, it would seem that strong action from the Congress is now necessary to make it more responsive to the needs of Americans everywhere. Since the committee system is the very backbone of our congressional system, it would seem that this is the logical place to begin.

And we did begin there. Early last year, the House authorized a Select Committee on Committees and charged it with the responsibility to completely review the committee system in the House and come up with a comprehensive plan to revamp our committees.

The bipartisan committee, chaired by Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri, did just this.

The Bolling report, as issued to each Member of Congress, was the result of hours of testimony from House Members, academic witnesses and scores of outside interest groups. While it was not without its faults, it presented the first approach to committee reform offered to

the House in 28 years. As we know all too well, the past 28 years have resulted in many, many changes in our country and its priorities. We are now trying to resolve the many complex problems facing our country by working through committees that have overlapping jurisdictions, too many important responsibilities to be handled effectively, or simply outmoded responsibilities.

Change is desperately needed and it is my feeling that the vast majority of Members of the House were in strong support of the thrust of the Bolling committee.

However, it did step on several toes. Committee jurisdictions were changed, chairmanships were jeopardized, tenures threatened.

Hopefully, however, Members would be able to place their own feelings aside and act expeditiously on a proposal which would surely benefit the entire Nation. Unfortunately, this was not the case.

As we know, all too well, the House Democratic Caucus voted to have further study done on this tight, well-written report, and bring it back, with additional changes, for review in July.

Not only was the report shelved, it was done on a secret vote. Seemingly, this is against all the principles of a party which professes to be for the people. However, the fact remains that this was the path chosen.

With the possible exception of the Congressional Budget Review Act, there is no other proposal before the House today which is more important for the future of the Congress and the Nation. And, right now, it is pigeonholed in a review committee, which, undoubtedly, will come up with new provisions, provisions which will have the effect of negating the dynamic changes sought by the Bolling committee.

It is my strong hope that the Republicans in the House can join with the Democrats who have voiced approval of the Bolling report and loose this vital legislation from the Review Committee and bring it to the floor for the open consideration it deserves. If my calculations are correct, almost two-thirds of the House Members are in support of this vital proposal.

Action of this type is the only way the Congress is going to be able to start the long road back to winning the approval of the people we are here to represent. And that is what we must remember, we are here to represent our constituents, not to promote or protect our own power. It is an attitude that has prevailed all too long—changes must be made.

I urge my colleagues to join in requesting the Rules Committee to act expeditiously on the Bolling report. The Rules Committee does have the power to loose the report from the Review Committee and this must be done if we are to ever bring the original proposal to the floor for consideration. It is a vital step, one that must be taken before it is too late.

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, secret back-room tactics must not be allowed to kill

proposed reforms of the House of Representatives committee system.

House Resolution 988 is the product of 14 months hard work by a very able bipartisan committee, whose chairman was the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) and whose vice chairman was the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN).

This resolution offers the first opportunity to modernize the House of Representatives committee structure in 28 ways. We cannot pass up this opportunity.

If Members oppose any reform of committees, they should have the courage to oppose them openly. If some alterations should be made in the recommendations of the select committee, let us make them openly.

We must have open, public debate on this issue. We must have a record vote on this reform measure.

If these proposed reforms are killed because of a secret vote in a closed party caucus, the American public will not easily forgive this backsliding into old-fashioned bossism. There are those of us in this body who will keep the public reminded if these measures are swept under the rug by secret action in a smoke-filled room.

Surely the majority in this body is aware that Congress has sunken to the lowest public esteem in history. Surely the majority in this body wants to improve—not destroy—the regard in which it is held by the public.

The House of Representatives will not deserve approval of the public unless it engages in open debate and a record vote on proposed committee reforms.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special order of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN) on the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974. I think it is most regrettable that we must bring this matter to the floor today under a special order rather than an open rule, for there is no reason in the world, in my opinion, why this body should not today be fully debating and acting on House Resolution 988 as reported by our bipartisan Select Committee on Committees.

It is especially ironic that this reform proposal has been sidetracked by a Democratic caucus rule which was ostensibly designed to open up the House and make it more democratic. Instead, this rule has been twisted and misused for the purpose of killing reform and preventing the free operation of our democratic processes. In short, the democratic caucus, in consigning this reform proposal to the graveyard of a task force study, has made a mockery of the word "democratic."

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish, by my statement today, to condemn all Democrats in this body for the action of the caucus, because the fact is that this reform was reported unanimously by the select committee which is comprised of five Democrats and five Republicans. And furthermore, while 111 House Democrats voted to sidetrack this reform in caucus, another 95 Democrats voted

against such action. And, it should further be observed that those 111 do not even constitute a majority of the full Democratic Caucus of 247 Members.

While I do not profess to be an expert on the rules of the House Democratic caucus, it is my understanding that caucus members cannot be bound except by a two-thirds vote, and even then they cannot be bound if they have made a previous commitment to their constituents on a particular issue. I would assume that this applies to the Democratic members of the Rules Committee who the caucus presumed to instruct to take no action pending the further disposition of the resolution in caucus.

There is, therefore, no reason, Mr. Speaker, why this matter could not or should not be acted upon in the Rules Committee next week and brought to the floor under an open rule. If a majority of the House is not interested in moving on this reform, let them so indicate by voting against a rule on a recorded vote, rather than torpedoing this resolution in caucus by secret ballot.

Mr. Speaker, the time has clearly come to end this charade of further studying the committee reform proposal. The select committee did a most thorough job in that respect; as the committee report indicates, the committee interviewed numerous Members and staff personnel, engaged in extensive staff research projects, contracted numerous special studies with consultants, and conducted three sets of hearings over 37 days involving 107 witnesses, filling some 1,765 pages of record. Further study is not what is called for; the time has come to take action. As I mentioned in a previous statement on the caucus action:

The Democratic caucus cannot deceive the American people with this fancy bit of footwork, because no matter how you look at it, they're doing the anti-reform shuffle—that's two-foot-dragging sidesteps followed by four steps backward.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of high-sounding rhetoric in this Congress, especially from the other side of the aisle, about restoring our system of checks and balances by rejuvenating the Congress, by reasserting our constitutional prerogatives. We have heard a lot of talk about the need to reform our structure and procedures, to modernize and update our archaic ways of doing things. But talk is cheap, Mr. Speaker, and it has not done anything to improve our public approval rating which now stands at 21 percent, even lower than that of the President. We have made some hopeful beginnings in this direction by opening committee meetings more, by enacting war powers legislation, and budget reform procedures, but much remains to be done, not the least of which is restructuring our ancient committee system with its confused and duplicative jurisdictional lines. We also need to improve our oversight responsibilities, and increase minority committee staffing. These things are provided for in House Resolution 988, and it is imperative that we move now on these reforms so that they can be implemented with the beginning of the 94th Congress next January.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, no one is arguing that House Resolution 988 is perfect, and there certainly should be opportunity for floor amendments to improve upon it. But, to use a well-worn phrase, "let the House work its will" on this important reform and put an end now to permitting a minority of the Democratic caucus or a handful of antireform task force members to thwart the will of the House. I urge my fair-minded and reform-minded colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with us today in urging early action on this historic opportunity to put our House in order.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with the action taken by the Democratic Caucus to defer action and move to the back burner any future consideration of the comprehensive House committee reform proposal. If that caucus and especially the liberal members of the caucus had any real interest in seeing these reforms approved this year, they would have voted to permit the legislation to be immediately considered by the Members of the House.

The action taken by the Democratic Caucus has the effect of preventing the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, House Resolution 988, from being brought to the House for consideration until the plan has been restudied by a caucus task force. This means, in effect, that the committee reform bill will probably be killed for the rest of this legislative year because a majority of the leading opponents of the measure serve on that task force.

When the public image of Congress is at an all-time low and there is such a need for congressional reform, I cannot understand why any Member of Congress would intentionally block a well-conceived and urgently needed plan to put the House back in order.

Under the capable bipartisan leadership of Congressman RICHARD BOLLING and Congressman DAVE MARTIN, the Select Committee on Committees has prepared a plan to overhaul the House committee system and procedures. I endorse this reorganization of the House because we need to make every effort to enable the House of Representatives to be more responsive to the needs of the Nation.

Among other things, this plan would provide for a much closer watch by Congress on Federal programs, which we approve and finance and whether or not they are working in the manner designed by the Congress. Basically, the reforms would simplify the committee structure by abolishing some committees and transferring and focusing important areas of jurisdiction to others. The reforms would strengthen committee staffing, improve committee oversight functions, increase the quality of information available to Members of Congress, and provide a continuing study of committee jurisdiction.

The reform package would break the stronghold the Ways and Means Committee holds over vast amounts of legislation. The House Administration Committee would be free from consideration of campaign legislation. That committee

has been totally ineffective in reporting campaign reform legislation to the House. Even though in the last year the Senate passed and sent to the House two major bills to limit campaign contributions and spending, the committee is still sitting on both bills.

This reform legislation is one of the most important measures to come before the House this year and I can see no reason why it should not at least be offered for consideration and I urge approval. If the House is to effectively deal with the important issues of inflation, energy, health, foreign affairs, as well as the many other domestic needs, the House committee structure must be improved. The House has not been reorganized since 1946 and I, for one, think the time has come to take the necessary action now, without any further delays.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, we are besieged daily by numerous calls for reform—reform of everything from taxes to welfare to campaign spending. And although we are progressing well in many of these areas, Congress now has a unique opportunity to make substantial improvements in an area equally as vital as any of these to the health of our Government.

I was extremely disappointed by the recent move by my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, which may have killed all hope for effective reform of the committee system of this body—a system that has lain stagnant for some 28 years. That this move was accomplished by means of a secret vote casts even darker doubts upon the opposition party's image as the party of progress and reform.

Congress is in desperate need of committee reform. Our archaic system is no longer effective in dealing with many of today's most pressing problems. Additionally, in the past few years, the imbalance of power between the executive and the legislative branches of our Government has further contributed to the need for sweeping reforms.

Although the report of the Bolling-Martin committee may not have resolved all the problems posed by the issue of committee reform, I feel the issue deserves a more complete discussion of its merits by the full House.

It is imperative in this election year that the public be allowed to see how each Member of this body stands on this issue. But, this cannot be done if delaying tactics such as those we recently witnessed are allowed to continue.

The time for effective reform is long past. Many of the proposed changes are needed. This will not happen, however, until we get House Resolution 988 out from behind the closed doors of secrecy and onto the floor of the House.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleagues from New York (Mr. KEMP) and from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN) for their initiative in obtaining this special order enabling Members to discuss this regrettable situation, and wish to express my appreciation for their honoring me by their invitation to participate.

After 14 months of hard work and

compromise, the bipartisan House Committee on Committees, chaired by the able Congressman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), reported House Resolution 988, a resolution to reform the structure, jurisdiction, and procedures of the committees of the House of Representatives by amending rules X and XI of the House Rules. This resolution contains minimal but necessary reforms. This reform measure is the first chance for internal congressional committee reform in 28 years, and provides several urgently needed reforms long sought by the American public.

I am sure that many others of this House, as well as the public at large, were as dismayed as was I by the action of the Democratic caucus of the House 2 weeks ago, when it, by a single party's secret vote in a closed caucus, attempted to bury this very important reform legislation by recommitting it to one of the Democratic caucus committees. This action indefinitely postponed any consideration of these important reforms by the House. In one fell swoop, the Democratic caucus attempted to wipe out those long months of effort by the Bolling committee. This maneuver is clearly a delaying tactic, cynically designed to kill House Resolution 988, and cannot be considered to be anything but a case of putting self-interest and pressure politics before the public good. This duplicity is doubly dismaying when practiced by a political party which has tried to paint itself as the progressive, reform party of the Congress.

Surely those who purport to fight for freedom of information, open meetings, and full disclosure by others should make every endeavor to pursue the spirit of those reforms themselves.

No matter what their party, those sincerely interested in reforms surely will join in challenging this attempt to bury this important reform legislation and in bringing these reform measures to the House floor for open and public debate, for amendment where appropriate, and for enactment into the House Rules.

The Bolling committee's reform recommendations, embodied in House Resolution 988, offer hope for reform and a resurgence of public confidence in this body. The secret vote in the closed Democratic Caucus cannot help but send public confidence in Congress and in Government to greater lows. We may still curb this deterioration of public confidence by acting quickly to bring the committee reform resolution to the House floor for debate of its merits in the full view of all, and for recording of the position of Members of the House.

It was to this end that I joined yesterday, May 22, in the introduction of House Resolution 1144. This resolution was cosponsored, with its companion House Resolution 1145, by some 40 Members of this House. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House would consider the Bolling committee's reform proposal, House Resolution 988, and would publicly debate its merits. Unlike a motion to discharge House Resolution 1144 would allow amendments to House Resolution 988 to be considered

and adopted. I submit that this resolution is entirely reasonable and would urge the House Rules Committee to report House Resolution 1144 without delay so that the House may be allowed to consider, amend, and approve this important committee reform legislation.

The reforms proposed by the Bolling committee include measures designed to streamline the committee system of the House. House Resolution 988 would cut down on the total number of committees and would centralize similar or duplicate responsibilities. It would insure that each Member would be assigned to a major committee with responsibility over legislation and would permit him to serve on only that one major committee. It would eliminate proxy voting by Members in committees and subcommittees, thus encouraging increased attendance at hearings and committee meetings. I have long cosponsored and urged action on resolutions for the establishment of a Committee on Environment, and I am glad the Bolling committee has proposed consolidating jurisdiction over energy and environment, now located in several different committees and subcommittees, into a Committee on Energy and Environment. For several years I have cosponsored resolutions proposing the establishment of a House Committee on the Aging, to give the problems and special needs of the elderly the study and attention they deserve. I regret the Bolling committee did not recommend establishment of such a committee, but I am hopeful this oversight will be remedied by a floor amendment when the committee reform resolution comes before the House.

Any defects in the Bolling committee reform resolution can be remedied by House floor amendments. They in no way justify the Democratic caucus' bottling up this important reform measure. I urge all Members genuinely interested in reforms which will enable Congress to consider and to respond more efficiently to the needs and problems of America today, to join in uncorking the bottle and bringing House Resolution 988 to the House floor for debate and consideration on its merits.

One of the most important reforms proposed by House Resolution 988 is the upgrading of the House Select Committee on Small Business into a standing **Committee on Small Business**, with full legislative authority over small business matters including legislation related to the Small Business Administration. Early in its proceedings, the Bolling committee had at first considered abolishing the House Select Committee on Small Business and giving its study authority to the Small Business Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Many protests were made by small businesses throughout the United States, especially those members of the National Federation of Independent Businesses who had been alerted to this situation by their association. I am pleased that the Bolling committee was convinced by the arguments presented by these small and independent businessmen and provided in its final report and in the resolution

for the establishment of a Committee on Small Business, with full authority over legislation in its field.

Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I joined with many in Congress and across this Nation this week of May 19 to 25 in honoring National Small Business Week 1974. As President Nixon noted in his proclamation:

The history of America is in large measure the history of independent enterprise.

Today, 19 out of every 20 American firms are considered small business. They provide approximately 35 million jobs and contribute more than \$476 billion annually to the gross national product. America's small and independent enterprises form the very backbone, the sinew, and the fiber of our economy. Their strength and health are vital to the well-being of our economy. Yet on almost every hand the small businessman is being confronted with increasing obstacles, by mounting demands for reports, and for complying with often confusing and sometimes inappropriate and illogical regulations from a multitude of governmental agencies implementing mandates enacted by Congress in the name of consumer protection, pure food and meat, antipollution, safety, and so forth.

I commend the House Select Committee on Small Business for its efforts through years of studies and reports to persuade Federal agencies and the Congress of the need to give a second look at proposed laws and regulations insofar as they may place unconscionable demands upon small businesses and add to harassment of firms to the point of intolerance.

The Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has also given recognition to the problems of independent businesses within the restrictions of its limited legislative jurisdiction. But the small businesses of America deserve a far better and improved forum, one which by the Bolling committee's resolution would provide by establishing a standing Committee on Small Business with full legislative authority over small business matters. This important provision would justify House adoption of the Bolling committee's committee reform resolution. America's small and independent businesses demand and deserve no less.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the actions of the Democratic caucus in stalling a vote on committee reform proposals is a prime example of the kind of tactics that have given Congress its lowest rating ever in the public opinion polls. To subject this reform measure to secret back room shenanigans after 14 months of hard work and a unanimous vote by a bipartisan committee is a devious trick, designed to kill the committee's proposals without the benefit of an open vote.

It is particularly ironic that the party which has tried to pass itself off as the party of reform would take this action. No action could be further from the concept of open government that we seem to be hearing so much about these days.

The issue is no longer as simple as committee reform. Certainly, reasonable

Members may disagree over certain portions of the committee's report. But the actions of the Democratic caucus have made overall reform the central issue involved. In these times of rapidly declining public confidence in Congress, or at any time for that matter, is a secret vote any way to handle a reform proposal? It most certainly is not.

The proper way to handle such a measure is to debate it on the floor and vote it up or down on its merits. For some reason, this open, above-board method is distasteful to a majority of the Democratic Members.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Rules Committee to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor so that it can be debated out in the open, not in some back room. The people of this country deserve the opportunity to observe each and every vote on legislation to reform their legislature. Public opinion of this body will sink to new depths, and justifiably so, if we allow this devious tactic to deny them that privilege.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am joining in this special order today to voice my dismay over the recent action taken by the Democratic Caucus to delay debate and enactment of the Bolling report written under the leadership of Congressmen BOLLING and MARTIN.

I need remind no one of the prestige, or should I say, lack thereof, of the Congress in the eyes of the American people these days. This action by the Democratic Caucus can do little to enhance our image.

Few people would argue that our committee structure needs reorganization—jurisdictions overlap and committees consider matters that have no logical connection. As a member of the Interior Committee, I have found it difficult to deal with the immense problem of energy since this matter is spread through so many committees. Besides Interior, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Science and Astronautics, Armed Services Committees, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy deal in one way or another in this field. This overlapping of jurisdiction makes a centrally directed energy policy very difficult for the Congress to achieve. The Bolling report would in effect situate energy matters within a new Committee on Energy and the Environment. We have seen instances when because of an overriding national problem, the Congress has been able to pull itself together and expedite normally tedious and redundant processes. Unfortunately, these instances are few and far between and only occur under pressure. The Bolling report would insure that Congress could respond effectively in such a manner in its day-to-day workings.

There are other aspects of the report which need, at a bare minimum, to be debated if not enacted. It is important that minority members of committees are assured adequate staffing—something sorely lacking now, unfortunately. Our staffs are forced to cover many more areas than their counterparts on the majority side, and this out of necessity cuts down on their efficiency and their

usefulness to members. The elimination of proxy voting will result in a much more responsible action by committee members. No longer would one member be able to collect many votes during committee deliberations while others abdicate their responsibilities.

I do not mean to imply that I am in complete agreement with every part of the Bolling report. But I feel strongly that the House of Representatives needs to reorganize itself, and to be trite, the sooner the better. The House must become more sensitive to the needs and desires of the people. Their needs have changed—our structure should reflect that change. It is imperative that Congress streamline its operation so that it might act in the efficient manner which is so badly needed. It is a sadder state of affairs when such a far-reaching proposal which has been studied and worked on so diligently for so long is not given the courtesy of open debate. I would sincerely hope that the Democratic Caucus would reconsider its action and allow us to discuss this much needed change.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I join today with others in calling for a floor vote on House Resolution 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974. The Select Committee on Committees has labored long and hard to produce a committee reorganization proposal which is rational and functional. Every Member has had ample opportunity to study the committee's preliminary and final reports, to comment on them, and to suggest revisions, some of which were subsequently incorporated in this legislation. There is no need to delay action on this crucial modernization of the House committee structure any longer, and I deplore the secret vote of the Democratic caucus to sidetrack this matter by calling for further study of a proposal which is itself the product of extensive hearings and deliberations. The House should be given an opportunity to express itself on the committee reform plan by a floor vote now.

As a Congressman who has written to Select Committee Chairman RICHARD BOLLING on several occasions to lend my support to the panel's objectives and to suggest certain improvements, I am deeply disturbed that this proposal may not come to a vote. It is of overriding importance that the committee system of the House of Representatives be reshaped to make it more responsive to pressing national needs. We can no longer expect to deal intelligently and comprehensively with the issues of 1974 using a committee structure appropriate to the issues of 1946. There was no energy crisis in 1946. The environment was not threatened in 1946 as it is today. Our cities were not clogged with automobiles in 1946 as they are now.

The times have changed dramatically in the last 28 years and, if we are to meet the challenges of the 1970's, we must not shirk our responsibility to adapt our procedures. Failure to do so will only lead to a continuation of the present sluggishness of the House which results from jurisdictional competition among committees, the wasteful overlap

and duplication of committee work, and the impossibly heavy workload of a few committees.

As one who has worked since first elected to Congress for enactment of legislation to improve mass transit facilities in and around our metropolitan areas, I can attest to the difficulty of following the work of more than twenty subcommittees involved with transportation legislation. The close relationship between the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Urban Mass Transit and the Public Works Subcommittee on Transportation with jurisdiction over the highway trust fund, recently tapped for mass transit assistance, illustrates the absurdity of perpetuating not only an obviously cumbersome jurisdictional division but one that sets unnecessary roadblocks in the way of timely consideration of urgently needed legislative remedies. I am gratified that the Committee on Committees has recommended that mass transit matters be shifted to the proposed Public Works and Transportation Committee, thereby giving this issue the strong committee focus which it has long required.

A similar lack of clear committee focus has plagued consideration of legislation dealing with the crucial energy problems which have developed in recent years. The result of the predictions of the House Task Force on Energy, on which I served in the last Congress, concerning impending energy shortages simply resulted in a proliferation of energy-related subcommittees, further confusing questions of jurisdiction and frustrating any hope of grappling meaningfully with the complexities of energy matters effectively and expeditiously.

The same is true of environmental concerns which have been dealt with on an unsatisfactory piecemeal basis for too long. The result has been a critical delay in urgently needed legislation in this vital area. The proposed Energy and Environment Committee would go a long way toward overcoming the crippling deficiencies of our current committee system in the key areas of energy and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my strong feeling that the House must be permitted to vote on proposed committee reform without further delay.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that House consideration of the Select Committee on Committees' Committee Reform Amendments and their substantial adoption by this body would be good for the Nation as well as good for the House. It would be a travesty to allow the select committee's recommendations to be shunted aside and not be considered by the House of Representatives. If this happens, the American public should be made aware of who is responsible for sidetracking this modernization and rationalization of the House committee structure.

I would like to use the opportunity of this special order to explain some of the merits of the select committee's recommendations, giving special regard to the select committee's recommendations pertaining to the Education and Labor Committee.

The manner in which we organize the jurisdictions of the committees influences far more than the internal workings of the House. There is a ripple effect that influences the way the Senate deals with legislation; the way the executive branch organizes and plans and recommends; the way organizations and interest groups relate to Congress; and the way the individual taxpayer is affected by the host of Federal programs.

Last year the OMB was reported to have identified over 100 Federal grant-in-aid programs with appropriations of some \$43 billion. Who in this world can begin to understand half that number of programs? How can the Congress organize itself to deal with such a range of programs in a rational and effective way?

We cannot continue to allow several committees to exercise jurisdiction over logically definable and specific areas. We are at the point where no fewer than nine of our 19 standing authorizing committees are involved in the field of education.

It will, if we have not already arrived there, become almost impossible for the Congress or the administration to coordinate Federal policy. Duplication is rampant. A staff paper for the National Commission on Postsecondary Finance identifies 294 Federal programs expending over \$8 billion in fiscal year 1972 that relate in some way to postsecondary education alone. Almost 40 different Federal agencies administer these programs. The amazing part is that the Education and Labor Committee has jurisdiction over less than half of these programs. I believe Congress has contributed to the inefficiency in both the legislative and executive agencies. As long as House committees narrow their sights to only a few Federal agencies, and each agency in turn focuses its attention primarily on one committee of the House, we will have an uncoordinated, wasteful, duplicative, ineffective approach to many of our Nation's problems.

With regard to the select committee's recommendation that there be a separate Education and a separate Labor Committee, I am sure the Congress never dreamed of how involved it would become in the field of education when it created our Committee on Education and Labor in 1946. I feel sure this was a marriage of convenience only. Because there was little in the way of Federal education programs prior to 1958, the total number of committees could easily be reduced at the time of the 1946 reorganization by merging education with labor.

Approximately 12 years after that last reorganization, however, things began to change. The committee soon became the focal point for some of the most significant domestic issues of our time. The following public laws represent only the major new areas of legislation we have undertaken since 1958:

National Defense Education Act, Manpower Development and Training Act, Vocational Education Act, Higher Education Act, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Economic Opportunity

Act, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act, Occupational Safety and Health Act, Older Americans Act.

These are only a few. And what makes the longer list even more impressive in terms of workload is the fact that most of these acts have several titles, often authorizing several Federal programs per title. The workload soon becomes overwhelming because most of these laws expire after 2 to 5 years and require re-examination. Of course, once a bill becomes law, it seems next to impossible to terminate it.

Labor legislation is far less time-consuming and is generally less complicated than many education bills. One reason is that education bills generally deal with granting Federal funds for specific purposes, whereas much of the labor legislation sets regulatory laws. I would judge that only about 30 percent of our committee's total "effort" is devoted to labor legislation. But here, too, other committees now have jurisdiction over some aspects of labor-management relations and other labor-related matters which would seem better coordinated if handled in one committee.

The select committee has also provided for joint, successive, or split consideration by two or more committees and a procedure for resolving competing jurisdictional claims. For instance, it is not practical to incorporate every education-related law and proposal under one committee. Likewise, tax legislation should be kept under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, even when it has a major impact on the Federal role in education. However, there should be better mechanisms for the two committees to cooperate in the consideration of legislation, for instance, that is related to tax credits for educational expenses. I believe the education members would have a useful perspective to contribute to the Ways and Means members.

Federal policy would be better coordinated. Most important, however, is the special oversight jurisdiction the select committee has recommended for the proposed Committee on Education. This committee would have special oversight jurisdiction over education and student assistance programs under the jurisdiction of other committees. The wisdom of this recommendation for coordinating Federal education policy in the House and, thus, throughout the Federal Government, is evident. The committee will be the focus for the Federal policy. It will have a beneficial effect in eliminating the duplication of efforts and programs in the House and the executive branch. It will go a long way toward making the Federal response to national educational needs effective and efficient.

My discussion points out but a few beneficial considerations behind the select committee's recommendations. As I stated above, it would be a travesty to allow the select committee's recommendations to be shunted aside and not be considered by the House of Representatives. If this happens, the American public will be made aware of who is responsible for sidetracking this modernization

and rationalization of the House committee structure.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is most regrettable that we are partaking in this special order today to urge the Rules Committee to bring House Resolution 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, to the House floor for consideration. I say it is regrettable because these reforms should never have been sidetracked but should have been scheduled for House debate as a matter of course.

I am not going to indulge in a diatribe against my colleagues who are stalling reform. Rather, it is to convey the sense of frustration and concern over the future of our governmental institutions that I speak.

When I was first elected to Congress a little over 3 years ago, as with many first-termers I arrived in Washington with a sense of mission. I have been disillusioned, yes, but I still have hope. However, I wonder if the American people have any hope left for this governmental institution. The Congress has fallen steadily in public esteem over the past two decades—now hitting an all-time low of 21 percent.

Over the past year constituents have written me, expressing their disillusionment with our system of government; questioning the ability of Congress to govern, to legislate to meet the needs of our Nation and to anticipate and forestall crises. While I would acknowledge that in the past we have failed in many instances, I would also point to the Bolling-Martin committee recommendations as a means of achieving an effective, efficient, responsible, and responsive House of Representatives. Here, I told them, was the spur to reform and a means of bringing Congress into the 1970's and 1980's. The committee recommendations are not perfect. No reform is perfect. But it is a beginning step to inject logic and vitality into a legislative system to enable the House to deal with current problems in an expeditious and coherent fashion. What now do I tell my constituents?

By failing to take this first step toward reform, we are destroying what remaining faith the American public has in this institution.

Are we today so enmeshed with our own self-interest that we would allow the long-range institutional interests of the House to atrophy? Are we so immersed with selfish concerns that we can not function and organize for the best interests of the Nation? Must we continue to hold desperately to our own little fiefdoms? Do we not have enough confidence in our individual ability and capacity to grow, lead, and initiate under a new committee organization?

We are faced today with fragmentation of policy decisionmaking and dispersal of authority throughout the various committees of the House. Jurisdiction over large policy areas such as health, energy, transportation, environment, and foreign economic policy has been split among committees, with ensuing jealousies over prerogatives. The proliferation of subcommittees, now

totaling 148, attest to our outdated committee system, each committee creating new subcommittees in order to bring an area of interest into their purview. Hence, today it is virtually impossible to achieve a coordinated, effective, comprehensive approach to tackling our problems.

Much has been made of the fact that removing the existing multiplicity of overlapping jurisdictions will eliminate a valuable flexibility from the system. Is it "flexibility" that last year 14 of the 21 House committees held hearings on energy legislation? Is it "flexibility" that subcommittees pop up all over the place as committees maneuver to secure expanding jurisdiction? I do not think "flexibility" is the term to be applied here. Rather, I think chaos is the more suitable term. And the result is a Congress that reacts rather than takes imperative action, ponders rather than produces, agonizes rather than legislates. And, of course, the net result is a belief among our citizens that their elected officials no longer understand their problems or care about their needs.

Many say a "lame duck" Congress should not make the changes it may not have to live with, that the new Congress should initiate changes. I say, hog-wash. We know the problems; we have lived with them on a day-to-day basis. We, the 93d Congress, can best legislate the solutions, so that the 94th Congress can work effectively from the first day of their convening in 1975. The 94th Congress should be a new beginning, spurred by a reform-minded 93d Congress.

Understandably, in a subject area such as this which has such a direct bearing on each Member's role in the House, there are differing viewpoints as to the merits of various parts of the Bolling-Martin committee recommendations. Indeed, this is not legislation in the ordinary sense. But despite differences, it is vital that the resolution be scheduled for debate. Let modifying amendments be offered and let the House membership decide their value. But above all, bring this resolution to the floor so that the House can work its will.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is not a happy occasion when my colleagues and I must use the forum of a special order to plead with the Rules Committee to bring the committee reform amendments to the floor for consideration and a vote.

Nine distinguished colleagues and I labored for a year and a half to develop the first legislative overhaul of the House committee structure in 28 years. We knew the final results would not be popular and that some important toes would be stepped on. We anticipated that the final product approved by the House would differ from our proposal in some degree.

What we did not anticipate, however, was that a partisan caucus, in closed session and by secret ballot, would bury our reform proposal in one of its subcommittees.

In the face of the lowest degree of respect ever accorded the Congress by the American people, in the face of a legislative backlog attributable in part to orga-

nizational problems in the House, and in the face of critical new national priorities unrecognized in existing committee structure, the Democratic caucus put the lie to its progressive, reformist image by sabotaging a major effort to clean house in Congress. If the House follows the decision of the caucus, it will remain indefinitely entrenched in the organizational mode of the 1940's and correspondingly unresponsive to the needs of our complex, fast-changing society.

Mr. Speaker, I placed my name on House Resolution 988 as a sponsor with all of the other members of the select committee, even though there are some recommendations in the proposal with which I do not agree. I did so as an expression of my strong support for the overall concept of committee reform, and feeling that I could express my reservations when the measure came before the House for consideration. The select committee did not plan to request a closed rule. All we wanted was the free and open consideration, debate, and amendment of a major reform proposal on which we had expended substantial time and effort at the direction of our colleagues. Two hundred and eighty-two Members of the House voted on January 31, 1973, to create the select committee; now some 111 Members of a single party are blocking this substantial majority from considering the results of their mandate.

The very swiftness and secrecy of the burial of House Resolution 988 out of public attention compels concern. The Congress does not need any more negative publicity than it has; we stagger now under the weight of public disaffection and mistrust in Government. Let us hope that we can avoid any further growth in these trends. One way to restore confidence in the Congress and in congressional willingness to enact reforms would be for the House to reform itself. Openly and with input from all concerned, not just the behind-the-scenes special interests.

I urge the Rules Committee to ignore the caucus vote and hold hearings on a rule for House Resolution 988, so that the House can face the 1970's and the American people with a revitalized structure and a renewed determination to be of maximum service to all Americans.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for over a year the members of the bipartisan Select Committee on Committees worked to develop reforms which would improve the responsiveness and functional efficiency of the House of Representatives. Recognizing the significance of its undertaking, the select committee opened its hearings and markup sessions to an interested public.

Recently, in a meeting held behind closed doors, the Democratic Party caucus managed in a few short minutes to block the months long reform efforts of the select committee. In an unrecorded ballot, House Democrats voted to deny the entire House membership an opportunity to consider the reform resolution as reported from the committee. By instructing the Rules Committee to defer consideration of the measure, and instead sending the resolution to its own

partisan caucus committee, these few members have ironically demonstrated why the reform measures are so necessary.

The Democratic Party, which seems to be continually pushing in Congress to reform every phase of American life, is now unwilling to allow even the discussion of congressional reform on the House floor.

It has been three decades since the House last examined and modified its structure. In recent years this structure has proven sadly unresponsive to the rapidly changing demands placed upon it. The lack of coordination between committees, the increasing incidence of jurisdictional overlap and conflict, and the inequitable distribution of committee responsibility among Members have sorely limited Congress ability to respond effectively to the public's needs and opinions.

Of course, there are certain objectionable points among the numerous proposals of the select committee. But the proper forum for the consideration of such a vital national issue is the floor of Congress, not the party caucus room.

With its Members daily bombarding the American public with the rhetoric of full disclosure and openness in Government, the House would do well to heed its own words.

I join with other concerned Members of the House in urging the Rules Committee to promptly move House Resolution 988, the Committee Reforms Amendments of 1974, to the floor of the House for open debate and proper consideration.

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure as Congressman from South Dakota, I have heard the cries from this very Chamber for honesty in Government. In this past year stirring words of congressional leadership have filled the newspapers and airwaves of this country. The restoration of the power of the legislative has daily provided the atmosphere for our deliberations.

Surely we have witnessed the bankruptcy of cheap rhetoric early this month when by secret vote the Democratic Party caucus blocked consideration of badly needed procedural reforms of this very body. All those voices crying in the wilderness have been revealed to be little more than echoes from campaign promises safely made to home constituents. But like the old saying so aptly describes, "it depends on whose ox is being gored."

The constellation of pressures on this body have taken on a new focus during the past year. Cries of Presidential weakness have only been met with congressional inaction and confusion. Demands for the restoration of the equality of the legislative branch vis-a-vis the executive are juxtaposed on congressional docility and empire building. Honesty and integrity in Government demanded so sanctimoniously by Members of this body have been met only with secrecy and duplicity.

Where now are all the Jeremiahs of the first session? This body acted last January to establish a Select Commit-

tee on Committees to study the internal structure of the House. At that time Congress commissioned this committee to formulate new procedures to adopt the ponderous mechanisms presently used in our deliberations. They were mandated to restructure this body to better meet the complex demands of modern issues and problems.

The recommendations of this committee soon ran into the foundations of empires of my fellow colleagues. Demand for reform seems only to be discussed in the third person. The present attitude of "They should put their house in order" is a ludicrous prostitution of the reform spirit of this body only a year ago.

We are here today, not to memorialize our contempt, but to again request our colleagues to address the issue of reform honestly. This past year has witnessed sweeping changes in this society and in our Government. On numerous occasions in our history, Congress has seen the need to update its procedures and structures to address a changing environment with changing needs. We pride ourselves for living in a country that accents the peaceful nature of change in this society and in our Government. It has been our history to have honesty serve as the midwife of change, not violence or duplicity. We have before us an opportunity to continue that history. It is my call today not to further prostitute our obligations as representatives and avoid our responsibilities.

Authority and power will not fall to Congress by default, as it abdicated that power over the past dozens of years. It will not accrue to us as the result of our sincerity, for sincerity has no intrinsic value. Our constitutional obligations will be restored only when we assume the responsibility ourselves, even at the expense of our personal ambitions and positions. We are not in pursuit of a holy grail. We are not trying to finally construct a governmental utopia. Our sole task is to be continually vigilant in striving for ways to make this body more effective.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Miss JORDAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I personally knew nothing of Watergate or of the activities of those individuals involved. It has been discussed throughout our Nation. Every fireside has seen and heard it day after day after day. We have heard about the tapes. We have read ex-

cerpts and replays. No Member of this House, to the best of my knowledge—or of the other body—had anything to do with the tapes or with Watergate.

There is an old political axiom that one should never write or record anything which is political, or which involves another person, a political opponent or even a friend adversely. I think that serious mistakes were made in writing and recording political feelings, impressions and descriptions of actual happenings.

I do not condone the breaking and entering of Watergate; neither do I condone the breaking and entering of the psychiatrist's office in California. However, I would say that if Daniel Ellsberg, who stole the secret Pentagon papers and released them, had done this during the administration of Andrew Jackson, he would have been hung as high as Haman. Instead of that, some people have attempted to make a folk hero of him because he betrayed his trust and his oath of office in so doing.

I remember when President Franklin Roosevelt, years ago, in reference to harsh words said about his dog Fala, replied:

The leaders have not been content with attacks on me, or my wife, or on my sons. No, not content with that, they now include my little dog, Fala. Well, of course, I don't resent attacks, . . . but Fala *does* resent them . . . I think I have a right to resent, to object to libelous statements about my dog.

Some members of the press—not all of them, but many of them—have gone beyond the bounds of propriety. They have attacked Mrs. Nixon, who, as far as I have been able to determine, is really a moral woman of the highest type.

They have attacked little Julia Eisenhower who has stood and fought for her father, fielding the most difficult and sometimes insulting questions that have ever been perpetrated in the human mind, and she has never lost her composure.

If the President deserves to be charged with impeachable offenses, this will be brought out by the Judiciary Committee, but until this is done, and unless a conviction is made according to the Constitution and the laws of our land, he is to be considered innocent. But, as yet, I have seen no impeachable offenses come over the horizon.

We can say that he was ill-advised, that he was inept, and that he had a court of inexperienced political neophytes about him. But to say, at the present time, that he is guilty without definitive proof is impossible. Yet we all know that he has been called every vicious, abhorrent name imaginable. Let us bring to a conclusion this part of the discourse which I am making by saying that any man is presumed innocent until proven guilty. If he should resign at this time, it would be taken by many to be an admission of guilt.

Now let us dwell for a little while upon the positive accomplishments of this administration:

First, an end to our participation in the war in Vietnam, and our POW's came home proudly saluting the flag.

Second, substantially improved relations with the People's Republic of China.

Third, détente with the Soviet Union.

Fourth, improvement of conditions in the Middle East.

Fifth, reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Egypt.

Sixth, improvements in social and health programs.

Seventh, jobs.

Eighth, hospitals.

Ninth, vocational schools.

Tenth, pure water and sewage treatment systems.

Eleventh, roads and parks.

Twelfth, significant increases in social security benefits and veteran compensation and pensions.

Further, the little country of Israel, established in 1947, and whose existence was guaranteed by practically every major country in the world, was attacked on the day of atonement, Yom Kippur. We gave assistance to this little country. Without our aid, it would have been destroyed and as a result an oil embargo was enforced by the Arabic countries against the United States. Of course, this precipitated the energy crisis. And I know that all of you remember the long lines in Washington and in its environs in which people waited for gasoline by means of which they could be propelled to and from their work.

I know that many of you traveled, as I did, about the country on the weekends and saw the numbers of people registered at our motels decimated, reduced by at least 90 percent. We saw the wonderful cooperation of the American people. On our Interstate highways, very few cars were seen. Part of this was because of the cooperation of the American people, much of it was caused by the unavailability of gasoline.

Through the efforts of the present administration and our Secretary of State, Mr. Henry Kissinger, the oil embargo was lifted, peaceful relations were established between Egypt and Israel, and peaceful relations are in the process of final agreement between Syria and Israel.

There is no question but that a deep depression would have come to pass within the United States if the oil embargo had been maintained.

I submit that these agreements have resulted in the greatest diplomatic accomplishments since the days of Disraeli, or perhaps in history.

But we never read in the Washington Post or the New York Times of what the administration has really accomplished. All we see in the papers is some article castigating the President of the United States. But let us remember that without these diplomatic maneuvers we at the present time would be in the depth of a depression with hundreds of thousands of people out of work. You and I would not have gasoline to get to our places of work each day.

It is evident that some of the newspapers published in this country have hated Richard Nixon for many, many, many years because he uncovered the conspiracy of Alger Hiss, and because he defeated the darling of the liberals, Helen Gahagan Douglas.

And I see among my own party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, Republicans cowering in their dens, afraid to speak up as to what this administration has accomplished.

We are all cognizant of the fact that Abraham Lincoln too was criticized more bitterly in the press than any man in the history of the United States prior to the present time. He was called a monkey, an ape, a baboon, a country lout, and at the pinnacle of his career he was knocked down by an assassin's bullet. And only then, and after that, was it recognized that the man who said, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it," was our country's greatest American.

I have been in the White House during the present administration and during the previous administration, and I have heard words that would curl the hair and burn the ears of a muleskinner.

Although I am a physician, I have been interested in politics for many, many years, and I have been actively engaged in every election since I was able to cast my vote. And in all of them, each and every one, I have seen things done which should not have been done. And I say to you here today that if you are without sin, then you can cast the first stone. Until the evidence is in, and the Judiciary Committee submits its findings, it behooves each and every Member of this body to withhold his judgment and judge not that you be not judged. For with what judgment you judge, you shall be judged; and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again, full measure pressed down, heaped up and running over.

Members of the Republican Party who work in our system throughout the United States will not look kindly on those of this faith who prejudge.

Republicans should cast aside the cloak of guilt and focus upon what is right with America.

It is said that Mrs. Nixon and her lovely daughters have received gifts from foreign countries. And that these should be made the property of the State. This, I do not deny, but if I recall correctly, one of our former President's wives visited in India and was showered with gifts of all descriptions, and among those gifts was a fine, Arabian gelding. I never heard of any of these gifts being turned over to the Federal Government. And if you use the same measuring stick as you have against Mrs. Nixon and her daughters, then you must admit that those gifts should have become the property of the Federal Government. However, our liberal limousine press never once, to my knowledge, mentioned one word concerning the ownership of this property.

This is just another indication of how the press does not only want to impeach and convict Richard M. Nixon, it is evidence of the fact that they would roast him over a slow fire. And this, I submit, is unfair, unusual, and inhuman treatment.

I pray that strength, stability, and sound judgment will prevail.

Mr. KEMP. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. CARTER. I am happy to yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my regard for the gentleman and my agreement with the statement he is making here today. The gentleman in the well of this House is known for his integrity and for his conscience. I greatly respect and admire him.

The gentleman is saying something here today with which I fully concur. That is that it ill behooves a Member of Congress to be making a prejudgment on this issue, putting his feet in concrete, as it were, as to what the final constitutional judgment will be, until all the evidence is forthcoming from the investigations that are going on. To do so is to violate the oath of impartiality that we as potential jurors must accept as our role in this process.

Many of us in this legislative body are finding ourselves in a highly charged political climate, the likes of which probably have not been paralleled since the time of Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson. There are many of us on both sides of the aisle today who are, I am sure, deeply concerned about reelection.

I have given a great deal of thought, not only to what the gentleman is saying here today, but as to how, in agreement with my own conscience, I will be making these historic decisions. They must be made on constitutional grounds. I would just emphasize and try to give as a piece of advice to my own colleagues the thought that it makes no sense to be calling for the resignation of the President. Resignation would lead to a great deal of cynicism and doubt in this country as to the ultimate ability of our Constitution, to which we owe our allegiance, to continue to serve as the foundation stone for our process of government and justice.

I would just say to the Members of my own party publicly—and I have said it before—that they should be exhorted to work hard this year, to work harder than they have ever worked before.

Members should emphasize the places where they can agree—as well as also emphasize those areas where they may disagree—with the administration. I am sure the gentleman in the well, for one, has some, and I have some myself.

I believe we should allow—require—our constitutional system to work. If the President is willing to put himself in a situation where he is relying on the Constitution to work, it does not behoove us to either call for his resignation or to use other extra-constitutional means to resolve the issue.

I am proud of this system. I believe it is working, and I know in the final analysis a judicious and expeditious investigation is in the best interests of the President.

This body, the gentleman in the well, and all of us on the floor today, owe our allegiance to the United States of America even before allegiance to our own party.

I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I want to commend him for taking this time.

It is obvious that this House is moving toward eventual resolution of the pend-

ing inquiry into the possible impeachment of the President.

I think it wise, therefore, to pause and reflect upon the responsibilities of a Representative—each and every one of us as individual Members of the House—in the conduct and resolution of this inquiry.

The Committee on the Judiciary is still gathering information deemed by the majority of that committee to be essential to its inquiry. No one now knows, of course, when the committee's investigation will be concluded and when it will begin considering, item by item, the specific weight behind each allegation of an impeachment offense made against the President.

I support an investigation by the committee and voted for funding such an investigation. I feel that only a full, fair, and speedy investigation will restore the people's confidence in the Office of the Presidency, a confidence necessary to the stability of our form of government.

Until the air is cleared on this issue, our entire machinery of government and society is impeded. That is why I hope the committee's investigation will come to a conclusion at the earliest possible date.

As we move toward settlement of this issue, I think it is important to state what I see to be the nature of our responsibilities.

Our situation in the House is analogous to that of a grand jury in a criminal proceeding within our judicial system. There—and here—the evidence is presented to a body whose sole responsibility it is to determine if the weight of the evidence supports an actual trial. If the House feels that it does, then it accepts the bill of impeachment and the matter then goes to the Senate where the actual trial of impeachment is conducted.

The role of the Senate is like that of a trial jury. It must actually decide guilt or innocence with respect to the specific allegations contained in the bill of impeachment sent to it from the House. Removal from office, by vote of the Senate, does not constitute a conviction, for actual convictions of criminal or civil offenses is a matter for the courts of the land, not the legislative branch of Government. Removal from office, by vote of the Senate, is simply that: Removal from office.

Many responsibilities rest with each Member of the House in his role in voting for or against the bill of impeachment. Transcending all of those responsibilities is the notion of due process—of fair play—and the principle that one is innocent until proved guilty. We owe it to ourselves, to our constituents, to the President, and to posterity not to make prejudgments on impeachment, until all the facts are in. In my opinion, it is as wrong for a Member to make such a prejudgment as it would be for a grand juror to make such a prejudgment before all the facts are in. And, surely, the facts are not all in on the impeachment matter.

It is not only unfair but in derogation of our constitutional responsibilities for Members to act on any basis other than an examination of all the evidence when

that evidence comes to us at the conclusion of the committee's inquiry.

We would be abhorred if grand jurors were making up their minds and announcing their decisions and judgments before all the evidence was in during a criminal inquiry. As a matter of fact, under our laws and rules of procedure, such a person would be disqualified from serving further upon the grand jury. It is, I suggest, as wrong for us in the Congress to make up our own minds on impeachment before all the evidence is in as it would be if we were serving on a grand jury.

Mr. CARTER. I am certainly happy to have the gentleman from New York agree with me. I must state that his words were very meaningful and well expressed.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, (Mr. LANDGREBE).

Mr. LANDGREBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must say I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman in the well. He is one of the fine men in this Congress.

Does the gentleman remember any talk of impeachment following the announcement of the Nixon doctrine that proved to be so successful in southeast Asia?

Mr. CARTER. I do not recall that I remember any call for impeachment, although at that time I do know certain Members of the House indicated even earlier, before mention was made of Watergate, that they were for impeachment.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Well, the general public was not clamoring for the President's impeachment because of the successful Nixon doctrine. In other words, what I am trying to point out here, Dr. CARTER, is that in my observation certainly no one called for his impeachment on the day that he gave the posthumous awards to families of deceased veterans at the White House.

Mr. CARTER. Absolutely not.

Mr. LANDGREBE. It was really a very difficult chore for that great man. I was there at the time.

The point I am trying to develop here is that the President really did not feel the storm of the impeachment promoters until he had vetoed a couple of big spending bills. The President, of course, began his term in office with a call for and a determination to have a balanced budget even with the war in Vietnam going on. That was his one big mistake, because it was totally impossible to balance the budget with an expenditure of \$30 billion a year going on in this war in Vietnam, which he did not start. Anyway, we come down to the situation today.

I want to go back to one point I want to make in this discussion. We have a penalty which can be exacted, and that is impeachment. We have a call being made on the President of the United States. We will have no charge placed against this man nor has he been convicted of any charge. In Indiana we cannot hold anyone, no matter how much evidence there is, unless we place a charge against him in 24 hours or less. He cannot be held if we do not place a charge with 24 hours. We have spent literally

millions of dollars trying to find a charge to place against this man that we can really make stick. If there is anything on the horizon to show that or that hints that there is a charge that can be made to stick, it has not even been whispered in the Halls of Congress. Has the gentleman heard one charge that might relate to an impeachment proceeding?

The people say, "On what charge?" And he says, "On any of 40 charges." But he never is specific.

This, again, is the President of the United States, the man that the people of America elected just 1½ years ago with the greatest majority in the history of our country, and in the State of Indiana with a 650,000 vote majority. And the war was not even over yet, the boys were not home yet.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana allow the gentleman from Kentucky to yield to me so that I can cover one point?

Mr. LANDGREBE. Certainly I will permit the gentleman in the well to yield to the gentleman from California. However, I have not completed all of my remarks as yet.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Indiana yielding to me. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for taking this time.

The point has just been raised that a basic precept of our country; namely, that a man is clearly innocent until he is proven guilty, has not been practiced in a very even-handed manner by some of the Members of this House, by the press, or by various public spokesmen. It is incredible to many of us that the so-called champions of civil rights, or those who claim to be the champions of civil rights, especially from the other side of the aisle, are constantly shrieking from the roof top about all kinds of things that they think are wrong about the President's past actions, and yet they cannot produce any real hard evidence. As a matter of fact, these voices of gloom and doom as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) has indicated do not seem too much interested in the President's civil rights, just the allegations. I realize that many members of the Committee on the Judiciary who do believe in civil rights in some cases have withheld making any comments, or judgments, because they want to see the facts and the evidence.

I think the point that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) makes, and the point the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) also outlines is correct, and are ones that have not really been adequately covered by members of the press. These are the same members of the press, who claim to be great champions of civil rights, and who are so quick to place before the public hearsay material on allegations that cannot always be substituted, and make it appear that the President is guilty when the actual hard evidence has not been adequately produced.

So, Madam Speaker, I compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) for taking his special order today, and for trying to bring forward

some of the positive and constructive things the President has done.

The gentleman has supported, as I have, many of the Presidential vetoes that were clearly called for, because there was a vast over expenditure of funds on the part of the Congress through various appropriation bills and, therefore, we had to sustain those vetoes. For whom? For the taxpayers, for the average citizens of this country, who are so overwhelmed by a congressional imposed tax burden.

So, Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Indiana both can be complimented for bringing out the important point that it is a basic precept of our country, and the bulwark of our whole way of life, that a man is clearly innocent until he is proven guilty. Until the evidence is presented in a judicious and fair manner, we in the Congress should not be a party to the howling political lynch mobs or the hearsay that continues to go on and on endlessly. We are hopefully that the press will exercise greater restraint and be more responsible in the way it handles this impeachment matter.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) and to ask the gentleman, if the gentleman would not mind answering, as to whether he does not think that the press sets a double standard for certain people? Is that correct?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that on many of these issues there has been a double standard. Nobody can complain when the press, either editorially or through articles, brings up items that should legitimately be brought to the public's attention, but when they try in the same voice to clearly condemn and convict without hard evidence, then I think that is a double standard.

Mr. CARTER. My point is this: that Mrs. Nixon and Julie have been criticized for gifts which they received, and it was stated in the press that they should turn them back to the Federal Government, probably to the Archives. They may be right legally, but I remember quite well just a few years ago when one of our First Ladies visited India, and at that time was presented with many gifts, all sorts of gifts, including an Arabian gelding, tiger cubs, and so on, but I have never heard of any of those gifts being sent to the Archives or being turned over to the Federal Government. Has the distinguished gentleman from California heard of this?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. No; not to my knowledge.

Mr. CARTER. Is that an example of a double standard?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. It is indeed.

Mr. CARTER. Indeed, instead of any complaint, this was discussed in a praiseworthy way, that these things had been given.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Another note on gifts and trophies. I am waiting for Jack Anderson to do a column on the annual Washington Press Club golf tournament, and on the gifts and trophies—and where they come from. I can hardly wait. He

always goes into the congressional golf tournament with great alacrity to show where those gifts come from. But I think that we should have a full exposure soon about all the gifts that the press gets, in this local golf tournament, and more important where all these gifts originate. I am sure the public will want to have all of those facts.

The standard of "full disclosure" should be applied equally to our good friends in the press who demand "full disclosure" for public officials.

Mr. ARENDS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I should like to join my colleague in commending the gentleman for the statement he is making here today, because today he is taking a positive approach to some of the matters that are of grave and important concern to the American people.

The gentleman touched upon one thing that I think about so much; namely, foreign policy and what is happening today in a troubled, upset, and disturbed world. In this instance we see the President of the United States doing what had not been done over a generation past—bringing about peace, peace for this generation and generations yet to follow—the first man who may go down in history as the individual who brought peace to this world for the first time.

To me this is the overriding issue of all issues and the thing which the American people should be paying some attention to. I heartily commend the gentleman again for the position he has taken here today.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. I wish to say that what he has said is the truth. Our administration has sought to achieve the peace and has achieved the peace. But yet the press does not praise the administration for what it has done. It fails to do that, and that is the negative instead of the positive approach to accomplishments.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say I would be delighted to pick up the paper tomorrow morning and see the statement of the gentleman on the front page. That would be delightful.

Mr. CARTER. It would be on page 14, I am sure.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I really appreciate the assistance of the gentleman from California in helping to develop in a clearer manner what I was trying to touch upon. We did not have a very lengthy debate today on our great deficit, now approaching half a trillion dollars. This is of concern to people, and even people in government are starting to realize that we are coming to the end of our rope.

I have just a quick question. Does the gentleman feel that the millions that have been spent looking for a charge

to place against the President have helped to ease our deficit, or the pre-occupation of this Congress over the months with Watergate, in addition, it seems, to the courts carrying on and sending Magruder, and this man and that man to jail for 10 months or 10 years, and people being indicted? And while all of this is happening in the legal processes, this Congress has been preoccupied with it, too. What benefit has it been to the people through that preoccupation; can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. CARTER. Of course, they have been striving to find out if there is an impeachable offense. As I said, they have not found it. I trust they will come to a conclusion and that the Committee on the Judiciary will give us a report on which we can act, basing our judgments on what we think are right, and measuring our judgments carefully.

I trust that we will do that so that we can get along with the business of our country. We have many problems which we need to attack.

Mr. LANDGREBE. In response to the gentleman's invitation to join him, I really did so to make just one point. I could not resist discussing some of these other things. I wish to point out, No. 1, that I have been in the presence of the President a number of times. I have never heard him say even one "damn it." I have never heard a lewd story told at any formal meetings at the White House, formal entertainments. I have always been impressed with the respectability of President Nixon, his wife, and his very lovely daughters and sons-in-law. But this brings me to a point.

When I was first elected to Congress—in fact, when I arrived in Washington—I was amazed at the stacks of mail waiting for me on my desk. Many, many of those pieces of mail included packets of pornographic material that had been delivered through the Postal Service to people in my district.

One was especially vulgar, particularly profane, some of the Swedish true pornography which had been sent to a Boy Scout. Somehow those people had gotten a list of the names and were sending this sort of stuff into the homes. During the first few months and perhaps up to the first year of my service in the Congress I was receiving one such piece of mail a day, or four or five a week, and I sent all those to the Postal Department, except those extremely pornographic and those I sent to the White House, to the attention of the President.

I will ask the gentleman how much of this material he has received in the last few months. But before he answers I would like to tell the gentleman we have not had one piece of such mail sent to my office from the irate people in my district in a year. This is just one of the tiny but important things that has happened to our country during the Nixon administration. However, that was truly dynamite and the Nixon administration got rid of it.

How much of that material has the gentleman had in his mail in the last few months or year?

Mr. CARTER. None that I recall. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made on May 13 over station WMAL by Joseph McCaffrey, our well-known Washington commentator.

Joe McCaffrey has always been factual in editing his remarks with reference to the U.S. Congress and the Members serving in the Congress.

The editorial commentary on our system of government which he delivered on May 13 was, in his usual style, factual, and timely, and it went to the heart of the issue.

It is for these reasons that I call it to the attention of my colleagues. The McCaffrey commentary follows:

COMMENT BY JOSEPH MCCAFFREY

Richard M. Nixon may or may not resign the Presidency.

Although support for him within his own political party erodes more with each passing day, the decision when it is made will have to be made by him.

In the meantime Americans should give thanks to those fifty-five men who put together this system under which we live. This system which is so strong, so resilient that it can survive a politically wounded president.

In 1787 when those men met in Philadelphia, they could not have known the dilemma their country would be in 187 years in the future; in 1974 when faith and trust in the leading principal would be at an all time low.

But, with some strange prescience those fifty-five men crafted a system which would protect the country they loved from grinding to a halt when the man who happened to be at its head had come a cropper.

This July 4th we should devote more than the usual perfunctory bow to those who shaped the constitution. If it hadn't been for their great genius we would be in a very bad way today, if we had survived until today. That we are able to overcome the disaster we now face, and that we have come along so well over the last 187 years is due to those fifty-five men who met in the Federal convention in 1787.

Thank God for the system they brought forth!

It serves us well today.

VETO THREATENED

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon yesterday threatened to veto the education bill unless the House-Senate conference committee modifies particular provisions of the Senate-passed version. Mr. Nixon specifically attacked the Senate antibusing amendment. He prefers the House measure, which forbids courts to order busing of children to achieve desegregation beyond the school closest or next closest to their homes and would reopen all busing orders which violate the House prescription. The Senate forbade reopening of past cases and said that courts could ignore the antibusing strictures if they believed black students' constitutional rights were being violated.

Mr. Nixon's most recent attack on busing indicates his continued reliance on the techniques of Watergate politics. He is trying to curry favor with conservatives by an appeal based on emotionalism, not fact. In his statement yesterday, Mr. Nixon referred to "busing to achieve racial balance," and "massive forced busing." His facile, loaded presentation of the issue was designed to arouse the fears and prejudice of Americans. In fact, as Mr. Nixon well knows, "busing to achieve racial balance" is not now, and never has been, the issue. Mr. Nixon used the phrase to raise the totally imaginary specter of massive, forced busing across districts and even States. No court to date has ordered such busing, and no court is likely to. It is a false and misleading issue.

As Senator BROOKE pointed out in his Senate speech against the Gurney amendment, 20 million children ride schoolbuses each day. The Supreme Court ruled in North Carolina State Board of Education against Swann that busing is "an integral part of the public education system." The Court found "no basis for holding that the local school authorities may not be required to employ bus transportation as one tool of desegregation," and stated that "desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school." Here lies the crux of the issue, which Mr. Nixon's insidious rhetoric so neatly avoids. Will we deny black students their rights under the Constitution? Will the Congress force the Supreme Court to rule once again that courts must be allowed "breadth and flexibility"—Swann—in determining what measures are necessary to achieve constitutionally mandated desegregation?

The fact that I feel compelled to repeat these arguments, familiar to all informed students of desegregation and busing, is an indication of the dangerous nature of Mr. Nixon's attack. Once again, he is trying to undermine progress toward a truly integrated society and equal education for all schoolchildren. He is playing on the groundless fears of the people and the political fears of Members of Congress.

In addition, Mr. Nixon is once again attempting to interfere in the legislative process. He threatens us with the power of the executive branch. But Congress can, and must, resolve this issue independent of Mr. Nixon. The House and Senate conferees must not allow Mr. Nixon's grandstand play for popularity to affect their rational, sensible considera-

tion of the education bill and its amendments.

One branch, at least, must join the Supreme Court in upholding the Constitution. Black students are entitled to constitutional rights. Mr. Nixon's calculated political appeal does not change that fact. It merely indicates once again the President's willingness to use any and all means to achieve his dubious ends.

1,000 PAY TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES W. REDMOND

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening, May 11, 1974, it was my pleasure to attend a testimonial held in Milton, Mass., in honor of Dr. James Redmond. Dr. Redmond is a well-known and greatly admired doctor in my district; he is also a friend of mine. His dedication to the people of Milton and South Boston should serve as an inspiration to doctors across the land. I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an article from the Quincy Patriot Ledger of May 13, 1974, concerning the testimonial held for this fine man:

1,000 PAY TRIBUTE TO DR. REDMOND

MILTON.—About 1,000 persons paid tribute to Dr. James W. Redmond of Milton and South Boston Saturday night.

Dr. Redmond, a pediatrician, practiced from his family home in South Boston for the past 47 years, as did his father before him from 1898 to 1927. The testimonial buffet dance, held in St. Agatha's parish center, was on the occasion of his 74th birthday, which he will celebrate later this month.

PROCLAMATION READ

Selectman Ralph Kent commented it was nice "so many people haven't forgotten one of the grandest men God ever made." Mr. Kent read a proclamation from the town of Milton naming Saturday Dr. James W. Redmond Day.

Rep. Michael Flaherty, D-South Boston, brought the congratulations of the Massachusetts House of Representatives in recognition of the doctor's many years of child care. Rep. Flaherty presented the proclamation which will name the South Boston Health Unit on Dorchester Street the "Dr. James W. Redmond Health Unit."

Councilor Louise Day Hicks said she owes her life to Dr. Redmond and added that although Saturday was Dr. Redmond Day in Milton, every day is Dr. Redmond Day in South Boston.

The naming of the health unit was voted unanimously by the House as a result of Mrs. Hicks' motion to the city council.

Mrs. Ronnie Barrett, mother of nine, summed up the feelings of most when she said if anyone ever finds another Dr. Redmond, send him to South Boston because they need him.

Dr. John Todd, toastmaster, read a telegram from the Boston City Hospital Nurses Alumnae Association commending Dr. Redmond for his constant cooperation and help while on the staff and as pediatrician-in-chief at that hospital. He also read a letter from the Rev. Fr. William Hunter, S.V.D., a family friend stationed in Rome, who sent his good wishes.

FAMILY

Sharing in the tribute were: Mrs. Redmond, the former Helen McLoughlin; their daughter, Miss Mary Louise Redmond of Bos-

ton; two sisters, Miss Mary Redmond and Miss Margaret Redmond, both of South Boston; a brother, Paul Redmond, and his family of Southboro. A third sister, Miss Helen Redmond, of New York was unable to attend.

Also in attendance was the Rev. Fr. Robert Hunter, S.V.D., of New York, a long-time family friend as well as clergyman from Milton, Scituate and South Boston, physicians who were associated with Dr. Redmond during his long career. Sisters from St. Margaret's Hospital, where he also served as pediatrician-in-chief and other dignitaries from both communities.

The majority, however, were persons whom Dr. Redmond took care of as children and their children. The children, most with families of their own, listened to anecdotes about the doctor and how much he gave of himself to his chosen career.

A portrait of Dr. Redmond, by Mrs. Mary Jacobs, a Winchester artist, was displayed. It will hang in the South Boston Health Unit which will be dedicated later this month.

The ceremonies concluded with the presentation of a silver Paul Revere bowl from Mayor Kevin White by Mrs. Hicks. Dr. Redmond then greeted his many friends.

HONOLULU POLICE DEPARTMENT SUCCEEDS WITH COMMUNITY RELATIONS EFFORT TO REDUCE YOUTH DELINQUENCY

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin boasts an article of which I and the people of my State of Hawaii are immensely proud. The story it tells is of a program initiated by the Honolulu Police Community Relations Department which I believe is worthy of emulation by police departments across our land.

One of the major problems confronting law enforcement today, one that has escaped solution in many cities and towns across the United States, is the increasing void of communication between the police and the people they protect. This communication gap has in many cases, been caused by police departments themselves, as modernization and progress in law enforcement techniques have withdrawn police officers from personal contact with the general public.

In Hawaii, a major effort has been made to bridge that widening gap by reaching the youth of the community, and it has been successful. The Honolulu Police Department, through its progressive-thinking chief, Francis A. Keala, and Sgt. Harry Chinn of the Community Relations Department, has developed and conducted a remarkable program of community relations second to none in the Nation. This program has benefited both police and youth, fostered mutual understanding of the duties of the officer and the problems of city youth, and has resulted in substantial decreases in youth arrests where the program has operated.

In my view, the Honolulu Police Department has proven that respect for the law and the law enforcer is not gained by bullets and clubs, but through mutual understanding and communication fostered by enlightened police officers and open-minded administrators.

It is with a great deal of personal pride in a truly commendable organization, the Honolulu Police Department, that I submit this article from the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for the RECORD:

LAW AND JUSTICE AWARENESS PROGRAM

(By Sgt. Harry J. Chinn)

Hawaii, the paradise of the Pacific and long considered the utopia of racial equality and harmony, suffers its share of crime and violence. Its capital city of Honolulu is constantly growing as new people arrive every day. Like other cities faced with rapid growth, we have increased problems of insufficient housing, unemployment, welfare, and racial disharmony. The manifestation of these sociological factors in crime and socially aberrant behavior ultimately has an influence on youth.

The Honolulu Police Department has recognized that youth are in turmoil about values and lifestyles, and since they reject many authorities, they may reject or resent even more the authority represented by those who enforce the law. The growing influence of youth permeates every aspect of our culture. The impact of youth on fashion, entertainment, political processes, and morals is inescapable. The course of action is quite apparent. Youth must be made aware of the necessity of the law and its total effect upon their environment. They need to be exposed to the truths and fallacies, not only of the police and the law, but of social and ethnic relations as well.

The Police Community Relations Division and the Model Cities Law and Justice Citizen Task Force agreed that a comprehensive plan for formal education in law and justice was needed to meet this challenge. As a result, the law and justice awareness program was implemented. In September of 1972, the law and justice awareness program, along with the college opportunities program, was recognized nationally as one of the outstanding Model Cities projects by the National Model Cities Directors Association.

The inception of the Model Cities police-community relations program in 1969 included two components: (1) the neighborhood safety community service aide program, and (2) the law and justice awareness program. These projects were established as an attempt to improve police-community relations and to reduce and prevent deviant or delinquent juvenile behavior. The neighborhood safety aide component was terminated in 1972 for several reasons; however, some of the experiences and ideas generated by the project were later utilized in developing an expanded community relations program.

THE PROGRAM

The law and justice awareness program was implemented through the public school system in the Model Neighborhood Areas. The school, as a cultural liaison between our society and our youth, is the best equipped resource to impress upon our youth, and the general public as well, the necessity for a lawful society. The program curriculum is designed to provide a comprehensive program of formal instruction for the three educational levels—elementary, intermediate, and high school.

Some objectives of the program are:

To develop an understanding of society based upon justice, the process by which laws are established, and why laws are necessary.

To develop a positive attitude toward upholding law and to strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and the community.

To provide students an opportunity to ask questions and express their views in a relaxed setting which promotes police-youth interaction.

Although the objectives parallel those of other school programs, the officer-instruc-

tor's approach and expectations of students differ considerably. The emphasis is primarily on creating the kind of atmosphere necessary to establish a genuine relationship between the officer-instructor and the student, rather than upon the academic phase of the lessons. The officer-instructor visits parents of all participating students to encourage and facilitate this relationship further. In addition, followup counseling is extended to students with problems that could not be corrected either by the regular school guidance system or by parental direction. Once established, this rapport provides the avenues for the student to reach a level of awareness where he can appreciate the human aspect of the law and those who enforce it. The basic method involves discussions and dramatizations by the students of real-life situations involving citizens and law enforcement officials to sensitize them to the problems inherent in these situations. Students thus come to their own conclusions as to the role of the law in society.

The duration of the course is approximately 40 hours, and the highlights of the curriculum are as follows:

Introduction to the function of law enforcement. Youth discussion of their own losses due to theft, and discussion regarding causes and prevention of theft.

Personal responsibility. Problems of an individual's reputation as affected by friends' deviant activities; dangers of environment and character weakness which lead to negative labeling and trouble with the law.

Regulatory agencies and the law. Discussion of offenses resulting from unethical business and professional practices, as well as violations of municipal codes, such as sanitation regulations.

Meaningful community involvement. Discussion, with case histories and personal experiences of students, of apathy and unwillingness to become socially involved; discussions of heroes who did become involved; volunteer and charity programs.

Understanding the role of the police officer. The police officers' approach to groups, gangs, and individuals; dangers and other factors which affect the police officers' behavior; dramatizations.

The lawmaking process. Anarchism; how laws are established in other societies and how they differ from our own.

Understanding the administration of justice process. Mock courtroom situations with discussion of decisions; open discussions for creating new ideas and approaches to solve problems which face the community and the school; how we can help family and friends to understand the functions of law and order.

The learning process is further reinforced with field experiences to coincide with relevant lectures and discussions. Field experiences include tours of the district, family, and circuit courts; the State Capitol; and even the military complex at Pearl Harbor. The trip to Pearl Harbor and the U.S.S. Arizona Memorial there is scheduled to focus upon the concept of "meaningful involvement and responsibility." This visit has the effect of dramatizing the point that maintenance of our free society has in the past required, and will in the future require, determined effort and sacrifice.

SPECIAL TECHNIQUES

Special classroom techniques are designed to increase program effectiveness. It is clear that words alone cannot make an individual aware of the problems of the police officer. To create a realistic approach to the problem through education, drama is utilized in the curriculum. The class is divided into three groups, and each group is given an assignment to dramatize a realistic conflict situation. For example, one group is instructed to act out a noisy party affair, another to portray a college student protest demonstration, and the third still another situa-

tion. The students are instructed that, during this performance, they will be confronted by the officer-teacher as if he were a patrolman on the beat. They in turn will react to the officer as they have seen adults reacting in similar situations.

During the presentation, emotions sometimes surface and occasionally get out of hand. Hostility toward the officer is unmasked. In such instances, one of the remaining classmates is asked to play the role of the police officer. The students take it from there.

This kind of confrontation through role playing often exposes prejudices and misconceptions to more meaningful examination. In one critique after a dramatization, a student who was known for his resentment toward the police was asked how he felt about the reenacted episode. He answered, "Now I know why the policeman had to use force to carry out his duties." These sessions have truly made it possible for the youth to emphasize with the police officer and understand his problems. The students also enjoy this method of learning by exploring in simulated incidents the problems of living and relating to people.

As a spinoff of this classroom activity, students at one high school have developed a musical drama "Who's GUILTY?" The play portrays the problems of law and justice and also provides an opportunity for the students to put their natural singing and dancing talents to positive, creative use. This drama has been performed widely throughout the State of Hawaii and also was performed in Chicago, Ill., at the national Model Cities conference. The play has been filmed by the State department of education and will be used as part of the department's government curriculum.

The experience has had noticeable impact upon the 100 or so young people who have participated in the musical drama. Previously, many were unable to communicate well with other people, and others were considered to be behavior problems. The changes in their ability to relate to others, their improved self-confidence, and their more positive outlook, particularly of the future, have been amazing.

At the conclusion of each class, the students are given the opportunity to evaluate the program in an anonymous manner. The question "What do you feel are the most important ideas gained in the course?" is asked. One student answered, "To try to get along with other people, and policemen, and also to get a better understanding of what's going on in this world. Today there are not too many people who have learned about this. And I hope they could have this course in every school . . . so that the younger students, and the older students would understand and wouldn't get into trouble in the future."

Several events have occurred which have demonstrated the worth of this program. One involved a former law and justice awareness student, then a 9th grader at Nanakuli High School, who was instrumental in the apprehension of two "drug pushers" on the school campus. The student commented, "I learned from the law and justice awareness class to get involved and help keep our community free of drugs."

A total of 4,321 young people from the Model Neighborhood Areas have participated in the program. The most encouraging indication of the programs' success is the marked decline in the juvenile arrest rates in the two neighborhoods where the program operates. Comparing neighborhood statistics for fiscal year 1972-73 with those for 1969-70, which indicate the number of arrests per hundred population in ages 6-17, Waianae-Nanakuli has dropped from second to fifth place in the rate of juvenile crime for neighborhoods on the island. Kalihi-Palama, which was highest in the island's rate of crime in

1969, showed a decline in juvenile arrest of 21.1 percent. It is believed that this program has been a major factor in the decline. Of the students completing the course who had previous arrest records before enrolling in the law and justice awareness class, only 5.3 percent have been arrested again.

Like most new ideas, the program encountered stiff resistance at the outset. School officials and teachers tended to be highly skeptical about changes in the normal academic curriculum. Resistance to the program was strong. Insinuations were even made that the program was a form of propaganda rather than education. Some community members questioned police motives. However, with the aid of key individuals in the community, and the eventual success of the program, we have been able to overcome most negative attitudes. Overall, there has been a positive community response to the program. Many other school districts within the State of Hawaii have requested it for their schools.

EXPANSION OF PROGRAM

The Honolulu Police Department, in September of 1971, expanded the law and justice awareness program to schools, serving approximately 700 students annually, outside of the Model Neighborhood Areas. A unique phase of the expansion was the formation of classes for youngsters, both boys and girls, from the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility. The results of these special classes have been gratifying in initiating constructive attitudinal changes among these young people.

Patrol beat officers with community relations training are now providing instruction in law and justice awareness classes for students.

Also a part of the expanded program is conflict intervention, which developed out of the experiences of the law and justice awareness program. Through a series of incidents and confrontations, the community relations specialists developed a dialogue with young gang leaders in the Waianae neighborhood concerning the future of youth in the community. As a result of these discussions, pushing of drugs in the schools, auto theft, and vandalism in the neighborhood were greatly decreased. Through increased awareness of their surroundings, positive involvement in community activities developed among many youth gang members.

Ongoing training sessions with community relations officer specialists are conducted during the 3-month rotation of beat officers into the community relations program. In addition to utilization of community relations programs, they are also assigned for purposes of orientation to other agencies and juvenile and adult probation counseling programs.

The officers who have so far participated in the program have responded positively. One of the officers who, prior to involvement in the program, had shown no interest in the community or youth problems, wrote this letter to the parents of youngsters involved in the law and justice summer youth program:

"Since our summer youth program is coming to an end, I just want to take this opportunity to say that it has been a pleasure and a great experience for me to work with your son (daughter).

"At the beginning of the program, the kids were a little reluctant to openly express themselves. In time, however, we all got to know one another and the kids learned from the experience as well as me learning from them.

"I hope all that we have shared together will remain with us through the years. Soon, everyone will be going their separate ways, and I will be returning to my regular duty as patrol officer, but I'm sure we won't forget each other. If there is anything I can do for your son (daughter) at any time, please feel free to call on me."

Creation of this change in attitude in the patrol beat officer is, in itself, a major program achievement.

The significant aspect of this concept is the unique training interaction process of rotating beat personnel at the district level. This interaction creates an awareness in the individual officer of community relations objectives. More important, this program provides a practical setting for the police and community to explore and discuss mutual needs and goals.

The law and justice awareness program shows great promise; however, much work still is required to make it a permanent part of police operations. Perhaps, it will open the way for a more enlightened era of police-community relations.

REFORM OF THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity go by as a new Member of the House without responding in kind I think to the types of comments that have been made by my distinguished colleagues on the other side. I think it is somehow symbolic that they have been reduced to the sorry plight of speaking to an almost empty House after everyone else has left.

In the case of the remarks by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN), he takes great pride in the fact that he seems to be for the reform of the committee system. Of course, that is very easy after the Democrats have had a caucus and by a very narrow vote referred the matter to a committee for further study, and they have already agreed to report it out at a later date. But at this time he says he supports reform. He goes no further. I am sure the comments he made must have been in previous years on the floor because I did not hear him support those kinds of reforms during consideration of the measure itself.

As one of those who voted for it not to come out of the committee, I would like to ask the gentleman if he supports the single committee concept in that report? Is he prepared to support the changing committee jurisdictions when and if the bill comes to the floor? I am sure he will approve the one-third minority staffing for the minority side because of course that is to their advantage. But I wonder about these other specifics. Or is the gentleman taking just an easy demagogic shot at the Democrats in their attempt to create some significant reform on the floor?

Let me go to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), who had the good sense to refer to the great Republican President Abraham Lincoln and the words the gentleman said Lincoln quoted from the Bible: "Judge not that ye be not judged." And the gentleman proceeded to do just that by, among other things, calling a great lady from the State of California, from my State, who had the temerity I suppose one could say to run against the man now President of the United States, a "limousine liberal." I certainly have no

limousine, and I think my liberal friends in my own Democratic district would hardly refer to me as their own kind of liberal.

I do want to take exception to that particular comment, because I think she was and still is a very great lady and would have made a great Senator.

I want to say in view of this—

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, a point of personal privilege. The gentleman has made some statements and I have a right to reply, according to the rules.

My quote to which the gentleman referred was not attributed to Lincoln, but was taken directly from the Bible, and certainly had no reference to him. Further, I really do not know whether the gentleman is a liberal or a conservative.

I only want to say that certainly I meant nothing derogatory about Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas. I am sure she is a fine lady and if hearty sorrow will be a sufficient ransom for offense, I tender it to my friend here. But as far as Mrs. Douglas is concerned, I doubt if she would suggest that she is not a liberal.

I did not mention any party, any Member of any party in a rough manner. I do not do that.

I happen to be one of these people who married a Democrat and I have great respect for my Democratic friends. President Johnson was very kind to me and to my district, and I have never nor will I ever make a disparaging remark on the floor of the House in reference to the late President.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RYAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RYAN. I would yield, if he wants to finish his comments.

Mr. CARTER. I have no further comment for the RECORD, unless the gentleman from California wishes to ask me something.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California have a motion?

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I still have time. I wanted to make a couple of comments in reply to the gentleman from Kentucky.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RYAN. I have 1 minute remaining and I would like to take that time and then make a motion.

I would like to point out that some of the comments were made perhaps in earnest, but without sufficient knowledge.

For example, the tiger cubs given to Mrs. Douglas were sent to the Zoological Gardens of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington and so on.

I think the nature of the comments made here have been partisan. They do deserve a reply and that was my attempt.

PETER KIHSS RECEIVES COLUMBIA JOURNALISM ALUMNI ASSOCIATION AWARD

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, Peter Kihss, a reporter for the New York Times, was honored by the Columbia Journalism Alumni Association. The association gave him one of its awards because "for 40 years he has personified the best traditions of the Graduate School of Journalism and of the profession itself."

I have known Mr. Kihss for many years and long admired his clear, fair, and accurate reporting for the New York Times. Perhaps most telling about Mr. Kihss' character has been his steadfast refusal during the past several years to accept the Columbia Journalism Alumni Association award, because he thought others were more deserving. Mr. Kihss' modesty is particularly striking in relation to his outstanding qualities as a reporter. This year the association was determined to give Mr. Kihss the award and so, did not tell him about it until it was too late for him to refuse the honor.

Peter Kihss is a general assignment reporter on the metropolitan staff of the New York Times where he has worked since 1952. He graduated from the Columbia School of Journalism in 1933 with a Pulitzer traveling scholarship. The Columbia Journalism Alumni Association award is not the first he has received as a reporter. In 1966 he won the Page One Award of the American Newspaper Guild for a story that he wrote on the 1965 blackout in New York City. He also won the Society of Silurians Award for the best editorial achievement in 1953 and 1966, the Chilean Order of Merit in 1950, and a Newspaper Guild commendation in 1955 for his reporting on civil liberties. In 1966, Mr. Kihss received the annual Mike Berger Award of the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism for distinguished local reporting.

I am delighted that Peter Kihss was given this most deserved honor by the Columbia Journalism Alumni Association. And I pay this tribute to him, because I know that many of our colleagues have a great deal of confidence in a story bylined by Peter Kihss.

BLESSINGS OF FREEDOM

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, with Memorial Day approaching, I am constrained to offer a wonderful sermon preached 4 years ago by Rev. Richard D. Ellsworth of Central College Presbyterian Church of Westerville, Ohio.

As a man of God, with clear vision of our national problems, Dick Ellsworth has a rare talent to bring the true message to the people and I am happy to share this fine sermon of May 31, 1970, with my colleagues:

BLESSING TOO PRECIOUS TO LOSE—"FREEDOM"

(Preached by the Reverend Richard D. Ellsworth at the Central College Presbyterian Church, Westerville, Ohio on Memorial Day Sunday, May 31, 1970)

Scripture, I Samuel 12:1-15
Text, I Samuel 12:7.

Our text for this morning is lifted from the context of our scripture lesson and is the statement of Samuel when he spoke to Israel saying: "Now therefore stand still, that I may reason with you before the Lord of all the righteous acts of the Lord, which He did to you and to your fathers." (King James Version)

It was a time of great crisis for the nation of Israel. A little over 200 years had passed since the Israelites had established themselves in Palestine. They had found freedom from slavery in Egypt, they had consolidated themselves as a confederation of tribes; but they were now facing some rather tremendous problems—problems which were threats to the freedom which they cherished.

There was a growing threat of the Philistines who had moved in and occupied the land to the west of the Israelites. The Philistines had a good strong foothold along the shores of the Mediterranean.

There was also the constant threat of the enemies who came from the east, attacking first one place and then another. It was just such an attack on the part of the Ammonites which had caused the various tribes of Israel to gather together under the leadership of Saul. But the people knew that even though the Ammonites had been defeated there were still the enemies that would come and threaten the existence of the nation.

Yes, there was the threat from the west, the threat from the east, and there were also internal problems and conflicts.

Freedom was cherished by everyone, but not everyone was willing to work unselfishly to preserve that freedom. All these things put together—the internal turmoil and confusion as well as the pressure of the enemy from the west and the pressure of the enemy in the east—put a great threat upon the freedom which had been given earlier to the Israelites by God.

And now because of the threats, the Israelites in order to maintain their freedom which was so precious to them, demanded a king. They wanted to go from a theocracy—where God ruled through the word given to His people by the prophets—to a monarchy—where there was a king. Other nations had kings. The Israelites wanted a king. They wanted a king who would provide a continuity of leadership; they wanted a king that they could see and around whom they could rally.

It was an opportune time, then, when the Ammonites invaded the land of Palestine and the cry went out for leadership—it was an opportune time for Saul to assume that role. He was chosen. The prophet Samuel put his hand upon him and said, "If a king is what you must have, then this is the man whom God has chosen."

And the people looked to Saul to preserve and maintain their freedom. The people believed that with a king their troubles would end. He would provide the leadership; he would do all that was necessary to preserve their freedom which they had won even by paying the supreme sacrifice at times. They had endured hardship, they had fought, and they were free. Now they wanted a king to preserve that freedom.

Samuel knew better, however! Samuel had prophesied even before the people had chosen Saul to be king. He had told them that if they demanded a king rather than to accept that rule of God, they would have to pay the price that a king would demand.

Samuel reminded the people of Israel that a king would take their sons and appoint them for himself and for his charlots, and to be his horsemen; and he would appoint captains over thousands and captains over fifties; that he would use the people to get the work done and he would take the fields and the vineyards and demand the best of crops; he would take a tenth of the seed and of the fruit of the vineyard. In other words, there would be taxation and there would be conscription. And so it was.

There had to be. In order for there to be a strong central government there had to be financial support of this. If that is what the people wanted, then God told Samuel not to stand in the way—let the people have the king.

But here was Samuel once again, the king having been chosen in spite of his warning, in spite of the prophecy, here was Samuel once again warning the people.

He said to them in the words of our text, "Now therefore stand still for a moment, that I may reason with you, that I may recite for you some facts you need to know."

"What is the background for your freedom?" asked Samuel, and then he went ahead and answered, "The background for true freedom is God."

Remember your history; remember your heritage, said Samuel. Jacob had migrated to Egypt and there the people of Israel had been subjected to slavery—slave labor in the camps of the Egyptians.

But God had heard their voices and had come down to them. He had supplied them a leader in Moses and Moses had lead the Israelites out from under the bondage of Egypt, across the Red Sea through the barren wilderness until at last, under the leadership of Joshua, they had occupied and secured the Promised Land, the land of Canaan, the land we know today as Palestine.

When there had been enemy uprising against the people, God had raised up a ruler to deliver them. As long as the people put their faith and trust in God and obeyed His commandments, all went well. But when they turned from God and did not follow His guidance and His rulership, which was a rulership of the heart and of the mind and of the soul, then the Israelites lost their freedom.

"Time and time again," reminded Samuel, "You have turned from God; you have forgotten God; you have not followed God's way and God's rule, and things have gone poorly, and you have almost lost your freedom down through the years. Now you have chosen a king! Remember this—it is not the king who is the answer to the problems which face you. He can be useful, but remember that it is still the Lord God who is the center and who is the source of all true freedom. And," added Samuel, "if you will obey the voice of the Lord and not rebel against the commandments of the Lord, then that blessing too precious to lose, that blessing of freedom shall be yours."

Ah, how good it would be at this point to question Samuel for there seems to be a contradiction here. He says as long as there is an allegiance to, a loyalty to, an obedience to God, then there can be freedom.

But is that freedom, Samuel? Is there not a contradiction here? Are you not saying that one has to be a captive before he can be free?

And I wonder if we were able to ask Samuel that question if he might not reply, "Yes, that is true."

In the words of the hymn "Make Me a Captive Lord, Then I Shall Be Free"—this is the heart of freedom.

With some careful thought, perhaps we might come to that same conclusion.

What is freedom? What is this freedom about which we say so much in America?

What is this freedom for which men down through the years have yearned and fought and suffered and died?

Freedom is more than just a collection of words. It is more than just an idea.

It is a way of life—a way of life so precious that men have suffered and died. We remember this Sunday morning those who have paid the supreme sacrifice. Many have paid the price in many different fields of battle, not always when a gun and cannon are fired, but sometimes in the courtroom, in the classroom, in the science laboratory the war for freedom is waged.

But this Sunday morning we remember in a particular way those who have been called into the service of our country and who have gone forth to serve in the name of our country. We remember those for whom such names as Verdun, Argonne, Belleau Woods, Chateau-Thierry, Pearl Harbor, Corregidor, Normandy, the Battle of the Bulge, Salerno, Iwo Jima, North Korea, South Vietnam, Cambodia—all have very special meaning.

We remember this day the young men down through the years who responded to the call of this nation. We remember these men and as we do I would suggest in the words of Samuel that we need to stand still for a moment and we need to consider once again what was meant by the word freedom for those who have gone and fought for it. We need to remember this nation and the principles upon which it was established.

Certainly many things have gone wrong; certainly many things are wrong! Certainly there have been times and there are conditions where there is not freedom and equal opportunity. But the particular system of government that has been established here is a system by which and through which freedom can be given and maintained and improved. I know of no other system which has worked as well.

I would suggest that in America today we need to stand still and remember our history. We need to remember that those who have paid the sacrifice paid it for a purpose. We need to remember that to tear down a system which has some faults in it is utterly ridiculous if there is not a better system to replace it.

We need to remember as Samuel reminded the Israelites that there are enemies—from within, yes, that need to be seen clearly—but also enemies from without. We cannot be blind to the Godlessness of communism and to its verbalized intention to destroy America and the freedom that has been purchased and maintained by those who gave themselves so nobly in years gone by.

Stand still and remember the history of this country lest we be guilty of demanding something that will only take away the freedom and put us into slavery.

But I would not leave it on the level of just nationalism, for Samuel did not leave it there; our text will not let us leave it there; a good common sense will not let us leave it there! Samuel reminded the people that true freedom could be achieved only under allegiance to God.

Is this not why the founding fathers established this nation as a nation under God?

I am not suggesting this morning that the role of the church is to evangelize the nation and to make it subservient to the church. I am suggesting to you that the role of the church is to make clear the fact that there has to be allegiance and loyalty before there can be true freedom. Freedom demands discipline; freedom demands a loyalty. And I suggest and submit to you that the only true freedom—the freedom to really be the person that one can become—can only be achieved when one's loyalty is to God.

God has given us a way of life. He has prescribed how man can learn to live with his fellow man. The law is summarized for

us in the ten commandments. The first four, tell us of our allegiance to God and when we have that basis of love that God provides, then we are free to live one with another, but within a guided and disciplined way of life.

How often we say that freedom is that condition which enables one to do just as he pleases. But if I do just as I please, if I am to be subject to every whim and fancy and blowing of the wind, then I shall find myself a slave. It is only when I have the discipline to say "no" that I still have the freedom to say "yes." When there is a discipline then one is free. But when there is no discipline, then a person may not be free any longer to say "no" or "yes."

This is true for the individual. It is also true of the life of our nation. We have a pattern given to us within the form of government, a pattern which has worked, not as effectively perhaps as it should have worked, but a pattern which can work when we choose to remain within that pattern. It is a pattern which recognizes God as the motivating factor and force in life. Perhaps it could be summarized best this morning for us in the words of that great and stirring hymn "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." Remember the lines!

"As Christ died to make men holy
Let us live to make men free."

There is a responsibility that comes to you and to me to so live that those who have died for the cause of freedom will not have died in vain—to live with an allegiance to God and a loyalty to this nation established upon the basic principles of freedom—to work so that the freedom we have inherited may be passed on to those who come after us and may be shared fully with all others in this world which God has created.

"As He died to make men holy, truly let us live to make men free."

PARTISAN IMPEACHMENT?

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a respected businessman in the Nation's Capital, Mr. Oscar R. Strackbein wrote a short paper on impeachment perspectives which I feel should be shared by all readers of the RECORD.

IMPEACHMENT PERSPECTIVE: LOOKING IN THE MIRROR OF HISTORY

(By O. R. Strackbein)

From time to time statistics on crimes committed throughout the country, sometimes classified by cities, States or regions, are given to the public. The trend seems unfortunately to be upward.

However else crime may be classified there seem to be no statistics that classify crimes on a political basis or a religious basis. To be sure, we do have classifications according to race and color. That fact, however, is irrelevant to the question of criminality according to political partisanship. Do Democrats, Republicans or Independents commit more crimes per a hundred thousand people? It seems safe to say, we have no idea; and no allegation in any such direction would be tenable.

Why ask the question? What difference does it make?

That the question is not wholly irrelevant may be deduced from the historical fact that so-called political crimes have borne a close correlation to the accidents of political power (the word "accident" being used in the sense of something not being caused by the element under consideration).

Burnings at the stake, committals to dungeons, beheadings, have seemingly always

been associated with political or religious accidents of power. Whoever was in power dispensed the sentences. When an overthrow occurred the victims also changed. The question of justice, even though it was the subject of much pious profession, was, as we see it today, a colossal, transparent hypocrisy. Otherwise why was it that it was always the "ins" who meted out "justice", and the "outs" who suffered the punishment?

The two daughters of Henry VIII, Mary and Elizabeth, were caught in a web spun of the strands of religious differences (Catholic and Protestant). It was to be a question of time and the turn of political fortunes that was to determine who was to have whom beheaded. Elizabeth had greatly feared for her own life from her sister. When she (Elizabeth) became queen, however, it was the Catholic head of Mary that was severed by the axe in the Tower. The two sisters had professed much love of each other. Elizabeth wept when Mary lost her head; but, "politics is politics"! It (politics) is still the source of a not inconsiderable degree of bitterness.

In France it was not Bourbons or Capetians who guillotined Bourbons or Capetians. It was the Jacobins (during the Revolution). They also took off the head of Marie Antoinette rather than eat cake. It was not to a Stuart rival that Charles I of England lost his head, but to Parliament over which he had lost control. He could not very well behead Parliament even while he was still in power.

Napoleon did not hate the Duke d'Enghien in person or as such. He feared his political rivalry. Napoleon was in power. The Duke was not. It was the Duke who was executed. Exceptions to this rule are, of course, found in assassinations; but these do not proceed under the color of administration of justice. The practice of self-righteous justification exhibited by man in his dispensation of "justice" from a seat of power has always been a shuttlecock batted back and forth.

Not only church history, including in particular the post-Reformation era, but the history of the British monarchy, with which as Americans we have some acquaintance, runs over with the shuttlecock of political "justice", alternating with who it was that wielded power. It goes without saying that the outs alternately were justified by outrage over the "inhuman" and cruel acts and atrocities of the ins. To us of today it is quite clear that there was little to choose on this score between this side or that. It was the cruelty of the times that was inflicted indifferently, whether this side or that was in power. Justice was a word to which homage must be rendered.

Unquestionably some progress has been made; but let us not be too self-congratulatory! Our own history, as we read it a century or two or three after the facts, is not without its flaws, for, we after all, were the heirs of our progenitors, and we, too, were products, in our conflicts, in our harmonies and our interests, of emotions and passions. In our earlier history as a nation our conflicts and our alignments, were no less than today in response to what we at that time perceived as our interests. How different is it today?

Why were Hamilton and Jefferson at odds? Did not each believe himself right and the other wrong? They came from diverse backgrounds, but they would hardly have explained their differences on that basis. It would have seemed too shallow! When it came to a very close personal question, Hamilton threw his influence behind Jefferson to give him the presidency when the choice fell to the House of Representatives because of a tie vote in the election of 1800. Why? Hamilton hated Jefferson from partisan motives, but he hated Aaron Burr yet more. The latter in turn had his revenge when he killed Hamilton in a duel.

Burr himself was tried for treason during the Jefferson Administration. John Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States, presided at the trial. He bore a deep hatred, reportedly, of Jefferson. Burr was acquitted. Did Marshall's hatred of Jefferson have a bearing on the outcome?

Andrew Johnson was impeached in 1868. He had been badly beaten at the polls in the Congressional election. The Radical Republicans were overwhelmingly victorious. Had his party prevailed in the house, would he have been impeached?

Do Democrats impeach Democrats? Do Republicans impeach Republicans? Had the 1972 victory of Nixon also swept a majority of Republicans into the House and Senate, would he face impeachment today?

History seems to answer that question unmistakably, the exceptions being assassinations; and, of course, many of these were also politically motivated. They represented direct action rather than self-styled judicial processes.

Is impartiality humanly possible, and therefore justice itself, when the political victor brings the vanquished to trial before the bar of justice controlled by the victor? Political impartiality as a repository of the cause of justice is probably a contradiction in terms.

The duel has been abolished. As an arbiter, it became too obvious to our growing sensibilities, that it was superior marksmanship rather than justice that prevailed. How much better is the accident of the political upperhand? Political rivalry, partisan vehemence and intemperance, popular emotions, centered in a political majority exercising the upper hand, are not the constituents of justice. Quite the opposite.

Is there not a better way of dispensing justice? Will history simply write: In the year 1974 a heavily Democratic Congress impeached a Republican President who had been re-elected in 1972 with all the electoral votes except those of one State and the District of Columbia, as in 1868 a heavily Radical Republican Congress impeached a President who had lost control of the House (much as Charles I had lost control of the House of Commons) as a result of a Congressional election?

Can we move from beheading as a remedy for settling political conflicts, on to impeachment by a partisanly divided body, on to something a little closer to the classical demands of justice, as the centuries pass?

How is progress to be achieved in the refinement of justice if it is not made when the occasion for it arises?

Partisan judgments spit against the very face of justice. Is the fiber of our sense of justice yet so gross that we cannot perceive the mockery of a partisan proceeding (so roundly condemned by history as injudicious) in which the party in power sits in judgment on those in a minority position? No doubt we shall see.

Did our Constitution-makers contemplate that a President might be tried by a Congress of a different political complexion from his? We have had only one experience of the kind and it was very nearly disastrous!

ENERGY COST

(Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most devastating effects of the energy crisis is the tremendous increase in the cost of electrical power in those regions where utilities are dependent on fossil fuels to run their generators.

The effect has been particularly severe in New England, where the high residual oil prices paid by utilities have been passed through to the consumer by way of the "fuel adjustment clause," a provision of Massachusetts State law which allows an automatic increase in a customer's monthly electric bill to reflect increases in the utility's fuel costs.

For Massachusetts residents, the electric bills now arriving in the mail are simply staggering, and have swallowed up what little remains of many families' monthly income after the other necessities of life are paid for. Cases have been brought to my attention in which families with good incomes cannot pay for food and shelter, and are confronted with a desperate situation.

More and more people are speaking out, pleading for some relief, and as they find their friends and neighbors in the same plight, their voices merge, and organizations coalesce.

One such ad hoc citizen group has been particularly effective in focusing attention on the crisis, the Committee Against Fuel Adjustment, organized and directed by Mrs. Margaret Mack of Attleboro, Mass. During the past months, Mrs. Mack has effectively and eloquently voiced the feeling of frustration and desperation that is felt by tens of thousands of average citizens in our State, and who once again remind the country what I have been saying since I first entered Congress—that New England cannot afford to remain the forgotten stepchild of the big oil companies, left to wither at the very end of their pipelines.

The energy crisis is nothing new for us in Massachusetts, because for years we have endured shortages, exorbitant prices, and the economic handicaps which inevitably result. Every autumn we have been short of heating oil, and we always pay top dollar for what we get. Every autumn, I have risen in this Chamber to once again speak out against this injustice. Since coming to Washington, I have urged the end of the oil import quota, I have voted for a crash program of research into solar energy, and in the last year I have worked and voted for a rollback in oil prices. Yet there is still no relief in sight.

Now, others here in Washington have realized the truth of what I have long said, and the fight is not such a lonely one. I am glad to welcome the Committee Against Fuel Adjustment to the battle for equal treatment for New England, and I am glad to have this opportunity today to read to my colleagues a heartfelt statement by Mrs. Mack, speaking on behalf of tens of thousands of my fellow citizens from Massachusetts:

POSITION STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST FUEL ADJUSTMENT

(Presented by Margaret T. Mack)

In view of the alleged facts presented by the Oil Industry, that since 1958, they have been predicting the energy crisis and the scarcity of oil, CAFA accuses the oil industry of economic sabotage, and the United States Government for not keeping faith with its own people, by not initiating programs in the search for new energy.

The year is now 1974 or 16 years later, in which we now find our country engulfed in an economic nightmare, affecting the paychecks of the American consumer, not only

in regards to fuel and electricity cost, but in all products that are petroleum related. We also find our governmental Federal Energy Office playing the role of an allocator, a position which could have been filled by a grammar school student with an A in math.

The realization of what is, and what is to be, has to be established at this point in time, and not another 16 years later. Advocates of Nuclear Power plants point out their success in lowering prices, and the odds against failure. While others point out, the dangers of transportation and the burying of radio active waste from these plants in the ground or sea bed. Others also point out the destructive forces of nature and man, that defy man's ability in safe guarding. The burning of coal for lowering the cost is also mentioned. To burn it more efficiently for cleaner air, and to mine it without ravaging the land, poses a problem, but one that should not prove insoluble.

Natural gas by acceptable exploration takes its place in sharing the burden of energy, but natural gas by atomic bombing in the ground and in the sea bed not only raises questions concerning the Earth's structure, but also the release of radio active materials that is mixed into the gas, which has to be controlled or watered down properly before it is passed on to the consumer. Proposed off shore drilling and refineries in the Northeast no doubt could add more oil to the world's supply. The environmental impact could be debated many times over. Whether or not the oil would be sold in the Northeast is still another question.

The long range estimates of the world's supply of natural resources and the resulting cost to the consumer will always be open to manipulations, by those who control the resources, as evidenced by today's so called oil crisis, and if the depletion of natural resources is inevitable, then we are in the process of stop gap solutions instead of real solutions.

CAFA is not concerned with the phantom figures of how much coal, gas, or oil that is still to be tapped. Time alone will prove the correct figure. What bothers CAFA and the American people is that if oil is in a limited supply whether it be above or below ground, then it would seem more sensible to save this limited supply for petroleum related industries such as plastics and fertilizers, and not to burn it off in areas where another source of energy may be sufficient to carry the burden, such as sun, wind, or water power. Although new programs using these three sources for energy may be labeled as today's follies especially by those who will not directly profit from them, it is imperative that our government recognizes the immediate need for implementation and not rhetoric, in regards to such programs. If our government refuses to pick up this challenge then today's neglect will surely be tomorrow's disaster. If the American people are feeling a strain now, what will the children of tomorrow experience, if we do not begin now to build a better legacy of energy.

CAFA is therefore asking our government to wipe off the dust from past researchs and studies, and to ignore the lobby money that prevents the growth of such programs.

CAFA is also calling upon the American oil industry and their foreign partners to bring immediate economic relief by voluntarily rolling back their oil prices.

CAFA is also calling upon the American oil industry to show their good faith and concern towards the welfare of the American people and their children of tomorrow, by using its lobby money and a percentage of its astronomical profits in the form of a subsidy to further the programs of energy that pertain to the sun, wind, and water.

Only by taking these concerned actions will America prove once again its foresight and ability to point out the road to a better

way of life, and only by taking these steps will the American people begin to believe once again in their elected leaders, and the duty that they have sworn to uphold.—Margaret T. Mack, Chairwoman, C.A.F.A., Box 1053, Attleboro, Ma.

PROJECT HOPE: ONE ERA ENDS, ANOTHER BEGINS

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently my wife and I received a letter from our good friend Dr. Bill Walsh who is president of Project HOPE.

It was with a certain sense of sadness, on the one hand, that we learned of the retirement of the ship *SS Hope* while, at the same time, it was heartening to learn that Project HOPE will continue on a larger, more permanent scale.

Several years back I joined with our former colleague Ed Edmondson in sponsoring legislation which would have authorized the President to establish a "Great White Fleet" whose goal would be to provide emergency medical aid and assistance to people of other lands in the wake of natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods, epidemic diseases, and famine.

While this proposal was never implemented as a program of the Federal Government, the same concept was the genesis of Project HOPE established by the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc.

Throughout its 15 years of operation, the *SS Hope* has not only provided first class medical care to individuals in the many countries it has visited, but it has also enjoyed a great measure of success in teaching and training medical personnel of other countries in modern medical techniques.

The phenomenal success of this program is due in no small part to the untiring efforts of its extremely capable administrator, Bill Walsh, and his associates, coupled with the enthusiasm and professionalism of the volunteer staff of physicians, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel. Public interest and support—both financial and moral—has been generated by local Project HOPE committees which have been established all over the United States.

While the *SS Hope* has been the focal point of the overall activities of Project HOPE, many highly successful and effective land-based establishments such as Schools of Health Science in Brazil, Barbados, Jamaica, and the United States have been permanently instituted by HOPE. By eliminating what was becoming increasingly a financial drain—the continued operation of the *SS Hope*—Project HOPE will be in a position to earmark a larger share of its budget for such permanent facilities.

In addition, services can be better offered to land-locked nations which were previously excluded from sharing in the benefits of HOPE's significant contributions.

So, while the retirement of the *SS Hope* in a sense marks the end of an era, at the same time it signifies the com-

mencement of another era. With the dynamic leadership of Bill Walsh and his dedicated staff, we feel certain that this new phase of HOPE operations will be equally successful in meeting and fulfilling future challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues the letter from Dr. Bill Walsh and a recent editorial from the Key West Citizen:

PROJECT HOPE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. FASCELL: For the past fifteen years, one activity of Project HOPE—a dramatic one to be sure—has been the teaching-treatment missions of the hospital ship S.S. HOPE.

In April of 1974, we made a hard decision based on the fact that our Project had in effect outgrown the ship.

For many months before that decision was made, I had the opportunity to visit with HOPE supporters in a variety of cities and found virtually all in sympathy with our aim to concentrate on the further development of land-based operations. The reasons I gave to them can be summarized here:

We found it essential to respond, finally, to the repeated invitations of land-locked nations equally in need of our teaching and training programs. Planning need no longer be restricted to a ten-month, ship-oriented program. Several HOPE medical demonstration units worldwide are now possible. In many developing areas there are hospitals and clinics with a real need for the training of personnel so that these establishments can function and deliver comprehensive health care to their own people.

Operating from a ship has limited the Project to those countries which possessed adequate harbors and docking facilities.

No solution could be found to appreciably lessen the mounting cost of the ship's operation. This was the unfortunate result of inflation compounded by both the rise in fuel costs and particularly, the shortage of fuel in the countries which we serve. We choose to maximize the use under these circumstances of the donated dollar.

Finally, the ship itself—a veteran of thirty-one years' service—deserved a dignified retirement. Spare parts were nonexistent and their fabrication would be costly. After equipment and supplies donated by American industry are removed, she will be turned over to the Navy for their own disposition. The equipment and supplies will be put to good use in our land-based locations.

Project HOPE is indeed very much alive and well and working all over the world. Currently there are Project HOPE Schools of Health Sciences in Maceio, Brazil; Natal, Brazil; Bridgetown, Barbados; and Kingston, Jamaica. Project HOPE has for many years worked in its previously developed teaching centers in Peru, Colombia, and Tunisia. Health education and career training programs continue in Laredo, Texas, and Ganado, Arizona, with a new program scheduled to open in El Paso, Texas, this summer.

The Project HOPE Hospital and School of Health Sciences in Ethiopia will be one of the most extensive programs ever undertaken by the organization. More than one hundred medical, nursing, and allied health personnel will be involved in that education center, and work will be carried out in several locations throughout the African nation. The initial members of the HOPE Ethiopian team are already on station.

Requests for programs from Nigeria, Paraguay, and Iran are currently being studied and the final decisions will be made soon. With the growth of Project HOPE into a major international health organization, more and more teaching centers will be established.

It began with a ship called HOPE and developed into a Project which still bears the

name of its most precious gift—HOPE. HOPE continues to welcome the support of concerned individuals and organizations. HOPE continues to offer the best opportunity for participation in an effective, international self-help Project.

Sincere personal regards,

WILLIAM B. WALSH, M.D.

[From the Key West Citizen, May 7, 1974]

BUT ITS PURPOSE LINGERS

Between 1960 and 1973, the good ship HOPE sailed to 11 countries around the world, spending about 10 months in each where her staff of volunteer physicians, dentists, nurses and other health personnel conducted medical teaching-treatment programs.

In those years, the great white ship became a world-renowned symbol of people helping people.

Recently, Dr. William B. Walsh, who started it all, announced that the HOPE had sailed her last mission. It was a difficult decision, but it was costing \$6 million a year to keep the hospital ship afloat.

However, while the S.S. HOPE is gone, Project HOPE will continue. It will now emphasize its less expensive yet more complete land-based medical facilities in foreign countries in order to maximize the use of donated money.

Currently, there are Project HOPE Schools of Health Sciences in Mexico, Brazil, Barbados and Jamaica, as well as the United States. Another, the most extensive yet, is planned to open in Ethiopia this summer. Project HOPE is also involved in programs in Peru, Colombia and Tunisia.

Wherever there is HOPE, there is life.

FOOD PRICES IN THE WASHINGTON AREA

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, once again this month's Consumer Price Index figures have confirmed what I have been saying for more than a year—that food prices are going up faster in the Washington area than in the rest of the country.

While food prices nationally went down 0.7 percent from March to April, Washington's food prices were increasing 0.1 percent.

This confirms the long-term trend illustrated in my testimony before the Senate Consumer Subcommittee on March 1, that increases in food prices are worse here than elsewhere, and that the situation is getting worse.

My own survey comparing prices, in the Baltimore suburbs and Montgomery County showed prices here approximately 3-percent greater than in Baltimore—the same percentage indicated in Bureau of Labor Statistics data for the two cities at the time of my survey. Significantly, in testimony yesterday before a Senate subcommittee investigating the food industry, a Federal Trade Commission economist, Dr. Russell Parker, used the same figure in reference to Washington, stating that area retailers could make a 3-percent reduction in prices and still earn substantial profits.

In his testimony Dr. Parker commented on the oligopolistic market structure in Washington where four firms control more than 70 percent of the mar-

ket. Despite this testimony and despite published evidence by the FTC on the lack of competition in the Washington area, the FTC continues to refuse to take any substantive action. In a recent letter to me, the Commission secretary, stated:

There was a general consensus that the Commission had reason to believe that together Safeway and Giant possess an oligopoly position in retail food sales in the Washington area.

Yet no action has been forthcoming.

One approach I have pursued directly with the District of Columbia government is that of opening up the industry here to greater competition by stimulating the entry of new food chains. I have written the mayor and the chairman and vice-chairman of the city council proposing that the District make government-owned land available at low cost to potential new food chain entrants in order to improve the competitive structure of the market here and to provide needed supermarket services to District residents. Such a move, by making the market for the whole area more competitive, will help to lower prices in the suburbs as well as in the District. I am hopeful that the District government will act promptly to make this proposal a reality that would benefit all consumers in the Washington area.

FLOOR STATEMENT ON EXTENSION OF COMPULSORY LICENSING PROVISIONS

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to extend the compulsory licensing provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. These unique provisions are found in section 153 of the Atomic Energy Act, and will expire on September 1 of this year unless Congress takes action.

Section 153 authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to declare that a patent which is related to atomic energy is affected with the public interest when licensing of that patent is found to be of primary importance to the policies and purposes of the Atomic Energy Act. Once such a finding has been made, the Commission is thereby licensed to make use of the invention or discovery covered by the patent, and is further authorized to compel the patent holder to license its use by other suitable parties under reasonable terms.

This provision insures the U.S. Government and the American public that they will reap the benefits of major advances in the field of atomic energy. With the urgent needs of this Nation for improved and new sources of energy, this assurance remains of vital importance. On April 18, at my direction, the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy wrote to the Atomic Energy Commission inquiring what they proposed to do in regard to the approaching expiration of this authority. We still do not know what the Commission's plans are. I understand that they have proposed a bill which is now under review by the Office of Management and Budget.

The time we have left on which to act on this matter is short. Accordingly, I am introducing a bill which would extend the Commission's compulsory licensing authority until September 1, 1979. I would hope that we will also have the Commission's proposal in time to consider it along with this bill. I urge that when the Joint Committee completes its action and issues a report on this matter that the Congress move rapidly to consider and act on the legislation.

UNFRIENDLY SKIES OF PIEDMONT AIRLINES

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Don Hatfield, the managing editor of the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser, is an easy-going, even-tempered type of person who has always looked on the sunny side of life. But even Don was hard put to find any silver linings during a recent cloudy experience with Piedmont Airlines. Don related this experience in his column, "A Personal View" which appeared in the May 21 Huntington Advertiser. Even the most hardened traveler will wince after reading the column that follows:

THE ULTIMATE IN FLYING (By Don Hatfield)

Anyone who does much flying has had, at one time or another, problems with the airlines. And I've had my share. But a combination of experiences I had last week with Piedmont Airlines boggles the mind.

Can you believe that an airlines official would threaten to cancel a flight it had oversold unless one of the passengers volunteered to drop off? And can you believe this same official would scream that the flight was being canceled "because you people won't cooperate"?

Cooperate? His airline had oversold the flight. Why didn't it "cooperate" by finding another way for one, or more, of the passengers?

It was the final blow of a series of blows, all charged to Piedmont Airlines. I view this not as a particularly humorous subject for a column such as this, but as something that needs to be written about. It's time the public stopped accepting being pushed around. So bear with me, and read on . . .

I arrived at Tri-State Airport Sunday, May 5, in plenty of time for Piedmont flight 916, which was to leave at 1:12 p.m. and take me to Richmond, Va.

However, I was told I had not been confirmed (I had, of course). I could ride the plane as far as Charleston, an airlines representative said, but it would fill up there and I'd have to get off.

So the plane left without me.

For the next two hours one unusually (for this outfit) courteous Piedmont employe and I went over dozens of flight schedules, trying to find a way to get me to Richmond.

But everything was full except an 8:10 p.m. flight to Washington, D.C. I could be confirmed for that, but then I'd have to accept standby status for a 10:10 flight on to Richmond.

Trouble was, I had to be in Richmond, on business, by 6:30 p.m.

Fortunately, Huntington banker Bob Beymer came to the rescue. It so happened his private twin-engine plane was to be flown that afternoon to Myrtle Beach, S.C. Beymer

and his pilot were good enough to give me a lift to Richmond.

I thought then my airline problems were over. But the best—or, as it turned out, worst—was yet to come.

I checked two days early to make certain I was confirmed for the return flight. Certainly, Piedmont said, why should I doubt it?

Wednesday, May 8, I arrived at the Richmond airport in plenty of time for Piedmont flight 919, scheduled to leave at 7:12 p.m.

At 6:50 p.m., a Piedmont representative announced that the flight had been delayed, would not arrive until 7:30 p.m., and not depart until 7:40 p.m.

However, about 7:15 or so, it did arrive. And it sat there. By 7:30 I was restless. By 7:45 p.m., I wanted to know what was going on. So did a lot of other people.

Looking anxious, the Piedmont representative apologized, said somehow the airline had oversold the flight by one passenger, and one of us would have to drop off. "I'm calling for a volunteer," he said, trying to smile.

By 7:55, nobody had volunteered. So I asked him what he planned to do.

That's when he screamed, "We're canceling this flight because you people won't cooperate!"

And that's when everybody, including me, became angry. There were shouts, fist pounding, and almost physical violence. Finally, the little man walked to the plane, and apparently someone volunteered to get off (or was removed, for all I know). In any event, another man followed our red-faced Piedmont official, and we were allowed to board—a full hour late.

"I've never seen anything like this," I told the stewardess.

Instead of the usual warm greeting one gets from stewardesses, however, I was told, "You haven't been waiting as long as we have!"

"The hell I haven't," I said.

Looking back, it all seems very funny. But it was not. It was not funny to all the relatives (including my two young sons) anxiously and fearfully waiting in dark airports. It was not funny to all the passengers who had been confirmed, yet threatened because they would not "cooperate." It was not funny to those who missed connections, or who did not get to bed until the wee hours, all because of Piedmont's foulups.

Ironically, a check later showed that the original flight for which I had been confirmed, yet not permitted to board "because it is full-up," arrived in Richmond with two empty seats.

I have heard jokes about Piedmont service for some time. This is no joke. Such a major carrier should not be permitted to get away with such shabby treatment of the public.

If it happens to you, raise heck. Then write your congressman and president of the airlines.

That's what I'm doing.

STRIP MINING BILL INVITES MORE DEVASTATION

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is highly unfortunate that the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has labored so long and come up with a mouse of a strip-mining control bill. I cannot vote for this woefully weak and watered down bill in its present form. In fact, I have drafted a substitute bill which will phase out strip mining within 6 months in mountainous areas and within 18 months in relatively flat areas, which is being introduced today as

H.R. 15000. Copies of H.R. 15000 should be available very soon.

Although I fail to understand how the National Coal Association could possibly label the House committee bill (H.R. 11500) as an abolition bill, and although I usually do not find myself in agreement with the coal and utility lobbies, I must say that I happen to be on the same side when they contend that H.R. 11500 must be defeated. But, of course, the reasons for my position are 180° different from those of the coal and utilities lobbies.

Recently, I read an editorial in the Louisville, Ky., Courier Journal, dated May 18, 1974, which I believe deserves attention.

This editorial reflects the feeling in the coalfields that it is high time that Congress stop listening to the big coal, oil, and utility interests and start standing up for the protection of the land and the people. The editorial from the Louisville, Ky., Courier Journal of May 18, 1974, follows:

THE COAL LOBBY IS RIGHT: DEFEAT THE STRIP-MINE BILL

The U.S. House Interior Committee has labored mightily to bring forth a gnaw. That's discouraging news for those who had hoped for strong federal controls to curb the worst abuses of strip mining.

The bill finally approved by the committee this week would produce nothing more than an insect bite on the great body of the coal industry, though the industry is bellowing as though it had received a mortal wound. This is nothing more than an attempt to avert strengthening of the bill on the House floor, or later in conference with the Senate.

The National Coal Association says the bill should be defeated, and for once the industry lobby is right. Unless this legislation is improved dramatically, now that it's out of the hands of a committee in which some of Big Coal's best friends got too much of their way, Kentucky's congressmen should vote against final passage.

Why? The meaningless "interim" standards the bill would apply, prior to full implementation of the federal regulatory program in 1978, would encourage the continued rape and ruin of Appalachian coalfields in the short run. In the long run, the regulatory approach would be so weak and ineffectual that the great corporations now owning and leasing coal in the Western Great Plains would be able to exploit this area on their own terms. Goodbye, Golden West.

A strong bill certainly would discourage the pell-mell development of Great Plains coal, since it is even more difficult to reclaim stripped lands in that arid climate than it is to restore the rolling farmland of Western Kentucky or the hills of Appalachia. A strong bill also would discourage the kind of irresponsible strip mining which is all too often characteristic of operations in the East.

PHASE OUT STRIPPING

So where would we get the coal if strong regulatory legislation were adopted? Would the lights go out, as the industry's swarms of public relations people would have you believe? Would factories close, as the coal barons have regularly predicted? Would we be helpless before the nation's oil-rich Arab tormentors? The answer, simply, is that strip mining is not necessary.

According to an Environmental Policy Center report, based on U.S. Geological Survey and U.S. Bureau of Mines figures, there is 30 times more low-sulfur, deep-mine coal in the national reserve than low-sulfur, strip-minable coal. The figures are even more compelling when sulfur content is ignored—as the Louisville Gas & Electric Company is proving it can be—because it's possible to remove this pollutant at the generating plant.

Phasing out strip mining over a reasonable period of time while expanding deep mining not only makes environmental sense. It also makes sense economically. A national strategy which anticipates meeting the nation's coal needs primarily from Eastern deep mining operations would mean a dramatic increase in mining employment in Eastern states which need work for Appalachia's jobless.

State and local officials in the East have let themselves be mesmerized by the prospect of coal conversion plants. They seem to believe that continued, uncontrolled stripping is necessary if coal conversion plants are to be built. Yet the EPC report notes, "Numerous coal conversion plants are planned for the West, but there appears to be no interest from the Federal Government or the coal industry to convert the high sulfur coals in the Central states (i.e., Western Kentucky coal) or the bituminous coals in the East (essentially Appalachian) to sulfur-free, synthetic fuels."

Island Creek Coal Company chairman Albert Gore is right in saying that Kentucky is a perfect location for a gasification plant, but what are the realistic prospects? Where is the real coal-conversion industry going to be located? Isn't it going to be, for the most part, on top of those huge Western coalfields, assuming Congress passes a regulatory program sufficiently weak that the energy industry can make the huge financial commitments necessary to open those Great Plains seams up?

WAIT FOR NEXT YEAR

With the development of sulfur-control technology, it is clear that the Western reserves need not be exploited in the way the energy barons seem to want them exploited. Based on heat content, or real energy value, 55 per cent of the total national coal reserve is east of the Mississippi River.

Admittedly it's frustrating to counsel further delay in the federal legislative response to strip mining. The struggle to pass a Senate bill, and to get a House bill out of committee, has been a brutalizing experience for advocates of realistic controls. The tendency on the part of many congressmen who have fought for the public interest is to say, "Half a loaf is better than none." However, with the prospect of electing a more responsive Congress this fall, clearly the better approach is to wait. Barring dramatic improvement of the House bill, this Congress should just leave the issue at the top of its agenda for the next session.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from 2:30 today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CLEVELAND, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. STEELMAN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. CARTER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WRIGHT to extend his remarks during debate on House Resolution 1141.

Mr. GROSS to insert his remarks in the Record immediately preceding the passage of H.R. 14832.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. SARASIN.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. BAUMAN.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. MICHEL in six instances.

Mr. FROELICH in two instances.

Mr. SYMMS.

Mr. HUBER in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL in three instances.

Mr. GUYER in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. STEELMAN.

Mr. HUDNUT.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. DELLENBACK in two instances.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. CRONIN.

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

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. RANGEL in 10 instances.

Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. WALDIE in two instances.

Mr. TRAXLER.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. FASCELL in three instances.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. REID.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia in two instances.

Mrs. MINK in two instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. HAWKINS.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that

committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10972. An act to delay for 6 months the taking effect of certain measures to provide additional funds for certain wildlife restoration projects.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 501, 93d Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, May 28, 1974.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 501, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 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:

2355. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on export administration for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1973, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. App. 2409; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2356. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 1973 financial and statistical report of the District of Columbia Government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2357. A letter from the Chairman, Interdepartmental Council to Coordinate All Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs, transmitting the second annual report of the Council, pursuant to section 409 of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2358. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 74-18, and the justification therefor, that no non-African nation employs or has employed assistance provided to it after December 17, 1973, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, the Foreign Military Sales Act, or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, in support of its military activities in its African territories, pursuant to section 38 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-189); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Department of State for contribution to the International Commission of Control and Supervision in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2360. A letter from the Acting Associate Director, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, transmitting a correction to the letter of the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior which submitted a proposed amendment to a concession contract authorizing the continued provision of facilities and services for the public in Grand Teton National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2361. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 216(b)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2362. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft

of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act to provide for automatic cost-of-living increases in supplemental security income benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2363. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems in managing the development of aircraft engines in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. House Joint Resolution 876. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos (Rept. No. 93-1058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1072. Resolution, authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the committee print entitled "Procedures for Handling Impeachment Inquiry Material"; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1059). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1073. Resolution, authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the committee print entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of February 5, 1974" (Rept. No. 93-1060). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1074. Resolution, authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the committee print entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of March 1, 1974" (Rept. No. 93-1061). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 415. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of summaries of veterans legislation reported in the House and Senate during the 93d Congress (Rept. No. 93-1062). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 83. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Surgeon General's Report by the Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior" (Rept. No. 93-1063). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H.R. 14987. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ELBERG, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HUNT, Mr. LENT, Mr. MANN, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 14988. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a National Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 14989. A bill to amend section 404(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that no physically handicapped individual shall be denied air transportation solely because of such physical handicap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14990. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to investigate and report to the Congress with respect to whether certain railroad facilities and equipment meet Federal safety standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 14991. A bill to provide assistance to zoos and aquariums, to establish standards of accreditation for such facilities, and to establish a Federal Zoological and Aquarium Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, and Mr. WAMPLER):

H.R. 14992. A bill to continue domestic food assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUNTER (for himself, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KEMP, Mr. ROE, Mr. HUNGATE, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 14993. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of meat or meat products from livestock slaughtered or handled in connection with slaughter by other than humane methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 14994. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of any fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat during a 180-day period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANRAHAN:

H.R. 14995. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and title 18, United States Code, to reform the Federal election process; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 14996. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it unlawful for any person holding Federal office to accept or receive any honorarium in excess of \$500, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. ROY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.R. 14997. A bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act to prohibit certain corporate management interlocking relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 14998. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, by extending the compulsory licensing provisions until September 1, 1979; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. STEELMAN:

H.R. 14999. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, to increase the appropriation authorization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 15000. A bill to provide for the orderly phasing out of surface coal mining operations, and to control those underground coal mining practices which adversely affect the quality of the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 15001. A bill to authorize recomputation at age 60 of the retired pay of members and former members of the uniformed services whose retired pay is computed on the basis of pay scales in effect prior to January 1, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15002. A bill to declare that title to certain lands in the State of New Mexico are held in trust by the United States for the Ramah Band of the Navajo Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15003. A bill to quitclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain real property in Sandoval County, N. Mex., to the record owner of such property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15004. A bill to establish regional Federal Medical Malpractice Boards to reduce the expenses of bringing, and the awards granted in, medical malpractice suits in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15005. A bill to provide for the creation of the National Fire Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 15006. A bill to establish a national family health protection program under which the Federal Government, in cooperation with, and acting through, private qualified companies, will make adequate health insurance available to every individual and family in the United States regardless of their income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15007. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to authorize the transfer of certain property at Los Alamos, N. Mex.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 15008. A bill to extend the appropriation authorization for reporting of weather modification activities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 15009. A bill to permit nonimmigrant foreign students to be employed during school vacations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 15010. A bill to establish an equitable tax on real property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. GROVER):

H.R. 15011. A bill to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1980; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 15012. A bill to amend part B of title XI of the Social Security Act to provide a more effective administration of professional standards review of health care services, to expand the professional standards review organization activity to include review of services performed by or in federally operated health care institutions, and to protect the confidentiality of medical records; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WHITE):

H.J. Res. 1030. Joint resolution relating to the publication of economic and social statistics for Spanish-speaking Americans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H.J. Res. 1031. Joint resolution designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:
H. Con. Res. 503. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that John Adams should be honored as the Father of the U.S. Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOWARD:
H. Con. Res. 504. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the imprisonment in the Soviet Union of a Lithuanian seaman who unsuccessfully sought asylum aboard a U.S. Coast Guard ship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):
H. Res. 1146. Resolution to condemn terrorist killings of schoolchildren in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:
H. Res. 1147. Resolution relative to post-

ing prices of gasoline and diesel products by retail marketers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ESCH, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. LENT):

H. Res. 1148. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Resolution 988; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):
H.R. 15013. A bill for the relief of Cecelia

Helen Tomczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 15014. A bill for the relief of Viola J. Stewart, Lois Souby, Jane Robertson, and Norma Jean Ridgeway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:
H.R. 15015. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Panoutsopoulos, Angeliki Panoutsopoulos, and Georgios Panoutsopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,
438. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Joseph P. Gerardi, Arlington, Va., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS' FIGHT TO HELP DELINQUENTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Gus HAWKINS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the House Education and Labor Committee, is currently cosponsoring—with Congressman CARL PERKINS—a Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (H.R. 6265). Mr. HAWKINS' leadership in this area has been consistent and far-sighted. He believes juvenile delinquents must be helped before they become adult criminals.

The bill reflects Mr. HAWKINS' strong commitment to helping youthful delinquents. It provides Federal support for alternatives to prison and punishment for those young people in our society who, as Mr. HAWKINS has maintained for so long, need noninstitutionalized treatment. I place in the RECORD today an article by Mr. HAWKINS from the Sacramento Observer of May 9-15, 1974, which I urge my colleagues to read:

A NEW LOOK AT JUVENILE JUSTICE

(By Augustus Hawkins)

America's deep concern about juvenile neglect and juvenile delinquency led to the formation, in the late 19th century, of a series of juvenile courts, whose chief aim was to provide special protection to children needing society's care. Eventually, this movement spread throughout the country, and by 1925 all but two states had legislatively created a state juvenile court system.

Today, every state in the Union, has such a system; thus, there are 50 different governmental jurisdictions, not including the Federal system, legally empowered to handle juvenile problems.

Each juvenile court system hoped to go beyond detention and confinement of youthful offenders, and to broaden their system's responsibility to include treatment to offenders. Their intent was to totally reform and improve upon prior systems which were singularly punitive.

Proponents of this new way of providing a fair and just system of rehabilitation for youthful offenders (juvenile delinquents)

met with great success; they also experienced dismal failures. Each state system was (and still remains) so different in its approach.

An inherent part of the system necessitated a clear definition of the term "delinquency." No reasonably accepted definition has been developed, which would thus form the basis of a mutual, nationwide guide. Confusion rather than coordination continues to exist.

In some jurisdictions, youngsters who become wards of the state due to parental neglect, end up in juvenile facilities which also house youngsters who have been involved in adult crime.

Some courts handle 16-21 year olds; others handle only youngsters below the age of 18. In some states, if a "delinquent" youngster commits an offense punishable by death or life imprisonment, his case must be remanded to an adult court. A number of states, provide no exclusive rights to the juvenile courts, except in cases of children below the age of criminal capacity.

The officers and specialists within this system also have immense difficulties.

Court dockets are overcrowded, professional staffing has been insufficient in number and quality, investigative and casework supports function poorly because of overloading, treatment services are not available to the court, public and private treatment facilities are often too few in number and restricted as to use.

With current nationwide increase in juvenile violence and crime, there needs to be a fresh approach to this whole sensitive area.

I believe H.R. 6265, a Bill co-sponsored by Congressman Carl Perkins and me, will assist in moving the nation in the direction of a more comprehensive approach to resolving juvenile delinquency.

Costing approximately \$1 billion over a four-year period, H.R. 6265 proposes to establish programs and services which will divert juveniles from entering the traditional juvenile justice system.

States will be encouraged, through realistic Federal support, to develop community-based programs designed to create non-institutionalized diagnostic, treatment or rehabilitative services; to work with families, so that a juvenile can remain at home; to provide counseling, work, and recreational services, using youth, volunteer and paraprofessional role-models; to develop foster-care and shelter-care homes, group homes, and halfway houses as alternative facilities to traditional, lockup facilities.

The Bill also establishes a new National Office of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention; this office will provide direction, coordination, and review of all federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs.

Setting national standards and providing resources for upgrading our juvenile justice system, should be a top priority on this country's agenda for its youth.

I believe that H.R. 6265—Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act—moves us in this direction.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration celebrates its 20th anniversary this year, and this week is Small Business Week.

I think this would be an ideal time to acknowledge the many accomplishments of the SBA in its endeavors to preserve and protect the concept of small businesses.

The small businessman is the backbone of our Nation. In recent years it seemed as if the large corporations would dominate our labor market and squeeze out the small businessmen, but through its intensive efforts the SBA has kept alive the dream of many an aspiring individual.

The SBA provides today's small businessman with counseling in many areas and helps insure that he receives a fair share of Government purchases and contracts. It offers a wealth of information concerning advertising, competitive strategy, and selling procedures.

I have long been a staunch advocate of the SBA as it carries out the mandate of Congress, granted in 1953, to encourage, assist, and protect the interests of the small businessman, and to foster the research and development of information that would widen his opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that everything possible should be done to aid the small businessman in the pursuit of his dream; for it is yesterday's dream that becomes today's reality. That reality can represent a vast improvement in our Nation's employment and economic picture.