

tax returns, for totally illegitimate purposes. This was a flagrant violation of the responsibilities of office and remains a potential threat to the privacy of every American.

One answer—the most obvious one—to this problem is to elect principled leaders. Of course, this must be done. But the experience of the past few years teaches us that we also must try to restrict access to and limit the private information which the government has in order to protect our privacy. Only with institutions and laws which are sensitive to and meet the threat to privacy, as well as leadership committed to preserving privacy, will the privacy of our citizens be adequately protected.

In this statement, I offer several proposals which I feel meet some of the problems in these areas and which represent a program to ensure that the privacy of our citizens is respected by our state government.

1. LIMITED ACCESS TO INFORMATION

First, access to personal or confidential information submitted to state government should be strictly limited to those "who need to know" that information in order to carry out a specific, legitimate government function. This policy should be contained in state regulations, and where appropriate, agencies should limit access to such information to a list of certain government employees.

I believe this policy, firmly embedded in our government's procedures, will aid in keeping confidential what should be confidential, whether it be tax information, confidential business information, state medical records, or other categories of information which deal with individuals' personal lives.

Not only should this information be restricted to those who have demonstrated a bona fide need to know, but also non-government agencies should never receive such information without the consent of the individual involved. Private parties, whether they are potential employers, credit agencies, insurance companies, or private investigators have no business receiving such information without the explicit approval of the person involved. This principle should also be contained in our agencies' regulations.

THE RIGHT TO CORRECT

In many instances, government files may contain incorrect or derogatory information about an individual, and these errors, unknown to that person, go uncorrected. In many instances this can be remedied by allowing each citizen to inspect the government file dealing with him or her and allowing that person to add a statement to the file and to request the government to correct any errors. This is the surest and the easiest way to eliminate inaccurate or harmful material and to let our citizens know what about him or her is in the government's files.

Such a proposal has been made on the federal level, where bipartisan legislation has been introduced in Congress. I believe we should apply it immediately at the state level.

Of course, certain files, by their very na-

ture, would have to be excluded from this "right to correct" category. For example, current criminal investigative files cannot be made available to the subject of such an investigation while it is taking place. Also, certain medical files may have to be kept to an absolute minimum.

Indeed, as also suggested at the federal level, we should, where appropriate, apply the "right to correct" rule to non-governmental agencies which keep files on individuals such as credit bureaus, utilities, insurance companies and certain other businesses. These files, in private hands, can cause serious economic harm or humiliation to individuals. And of course, access to these files is not restricted. It seems only fair that people have a right to look at these files to correct mistakes which they may contain.

The "right to correct" principle will serve to do more than just correct errors. By knowing that individuals will have access to these files, both government and business will be more careful in collecting information and will restrict the information which they collect to that needed for legitimate purposes in order to avoid embarrassment and complaints.

3. STATE PRIVACY RULES TO CONTROL

Recently, it has become clear that even carefully drawn state regulations to protect privacy can be undermined by federal programs seeking state data. For example, Massachusetts is now battling the federal government to maintain the confidentiality of its criminal justice records in the face of a massive, federally sponsored, national computer program for all such information which has much weaker safeguards for privacy.

I believe that when a state government collects private information—whether it is tax information, health records, court records, or whatever—and the state promises to keep that information confidential, then the state should oppose any federal efforts to obtain that information unless equally stringent guarantees of privacy are imposed. I would oppose Maine's participation in any federal program which involved sharing such information without protecting the privacy as well as Maine does.

The Massachusetts example brings up another area of privacy that must be guarded: our police and court records. In this area, there is necessarily much derogatory and unsubstantiated information about people, whether it be an arrest report or investigative files. Such information should be kept closely guarded and strictly confidential from those outside the state criminal justice system until an innocent person is proven guilty by proper procedures. Just as a man should remain free until proven guilty, so too should his reputation remain free of accusation until he is found guilty.

4. PRIVACY IN OUR SCHOOLS

Privacy is especially important for our children. Our schools and, at times, other agencies of government deal with our child-

ren and with confidential information about our children. Because of this added access to such private information, there must be added vigilance to preserve its privacy. This has been done in many juvenile court systems, where many proceedings are not made public. I believe such special protection should be extended to other areas.

For example, it has recently come to public attention that certain federal government agencies, and in particular, the Office of Education, has been giving questionnaires to children in order to evaluate certain programs. These have contained questions about social background, family life, and other matters which many people find offensive and intrusive. While I believe we must be careful to evaluate any such allegations, and we must not cripple government programs by unreasonably restricting the information they seek, we must also be vigilant in opposing federal or state efforts to gather facts from us or our children which intrude too far into our privacy.

What is particularly disturbing was the fact that these questionnaires were presented to the children by teachers—authority figures whom the children obeyed—without any consent or knowledge by the parents.

And more important, I think we must guard zealously records involving our children. Here the main issue is school records, which often deal with disciplinary problems, emotional difficulties, and family matters. In high schools and colleges, where counseling is often available, health or mental health records may be involved. With these files, which are needed for the proper functioning of our school system, we must exercise special care. For students do not and cannot maintain the privacy of their lives, and there are many outside parties, such as employers, who naturally look to such records for information.

To protect our children, I believe that school records involving personal matters should not be released to anyone outside the school system without the informed consent of the parents of the child involved. This simple protection will guard against any possible abuses of these records. Of course, once a child reaches 18, he or she would make the appropriate decision on release of these records.

I make these proposals knowing full well that they do not completely solve this difficult problem. But I believe they should be taken, because our privacy is so important that we should take reasonable steps to protect it.

At the national level we have in the past few years seen illegal wiretapping, surveillance and burglary by government agents. As government at all levels continues to grow, so does the need to restrain it from invasion of our privacy.

For these reasons, I believe we must act promptly to protect our citizens and to reassure them that their right to privacy will not be invaded or eroded.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 13, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Paul J. Ascioia, assistant administrator, Villa Scalabrini Home for Italian Aging, Northlake, Ill., offered the following prayer:

I was a stranger and you welcomed me.—Matthew 25: 35.

Almighty God, today the world is in a state of turmoil, blinded by its own prosperity. Man feels exalted by his conquest over matter and lords it over nature as its master, tearing the lifeblood out of its soil, taming the lightning, bringing confusion among the waters of the oceans.

Nations fall, rise, and renew themselves once more. Races reach out and intermingle. Through the noise and clatter of our machines, beyond all this feverish activity of work, in the upsurge of these gigantic achievements, Your sublime plan is maturing * * * the union of all peoples.

It will be a joyous day when all voices, be they in different tongues, will be lifted up in a single hymn of praise to You. Amen.

(Based on a prayer of Bishop John Baptist Scalabrini (1839-1905), founder of the Congregation of Scalabrini Fathers, Missionaries for Migrants.)

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 communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

FATHER PAUL ASCIOLLA DELIVERS INVOCATION

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to welcome Father Paul J. Asciolla, C.S., who has delivered the invocation today. He is the editor of FRA NOI, Chicago's leading Italian-American newspaper, and assistant administrator of Villa Scalabrini Home for the Italian Aging in Melrose Park, Ill.

Father Paul is also an associate at the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs here in Washington, and is a member of the Scalabrini Fathers and Brothers Religious Congregation whose principal work is among migrants.

A graduate of Providence College in 1955 and Northwestern University, where he received his master's degree in 1966, Father Paul has attended major universities in the East and Midwest and has served as guest lecturer on migration problems and intergroup relations.

Father Paul is a member of the advisory board of the National Project on Ethnic America initiated by the American Jewish Committee and chairman of both the Chicago Consultation on Ethnicity and the Illinois Consultation on Ethnicity in Education. Recently appointed as an adviser to the CBS outlet in Chicago, he has been featured on national television and is active in local Chicago TV and radio on the subject of ethnic groups and the ethnic factor in American life.

Most important of all, Mr. Speaker, is Father Paul's love of people and his rare empathy with other human beings. I am proud to number him among my friends and thank him for being with us today. He is a dedicated and resourceful leader in our community and I wish him continued success in his work and in his life of service.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in congratulating Father Paul J. Asciolla on his timely and inspiring message.

I find it particularly appropriate that Father Asciolla deliver today's prayer. Here, very shortly, we will engage in ceremonies marking Flag Day. This is a day on which Americans honor the symbol of this great Nation, a nation that has rightly been called a nation of immigrants.

As my colleagues know, Father Asciolla is a member of the Scalabrini Fathers. This particular society of Catholic priests is a missionary society especially devoted to the spiritual welfare of Italian immigrants in the Americas. Since the late 1800's the Scalabrinis have been assisting Italians who, for a variety of reasons, left their native land to adopt a new country—and a new flag. As the son of Italian immigrants, I know the particular pride that my parents had in this country and our Flag.

On behalf of the children of immigrant parents who were helped so much by the Scalabrini Fathers, I want to say a heartfelt thank you to Father Asciolla and all of the members of the Scalabrini Society

for their tireless work in parishes, orphanages, and homes for the aged.

John Baptist Scalabrini, founder of the society, beside his devotion to the Italian immigrant, was also known for his enlightened concern for social, political, and economic issues. In his message today, and by his work, Father Asciolla has shown that he has followed the path Bishop Scalabrini set out.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for inviting me to welcome the Reverend Paul J. Asciolla, C.S., who delivered the opening prayer today in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to acknowledge and greet today Father Asciolla, who is the current editor of FRA NOI, an Italian-American newspaper which serves the Chicago area. Our guest is also assistant administrator of Villa Scalabrini Home for the Italian Aging in Melrose Park, Ill.

Father Asciolla is a member of a religious congregation, the Scalabrini Fathers and Brothers, whose principal work in this country is among migrants and their insertion into our society and culture.

Through his work in the religious order, Father Asciolla has become well known in the United States for his knowledge of the ethnic group in America.

He holds membership on several national and local organizations dealing with ethnicity in America, including the National Project on Ethnic America and the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs in Washington, D.C. As a noted author, lecturer, and teacher, Father Asciolla has worked to keep the many ethnic heritages alive in the United States. He is most proud, I am sure, of his Italian-American heritage. He expresses this love of his heritage by his work on FRA NOI and for Villa Scalabrini where he joins with the Italian-American community in showing its devotion for its aging members.

I would like to commend Father Asciolla for his most worthwhile work and also for leading the prayer today in the House.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) and others, in welcoming Father Paul Asciolla to the House, and to commend him for the work he has performed.

A member of the Scalabrini Order of Fathers and Brothers, Father Asciolla has distinguished himself, particularly in his work with migrants and their successful inclusion in host culture. His work in the field of ethnicity has been recognized internationally, and indeed, he has been an important force in these areas.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we are indeed privileged to have Rev. Paul J. Asciolla, C.S. grace our Chambers this afternoon. Father Paul and I have shared a most special friendship over the years. And, with the passage of time, the sensitivity, the devotion, and the love this great man holds for all people has become ever more cherished by all who have been fortunate to know of his good works.

Every citizen of this Nation has ethnic roots in other lands. Each of us interprets the meaning of the traditions and culture of our fathers and grandfathers through our own experiences, hopes, and dreams. Father Paul has devoted perhaps his most precious years of service to developing a stronger understanding and appreciation among all ethnic groups of the important role each plays in America today. The commitment and leadership Father Paul has given to the men and women of the Villa Scalabrini, a community of our older Italian Americans proud of their bicultural heritage, stands as a symbol of Father Paul's understanding of the needs of all ethnic Americans.

He is indeed a servant of God and of the people and has become a spiritual inspiration for many. He has served, for all of us, as a moral leader in these troubled times. And, it is with great pride that I join my colleagues in welcoming him here today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks relative to Father Paul Asciolla's prayer.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

Mr. CONTE reserved all points of order.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the judiciary and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14354, SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following conference report and statement on 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:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-1104)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act Amendments of 1974".

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

SEC. 2. The National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended by redesignating section 14 as section 15 and by inserting immediately after section 13A the following new section:

"COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

"SEC. 14. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, during the period beginning July 1, 1974, and ending June 30, 1975, shall—

"(1) use funds available to carry out the provisions of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612(c)) which are not expended or needed to carry out such provisions, to purchase (without regard to the provisions of existing law governing the expenditure of public funds) agricultural commodities and their products of the types customarily purchased under such section, for donation to maintain the annually programmed level of assistance for programs carried on under this Act, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, and title VII of the Older Americans Act of 1965; and

"(2) if stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not available, use the funds of such Corporation to purchase agricultural commodities and their products of the types customarily available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431), for such donation."

LEVEL OF COMMODITY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and subsequent fiscal years, the national average value of donated foods, or cash payments in lieu thereof, shall not be less than 10 cents per lunch, and that amount shall be adjusted on an annual basis each fiscal year after June 30, 1975, to reflect changes in the series for food away from home of the Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. Such adjustment shall be computed to the nearest one-fourth cent. Among those commodities delivered under this section, the Secretary shall give special emphasis to high protein foods, meat, and meat alternates."

INCOME GUIDELINES FOR REDUCED PRICE LUNCHES

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 9(b) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974".

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION FOR NONFOOD ASSISTANCE

SEC. 5. The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771-1786) is amended by striking out "\$20,000,000" in the first sentence of section 5(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$40,000,000".

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 6. The third sentence of section 17(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking out "\$40,000,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 3 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "sections 11 and 13" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 13".

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL D. PERKINS,
LOYD MEEDS,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
PATSY T. MINK,
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM,
MARIO BIAGGI,
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
HERMAN BADILLO,
WILLIAM LEHMAN,
IKE ANDREWS,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
ALPHONZO BELL,
JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE,
PETER A. PEYSER,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
DAVID TOWELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
GEORGE MCGOVERN,
JAMES B. ALLEN,
DICK CLARK,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROBERT DOLE,
HENRY BELLMON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to 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, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying Conference Report.

The Senate amendment strikes all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for conforming, clarifying and technical changes.

(1) The Senate amendment provides that the short title is the "National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act Amendments of 1974". The bill, as passed by the House, con-

tains no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

(2) The House bill amends the National School Lunch Act by adding a new section 14 dealing with the commodity distribution program. The proposed new section 14 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period July 1, 1974, through June 30, 1975, to use funds available under section 32 of Public Law 74-320, to purchase agricultural commodities and their products of the types customarily purchased under section 32 for donation to maintain the annually programmed level of assistance for programs authorized under the National School Lunch Act, the Child Nutrition Act, and Title VII of the Older Americans Act. The House bill also authorizes, for the same period of time, the Secretary to use funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase agricultural commodities and their products of the types customarily available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 for such donation.

The Senate amendment adds a new subsection (e) to section 6 of the National School Lunch Act to provide that, beginning with the fiscal year 1975, the national average value of foods donated under the section, or cash payments made instead of such donations, shall not be less than 10 cents per lunch. Such minimum amount is to be adjusted for each fiscal year after fiscal year 1975 to reflect changes in the series for food away from home of the Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. Adjustments shall be computed to the nearest one-fourth cent. The Senate amendment also provides that, in donating commodities, the Secretary shall give special emphasis to high protein foods, meat and meat alternates.

The conference agreement adopts both the House and Senate provisions with an amendment to the new section 14 proposed by the House. Under the revised House provision in the conference agreement, the Secretary's authority to use section 32 funds to purchase commodities of the type customarily purchased under section 32 for donation to maintain the annually programmed level of assistance for programs authorized under the National School Lunch Act, the Child Nutrition Act, and Title VII of the Older Americans Act is mandatory. In addition, the conference agreement makes mandatory for one year the Secretary's authority to use funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase agricultural commodities and their products of the types customarily available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 for such donation.

Over the past several years, the Department of Agriculture has consistently provided a level of commodity donation for the school lunch program of approximately 7 cents per lunch. The Department's 1975 fiscal year budget includes \$290,000,000 for such commodity purchases to provide such a level of support. Under the conference agreement, the Secretary is required during fiscal year 1975 to meet the programmed level of \$290,000,000 in commodity acquisitions.

The new subsection (e) of section 6 of the National School Lunch Act requires, for fiscal year 1975 and subsequent fiscal years, that the national average value of donated foods, or cash payments in lieu thereof, shall not be less than 10 cents per lunch. Thus, under section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, the Secretary must provide total assistance of at least 10 cents per lunch.

The Conferees wish to note that subsection (b) of section 6 of the National School Lunch Act—authorizing cash in lieu of commodities—remains applicable to the commodity distribution program. As such,

the Secretary is required on February 15 to estimate the value of the commodities which will be delivered to the school lunch program in the current school year. If the estimated value is less than 90 percent of the amount programmed, the Secretary must pay to State educational agencies, by not later than March 15, an amount of funds that is equal to the difference between (1) the amount programmed and (2) the estimated amount to be delivered. Any cash payments required by subsection (b) will be in addition to any cash payments needed to reach the total level of section 6 assistance established on a per-lunch basis in the new subsection (e).

The Conferees wish to note further that subsection (b) of section 6 of the National School Lunch Act is not applicable to the new section 14 proposed in the conference agreement, which requires the Secretary to meet the programmed level for commodity acquisition and distribution. Regardless of the Secretary's action on February 15 and the subsequent payments of cash in lieu of commodities, it is the Conferees' intention that the Secretary during fiscal year 1975 acquire commodities at the programmed level of \$290,000,000. Any commodities which are acquired too late for use in the current school year will be available for utilization in the subsequent school year.

The new subsection (e) of section 6 of the National School Lunch Act provides that the Secretary, in donating commodities to the school lunch program, shall give special emphasis to "high protein foods, meat and meat alternates." High protein foods include cheese, milk and fish.

At least one State has phased out its commodity distribution facilities according to the previously-stated intention of the Department of Agriculture to terminate the commodity distribution program and now lacks the personnel, facilities, and budget to distribute commodities for the school lunch program. In such a case, it is the Conferees' expectation that the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to work out with the affected State arrangements for the distribution of commodities made possible through this new legislation. At the same time the Conferees wish to stress that no State is to be penalized because of previous action on the part of the State in phasing out commodity distribution facilities and mechanisms. In the unusual case where commodity distribution is not possible, there is sufficient authority for the Secretary to make cash payments in lieu of commodities. When such payments are made, the State educational agency shall promptly and equitably disburse any cash it receives in lieu of commodities to schools participating in programs under the National School Lunch Act and such disbursements shall be used by such schools to obtain agricultural commodities and other foods for their food service program.

(3) The Senate amendment amends section 9(b) of the National School Lunch Act to make permanent the State educational agency's authorization to establish income guidelines for use by schools in the State in determining eligibility for reduced price lunches, at levels up to 75 percent above those in the Secretary's income poverty levels. The bill, as passed by the House, contains no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

(4) The Senate amendment amends section 5(a) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to increase the authorization for appropriations for non-food assistance for fiscal years after 1975 from \$20,000,000 to the amount currently authorized, which is \$40,000,000. The bill, as passed by the House, contains no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

(5) The Senate amendment amends section 17(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to increase the authorization of appropri-

tions for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children and the utilization of section 32 funds for such program for fiscal year 1975 from \$40,000,000 to \$131,000,000. The House bill contains no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with an amendment reducing the proposed new authorization from \$131,000,000 to \$100,000,000. While section 17(b) of the Child Nutrition Act now requires that \$40,000,000 be expended for this program in fiscal year 1974, the Conferees intend that any part of this amount not expended in fiscal year 1974 be carried over to fiscal year 1975, and that such amount be in addition to the \$100,000,000 in the conference agreement.

CARL D. PERKINS,
LLOYD MEEDS,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
PATSY T. MINK,
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM,
MARIO BIAGGI,
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
HERMAN BADILLO,
WILLIAM LEHMAN,
IKE ANDREWS,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
ALPHONZO BELL,
JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE,
PETER A. PEYSER,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
DAVID TOWELL,

Managers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
GEORGE MCGOVERN,
JAMES B. ALLEN,
DICK CLARK,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROBERT DOLE,
HENRY BELLMON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. 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. 293]

Abzug	Fascell	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Flah	Nelsen
Archer	Ford	Pepper
Aspin	Fraser	Powell, Ohio
Badillo	Frey	Price, Tex.
Biaggi	Gray	Quillen
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Rangel
Boggs	Griffiths	Reid
Boland	Gubser	Riegle
Brademas	Hammer-	Robison, N.Y.
Breaux	schmidt	Rooney, N.Y.
Brotzman	Harsha	Runnels
Brown, Calif.	Hastings	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Hébert	Shipley
Burleson, Mo.	Hillis	Shoup
Carey, N.Y.	Hollifield	Sikes
Casey, Tex.	Howard	Staggers
Cederberg	Huber	Stanton
Chamberlain	Jarman	J. William
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Stratton
Clark	Jones, Okla.	Symington
Clay	Koch	Talcott
Collier	Long, La.	Tiernan
Collins, Tex.	McEwen	Trien
Conyers	Macdonald	Ullman
Culver	Martin, Nebr.	Widnall
Davis, Ga.	Matsunaga	Wilson
Dellums	Millford	Charles H.,
Diggs	Mills	Calif.
Dorn	Minshall, Ohio	Wyatt
Dolan	Mollohan	Wyder
Dulski	Morgan	Young, Fla.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 341 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of April 23, 1974, the Chair declares the House in recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

FLAG DAY

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the United States Flag, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding.

FLAG DAY PROGRAM, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 13, 1974

The United States Army Band (Pershing's Own) and the United States Army Chorus entered the door to the left of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The honored guests, Mr. Henry "Hank" Aaron, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commandant of the Coast Guard entered the door to the right of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them. Mr. Henry "Hank" Aaron was seated at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The United States Army Band (conducted by Col. Samuel R. Laboda, Leader and Commanding Officer, United States Army) presented *Grand Old Flag*.

The Doorkeeper (Hon. William M. Miller) announced the Flag of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The U.S. Army Band and the U.S. Army Chorus presented *God Bless America*.

The Flag was carried into the Chamber by Color Bearer, and a Guard from each of the branches of the Armed Forces: Sgt. Philip Young, United States Army, in charge; Cpl. Bob Rathbone, United States Marine Corps; Sp4c. Robert L. Harman, United States Army; Seaman Mike Whiteman, United States Coast Guard; Seaman Gary Dison, United States Navy; Sgt. Mark Kramer, United States Air Force; Cpl. David G. Hietpas, United States Marine Corps; Sp4c. Morris Hughes, United States Army.

The Color Guard saluted the Speaker, faced about, and saluted the House.

The Flag was posted and the Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is now pleased to recognize the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS) to preside over the Flag Day Ceremonies.

Mr. NICHOLS. The invocation today will be given by the Honorable RALPH REGULA, Member of Congress from Ohio, and a member of the Flag Day Committee. I would ask that everyone stand and remain standing until the Pledge of Allegiance is given, which will be led by the Honorable BARRY M. GOLDWATER, Jr., Member of Congress from California.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, at this time let us bow our heads and hearts to offer a prayer of thanks to the Almighty for all that is symbolized in the magnificent Flag of the United States of America.

O Lord, surely we have been blessed to be citizens of this great, good and mighty land—a free people, able to enjoy the liberty that is the God given due of all people, and to worship as the conscience of each dictates. We offer our prayers for the continued grace of Divine Providence, as we gather today to honor that symbol of our national life—the American Flag, a symbol that represents the best hopes of our millions of people and which has flown these many years in spite of all attempts to rend it asunder.

Lord, we are mindful of the twin sins of pride and vanity, and we ask only that our ideals—so well symbolized by our Star-Spangled Banner—continued to emphasize all that is good in our American heritage. Ours has been a rich tradition, founded on liberty and equality, forged by a tradition of individual and collective accomplishment, and reborn each morning that finds the dawn of a new day casting its light upon the Flag of a free people, upon the Flag of the United States of America.

God of eternity, our Nation is young—yet the longing of all men to be free transcends any one country or any one age. It is Your gift to us, as your children—to be, as was so nobly inscribed in our Declaration of Independence, “endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

Let us, O Lord, be cognizant of our strengths, yet aware of our weaknesses. Let us raise high our hopes and our magnificent Flag, yet never fail to bow our heads in reverent prayer for humility and Divine guidance. And, Lord, let us continue to work out what surely must be one of mankind's most noble endeavors—our American experience in democracy, an experience that has brought to our people the opportunity to weather all storms, all obstacles, and live “as one nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all.”

We pray, O God, that we will be granted those qualities so aptly symbolized in our beautiful Flag—courage, devotion, fidelity, faith—and that we will be reminded, as was Henry Ward Beecher, that “a thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself.”

Lord we give Thee a special thanks for the goodness of our guest today and for the home run he has hit in the hearts of all Americans. Amen.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in the Pledge to our Nation's Flag.

The Members and guests, led by the Honorable BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR., recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Mr. NICHOLS. The Flag Day address this year will be given by the Honorable PETER KYROS, a Member of Congress from the State of Maine, and a member of the Flag Day Committee.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, in 1777, a few days short of the first anniversary of the signing of our Declaration of Independence, the Continental Congress adopted this glorious National Flag which we now honor, and ordained it before God and all men as the ensign of American liberty.

Even then it was intended to stand for our Founding Fathers' hope that this Nation would be a land of justice, opportunity, equality, and compassion. Today, it has become the most important symbol in our national experience, exerting a compelling influence in its presence. Our blood, our history, and our well-wrought liberty fly with it.

As Adm. H. G. Rickover said after the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Francis Scott Key* in December 1966:

Francis Scott Key caught the mystique the Flag has for us, who are a nation not only by consanguinity, not by a long common history, but by devotion to an abstract, the concept of liberty under the law.

Continuing, Admiral Rickover remarked:

Dennis W. Brogan once tried to explain what the Flag means to Americans. “It is more,” he said, “than a mere symbol. It is the regimental color of a regiment in which all Americans are enrolled.”

On this, Flag Day, 1974, let us remember the sense of unity captured in those words. Though there is still much to argue about and much to fight for in America, our Flag should always fly high above the debate, a sign of the common purpose that transcends our differences.

The product and illustration of our American way of life, the same Stars and Stripes wave over the campuses, over the ghettos, over the grape fields, over the auto factories, over the chambers of elected officials, and over the graves of brave Americans.

To each of us, the Flag evokes special memories: Of times spent in schools and town halls, of parades, of Flags flown over the Capitol and sent home to constituents, of local rituals ripe with meanings personal and private.

For me, it is this way:

When I look at our Flag, I see more than a beautiful cloth banner.

And I see more than the symbol of freedom, and justice, and equality, even though the Stars and Stripes stand for those values as no other symbol in our heritage.

I see our enduring strength—a foundation of democracy as strong as the rocky coast of my own State of Maine; an America strong in spirit, strong in compassion, and strong in trying to meet the needs of its people.

I look at our Flag, and I see 200 million faces, men and women of all races, all creeds, all walks of life.

I see Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and Yorktown.

I see Bull Run, Manassas, Chancellorsville, and Vicksburg.

I see Manila.

I see muddy trenches in France.

I see Africa, Italy, Normandy, and a thousand torrid islands in the Pacific.

I see Iwo Jima, Korea, and, yes, Khe Sanh.

I look at our Flag, and I see Americans fulfilling a lifetime ambition of mankind: Standing on the Moon and gazing Earthward at the blue loveliness 240,000 miles away, and sensing for all time the brotherhood of man.

But above all, I look at our Flag and I see hope: Hope that wherever it flies, it will always be a symbol of American justice, equality, and friendliness around the world—the red, white, and blue badge of courage of the men and women who have lived and died by its ideals.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The United States Army Band and the United States Army Chorus (Narrator, M. Sgt. Bill Fox) presented, *A Song of Freedom*.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the Congress, our distinguished guests and visitors: In past years your Flag Day Committee has honored prominent Americans whose talents have made significant contributions to the American way of life. This year for the first time, the committee is honoring an outstanding athlete who has set records in almost every imaginable category in the field of baseball.

As we all know, Hank Aaron is the unchallenged “king of the home run” and I daresay the majority of those present in this Chamber today were thrilled just as I was to see Hank belt his 715th home run in the Atlanta Stadium this spring, against the Los Angeles Dodgers.

Someone has said that trying to get a fast ball past Hank Aaron is like trying to “get the morning Sun up past a rooster's crow,” and there are many National League pitchers who would support this statement.

There is, however, another aspect of this great athlete's life which is little known to the general public, and that is his tremendous affinity for his fellow-man.

Hank Aaron—a big man from every standpoint—has been generous with both his talents and his time. He has established not one, but two scholarship funds—one for a deserving college student and another which helps keep high school students in the classroom.

It would be difficult to estimate how many autographed baseballs and bats Hank Aaron has donated to celebrity auctions to raise money for retarded children.

In 1972 the Hank Aaron Bowling Tournament raised in excess of \$25,000 for research in sickle cell anemia.

Hank is currently serving as national sports chairman for the Easter Seal Foundation and is president of the “No Greater Love” organization which assists children of men missing in action in Southeast Asia.

And so Alabama born Hank Aaron is much more than America's No. 1 athlete, a great competitor and a sportsman in the finest American tradition, but our

guest is also a humanitarian unsurpassed.

Call him what you will—Hammering Hank—Bad Henry—or just plain Hank Aaron, he has without a doubt left his indelible mark in the annals of American sports and in the hearts of the American people for many, many years to come.

It is my honor to present to the U.S. Congress our very special Flag Day guest of honor, Mr. Hank Aaron.

Mr. HENRY "HANK" AARON. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, friends, and my Congressman Mr. ANDREW YOUNG of Georgia, I would like to say thank you for this high honor that you are paying me today. I would also like to present to you some friends who came along with me to share this day with me: Mr. Bill Bartholomay, chairman and owner of the Atlanta Braves, on my right; Mr. Donald Davidson, assistant to Mr. Bartholomay and also the traveling secretary;—and you always have to have a legal counsel around, so I brought mine with me—Mr. Irving Kaler from Atlanta.

Although I have hit 723 home runs as of today, I always seem like I am lost if I just do not carry this young lady along with me: my wife, Mrs. Aaron.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

When I received the invitation to speak before you from a fellow Alabamian, Congressman BILL NICHOLS, I was struck by the fact that baseball players and Congressmen are similar and have something in common. Both of us fall prey to the old adage: "So what can you do for us next year?"

No matter how many home runs I have hit or how many base hits I have gotten, each spring when I go to camp, I have to beat out some young player. So we both have something in common. As a Congressman, no matter how many bills you pass, no matter how many committee assignments you hold, come the end of 2 years you still have to prove to your constituents that you can deliver in the next Congress.

So it is a great honor for me to come here before the Congress on this special occasion, as I have always had great respect for the Flag and what it symbolizes. To me the Flag has been more than just merely an inspiration. In my more than 20 years of professional baseball I have seen the Flag waving in every ball park from legendary Ebbets Field and the Polo Grounds to the new sports complexes around the National League. Ever since my first game in Eau Claire in the Northern League in 1952, I have been aiming at the Flag in more ways than one.

[Laughter and applause.]

I want to thank you again. I feel honored to speak in the same building where so many Founding Fathers realized the birth of the American dream so long ago. Thank you very much.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The Members and guests rose and sang the *Star Spangled Banner* (first verse) accompanied by the U.S. Army Band and the U.S. Army Chorus.

The Colors were retired from the

Chamber, the U.S. Army Band playing *Stars and Stripes Forever*.

The U.S. Army Band and the U.S. Army Chorus retired from the Chamber.

The honored guests retired from the Chamber.

At 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m., the proceedings in honor of the U.S. Flag were concluded.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 12165. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of certain works in the Colorado River Basin to control the salinity of water delivered to users in the United States and Mexico; and

H.R. 14434. An act making appropriations for energy research and development activities of certain departments, independent executive agencies, bureaus, offices, and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14368) entitled "An act to provide for means of dealing with energy shortages by requiring reports with respect to energy resources, by providing for temporary suspension of certain air pollution requirements, by providing for coal conversion, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11873) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DOLE, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14434) entitled "An act making appropriations for energy research and development activities of certain departments, independent executive agencies, bureaus, offices, and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. FONG, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. MATHIAS, and

Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1865. An act to authorize and encourage establishment of, and to render assistance to, environmental centers in the several States and regions of the Nation, and for other purposes; and

S. 3523. An act to establish a National Commission on Supplies and Shortages.

FLAG DAY

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, most of us in our early youth learned the words of a short paragraph which we repeated each morning in school—the Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag. As we entered adult life, following separate paths, some going on into public service, some going off to war, we have come to more fully appreciate the significance of the words of this pledge—the years have given us a deeper realization of what this brief paragraph means.

Today, as we observe Flag Day, one of the best ways we can honor our flag and pay homage to the great Nation that its represents is to reflect on its true meaning and the heritage it symbolizes.

The act of Congress creating our flag described the pattern of stripes and stars it would have; the stars to be set in a circle on a field of blue, representing a new constellation, a new light in the heavens.

The 13 stripes represent the Thirteen Original States, and we have grown over the past two centuries, from that original 13-star flag to a banner with no less than 50 stars.

When we pledge allegiance, we pledge our loyalty not to a flag, but to the Republic for which it stands. That Republic has been saved and nurtured time and time again by the selfless sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of patriots.

Four thousand patriots gave their lives to establish our Nation. Another 497,000 brave men died in a conflict challenging whether we would indeed be "one nation, indivisible"—the Civil War.

The closing words of our pledge our "with liberty and justice for all" brings to mind that in the last century America has opened her doors, becoming the beacon of liberty to oppressed people all over the world. We have welcomed all, turned none away. We have been the champion of freedom and independence for other nations. We have given the lives of 116,000 of our soldiers to make the world safe for democracy in World War I and another 406,000 deaths were suffered in our crusade against tyranny in World War II.

Throughout our history, no matter the cost, our creed has been that verse which is inscribed on the Statute of Liberty. Give me your tired, your poor, Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore, Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

This, then, is what we should bear in mind as we honor our flag. Let us recall the brave sacrifices of our Founding Fathers, the courage of our Nation's defenders in many wars. Let us recall the hope in the eyes of millions of immigrants, as they came here to start a new life and let us look to our Nation's future, not a dark and stormy future as some would say, but to a bright future of happiness, success, prosperity, and freedom.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, June 14 is Flag Day—a day set aside to honor this marvelous and colorful banner of freedom.

Ten years before the drafting of our Constitution, delegates to the Continental Congress passed a resolution approving a design for our National Flag. The design had been submitted by a committee led by George Washington, and the Flag was finalized with 13 alternating red and white stripes.

Since that time, the number of stars has grown with our Nation, and today the flag stands as one of the most cherished symbols of our Nation and its heritage in the world. It is only proper that we should set aside a day to pay homage to our Flag, and the principles of liberty it represents.

Our forefathers, while caught up in the great conflict which insured this Nation's independence, set down the principles of this struggle. These rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" were meant for all the people of our time. They were "unalienable rights," "self-evident" to all men. In tribute to these principles, and the ideals they represented, these men approved a national flag. It was a bonding force in a trying time of our history.

Yet our Flag represents much more than a collection of abstract principles. It represents more than the thoughts of political philosophers and the wise words of our forefathers. Our Flag represents the very soul of the people of our Nation. It represents the sacrifices of those who fought at Bunker Hill and Gettysburg. It was carried proudly by those who braved the harsh deserts and the hostile mountain passes to stake their claim on a better life.

When we raise our Flag, we raise with it the beliefs of those who fought for our Nation in two World Wars and then airlifted supplies into a beleaguered Berlin. And we must not forget the love of those who toiled long lonely hours at home while the men were away. They all believed in America and its Flag.

Our Flag then, represents many things to many people. But above all it represents the ideals of liberty and justice that our ancestors first conceived, and the people who since then have toiled through the years for those ideals and the Nation they love.

It is a privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our Flag.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceed-

ings had during the recess be printed in the Record, and that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on Flag Day.

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

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATS' DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, according to today's Washington Post, a former Democratic Vice President has been caught with his hand in a \$170,000 cookie jar. I realize his cronies will probably say "boys will be boys."

We are told that he really did not know it was illegal to accept a 7.9 carat diamond and 10 furs from a foreign head of state who incidentally was receiving \$350 million in foreign aid from America. We are also told that the file on this matter somehow disappeared from the State Department in the last days of previous Democratic administration.

Mr. Speaker, one Vice President gets drummed out of office for accepting kickbacks—as he should be—but—it is supposedly all right for another Vice President, whose party controls this place, to accept a \$170,000 so-called gift—which he hurriedly returns only after a newspaper starts asking questions about it.

I have not been around here long enough to adjust to the double standard foisted on the minority by the majority on this Hill. I call on the Justice Department, the Ervin committee, and the Judiciary Committee to investigate these transgressions just as vigorously as Watergate is being pursued.

And to my colleagues on my side—I ask when are we going to stop sitting on our hands, letting these hypocrites do a job on us? We are not even toothless tigers—we are a bunch of pusillanimous pussycats.

RECLAMATION OF MINED LAND

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, if a crippling surface coal mining bill such as H.R. 11500 should become law it would seriously deteriorate the Nation's energy situation. Up to one-third of the coal supply could be put out of reach. The result would be economic depression and universal misery.

Reclamation of mined land is the stated objective of H.R. 11500 and it is a good one. It is the same one stated by H.R. 12898. Both bills would reclaim the land. But with H.R. 12898 you can also dig coal. With H.R. 11500 it would be extremely difficult because H.R. 11500 is an extremist bill. H.R. 12898 should be substituted for it.

This proposition is so compelling that I call upon every individual and every organization in any way affected by the

threat of inadequate coal supplies to join me in seeking the substitution.

This call includes every group in Washington or elsewhere, whether consumers or producers of coal, who will be needlessly damaged. I specifically call on the various labor unions to join in and make contact with Congressmen who will be called upon to choose between the two bills. The same goes for such organizations as represent the coal, the mining, and the electric utilities industries, the Chamber of Commerce and so on. And, the call goes to every citizen of this land whose future would be jeopardized.

For the good of the country I will work with every individual and any recognized group or organization dedicated to honest and effective reclamation of mined land by means and under laws which also permit adequate amounts of coal to be dug. I invite their help, cooperation, lobbying and every other legitimate effort to bring about the passage of H.R. 12898 and defeat of the vicious H.R. 11500. I open my door to them. The facilities of my office will be available to them for so long as this battle takes.

DECLARING JUNE 14 TO JULY 4, 1974, AS PERIOD TO HONOR AMERICA

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 537) declaring June 14 to July 4, 1974, as a period to honor America, which I introduce on behalf of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 537

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress declares the twenty-one days from Flag Day, June 14, 1974, to Independence Day, July 4, 1974, as a period to honor America, and let there be public gatherings and activities at which the people of the United States can celebrate and honor their country in appropriate manner.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote:

America is another name for opportunity. Our whole history appears like a last effort to divine Providence in behalf of the human race.

This is an apt description of the real power behind our great country. Now, all of us are going to have an opportunity to express our gratitude for living in America, our faith in its ideals and institutions, and our hopes for a history of continued greatness.

The 21 days between Flag Day, June 14, and Independence Day, July 4, are designated as "Honor America Days." This is the fifth such annual observance—and it records our Nation's 198th birthday. This is a program that is nonpolitical and nonpartisan. It is an outpouring of patriotism, a rededication to the principles of our Republic, the noblest ex-

periment in government ever devised by the hand of man.

I urge all Americans, as individuals, to utilize this opportunity to reaffirm their thankfulness that they live here under the best kind of government on Earth. I earnestly hope that all citizens will take part through their local organizations in the festivals, concerts, folklore and craft exhibitions that will be held.

It is with great pleasure that I join the leadership in Congress in recognizing this period for a review of our heritage and counting of our blessings. May all of us strive to make this land forever the land of opportunity.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 537.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12165, COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 12165) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of certain works in the Colorado River Basin to control the salinity of water delivered to users in the United States and Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That this Act may be cited as the "Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act".

TITLE I—PROGRAMS DOWNSTREAM FROM IMPERIAL DAM

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary", is authorized and directed to proceed with a program of works of improvement for the enhancement and protection of the quality of water available in the Colorado River for use in the United States and the Republic of Mexico, and to enable the United States to comply with its obligations under the agreement with Mexico of August 30, 1973 (Minute No. 242 of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico), concluded pursuant to the Treaty of February 3, 1944 (TS 994), in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) (1) The Secretary is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain a desalting complex, including (1) a desalting plant to reduce the salinity of drain water from the Wellton-Mohawk division of the Gila project, Arizona (hereinafter referred to as the division), including a pretreatment plant for settling, softening, and filtration of the drain water to be desalted; (2) the necessary appurtenant works including the intake pumping plant system, product waterline, power transmission facilities, and

permanent operating facilities; (3) the necessary extension in the United States and Mexico of the existing bypass drain to carry the reject stream from the desalting plant and other drainage waters to the Santa Clara Slough in Mexico, with the part in Mexico, subject to arrangements made pursuant to section 101(d); (4) replacement of the metal flume in the existing main outlet drain extension with a concrete siphon; (5) reduction of the quantity of irrigation return flows through acquisition of lands to reduce the size of the division, and irrigation efficiency improvements to minimize return flows; (6) acquire on behalf of the United States such lands or interest in lands in the Painted Rock Reservoir as may be necessary to operate the project in accordance with the obligations of Minute No. 242, and (7) all associated facilities including roads, railroad spur, and transmission lines.

(2) The desalting plant shall be designed to treat approximately one hundred and twenty-nine million gallons a day of drain water using advanced technology commercially available. The plant shall effect recovery initially of not less than 70 per centum of the drain water as product water, and shall effect reduction of not less than 90 per centum of the dissolved solids in the feed water. The Secretary shall use sources of electric power supply for the desalting complex that will not diminish the supply of power preference customers from Federal power systems operated by the Secretary. All costs associated with the desalting plant shall be nonreimbursable.

(c) Replacement of the reject stream from the desalting plant and of any Wellton-Mohawk drainage water bypassed to the Santa Clara Slough to accomplish essential operation except at such times when there exists surplus water of the Colorado River under the terms of the Mexican Water Treaty of 1944, is recognized as a national obligation as provided in section 202 of the Colorado River Basin Project Act (82 Stat. 895). Studies to identify feasible measures to provide adequate replacement water shall be completed not later than June 30, 1980. Said studies shall be limited to potential sources within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and those portions of Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming which are within the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River. Measures found necessary to replace the reject stream from the desalting plant and any Wellton-Mohawk drainage bypassed to the Santa Clara Slough to accomplish essential operations may be undertaken independently of the national obligation set forth in section 202 of the Colorado River Basin Project Act.

(d) The Secretary is hereby authorized to advance funds to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC), for construction, operation, and maintenance by Mexico pursuant to Minute numbered 242 of that portion of the bypass drain within Mexico. Such funds shall be transferred to an appropriate Mexican agency, under arrangements to be concluded by the International Boundary and Water Commission providing for the construction operation, and maintenance of such facility by Mexico.

(e) Any desalted water not needed for the purposes of this title may be exchanged at prices and under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary and the proceeds therefrom shall be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury. The city of Yuma, Arizona, shall have first right of refusal to any such water.

(f) For the purpose of reducing the return flows from the division to one hundred and seventy-five thousand acre-feet or less, annually, the Secretary is authorized to:

(1) Accelerate the cooperative program of

Irrigation Management Services with the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, hereinafter referred to as the district, for the purpose of improving irrigation efficiency. The district shall bear its share of the cost of such program as determined by the Secretary.

(2) Acquire, by purchase or through eminent domain or exchange, to the extent determined by him to be appropriate, lands or interests in lands to reduce the existing seventy-five thousand developed and undeveloped irrigable acres authorized by the Act of July 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 628), known as the Gila Reauthorization Act. The initial reduction in irrigable acreage shall be limited to approximately ten thousand acres. If the Secretary determines that the irrigable acreage of the division must be reduced below sixty-five thousand acres of irrigable lands to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is authorized, with the consent of the district, to acquire additional lands, as may be deemed by him to be appropriate.

(g) The Secretary is authorized to dispose of the acquired lands and interests therein on terms and conditions satisfactory to him and meeting the objective of this Act.

(h) The Secretary is authorized, either in conjunction with or in lieu of land acquisition, to assist water users in the division in installing system improvements, such as ditch lining, change of field layouts, automatic equipment, sprinkler systems and bubbler systems, as a means of increasing irrigation efficiencies: *Provided, however*, That all costs associated with the improvements authorized herein and allocated to the water users on the basis of benefits received, as determined by the Secretary, shall be reimbursed to the United States in amounts and on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary.

(i) The Secretary is authorized to amend the contract between the United States and the district dated March 4, 1952, as amended, to provide that—

(1) the portion of the existing repayment obligation owing to the United States allocable to irrigable acreage eliminated from the division for the purposes of this title, as determined by the Secretary, shall be nonreimbursable; and

(2) if deemed appropriate by the Secretary, the district shall be given credit against its outstanding repayment obligation to offset any increase in operation and maintenance assessments per acre which may result from the district's decreased operation and maintenance base, all as determined by the Secretary.

(j) The Secretary is authorized to acquire through the Corps of Engineers fee title to, or other necessary interests in, additional lands above the Painted Rock Dam in Arizona that are required for the temporary storage capacity needed to permit operation of the dam and reservoir in times of serious flooding in accordance with the obligations of the United States under Minute No. 242. No funds shall be expended for acquisition of land or interests therein until it is finally determined by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction that the Corps of Engineers presently lacks legal authority to use said lands for this purpose. Nothing contained in this title nor any action taken pursuant to it shall be deemed to be a recognition or admission of any obligation to the owners of such land on the part of the United States or a limitation or deficiency in the rights or powers of the United States with respect to such lands or the operation of the reservoir.

(k) To the extent desirable to carry out sections 101(f) (1) and 101(h), the Secretary may transfer funds to the Secretary of Agriculture as may be required for technical assistance to farmers, conduct of research and demonstrations, and such related investigations as are required to achieve higher on-farm irrigation efficiencies.

(1) All cost associated with the desalting complex shall be nonreimbursable except as provided in sections 101(f) and 101(h).

SEC. 102. (a) To assist in meeting salinity control objectives of Minute No. 242 during an interim period, the Secretary is authorized to construct a new concrete-lined canal or, to line the presently unlined portion of the Coachella Canal of the Boulder Canyon project, California, from station 2 plus 26 to the beginning of siphon numbered 7, a length of approximately forty-nine miles. The United States shall be entitled to temporary use of a quantity of water, for the purpose of meeting the salinity control objectives of Minute No. 242, during an interim period, equal to the quantity of water conserved by constructing or lining the said canal. The interim period shall commence on completion of construction or lining said canal and shall end the first year that the Secretary delivers main stream Colorado River water to California in an amount less than the sum of the quantities requested by (1) the California agencies under contracts made pursuant to section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), and (2) Federal establishments to meet their water rights acquired in California in accordance with the Supreme Court decree in Arizona against California (376 U.S. 340).

(b) The charges for total construction shall be repayable without interest in equal annual installments over a period of forty years beginning in the year following completion of construction: *Provided*, That, repayment shall be prorated between the United States and the Coachella Valley County Water District, and the Secretary is authorized to enter into a repayment contract with Coachella Valley County Water District for that purpose. Such contract shall provide that annual repayment installments shall be nonreimbursable during the interim period, defined in section 102(a) of this title and shall provide that after the interim period, said annual repayment installments or portions thereof, shall be paid by Coachella Valley County Water District.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, eminent domain, or exchange private lands or interests therein, as may be determined by him to be appropriate, within the Imperial Irrigation District on the Imperial East Mesa which receive, or which have been granted rights to receive, water from Imperial Irrigation District's capacity in the Coachella Canal. Costs of such acquisitions shall be nonreimbursable and the Secretary shall return such lands to the public domain. The United States shall not acquire any water rights by reason of this land acquisition.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to credit Imperial Irrigation District against its final payments for certain outstanding construction charges payable to the United States on account of capacity to be relinquished in the Coachella Canal as a result of the canal lining program, all as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That, relinquishment of capacity shall not affect the established basis for allocating operation and maintenance costs of the main All-American Canal to existing contractors.

(e) The Secretary is authorized and directed to cede the following land to the Cocopah Tribe of Indians, subject to rights-of-way for existing levees, to be held in trust by the United States for the Cocopah Tribe Indians:

Township 9 south, range 25 west of the Gila and Salt River meridian, Arizona;

Section 25: Lots 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Section 26: Lots 1, 12, 13, 14, and 15;

Section 27: Lot 8; and all accretion to the above described lands.

The Secretary is authorized and directed to construct three bridges, one of which shall be capable of accommodating heavy vehicular traffic, over the portion of the bypass drain which crosses the reservation of the Cocopah Tribe of Indians. The transfer of lands to the Cocopah Indian Reservation and the construction of bridges across the bypass drain shall constitute full and complete payment to said tribe for the rights-of-way required for construction of the bypass drain and electrical transmission lines for works authorized by this title.

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary is authorized to:

(1) Construct, operate, and maintain, consistent with Minute No. 242, well fields capable of furnishing approximately one hundred and sixty thousand acre-feet of water per year for use in the United States and for delivery to Mexico in satisfaction of the 1944 Mexican Water Treaty.

(2) Acquire by purchase, eminent domain, or exchange, to the extent determined by him to be appropriate, approximately twenty-three thousand five hundred acres of lands or interests therein within approximately five miles of the Mexican border on the Yuma Mesa: *Provided*, however, That any such lands which are presently owned by the State of Arizona may be acquired or exchanged for Federal lands.

(3) Any lands removed from the jurisdiction of the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District pursuant to clause (2) of this subsection which were available for use under the Gila Reauthorization Act (61 Stat. 628), shall be replaced with like lands within or adjacent to the Yuma Mesa division of the project. In the development of these substituted lands or any other lands within the Gila project, the Secretary may provide for full utilization of the Gila Gravity Main Canal in addition to contracted capacities.

(b) The cost of work provided for in this section, including delivery of water to Mexico, shall be nonreimbursable; except to the extent that the waters furnished are used in the United States.

SEC. 104. The Secretary is authorized to provide for modifications of the projects authorized by this title to the extent he determines appropriate for purposes of meeting the international settlement objective of this title at the lowest overall cost to the United States. No funds for any such modification shall be expended until the expiration of sixty days after the proposed modification has been submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress, unless the Congress approves an earlier date by concurrent resolution. The Secretary shall notify the Governors of the Colorado River Basin States of such modifications.

SEC. 105. The Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts that he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this title in advance of the appropriation of funds therefor.

SEC. 106. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall consult and cooperate with the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other affected Federal, State, and local agencies.

SEC. 107. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to modify the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, or, except as expressly stated herein, the provisions of any other Federal law.

SEC. 108. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$121,500,000 for the construction of the works and accomplishment of the purposes authorized in sections 101 and 102, and \$34,000,000 to accomplish the purposes of section 103, based on

April 1973 prices, plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs involved therein, and such sums as may be required to operate and maintain such works and to provide for such modifications as may be made pursuant to section 104. There is further authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay condemnation awards in excess of appraised values and to cover costs required in connection with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 90-646).

TITLE II—MEASURES UPSTREAM FROM IMPERIAL DAM

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall implement the salinity control policy adopted for the Colorado River in the "Conclusions and Recommendations" published in the Proceedings of the Reconvened Seventh Session of the Conference in the Matter of Pollution of the Interstate Waters of the Colorado River and Its Tributaries in the States of California, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Wyoming, held in Denver, Colorado, on April 26-27, 1972, under the authority of section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1160), and approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on June 9, 1972.

(b) The Secretary is hereby directed to expedite the investigation, planning, and implementation of the salinity control program generally as described in chapter VI of the Secretary's report entitled, "Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Program, February 1972".

(c) In conformity with section 201(a) of this title and the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency under Federal laws, the Secretary, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Secretary of Agriculture are directed to cooperate and coordinate their activities effectively to carry out the objective of this title.

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the following salinity control units as the initial stage of the Colorado River Basin salinity control program.

(1) The Paradox Valley unit, Montrose County, Colorado, consisting of facilities for collection and disposition of saline ground water of Paradox Valley, including wells, pumps, pipelines, solar evaporation ponds, and all necessary appurtenant and associated works such as roads, fences, dikes, power transmission facilities, and permanent operating facilities.

(2) The Grand Valley unit, Colorado, consisting of measures and all necessary appurtenant and associated works to reduce the seepage of irrigation water from the irrigated lands of Grand Valley into the ground water and thence into the Colorado River. Measures shall include lining of canals and laterals, and the combining of existing canals and laterals into fewer and more efficient facilities. Prior to initiation of construction of the Grand Valley unit the Secretary shall enter into contracts through which the agencies owning, operating, and maintaining the water distribution systems in Grand Valley, singly or in concert, will assume all obligations relating to the continued operation and maintenance of the unit's facilities to the end that the maximum reduction of salinity inflow to the Colorado River will be achieved. The Secretary is also authorized to provide, as an element of the Grand Valley unit, for a technical staff to provide information and assistance to water users on means and measures for limiting excess water applications to irrigated lands: *Provided*, That such assistance shall not exceed a period of five years

after funds first become available under this title. The Secretary will enter into agreements with the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a unified control plan for the Grand Valley unit. The Secretary of Agriculture is construction of on-farm system measures undirected to cooperate in the planning and der programs available to that Department.

(3) The Crystal Geyser unit, Utah, consisting of facilities for collection and disposition of saline geyser discharges; including dikes, pipelines, solar evaporation ponds, and all necessary appurtenant works including operating facilities.

(4) The Las Vegas Wash unit, Nevada, consisting of facilities for collection and disposition of saline ground water of Las Vegas Wash, including infiltration galleries, pumps, desalter, pipelines, solar evaporation facilities, and all appurtenant works including but not limited to roads, fences, power transmission facilities, and operating facilities.

Sec. 203. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to—

(1) Expedite completion of the planning reports on the following units, described in the Secretary's report, "Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Program, February 1972":

- (i) Irrigation source control:
Lower Gunnison
Utah Basin
Colorado River Indian Reservation
Palo Verde Irrigation District
- (ii) Point source control:
LaVerkin Springs
Littlefield Springs
Glenwood-Dotsero Springs
- (iii) Diffuse source control:
Price River
San Rafael River
Dirty Devil River
McElmo Creek
Big Sandy River

(2) Submit each planning report on the units named in section 203(a)(1) of this title promptly to the Colorado River Basin States and to such other parties as the Secretary deems appropriate for their review and comments. After receipt of comments on a unit and careful consideration thereof, the Secretary shall submit each final report with his recommendations, simultaneously, to the President, other concerned Federal departments and agencies, the Congress, and the Colorado River Basin States.

(b) The Secretary is directed—

(1) in the investigation, planning, construction, and implementation of any salinity control unit involving control of salinity from irrigation sources, to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out research and demonstration projects and in implementing on-the-farm improvements and farm management practices and programs which will further the objective of this title;

(2) to undertake research on additional methods for accomplishing the objective of this title, utilizing to the fullest extent practicable the capabilities and resources of other Federal departments and agencies, interstate institutions, States, and private organizations.

Sec. 204. (a) There is hereby created the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Advisory Council composed of no more than three members from each State appointed by the Governor of each of the Colorado River Basin States.

(b) The Council shall be advisory only and shall—

(1) act as liaison between both the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the States in accomplishing the purposes of this title;

(2) receive reports from the Secretary on the progress of the salinity control program and review and comment on said reports; and

(3) recommend to both the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency appropriate studies of further projects, techniques, or methods for accomplishing the purposes of this title.

Sec. 205. (a) The Secretary shall allocate the total costs of each unit or separable feature thereof authorized by section 202 of this title, as follows:

(1) In recognition of Federal responsibility for the Colorado River as an interstate stream and for international comity with Mexico, Federal ownership of the lands of the Colorado River Basin from which most of the dissolved salts originate, and the policy embodied in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 816), 75 per centum of the total costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement of each unit or separable feature thereof shall be nonreimbursable.

(2) Twenty-five per centum of the total costs shall be allocated between the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund established by section 5(a) of the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 107) and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund established by section 403(a) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act (82 Stat. 895), after consultation with the Advisory Council created in section 204(a) of this title and consideration of the following items:

(i) benefits to be derived in each basin from the use of water of improved quality and the use of works for improved water management.

(ii) causes of salinity; and
(iii) availability of revenues in the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund and increased revenues to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund made available under section 205(d) of this title: Provided, that costs allocated to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund under section 205(a)(2) of this title shall not exceed 15 per centum of the costs allocated to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund.

(3) Costs of construction of each unit or separable feature thereof allocated to the upper basin and to the lower basin under section 205(a)(2) of this title shall be repaid within a fifty-year period without interest from the date such unit or separable feature thereof is determined by the Secretary to be in operation.

(b) (1) Costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement of each unit or separable feature thereof allocated for repayment by the lower basin under section 205(a)(2) of this title shall be paid in accordance with subsection 205(b)(2) of this title, from the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund.

(2) Section 403(g) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act (82 Stat. 896) is hereby amended as follows: strike the word "and" after the word "Act," in line 8; insert after the word "Act," the following "(2) for repayment to the general fund of the Treasury the costs of each salinity control unit or separable feature thereof payable from the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund in accordance with sections 205(a)(2), 205(a)(3), and 205(b)(1) of the Colorado River Salinity Control Act and"; change paragraph (2) to paragraph (3).

(c) Costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement of each unit or separable feature thereof allocated for repayment by the upper basin under section 205(a)(2) of this title shall be paid in accordance with section 205(d) of this title from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund with-

in the limit of the funds made available under section 205(e) of this title.

(d) Section 5(d) of the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 108) is hereby amended as follows: strike the word "and" at the end of paragraph (3); strike the period after the word "years" at the end of paragraph (4) and insert a semicolon in lieu thereof followed by the word "and"; add a new paragraph (5) reading:

"(5) the costs of each salinity control unit or separable feature thereof payable from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund in accordance with sections 205(a)(2), 205(a)(3), and 205(c) of the Colorado River Salinity Control Act."

(e) The Secretary is authority to make upward adjustments in rates charged for electrical energy under all contracts administered by the Secretary under the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 105, 43 U.S.C. 620) as soon as practicable and to the extent necessary to cover the costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement of units allocated under section 205(a)(2) and in conformity with section 205(a)(3) of this title: *Provided*, That revenues derived from said rate adjustments shall be available solely for the construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement of salinity control units in the Colorado River Basin herein authorized.

Sec. 206. Commencing on January 1, 1975, and every two years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit, simultaneously, to the President, the Congress, and the Advisory Council created in section 204(a) of this title, a report on the Colorado River salinity control program authorized by this title covering the progress of investigations, planning, and construction of salinity control units for the previous fiscal year, the effectiveness of such units, anticipated work needed to be accomplished in the future to meet the objectives of this title, with emphasis on the needs during the five years immediately following the date of each report, and any special problems that may be impeding progress in attaining an effective salinity control program. Said report may be included in the biennial report on the quality of water of the Colorado River Basin prepared by the Secretary pursuant to section 15 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 111; 43 U.S.C. 602n), section 15 of the Navajo Indian irrigation project, and the initial stage of the San Juan Chama Project Act (76 Stat. 102), and section 6 of the Frypan-Arkansas Project Act (76 Stat. 393).

Sec. 207. Except as provided in section 205(b) and 205(d) of this title, with respect to the Colorado River Basin Project Act and the Colorado River Storage Project Act, respectively, nothing in this title shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, modify, interpret, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact (45 Stat. 1057), the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact (63 Stat. 31), the Water Treaty of 1944 with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994; 59 Stat. 1219), the decree entered by the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California and others (376 U.S. 340), the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774; 43 U.S.C. 618a), section 15 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 111; 43 U.S.C. 620n), the Colorado River Basin Project Act (82 Stat. 885), section 6 of the Frypan-Arkansas Project Act (76 Stat. 393), section 15 of the Navajo Indian irrigation project and initial stage of the San Juan-Chama Project Act (76 Stat. 102), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Sec. 208. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide for modifications of the projects authorized by this title as determined to be appropriate for purposes of meeting the objective of this title. No funds for any such modification shall be expended until the expiration of sixty days after the proposed modification has been submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress, and not then if disapproved by said committees, except that funds may be expended prior to the expiration of such sixty days in any case in which the Congress approves an earlier date by concurrent resolution. The Governors of the Colorado River Basin States shall be notified of these changes.

(b) The Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts that he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, in advance of the appropriation of funds therefor. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$125,100,000 for the construction of the works and for other purposes authorized in section 202 of this title, based on April 1973 prices, plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in costs involved therein, and such sums as may be required to operate and maintain such works. There is further authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay condemnation awards in excess of appraised values and to cover costs required in connection with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 90-646).

Sec. 208. As used in this title—

(a) all terms that are defined in the Colorado River Compact shall have the meanings therein defined;

(b) "Colorado River Basin States" means the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the amendment made 21 changes in title I and 3 changes to title II. All changes are germane.

Of the 21 changes to the text of title I, 20 of them are technical and clarifying in nature and are of no substantive effect whatsoever. The 21st change has the effect of increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated by \$5,000,000; thus increasing the appropriations authority for the desalting complex from \$116,500,000 to \$121,500,000.

I might add at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of \$5,000,000 was omitted from H.R. 12165 by inadvertence. The purpose of the \$5 million item is to finance the acquisition of fee title to certain reservoir lands behind Painted Rock Dam upon which only flowage easements are now held. It is necessary to acquire fee title to the lands to enable the reservoir to be operated for relatively long-term impoundment rather than for short-term detention, thereby limiting flows along the Gila River to the channel and keeping such flows from entering the Wellton-Mohawk drainage system and subsequently the desalting plant.

The changes in title II are likewise germane and consist of one substantive change and two conforming changes. The substantive change involves expanding the Grand Valley—salinity control—unit from a 25,000-acre project with a

capability of removing 70,000 tons of salt annually from the river at the cost of \$16,600,000 to a 75,000-acre program with a capability of removing 200,000 tons of salt annually at an estimated cost of \$69,000,000. Accompanying conforming changes were made to H.R. 12165 to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated from \$82,700,000 to \$125,100,000 and to remove the ultimate Grand Valley unit from the list of future projects requiring more study.

While the change in title II has the effect of substantially increasing the price tag on title II, it is believed that the rate of expenditures on behalf of the program will not be greater than under our version. In fact, the Appropriations Committees can be expected to keep this program in balance and not appropriate for the ultimate Grand Valley program until the initial program has proved itself as an effective salinity control measure. For these reasons, and because of the need to have this legislation enacted into law by June 30, 1974, I renew my request that the House agree to the Senate amendment.

All of these amendments are germane. As I stated, the only two major changes are the items dealing with the authorization of \$5 million for the purchase of land in the Painted Rock Reservoir and the expansion of the Grand Valley project from 25,000 acres to 75,000 acres.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of California moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 12165).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. I concur with the gentleman from California that these two amendments ought to be approved by the House. Basically what we are doing, we are completing a project that we would have had to come back and complete later on anyway. These two additional projects that we are putting more funds into simply help to reduce further the salinity of the water in the Colorado River and that is what we started off to do and we might as well go ahead and do this right away.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since we have nothing before us detailing the increase in cost in this bill, I believe I am correct in assuming there is an increase as a result of the conference; is that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There was no conference held. The bill went over to the Senate. The Senate had approved their amendment in committee. When our bill arrived in the Senate it was taken from the table, their amendments were placed in the bill, and it was sent back to the House.

Mr. GROSS. What is the total of the increase over that approved by the House a few days ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is \$5 million in title I, \$42 million in title II.

The amount in title I was inadvertently left out of that authorization. We simply missed the consideration as a part of the total project. We merely provided legislative language for the purchase of land in the Painted Rock Reservoir but provided no funds. In that area there are a number of acres of land that are covered by a flood-flow easement. This \$5 million allows the Federal Government to purchase fee title to those lands found in the reservoir area.

Mr. GROSS. How many acres are in the \$5 million purchase?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The \$5 million would purchase, I am trying to recall—

Mr. GROSS. What is the total land acquisition as a result of the amendments which increase the cost of the bill? If I have the figures right, this increases the cost by about \$47 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is true. Might I say to the gentleman from Iowa, there is \$5 million for this one particular property, that is to acquire the lands that are covered by for flood-flow purchases in the Painted Rock Reservoir.

In title II, instead of taking into consideration the removal of the salinity from 25,000 acres of land in the Grand Valley, the Senate has considered the total area that has been under study and has agreed to authorize a program amounting to 75,000 acres, with an additional cost of \$42,500,000. The total cost added to the bill would be \$47 million.

Mr. GROSS. How much was provided in the bill when it left the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. \$233,200,000.

Mr. GROSS. So these increases put it up to more than \$275 million?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is true, I say to the gentleman from Iowa, and there are 9,000 acres in the Painted Rock Reservoir area supposedly to be purchased in fee title.

Mr. GROSS. And the other body did not suggest that Mexico ought to pay any part of this bill, did it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, they did not. Everything that I read in the record that was said in the Senate was very much in favor of the agreement that had been reached by Mr. Brownell and his counterparts in Mexico in recommending that the United States build the facility just southwest of Yuma, Ariz., at no cost to the Mexican Government.

The balance of this project is for the benefit of the people in the United States. It takes care of Mexican obligations against the United States, and we will pay all those costs with the exception of \$21 million that will be paid back.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, as I tried to say the other day, when the bill was originally before the House, this is special privilege legislation. I hope—I hope it does not go back to the other body again because if it does

I am sure it will be increased by another \$40 million or \$50 million.

I want the record to show that I am more opposed than ever to this legislation in view of the increased spending that has been authorized.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I think it significant that the additional funds that are being provided here, assuming that the motion carries, are those funds that are referred to in title II of the bill; those funds which would be spent north of the border in the United States, on U.S. projects, of benefit to the residents of the various States of the Colorado River Basin.

This is significant, because when this legislation was recommended to us by the administration, it was only recommended that something be done to the Mexican half. It appeared to the Interior Committee's members who considered the recommendations that, having made this commitment to the Mexicans, the Presidential commitment, we were more or less obliged to carry it out, and so we did in title I of the bill. But, we also felt that there should be some consideration for the people upstream, the American taxpayers who are footing the bill for all this, and so we added title II, which will be of benefit north of the border in the several States that are affected.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that the other body recognized the importance of doing something for people as well, and has rounded out the project, as possibly we should have done on our side in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13839, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY ACT OF 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 1167 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1167

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. 13839) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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 California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON). I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy whatsoever on this rule. It is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate. I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 13839, authorizing appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, is House Resolution 1167. This is an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The primary purpose of H.R. 13839 is to authorize \$1,800,000 for fiscal year 1975 for the Council on International Economic Policy—CIEP.

The Council's function is to help assure that all factors affecting international economic policy are more fully considered and that policy decisions are based on realistic assessments of U.S. foreign economic interests.

Dissenting views were filed by Members BLACKBURN, WYLIE, CRANE, ROUSSELOT, and BURGNER in opposition to this legislation because "the organization and function of this body is almost completely duplicative of the functions of other offices in the executive branch." They propose that these functions be undertaken as an integral part of the Council of Economic Advisers' activities and that the present members of CIEP be consulted as to their particular concerns on international economic policy.

Mr. Speaker, the rule is open, and although I have personal reservations about the legislation, I recommend adoption of the resolution so the House can proceed with its business for the day.

Mr. Speaker, I do have a request for

time from the gentleman from Iowa, and I yield 5 minutes to Mr. GROSS.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) a question or two concerning this bill. I assume the proponents of it came before the Rules Committee and justified this dig out of the taxpayers' pockets of \$1,800,000, and for what? I am unable to find an explanation from reading the report.

What justification was given the Rules Committee for this kind of duplicative council?

Mr. BOLLING. To answer the gentleman's question, I defer to the gentleman from Ohio. I am merely handling the procedural problem of getting the bill to the floor and not dealing with the substance of the bill, as is my usual practice. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio to answer the question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that when I appear before the Rules Committee, the members of the committee have no hesitancy in asking me why I am there. I just thought perhaps there was some justification for asking for this money.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to comment on the gentleman's remarks if I could. I would assume he has a good reason for making them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I still would like to have some Member tell me on what justification this bill was carried to the House floor.

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

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if he will be satisfied if I address myself to that subject in my comments during general debate.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the only trouble with that is that we have no justification for passage of the rule, and it might help to get the rule adopted if we have some information.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the justification, of course, for the rule is this:

After all, what is involved here is the authorization of appropriations for the Council on International Economic Policy. We gave statutory status to the Council in 1972.

Prior to that time, as the gentleman knows, it came into being by administrative fiat by the President in 1971. He requested that the Congress act in the matter to give the Council statutory status because it increased his flexibility, and it involved the Congress as well as the executive branch in the policymaking process. For these reasons he asked in 1972 that we give the Council statutory status.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that the fact the President asked for a continuation of this bureaucracy leaves me completely cold.

Mr. ASHLEY. There is no other body that does the work that the Council on International Economic Policy does. The CEA does not do it. There is no other group whose purpose is to focus on the

broad range of policy issues with respect to international economic policy.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I think that is not wholly true. This function has, in fact, been handled by other bodies that handled it very well.

The Council of Economic Advisers used to handle this function; they did the job very thoroughly. The argument that nobody else can do it is totally false. Other executive branch organizations which have evaluated and reported on these issues are: The Council on Economic Advisers, the Bureau of International Commerce in the Department of Commerce, the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the East-West Trade Policy Committee, the Treasury Department, and the Federal Reserve System.

I would also like to remind my good colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, who I know is very anxious to be accurate, that the Bureau of International Commerce does in fact cover the same type of statistics and research, and, as a matter of fact, the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations carries out similar types of research.

It is admitted in the report that this is primarily a research and statistics gathering agency. So it would be wrong to say that no one else is able to do this job. I know that the gentleman wishes to be accurate.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is the assessment of the gentleman from California. The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers does not share the gentleman's view. The gentleman's assessment is absolutely inaccurate.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Does the gentleman mean Mr. Stein?

Mr. ASHLEY. Of course that is who I mean.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I received a letter from him on June 4.

Mr. ASHLEY. What does it say?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Stein admitted in one portion of his letter—and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio has a copy of it—that “I am aware of the partial duplication between CIEP’s annual report”—that is this Council—“and the International Chapter of the CEA report. In a sense the overlapping is inevitable.”

Mr. Stein says that himself.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to read the rest of the letter.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I will say that I will be glad to read the rest of it during the regular debate. What I am saying is this—and I know the gentleman wants to be accurate—that this is in fact duplication. The job has been done by another agency composed of very capable research people.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

[Roll No. 294]

Abzug	Gibbons	Rarick
Addabbo	Gray	Reid
Archer	Green, Pa.	Robison, N.Y.
Arends	Gubser	Rooney, N.Y.
Aspin	Hansen, Wash.	Roy
Badillo	Hastings	Runnels
Blaggi	Hébert	Ryan
Boggs	Hillis	Shipley
Boland	Hollifield	Shoup
Brademas	Horton	Smith, N.Y.
Breaux	Howard	Staggers
Broyhill, Va.	Huber	Stanton,
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, Okla.	J. William
Carey, N.Y.	Jones, Tenn.	Stanton,
Carter	King	James V.
Cederberg	Kluczynski	Stephens
Chamberlain	Koch	Stokes
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Talcott
Clark	Landrum	Tierman
Clay	Lent	Treen
Collier	Long, La.	Udall
Conyers	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Culver	Mallory	Vander Veen
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Wilson,
Diggs	Meeds	Charles H.,
Dingell	Morgan	Calif.
Dorn	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyatt
Dulski	Nix	Wydler
Eckhardt	Passman	Wyman
Esch	Pepper	Young, Fla.
Fish	Powell, Ohio	Young, Ga.
Frey	Price, Tex.	Zwach
Fulton	Quillen	
Fuqua	Rangel	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 14992

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 14992.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR CARRYING OUT THE PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY ACT OF 1972

Mr. ASHLEY. 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. 13839) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, as amended.

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

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. 13839, with Mr. McCORMACK 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 Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13839, a bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, as amended.

For economic policy formation in the international field, the President relies upon a specialized cabinet level group, the Council on International Economic Policy—CIEP. The President and the Council are served by a staff under an executive director who is also an assistant to the President.

The Council on International Economic Policy was first created by Presidential memorandum in January 1971, on the recommendation of the Advisory Council on Executive Organization, to improve the coordination of U.S. Government agencies with responsibilities in the field of foreign economic affairs. The Congress gave statutory status to the Council in the International Economic Policy Act of 1972.

The purpose of the Council is to achieve a clear, top-level focus on the broad range of international economic policy issues. It is the function of CIEP to help assure that all factors affecting international economic policy are fully considered and that policy decisions are based on realistic assessments of U.S. foreign economic interests. Another objective of the Council is consideration of these policy choices in the context of both domestic economic development and our broad foreign policy objectives.

The CIEP staff is used by the Council and its executive director to coordinate the efforts of individual agencies and to synthesize the sometimes divergent policy recommendations forwarded by them.

Among the important issues in which the Council was involved during 1973 were:

Negotiations on trade and monetary reform;

New international agreements on the treatment of foreign investment;

The impact of U.S. banking and securities regulations on international investment patterns;

U.S. policy on expropriations of U.S. investments by foreign governments;

Problems associated with the transfer of U.S. technology abroad;

Export controls on agricultural and industrial commodities in short supply, and

East-West trade policy.

Authorization for CIEP appropriations expire June 30 of this year. H.R. 13839, as introduced, would authorize to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary until the expiration of the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, as amended, to June 30, 1977. The committee adopted an amendment to the bill which would limit the authorization of appropriations to the fiscal year 1975, and in an amount not to exceed \$1.8 million. It was the view of the committee that authorization of the appropriations for 1 year would aid the committee in its review of the activities of the Council for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H.R. 13839, as amended.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13839.

As the world economy continues to produce severe challenges for all nations affecting not only their overall relations with each other but having widespread impact upon their domestic economies, it is vital that this Government insure that it is equipped for effective policymaking. One of the most promising and successful steps we have taken in this area has been the creation of the Council on International Economic Policy, established in 1971 to bring about close top-level coordination of the many departments and agencies with responsibilities in this area.

We could not have afforded much longer to operate without such a coordinating mechanism. And we certainly cannot afford to revert now to the situation we faced prior to 1971, when there was no such mechanism within the Executive Office. These problems are simply too complex, and the linkages among trade, investment and monetary activity too close, for decisions to be made within one discipline without reference to the others, as well as to the impacts of economic policy decisions upon our overall foreign policy aims. And certainly we have learned in recent years how deeply our own economy's functioning can be affected by its interaction with other nations; there simply has to be a central body within the Executive Office to guarantee that the recommendations considered by the President take into account their foreseeable effects upon the jobs and incomes of our citizens.

When the Congress authorized the CIEP in 1972, it required that an annual report be submitted by the President, reflecting the U.S. international economic position and the basic thinking behind relevant U.S. policy recommendations. Since that date, two such "International Economic Reports of the President" have been prepared by the CIEP. The many serious policy issues which have concerned the Council over the past 2 years have been described in detail in those reports. Many of our colleagues, as well as representatives of the private

sector, have rightly commended these documents for having packed such clear explanation of vital and complex matters into such a brief publication.

But the annual report, while very visible and increasingly well-known, is not the principal product of the CIEP. Indeed, the Council's most important product is the international economic policy of the United States. Composed of Cabinet-level members, it is the body through which the critical economic policy recommendations are made to the President, regardless of the specialized department or agency which might have recommended them. In this way, balanced and realistic recommendations can be formulated, and the President can be sure that all important facets of these issues have been considered. Once decisions are made, the high-level nature of the Council helps insure that that policy will in fact be carried out by all agencies of the Government. In a sense, then, it corresponds to the role of the National Security Council with respect to international political and security issues.

Certainly no one can question that the complexity of our economic relationships abroad and their serious impacts upon our own economy have increased in importance for our national well-being during the past years. More and more, these are areas of problems and policymaking needs which require the strongest analytical and decisionmaking efforts we can mount.

It was clearly foreseen from its beginnings in 1971 that the vital detailed work of the CIEP would have to be done by a staff under its Executive Director, and that the success of the Council in identifying issues and in coordinating recommendations from the many Federal departments would depend upon attracting and maintaining a staff of unusually high competence. The CIEP staff has been kept relatively small as Federal agencies go, but its Executive Directors—initially Peter G. Peterson and currently Peter M. Flanigan—have succeeded in building an exceptionally strong staff to handle these complex matters. The CIEP staff is composed partially of Government officials borrowed from other departments because of particular experience and skills, and partially of persons from the private business and academic sectors. In this way, it acquires the versatility required to handle the wide range of problems within its areas of responsibility. My own contacts with that staff have confirmed the very excellent reputation it has earned among my colleagues. And certainly the performance of its Executive Director, Peter Flanigan, merits special commendation. Not perhaps the most important of his activities, but nevertheless one of particular interest to me and to many of my fellow Members of this House, has been his willingness to respond to our requests with personal appearances here on Capitol Hill and to provide eloquent and comprehensive replies to our questions.

The list of specific accomplishments of the CIEP is long and varied. It reaches from the fundamentals of our initiatives in the trade and monetary reform areas,

to current efforts to move forward in reforming international investment codes. The Trade Reform Act, currently before the Senate, grew out of the activity of this Council. The overall direction of our negotiations with the Europeans, in which some progress was reached in recent weeks, has been carried forward under the guidance of the Council. The conduct of our successful negotiations to settle outstanding investment disputes with the government of Peru was a further accomplishment of this group. And the Council's staff is currently engaged in comprehensive studies, enlisting the energies and talents of the relevant agencies, of our current major policy challenges, from various aspects of the energy problem to the search for ways of ensuring supplies of needed raw materials at reasonable price.

Mr. Chairman, I for one believe the challenges this country faces in the international economy will continue to grow more severe, not less so. Their impact upon our overall foreign policy objectives will continue to be very great, and to require close attention if our economic policy is to support our search to strengthen the structure of world peace. And finally, the impact of our international economic policy decisions upon the jobs and incomes of our citizens will continue to be crucially important. For all of these reasons, it would be foolish indeed to fail to support the mechanism by which all of these complex interrelationships are studied in the course of considering policy decisions. This vital job must continue to be done. And we must express our recognition of this need in strong enough terms that those within the CIEP and its staff who are tasked with these responsibilities have no doubt as to our commitment to their efforts. Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend our approval of the CIEP authorization request.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 13839, a bill which would authorize the appropriation of \$1.8 million for the continuation of the Council on International Economic Policy. The CIEP is a research, reporting, and policymaking agency which was originally created by Executive order in 1971 and which has operated under legislative authority since 1972.

The various functions which the agency conducts overlap with those of a number of other executive branch agencies, including the Council of Economic Advisers, the Bureau of International Commerce in the Department of Commerce, the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the East-West Trade Policy Committee, the Treasury Department, and the Federal Reserve System. It was for this reason that several members of the committee joined me in suggesting, in our dissenting views to this bill, that the present functions of the CIEP be made "a part of the operation of the Council of Economic Advisers."

In response to our suggestion I have received a letter dated June 4, 1974, from Chairman Herbert Stein of the CEA in which the Chairman acknowledged the "partial duplication between the CIEP's annual report and the International Chapter of the CEA report" but described it as "inevitable—if, as the Congress has legislated, the CIEP report is to provide a more extensive description of our international economic position, problems, and policies." Mr. Stein stated that his staff at the CEA would need to be expanded if it were to take on the duties of the CIEP.

Although I am not fully convinced that the functions of the CIEP cannot be absorbed within either the CEA or one of the other executive branch agencies which I have listed, Mr. Stein's implication that duplication could be avoided by transferring CIEP's functions to the CEA and adding additional staff has considerable merit. It would, in my judgment, be a small but significant step in the direction of reducing the proliferation of Federal agencies dealing with economic policy and the consequent fragmentation of the authority and responsibility for formulating policy in this vitally important area.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to defeat this legislation. The functions of the CIEP, including its policymaking responsibilities, could then be centralized in the CEA, and this elimination of duplication can be accomplished at the executive level without the need for further legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio after I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary to point out that as far as Mr. Stein is concerned, he appreciates your confidence but he does not share your views.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I understand that. Mr. Stein does feel that the Council on International Economic Policy should be a separate operation.

Mr. ASHLEY. What he says is, "We do not believe that the transfer would be desirable and that it would achieve the desired economy."

He goes on to state that the Council of Economic Advisers has as a staff one senior and one junior person working in international economic problems.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is because, if the gentleman will yield, that some of that personnel when this agency was formed was transferred over from the Council on Economic Affairs about 2 years ago.

Mr. ASHLEY. He does go on to say that the Council of Economic Advisers, if it takes over the CIEP function, will

need additional staff of approximately the size of the CIEP staff.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. But the overall administrative costs would not be as great if the Council of Economic Advisers maintained that group within its structure. My judgment is that it would require fewer people, and I have already mentioned that in my remarks.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman in opposition to this liquidation and I would just like to ask a question. How much advice do you think the Council on International Economic Policy gave to the President on the recent 6-percent Export-Import loan to the Soviet Union?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I do not know how much total input CIEP had in that decision because, as the gentleman knows, there were others participating. The gentleman is talking about the loan to Russia?

Mr. KEMP. Yes, I am, and I do not believe it was in keeping with the intent of Congress, further I am strongly opposed to it. Persons and businesses in western New York and America are paying exorbitant interest rates. I cannot understand how we can make these low-interest loans to Soviet Russia.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I do not think they were the prime advisers on that. There is a so-called informal committee which comes from the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Board, the State Department, and others, which advises on this type of guaranteed loan now going to Russia, and I am sure the gentleman and I would disagree with those kinds of credits.

I am sure their input, whatever that was, if they did advise 6 percent, I think they made a mistake, but in any respect I am sure their input would not be the major input that would be finally considered anyway.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding this time to me.

I regret that I have to oppose the position of my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY), who is knowledgeable and most effective and for whom I have great admiration and respect. But I opposed the creation of this agency, in the first instance, back on August 3, 1972. As a matter of fact, the House, in its wisdom, rejected making CIEP statutory. The other body put it back in conference.

At that time I predicted that once CIEP was made statutory, it would come back again, again and again for more

and more money, and my prediction is coming true. So far, the agency has spent in 2 years \$2.8 million. This year it wants \$1.8 million. It wanted more than that, as a matter of fact. The bill which was sent up to the Committee on Banking and Currency asked for an open-ended authorization for 5 years; but in its wisdom, the Committee on Banking and Currency decided that it would fund CIEP to the tune of \$1.8 million for just 1 year.

Mr. Chairman, it was not very long ago that this House, by one vote, passed an increase in the debt ceiling to \$495 billion, \$5 billion less than half a trillion dollars.

It seems to me that it is time that we attempt by some process or another to avoid duplication in spending.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT), mentioned only a few of the 60 agencies having responsibility in this area. I think it is time to call a halt to the duplication of Government effort and to the creation of additional advisory councils that add to unnecessary expenditures and add to the Federal deficit. We just do not have the money to be so generous.

Mr. Chairman, just today I introduced a bill similar to H.R. 144, which was introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), recommending that the Congress of the United States spend no more money that it takes in, and, reduce the Federal debt. To repeat my proposal for the benefit of the Members, the bill I introduced today similar to H.R. 144 would say that Congress could not appropriate any more money than it takes in, and that the Federal debt would be reduced by 2 percent the first year that the bill goes into effect; 3 percent the next year; 4 percent the next year; and 5 percent the next year and so on until the Federal debt is retired.

Mr. Chairman, with the increase, as I have just mentioned, in the Federal debt to \$495 billion just last week by only one vote—and passage required the vote of the Speaker—it seems to me that we can well do without this bill, which I regard as unnecessary.

Even though, as I say, it only adds \$1.8 million to our deficit, still, I think we have to start some place. I am going to vote "No" on this bill because I do think that it is merely duplicatory of what other agencies of the Federal Government do. I therefore recommend that the Members vote "No" also.

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

Mr. WYLIE. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement that this agency is duplicative.

I am wondering just exactly what the Council does do. For example, one of its responsibilities, I understand is to define and evaluate foreign investments, that is, U.S. investments in foreign lands and, I presume, foreign investments in the United States.

One of the matters that would seem to come under the jurisdiction of the Council would be this problem of increasing investment within the United States by foreign nationals. I know many people are getting very much concerned about the purchasing of property by aliens, and I think we can take judicial notice of the fact that U.S. laws are less restrictive in this regard than they are in any other modern civilized nation.

This would seem to be an area in which the Council should at least conduct research.

Has the Council done any such research, to the knowledge of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware whether the Council on International Economic Policy has done any work in this area or not. I did see their report; I did not read it in detail. It is quite voluminous.

There are other agencies which ought to be concerning themselves with this matter: For instance, the Domestic and International Economic Business Agency. The Department of Commerce ought to be concerning itself with this matter, it seems to me, as well as the Council of Economic Advisers.

I think the gentleman, with his remarks, is helping me make my point, that there are many other agencies in Government that ought to be concerning themselves with this issue, if the Council on International Economic Policy has not done so already. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to be looking into it, and we ought to be getting some input from one of these Federal agencies, and that the process ought to be clarified.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13839.

In considering the authorization for the Council on International Economic Policy, it is important that we clearly understand the purposes for which it was created and accurately perceive what it has been able to accomplish during these first 2½ years of its existence.

By the beginning of the 1970's, it had become clear that the world had changed fundamentally since the immediate post-World War II period, and that these changes deeply affected and greatly complicated policymaking in international and economic trade, investment, and monetary affairs. At the same time, it was becoming more and more apparent that our own economic well-being is significantly affected by our international economic relationships. Finally, it had become obvious that the policymaking machinery of the Federal Government was not adequate to insure realistic and effective decisionmaking: in particular, that there was no central top-level coordinating body to handle the recommendations of the many departments and agencies involved in these matters.

Acting upon the strong recommenda-

tion of the Ash Advisory Council on Executive Organization, the President created the Council on International Economic Policy by memorandum in January 1971. The Congress first authorized the CIEP in August 1972, and, in October of last year, extended the legislative authorization through June of 1977.

The Council's top-level membership—and it is composed largely of Cabinet officers—enables it to make decisions on a basis of thorough consideration of the many aspects of policy issues. It has in fact greatly improved the policymaking process, in providing the President more balanced and realistic policy choices. Furthermore, the departments with specialized responsibilities and views have had, for the first time, a clear framework within which to present their recommendations and to see them considered in the broader context of the national interest. The Council has provided a forum within which international economic policy can be related to our overall foreign policy objectives as well as to the jobs and income of our own people.

Of necessity the greater part of the work required in order to make possible the effective functioning of such a high-level Council is staff work, and must be handled within the Executive Office. It has been found most efficient to have a small but highly competent staff under the control of the CIEP Executive Director. All of the resources available to the White House from the Federal bureaucracies are of little value unless this crucial staff function is carried out well. In this sense it is correct to speak of the CIEP staff as a management tool of the President in the policymaking process.

The procedures by which this staff job is carried out by CIEP depend both upon the nature of the problem and the resources available for studying it. Most often an interagency group of experts, under CIEP staff leadership, will prepare detailed background and policy papers for CIEP review. Sometimes this is done, at CIEP request, under the chairmanship of one of the specialized departments having unique experience with the problem under study. Alternatively, CIEP may contract out research projects to consultants from business or academic life. Once initial staff work has been accomplished, the CIEP itself may meet at sub-Cabinet level for review of the ongoing work. Final CIEP decisions on policy recommendations to the President are reached at the Cabinet-level meetings, currently under the chairmanship of the Counselor to the President for Economic Policy, Kenneth Rush.

Areas of special interest, study and policy recommendations during the past year included, U.S. policy toward negotiations on trade and monetary reform, policy on seeking new intergovernmental agreements concerning the treatment of foreign investment, the international transfer of technology, export controls on commodities in short supply, East-West trade policy, and export promotion. Of special interest is the CIEP staff's role

in the preparation of the Trade Reform Act which has passed the House and is currently before the Senate Finance Committee. In this connection I should note that, although the CIEP has never been an "operational" agency, and therefore leaves the conduct of trade negotiations to the special trade representative, the policy direction of these negotiations is determined by the President through the CIEP mechanism. The recent long-sought agreement to settle various outstanding investment disputes between U.S. firms and the Government of Peru was negotiated under the auspices of the CIEP. Other policy issues upon which CIEP worked during the year are outlined in the International Economic Report of the President, prepared by the CIEP staff and submitted to the Congress in February. That report is commendable for its unusually lucid and concise explanation of complex policy issues.

Despite the significant progress our country has made in restoring its trade and payments balances, and initiating negotiations toward the reform of the world economic system, we face important new challenges. The momentum we have achieved is threatened by growing concerns over supplies of energy and needed commodities. The CIEP staff has therefore initiated major work projects on these issues, in an effort to provide the President the most effective possible policy guidance during the coming year.

I urge the House to approve the CIEP authorization request in order that it may continue its excellent performance of this vitally important job.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding time to me.

I just want to make several quick observations. I do not think I will take the entire 5 minutes.

I do want to repeat the argument advanced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WYLIE. Just in the last few weeks, the country was literally on the verge of economic chaos because we were not willing to extend the national debt.

The national debt is not made up of just one big \$400 billion budget. We are looking at a \$300 billion budget next year, assuming we are fortunate enough to be able to cut down proposed expenditures by \$5 billion in order to get down to that \$300 billion mark.

When we consider these very simple facts of life, when we consider that the national budget is like the pebbles on the beach, we realize that we must come to grips with this problem.

It takes a lot of pebbles to make up a beach. With the national budget, we get a \$1½ billion item here and a \$2 billion item there. Before long, it adds up to a lot of money. I think one of these times

we ought to start eliminating some of the pebbles.

Mr. Chairman, this country existed nearly 200 years without this Council. I suspect that we will do very well in the future without it—particularly if its abolition will mean a significant step forward; a step which, at least, will indicate a determination that, for once, we are going to try to come to grips with the problem of our national budget.

If this Council has contributed anything in the way of concrete suggestions toward this country's economic policies abroad, those suggestions have escaped the members of the committee. I suspect they have escaped the attention of any of the Members of the House of Representatives.

This administration already is exporting to the Soviet Union huge volumes of American technology—computers, capital equipment, and the biggest truck factory in the world. Now we are getting into the business of building one of the most modern fertilizer plants in the world for them—plants which can be used to manufacture nitrogen for explosives as well as fertilizer. Yet, this Council has not said one word about the potential hazard to American workers nor to American industry which can result from the mix of American technology and nonfree Soviet slave labor. How can we expect American industry to protect American markets abroad?

American workers enjoy a free labor market. They can join a union. They can organize strong, independent unions. They can strike and exercise the full range of American rights.

How can we expect them to compete against the Soviet slave laborer? He has no union. He has no right to strike. He has no right to relocate nor choose a different form of employment. Why has not this Council addressed itself to this very important problem at the very time our Nation is exporting literally billions of dollars to the Soviet Union?

Last year these exports ran close to \$1.5 billion in American goods and technology. These are not consumer goods; these are not socks and shoes for little children; these are not little dresses for little girls. These are exports of machinery to make tractors and trucks, to make fertilizer and nitrate explosive factories, if you will.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. News & World Report has told us of Russian tractors selling in New York for some 10 or 20 percent less than a comparable American tractor. Are we not going to look pretty silly when American-designed trucks produced in an American-designed Russian plant are sold here at prices with which American truck producers cannot compete?

All right, someone will say, we have an agreement with the Soviet Union that they will not dump their products in the United States, all we have to say to them is no, we do not want you exporting to the United States. That is true. But what will we say when they start exporting these trucks into Latin America, into

Africa, and into other parts of the world?

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I am saying that a significant danger to American markets is on the rise throughout the world through the combination of American technology and Soviet non-free labor, and this Council has said nothing about it.

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to serve on the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Several years ago this subcommittee undertook a study of international economic policymaking in the United States. It was quite obvious from this review that there are many bureaus and departments of Government involved in the field of international economic policy. Thus, I reached two conclusions: First, at the time there was a lack of coordination within the executive branch of the Government with respect to international economic policy decisions; and, second, in many instances these decisions were contradictory.

As a consequence, I concluded that it was essential we have some kind of an organization within the executive branch which would coordinate international economic policy matters and decisions.

I would like from my perspective as a member of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee to make three observations. First, it is clear that there is some misunderstanding as to what is CIEP's actual role. There are vast information-gathering resources which do indeed exist within the Federal bureaucracy.

Yet these are useless to the President for effective decisionmaking unless the Executive Office can itself perform the crucial job of weighing and assessing conflicting recommendations on conflicting matters. The impact of our international economic decisions is too great, Mr. Chairman, both on our foreign policy in general and upon our domestic economic welfare, for us to permit this crucial job to be done poorly, or not at all. It is this job which constitutes the vast bulk of CIEP's staff work load, not the preparation of annual reports or congressional testimony as implied in the dissenting views.

Specifically, what has CIEP dealt with in 1973? Let me just mention some of them:

Negotiations on trade and monetary reform;

New international agreements on the treatment of foreign investment;

The impact of U.S. banking and securities regulations on international investment patterns;

U.S. policy on expropriations of U.S. investments by foreign governments;

Problems associated with the transfer of U.S. technology abroad;

Export controls on agricultural and industrial commodities in short supply, and

East-West trade policy.

Second, Mr. Chairman, there has been

some confusion as to the difference between CIEP and the Council on Economic Advisors, and even some suggestion that there is substantial overlap in the functions of these two organizations.

Now, CIEP is, basically, a gathering of heads of policy-making departments, brought together to present their various views so that all can be considered in deciding upon final policy recommendations to the President. The Council of Economic Advisors, in contrast, has no member who is head of an operating and policymaking Federal agency: It is not a gathering of policymakers, but rather a trio of highly qualified economists who perform another essential but quite different function for the President: they give the best advice they and their analytical staff can provide as to where the economy appears to be going, and what impact administration policy appears to be having, and particularly with regard to the purposes of the Employment Act of 1946 which established this office.

Third, the dissenting views display some misunderstanding as to the reason for whatever duplication does exist between the Annual Reports of the CEA and the CIEP. The annual report of CEA has appeared each year for a generation, presenting analyses primarily focused upon domestic economic activity, but more recently also containing one chapter on the international economy. The CIEP's "International Economic Report of the President," submitted each year pursuant to the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, is much more heavily oriented toward the role of the United States in the international economy. It attempts to place our policy and performance in the context of economic developments at home and abroad, as well as within the framework of our broader foreign policy aims. It is a policy-oriented document.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by stating that CIEP is a relatively new organization. It certainly has not reached its full potential. Yet since its establishment it has improved its operations and its functions each year. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I plan to support this legislation, and I urge that my colleagues do likewise.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ASHLEY. I 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 the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, as amended, is further amended by striking out section 210 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 210. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as

may be necessary until the expiration of the provisions of this title."

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On the first page, line 7, strike out "are" and insert in lieu thereof "is".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On the first page, beginning in line 8, strike out "such sums as may be necessary until the expiration of the provisions of this title" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) who, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, would vote, I believe, for about anything that was labeled with the word international. I doubt that it would make much difference whether it covered the entire waterfront or just part of it. He says this International Council provides coordination. There is no evidence before the House this afternoon that this Council has coordinated anything.

He read a list of allegedly important issues in which the Council was involved during 1973, but the question is: What has this bureaucracy accomplished? What does it do? The record is completely silent.

It has expended some \$2 million up to this point, and now this outfit wants another \$1,800,000—for what?

As far as the international situation is concerned, it has done nothing but get worse. Our balance of trade is probably at its worst point ever. What contribution has this bureaucracy made to the welfare of this country or any part of it?

The Council has 23 employees, including an executive director. These must be among the highest paid employees in the Government on the basis of the \$1,800,000 that is being requested. There is nothing in this report to show what is being spent on travel, foreign and domestic.

The House started today's session with an impressive Flag Day ceremony. Let us not spoil the good that has been done by ending the day approving this overstuffing of the already bloated Federal bureaucracy.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly find myself in agreement with the gentleman's observations.

I think it is important that we recognize here the biggest fallacy in the creation of this agency is the belief that we somehow can segregate our international economic policy from our internal domestic economic policy. If we are going to have these reports, they ought to come from the Council of Economic Ad-

visers, which has the total overview of our economic policy.

I recall when we first established this agency, I argued at the time that we were kidding ourselves if we thought we could have one policy for international economics and another policy for domestic economics. The reports we get from this Council are nothing more than a compilation of what other agencies have done. This agency never makes any positive contribution or recommendations toward economic policy.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his statement, and I agree with him thoroughly.

This Council on International Economic Policy is completely duplicative as far as I can ascertain. No one has made a case to the contrary.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Actually prior to the time that this function was split off of the Council of Economic Advisers, it was coordinated. The whole research and background studies, and so forth were in fact better coordinated, in my opinion, under that system.

As the gentleman has pointed out, the so-called objective of coordination has not been achieved, and the system of coordination would be better served by keeping it under the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

I say to my colleagues in the House that in view of the financial situation and runaway inflation that confronts this country you will have no better opportunity to save \$1.8 million than you have here and now. I urge the Members to join in defeating this bill and demonstrating just a little fiscal sanity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the second committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCORMACK, 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. 13839) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 1167, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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. BLACKBURN. 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 175, nays 168, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

YEAS—175

Anderson, Ill.	Hamilton	Railsback
Annunzio	Hanley	Rees
Ashley	Hansen, Idaho	Regula
Barrett	Hansen, Wash.	Reuss
Bergland	Harrington	Rhodes
Blester	Hays	Riegle
Bingham	Heckler, Mass.	Rinaldo
Blatnik	Hicks	Rodino
Bolling	Hogan	Roe
Brasco	Holifield	Rosenthal
Bray	Holtzman	Rostenkowski
Breckinridge	Horton	Roush
Brooks	Hunt	Ruppe
Brotzman	Johnson, Calif.	St Germain
Brown, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Jones, Ala.	Sarasin
Broyhill, N.C.	Karth	Sarbanes
Buchanan	Kastenmeier	Schneebeil
Burke, Calif.	Latta	Selberling
Burke, Mass.	Long, Md.	Shriver
Burton	Luken	Sisk
Carney, Ohio	McClory	Slack
Clark	McCloskey	Smith, Iowa
Cleveland	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Cohen	McKinney	Stark
Collins, Ill.	Macdonald	Steed
Conable	Madigan	Steele
Conte	Mathias, Calif.	Steelman
Conyers	Matsumaga	Steiger, Wis.
Corman	Mayne	Stephens
Cotter	Meeds	Stokes
Coughlin	Melcher	Stratton
Cronin	Metcalfe	Sullivan
Daniels	Mezvinsky	Symington
Dominick V.	Millford	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	Mills	Thone
Dellenback	Minish	Udall
Dellums	Mink	Vander Jagt
Donohue	Mitchell, Md.	Vanik
Drinan	Mitchell, N.Y.	Vigorito
du Pont	Moakley	Waldie
Edwards, Ala.	Moilohan	Wampler
Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead, Pa.	Whalen
Ellberg	Morgan	White
Erlenborn	Mosher	Widnall
Esch	Murphy, Ill.	Williams
Evans, Colo.	Nedzi	Wilson, Bob
Findley	Nelsen	Wilson,
Flood	O'Neill	Charles H.,
Forsythe	Owens	Calif.
Fraser	Patman	Wilson,
Frelinghuysen	Patten	Charles, Tex.
Frenzel	Perkins	Winn
Gettys	Pettis	Wright
Glaimo	Pickle	Yatron
Gilman	Pike	Young, Ga.
Grasso	Podell	Young, Tex.
Griffiths	Price, Ill.	Zablocki
Gude	Pritchard	Zwach
Guyer	Quile	

NAYS—168

Abdnor	Bafalis	Broyhill, Va.
Adams	Baker	Burgener
Alexander	Bauman	Burke, Fla.
Anderson,	Beard	Burleson, Tex.
Calif.	Bell	Burlison, Mo.
Andrews, N.C.	Bennett	Butler
Andrews,	Beyll	Byron
N. Dak.	Blackburn	Camp
Armstrong	Bowen	Carter
Ashbrook	Brinkley	Casey, Tex.
Aspin	Broomfield	Clancy

Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cochran
Collins, Tex.
Crane
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Downing
Duncan
Eckhardt
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford
Fountain
Froehlich
Gaydos
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gunter
Haley
Hammer-schmidt
Hanrahan
Harsha
Hechler, W. Va.
Heinz

Helstoski
Henderson
Hinshaw
Holt
Hosmer
Hudnut
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jones, N.C.
Jordan
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Leggett
Lehman
Littton
Lott
Lujan
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
Mahon
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, N.C.
Mazzoli
Michel
Miller
Minshall, Ohio
Mizell
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Moss
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
Obey
O'Brien
Parris
Peysner

Poage
Preyer
Randall
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncalio, N.Y.
Rose
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Ruth
Satterfield
Schroeder
Sebelius
Shuster
Sikes
Skubitz
Snyder
Spence
Steiger, Ariz.
Stubblefield
Studds
Symms
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thornton
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Treen
Van Deerlin
Veysey
Waggoner
Walsh
Ware
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Wolff
Wyllie
Yates
Young, Alaska
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Zion

NOT VOTING—90

Abzug
Addabbo
Archer
Arends
Badillo
Blaggi
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Breaux
Brown, Ohio
Carey, N.Y.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clay
Collier
Conlan
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Diggs
Dorn
Dulski
Fish
Frey
Fulton
Fuqua
Gibbons
Gray

Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hanna
Hastings
Hawkins
Hébert
Hillis
Howard
Huber
Ichord
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Landrum
Lent
Long, La.
McEwen
McKay
McSpadden
Madden
Mallory
Martin, Nebr.
Mathis, Ga.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
O'Hara
Passman

Pepper
Powell, Ohio
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Robison, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Runnels
Ryan
Scherle
Shipley
Shoup
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Stuckey
Talcott
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Ullman
Vander Veen
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Young, Fla.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Davis of South Carolina against.
Ms. Abzug for, with Mr. Rarick against.
Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Chappell against.
Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Landrum against.
Mr. Koch for, with Mr. Jones of Tennessee against.
Mr. Boland for, with Mr. Fish against.
Mr. Blaggi for, with Mr. Conlon against.
Mr. Brademas for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Fuqua against.
Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Martin against.

Mr. Vander Veen for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mrs. Boggs for, with Mr. Scherle against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Wylder against.

Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. Young of Florida against.

Mr. James V. Stanton for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.

Mrs. Chisholm for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Clay for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Lent against.

Mr. Badillo for, with Mr. Gubser against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Ichord against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Stuckey against.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Mathis of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Breaux.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Archer.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Cederberg.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Hastings with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Hillis with Mr. Huber.

Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Mallory.

Mr. McEwen with Mr. McKay.

Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Reid.

Mr. Robison of New York with Mr. Ryan.

Mr. Shoup with Mr. J. William Stanton.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Wyman with Mr. Wyatt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7917

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 7917, Consumer Product Warranties and Federal Trade Commission Improvements Act.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, with respect to the request of the gentleman from California, what is the bill that accompanies this report?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the bill which accompanies this report is the Consumer Product Warranties and Federal Trade Commission Improvements Act.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if he would tell us whether the report is available to the members of the committee participating in its writing. I would like to see some of the language in it before I disagree with it.

Mr. MOSS. If the gentleman will yield, the report is normally handled by the Chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would not be in a

position to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, because I have had some part in this and have participated in the writing of this legislation, and because I have seen some excerpts from the language in the report with which I disagree, if the language stays in the report I would be constrained to write minority views. For this reason I must object so that I may have an opportunity to read the report in detail.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PROPOSAL OF 15 NEW ADDITIONS TO THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-319)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

There is no greater challenge facing America today than the discovery and development of new energy resources.

As we move toward national self-sufficiency in energy, however, we must be diligent in protecting and preserving our natural heritage of unspoiled wilderness areas and the ecosystems which they support.

With this goal in mind, and pursuant to the Wilderness Act of 1964, I am today proposing 15 new additions to our National Wilderness Preservation System. These additions comprise more than 6 million acres and would nearly double existing wilderness acreage.

I would also like to take this opportunity to urge once again that Congress enact the eastern wilderness legislation I recently submitted, now embodied in legislation labeled S. 2487 and H.R. 10469. On May 31, the Senate passed a bill which would designate certain wilderness areas in the Eastern United States. The Senate bill, I believe, is inadequate. I urge the House to give early and favorable consideration to wilderness legislation incorporating the Administration proposal, and I urge the Congress to adopt it as the most balanced approach to studying and designating wilderness areas in the Eastern United States.

Briefly described, the additions I am proposing today are:

(1) Crater Lake National Park, Oregon—122,400 acres. Crater Lake is the deepest lake in the country and, in its ancient caldera setting, one of the most beautiful. The lake is surrounded by rugged and varied terrain, most of which is recommended for wilderness designation.

(2) Havasu National Wildlife Refuge, California—2,510 acres of Sonoran desert land. Located in one of the hottest and driest areas of the country—rainfall averages only 4.73 inches per year—this

refuge is the home of such rare or endangered species as the Yuma clapper rail, the Gila monster, and the peregrine falcon.

(3) Semidi National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska—256,000 acres comprising nine islands and surrounding submerged lands in the western Gulf of Alaska. The refuge's fragile estuarine system is a breeding ground for vast colonies of sea birds and other forms of wildlife.

(4) Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge, Hawaii—1,742 acres on various inlets and reefs distributed among some 800 miles of ocean between the main Hawaiian Islands and Midway Island. Among the rare forms of wildlife found within this refuge are the Laysan teal, found only on Laysan Island; the Hawaiian monk seal; and the green sea turtle.

(5) Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge, Illinois—4,050 acres. This refuge is a haven for such migratory waterfowl as Canada geese, snow and blue geese, and mallard ducks.

(6) Zion National Park, Utah—120,620 acres. This park is a superlative example of the effect of erosion on an uplifted plateau. The great bulk of its towering peaks and pinnacles, arches, and natural bridges are recommended for wilderness designation.

(7) Katmai National Monument, Alaska—2,603,547 acres. Situated near the base of the Alaskan Peninsula, this massive area comprises three entirely different ecosystems: a coastal area dotted with fjord-like bays; a mountainous area atop ancient volcanic basement rocks; and a plain crisscrossed by lakes of glacial origin.

(8) Rice Lake and Mille Lacs National Wildlife Refuges, Minnesota—1,407 acres. Consisting largely of bog, forest, and lakes, Rice Lake National Wildlife Refuge supports a variety of birds, notably the ring-necked duck. Both of the islands which constitute the small, nearby Mille Lacs National Wildlife Refuge are also included in this recommendation.

(9) Glacier National Park, Montana—927,550 acres. Located in the Rocky Mountains of Montana, this park—nearly all of which is suitable for wilderness designation—contains some 50 small glaciers and 200 lakes.

(10) Red Rock Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, Montana—32,350 acres. Although it harbors a multitude of ducks, as well as such mammals as moose, elk, deer, and antelope, the primary purpose of this refuge is to protect the once-rare trumpeter swan, largest of all American waterfowl.

(11) Olympic National Park, Washington—862,139 acres. The home of more than 50 wildlife species, this landscape of rain forests and seashore lies in the wettest winter climate in the lower 49 States.

(12) Tamarac National Wildlife Refuge, Minnesota—2,138 acres. One of the most important sanctuaries along the Mississippi Flyway, this area hosts thousands of pairs of ducks during the annual nesting season.

(13) Rocky Mountain National Park,

Colorado—239,835 acres characterized by massive peaks, Alpine lakes, and mountain forests. Among the wildlife found here are wapiti, mule deer, and bighorn sheep.

(14) Missisquoi National Wildlife Refuge, Vermont—620 acres. Located less than a mile from the Canadian border, this refuge supports primarily waterfowl but also a population of 100 white-tail deer, a species which was all but nonexistent in this area 30 years ago.

(15) Unimak Island (Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge), Alaska—973,000 acres. A rich diversity of wildlife, including the Alaskan brown bear and the once-rare sea otter, inhabit this island. Its scenic coastline, rugged mountains, and volcanic remnants make the island ideal for the study of interrelated marine and terrestrial ecosystems.

In addition, two proposals which have been previously submitted—Pinnacles National Monument and Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Parks, all in California—have been augmented by sufficient acreage to warrant resubmission to the Congress. The enlargements, which are attributable to revised management philosophy and plans and the recent acquisition of private inholdings, amount to 5,970 acres in the case of Pinnacles and 68,800 acres in the case of Sequoia-Kings Canyon.

Three other areas—previously proposed—Cabeza Prieta Game Range, Arizona; Desert National Wildlife Range, Nevada; and Glacier Bay National Monument, Alaska—contain surface lands suitable for wilderness designation. However, because two of these areas are open to mining, and all three may contain minerals vital to the national interest and have not been subjected to adequate mineral surveys, I am recommending that action on these proposals be deferred pending the completion of such surveys.

After a review of roadless areas of 5,000 acres or more and roadless islands, the Secretary of the Interior has concluded that seven areas are not suitable for preservation as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. These are: Savannah National Wildlife Refuge, Georgia; Little Pend Oreille National Wildlife Refuge and Turnbull National Wildlife Refuge, Washington; Bowdoin National Wildlife Refuge and the National Bison Range, Montana; National Elk Refuge, Wyoming; and Horicon National Wildlife Refuge, Wisconsin.

In addition to this message, I am transmitting herewith to the Congress letters and reports from the Secretary of the Interior regarding these wilderness proposals. I concur with the recommendation of the Secretary in each case, and I urge the Congress to give early and favorable consideration to all of these proposals.

RICHARD NIXON.

The WHITE HOUSE, June 13, 1974.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader if he is in a position to inform the Members of the House as to the program for the rest of this week and for the following week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, I will be happy to respond.

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, there is no further legislative business scheduled for today.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of June 17, 1974, is as follows:

On Monday we will call the Consent Calendar, and we will consider four bills under suspension of the rules, as follows:

H.R. 14354, National School Lunch Act amendments conference report;

H.R. 12356, Indian Claims Commission Authorization;

H.R. 14992, Domestic Food Assistance Act; and

H.R. 15296, Commissioner of Education Fellowship Authority.

The Speaker will postpone all rollcall votes until the end of the day, under his prerogative.

On Tuesday, we will call the Private Calendar, and we will consider under suspension of the rules one bill, as follows:

H.R. 15124, 12-month Extension of Eligibility of Supplemental Security Income Recipients for Food Stamps (until July 1, 1975).

We will also consider the conference report on H.R. 7130, Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

Then we will consider the State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1975; and

S. 411, extended phasing of postal rate adjustments, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

On Wednesday, we will consider Transportation appropriations for fiscal year 1975; and

H.R. 14715, White House Office Authorization, subject to a rule being granted.

On Thursday, we will consider H.R. 15361, the Housing and Urban Development Act, subject to a rule being granted.

Finally, on Friday, we will consider Agriculture-Environmental-Consumer Protection appropriations for fiscal year 1975.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the distinguished gentleman is aware of the fact that we will meet Friday, because I believe this is the fifth or sixth time that we have notified the membership that we do anticipate Friday sessions for next week and for the following week.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON
APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL
MIDNIGHT, JUNE 14, 1974, TO FILE
REPORT ON APPROPRIATION BILL
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED
AGENCIES

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night, June 14, 1974, to file a report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year 1975.

Mr. SHRIVER reserved all points of order.

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

There was no objection.

HOUSE COAL STRIP MINING BILL
IS SOUND LEGISLATION

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

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. The land strip coal mining legislation, hopefully soon to be reported from the Committee on Rules and brought before the House in a week or two, is, in my opinion, the most singularly important piece of legislation in my nearly decade of association with the House. I have an editorial supporting it from the New York Times, but I do not think it would influence anybody here, frankly, so I will not include it in the RECORD. But I will include one from the Denver Post, which I will ask the Members to read, and then give their support for this legislation, H.R. 11500.

The editorial is as follows:

HOUSE COAL STRIP MINING BILL IS SOUND
LEGISLATION

The U.S. House of Representatives has been handed a bill on coal strip mining. The bill, H.R. 11500, was prepared by the House Interior Committee. It is a good bill and should be passed with a minimum of alterations.

With the nation's strip mining going into high gear—largely in the West—because of the energy crunch, it is essential to pass a bill now. The land needs protection before the energy crisis, wrapped in the flag, carries all before it.

H.R. 11500 contains these major elements: It would severely limit where coal can be strip mined. No permit would be allowed on a national forest, in a designated wilderness area or wildlife preserve. States are required to set up procedures for declaring certain areas unsuitable for surface mining by virtue of natural, historical, cultural or scientific reasons.

A reclamation fee will be charged, and at today's fuel prices it should be a stiff one. Levied according to heat value in the coal, the amount will average 30 cents a ton and will be as low as 20 cents in some Northern Great Plains areas where BTU content is low. This money will be used for reclamation of "orphan" lands—abandoned lands from old stripping operations. On existing operations the operator will pay the cost of his own reclamation work. These provisions must be stringent.

Strip-mined land must be returned to "approximate original contour" under terms of the bill. The bill eliminates "high walls"—steep slopes remaining after mining—and spoil banks (heaps of ungraded material) on downslope areas.

If reclamation on any land is not feasible for economic or physical reasons, then the land cannot be strip mined until such time as technology permits.

The hydrologic (underground water) balance is not to be disrupted. Surface water is protected from pollution. The bill concedes as inevitable some change in surface water patterns, however, and permits lakes to be left in depressions provided quality of the water is good.

Land reclaimed and returned to federal ownership will, under terms of the bill, be available for agriculture or recreation purposes. Communities undergoing dramatic growth because of coal mining can apply for such lands for use in meeting development needs: housing and other facilities.

These are among the key provisions of H.R. 11500. The chain of command envisioned still includes participation by the states. States may enforce their own laws on coal strip mining, provided they are as strong or stronger than the federal law.

There are a number of areas where the bill is vulnerable to criticism. Environmentalists say it is too weak, that nothing but a complete ban on strip mining is workable.

Thus, Louise Dunlap of the Environmental Policy Center, Washington, D.C., attacks any concession to mining she can find. The section on water, for example, says that coal firms shall give "particular attention" to aquifer recharge. "We don't believe giving 'particular attention' to something is a very precise way to protect it," she said.

A Western utility spokesman, while favoring the bill's reclamation provisions, believes the definition of areas "unsuitable" for mining is so broad as to ban mining almost anywhere. He'd like to see that changed.

But fundamentally the bill is not in bad shape. It should receive favorable consideration. There is one problem, however, which no one has been able to solve; it involves the mining of publicly owned coal which lies under privately-held homestead land. This problem will be discussed tomorrow.

FALLING LIVESTOCK PRICES
THREATEN DEPRESSION

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, every citizen of the United States must on sober consideration be concerned with the disastrous drop in the price of live cattle

and hogs. On the other hand, I recognize that probably 90 percent of the people of this Nation are going to make a hasty, and I fear, unwarranted appraisal of this situation and take the position that they are happy to see anything that brings down the price of meat.

Certainly last summer the price of meat did reach record levels, but now cattle prices and hog and poultry prices have broken disastrously. Live cattle sold yesterday in Omaha for \$35.50 a hundred, almost exactly the same that they brought 20 years ago—1951, to be exact—when the purchasing power of the dollar was much greater than it is today and when production costs were but a fraction of what they are today.

The first people to be destroyed were cattle feeders. After feeding the cattle for unreasonable periods of time in the hope of increased prices, many of them have put far more money per head in them than the cattle are now worth. These feed-lot losses were necessarily immediately reflected in the value of cows and calves. Of course, the price of hogs cannot remain very high when the price of cattle drops as it has recently, and it has not. The same thing is true in regard to turkeys and chickens. The live prices of all of these animals have declined to where it is utterly impossible for any producer to hope to feed even \$2.50 corn or protein feed made from \$5 beans and to ever hope to come out.

Disastrous as these livestock losses are, I think that it is clear that we have only seen the tip of the iceberg. The price of feed grain is bound to plummet in the next few weeks if the price of live animals stays where it is.

With low-priced corn and soybeans farmers are going to turn to wheat, cotton, and similar crops, but this year we are going to produce something like 20 to 25 percent more wheat than we produced last year. Obviously the whole agricultural structure is in grave danger.

Again, I recognize that many of our constituents are going to say "Ain't that nice." Maybe it would be nice for them if it did not clearly carry the unmistakable storm warning of an approaching disaster. I have lived long enough to personally observe a number of depressions. Some of our younger colleagues have never seen a depression. A depression can cause more misery, more heartaches, and indeed more physical loss than a hurricane or a foreign war. Ask those who had the responsibility of the family in 1931.

Now the alarming thing is that I have never seen a depression that did not start with a break in farm prices. I do not mean that every drop in farm prices is going to cause a depression, but I do mean that we have set the stage. We have created the situation, and I am convinced that if we do not take prompt action to stop this decline in farm prices, we will see all of our hard earned social gains wiped away.

And if it comes, remember that a depression strikes harder in the great cities than it does in the rural area. Farm people will not have much, but they will not starve. It is easy to say that the Gov-

ernment will not let anyone starve in the cities, but if we face a real depression, the Government may very well find itself powerless to feed the people of our cities. I, therefore, want it said that we did have warning that a depression might occur—that there were those in Congress who sounded the alarm.

Now, what can we do about it? The very first thing that can be done is that the President can close the gate that he opened more than a year ago when he suspended the statutory limitation on the importation of meat to this country. He opened this gate for the purpose of bringing in meat when supplies were short and prices were high. Conditions are now exactly the reverse and he should at least bring these imports down to the level provided by law. This can be done by a simple order. It does not require any legislation.

In the next place we can provide some credit for those who have been so cruelly hurt by the drop in livestock prices. If these people are to stay in business, and if the production of meat is to continue, somebody must provide that credit. In most cases the banks cannot provide it. We have a so-called Small Business Administration, but it will not make loans to the people whose business it is to produce the food and fiber for the Nation, because they say that this is not "business." This is "just farming."

I am told that there are some fortunate livestock operators who suggest they do not want any loans, and I certainly would not urge them to take any, but I am sure that there are a great many who must have credit or quit producing. We hope there are other things that can be done to keep production on an even keel.

In an effort to try to learn just what can be done and to learn what should not be done, I have announced hearings before the Agriculture Committee beginning next Tuesday. The Speaker of the House will be our first witness. We have, of course, invited the Secretary of Agriculture, and we have invited representatives of the White House. We feel that we need a frank Government. We have asked the representatives of the industry, at least those who can afford to make the trip to Washington, to come here and give their views.

We know there will be conflicts and differences in judgment. It will be the problem of the committee to try to appraise the various suggestions made. A number of bills have already been introduced. Others will be introduced during the coming days. These bills are being referred to the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains, headed by Mr. FOLEY of Washington. He has announced that he will, on the following week, that is, on June 25, beginning consideration of the specific legislative proposals after the full committee has heard and considered the problems and the basic ideas for their solution. We invite every Member of the House and of the other body to attend any and all of these hearings. We think they might concern your constituents more than you have supposed.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO INCREASE FEDERAL ESTATE TAX EXEMPTION

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

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to remedy what I consider to be a defective and regressive feature of the U.S. tax code. This bill will increase the Federal estate tax exemption from the present \$60,000 to \$120,000.

The amount of this exemption has not changed since 1942 during which time the cost of living has just about tripled. In 1942 dollars, the equivalent exemption today would amount to nearly \$180,000. I believe some adjustment is clearly needed.

This proposal will greatly benefit small businessmen and farmers who want to pass on the family business to their sons and daughters. It will also assist a family that has invested the bulk of its assets in a home. Land speculation and rising property values are forcing many of these persons to sell their farms, and businesses, and homes just to pay the estate taxes. These people—not the wealthy—are the ones who stand to benefit from this legislation.

Another reason for increasing the \$60,000 exemption is a recent change in the tax law which speeds up the collection of the estate tax from 15 to 9 months after the date of death. Owners of small businesses, farms, and homes will likely not have sufficient liquid assets readily available to pay a large estate tax bill 9 months after a death. This situation may well jeopardize that business, farm, or home for which a family or individual has worked so hard.

I believe this legislation will effect a genuine and needed reform in this Nation's tax system and I urge its enactment.

I include as part of my remarks the text of H.R. 15373:

H.R. 15373

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2052 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption for purposes of the Federal estate tax) is amended by striking out "\$60,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$120,000".

(b) Section 6018(a)(1) of such Code (relating to estate tax returns) is amended by striking out "\$60,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$120,000".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to the estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1972.

STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, with a petulance usually reserved to Secretaries of State, Mr. UDALL and HENRY JACKSON have blamed the defeat of the

land use planning bill on "impeachment politics." Mr. UDALL states that the President changed his position on land-use planning in order to retain the support of conservative Members of the House regarding impeachment. That is not just a political distortion; it is undiluted, weed-growing, grass-burning chicken manure.

UDALL says the President shifted his position. Not so. He had never supported the Udall bill. The President supported, strongly, the concept of land-use planning. He still does. He was made aware of the restrictive nature of the Udall bill by myself. He agreed, after analysis, that private property was jeopardized—as did Mr. UDALL who planned to support an amendment that he said would remedy this. The President felt that the involved Federal process set up in the Udall bill would delay and confuse already long-delayed and very confused State and community land planning programs. He supported the Steiger-Rhodes bill, as did the Secretary of the Interior.

Since, by chance, I was involved in every facet of the effort to stop the Udall bill, and thus aware of all the pulling and hauling, I am particularly offended by the implication that I and all of the other concerned Members of Congress on both sides of the political aisle were part of some kind of a deal to trade for impeachment support.

The fact is that the bill was a lousy bill. The one single action which brought about the defeat of the rule was Mr. UDALL's insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several days before the bill came to the floor of 21 amendments he planned to offer on the floor of the House. A great deal of lobbying had been done by private and public groups to alert the public to their concerns about the bill. The folks responded heavily with mail opposing the bill. But the rule would have passed if UDALL had not clearly demonstrated the bill's inadequacies by this flood of amendments that had been promised to gain support from disgruntled private interests. The Members of the House are reluctant to write legislation on the floor of the House because of the lack of certainty as to the effect of specific amendments.

The problem presented by the disappointed UDALL and JACKSON at seeing their national white horse left in the barn poses a very real threat to an already lurching legislative process. If the liberals start screaming "impeachment politics" every time a new Federal grab is stopped, they are going to intimidate some Congressmen in this election year.

And that is a use for Watergate that even the Washington Post or the New York Times had not thought of.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona a question as to whether or not the gentleman in the well had informed the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL)

that he was going to be discussing him and using his name?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for raising that question. I not only advised the gentleman from Arizona, but I showed the gentleman the text of this rather sensitive and objective material which I am in the process of discussing.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I am not sure I agree with the characterization of that, but I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, relevant to the question that has just come up, was the gentleman from Arizona now in the well informed of the press conference that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) was going to have yesterday? This press conference was covered by papers all over the country. Was the gentleman consulted and informed that totally false accusations would be made that Members of this House who voted to defeat the rule on the land use bill are indifferent to the Nation's problems, and that the "country's land" was mortgaged "for conservative votes on impeachment?" Was the gentleman consulted on this?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. No, I was not, but I do not share the concern of the previous questioner that it somehow or other breaches ordinary conduct. When one has dealt with venal abuses all of one's political life, nothing surprises you. That is an editorial sort of a comment.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the recent statements of my colleague (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) concerning the action taken by this body Tuesday on the Land Use Planning Act.

I voted in favor of granting a rule for this legislation, but obviously the majority of the Members did not think this bill was ready for floor action. The will of the House has been worked.

The frantic cries by these two distinguished Members of "impeachment politics" and "scare tactics" are regrettable and certainly unwarranted. This smacks of sour grapes and is not worthy of these two gentlemen.

Senator JACKSON's threat of attaching this land use measure to a "must bill" is most inappropriate. I have always deplored this type of political maneuvering and to attempt to pass such major legislation as this in such a manner is unthinkable.

I remind my friend the Senator from Washington that we still have two bodies in Congress and urge him to confine his legislative muscle flexing to his own Chamber.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear and plain that I voted against the rule, and there was certainly no impeachment deal in my voting against the rule. I resent any implication on any of us as that being the reason for doing so.

I might say parenthetically that it is a very rare instance in which I have ever voted against an open rule, but I suppose an exception proves the rule.

I think that the discussion during the colloquy that took place during consideration of the rule brought out the fact that there were many, many amendments that were to be offered by the authors of the bill to try to make the legislation more acceptable. I believe that was really an admission on the part of the authors of the legislation themselves that it was not a good bill, and that the rule, therefore, should not be granted.

Mr. Speaker, I have no apologies for opposing that rule. I think the time is going to come when there will be some land use legislation that probably will not be of the variety or kind that the gentleman proposed, but most certainly not this carrot-and-the-stick approach that was being offered at that time. Every foot of land in this country would have been subject to Federal control.

I certainly am delighted that the gentleman took the special order, and I think all of us can join in the feeling that those who voted against this had nothing to do with impeachment. It simply is not true. I repeat again, I do not know the forces that were raised for or against this thing. I simply know that the people in my district believe it was a step, a foot in the door, that would ultimately lead to Federal control over every foot of land in America.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is entitled to oppose the bill, as the gentleman from Missouri is. But I think it would be unfortunate if there should be a suggestion interpreted in the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) or the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) that anyone in this Congress voted against this rule on the basis of some question of impeachment.

The suggestion was that the administration changed its position because of the known opposition of many Members of Congress to the bill, and there was a suggestion that the administration was motivated by impeachment politics, not that any Member of the House changed his vote or bargained his vote, and I think that ought to be clear because I

think it is a disservice to the statements made by both the junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) to imply that they were questioning the motivation of Members of the House in their vote. They, as I, disagree with the result, but there was no implication of impropriety in the decision made by the Members.

I think the gentleman from Missouri is entirely within his rights in opposing the bill. I disagree with his interpretation. I think the RECORD should be made clear that there was not an accusation made by any gentleman in the press conference as to the motivation of the Representatives in the House. There was, indeed, a question of the motivation of the administration.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his comments and the eloquent defense of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

I will tell the gentlemen that the direct result of the press conference he referred to was three phone calls from members of the press who attended that conference, who asked me if I had, indeed, made any deal with the White House on impeachment in exchange for my leadership in defeating the bill. What the gentleman reports to us here I have no doubt is exactly what he felt was said by Mr. UDALL and Senator JACKSON.

I will tell the gentleman that at least three members of the press at that conference felt that both Senator JACKSON and Mr. UDALL suggested that impeachment politics has pervaded this body to the point where we were exchanging votes for a position on the bill.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I assume the gentleman has read the press releases that were attendant to that press conference.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I only read that portion reproduced by the press. I did not read any handouts.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, they were available. I think the gentleman should consult them, because they were reduced to writing, and I think they would clear this matter up.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I will tell the gentleman that that which I read in the press did nothing but persuade me in my position. All of the reference made to impeachment politics was not further defined, and the interpretation of that was made by the members of the press, and the gentlemen heard the full text.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM).

Mr. KETCHUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself totally with the gentleman's remarks. I deeply resented the implication in the press release, or in the story that I read in the Washington Post this morning, of the statements allegedly and purportedly made by the gentleman from

Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and the Junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

I am and have been a member of the Interior Committee since I have been a Member, admittedly a very short time, but I think the gentleman in the well knows, as do most Members of the Congress, that I totally oppose the concept of the Federal land use planning, which, to my way of thinking, was a total Federal intervention in State business. I am a Republican. The President never calls me; no counselor to the President ever contacted me; and, as a matter of fact, the Department of the Interior was in my office every 15 minutes lobbying on behalf of the bill.

That certainly does not seem to indicate to me, since the Department of the Interior is a branch of the executive, that the President was out to kill the bill.

I think it is doubly unfortunate that the reference to impeachment politics was made by the gentleman from Arizona apparently in trying to give some flavor in a petulant manner to this matter over which he was so upset, that is losing this bill.

It is interesting to note also that when he went before the Rules Committee last February to get a rule on this bill, his first indication to the press was that he had been double-crossed by the members of his own party. The bill was not one iota different when the Rules Committee put it out this past month than it was in the previous months, so the bill was just as bad when it came to the floor the other day as it was in February, and indeed as it was when it was introduced. The bill was bad.

I opposed the bill as a leader, or at least I assume I was a leader of the opposition on the floor the other day, and I opposed the rule which brought it to the floor. I deeply resent any implication or any innuendo that it had one thing to do with impeachment politics.

I think perhaps it might have had a little something to do with Presidential politics. It is rather interesting to note that both individuals who held that press conference are Presidential aspirants. Perhaps this is the way they get their press.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would like to make one further point before I yield further, and it is a little broader than the immediate concern of those who voted on the matter before us on Tuesday. As I said earlier, I think the problem presented by the disappointed gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and the disappointed Senator from Washington at seeing their national white horse left in the barn is this: If each time they are disappointed the liberals will be screaming "impeachment politics," every time a new Federal grab is stopped, there are bound to be some Congressmen who will be intimidated in this election year. That is a use for Watergate that even the Washington Post and the New York Times have overlooked. I think it presents a very real threat. It distorts even further the soul of this country because while we are all focused on and concerned about

the future of the Presidency, we have to recognize this is a calculated device, in my mind, to utilize that national concern to warp legislation to a position that it could not have achieved in any other climate.

I do not think that anybody here is going to be consciously intimidated by statements that if we voted for this bill we will be considered as supporters or antagonists of the President in impeachment. I do not think that will occur, but I think we have to recognize that possibility exists.

In the same manner the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) threatened us with being placed on the environmental evaluation political list if we voted against the rule. We can look for more of the same in the future, I assume, from people who think this is a valid political device.

All I am saying is that I would quarrel with nobody who supports land-use planning, as to the economics of that position. I would quarrel with nobody who supports the Udall bill. I would not object to people who even accuse me of excessive lobbying. I do not feel bad about people who say I and others who oppose the bill distorted the facts, because I know we did not. But I really feel bad about being accused of involving this situation in impeachment politics, not only because that was not so but also because I think it seriously jeopardizes whatever work we might be capable of doing in this body.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The Washington Post article this morning also reported that proponents of the land-use legislation are charging that "scare tactics" were responsible for the House defeating the rule on the land-use bill this week.

As the Members of this House know from the debate on Tuesday, serious and well-founded objections to the provisions in this legislation on Constitutional grounds were raised. The "taking" of private property without just compensation is in clear violation of the fifth amendment. The concept of land-use planning controlled at the Federal level could be in direct violation of the 10th amendment which reserves to the States or to the people those "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States. . . ."

All the raising of these constitutional questions are the "scare tactics" we who opposed the bill are being credited with, and these are the facts which the Post did not print, then I am pleased to have raised these constitutional questions.

It is time the proponents of this legislation stop making excuses, and accept the fact that the rule on this bill was defeated because the majority of Members of this House believe strongly in the Constitution and their responsibility to the people who elected them.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman who did a tremendous

amount of work to oppose this bad legislation. His efforts to acquaint Members with the facts about the provisions in this legislation were substantially responsible for the rule being defeated.

I think we can be grateful that additional hearings were held giving people, who were familiar with this legislation, as reported, the opportunity to present their views. It helped to have the logical reasons why this legislation would be, in fact, so badly detailed in the record of the hearings.

I think that it is even more important that the gentleman took this time today to clearly put to rest the very fallacious argument that our votes were in any way related to "impeachment politics." There is no relationship whatsoever. It is highly unfortunate that the motives of the Members who voted, according to their principles, to defeat the rule on this legislation are being cloaked in "impeachment politics."

We can fully appreciate that the gentleman from Washington, who is an active candidate for President, might be seeking ways to present his case in some kind of a different manner.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will suspend for a minute, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to impugn the motives of a Member of the other body?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have not impugned anyone's motives.

Mr. FOLEY. I pose the parliamentary inquiry, whether or not discussion of the motives of a Member of the other body is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. It is not in order, in view of the rule of comity between the two Houses.

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) that I am about to continue to yield him the time; that I, too, think it is very presumptive of the gentleman from Washington, who is running for President; all I heard the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) say was that the Senator was a candidate for President.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. He is a potential candidate for President. If that is impugning his motives, I do not see how it is.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The remarks of the gentleman from California and the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona are out of order. I ask that they be stricken.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, might I be heard on that point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed on the point of order.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I would restate what I said, that in my view it is

presumptuous of the gentleman from Washington to hold himself up as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. I fail to see that that is impugning the gentleman's motives.

It is an accepted fact in political life that the gentleman from Washington is, indeed, a candidate for the Presidency, at least in his own eyes.

I suspect, and I am certainly entitled to a view of that candidacy and I have stated that view, with no intent at all of demeaning the gentleman from Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. While the gentleman has not demanded that words be taken down, the Chair will state that under the rules of debate it is not in order for a Member to voice an opinion or cast a reflection on either Members of the House or Members of the other body and it is not in order to refer to Senators by name or in terms of personal criticism, or even for the purpose of complimenting and the inhibition extends to comments of criticism of their actions outside the Senate.

The Chair would also point out to the gentlemen who are carrying on this debate that it is Thursday afternoon and there is no need to get involved in a big political debate.

So the gentleman in the well will proceed in order.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I will tell the Speaker that his logic is irrefutable.

I will yield to the gentleman from California further to please proceed in order. I would request when yielding to him that he would refrain from any comment on any Senator running for President in any State in the Northwest.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. I would just like to say that it is the purpose of this special order to comment further on our vote on Tuesday relating to the land use bill, and the press conference that was held yesterday discussing that vote.

I thought in this House we had the right to discuss these kinds of things, and that is why I was thanking the gentleman from Arizona for bringing this up. I think it needs to be discussed in view of the fact that some of the comments made during that press conference by various Members—and others—were in fact comments that needed proper refutation.

Mr. Speaker, I will just say, in conclusion, that during that same press conference, there was a comment about "scare tactics," and that some kind of "scare tactics" were involved. Many of us were concerned—I do not think it was a matter of "scare tactics"—about the constitutional considerations that were raised by this legislation. We felt that it might potentially lead to violations of government at several levels, the taking of property without due process and without just compensation procedures.

We were concerned about possible violations of these constitutional principles, and if the two gentlemen who conducted the press conference considered raising questions about the Constitution to be "scare tactics," so be it, because a lot of

people in this country shared these concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment again the gentleman from Arizona for bringing about this discussion, because I think it needed to be undertaken. I do not think that we should ever take the position that because somebody—somebody—might be interested in being a Presidential candidate, that it is somehow a bad thing, I think it is a fine thing.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, as it relates to impugning motives, if I understood the reading of the rules a moment ago by the Speaker, it seems the other gentleman from Arizona the other day impugned many Members' motives here by suggesting why they did not vote for that particular rule; suggesting there might be something else involved. So, I certainly think at that particular time also that Members' motives were impugned by the other gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I think the Speaker is absolutely right when he points out it is improper to be impugning motives, whether it is done by us, the good guys, or by the bad guys.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric which hit the headlines on the defeat of the Federal land use control legislation turns my stomach. Who is kidding who?

This body is the elected House of the people. We have spoken, and I challenge anyone to discredit my vote as having had ulterior motives. There is not one man in this Chamber who would consider selling his vote over to the kind of cheap antics ascribed in this morning's Washington Post. Are we to live out the remainder of this Congress hearing about so-called Watergate insurance every time someone's pet bill is defeated? Will we continue to hear from our colleagues in the Senate such threats as "That's all right, boys, you defeated my bill, but I can just attach it to another piece of legislation." What has happened to the code of conduct that once said: "When voted down, a bill is dead." Instead of bringing along our card for the electronic voting machine, must we now begin to utilize a shovel to beat these bills to the floor?

In the past 2 weeks, I have signed close to 400 letters in response to about the land-use planning legislation. Five of those—and I repeat five—supported the proposal. Gentlemen, I submit to you, the people back home have spoken, and the House has acted accordingly. Let this issue die a comfortable death.

Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman from Washington wishes some more time—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would point out to the gentleman from Arizona that the gentleman from

Washington has his own time a little later on.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I was about to yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just suggest to all the Members who expressed this indignation that they seek a copy of the remarks that were made in the press conference referred to and judge for themselves whether motives of Members of the House were impugned.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. The gentleman is not suggesting that members of the press were possibly misinterpreting what was said at that press conference, is he; because I know the gentleman is a great champion of the press. He is not saying that the press erred in what they reported?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will have to dispute the gentleman. It is my opinion that in many cases the press has misstated what has gone on.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, now we get around to the point, I say to the gentleman from Washington presently on the floor, where we need some explanation of what happened with respect to the press conference. Can the gentleman tell us whether any individual, or any individual who was involved in that press conference, has asked for a retraction or correction or anything else with respect to the statements carried by the newspapers?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am present on the floor for a different purpose. I have a 5-minute special order of my own on another subject.

I have read both releases that were the subject of this press conference, and I did not in any sense draw the interpretation that has been drawn by the various Members here today, that those statements impugned the motives of Members of Congress in voting against the rule.

My original purpose in seeking the colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona was just to point out that the point was made with reference to the administration changing its position on this bill; not in any sense charging Members of Congress with having changed their positions on this bill as a result of any alleged impeachment politics.

Mr. Speaker, I just suggested that before any Members draw any conclusions, the press conference releases are available and they might request them. They could be a part of this special order and be put in the RECORD.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the gentleman from Washington that since nobody sent us a copy of the release, all we had to depend on was the newspaper reporting. That is all we are responding to.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I think that should be clear, that you are responding to the press report rather than to the releases which were the subject of this press conference. I think an examination would satisfy the Members that no impugning of their motives was intended at the press conference.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, those who are issuing a press release or holding a press conference do not have to keep Members of the House advised of it. They do not have to see that Members of the House are given a copy of the press release. It is not incumbent upon Members of the House to run around seeking press releases from Members of the other body or of this body.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think it is customary for Members of the House to send each one of their colleagues copies of press releases. But I am sure they are available. This one was probably Mr. UDALL's, and I am sure that Mr. UDALL would be glad to furnish Members a copy of the press release or copies of the press release.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want it to appear that the gentleman from Arizona should run around seeking a press release after he has seen what appeared in the newspapers about a bill that was disapproved.

Mr. FOLEY. Not in my judgment. I will tell the gentleman from Iowa that the assertion was made that a press release impugned the Members of Congress. I think that before that charge is made there ought to be an effort to find out what was said and not simply rely on press reports.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I know the gentleman was present at a meeting of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There was a discussion of this very matter, if my memory serves. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) answered the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) very much in the same vein as that which we are discussing now.

Another gentleman of the committee (Mr. KAZEN) took sharp issue with those remarks, unless I am mistaken.

Can the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) tell me whether I am correct?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. My recollection is that he responded as though he had been accused of making some kind of deal on impeachment because he voted against the rule. That was his reaction.

Mr. Speaker, I may be violating the rules of the House against reading anything in the well, but I was just handed a report on the Udall comments with regard to this matter. This was in the Washington Star-News dated Wednesday, July 12:

Supporters of the bill charged after yesterday's vote that the White House helped

kill it by playing impeachment politics. Representative Morris K. Udall said President Nixon played impeachment politics on the bill, deliberately withdrawing his support of the measure his Interior Secretary helped write, to get conservatives to stay with him on impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that certainly implies that an arrangement had been made. If that is an erroneous quote, I am sure Mr. UDALL would be happy to apologize for it, as the gentleman from Iowa suggested.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) in questioning this morning's press reports about the resurrection of the land use bill.

The House spoke out on Tuesday and decided to postpone consideration of this very significant legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support the action of the House in deferring action on this bill, and trust that we will not again have to consider legislation which is so deficient in so many respects. I would find it very offensive if my colleague from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) would actually impugn the motives of a majority of the Members of this House, as it was reported by the press.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, just 2 days ago, a majority of the Members of this House rejected the rule on a Federal land use bill (H.R. 10294) on grounds which were eminently fair and reasonable. The bill was rejected because it was faulty; the fact that its sponsors suddenly were prepared to offer 21 last-minute amendments of their own is ample evidence of that. Scores of other amendments had been drafted by a broad array of Members from both parties. But legislating in this fashion does the citizen of the United States a grave disservice. The work should have been done in the Interior Committee; instead, its sponsors held doggedly to a position of intransigence during committee deliberations.

The bill was rejected because it would have effected a dramatic shift in the distribution of powers among local, State, and Federal governments. It would have subordinated local zoning and land use powers entirely to State-level agencies, and in turn made those State agencies ultimately responsible to the oversight of bureaucrats in Washington. Claims by the sponsors of the bill that it was just a simple little measure to "encourage" land-use planning by the States and localities were, and are, absurd, and a majority of the Members of this House recognized that fact. It does not take a bill 47 pages long to offer a little "encouragement."

And most important of all, the bill was rejected because not only is there no broad ground swell of enthusiastic support to be found among the citizens of the Nation for it, but because in fact there is very considerable and deep-seated opposition to the imposition of a Federal role in land-use planning. The bill's sponsors have not made a case for their measure to the satisfaction of the American people. And it is about time that this fact be given some attention.

I was disturbed indeed by a press con-

ference called yesterday by the chief sponsors of the land use bill from this House and from the other body, at which they claimed that "impeachment politics" were to blame for the bill's defeat. This charge is utterly without foundation, and is easily contradicted by the fact that anonymous White House functionaries sent down a last-minute package of amendments which they contended would make the committee bill acceptable to them. In fact, the administration has taken just about every position imaginable on this bill, and to contend that they had anything to do with defeating the entire business just does not have any relation to reality. Incidentally, I find it almost amusing to observe sanguine liberal observations one day that the President has been crippled so badly by Watergate that he is powerless in his dealings with Congress, and the next day find the very same individuals charging that the President has so much power that he can singlehandedly defeat one of the biggest liberal cause celebres of the decade. There is a pretty strong odor there somewhere.

I am disturbed, too, by the threat that this bill will be attached as a rider to some other unrelated measure in the Senate. This represents a flagrant attempt to thwart the obvious and very strong opposition to the measure on the part of many Americans. Dire predictions of disaster and every plague known to man should this measure fail to be signed into law remind one of Chicken Little's plaintive claim that the sky is about to fall. The sky will not fall. A Federal role in land use planning is neither needed nor desired by most citizens, who know that they will have the most effective voice regarding land-use decisions in their localities if the responsibility is retained at the local level. And for better or for worse, many States are opting for their own State level land use programs, including my home State of Maryland. But they are doing so without being subject to a federally imposed straitjacket of regulations and requirements, and in so doing they have available to them a wide variety of options in developing and implementing land use planning programs which are best suited to them.

Mr. Speaker, the main thing any Federal Land Use Planning Act will do is spread around more of the taxpayers' money that we do not have to spread around; and establish Federal authority in an area which has been reserved exclusively to the States for the nearly 200 years we have been incorporated as a constitutional Republic.

To attempt to jam this down the throats of the American people and of the Members of this body, who wisely voted to reject the measure earlier this week, would be wrong headed and dangerous. And no amount of diversionary chatter about "impeachment politics" or "scare tactics from the right" are going to change the basic fact that this bill is a bad bill. Trying to pin the blame for defeat of a bill on bogeymen is an old story. It is not the first time it has been tried and it will not be the last. But I am hopeful that the Members will recognize this ploy for what it is and reject any attempts to revive one of the most ill-ad-

vised pieces of legislation in recent history.

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) on the Land Use Planning Act of 1974. An article in the Washington Post today indicates there may be an attempt to attach the substance of H.R. 10294, to some House-passed bill that is "must" legislation. I certainly hope this controversial measure will not be brought before us again under such a procedure.

I voted "nay" on the rule for consideration (H. Res. 1110) because I felt the bill should have been changed to a great extent before coming out of the House Interior Committee. The proposal is landmark legislation which could effect adversely the lives and property rights of individual citizens, the plans and programs of States and municipalities, the direction of industrial growth and expansion across the Nation. It could also, in the opinion of many, constitute the first step toward rigid Federal control of all land. Yet no field hearings were conducted and there were reports that an attempt would be made to rewrite the bill on the House floor through the introduction of numerous amendments. In my judgment a bill of such importance should not be considered under these circumstances.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of any further requests for yielding time, I am going to yield back the balance of my time.

THE ARAB'S VIEW OF THE MIDDLE EAST PROBLEM

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, now that a cease-fire and a withdrawal from territories occupied in the 1973 war have been achieved in the Middle East, the hard bargaining can get underway at Geneva. The thorny problems of withdrawal from lands occupied in 1967 and that posed by the Palestinian refugees will be even more difficult to resolve than the issues which confounded Secretary Kissinger for over a month before yielding to the cease-fire in the Golan Heights.

To understand the Arab position regarding the contemporary Middle East problem, it is necessary to view the issue in its historical context. For more than 5,000 years the Arab peoples and their ancestors have inhabited the Middle East, commonly called the "cradle of civilization" and have had sovereignty over the area. The Arabic peoples, the Canaanites and Philistines lived in Palestine some 3,000 years before Christ.

Egypt under the Pharaohs had one of the oldest civilizations extending from the Nile to the Sinai and the Sudan. The civilizations of the Philistines, Hittites, Sumerians, Arameans and Phoenicians encompassed the Tigris-Euphrates area, present-day Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Israel or Palestine. In the 14th century its capital, Jerusalem, was ruled

by Abd Khiba, an Arab, under an Egyptian dependency. Jerusalem was still a Canaanite city when David and his son Solomon ruled it in the 10th century B.C.

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

It was here in the birthplace of civilization that the three great monotheistic religions emerged, each borrowing from one another. Akhenaton, the pharaoh, was the first to believe in monotheism and some say he influenced Moses, forefather of the Hebrews. The birth of Jesus Christ brought forth a new dimension in religious thought. When Islam emerged in the seventh century, it was symbolized by tolerance toward all people—Christians, Jews and Moslems alike. This was demonstrated during the Islamic period when Christians, Jews and Moslems cooperated in science, medicine, philosophy, art and translations of the classics. This spirit lasted until the Ottoman Turks conquered the area in 1916 and the Arab empire fell into disarray. For 400 years the advances of the Arab world were dormant until the spirit of nationalism swept across Europe and, belatedly, began to influence the Middle East.

1898 ARAB AND JEWISH NATIONALISM

Arab nationalism, the desire to throw off the yoke of the Turks, was awakened in the late 19th and 20th century. At the same time, in 1898 Theodore Herzl advanced the concept of Zionism—a Jewish return to Palestine based on Biblical prophecy.

During the First World War the British and French made conflicting promises to both peoples. The Husain-MacMahon correspondence promised the Arabs independence in return for joining the British and French against the Central Powers. The Balfour Declaration promised a homeland to the Jews. The Balfour Declaration also stated that "nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine." Then the secret Sykes-Picot Treaty divided the area into French and British spheres of influence which resulted in the postwar mandate system. These were the seeds of broken promises at the root of the present-day Arab-Israeli conflict.

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

The Arabs view it as ironic that the area in which the Jewish people had for centuries lived free of persecution—the Middle East—would have to pay for the atrocities and guilt of the West. No two groups of people have more cultural affinity and common history than the Arabs and the Jews. Arab attitudes over the creation of the state of Israel are not anti-Jewish, but based on antipathy toward the political movement of Zionism, which has displaced Arab inhabitants who had been in Palestine for 5,000 years.

In 1922 Jews represented only 13 percent of the population of Palestine; in 1935 they accounted for 28 percent of the population; and in 1947, 33 percent. As numbers increased, the idea for a national home turned into aspirations for a Jewish state to be exclusively Jewish—politically, ethnically, and economically. This concept was opposed by the Arabs

who wanted to preserve the Arab character of Palestine and to restrict immigration.

The Palestine question reached international proportions during World War II and the years that followed. Traditional American support for minorities and the strong feelings of guilt which still prevailed over the U.S. failure to alleviate the plight of the Jews in Europe during the ruthless Nazi purges galvanized political support in the United States for the Zionist movement. In 1944, Congress called for unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine and the reconstitution of Palestine as a Jewish state.

Unable to reconcile the divergent points of view, the British Government on February 18, 1947, decided to submit the entire Palestine problem to the judgment of the United Nations, then an embryonic organization in the process of establishing procedures for the international community.

1947-49

On November 29, 1947, the U.N. General Assembly recommended that Palestine be divided into an Arab and Jewish state with Jerusalem internationalized. Within a few days units of the Hagana and Irgun, the two Jewish underground paramilitary organizations, began moving out to consolidate their hold not only over the area allotted to the Jewish state by the United Nations, but also over Arab areas as well. In his book, *The Revolt*, Menachem Begin, leader of Israel's Likud party, puts the strategic objectives of the Irgun in January 1948 as: Jerusalem, Jaffa, the Lydda-Ramleh plain and the Nablus-Jenin-Tulkarm triangle, all within the proposed Arab state. Arab reaction to these developments was disorganized and largely ineffective. Hence, when the British Mandate terminated in May 1948, a Jewish command of some 62,500 men—many combat veterans of World War II—was in the field to contest the Arab attempt to thwart the establishment of the Jewish state. The Arab forces which entered Palestine totaled 17,500. These forces succeeded in holding large portions of the West Bank of Jordan, including East Jerusalem. The only Arab troops which succeeded in penetrating the Jewish state boundaries were an Egyptian column which crossed the Negev to Beersheba.

The fighting in 1947-49 amply demonstrated to many Arabs the ability of the essentially European-Jewish community in Palestine to field a modern, well-trained and organized fighting force which succeeded not only in securing a Jewish state as envisaged in the U.N. Partition Recommendation, but an additional 25 percent of Palestine as well. During these hostilities, more than half of the Palestinian Arab population fled the combat areas. This group constitutes the core of the Palestinian refugees now numbering over a million and a half. Most Arab perceptions of the Arab-Israeli conflict emanate from what they believe happened in the 1947-49 period.

THE FIFTIES AND SIXTIES

The attempts to resolve the issue in the fifties and sixties met with failure

from the Arab viewpoint because the fundamental right of repatriation or compensation as required by United Nations General Assembly Resolution 194(III) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was never granted to the Palestinians by Israel. The Arabs predicated any consideration of acceptance of the state of Israel on the precondition of the Palestinians' right to return to their homeland.

While the refusal of the United States to loan Egypt funds for the Aswan Dam in 1955-56 damaged the U.S. image in the Arab world and resulted in the nationalization of the Suez Canal, the subsequent attack on Egypt by Israel, France and Britain did even more to alienate the Arabs from the West. President Eisenhower's demand for a cease-fire and withdrawal, however, helped to maintain American credibility in the Arab world.

During the sixties, the United States supplied Israel with sophisticated military weapons to counter Soviet weapons going to Egypt and Syria and, therefore, Arab hostility to the United States increased. That these arms enabled Israel to consolidate its occupation of Arab lands following the 1967 war further enraged the Arabs.

1967

As former U.N. Ambassador Charles Yost has stated, the 1967 war was the result of a series of miscalculations, threats, counterthreats and over response by both sides. Continuous commando raids into Israel resulted in determined retaliation against Syria, the bombing of the village of Es Sammu, shooting down of Syrian airplanes, and increased fighting. Egypt mobilized and closed the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli ships. Israel considered the closing of the Straits of Tiran, which had occurred in 1956, an act of war. The United States tried unsuccessfully to reopen the straits through diplomacy.

Tension mounted and it was announced on June 4 that the vice president of the United Arab Republic would visit the United States to discuss the situation and to consider other alternatives. Israeli Foreign Minister Eban was also shuttling between capitals. But time had run out. On June 5 diplomacy gave way to war. Israel initiated a preemptive attack against the poorly organized Arab armies. In 6 days it inflicted a humiliating defeat on the entire Arab world.

ARAB REACTION TO 1967 WAR

Arab reaction to the Israeli strike was manifold: during the first 36-hours, disbelief over the military accuracy of Israel convinced the Arabs that the West had assisted them as they had once before in 1956. President Nassar and King Hussein accused the United Kingdom and the United States of assisting Israel in its military venture and the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Syria, Algeria, and three other Arab States broke diplomatic relations with the United States and Britain.

AFTERMATH OF THE JUNE WAR

Following the war, a carefully worded resolution was drawn up in the United Nations. United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 calls for:

First, withdrawal of Israeli Armed Forces from territories occupied in the recent 1967 conflict;

Second, termination of all claims of States of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereign territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

Third, guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;

Fourth, achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem; and

Fifth, guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones.

Egypt and Jordan committed themselves to U.N. Resolution 242 stating it was a literal formula for peace; whereas Israel accepted it as a frame of reference for direct negotiations. Syria never officially accepted U.N. Resolution 242.

Arabs have felt that the position of the United States during this time, and until recently, has been one of contradiction.

On one hand, the United States has given diplomatic support to U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, promoted the Big Four talks, developed the so-called Rogers' Plan in 1969, and effected a cease-fire along the Suez Canal in 1970. On the other hand, Arabs point out that the United States has given large quantities of economic and military assistance to Israel which has helped to solidify its position in the occupied territories. Arabs believe that military strength has also made possible Israeli control over Jerusalem. Many Arabs are bitter over the structural and architectural changes that took place in Jerusalem in defiance of the United Nations.

Of the additional 240,000 Palestinians who left the West Bank—for the second time in their lives—only some 27,000 returned. The remainder became refugees in make-shift camps—in their view denied the right of return, a fact which contributed to the resistance or "commando" movement which has plagued the world ever since.

Moreover, as the occupation wore on, Israel settlements, totaling over 40 in number were established on the West Bank, in Sinai, and the Golan Heights. In the summer of 1973, the Galili Plan to absorb economically and politically occupied Arab territories was adopted by the ruling Israeli Labor Party. Many Arabs viewed this as particularly degrading and it confirmed to them that the situation would not change until they acted.

THE OCTOBER WAR AND ITS AFTERMATH

The October war was born out of frustration over the years since 1967. It was an attempt to break the 7 year no war-no peace stalemate. The sole objective, confirmed by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Thomas Moorer, was to regain occupied Arab territories.

THE OIL EMBARGO

Even though the Soviet Union started to resupply Egypt and Syria during the

October war, the Arabs reacted quickly and dramatically to the massive rearmament of Israel by the U.S. and the commitment of \$2.2 billion to Israel's defense. On October 17, 1973, the Arab oil producing states applied an oil embargo against the United States and others who aided Israel. Five months later, the embargo was lifted.

THE ARAB POSITION IN 1974

Today, most Arabs welcome the efforts of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger to obtain disengagement of forces in the Middle East and start negotiations toward a lasting peace. They hope that the disengagement of Egyptian and Israeli forces can be followed by a similar disengagement on the Syrian front which will allow the 170,000 displaced Syrian civilians to return to their homes. The agreement signed May 31 could begin the process which will make this possible.

Beyond disengagement, the hard questions of withdrawal from lands occupied in 1967 and the Palestinian problem remain to be settled. In addition to withdrawal from occupied territories, the Arabs believe that any settlement must include:

First, adherence to all provisions of U.N. Security Council Resolution 242.

Second, a just settlement of the refugee problem entailing self-determination for the Palestinians, as provided for in several U.N. General Assembly resolutions.

Third, the return of Arab Jerusalem as provided for in several U.N. resolutions.

In short, what the Arabs want is for the United States to pursue a truly balanced policy in the Middle East. If we treat both Arabs and Israelis equally, we will greatly strengthen the fabric of world peace and best serve our own national interests.

AMENDMENT TO COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will amend the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 to increase the funds for fisheries disaster rehabilitation. It is time that positive steps be taken to aid our failing fishing industry. Our scattered efforts to research and improve conservation practices in the management of U.S. fisheries have been insufficient due to inadequate Federal funding and protection of our stocks. The foreign fishing fleets continue to exploit U.S. stocks on our shores and they continue illegal conservation practices on the high seas in violation of the agreements of various international conventions.

Environmental factors and natural seasonal fluctuations and disaster conditions to deplete our stocks because there are no preventive practices to protect our fisheries. In spite of the work done by many State and Federal agencies and private organizations to research the habits of U.S. fisheries, the stocks around the country continue to decline to the point of depletion.

Let me state an example. In Bristol Bay, Alaska, the sockeye salmon fishery has many times been the most valuable fishery in the State. The value of Alaskan salmon landings in 1972, an off year for salmon fisheries, was \$72.8 million, at about 65 percent of the total Pacific salmon harvest. Bristol Bay's total population of over 4,000 depends almost completely on the salmon industry. This world's richest "red salmon" grounds have given Bristol Bay residents as much as \$30 million in income in 1 year.

However, for the first time since the fishery started in the late 1800's, the Bristol Bay commercial operation has been closed by the State because the stocks were dangerously depleted to the point that it was feared that there would not be enough salmon to return and spawn in their original streams to replenish the populations.

There have been two major factors that have been responsible for this depletion. The first is that the Japanese fishing fleets have taken as much as 40 to 50 percent of the total harvest of our sockeye salmon in any given year. The second and even more destructive factor has been cold weather that has frozen or destroyed salmon beds. Man-made structures have also interfered with the normal traveling habits of the fish.

While the 200 mile bill may help to prevent the first cause of depletion, this second factor requires more serious consideration. There are two problems that must be considered and these are first, the rehabilitation of our now destroyed fisheries and second, the further prevention of such tragedies.

The bill I am introducing today will try to accomplish both goals by increasing disaster assistance to depleted fisheries of the United States by increasing the funding for rehabilitation of the depleted stocks. The funds that are not employed in this manner are channeled to the further research and enhancement of our marine resources.

Without this assistance, Bristol Bay fishermen and fishermen of other areas in the United States that have been forced out of fishing will suffer for an indefinite period of time without the hope of being able to fish on the same basis as in the past.

I would like to make one more point. The wise action taken by the State of Alaska to close the fishery, although initially costly, will in the long run give the fish populations a chance to grow.

Attempts have been made to plea with the fishermen of Japan to halt their fishing activities in the salmon fishery. However, our attempts have been ignored. If their fishing continues on the high levels of the past, damage will be irreparable. Such total disregard for essential conservation practices points to the necessity of a 200 mile bill or similar bill in addition to increased funding for our fisheries work.

The excellent financial return on the Federal Government investment makes this action look even more attractive. However, it is also a necessity for our fishing industry, and the American consumer who has depended on fish as a major source of high protein food.

The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress finds that—

(1) fish populations of the world have been steadily declining and certain populations are in danger of depletion as a result of inadequate fisheries management practices, as well as natural and undetermined resource disasters;

(2) one of the world's most important salmon fisheries, the sockeye salmon fishery of Bristol Bay, Alaska, which represented a substantial share of Alaska's and the United States' total landed value of commercial fish has recently been closed due to depleted fish stocks as a result of natural causes and violations of international fisheries treaties; and

(3) provisions for the rehabilitation of fisheries which have failed as a result of resource disasters, poor conservation practices or other causes have been inadequate.

(b) The Congress therefore finds that it is vitally necessary to provide additional funds to restore United States fisheries which have been adversely affected by resource disasters.

SEC. 2. Section 4(b) of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 779b(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000"; and

(2) by amending the first proviso thereof by striking out "That" and all that follows thereafter down through "undetermined causes," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary shall give a preference to those States in which he determines there is a commercial fishery failure (and among such States the Secretary shall give preference to those States in which any such failure resulted in any closure of a fishery) due to a resource disaster arising from natural causes, from foreign violations of international fisheries agreements, or from undetermined causes."

MCKINNEY SCORES SECRETARY SIMON'S LOTTERY TAX PLAN

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

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury has asked—through you—that Congress consider the enactment of legislation which would impose a 20 percent withholding tax on State lottery winnings.

While I hold Mr. Simon in high personal regard, I must ask, Mr. Speaker, that you ignore this request and further, I would hope that the Secretary would withdraw it for although I am sure unintentioned, it calls into question the integrity and intelligence of the American people.

To allay all concerns, I would ask that Secretary Simon give his support to H.R. 7719 which I have introduced calling for elimination of all Federal taxes on State lottery winnings.

My reasoning, as stated previously, is three-fold:

A Federal income tax on State lottery winnings further denigrates deteriorating government credibility in that one governmental entity—in this case, the State—creates the illusion of a "windfall" but that is short lived when "big brother" bursts the balloon and wants the tax grab;

A Federal income tax on State lottery winnings encourages the growth of illegal gambling since many law enforcement officers will tell you that organized crime is "double teaming" the lotteries and paying off in tax free cash; and

The Federal Government should follow the lead of the States which have seen the folly of this type of double taxation and exempt lottery winnings from State income taxes.

There is a "windfall profit" factor here, Mr. Speaker, but the only beneficiary is the Department of the Treasury which views this type of collection as unanticipated revenue and therefore, never includes this figure in budgetary projections.

I think it is especially sad, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the magnitude of this Nation's economic problems that the chief officer of the Department of the Treasury is left to carping about the small loss of lottery tax payments or what he refers to as "residual noncompliance." He expresses his concern after noting a "relatively high" compliance factor of 85 percent.

This "get the little guy" approach continues in his statement to you when he adds that "We have reason to believe that compliance is much lower for winners of less than \$600."

Insult is added to injury, Mr. Speaker, when he notes—

Many winners are unsophisticated in tax matters and thus fail to provide for timely payment of Federal income tax on their winnings.

In a fatherly manner, Mr. Simon then twits the children by telling you that—

In many cases, winners spend their lottery proceeds before the tax return filing date and consequently find that they are unable to pay the tax on their winnings when their taxes are due.

Mr. Simons' solution is to withhold at the source. Mine, Mr. Speaker, would save everyone all this trouble for I firmly believe that this devil does not deserve its due.

GREATER SCRANTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ANNUAL DINNER

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce recently held its annual dinner, at which I was pleased to be present in the role of toastmaster.

At that dinner particular attention was given to those firms in the Scranton area which engage in the export of their products, 46 such firms, with a volume of approximately \$25 million in export sales. I do not have to point out the significance of such export trade. It creates jobs in the local Scranton market. It is part of our national program to improve our balance-of-payments posture in world trade; and these firms are ample proof that American firms can compete in world trade.

Particular honor was paid to several of the people who have made notable con-

tributions to the growth of industry in the Greater Scranton area.

Edward J. Lynett, copublisher of the *Scranton Times*, and David F. Hansen, president of Pennsylvania Gas & Water Co. were cochairman of the chamber's sustaining fund drive. This is the fund that provides seed money for new industrial growth. They not only achieved their goal; they exceeded it. Timothy L. Curtin, president of Computer Reports Co., was chairman of the general membership drive. Again the goal was not only reached, but surpassed. In turn, Mr. Curtin paid tribute to Bernard Harding, Attorney Robert Preate, Bob Muti, and Robert Polidori for leadership in the membership drive.

It was the privilege of Mr. Muti, owner of Quality Car Wash, to pay special tribute to two local firms observing their 100th anniversaries—the West Side Bank and the Consolidated Molded Products Corp. He also introduced Miss Roberta Schoen, who recently triumphed in a contest with 1,400 other entrants in an eastern U.S. junior achievement contest. Miss Schoen is a student at Abington Heights High School.

Mr. Donald Moyer, executive vice president of the Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce addressed the members. Mr. Moyer will work full time in the future in helping to develop a new industrial future for the entire community. He is well experienced in the field of industrial development.

Certainly one of the outstanding speakers of the evening was Mr. Robert Noland, president of the Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce, a member of the firm of Bellante, Clauss, Miller & Nolan. We feel that our chamber of commerce is unique among the chambers of the United States. It has worked hand-in-glove with the citizenry of the community, with all sectors of the industrial community, with the men and women in the labor movement. Through this splendid cooperative effort, our community has pulled itself up by its bootstraps to become the hub of so many internationally minded companies. This rich heritage of joint venture and joint success is being added to by the current president, Bob Noland, who is engaging the members of the chamber in a role of major activities in seeking to improve the quality of life for all the people in our community.

We were fortunate to have as principal speaker the Honorable John K. Tabor, Under Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Tabor, of course, is well known for his work in promoting experts from firms all across the United States. His presence was an inspiration for all, and his remarks on the potential market for export was one listened to attentively by the members of the chamber that evening.

I know that all of my colleagues join me in saluting the members of the chamber, particularly the firms which were singled out for their work in the export market. I will, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, append an article from the *Scranton Tribune* concerning the dinner.

TABOR SALUTES REGIONAL FIRMS BRINGING MONEY FROM ABROAD

"From bubble gum to caskets, from the export of knowledge through correspondence

schools, to the design of embassies abroad, you are already bringing foreign money to Lackawanna County," Under Secretary of Commerce John K. Tabor declared in his address at the 107th dinner of the Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce Wednesday night.

Tabor's address at the Jermyn Motor Inn highlighted a salute to "world market" companies of the area.

Close to 500 heard Mr. Tabor laud the county's role as a "hub of international trade." He commended regional business firms, who he said, produce and export more than \$40 million in goods to foreign countries annually.

Earlier, Tabor presented certificates to 32 area firms engaged in international trade, hailing them for this "export" income at a time when the U.S. economy urgently needs it.

He pointed out that American trade with the Arab nations, alone, has a potential market of \$40 billion. He noted that these nations will have the wherewithal for large-scale investments in petroleum processes and other facilities both in developed and developing regions of the world.

In a talk with *The Tribune* prior to his speech, Tabor elaborated on the potential trade boom.

"The Arab countries need hospitals and medical facilities," he said. "They need air conditioning, new hotels, housing, better transportation and airports."

Explaining the "downstream" aspects of investing in an expansion of their petroleum processes he said the Arab communities want to build their own petro-chemical plants, shipyards, ships and steel mills.

But the United States faces stiff competition from the United Kingdom, Germany, France and Japan in the \$40 billion potential Arab market, the Under Secretary warned.

However, he thinks the U.S. carrot is a brighter orange and is waved from a longer and stronger stick than other competing countries.

"We have better products to offer the Arabs," he said. "And these products are more rugged and durable. And we have a better back-up service on parts."

In a local front, Tabor, speaking before the C of C, mentioned some area firms which have been successfully exporting their products abroad.

Grove Textiles has already sent one of its products literally out of this world: A special fabric of theirs was woven into the suits of American astronauts, he said.

"As far back as 1971," he said, "you had 44 firms in this area exporting over \$14.2 million worth of goods. The next year, you increased that dollar volume by more than 70 per cent to over \$24 million. Today, although no official figures are available, I am sure the value of your exports is well over \$40 million."

Tabor also mentioned that the "new markets in the Near East should be good news for you because you are going to have a very good friend looking out for your interests there—one of Scranton's own, Herman Elits, who has just been appointed U.S. Ambassador to Egypt."

THE DANGER OF PSROS

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, those countries which have had experience with socialized medicine have witnessed a dramatic deterioration in the quality of their medical care.

In fact, such countries have seen thousands of their most able physicians

leave because they did not wish to see their medical practice taken over by a huge and impersonal government bureaucracy.

At the present time, British doctors practicing for the National Health Service are worse off than their medical colleagues in any other European country. They work longer hours for less money, have less opportunity to follow the career of their choice and reach a senior position at a later age.

The June 7, 1974, issue of "To the Point International" notes that—

Australia House in London . . . has reported that enquiries from doctors wishing to emigrate have escalated dramatically in recent months. In December 1973, there were 12 enquiries, in January 42 and in February 51 . . . medical emigration is expected to increase even more.

One doctor who emigrated to the United States from Great Britain is Dr. Donald Quinlan, of Chicago, recently elected president of the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons.

Dr. Quinlan left England because of his opposition to governmental interference in the practice of medicine. He came to the United States because of our own longstanding belief in the private practice of medicine and today, unfortunately, he sees this principle eroding.

In recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Finance Committee, Dr. Quinlan discussed the dangers of the professional standards review (PSRO) program.

Dr. Quinlan points out—

This law will require that medical care be "standardized" for Medicare and Medicaid patients and their doctors will be forced to comply with a system of pre-set standards of medical diagnosis, treatment and care in accordance with the regulations of one man—the Secretary of HEW. Although he is not a licensed physician, he is the final judge of regulations controlling physicians' judgment governing the type of treatment physicians may prescribe for their patients. . . .

Another very harmful part of the PSRO program is its challenge to the traditional doctor-patient relationship and the confidentiality which is inherent in it. At a time when our concern for the right of privacy is mounting, and many are speaking out against government encroachments on privacy, it is ironic that the PSRO program has been instituted.

Dr. Quinlan declares that—

Under this law, a physician can be forced to turn over to federal employees all medical notes taken in his office or in a hospital, including the most confidential information about his patients. Likewise, it is planned to have massive, detailed, computerized files on patients and doctors which will be instantly available to federal employees as an aid to the surveillance program and for such other purposes as the Secretary of HEW may provide.

The American Association of Physicians and Surgeons has filed suit in the Federal court to have the PSRO law held unconstitutional as being an overbroad interference with the fundamental rights of patients and their doctors, unjustified by any legitimate and compelling legislative interests. PSRO, charges the AAPS, "is punitive in concept. Its

purpose is to entrap doctors in a system of government-imposed controls."

There have been, the AAPS charges, many misrepresentations made concerning the real meaning and purpose of the PSRO program. A document, "PSRO: Questions and Answers," written and distributed in December 1973 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is, Dr. Quinlan charges, misleading.

I wish to share with my colleagues Dr. Quinlan's testimony before the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Finance Committee of May 9, 1974:

STATEMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN
PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS
(By Donald Quinlan, M.D.)

We appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons. I am Donald Quinlan, M.D., President, a physician in the private practice of medicine in Chicago, Illinois. With me are Thomas G. Dorrity, M.D., a surgeon in the private practice of medicine in Memphis, Tennessee, who is also Chairman of our Legislative Committee; and Mr. Frank K. Woolley, Executive Director, with headquarters offices in Oak Brook, Illinois. With your permission, Dr. Dorrity and Mr. Woolley will assist me with our Statement and any questions you have concerning it.

The Association is a free, independent, non-governmental, voluntary organization of members of the medical profession. We are united for the purpose of analyzing the profession's problems and formulating actions to improve medical care for all Americans, preserve freedom of choice for patient and doctor, protect the practice of private medicine, and educate physicians and the public to recognize and resist schemes that would weaken or destroy our free-choice system of medical care.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, we will present a summary statement today and file for the record later on a more detailed analysis of the problems of the PSRO law.

We welcome this Committee holding "hearings to evaluate present and proposed implementation of the professional standards review legislation" because of its grave implications for individual freedom and responsibility as we have known it in this country since the founding of the republic.

Our testimony will demonstrate the basic concept of this law is coercive and punitive. Therefore, it cannot be satisfactorily amended. It should not be implemented. It should be abolished. We are asking the federal court to declare it unconstitutional and we are asking Congress to repeal it.

Basically, the law will require, as soon as federal government functionaries can get organized in every area of the country to the satisfaction of the Secretary of HEW, that medical care be "standardized" for Medicare and Medicaid patients. Patients and their doctors will be forced to comply with a system of pre-set standards of medical diagnosis, treatment and care in accordance with the regulations of one man—the Secretary of HEW. Although he is not a licensed physician, he is the final judge of regulations controlling physicians' judgment governing the type of treatment physicians may prescribe for their patients, whether, when and where they may be hospitalized, and for how long. Under his direction and control, a swarm of federally paid and directed functionaries will exercise case-by-case surveillance over the medical judgment of physicians during the course of care of these patients. The surveillance will determine whether the care proposed to be given by the physician is appropriate and necessary and to otherwise insure that the physicians' judgments conform to

regulations of the Secretary. Patients and their attending doctors will be denied the right to decide what is best for patients.

Also, under this law, a physician can be forced to turn over to federal employees all medical notes taken in his office or in a hospital, including the most confidential information about all his patients. Likewise, it is planned to have massive, detailed, computerized files on patients and doctors which will be instantly available to federal employees as an aid to the surveillance program and for such other purposes as the Secretary of HEW may provide.

Among the little understood provisions of this incredible law, not only will physicians be forced to subordinate their best medical judgment of what is "medically necessary for their patients," but when overruled by government functionaries, will be obligated to use their influence to convince their own patients the government is right and that they, the doctors, are, therefore, wrong.

In certain cases, the patient may be denied the doctor or hospital of his choice. In fact, if government paid agents or employees decide hospitalization is unnecessary, contrary to the judgment of the patient's physician, the patient may not be put in the hospital under the Medicare or Medicaid program. If he gets hospitalization, he'll have to find a way to pay for it himself. These patients, of course, are the elderly and the poor that government has promised to take care of.

And, naturally, the law has teeth in it which take the form of many sanctions to be imposed against physicians. Penalties can amount to \$5,000 for failure to conform to regulations.

The AAPS has filed suit in the Federal Court to have the law held unconstitutional as being an overbroad interference with the fundamental rights of patients and their doctors, unjustified by any legitimate and compelling legislative interests.

As might be expected, in answering the Complaint, the government attorneys say, in effect, that the federal government can regulate anything it subsidizes. Other government employees go on to say, "We intend to subsidize medical care for everyone and control that care."

This is a shocking situation in a country that prides itself on the fact that the central government is restrained by the Constitution from interfering with the private lives of its citizens.

The AAPS et al Complaint and Memoranda of Law by Plaintiffs and Defendant will be filed for the record of this hearing.

The people have no idea that legislation has been enacted to inject politics into medicine and to authorize one man, or a committee at his direction, to come between a patient and a physician and change their behavior in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Neither do they nor many of their representatives in Congress understand that authority has been given to one man and his subordinates to force all doctors to conform to their idea of the appropriate medical diagnosis, treatment and care that must be followed in caring for patients.

Political medicine is bad medicine. Obviously, political considerations will control the actions of those in the bureaucracy and those serving as paid agents of the bureaucracy. Doctors licensed by the states who now are free and ethically obligated to practice medicine of the highest quality will be forced to follow central government bureaucratic direction and, therefore, be denied the right of providing patients with the best care of which they are capable. Inferior and mediocre quality medicine must be the result. Furthermore, PSRO is a scheme designed to place the blame on doctors for broken political promises that patients would be given the best quality medical care they

wanted at the cheapest price. It calls for rationing and price control at the expense of patients. Even the Secretary of HEW, Caspar Weinberger, admitted to a House Committee on March 19, 1974 that:

"I would be less than candid if I did not express to you the feeling that I have that there is a potential danger of a very substantial government interference into the practice of medicine by this kind of statute."

Government interference means political interference. Obviously, anyone subservient to political considerations must be less than the best physician.

Patients will be badly served by adherence to the short-sighted policy of political interference with the best judgment of the patient's doctor.

We have stated before and we state again—PSRO is punitive in concept. Its purpose is to entrap doctors in a system of government-imposed controls. But what has been created is a trap that is going to catch the patients. They, not doctors will suffer the most, because medicine compressed into a standardized mold by political pressure will not be first-class care. Who will be deprived of first-class care? Obviously the patient, not the doctor.

Furthermore, no publicity has been given to the fact that this authority for detailed dictation and control was planned by the bureaucracy of the federal government as a part of a scheme of nationalization of medicine for everyone in the country.

MISREPRESENTATIONS

In our steadfast opposition to PSRO and our determination to inform the public and the medical profession of the truth about PSRO, we have been accused of misrepresentation. Let's examine who is, in fact, indulging in misrepresentation.

The May 1, 1974, issue of Medical Tribune published a somewhat hysterical diatribe against the "American Association of Physicians and Surgeons" by Dr. Henry Simmons, the man in HEW who has been tapped for the unenviable task of trying to persuade the nation's physicians that if they just hold their noses and swallow, PSRO won't be all that bad. Dr. Simmons accused the AAPS and another medical organization of "misleading" the profession, doing a "diservice" to the public and promoting a "climate of misunderstanding" about PSRO.

We assume Dr. Simmons was referring to our organization, the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, which we readily agree is undoubtedly the nation's most nagging critic of the vicious, punitive PSRO law. We submit that AAPS has been steadfastly telling the truth about PSRO. Those who have been misrepresenting PSRO have been officers of HEW and other public officials.

Let's start out with Dr. Simmons' statement as published in Medical Tribune to the effect that he challenges PSRO critics to show that anyone other than local physicians will determine PSRO standards.

"I don't know when people will start to believe," Dr. Simmons is quoted, "that under the legislation and under the regulations—and they are available to anyone in the country who cares to read them—the local PSRO decides what standards to practice under."

The very statement is misleading. Dr. Simmons doesn't define standards, HEW's recently issued PSRO manual identifies three categories of medical practice controls—norms, standards and criteria. While it is true that the manual asserts that PSROs will be responsible for developing and modifying criteria and standards and selecting norms, we contend that this assertion is a clever and calculated misrepresentation which is intended to con the nation's physicians into believing they will be allowed to exercise control over the PSRO review process.

We challenge Dr. Simmons and other HEW officials, including Secretary Caspar Weinberger and Assistant Secretary for Health Dr. Charles Edwards, to identify the section of this law which states clearly and unequivocally that PSROs are responsible for setting standards, norms or criteria of medical practice to which this country's doctors will be forced to adhere.

The PSRO law plainly states that the National Professional Standards Review Council shall (please note that the word is shall, not may)—and I quote—"provide for the preparation and distribution . . . of appropriate materials indicating the regional norms to be utilized . . ." Furthermore, the law specifies that if there is to be any deviation from prescribed norms, the PSRO is to be notified and may utilize different norms if the National Professional Standards Review Council consents.

You know and I know, and so does Dr. Simmons and Dr. Edwards, who approved a recently distributed PSRO information pamphlet which is misleading in the extreme—we all know that PSROs are not going to be allowed to do anything without HEW approval.

Each PSRO, for instance, will be required to serve a probationary period to prove it is capable in HEW's eyes of performing the PSRO policing operation. Even before that, the PSRO must submit a plan of operation, including norms, standards and criteria to be used—and they had better get them right or the Secretary will turn them down. Even after serving probation, an organization must get HEW approval to become a full-fledged PSRO.

Do Dr. Simmons and Dr. Edwards seriously want the American people to believe they plan to defy the requirements of this law and let local doctors control PSROs, including the development and application of compulsory norms, standards and criteria?

The essence, the substance, the very purpose of this law is control. It was intended to smother the medical profession in uniformity established by bureaucratic fiat.

Under that kind of alien system, the people of this country—our patients and your constituents—will be the worst losers.

Dr. Simmons alleged that there is growing support for PSRO among physicians. But he also complains, in seeming contradiction, that the bureaucracy has failed in its campaign to propagandize the doctors into swallowing the poison of PSRO. The fact is that when doctors discover the truth, they recognize it is a bad law. You should know that 17 state medical associations and many county societies are on record for repeal.

Dr. Simmons said he was disturbed that—and I quote—"there are associations that are trying to mislead." And he warns: "That's going to change."

MEDICINE THREATENED

Dr. Simmons didn't clarify what he proposes to do to organizations which exercise the freedom of disagreeing with him and other government officials. But it is not the first time the medical profession has been threatened in a transparent attempt to force it into a Socratic decision to drink the PSRO hemlock.

Last January, for example, Senator Bennett, Jay Constantine of the Senate Finance Committee staff, and Dr. Simmons, among others, discussed PSRO at a meeting of the American College of Radiology. According to the March, 1974, ACR Bulletin, these officials threw out blunt threat after blunt threat that unless physicians drop their opposition to PSRO and get in there and make it work the way the bureaucracy wants it to work, the wrath of Congress and the bureaucracy will descend upon them and they will get something a lot worse.

Is this the way this law is going to be forced down the throats of the people—by

threat and intimidation? If PSRO had all the virtues claimed for it, why would such tactics be necessary?

We think this committee should take a good, hard look at the facts and find out just who is misrepresenting these facts and who is doing a disservice to the people.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, most doctors in this country are not being fooled or hoodwinked into accepting a bad law just because someone says it's a good law. I can also promise you that the physician members of our organization are not going to turn tail and run just because someone in HEW or in Congress snarls at them.

We are going to continue to tell the truth about this law. It is a bad law. We know that misrepresentations about it by its propagandists will continue because it is so bad there has to be a cover up.

In an interview published in the April 1, 1974, issue of American Medical News, Dr. Simmons implied that if physicians did not institutionalize Medicare or Medicaid patients, they would not be affected by the PSRO law.

We submit that that is at best misleading. We can demonstrate to any reasonable man's satisfaction that once a doctor accepts a Medicare or Medicaid patient, he is caught in the PSRO trap.

Are you aware, as just one example, that if a physician sends a Medicare or Medicaid patient to a laboratory for diagnostic procedures or for therapy, that doctor is required to police the laboratory to assure PSRO that the lab is not doing something medically unnecessary or economically too costly?

Furthermore, according to a recent opinion of the Senate Finance Committee staff director, the doctor is trapped even though he does not take a penny directly from the government. According to this opinion, the doctor who has nothing to do with government—who takes no money or does not deal with government in any way—is just as subject to punishment for displeasing the bureaucrats as the doctors who do deal directly with government. His Medicare and Medicaid patients can be denied his services and he can be subjected to a fine if he doesn't knuckle under and practice medicine the way HEW's paid agents tell him to.

Why, we wonder, doesn't Dr. Simmons and Senator Bennett and Dr. Edwards explain to physicians and to the people just how this great PSRO boon to the nation can, in fact, deny the poor and the elderly the services of the doctor of their choice?

Isn't it a monumental disservice to the citizens of this country not to tell them such things?

So, who's misrepresenting?

A few months ago, Senator Bennett spoke on PSRO to the Essex County (New Jersey) Medical Society. He said, among other things, that PSROs would have "sole power to determine the acceptability of the parameters applicable to the area."

We challenged that assertion in the December, 1973, issue of the AAPS News Letter. An AAPS member wrote Senator Bennett for clarification. He replied: "I suppose I did overstate somewhat in saying the members of each PSRO would have sole power to determine the acceptability of the parameters applicable in the area." He then acknowledged—as we have repeatedly pointed out—that there is a higher authority in Washington with veto power over PSROs.

TRUTH IS HIDDEN

We also wonder if official Washington is ever going to level with the American people that PSRO will condone wholesale violation of the privacy of records of any patient of any physician who takes care of Medicare or Medicaid patients. Officials are now hiding the truth.

In that PSRO pamphlet approved by Dr. Edwards and distributed a few months ago to U.S. physicians, an attempt was made to

establish as fact the fiction that "any data or information collected by a PSRO is to be held in strict confidence" on pain of strong penalties. Senator Bennett in a statement in the April 2 Congressional Record even sought to allay fears by stating the law permits access only to records of Medicare and Medicaid patients.

Both these assertions are false. Senator Bennett cited in Section 15(b)(3) as limiting examinations to Medicare and Medicaid records. But Section 1155(b)(3) and (b)(4) authorize any PSRO "to the extent necessary and appropriate for the proper performance of its duties and functions" to "examine the pertinent records of any practitioner or provider of health care services . . ." and "services provided . . . of any practitioner or provider." And those are direct quotes from the law. I emphasize it does not limit scrutiny to Medicare and Medicaid patient records.

The law prohibits disclosure of information except to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of the law. All it requires of the Secretary is adequate (not full, mind you, but only adequate) protection of the rights and interests of patients. And guess who decides what is adequate? Obviously the Secretary.

Under this law the government official who wants confidential information to use against a patient or for some other purpose will no longer have to burglarize a doctor's files such as the White House ordered in the Ellsberg case. All confidences of all patients of all doctors covered by this law, and that is practically all of them, will be available to the politicians.

The plain truth about confidentiality is that this pernicious law is a vast and unholy grant of power to the Secretary of HEW to acquire confidential information from records of any patient and to use it in whatever manner he decides will further, in his opinion, the purposes of the law. The plain truth is that the PSRO law will protect individuals who rifle patient records for use by PSROs and HEW, not punish them.

That pamphlet of Dr. Edwards also falsely asserts or implies that:

A. The PSRO program is to be controlled by physicians,

B. The purpose of the PSRO program is to improve the quality of care and not to discipline physicians. (It is the Secretary and his subordinates and agents who do the controlling, not physicians.),

C. PSRO will cause little change in the way physicians practice medicine. (The opposite is true.),

D. Local physicians who make up PSROs will determine standards and criteria to be used "in determining the necessity and quality of care."

E. The primary emphasis of the PSRO program is assuring the quality of medical care. (Actually, it will guarantee a deterioration in the quality of medical care.)

If local doctors are going to do all this standard setting and criteria determining and all this controlling, what, in Heaven's name, is the purpose of this law?

Another alarming thing about this pamphlet is that it omits important facts which would expose just how bad this law really is and how detrimental it is to the best interests of the people.

For example, patients may be denied admission to a hospital for either elective or extended or costly services—even though the physician believes they are necessary for the health of the patient.

Nothing is said either about the fact that PSROs are required to harass and intimidate doctors who don't follow orders to get them into line. Nothing is said about the requirement that PSROs in carrying out this mandatory bullying must enlist the support of other professional and governmental or-

ganizations that have influence on the doctor.

(An evaluation of the numerous false and misleading statements in the HEW pamphlet have been filed with our Statement.)

But there is constantly more to worry about—as there always is when bureaucrats begin meddling. For a long time, for example, everyone was led to believe that PSRO was a device by which government could decide what was medically necessary for Medicare and Medicaid patients. But lately, officials at HEW have been talking and writing and laying out guidelines for determining also what is medically appropriate in caring for these patients.

Necessary and appropriate are vastly different things in medicine. It is dangerous enough to give bureaucrats the power to decide for a patient whether it is necessary for him to have an appendectomy, but it is compounding the danger beyond rational bounds to grant bureaucrats the power also to determine whether the surgical procedure is appropriate—in other words, the right one.

The evidence is clear that:

1. Federal government employees as part of their plans to change the behavior of individuals have plotted the PSRO Controls this Committee is considering. PSRO is the gear in the "nationalized medicine machine" with teeth in it.

2. The public knows nothing about these plans for control.

3. Furthermore, the people do not know how, or that, huge sums of federal money is being granted by government employees to influential educators and others to study how to extend government intervention and control of medicine and then how large numbers of these grantees testify for more intervention and more money.

4. Only a few federal legislators know what is in Public Law 92-603 and what its implications are.

5. The news media has not told the full story—in fact, the true nature of "standardization" was buried in the omnibus Social Security Law of 1972. Stories about it stressed benefits and what was being done for people through politics instead of what was being done to them.

6. This Committee has the constitutional duty and responsibility to blow the cover off this scandal before it is infinitely more disastrous to individual freedom and responsibility than Watergate.

Obviously, ten minutes is insufficient to bring such a tragic situation and its consequences into sharp focus, particularly when it has been skillfully blurred by adept promoters of unlimited bureaucratic power. However, we have quickly flagged as many points as we could in the time allotted and will submit additional information for the record.

We do want to emphasize that the attempts of government officials and other advocates of government intervention in medicine to blame doctors for wild government spending and inflation is ridiculous. For instance, HEW is scheduled to spend \$111 billions for the year beginning this July. Of that amount, only \$4 billions 242 millions is for physicians' services. \$3 billions 586 millions for Medicare and \$656 millions for Medicaid. Deduct everything HEW will pay to physicians this coming year and HEW will still be spending over \$106 billions (\$111 billions minus \$4 billions 252 millions=\$106 billions 758 millions). The \$106 billions, which excludes all payments to doctors, is more than all of the expenditures of the entire federal government in 1960. (For more information on who is responsible for inflation, see the attached copy of AAPS testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, April 26, 1974 opposing nationalized medicine schemes which incorporate PSRO.)

In view of the fact that many millions of dollars of federal funds may have come into the hands of witnesses who will testify before this Committee for this totalitarian scheme, we suggest that you ascertain from every witness whether he or she is a paid federal employee, whether they have or will receive anything of value from the federal government for studies or writings bearing on this subject, and whether or not they have or anticipate a contract with the federal government with respect to any part of this plan of standardization or any part of a plan for nationalization of medicine.

This Committee and all the people of this country should know that a governmental system of "Police Doctors" to ration and control medical care, rather than allow citizens to willingly exchange services and considerations without government interference, is not new or novel.

Such a system as PSRO or "Police Doctors" which originated in and flourishes in all totalitarian countries goes hand in hand with socialized medicine. Information about these "Police Doctor" systems and nationalized medicine in alien countries is readily available through the AAPS.

We will be pleased to supply each member of this Committee who wants it a copy of the book: "Medicine and the State," by Lynch and Raphael.

It is the most seminal study available on socialized medicine. It is objective, complete and factual. It was not paid for and its development was not directed by anyone having a vested interest in channeling more money of society through government or centralizing more power in government.

Clearly it documents how the dignity and freedom of both individual patient and physician have been undermined by unfulfilled and treacherous but believable promises of Utopia. It explains how confidentiality, mutual trust and rapport, so essential to optimum medical care, have been destroyed. It does this by documenting the irreconcilable conflicts that are created between the professional obligations to their patients and their legal responsibilities to government to police patients.

"Medicine and the State" examines and appraises, without hiding the truth, country by country, political promises and results regarding medical costs and quality, preventive medicine, doctor-patient relationships, vital health statistics and effects on national economies.

We urge you without prejudice to study the facts for yourselves so you may avoid being influenced by anyone who has a conscious or unconscious interest in betraying individual freedom.

You dare not rely on the bureaucracy and its allies to do the spade work upon which you base your judgment in this case since the awesome power it now commands and aspires to expand is the gravest threat to freedom facing America today.

CONGRESSMAN DRINAN EVALUATES NEW INFORMATION WHICH UNDERSCORES THE NEED TO PROHIBIT WIRETAPPING AND ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, recent developments have underscored the inability of Congress and other public bodies to control the use of wiretapping and other electronic surveillance by Govern-

ment officials. The failure of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to prevent the massive intrusion into individual privacy and abuse of constitutional rights caused by wiretapping and electronic surveillance testifies to the need for legislation which would absolutely prohibit these investigatory devices.

I would like to commend to the Congress the recent actions taken in this regard by French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing. Presiding over his first Cabinet meeting, the French President issued a directive which ordered the curtailment of all wiretapping and the destruction of any files or records of information gained from previous surveillance activities. I praise M. d'Estaing for his bold and progressive action, and fervently hope that the Congress will follow his fine example in banning the repugnant and unconstitutional practice of wiretapping and electronic surveillance.

RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

On May 13, 1974, the Supreme Court handed down two illuminating decisions in the companion wiretapping cases of United States against Giordano and United States against Chavez. Each of us should consider carefully the facts of these cases and their implications regarding the Nixon administration's attitude toward and implementation of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

Title III of the 1968 act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2520, strictly limits who, among Government officials, may approve submission of an application to the appropriate district court for an order to intercept a wire or oral communication. The statute authorizes only the Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General he specially designates to approve such applications.

In United States against Giordano, a unanimous Court affirmed the suppression of evidence resulting from a wiretap because the Department of Justice failed to follow the strict procedures set forth in 18 U.S.C. 2516(1). The wiretap in this case was approved by the Attorney General's Executive Assistant pursuant to an understanding that he could do so on the grounds that he fully understood the Attorney General's standards.

The evidence gained from that interception was suppressed by the lower court, and affirmed by the Supreme Court, because the Government admitted that neither the Attorney General nor a specially designated Assistant Attorney General ever authorized the application. Writing for the Court, Mr. Justice White quoted the applicable language concerning the authorization requirement in section 2516 from the Senate report:

[This provision] centralizes in a publicly responsible official subject to the political process the formulation of law enforcement policy on the use of electronic surveillance techniques. Centralization will avoid the possibility that divergent practices might develop. Should abuses occur, the lines of responsibility lead to an identifiable person. This provision in itself should go a long way

toward guaranteeing that no abuses will happen. S. Rep. No. 1097, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 97(1968).

Obviously this strict provision, designed to fix responsibility and prevent abuses, did not "go a long way" in controlling the use of electronic surveillance, because the Justice Department disregarded it. The failure of Attorney General John N. Mitchell to adhere strictly to the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 in the Giordano case is all the more disheartening and alarming as his failure to authorize properly wiretapping applications also applies to at least another 60 cases involving some 626 defendants. The illegality practiced by the Justice Department is expected to result in the dismissal of these indictments.

In the companion case, United States against Chavez, the Court, by a vote of 5 to 4, upheld the lawfulness of an interception based on affidavits filed by Attorney General Mitchell that he did, in fact, authorize the tap, although the application misidentified the authorizing officer. Again writing for the Court, Mr. Justice White stated:

[M]isidentifying the Assistant Attorney General as the official authorizing the wiretap application to be made does not require suppression of wiretap evidence when the Attorney General himself has actually given the approval.

But the Court added:

[W]e do not condone the Justice Department's failure to comply in full with the reporting procedures Congress has established to assure that its more substantive safeguards are followed.

Mr. Speaker, although the prosecution was upheld in the Chavez case, the failure of the Attorney General and the Justice Department to abide by the strict terms of the law raises again the question as to the workability of the safeguards designed to control abuses in the very delicate matter of wiretapping and electronic surveillance. As Mr. Justice Douglas cogently noted in dissent:

After the fact acceptance for the Chavez surveillance was made at no cost. The surveillance was productive and was directed against an alleged drug trafficker, a pariah of society. Accepting responsibility at this point, further, helped Mitchell and the Justice Department avoid the acute embarrassment of losing this prosecution. But this was not the scheme created by the Congress. By creating the identification provisions, which required the authorizing official to be made known at the time of an application, it established a mechanism by which a person's responsibility was to be acknowledged immediately, not a device by which the identity of the person authorizing the application would remain hidden until it was discovered that an instance of electronic surveillance had been productive and not ofensive to public sensibilities. . . .

[I]t is clear that this personal responsibility and public accountability, relied on by Congress to check the reckless use of electronic surveillance, is rendered a mere chimera when the official actually authorizing a wiretap application is not identified until years after the tap has occurred, when he might already be out of office, when the usefulness of the tap is already established, when it is clear that the surveillance was not abusive, and then only through voluntary admissions or the sifting of potentially con-

tradictory affidavits. Responsibility is hardly "focused," and the "lines of responsibility" are a gossamer at best. . . .

While Congress demanded the openness of political accountability, Justice Department documents drew a veil of secrecy, and no personal responsibility was attributed in any documents to Mitchell, the person actually responsible for authorizing the electronic surveillance.

The failure of the Nixon administration to respect the safeguards of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and to execute faithfully the provisions of that law in the true spirit intended, is all the more significant because the grave misconduct and irresponsibility demonstrated in the Chavez case affects an additional 99 cases involving 807 defendants. These two cases, Giordano and Chavez, of administrative impropriety in the conduct of wiretapping and electronic surveillance operations involve a total of 1,433 defendants. This sizable total becomes yet more significant when one examines the entire picture of wiretapping and electronic surveillance as revealed in the U.S. courts' "Report on Applications for Orders Authorizing or Approving the Interception of Wire or Oral Communications" for 1973.

WIRETAPPING IN 1973

In accordance with the provisions of section 2519(3) of title 18, United States Code, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts recently submitted to the Congress the sixth annual report of wiretapping and electronic surveillance covering the period from January 1, 1973, to December 31, 1973. During this period the Department of Justice sought 130 wiretap warrants. All 130 requests were granted by the courts. The two previously cited Supreme Court cases give evidence which casts doubt on the claim of the Justice Department that its high degree of success in obtaining warrants is due to the careful screening of all requests, and instead lends great credence to the contention of many civil libertarians that judges are too permissive in granting wiretap warrants.

Computation of the figures released in the report paints an incredible picture of the electronic surveillance operations conducted by the Federal Government in 1973. At a cost of over \$1,500,000 to the taxpayer, the 130 intercepts overheard and recorded over 110,000 conversations involving about 5,500 individuals, which lead to only 322 arrests and 59 convictions in the reporting period.

Furthermore all of the arrests resulted from only 34 of those intercepts—the remaining 96 yielding no arrests—and only 4.6 percent of the intercept operations lead to any convictions in 1973. Undoubtedly those statistics will need to be revised upward on the basis of later reports. But one figure which will not be "improved" by later reports is the astounding fact that a total of 112,314 conversations were overheard by Federal wiretapping and bugging activities. Less than half of these interceptions contained any relevant or incriminating information.

The 1973 report also contains considerable information about each of the

court-ordered operations, some of which furnish clear examples of the kind and degree of fruitless activities undertaken. One wiretap intercepted over 600 conversations without yielding any incriminating evidence, at a cost of \$36,293. A more expensive operation, which was granted three extensions, monitored 2,000 conversations, yet failed to date to result in one arrest. Further the report shows that the average cost for each intercept was \$12,236. And the total cost for all Federal intercepts since the passage of the act in 1968 has exceeded \$16 million.

Mr. Speaker, the inefficient and unchecked practices of the Justice Department, the high cost to the taxpayer, the dubious results obtained, and the massive intrusion into private conversations, the majority of which involved innocent use of monitored telephones, all serve further to convince me that wiretapping and bugging should be forbidden. The use of electronic surveillance by investigatory agencies of the Federal Government represents a most severe and outrageous intrusion into the privacy of the American people.

WARRANTLESS SURVEILLANCE

The 1973 report of the Administrative Office further notes that its figures include only those interceptions which were conducted under court orders. I call to the attention of my colleagues that an undisclosed number of warrantless wiretaps and surveillances are conducted yearly by the executive branch on the basis of its claimed authority to eavesdrop in the interest of "national security." At recent hearings before our Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice, the Justice Department refused to provide precise and accurate data on these operations. One can only imagine the number of intercepts and the magnitude of the invasions of privacy conducted under these secret operations.

In the past, the White House has said that, at any given time, approximately 100 wiretaps are in operation for the purposes of "national security." It is entirely reasonable that the extent of this type of intercept is much greater than its reported size in terms of the number of intrusions, unnecessary recording of innocent communications, and cost to the taxpayer. The House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, is currently examining in its impeachment hearings several such national security taps. It is my hope that our investigation may shed some light on this subject.

PUBLIC OPINION

Mr. Speaker, these recent events and revelations add further weight to the already persuasive argument and loud public cry to restrict wiretapping and electronic surveillance once and for all. Figures released to the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Government Operations Committee by public opinion pollster Louis Harris reveal the following conclusions:

(1) 75 percent of the public believes that "wiretapping and spying under the excuse of national security is a serious threat to people's privacy";

(2) 77 percent believe that Congress should enact laws to curb wiretapping; and
 (3) 73 percent believe that Congress should make political spying a major offense.

These figures represent a 180-degree turnabout in public opinion since the enactment of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act in 1968. Watergate and other related developments no doubt have brought home to the American people the unwarranted invasion of privacy which wiretapping and Government spying represent.

CONCLUSION

The Supreme Court decisions in *Giordano* and *Chavez*, the latest report on intercepts, and public opinion demonstrate that the detrimental effects of Government surveillance activities far outweigh any marginal benefits to law enforcement. All of these considerations demand the repeal of those sections of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 which authorize the use of wiretaps and other methods of electronic surveillance.

Last August I introduced a bill, H.R. 9781, which would prohibit the interception of any wire or oral communication. I invite my colleagues in the House to join as cosponsors of that bill. If we are to secure the rights guaranteed in the Constitution and advance the cause of personal freedom, we must end now and forever the intrusive practices wrought by electronic surveillance.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY ACT

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

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13839, the International Economic Policy Act Authorization. As favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, this measure is a modest proposal, and one deserving our support. Instead of the open-ended 3-year authorization requested by the administration, the committee prudently chose to recommend a 1-year authorization in order to give the Congress the opportunity to review the activities of the Council on International Economic Policy—CIEP—over the coming fiscal year. Thus, we are being asked only to approve a single authorization of \$1.8 million for fiscal year 1975, and will have the chance to review our decision again in several months.

Mr. Speaker, our actions with respect to the oil embargo, U.S. trade policy and American economic relations with such countries as Rhodesia and South Africa point up the need for a comprehensive overview of our international economic policies. Any attempt to discern the long-range implications of American economic policy, and hopefully act to correct some of the gross deficiencies and incongruities in that policy, is well worth our support and less than \$2 million it will cost next year.

American economic policy leaves much to be desired, especially with regard to underdeveloped and third-world nations. While we violate international sanctions to support an illegal regime in Rhodesia,

Nigeria supplies almost 25 percent of our imported petroleum. While multinational conglomerates reap record-high profits, poor nations like Jamaica are struggling to stay financially afloat despite the taking of the island's valuable bauxite by these same huge corporations.

Worldwide inflation is putting serious strain on these poorer countries. Surely it is possible to deal with our neighbors who are not attacking us without attacking them. If we are going to deny direct economic assistance, we must at least try to assess the long-range impact of our economic policies and work to restore a greater measure of decency and realism to this crucial aspect of our stature as a nation among nations.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a perceptive article by Mr. Carl T. Rowan which appeared in the *Washington Star-News* of May 20, 1974. With permission, the article follows:

JAMAICA'S UPHILL STRUGGLE

(By Carl T. Rowan)

A few weeks ago I wrote a column about the economic calamity which seems to be the destiny of weak developing nations now that worldwide inflation and an energy crisis have been heaped on top of a traditionally unjust trade system.

Beautiful but poor little Jamaica is a glaring example of a country that might be paradise but for the fact she gets pennies for what she sells and pays dollars for what she has to buy.

Jamaica is the second biggest producer of bauxite in the world, after Australia. Much of the aluminum you see in your kitchen or as the siding of houses originated in Jamaican ore.

Jamaica earns some \$25 million a year from this ore, a sum that is more than trifling in terms of the country's total budget. But Jamaicans of every political persuasion will tell you the big multinational firms which haul the ore out are reaping far greater profits.

Alpart Ltd. (a partnership formed by Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Reynolds Metals Co. and Anaconda Company) began producing alumina (a midstep between bauxite ore and aluminum) over three years ago. Because of a bit of shrewd bookkeeping, the Jamaicans say, Alpart has paid no taxes to Jamaica.

It seems that no "profit" occurs until the alumina gets to the United States and is transformed into ingots or sheet aluminum.

Jamaicans also say that Reynolds Aluminum provides jobs to 500 Jamaicans who extract bauxite ore, but that this same ore supports 30,000 workers in the States.

With one Jamaican out of every five jobless and many others underemployed, small wonder the Jamaicans are asking why more of the aluminum-making processes cannot take place in Jamaica.

There never has been a time when this was not a serious issue in Jamaica. But today it has become a matter of national survival.

With no local sources of energy, Jamaica has been spending about \$50 million a year for oil, mostly from Venezuela. With the energy crisis sending oil prices soaring, Jamaica's oil bill is now at least \$120 million a year.

The increase in oil costs alone has been enough to wipe out Jamaica's foreign exchange reserves, which now stand at about \$74 million, or just enough to finance one more month of essential imports.

The Jamaican government has imposed a stringent austerity program on the people, but that will not meet the crisis. So Jamaica's prime minister and his top aides have been carrying a solemn story to Great Britain, to

Prime Minister Trudeau in Canada, to Henry Kissinger in Washington.

"We do not want this to become a matter of political hostility," they are saying, "but Jamaica's very survival depends on our getting a fairer price for our bauxite, our sugar, our other raw materials—something that matches the astonishing high prices of the things we have to buy."

Five years ago Jamaica could sell 60 tons of sugar to Britain and get enough money to buy a tractor. Today it takes 90 tons of sugar to bring that tractor to Jamaica.

What is worse is that Jamaican labor costs, fertilizer costs, etc., have pushed the production cost for a ton of sugar to about \$165. That is some \$30 more than what Britain is paying under a contract signed a few years ago.

Or take oil. Just 14 months ago a ton of Jamaican sugar brought enough foreign exchange to buy 20 barrels of oil. A ton of sugar now brings five barrels of oil.

The Jamaicans are in some tough talks about bauxite and alumina prices with huge U.S. corporations which are not known to let sentimentality get in the way of turning another buck. Theoretically the U.S. government is not involved. But it is.

That aluminum we extract from Jamaican bauxite is of strategic importance to the United States. Having Jamaica remain a friendly democracy is of deep political importance to the United States.

If the rich countries are ever going to show a willingness to stop cheating the developing countries, in the interest of a just and peaceful world order, the time is now.

Jamaica would be as good a place as any for Uncle Sam to haul up the flag of economic decency.

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES FOR CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the commencement exercises for the Capitol Page School provided us with many inspirational thoughts and messages. I commend them to my colleagues as follows:

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL

(Caucus Room-Cannon House Office Building, Monday evening, June 10, 1974, 8 o'clock, Washington, D.C.)

PROGRAM

Prelude, U.S. Navy Band.
 Processional—"Pomp and Circumstances", Elgar.

Invocation (audience standing), Rabbi Morton Kanter.

Salute to the flag (audience standing), Audience.

Star Spangled Banner (audience standing), Audience.

Welcome, Mr. John C. Hoffman.

Salutatorian, Warren B. French.

Selection, U.S. Navy Band.

Greetings, Mr. Vincent E. Reed, Associate Superintendent, D.C. Public Schools.

Address, Honorable Carl Albert, Speaker of the House.

Valedictorian, Mark N. Albertson.

Announcement of honors, Mr. Hoffman.

Presentation of diplomas, Mr. Vincent E. Reed.

Selection, U.S. Navy Band.

Benediction, Rev. William Pryor.

Recessional, U.S. Navy Band.

GRADUATES

* Mark Nevins Albertson.

Ronald G. Andrews.

* Becky Bailey.

Andrew J. Bell.

*Jonathan Charles Coopersmith.

Curtis LaVaughn Brant.

John Patrick Cregan.

* Douglas Kent Diehl.

* Warren B. French, III.

Gary John Hamilton.

Timothy Joseph Harroun.

Debra Linn Kanter.

Ronald Byron Katz.

Robert E. Kieffer.

Ottillie Rosina King.

Robert Booth McNeil, Jr.

* Paul Medved.

* Jennifer Elizabeth Olney.

* Robin Keighley Patton.

Charles Phalen, Jr.

* William E. Pryor, III.

Brian A. Rawers.

* Siglinda Sanchez.

Marvin John Short, III.

* Heidi Stam.

* Kimberly Anne Tomb.

* Elvin Darcel Turner.

Steven Richards Valentine.

* Mark Alan Von Destinon.

* Byron R. Wadley.

Donald Gary Ward.

* Jerry O. Wofford.

Jerry Jay Watterworth.

* Robert O. Woodruff.

CLASS OFFICERS

Doug Diehl, President.

Ron Katz, Vice President.

Heidi Stam, Secretary-Treasurer.

Byron Wadley, Sergeant-at-Arms.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Stanford U., Oberlin College, N.H.S. Scholarship Finalist, Mark Albertson.

Ablene Christian College, Becky Bailey.

George Washington University, Curtis Brant.

Rochester U. Merit Scholarship, Jonathan Coopersmith.

Carroll College Honors Scholarship, Douglas Diehl.

Maryland University, Ronald Katz.

Marquette U., Bucyrus-Erie Co. Scholarship, Wisconsin Honors Scholarship, Paul Medved.

Southwestern at Memphis, William Pryor.

Yale University, Elvin Turner.

Depauw University, Mark Von Destinon.

Ablene Christian College, Byron Wadley.

Michigan State-Detroit Sports Broadcasters Assn. Scholarship, Jerry Watterworth.

USHERS

Julie Rosner, Chief Usher.

Paul Byrd.

Debbie Gelin.

Chip Irwin.

Mary Hayes Shea.

Music by the United States Navy Band.

Decorations, U.S. Botanical Gardens.

RABBI MORTON KANTER

Let us Pray:

Father of All:

We are grateful to Thee for having endowed us with a mind, giving us the capacity for learning and acquiring knowledge. For, it is because of this capacity that we are gathered here this evening.

We parents are thankful to Thee for having enabled us to reach the joy of seeing our children achieve an important milestone in their lives. Relatives and friends are joined in the ever-unique experience of renewed hope in the purposefulness of the human experience.

And our graduates look to Thee for strength and guidance in the years to come, as they grow to become the men and women upon whom the future of our country and world will depend.

We pray Thee, O Lord, bless each of them with the vision to learn the truth that our

* Members of National Honor Society.

country so urgently needs in day of internal stress that no person may be satisfied with acquiring academic knowledge alone. But each person must act to ever increase his knowledge of Thee and of Thy will: Ever striving to fulfill what Thou requirest of him: To do justly, and love mercy and to walk humbly with Thee.

For as men and women live according to Thy will, so shall they be building a universe of truth and of peace. Amen.

WELCOME: MR. HOFFMAN

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Pryor, Rabbi Kanter, Mr. Brown, Honored Guests, Alumni, students and friends. We also know there are members of Congress with us tonight, but without knowing all who are present we are reticent to mention some, at the expense of slighting others. We feel the same about alumni, but are always delighted to see them.

Our faculty wishes to thank you for sharing our commencement exercises this evening. We feel that our young people have been privileged to serve Congress, but they have served well both on the floor of Congress and in the "Penthouse" at the Library of Congress, so we believe it apropos to honor them tonight.

Now, it gives me pleasure to present the president of the senior class, Mr. Douglas Diehl, who will preside and announce the program.

WARREN B. FRENCH: SALUTATORIAN

Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Kanter, Reverend friends, and relatives: On behalf of the class of 1974, I want to extend a warm welcome to everyone.

I would like to begin with a brief history of the senior class. In the school year 1970-71, when this class first entered the capitol page school. There were only three freshmen. Of these three, one lone student is in the graduating class. By the sophomore year of 1971-1972, the class had grown to nine members, two of whom are still with us. As juniors, the class of 1974 had increased to 17 pupils. Seven of those 17 are in this graduating class tonight. This year, 26 new pages were added to the returning seven to make 33, the largest graduating class in the school's history.

These 33 represent every section of the country, coming as they do from 14 different States and the District of Columbia. Texas and Michigan each have five pages in this class, and Virginia has four. New Jersey and New York have three each; and the District of Columbia, Maryland, and West Virginia each have two. There is one page from each of the States of California, Hawaii, Illinois, Montana, Ohio, South Carolina, and Washington.

The widely scattered regions from which the pages came, contributed to a very educational year. Knowledge of our governmental operations has been acquired at work of course, but new friendships have added a different type of knowledge. All the varied customs, stories, and interests have been passed among the pages to make them, I feel, a closely knit group.

You do not usually see this in a school where everyone is from the same town or city. Here, everyone is a friend of everyone else. But that is not to say that we are without our differences of opinions. Many arguments have arisen over pride in one's job or over one's political opinions. Each page feels he has the best job, and that he does the most work. He also acts sometimes like a junior politician, ready to argue in a minute over some item just for the sake of arguing. Several student council meetings have been enlivened by such arguments.

For many of our parents in the audience this evening, this is their first visit to our Nation's Capitol. I believe very few really

know what their son's or daughter's duties entail. In the Capitol Page School there are four groups of pages, working in either the House, the Senate, the Supreme Court, or with a congressional staff. My discussion is centered around the House Pages, not because I myself am one, but because the work done by Pages is quite similar no matter where they work. There is in our class one Page from the Supreme Court, three from the Senate, four with congressional staffs, and the remaining 25 work in the House.

In the House there are four different types of Pages. The majority of these are the Bench Pages. They run errands for the Members or their offices. The Head Bench Page is called an overseer. He sees to it that the errands are assigned and that things are running smoothly.

The second largest group of House Pages are stationed in the cloakrooms. They must know each Member on the side of the House on which they work. They handle the telephone calls coming into the cloakrooms asking to speak with a member or requesting information concerning any action taking place on the floor.

Two of the House Pages comprise the third group and are called documentarians. They ring the bells that call the members to the floor. They must also make sure that all legislation being considered on the floor is available to the members. In addition, they raise the House flag each day the House is in session.

The last of the House Pages is the Speaker's Page. He is the Speaker's personal page. He must be ready at all times for any request the Speaker might make.

I also doubt many of you know how a Page's day is spent. His school day begins at 6:10 A.M. in the Library of Congress. He attends school until all his classes are completed. For the majority of the Pages, this is never later than 9:45. But a few take a fifth period which ends at 10:30. He then reports to his respective place of work and helps to prepare the chamber for the day's session. He remains at work until 5:00 P.M., or until the body adjourns, whichever is later. Sometimes that happens to be 2 A.M. the next morning. He returns home to eat, do homework, and relax. He then goes to bed, but it only seems like minutes until the alarm clock rings again. Social activities are reserved for the weekends when the Page has neither school nor work. Parties, concerts, and dining out are just a few items on a Page's weekend schedule. Sometimes, after a really difficult week at work, the entire weekend is spent trying to catch up on some sleep, or just resting the feet.

You may not have seen much of your son or daughter in the past year. In that time he or she has not escaped undergoing some sort of physical, mental, or emotional change. Early morning classes and long, hard working hours are enough to rid any ordinary person of ideas of becoming a page. But the page, after thinking back over all the new lessons and adventures, historical places and events, exciting people and new friends, has gained in just a very short period an experience that, no matter what he says, he will never forget.

Tonight is the end of 33 high school careers that have been filled with achievements and accomplishments. It also marks the beginnings of a completely new life: college. To some people college is a frightening experience. But a page is better prepared. He left home a year earlier and lived and learned in almost the same life style while also working full time. But you can see that we survived.

I feel that I can speak for the entire class when I say, that I am proud to have been a part of our history, no matter how small. We were pages in a very historical year. The resignation of a Vice-President, Watergate investigations, a State of the Union message,

the selection of a new Vice-President, the energy crisis, and talk of impeachment are just a few of the events to which we were witnesses. Yes, we have had many exciting educational experiences.

In closing, I want to say thank you to two special groups of people. First, to our sponsors; thank you for making this opportunity available to us. And finally to our parents: you gave us guidance in our beginning years. Without your patience and understanding we would not be here tonight. Because of your help we are now better prepared to face the world on our own.

Thank you!

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL, SPEAKER CARL ALBERT, JUNE 10, 1974

Mr. Hoffman, members of the faculty, and graduating pages: I am honored to have been invited to participate in your commencement exercises. On previous occasions, Capitol Page Schools have been addressed by illustrious former colleagues of mine, some of whom went on to the highest positions in government, including Jack Kennedy (who came to the House of Representatives with me in 1947), Lyndon Johnson (who served with me in the House), and Senator Hubert Humphrey (who for several years served with me as a part of the Joint Congressional Democratic Leadership). I am not here to compete with them—I am here only to acknowledge that to participate in an exercise in which such men have participated before me is an extraordinary distinction.

I am also honored because you have selected me to be a part of one of the really highpoints of your life no matter how long you may live. As I look back across the years there is no event in my life that stands out with greater significance than that evening when I received my diploma as a graduating senior of the McAlester High School of Oklahoma. So as long as you live you will have to rest with the notion that you didn't have the President, that you just had Carl Albert to make your commencement address because you will never graduate again.

I have always been a friend of the Page School. It is indispensable to the operation of the page system as we know it on Capitol Hill. It has worked well in the past. Its graduates have competed successfully with the graduates of all the schools of the nation in a cross section of institutions of higher learning from community colleges to major Ivy League universities. Some of the criticisms that have been thrown at it are not substantiated by the results.

I feel that no other person in the world is as close to the pages of the House of Representatives as the Speaker. Under the rules and traditions of the House, the Speaker is the chief executive officer of the House of Representatives. He is responsible for every official and employee who works in the House Chamber. He is responsible for the employment of pages and for their welfare. To assist him in this job, he appoints the Chief of Pages to supervise the work of our pages, and a Committee on Patronage to help in the process of selecting young people capable of withstanding the rigors of your work and of performing the duties of your office.

I feel, and have felt ever since I became Speaker, a very close and personal interest in every page in the House of Representatives and for that matter, in the Senate and Supreme Court, because pages of those bodies are also a part of our Capitol Page System.

I wasn't satisfied with the page system when I first came to Congress or when I was first elected Speaker. I think I can say without fear of contradiction I have added a new and better looking dimension to the page systems of the House of Representatives when I appointed Feida Hooper from a small town in my District the first girl page to serve

in the House of Representatives. Many have followed in her footsteps and now girl pages are no longer an oddity; at the present time their number has grown to 9. Their work has been of the highest quality and they have more than measured up to the expectations I had for them when I started the custom of bringing girl pages to the House.

May I bring a message to all of you, boys and girls alike, from my colleagues and a word of thanks to all of you for myself. You have been an indispensable part of the operations of the House and of my office. We are grateful to you for your hard work, for the quality of your performance and the ever-willing attitude which you display when you are called upon by me or any other Member. Personally, I want to say thanks from the bottom of a grateful heart.

I extend to you my double congratulations. First of all, I congratulate you for becoming high school graduates. I have no fear for your future. While you have had to sacrifice a lot of your study hours to your jobs, the very fact that you have wanted to be and have succeeded in being good pages sets you apart as young men and women capable of doing your school work under handicaps. Your days have been long, sometimes they have gone far into the night, but they have been worthwhile.

I therefore want next to congratulate you on being pages for the Congress or for the Supreme Court.

You may not realize the impact of your positions. You are the youngest employees of the House of Representatives, certainly the youngest with floor privileges. When I talk to youngsters across the country who have visited Washington and the Capitol and ask them what they remember about it, they invariably say they remember the Speaker and the pages, and they say Fish Bait Miller too, so you are my ranking competitors for recognition.

But being a page is far more than just being a person who runs errands. Your job gives you an insight into the political operations of your generation that nobody else of your age group can possibly have. Like the Speaker, you get to know every Member of the House of Representatives. You get to know the legislative and judicial giants of the present adult generation. You get the opportunity to see how they work and how they think. You get to see the American democratic system in action, whether on the legislative or on the judicial side. This gives you an insight into men and women and issues which you could not possibly get anywhere else. You have the opportunity to learn more about how things work in the process of changing an idea into a bill and a bill into law than the average professor of government at the largest universities in the land. Your knowledge is not just academic: it is based on reality and experience.

What is more, you have been here at a very important period of American history. You have seen things happen. During my time as Speaker we have seen more changes in the House perhaps than at any time in the last 60 years. Think of what we have done in the last three years to implement democracy. Not only have we added girls as pages but we have given 18-year-olds across the nation the right to vote. We have sent the Equal Rights Amendment to the States. We have seen the implementation of the 25th Amendment to the Constitution. We have been faced with the resignation of a Vice President and impeachment proceedings in the case of the President himself. We have seen the greatest education bills ever enacted at the national level in this nation's history. Within the last decade we have seen a manifestation of the greatest expansion of constitutional rights since the Civil War. We have done more to make real for all people, of all races and all national origins, the admonition of the Declaration of Independence that "all

men are created equal." The part of the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights and the post-Civil War amendments, designed originally to protect the liberty of the individual, have been given greater realism than they have ever known before.

But we have done more than that. Our constitutional re-awakening has not just been limited to the protection of individuals, not only against the Congress, the States, the Executive and government in general at every level, but the nation has become aroused to a new interest in the basic constitutional concepts with which the founding fathers dealt. As we approach the Bicentennial Anniversary of our existence, people across the land are beginning to seek answers on questions of the division of powers between the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of government. We have become increasingly aware as a nation of the constitutional structure of our government. This is one of the benefits of the traumatic experiences which are summarized in the word "Watergate".

We have seen perhaps the greatest resurgence in constitutional debate since the early days of our country. We certainly have had nothing like it since the pre-Civil War period when the great argument was about our federal system—where did the powers of the federal government begin and where did the powers of the states end? Now the question is, how do you draw the line between the departments of the federal government and how do you implement to the fullest extent the guarantees of the Bill of Rights.

You have been on the Floor on the House when these issues have been discussed and in some cases, determined. You have seen enacted the first War Powers Act in history. You have seen enacted the first anti-impoundment bill in history. You are about to see the first Budget Control Act in history. We are drawing our lines clearer and the American people are going to know better than ever before just what this government is all about.

I hope that some of you, like some who have gone before you, will go to Congress. I hope that many of you will enter public service. I hope that all of you will be active participants in politics because politics is the method by which public service is implemented. My first desire to be a Congressman was born when I was six years old. My own Congressman, Charles D. Carter, a Chickasaw Indian, addressed my first grade class and said, "One of you might some day go to Congress." My interest in Congressional leadership came in the 6th grade when I had a government teacher who was a friend of Champ Clark, who for 8 years had been Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I can tell you—with all its headaches and all its problems—the life which I have lived as a Member of Congress has been the fulfillment of a lifelong dream. I have been able, through most of my adult years, to swim in the middle of the stream. Nothing that happens anywhere in the world is more important than what happens right here on Capitol Hill. Since 1955 I have been a member of the Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives. At every meeting, when every important decision was made during the speakerships of Sam Rayburn and John McCormack, and during my own speakership, I have been present. I was present at every important discussion between the legislative leadership and the President during the administrations of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. I have been present at all of the important foreign policy meetings between President Nixon and his advisers, Bill Rogers and Henry Kissinger, since the Republicans have been in charge of the White House. This experience has caused me to know that politics is not the sinister thing which it is sometimes said to be.

I remember being in the Speaker's office when Sam Rayburn was Speaker and I was Whip, during the Eisenhower administration, when there was some reported scandal in the White House. Former Governor Tom Dewey of New York came by, and Mr. Rayburn introduced me to him. They were talking about the problem at the White House and Governor Dewey said, "You know, the trouble is that too many of the President's top advisers have not been politicians, and political science is the most important science there is." I have since been impressed by that statement and I think we can almost say it again today. President Nixon has had two Congressmen and one longtime high-grade Congressional employee on his staff, but the name of not a single one of these has been involved in any of the problems which less politically-oriented staff members appear to have brought to the Chief Executive's office. Politics is the human way of operating representative government. Get yourselves involved, not by destroying politics or belittling it, but by making it work.

As a member of the House of Representatives, I will be pardoned if I say that despite the recommendations of two successive Presidents, Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle have refused a change in the two-year term. You who have served in the House of Representatives have served in the only body of government in our nation's capital where the people have a ready hand at determining policy. The House is the only place where the incumbent must report on the commission which his constituents have given him every two years. The House is the only place where you can get your office only by election; every other official and employee in this vast government of ours can be selected by other than the election process.

Even Senators can be appointed in the case of a vacancy; even Presidents can receive their position by way of succession, and the Vice President, in case of a vacancy, can be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Congress, as we have recently seen in the Jerry Ford case. This is, perhaps more than anything else, the most important feature of our whole democratic government. The House of Representatives gives us the one place in our vast government where the people have immediate and direct control. As our nation grows, our government will grow in its responsibilities, our Congress will grow in its duties. More and more issues will have to be tackled nationally and internationally. More and more will it become true that the legislative process must be the avenue through which the people can reach every segment of their government.

Through it all, the Supreme Court still stands as a deacon and a balance wheel, not only between the Executive and the Legislative, but between man and government. An independent Judiciary is absolutely essential to the preservation of individual liberty and the protection of human rights. The Executive must be strong because national leadership cannot be splintered in a thousand directions. The President of the United States is, by the Constitution, the Chief Executive of the nation and he, more than anyone else, must give the nation the leadership which it requires. Our tri-partite government is basic to our system, and it must be preserved.

These are trying times, but America has strengthened her industry and her soul by overcoming trying times. We have never had a generation who gave up or who lost faith in our destiny, even during the darkest days of our history. The same spirit exists today as it did in 1776. The same spirit that tamed the wilderness put Americans on the moon. This country has stood strife and struggle. In the fraternal struggle of the Civil War, Longfellow emphasized the inner confidence that

Americans have in the old ship of state when he said:

"Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock,
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale."

We have survived civil wars and world wars and brush-fire wars. We have survived hot wars and cold wars. We have survived recessions and depressions, but we remain the richest, the strongest, the freest, and the most powerful nation in all the history of the world.

Young men and women you have added to the strength, to the glory, to the freedom, to the power of your country in your young years. As you leave here tonight, we of my generation will soon be handing the torch to you—take it and let it shine in greater glory and in greater luster because your generation worked and lived.

VALEDICTORIAN—MARK N. ALBERTSON

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Pryor, Rabbi Kanter, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Reed, honored guests, and fellow members of the Class of 1974. I want to take this opportunity to say a sincere farewell to the graduates of the Class of 1974. I am sure that as we sit here tonight, all of us are silently reminiscing about the past nine months and what they really meant to us. Some of us will look back on these months with amusement, others with a strong, satisfying sense of accomplishment, and several may simply be sitting here in anticipation of the time when, several minutes from now, we will take one last walk down the aisle and out of high school forever.

No matter what memories we hold of our days together at Capitol Page School, we can rest assured in the knowledge that our time together was an important time, a time not spent only on the tests and grades and frustrations that are a part of education, but rather, it was also a time in which the important lessons of maturity and responsibility were shared and achieved by all. We sit tonight as one class whose experiences at Capitol Page School will remain a part of us forever, whether they are frozen in the glossy pages of the yearbook or captured in the elegant script of the formal presentations on our high school diplomas.

F. Scott Fitzgerald once wrote that "... there are only the pursued, the pursuing, the busy, and the tired.", but I feel that perhaps our famous American author may have omitted a classification of importance to us all. For there are also the graduates, those of us who sit before you tonight and can proclaim to the world that we have spent the past year living and learning the lessons of the past in preparation for the promises of the future.

Yes, fellow graduates and members of the Class of 1974, we do have a future. Our future is one that sets us apart from most of the graduating classes in the nation, because we have been given the opportunity to draw upon a unique education. Our learning comes not merely from the textbooks and chalkboards with which we have become so familiar, but from working in the offices and chambers of Congress and the Supreme Court. All of us have listened to the endless hours of legislative and judicial debate on a variety of issues.

We have witnessed the rise and fall of men in power and have made countless friendships ourselves, hoping someday, that we will move from the rear of the House chamber or the steps of the Senate rostrum, to a desk on the floor of either body or to a seat on the Supreme Court. The fact that we live and work with men of enormous responsibility in our national government, such as the Chief Justice of the United States or the Vice President or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, frequently re-

minds us that there are few who have a future as optimistic and promising as ours.

It is unnecessary to punctuate my remarks with phrases such as "the broadening of our horizons" or "our release into the cold, cruel world", for they are as pompous and empty as their scope implies. Nevertheless, however broad our horizons may be, or however cold and cruel the world really is, it is important for us to realize that an important period in our lives has come to an end. We are leaving the narrow confines of life in the Capitol Hill community in preparation for the challenge of larger schools, new and unfamiliar faces, and a tempo of life that differs vastly from that which we have seen every day in the corridors of the Capitol.

In short, my fellow graduates, I offer you a promise for the future based on the responsibility and maturity that have brought us here tonight. Perhaps these feelings can best be expressed by the famed poet W. H. Auden, when he said, "We are all equal in the sense that each of us is a unique person with a unique perspective on the world, a member of a class of one."

And so in conclusion, I want to thank our friends and relatives for attending our graduation exercises. We greatly appreciate your attendance. Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AWARDS

6:10 A.M. and earlier—5 P.M. and later, that's the mentally and physically enervating challenge of Congressional Pages, so it is with sincere pleasure and great pride that I announce the recipients of awards well earned. Please try to refrain from applause until the end of the particular recognition.

Citizenship Medal, American Legion—Warren French; Civitan Honor Key Award—Mark Albertson; Danforth Award—Character, Scholarship and Leadership—Jonathan Coopersmith; Bausch & Lomb Award—Science Award for Excellence—Will Pryor; Journalism Award—Year Book—Mark Albertson; Faculty Award—Douglas Diehl; Valedictorian Medal—Mark Albertson; Salutatorian Medal—Warren French; Outstanding School Citizenship Certificate—Scholarship and Responsibility—Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia—Douglas Diehl, Ronald Katz, Robin Patton, Kimberly Tomb and Elvin Turner.

National Council of Teachers of English Award for Superior performance in Writing—Mark Albertson; Second Prize in Philip Gerry Poetry Contest—"Sun Up" and "Cleaning Out My Heart"—Curtis Brant.

Service and Achievement—School Letters: Curtis Brant, Jonathan Coopersmith, Douglas Diehl, Ronald Katz, Ottilie King, Jennifer Olney, Robin Patton, Heidi Stam, Kimberly Tomb, Mark Con Destinon, Warren French, Tim Harroun, Siglinda Sanchez, Byron Wadley.

Stars—Points or credits in excess of minimum requirements: Mark Albertson, William Pryor, Elvin Turner.

School letters—recognition of varsity basketball awards: Warren French, Ronald Katz, Charles Phalen, William Pryor, Brian Rawers, Elvin Turner.

Basketball Coach—Major Stewart McCaw. We did a little more than build character this year. We actually won 80% of our games. Basketball star: Mark Albertson, Bob Kieffer.

Most valuable player: Charles Phalen. Scholarships: (Listed on next sheet marked-insert—Scholarships): Further, we are proud that our students have been accepted by major and outstanding universities all over America.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Stanford U., Oberlin College, N.H.S. Scholarship Finalist, Mark Albertson.

Ablene Christian College, Becky Bailey. George Washington University, Curtis Brant.

Rochester U. Merit Scholarship, Jonathan Coopersmith.

Carroll College Honors Scholarship, Douglas Diehl.

Maryland University, Ronald Katz.
Marquette U., Bucyrus-Erie Co. Scholarship, Wisconsin Honors Scholarship, Paul Medved.

Southwestern at Memphis, Yale University, William Pryor.

Rutgers Alumni Scholarship, Siglinda Sanchez.

Yale University, Elvin Turner.
Depauw University, Mark Von Destinon.

Ablene Christian College, Byron Wadley.
Southeastern University, Donald Ward.

Michigan State-Detroit Sports Broadcasters Association Scholarship, Jerry Watterworth.

Our faculty, Mrs. Ulmer, Mrs. Rimmer, Ms. Godfrey, Ms. Nitkin, Ms. Neale, Mr. Hilton, Mr. King, and Major McCaw are proud of this graduating class, the largest in the history of the school, as are Mr. Miller, Mr. Wannall, Mr. Hepler and the many staff members on the "Hill" who work so closely with the pages. Our Parent Teacher Club officers, Mrs. Johnnie Albertson, President; Mr. Terry Shea, Vice President; Mrs. Evelyn Robinson, Treasurer also salute you our graduates.

As a former coach, I appreciate the fact that in order to win you have to have the talent, the proverbial "horses" going for you and we recognize the God given talent of these youngsters, but they couldn't have done it alone so we recognize and applaud you parents for you, too, should be accorded accolades for a job well done.

A dear friend of the pages is Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, Chaplain of the United States Senate, who very graciously sends a handsomely bound, autographed copy of the many prayers he offered on the Senate floor during the 92nd Congress, for each senior.

Now it is my pleasure to certify to you, Mr. Brown, that these students have honorably completed the course of study prescribed for the Washington, D.C. High Schools and I ask that their diplomas be granted in recognition of this fact.

CLOSING PRAYER FOR CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL
COMMENCEMENT, GIVEN BY WILLIAM PRYOR,
JUNE 10, 1974

We pray Lord God for this night and what it has held. For its endings and its new beginnings we give thee thanks. We pray in a very special way thy blessing upon these graduates, upon our Speaker, upon the homes from which they come. Now may grace and mercy and peace from thou who art the father, son and holy spirit be with and abide with each one of us now and forever more. Amen.

THERAPY SERVICES

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, among the issues the Committee on Ways and Means is called upon to consider and make recommendations upon, one of the most complicated, yet vital, issues which affects the lives of millions of our citizens, is medicare. This program has provided the means whereby medical care has been made available to constituents of mine and to those of every Member of this House. Without this program, needed health care could well have been denied. I am proud of our progress. The medicare program which the Congress initiated for the benefit of our older citizens is a program to protect social security beneficiaries from the costly health

expenses which they perform must face. It has been my own and I believe it has been the intent of the Members of the Congress to provide a health insurance program for these most deserving of our citizens.

Medicare, like most legislation, was not originally, nor is it now, perfect. We did make every effort to include those medical services which are necessary to a status of good health. We included, for good reason, services which are less known to many of us, but are vital for a comprehensive health program. One of these, and the one to which my remarks are directed, is physical therapy. To illustrate the importance of physical therapy procedures, I would point out to Members just two examples. The distinguished chairman of our committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, who required back surgery recently, has made no secret of the fact that following the surgical procedures it has been the physical therapy which he has received which in great measure has restored him to the excellent condition which we all are delighted to see him enjoy. Additionally, this entire Nation knows of the tragic assault made upon Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, of the tenuous days when heroic medical efforts were made at Holy Cross Hospital to save his life, and the subsequent combination of the Governor's determination and physical therapy which has restored him to his present capabilities, limited though they may be.

I believe it fair to say that the two principles which guided our Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress in the enactment of medicare and in the amendments we have subsequently made are sound. First, we wanted to assure necessary health care to social security beneficiaries and, second, we were impelled to provide adequate cost containment measures.

I am confident that considering the constraints within which we were working, we did pretty well. Do not misunderstand me. I believe that this Nation needs a comprehensive national health insurance program. But I am concerned by the experience of the past as we look to the inevitable larger programs.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to set the predicate of the action which I am proposing today. It was not too long after the medicare program became operative that rumors of abuses were circulating. Then there were documented examples of unscrupulous medical practitioners.

I shared with my colleagues the belief that the medicare law needed to be amended to guard against the unprincipled practitioner, but even more importantly, to make sure our Nation's elderly beneficiaries received the services to which they were entitled and needed. I am dismayed, however, by the insensitivity of the Bureau of Health Insurance, SSA, to what I believe was the intent of our committee when we added certain safeguards to the program in reference to several of its benefits.

On pages 109-110 of our committee report dated May 26, 1971, we explained in detail what we were doing and why. We specifically instructed the Secretary of HEW to consult with the professions directly involved in establishing criteria

for determining reasonable cost of services. Subsequently, I received information which alerted me to the possibility that our executive branch bureaucrats are not totally sensitive to congressional instruction.

It had been learned that BHI was acting to implement a salary equivalency concept even without specific legislative authority. On September 14, 1971, the Bureau of Health Insurance advised representatives of the American Physical Therapy Association, one of the professions referred to in our report that they—the BHI—were not yet ready to consult on proposed regulations. On September 17, 1971, only 3 days later, BHI distributed a draft intermediary letter which would serve as regulations to implement this provision of a House bill which had not yet become a public law.

Since enactment of Public Law 92-603, the Medicare amendments of 1972, the BHI has been struggling with regulations to implement section 251(c), the issue at question. While it was the intention of our committee to guard against overcharging the program, BHI has somehow fixed upon the conviction that our instruction must be translated into an hourly salary with no consideration being given to the amount of service provided.

This, to me, can be self-defeating and a totally unnecessary interference with patterns of health service delivery.

On July 31, 1973, I joined with four other members of the Ways and Means Committee, Congressmen PETTIS, CORMAN, ULLMAN, and CAREY in a letter to BHI, questioning the apparent course they were taking in the light of our committee intent and requesting a meeting with representatives of the American Physical Therapy Association and a member of our committee staff. It would appear 8 months later that the meeting was not an unqualified success.

Stated briefly, our committee wanted therapy services provided at a reasonable cost regardless of the method of employment arrangement. Many health institutions, referred to as providers of services, find it to their advantage to furnish service under an "arrangement", that is, by contract with a health professional not on the staff of their institution. One fundamental reason is that as the volume of therapy services goes down, the costs to the hospital go down.

On the other hand, personnel costs are fixed if the therapists are on the regularly employed hospital staff. There also can be savings for the medicare program as well.

Medicare pays its share of the costs of an institution based upon the percentage of medicare patients. To illustrate, if there are five medicare patients and five nonmedicare patients, medicare pays 50 percent of all costs including personnel. If the patient volume drops to six, of which three are medicare patients, medicare must pay 50 percent of personnel costs which remains the same, even though only three medicare patients are being served.

The fiscal savings of an arrangement for physical therapy services, both to

hospitals and to the medicare program, were graphically illustrated to me by a friend of mine. He shared with me the results of a survey of charges for physical therapy services in a large metropolitan area. Of the 20 hospitals surveyed, 12 retained physical therapists on a regular employee basis, while 8 provided physical therapy services under arrangement.

In virtually every instance, the institutions retaining the physical therapists under arrangement charged less for physical therapy services than did the hospitals where the therapists were retained under ordinary employment. There is, then, obvious potential benefit to the medicare cost containment objective by not thwarting the under-arrangement approach to retaining therapy personnel.

The approach of BHI would have this kind of detrimental impact to these efficiencies and economies.

Our committee was concerned with cost containment but we did not want to cut down productivity nor fix individual income. Reimbursement related to time rather than amount of service defeats incentives. We want the medicare program to have the benefit of the most economical of circumstances, whether the therapist is employed or under arrangement.

The test of reasonableness of costs should be based upon services provided and the cost to medicare should not be affected by the method by which therapy services are provided.

To make sure there is no question of congressional intent on this point, I am today introducing legislation to strike from section 1861(v)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act the words "equal to the salary" so that reimbursement for therapy services, as is the case with all other services provided under medicare, will be based upon reasonable costs.

ENCOURAGING HOME GARDENING

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, I am again calling to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress the rising costs in food prices and the dire predictions of food shortages in the years to come. Now is the time for this great Nation to take steps to prepare for the future. The warning signs are showing all over the world. Millions of unused acres of land exist throughout the country. The urban areas of this Nation have plenty of unused lots that can be converted to home gardens. A back-to-the-soil movement is needed if our people are going to have the opportunity to fight prices and prepare for food shortages. One bill that I filed provides for the supplying of free seeds upon request of our Secretary of Agriculture by the people at an estimated cost of \$6 million and would produce an estimated \$380 million in nutritious vegetables. This legislation has been heard by the Subcommittee on Agriculture, chaired by my esteemed col-

league the Honorable JOSEPH VIGORITO, of Pennsylvania. The bill has been very well received throughout the Nation, particularly by the consumers. Another amendment that has been tentatively approved by the powerful Ways and Means Committee, offered by myself, provides for a 7-percent investment credit for home gardeners on purchase of garden tools with a ceiling of \$100 in purchases. Both of these pieces of legislation will encourage home gardening and be a step in the right direction by showing some concern about the problems that lie ahead.

I include an article written by one of the ablest newsmen on the Washington scene, David Nyhan that appeared on page 2 of today's Boston Globe:

REPRESENTATIVE BURKE PLANTS TAX CREDIT SEED
(By David Nyhan)

WASHINGTON.—When Jimmy Burke was growing up in Hyde Park, his folks had a vegetable garden that fueled a neighborhood of kitchens.

When Burke, the Democratic congressman from Milton, goes up to Boston weekends now, he goes over to his brother Arthur's house in Dorchester. "He's really got the green thumb in the family," says vegetable-loving Burke.

And while Burke is more of the city-slicker type, compared with some of the rural types on the House Agricultural Committee, he is hip-deep at present in a James A. Burke back-to-the-soil movement.

So it was no surprise yesterday that Burke wrung from the House Ways and Means Committee tentative approval of a 7 percent tax credit for home gardeners.

The legislation, with the impressive title of "The Home and Family Garden Tax Credit Amendment," would give taxpayers \$7 back on their Federal income tax if they buy the allowable maximum of \$100 worth of tools and equipment for gardening home-grown vegetables.

Burke, who once was proprietor of a Victory Garden in Mattapan, wants "the little guy" to get a break in his food bill by growing his own vegetables.

He persuaded Congress several weeks ago to hold a public hearing on another scheme, in which he envisions the Department of Agriculture providing up to \$6 million worth of free vegetable seeds to anyone who asks. This would produce some \$400 million worth of vegetables, he figures.

Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz opposes the idea.

After two days of hearings on tax loopholes for "hobby farmers" in his Ways and Means Committee, Burke said he was tired of hearing about "tremendous tax writeoffs" for the wealthy, landed gentry.

"What about the little fellow who pays those incredible prices at the supermarket?" he asked.

Then he rattled off prices of various vegetables at local greengrocers: "Potatoes, \$4.65 a peck; spinach, 75 cents a pound. . ."

He had interns from his office fan out and buy up lettuce, turnips, squash and other foodstuffs and plunked them all down on a table in front of Butz at the recent hearing, flanked by signs showing their price per pound.

Burke's finale was a tomato-thumping routine. Flourishing one of the pulpy red spheroids he shouted, "It looks like a tomato, it slices like a tomato—but it doesn't taste like one."

With that, he flung it down on the table. Instead of the expected "splat," the tomato in question, which had been rushed to harvest by one of the large corporate farming interests, "bounced like a baseball," according to a Burke aide who was present.

But it is a slow process, pushing a pet project through Congress, so Squire Burke repairs to Dorchester and Brother Arthur's back yard, where the sun goes down over a crop that includes "lettuce, tomatoes, string beans, butter beans, corn, squash, turnips—he grows everything."

EMERGENCY VISAS FOR SYRIAN JEWS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to authorize 5,000 special immigrant visas for Syrian Jews. And, to date, my bill has the eager support of 23 of my colleagues in Congress.

In my remarks made when this bill was first introduced, I noted that the few Jews left in Syria are subject to the worst forms of officially sponsored oppression and discrimination. Things are not getting any better for them. In fact, they are getting worse by the minute.

Just a few days ago, the Syrian Government secretly began the trial of two Jewish men who have been accused of killing two Jewish women. These women had been trying to escape from Syria, and their bodies had been found near the Syrian border. The men accused in these murders are related to the dead women. Stories coming from Syria are conclusive of the fact that this trial is trumped up, and just another in a long series of official acts of harassment against the remnants of the Syrian Jewish community.

In the past year or so, there have been a number of similar pieces of legislation, but this may be the first one with any real chance of helping the Jews in Syria. I have chosen this time to reintroduce it, because in a few days, President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger will be arriving in Syria. The United States is in a unique position to help these 4,500 men, women, and children, and we should do whatever we can to see to it that the Syrian Government acts humanely toward its Jewish citizens.

President Nixon is opposed to any interference in another nation's internal affairs, and this obviously includes matters concerning the treatment of religious minorities. He is against the United States doing anything to make it easier for Jews to get out of Russia. No doubt, he will be equally opposed to any efforts on our part to ease the burdens on the Jews of Syria.

But there is every reason for us to stretch out a hand of friendship and assistance to these people. We have won the trust of the Syrian Government. Now that peace with Israel has become a distinct possibility, the Syrian Government may stop looking on its Jews as enemy aliens, and be more willing to ease the restrictions on them and let them leave for other lands. The United States, as the major force behind the current moves toward peace, ought to do everything in her power to induce the Syrian Government to let the Jews emigrate. This is no more interfering in the internal affairs of another nation, than was Secre-

tary Kissinger's marathon efforts which produced the Israeli-Syrian cease-fire.

I have signed so many letters and cosponsored so many bills on the subject of Syrian Jewry that at times it seems like an endless succession. But I am finally confident that my efforts, and those of all my colleagues who have continued their support of Syrian Jewry, will not have been for nothing. The situation in the Mideast is changing. Peace is a likely prospect. We must be ready for that eventuality, and for the eventuality that Syria will let those Jews whom it now holds captive emigrate. My bill would open the doors of the United States for them, allowing them to taste the delicious fruits of freedom and to become contributing members of a society in which they will prosper and which will benefit greatly from their presence.

ELECTION OF CALVIN L. RAMPTON AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, it is with some local pride that I call the attention of the House to the fact that at Seattle, Wash., on June 5, 1974, Gov. Calvin L. Rampton of Utah was installed as Chairman of the National Governors' Conference. This is just recognition for a man who has served with great distinction as Governor of Utah and whose administration has been a model of integrity and accomplishment.

In an editorial on June 8, 1974, the Salt Lake Tribune stated:

The honor is obvious to anybody. But to those who have followed Gov. Calvin L. Rampton's career, this latest testimony to his administrative ability and political astuteness is especially appropriate.

As conference chairman Gov. Rampton will have added opportunity to demonstrate his talents on a national scale. He takes office at a time when states seem to be assuming more responsibility, both as a result of current federal policies and of Watergate-inflicted federal malaise.

Gov. Rampton is the right man at the right time. We are confident that under his administration the governors' conference will be revitalized and play an increasingly significant role in restoring public respect for public office.

In recent years the National Governors' Conference has grown in stature and is now recognized throughout the United States as a strong voice in matters of both local and national concern. During the past year significant legislation has been enacted by many States under the direction of the Conference in areas of tax reform, campaign financing and ethics, consumer protection, and sound fiscal management. States have expanded their traditional roles as leaders in creating open government, a trademark of Cal Rampton's philosophy as Governor of Utah. We can expect even greater support for this approach from the National Governors' Conference during the coming year. I am confident that Governor Rampton's leadership will stimulate even

greater achievements and that the Conference will play an expanding role in matters of public concern.

Governor Rampton was elected to his first term in November of 1964, becoming Utah's first Democratic Governor in 16 years. He was reelected in 1968 by the largest margin in the history of our State. In 1972 he was reelected to his current term, surpassing his own record for the biggest victory margin over an opponent, becoming Utah's first third-term Governor. He is well prepared for his new national responsibility as illustrated by the following accomplishments:

POSITION, COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION, AND YEARS

Chairman, Federation of Rocky Mountain States, 1970-71.

Vice-Chairman, Western Governors' Conference, 1968-69.

Chairman, Western Governors' Conference, 1969-70.

State Cochairman, Four Corners Regional Commission, 1971.

Member, Executive Com., National Governors' Conference, 1966-68, 1969-70.

Chairman, Education Commission of the States, 1967-68.

Chairman, Committee on Law Enforcement of the National Governors' Conference, 1969.

Chairman, Committee on Education of the National Governors' Conference, 1967-68.

Chairman, Committee on Management and Fiscal Affairs of the National Governors' Conference, 1971-present.

Chairman, Education Commission of the States Task Force on Early Childhood Development, 1970-present.

Member, Commission on Party Reform of the Democratic National Committee, 1970-71.

For 10 years in Utah we have been served by a Governor with a special commitment to the people of Utah. That commitment has been for the well-being of all Utah citizens, to all persuasions and to all political beliefs. That commitment has been for cleaner air and water and to protect the rights of future generations to enjoy our public properties and wilderness areas. That commitment has been for productive employment, for equal as well as quality education, and to stimulate the best in each of our citizens so that they can fulfill their greatest potential. That commitment includes listening with understanding to both the silent and the vocal, to those who are angry at our system, and to those who have committed themselves to the building of government operating on truth, honesty, and service.

These basic commitments Gov. Calvin L. Rampton made to the people of the State of Utah are now expanded to the people of the United States in his new role as Chairman of the National Governors' Conference.

A TRIBUTE TO COMMISSIONER GENERAL J. WELLES HENDERSON

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

man from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the International Exposition on the Environment, Expo '74, is currently being held in Spokane, Wash., and will continue through November 3, 1974. This event is the only internationally recognized exposition that will be held in the United States between now and our Bicentennial celebrations in 1976.

In addition, it is the first international exposition to be held in the United States since this country became a signatory in 1969 to the 1928 Convention on International Expositions, as amended. This international agreement establishes standards and conditions for international expositions and, along with the provisions of Public Law 91-269, which governs U.S. participation in such events, seeks to insure that every international exposition meets the highest standards of presentation and overall quality.

There has been a great deal of favorable comment regarding Expo '74 and its meeting of these stringent national and international standards. Although full credit is due to the citizens of Spokane and the local political and business and labor leadership of that community for conceiving and bringing into life Expo '74, its success as a truly international event must also in large measure be attributed to the extraordinary ability and skill of its first Commissioner General J. Welles Henderson, of Philadelphia, Pa.

As the official representative of our national effort, reflected so well in this remarkably dynamic and exciting exhibition, Commissioner General Henderson was charged with the obligation to both represent the U.S. Government and to guarantee the fulfillment of all its obligation toward the foreign participants, of which there are 10 including such major countries as the Soviet Union, Japan, Canada—including British Columbia and Alberta—Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Korea, the Republic of China and the Philippines faced an enormous task being appointed less than a year before Expo '74 was scheduled to open, but with characteristic determination and diplomatic skill he immediately set off on a number of international negotiating trips to bring together the foreign representation that was so essential to meeting the goals and obligations of Expo.

It is not exaggerating, I believe, to state that without his patience, depth of understanding and unique ability to resolve the many complex questions and issues involved in the decision of a foreign nation to officially participate in an international exposition, Expo '74 could not have been the success it is today.

This first step was, of course, only a beginning and that complex structural entity known as an international exposition had to be translated from paper commitments and proposed plans for participation into a reality, and the expertise that he demonstrated on the international scene now had to be transferred and translated into bringing about a major domestic event that is well on its way to attracting more than the originally estimated 4½ million visitors.

Expo '74 was officially opened on May 4 in ceremonies presided over by President and Mrs. Nixon and it was my pleasure to have been there on that day and witness at first hand the culmination of the remarkable efforts of Commissioner General Henderson, a man that I have come to admire and respect so much. I wish also to express my respect and admiration for Hannah Henderson, the charming wife of Commissioner General Henderson who has been so great and constant a help to him.

Commissioner General Henderson recently announced his decision to resign, for personal reasons, from his post and return to substantial professional, community and family obligations in Philadelphia. I am sure that I speak for the citizens of Spokane and his colleagues in the international community at Expo when I say that all those involved in the exposition owe him a good deal.

As an indication of the respect with which he is held by his colleagues who represent the other nations participating in Expo, I take great pleasure in inserting at this time a recent letter to the Commissioner General from the Honorable Patrick Reid, Commissioner General of Canada and the president of the College of Commissioners General at Expo '74:

COLLEGE OF COMMISSIONERS
GENERAL, THE INTERNATIONAL
EXPOSITION ON THE ENVIRONMENT,
Spokane, Wash., May 30, 1974.

MR. J. WELLES HENDERSON,
U.S. Commissioner General, The International Exposition on the Environment,
Spokane, Wash.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER GENERAL: It was with profound regret that the members of the College of Commissioners General learned of your decision to resign your appointment and leave Spokane. There has been universal admiration, and respect, for you, and for Mrs. Henderson, among the foreign staffs at Expo '74 and the news of your imminent departure has dismayed us all.

Perhaps because I have had the longest association with you, and because of the position I have the honour to hold, I am also well placed among my fellows to record that your personal contribution to the success of this exposition has been extraordinary. The strenuous activity of your staff has also been noted most favourably by the College, and we are well satisfied with the manner in which the international relations and protocol arrangements of the Office of the United States Commissioner General have been developed.

It is a mark of the excellence of your efforts that only a very few foreign Commissioners General realized the difficulties that faced you in endeavouring to follow the International Convention, and administer the General Regulations, when the organizational and financial structure of the exposition itself precluded you from the exercise of the sort of authority that might have been commensurate with your responsibility. I make reference to this now because it will be my duty to raise the jurisdictional issues involved when the report of the College of Commissioners General is made to the International Bureau of Exhibitions at the conclusion of Expo '74.

We hope sincerely that you can, in the days to come, look back on this period of intense activity as having been worthwhile in a personal sense. I can assure you, as a privileged

observer, that your public accomplishment has brought great credit both to yourself and to the Government of the United States. This sentiment was, as you know, expressed on at least two formal occasions, and was supported by all foreign Commissioners General. In appreciation of your tenure it is my intention to ask the College in due course to recognize your contribution in the same manner as would have been the case if you had been able to remain in office until November.

Yours sincerely,

PATRICK REID,
Commissioner General,
President of the College.

MR. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

MR. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington for yielding, and I wish to commend him for bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of the House.

I have had the privilege of flying in and out of Spokane, Wash., which is directly west of the first district of Idaho.

Many, many of my constituents have been telling me on recent trips in and out of the State of the fine expo that they have at Spokane. They keep asking me if I have been there. I have not yet, but I am looking forward this summer to doing it if I can get the cooperation of the Speaker to adjourn this body. Then I will have the pleasure of going there.

Again I wish to thank the gentleman from Washington for bringing this matter to our attention.

MR. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Idaho. I think very often we tend to underplay what is involved in an undertaking of this kind and the effort is not always appreciated. The work of Commissioner General Henderson has been an outstanding part in the success of Expo '74. I want, by this statement, to pay tribute to his efforts, skill, and ability. We in the Spokane area and the whole city of Spokane-Expo '74 will miss him and his charming wife.

SHAM STUDY

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

MR. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in 1971 Congress passed Public Law 92-318 which authorized \$300,000 for a study to be made of children's camps. This law was passed in place of the Youth Camp Safety Act to determine if Federal legislation is needed to regulate youth camps.

The report due March 1, 1973, was issued April 29, 1974, and was incomplete, faulty, and contradictory in documentation.

First, the survey conducted by the Center for Disease Control is too small to be considered statistically accurate—only 128 of the proposed 200 camps were actually surveyed.

Questionnaires were sent to 7,861 camps and only 42 percent replied. There was no attempt to check the accuracy of reports of illness, accidents, and deaths.

No reports were obtained from outside sources such as police and hospitals.

The survey itself clearly states that no conclusions could be drawn from the statistics compiled.

The Select Subcommittee on Labor, which I chair, has held hearings on youth camp safety legislation in 1968, 1969, 1971, and this year. These hearings have clearly demonstrated the need of the Federal Government to take the leadership to set basic minimum safety and health standards.

The following article from the Christian Science Monitor expresses that papers' opinion on this study:

CAMP SAFETY STANDARDS

In wasteful disregard of its obligation to the public and to Congress, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has paid nearly \$300,000 for a report on camp safety which is all but worthless. . . .

The report was an outgrowth of a camp safety bill which passed the Senate two years ago but was changed into a study during a House-Senate conference at the insistence of a Texas congressman. . . .

After pointing to all the inadequacies in present state laws and citing the deaths and injuries, the study comes to the conclusion that federal action is not needed. In brief, it says the job belongs to the states.

Of course the whole reason for the push to enact federal camp safety legislation arises from the fact that the states are not doing their job. . . .

The \$300,000 HEW blunder convinced us more than ever that adequate federal camp safety standards are needed and should be enacted into law during the current session of Congress.—Danbury (Conn.) News-Times.

CONGRESS MUST HELP LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY NOW

(Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

MR. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the cattle industry is rapidly approaching a crisis as production and imports remain high and the wholesale price received by farmers and ranchers is dropping drastically. Most housewives in America are not aware of this situation because they have not noticed any drop in retail prices. While the producer is suffering, lower prices are not being passed along to the consumer.

As usual, the hardest hit in this situation is the small-scale operator, who even during good times is relying upon the quirks of a complicated marketing process to make a decent profit. He is being drawn into an ever-tightening squeeze of soaring expenses and dropping income. Since 1971, the cost of feed has risen dramatically—corn is up 150 percent, hay up 75 percent, silage is up over 100 percent. Yet today the small-scale cattleman in Wyoming and other Western areas is getting just a little over half what he received last year for his animals.

I think the severity of the crisis we are facing is eloquently expressed by one of my constituents in one of the dozens of letters I have received about this problem. He writes:

I think the time has come that we must impress upon the minds of all our Congressmen that the small ranchers and perhaps bigger operators too, are in real trouble.

The cattle market is taking a drastic drop and all our expenses are going up. We are just not going to be able to meet our obligations.

Example: Our leases on all public lands are increasing in price every year and our cattle market is dropping to nearly half.

Fuel oil for our houses increased from 16 cents a gallon to 38½ cents. I think you should be trying to do something about this as well as propane.

Of course, gasoline has gone up considerably which is very essential in the ranching business today.

Fuel costs are very high. All repairs and materials that we must have to get by on have more than tripled in some cases.

I could mention many more things, but with all the same increase in cost.

How can we, the small operator with 125 cows, meet our obligations?

I am told that beef imports are playing a considerable part on our cattle market. If so, let's do something about it before it is too late.

Financially, I am scared and worried. On top of all these worries we are having a severe drought which looks now like a lot of people in Weston County will be forced to sell their cattle on this low market.

I am not smart enough to know the answers to these problems, but I do know if the small operator is going to exist something will have to happen soon.

Beef imports are up 6 percent during the first quarter of this year, increasing the domestic supply while our own producers are facing bankruptcy. Last week I introduced legislation to stop all beef imports for a 180-day period while wholesale prices are given a chance to stabilize.

Wholesale prices for feeder steers are down 27 percent in May on the Kansas City market compared to a year ago. Railhead prices in the West are down even farther as transportation costs climb.

With production forecasts for the summer and fall predicting a 9-percent increase over last year, the situation will not improve unless something is done now to restrict importation of beef.

Relief for the small operator is essential. That is why I am co-sponsoring legislation by my colleague Bob PRICE of Texas this week which will establish a program of low interest revolving 5-year loans for cattlemen hard hit by the cost squeeze. Those funds are desperately needed by many feedlot operators to replenish their stocks while they take momentous losses during this period of price instability.

BILL WOULD ELIMINATE SOCIAL SECURITY DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEN

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, sexual discrimination takes many forms: unequal pay for equal work, hiring and promoting men over women, and barring women from men's bars are but three examples.

While the majority of sex discrimination cases involve unfair treatment of women, occasionally an example of discrimination against men is uncovered. One such case represents a remnant of

the past, a useless and, indeed, unfair practice embodied in Federal law that should be excised.

The Social Security Act provides that if a husband and wife are both working and the husband dies, the wife automatically qualifies for social security benefits based on the higher of the two earnings histories. On the other hand, if a wife's earnings are higher than her surviving husband's, he does not automatically qualify for the higher benefit payment.

Today, all a widow need do to qualify for the higher benefit is file her claim at the nearest social security office and prove she is a widow. By contrast, if a widower seeks to receive benefits computed on the basis of his wife's higher income history, he must also prove that he was dependent upon his wife for over 50 percent of his support at the time she became eligible for social security benefits.

Other than in reliance upon principles long discredited, there is no reason why women should be considered by the Social Security Administration as inherently dependent, or why, unless he can prove otherwise, a man should be thought of automatically as the family breadwinner.

If one spouse is able to obtain higher benefits based on the earnings of the other spouse, both spouses should have that opportunity without any discriminatory tests being applied. To accomplish this goal, I am today introducing legislation to eliminate this form of discrimination against males in the social security law.

THE PRICE-ANDERSON ACT

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is at the markup stage in regard to legislation to modify and extend the Price-Anderson Insurance and Indemnity Act for nuclear powerplants. The purpose of this proposed legislation, as set forth in the administration's bill, H.R. 14408, introduced by request on April 25, and the Joint Committee's proposed modified bill, H.R. 15323, introduced by me on June 11, is to protect the public against personal and property losses in the unlikely event of a large nuclear accident.

The principal features of the proposed modification and extension are:

First. To phase out governmental indemnity by the early 1980's through a system of utility retrospective insurance premiums administered by insurance companies.

Second. To increase total coverage from \$560 million to \$1 billion and beyond as the number of reactors with commitments for retrospective premiums increases.

Third. Continuation of no fault and prompt payment features as to third party liability coverage.

Fourth. Inclusion under the act of floating nuclear powerplants and transportation between U.S. licensees via

routes which are partially outside the United States.

Fifth. Extension of the Price-Anderson Act, as modified, to 1997, with a study and report to Congress in 1987.

My colleagues and I received identical letters from a number of Members of the House and Senate urging postponement by the Joint Committee of its consideration of legislation extending and modifying the Price-Anderson Act. Postponement was urged on the grounds of lack of pressing need for this legislation and the desirability of awaiting completion of a safety related study by Dr. Norman Rasmussen of MIT. The committee has determined that it would not be in the national interest to delay consideration of the proposed legislation, and has scheduled an open markup session for 2 p.m. today.

The committee has requested the attendance of Dr. Rasmussen at the session, and he has expressed his willingness to answer further questions regarding the study under his direction and its relationship to the Price-Anderson Act. For your information, he testified before the Joint Committee on May 16, 1974, and provided the conclusions of this study and their indirect relationship to the Price-Anderson legislation.

It appears from the comments in the letter we have received that there may be some misunderstanding regarding the circumstances and background of this legislation. The \$2 million Rasmussen study is a part of the ongoing \$100 million safety research program conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission. As such it is not directly related to the Price-Anderson legislation, any more so than any of the other studies which make up the program.

There is a common misconception that since the Price-Anderson Act will not expire until 1977, there is no need for immediate action. This is not the case. A 60- to 90-day delay beyond the date of release of the Rasmussen study, followed by further hearings, would effectively preclude action during this Congress. Since the leadtimes for construction permits for nuclear powerplants range from 2 to 4 years, depending on a number of factors, uncertainty on extension of the Price-Anderson Act until mid-1975 could create a significant disruption in utility planning.

The effect of postponement could be as much as a 25-percent shift in orders by utilities from nuclear to coal- and oil-fired plants. These fuels, as you know, are in short supply and have undergone severe price increases which may be further exacerbated, and create significant environmental problems. For these reasons the committee does not feel it is prudent to delay consideration of the bill without compelling reasons. The committee does not consider the schedule for the Rasmussen study a significant enough factor to warrant delay.

The committee has heard testimony on the preliminary results of the Rasmussen study. Professor Rasmussen himself stated on May 16, 1974:

I believe that the proposal before you represents a reasonable way to phase out the Government responsibility for nuclear insurance and shift the responsibility to the

insurance companies and the nuclear industry. I believe that the current 560 million dollar limit is a reasonable value at this time and will cover all combinations of circumstances which can reasonably be considered credible.

The preliminary results of the study indicate that the probabilities of severe nuclear incidents are much less than had previously been thought. Thus the protection afforded by the current Price-Anderson Act is even more all-embracing than was anticipated. The study is now in the report preparation stage. Thus any significant change from these preliminary findings is highly unlikely.

The draft of the report will undoubtedly be the subject of intensive review and comment by interested parties. It will be many months before a "final" report is published, and even this final version will be subject to continuous updating and refinement as new engineering data and operating experience develop. The subject of nuclear reactor safety will never be a closed book so long as reactors are operated. The committee cannot await a final definitive analysis to act. The costs in terms of potential energy shortages would be too high.

The committee held public hearings on the possible modification or extension of the Price-Anderson Act on January 31, March 27 and 28, 1974, and hearings on H.R. 14408, S. 3254, and S. 3452 were held on May 9, 10, 14, 15, and 16, 1974. An informal planning committee, drawn from the Joint Committee staff, the Atomic Energy Commission, the legal profession, the commercial power and insurance industries, and public citizen groups, assisted the committee and staff in regard to the scope of the hearings and potential witnesses.

The following witnesses from the Atomic Energy Commission appeared before the Joint Committee to present testimony or to assist in the development of the record:

LIST OF WITNESSES

Dr. Dixy Lee Ray, Chairman; William O. Doub, Commissioner; Marcus Rowden, General Counsel; L. Manning Muntzing, Director of Regulation; and Jerome Saltzman, Deputy Chief, office of Antitrust and Indemnity, Directorate of Licensing.

Other witnesses who appeared one or more times are:

Elmer Dee Anderson, Private citizen, Valparaiso, Indiana.

Dr. W. H. Arnold, Jr., General Manager, PWR Systems Division, Westinghouse Electric Company.

George K. Bernstein, Federal Insurance Administrator, HUD.

Arthur C. Gehr, Atomic Industrial Forum.

Frank P. Grad, Director, Legislative Drafting Research Fund, Columbia University.

Harold P. Green, Professor of Law, National Law Center, George Washington University.

Gerald R. Hartman, Professor of Insurance and Risk, Temple University.

Joseph F. Hennessey, Dechhoefer, Snapp and Trippe, Washington, D.C.

Larry Hobart, General Manager, American Public Power Association.

Mrs. Judith H. Johnsrud, Central Pennsylvania Committee on Nuclear Power.

Dr. Chauncey Kepford, York, Pennsylvania, representing the Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power.

Hubert H. Nexon, Senior Vice-President, Commonwealth Edison Company, representing Edison Electric Institute.

Norman C. Rasmussen, Department of Nuclear Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Charles A. Robinson, Jr., Corporate Counsel, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Miss Laurie R. Rockett, Greenbaum, Wolff and Ernst, New York City, New York.

Ms. Ann Roosevelt, New York, on behalf of Friends of the Earth.

Richard A. Schmalz, Hartford Insurance Group, representing Nuclear Electric Liability Insurance Association.

Chauncey Starr, Electric Power Research Institute.

Mark Swann, New Park, Pennsylvania.

Martin Victor, VP and Secretary, Babcock & Wilcox Company.

Richard Walker, Partner, Arthur Andersen & Company.

Bruce L. Welch, Director Environmental Studies, Friends Medical Science Research Center, Inc.

We concluded from this exhaustive inquiry that prompt action is required, and that the conclusions of the Rasmussen study are sufficiently well understood insofar as their application to this legislation that there is no need for delay. I urge you to join with us in supporting prompt action on the extension and modification of the Price-Anderson Act.

BISHOP ZUROWESTE, OF BELLEVILLE, ILL., DIOCESE, OBSERVES 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION AS PRIEST

(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, last week marked the 50th anniversary of the ordination of the Most Reverend Albert R. Zuroweste, D.D., bishop of the diocese of Belleville, Ill.

Bishop Zuroweste was ordained to the priesthood on June 8, 1924, and has served the Belleville-East St. Louis area for half a century. Among his many duties, Bishop Zuroweste has served as administrator of St. John's Children's Home and Central Catholic High School, editor of the Messenger, the diocesan newspaper, and pastor of St. Joseph's Church, East St. Louis.

For the past 26 years Bishop Zuroweste has served as the head of the diocese of Belleville, encompassing 28 counties in southern Illinois. During this time he has turned his organizational talents to the good of the entire area, constructing new schools, a new orphanage, and an inner-city ministry designed to specifically aid in the solution of problems encountered by lower income families.

Bishop Zuroweste may look back on these 50 years as time well spent in the service of God and man. Perhaps the following article and editorial which appeared in the June 7, 1974, edition of the Messenger best show the esteem and respect in which Bishop Zuroweste is held:

FIFTY GOLDEN YEARS

Bishop Zuroweste completes 50 years as a priest of God. Those of us who have been privileged to observe this priest in action raise our hearts in gratitude to God for the fact that we have known him.

God's book of eternity records his priestly life in the golden script of heaven's charm. For our part we have stood in admiration

and amazement at the indefatigable capacity for work he has displayed. Lesser men would have tired under the strain, but God has blessed us with a courageous man who met smilingly every new trial, every new difficulty and every new challenge.

His accomplishments as priest and Bishop are reviewed elsewhere in today's issue. It is no surprise that in the Providence of God he should be chosen to become a member of the college of successors of the Apostles. We, priests and laity, are grateful to God that he was named to shepherd the flock in his home Diocese of Belleville.

Filled with the warmth of the Holy Spirit, Bishop Zuroweste has diffused about him in a very practical way the charity of God, which is the Holy Spirit. As he celebrates his golden anniversary in the priesthood, the people of God in the Diocese implore through our Blessed Mother that God give him many more years to enjoy the work of the priesthood which he has so brightly illuminated.

HIGHLIGHTS OF BISHOP'S 50 YEARS

The coincidence of Bishop Zuroweste's jubilees in consecutive years (25 as bishop in 1973 and 50 as priest in 1974) created a two-fold opportunity for The Messenger to honor our Chief Shepherd and his ministries in the Diocese. Accordingly, our special edition of last year was devoted mainly to his 25 years in the administration of the diocese. This week's special pages give prominence to the years from seminary, through ordination and his many priestly duties until his elevation to the bishopric of Belleville in 1947.

The third bishop of Belleville was born April 26, 1901 in East St. Louis, the son of the late Henry and Elizabeth (Holten) Zuroweste. He was baptized in St. Henry Church.

Albert and his two sisters attended St. Joseph school; the family home for many years was at 1747 College avenue. His sisters are Charlotte, wife of Dr. Thomas E. Prosser II of Fairview Heights, and Esther, wife of Lawrence Prosser of Belleville. Another sister, Viola, died in 1914 at age of 10.

Mr. Zuroweste died in 1945 and Mrs. Zuroweste died in 1969 at the age of 98.

SEMINARY YEARS

The bishop-to-be spent four years in prep at Quincy College, Quincy, Ill., then the six-year major seminary course at Kenrick, St. Louis, in four years. He was accepted for ordination at age 23, three years younger than the usual norm.

Ordination day was June 8, 1924, for the largest class to receive Holy Orders in the episcopate of the late Bishop Henry Althoff. Members with Father Zuroweste were Msgr. John Fallon, Father Joseph Feldman, Msgr. Raymond Harbaugh, Father Francis Hodapp, Father Bernard Loepker, Father Lee Mondt, Father Leo Schloss, and Father William Wigmann.

Father Hodapp is the only living classmate of the bishop; he lives in retirement in Carlyle and plans a jubilee mass there.

FIRST ASSIGNMENTS

Father Zuroweste began his ministry July 2, 1924 as assistant at St. Joseph, East St. Louis. During these years he found time to serve as county juvenile parole officer, chaplain of the Knights of Columbus, and director-founder of a new Catholic young adult group, the Newman Club. He also was chaplain at Christian Welfare Hospital.

In June, 1931 the young priest was named administrator of St. John Orphanage near Belleville. In his four-year assignment he made major improvements to the physical plant, including the first all-electric lights, and introduced more modern institutional methods. The young director worked with child guidance and social service authorities to improve the education and care of the homeless.

Concurrent with the orphanage work was the pastoral ministry to Corpus Christi parish, Shiloh.

EDITS "THE MESSENGER"

Bishop Althoff chose Father Zuroweste to edit "The Messenger" in 1934, by arrangement with the owners, Buechler Publishing Co. of Belleville. The "parish plan" of subscriptions, still in operation, was evolved at this time to bring the Catholic publication in all homes. Belleville was one of the first dioceses to implement such a program.

Father Zuroweste was given another major charge late in 1935, to be administrator of the founding Central Catholic High at Seventh and Illinois avenue, East St. Louis, in the former (but enlarged) St. Patrick school, rectory and convent. He took up residence there, and continued editing The Messenger for the Belleville publisher.

As administrator, Father Zuroweste worked with the Brothers of Mary who conducted Central. His assignment was to supervise the business and finances and to develop the high school into a deanery-wide institution.

Early in 1937 Father Zuroweste completed arrangements with Bishop Althoff and Buechler company—which was discontinuing all periodical publishing—for the Diocese to acquire name and ownership of the paper. A contract for mechanical work was made with the East St. Louis Journal. Priest and lay staffers were added to carry out the publishing work.

PASTOR OF HOME PARISH

Still a third and concurrent assignment came to Father Zuroweste in October, 1940, the pastorate of St. Joseph Church, East St. Louis. Father moved his residence to the parish at this time.

During this same decade the young priest's ministries extended into diocesan and community projects: board member of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine with the responsibility of conducting summer vacation religion schools, establishing a state-recognized Catholic Charities office (1945) Community Fund-War Chest chairman and campaign director, arbitrator and mediator of union labor-management affairs, and the work of the Child Guidance Bureau.

Supplementing his communication ministry as editor, Father Zuroweste founded the "Catholic Hour" on East St. Louis' station WTMV and for seven years directed a program of news, editorials and seasonal devotions.

"EXTRA-CURRICULAR" WORK

As a diocesan editor he was associated with the national Catholic Press Association and served this professional group in regional and national offices. Also coupled with his press work was the assignment to the Catholic Legion of Decency and the National Organization for Decent Literature.

Associated with his assignment in the Catholic Charities office was the chaplaincy of the Queen's Daughters of East St. Louis, charitable group dating back to the turn of the century.

What time was left in his schedule was given to fraternalism and offices as chaplain and friar in both the Third Degree and Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus, and fulfilling speaking and preaching engagements for retreats, Tre Ores, Novenas, Missions, Forty Hours, etc. He was known as a young priest with a talent for hard work and long hours. And there were many groups and parishes that sought to help him maintain this reputation!

NAMED BISHOP OF BELLEVILLE

Father Zuroweste was honored by Pope Pius XII in 1945 by being named a Monsignor in recognition of his extraordinary works.

Bishop Althoff died in July, 1947 and for five months the Diocese awaited the Holy Father's decision. Many names were mentioned—but on December 2, 1947, midnight radio news from Washington, D.C. relayed the Apostolic Delegate's announcement that Albert Rudolph Zuroweste was to be the third bishop of Belleville.

The bishop-elect selected the Feast of St. Francis de Sales, patron of the Catholic Press for his consecration day (now termed "episcopal ordination"). One day prior, by church law, Msgr. Zuroweste took up residence in the Chancery Office, 222 South Third street and assumed formal leadership of the Diocese. (He resided here for a number of years before purchasing the present home at 925 Centerville avenue).

CONSECRATION DAY, JANUARY 29

A former Cathedral pastor, now bishop of Peoria, Most Rev. Joseph H. Schlarman was the consecrating prelate, assisted by St. Louis' Auxiliary John P. Cody (now Cardinal Archbishop of Chicago) and another former Cathedral pastor, Most Rev. Joseph M. Mueller, Bishop of Sioux City, Iowa (now retired and living in Sioux City). The sermon for the day was preached by the late Bishop James A. Griffin of the neighboring diocese of Springfield, Ill.

It was a cold, blustery day, but a gala one as the Diocese of Belleville, for the third time, received a native-son as Chief Shepherd.

FIRST YEARS

After the usual civic and church receptions and welcomes, the new Bishop set to work organizing his Chancery Office and planning for the future.

Among the "firsts" of 1948 recorded in The Messenger's files are:

Confirmation: St. Peter's Cathedral, March 23.

School Dedication: St. Martin's, Washington Park, April 2.

Ordination: Father Paul Stauder, May 22.

New Parishes: Caseyville and Anna, raised from mission status.

Diocesan Event: Presided at Eucharistic Congress, Johnston City, May 30.

New Organizations: Established the vocation committee, Diocesan Resettlement Council, aided development of the East St. Louis Serra Club, encouraged expansion of the Te Deum lecture program to include an East St. Louis chapter, and formed the Cana and Pre-Cana marriage prep courses.

First State Offices: Illinois K. of C. chaplain; spiritual director of Catholic Knights and Ladies of Illinois.

OTHER EARLY-YEAR FIRSTS

Dedication of new church: Holy Angels, East St. Louis, 1950.

Completion of King's House building and retreat program, 1951.

First National office: president of Catholic Rural Life, 1950.

First new parish: St. Albert the Great, Fairview, 1951.

Dedication of his first major diocesan project, St. John Orphanage buildings, 1952.

INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL OFFICES

Bishop Zuroweste's association with national groups brought state, national and international recognition to him and to the Diocese of Belleville.

He served as State Chaplain of the Knights of Columbus for 20 years and was named Knight of the Year in 1963.

In 1950 our Bishop was elected president of the National Catholic Rural Life. In this capacity he presided at national meetings for eight years, led delegations to the Vatican, Colombia and Panama for international congresses.

His work as editor-journalist culminated in a series of national Press Chairmanships with the National Catholic Welfare Conference (forerunner of U.S. National Conference of Catholic Bishops). He was assistant Episcopal Chairman for the next five years.

Bishop Zuroweste served on the board of governors of the Catholic Church Extension Society (home mission administration).

VATICAN II DUTIES

His roles in Vatican Council II began prior to the formal sessions. In 1960 he was named to the council's preparatory commission for

the proposed Media of Social Communications documents, and made several trips to the Vatican for these meetings. In the council years (1962-1965) he headed a five-bishop public relations liaison panel for English speaking newsmen and helped establish briefing panels, a service highly regarded by correspondents.

In more recent years, as the NCWC was reorganized and the bishops administration was restructured, Bishop Zuroweste was elected in the new popular balloting as consultant to the Press Department; he also was elected to the committee on Election of Bishops and Boundaries of Dioceses.

For the past four years he has served as episcopal advisor of the National Catholic Stewardship Council, a recently formed group representing some 40 dioceses, for the purpose of interchanging information pertaining to financial support of parishes and diocese.

In 1972 the bishop accepted the invitation of the International Daughters of Isabella to serve as their Spiritual Director.

DIOCESAN DEVELOPMENT UNDER BISHOP ZUROWESTE

The King's House of Retreats' campaign, inaugurated shortly before Bishop Althoff's death, was accelerated by Bishop Zuroweste and the "spiritual powerhouse of the diocese" was dedicated in July, 1951. It is truly a diocesan center serving men, women, clergy and religious and high school youth.

The post World War II years found most parishes sorely in need of new physical facilities. Bishop Zuroweste established the Diocesan Building Fund to assist in hundreds of projects, particularly new schools and the 100,000 mark. Nearly every parish in the diocese conducted some construction project in this era.

St. John's Children's Home, the former orphanage on Shiloh Road, was the first major project completely supervised by the bishop. The buildings were dedicated in 1952; St. John's continues to fill specific charitable demands.

New parishes founded to fulfill the needs in the expanding suburban areas included St. Albert the Great and Our Lady of the Assumption in Fairview Heights; St. Augustine of Canterbury and Our Lady Queen of Peace in west Belleville, St. Catherine of Labour, Cahokia, the development of the St. Stephen Mission in Caseyville to full parish status. In the rural areas Fort Gage also became an independent parish and a mission was formed far to the south of Ullin.

In East St. Louis, due to the population shift, downtown parishes were closed or consolidated with their neighbors—St. Mary, St. Elizabeth and St. Augustine and St. Cyril, Sacred Heart and St. Adalbert were combined.

Most recent development to diocesan administration was the purchase of the building at 5312 West Main street, Belleville, as a new diocesan chancery, replacing the antiquated quarters at 222 South Third Street.

STEWARDSHIP RESPONSIBILITY

In the earlier years of the bishop's administration several diocesan-wide and district fund raising campaigns were successfully concluded: King's House, the Orphanage, Newman Center at Carbonale, high school construction in Belleville, East St. Louis, Clinton County and West Deanery, and Catechetical center in the eastern and southern areas.

A natural outgrowth of this development of Stewardship Responsibility was the founding in 1966 of Diocesan Development Fund (later changed to Diocesan Services Appeal) to support agencies operating at the diocesan level. These agencies include the district high schools, seminaries, vocation office, clergy retirement, Religious Education Office, CYO Catholic Social Service, Pro-life, Inner-City, Guatemala mission and

others. The People of God have responded well to underwriting these activities.

The much-needed improvement and renovation of the Cathedral, was completed for Christmas, 1968. The stately edifice is truly a Mother Church for the Diocese.

Meredith Home in Belleville is a living memorial to the charity of the late Florence E. Meredith. The former Hotel Belleville provides a home for nearly 100 residents.

The Guatemala Missions in El Progreso were developed as adopted parishes following the plea of Pope John to the Western World in 1960. For many years priests of the Diocese served directly as administrators. Today the Missions still are under the direction of the Diocese and help the People of God fulfill their obligations to the Latin neighbors.

ADVANCES IN EDUCATION

Bishop Zuroweste's concern for children and youth has been in the forefront of most of plans for the Diocese. During his 50 years of service he has witnessed and participated in the tremendous school growth since his year of ordination, reaching a peak attendance of some 20,000 students in the mid-1960's. Both elementary and secondary development blossomed throughout the Diocese. In more recent years the trend has been downward but the annual decrease now is slight and stabilizing.

While the numbers are not as impressive, the quality of education maintained and advanced has kept Catholic Education a prime prerequisite for Catholic parish life. In the late 1960's there seemed hope for both federal and state parochial school aid. But the Supreme Court decrees have determined that such assistance, if any, will be slight. But... rather than having an adverse effect, this rebuff has made parents, teachers, pastors and bishop more determined to continue Catholic Education, sacrifices notwithstanding.

Major improvements directed by the bishop in recent years include the establishment of the diocesan board and parish boards to assist an enlarged diocesan school office.

The Religious Education Office, operating at the tri-level of elementary, secondary and adult programs, is well established with its own office and staff.

The Newman program at the college level, established years ago at SIU Carbondale, in recent years has led to the formation of plans for supportive religious activity at the Area College level as well.

The Catholic Youth Organization (CYO), little more than a name in the 1940's, has been developed in most areas of the diocese, offering spiritual, cultural and athletic programs for youth.

Scouting for boys and girls is another area in which the bishop's appointed leaders have made noteworthy advances. The annual Diocesan Scout Sunday has become a popular tradition.

Camp Ondessonk was inaugurated unofficially in 1958 when Bishop Zuroweste authorized a "search" for a site. The camp was dedicated in 1960 and in the years since has offered outdoor education and recreation to many thousands of youth.

INNER-CITY PROGRAMS

With the change in Catholic population centers in recent years, particularly in East St. Louis, the diocese participates in a new mission to assist parishes and schools where dwindling Catholic population results in financial hardships. The bishop through DSA and other diocesan sources has supplied funds for maintenance of schools and parish buildings and money for teachers' salaries and buses for school children.

In Cairo, during the later years of St. Mary Hospital administration by the Holy Cross Sisters, the Diocese also rendered assistance there. The Cairo Recreation Com-

mittee, a biracial group, was another benefactor.

SPIRITUAL LIFE

In the period from 1924 until 1948 the Church's spiritual life and external practices changed little. Vatican Council II, decreed by Pope John and conducted by Pope Paul, instituted many liturgical changes. Bishop Zuroweste has adopted every such liturgy change authorized and in some instances the Belleville Diocese was well in the forefront of those adopting renewal features.

The Mass and Sacraments became more meaningful as participation and use of the vernacular became universal.

THE PRIESTHOOD

As today's page one editorial states, the priests are the emissaries of the bishop in the administration of a diocese. To bring the clergy into closer participation with the work of the Chief Shepherd, the Priests' Senate was established in 1966 to serve as counseling body to assist the bishop by research, study and recommendations in a wide range of areas.

The Personnel Board, appointed by the bishop, is an advisory board, apart from the Senate, to assist the bishop in clergy assignments.

As early as 1948 the bishop established a vocation recruiting program with the appointment of a director and his "Twelve Apostles." Today the Diocese has a full-time director and a clergy team to carry on this work, assisted by the Serra Club of St. Clair County—founded in 1951 (in East St. Louis) and 1959 (in Belleville).

Monetary concerns beset all administrators. To give the people of the diocese an opportunity to assist in defraying expenses of seminary training, the Diocesan Priesthood Bursary was formed in 1951. Only the earnings of the burses are expended annually; thus the contributions are living memorials.

St. Henry Prep Seminary, formerly operating on a six-year program (prep and junior college) in recent years changed to the "4-4-4" plan; that is high school, college, major seminary, with St. Henry's providing the high school training.

ROLE OF THE LAITY

Possibly the greatest change in the Church, other than in the Liturgical Renewal, has been the sharing of responsibility by the laity.

Bishop Zuroweste time and again has responded to this later-day assistance. The Diocesan Finance Committee, to advise in regard to fiscal policy; the diocesan boards for education, communications, social service, the seminary, scouting, Camp Ondessonk, CYO, and the encouragement of parish councils operating in much the same manner and for the same purpose all have been formed to bring the people and the diocesan headquarters into a closer working relationship.

In addition to these central bodies, a great variety of lay groups function in specific commitments to carry out programs of education, charity, or fraternalism working closely with the Diocese in these regards: the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, the Knights of Columbus, Diocesan Pro-Life Committee, Daughters of Isabella, Catholic Daughters of America, the Newman Auxiliary, the King's House League for Women, Guatemala Mission Society, Ancient Order of Hibernians and Auxiliary, Catholic War Veterans and Auxiliary, St. Henry Seminary Auxiliary, Serra Clubs, St. Vincent de Paul Societies, King's House League for Men, Holy Name Societies, Third Order of St. Francis and the Catholic Physicians and Dentists Guild, the Legion of Mary.

Fraternal groups, too, have their place in the Catholic Life of the Diocese: Catholic Knights and Ladies of Illinois and Western

Catholic Union, combining insurance and Catholic works.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Messenger, privately founded in 1907, was established as the diocesan publication under Father Zuroweste's direction in 1937.

The Catholic Hour founded by Msgr. Leonard Bauer on Belleville's WIBV in 1947, continues to bring the Word of God to radio listeners on Sunday afternoons.

The latest development in communications is the appointment last month of Father Richard Mohr, Albert Jerome and James Blazine to the Diocesan Communications Commission to further develop media use on a diocesan level.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL SERVICE

Fifty years ago works of charity were carried on at the parish level by groups such as the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and individual priests who gave marriage counseling or assisted in adoptions and placement of homeless children. St. John's Orphanage, from near the turn of the century, has been the diocesan shelter for child care.

In more recent years the Diocese realized the need for a central agency. Bishop Althoff commissioned the forming of Diocesan Catholic Charities and Father Zuroweste completed this work in 1947 when the state department of Illinois licensed his office for adoptive and foster child placements.

Today, under a new title but with the same aims and purposes, Catholic Social Services is an important adjunct to Catholic Life. Staffed by professional personnel, the East St. Louis, Belleville and Marion offices provide marriage and family counseling, assistance to unwed mothers, and adoptive and foster home care. Recently, with the advent of liberalized abortion laws, Pro-Life has become another major facet in CSS programs.

SINCE JANUARY, 1947

Of special note in Bishop Zuroweste's 26th year and the beginning of his 27th year as head of the Diocese are the following developments:

A strong re-emphasis on Catholic Education: with the issue of "parochialism" becoming more and more of a dim hope, Catholics rallied to support their system of education. . . . A diocesan Pro-life Committee was formed in June, 1973 to combat the effects of the January-1973 Supreme Court decision which greatly liberalized abortion. . . . Bishop Zuroweste approved plans to consolidate Assumption High and St. Teresa Academy, East St. Louis. . . . The program of Newman for Catholics on secular college campuses was extended to Area Colleges. . . . An office building at 5312 West Main street, purchased for Diocesan Chancery headquarters was occupied late in 1973. . . . Four young men were ordained to the Priesthood in January, 1974, thus a total of ten new priests joined the Diocesan Ministry during the Bishop's golden jubilee year. . . . The Catholic Communications Commission was established. . . . The first lay deacon-aspirant, John Dilley of Trenton, was received in the Ministry of Reader. . . . Another highlight of the jubilee year is inauguration this June of the Summer Theological Courses at Saint Louis U. of School of Divinity for a group of priests from the Diocese. This will be an integral phase of the Continuing Education of the Clergy program.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. RANGEL (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GUYER (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for June 17, 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. HUDNUT), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, for 45 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. McDADE, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. CRANE, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 60 minutes on June 19, 1974.

Mr. MICHEL, for 60 minutes on June 19, 1974.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. DRINAN, for 15 minutes today.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 15 minutes today.

Mr. FULTON, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. UDALL, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. PODELL, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, for 5 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter in three instances.

Mr. BENITEZ notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$992.75.

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

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. McEWEN in six instances.

Mr. STEELMAN.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. KETCHUM.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. MICHEL in three instances.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. ARCHER in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. DERWINSKI in five instances.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina.

Mr. BROZMAN.

Mr. MIZELL in five instances.

Mr. SNYDER in two instances.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. GUYER.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio.

Mr. KEMP in six instances.

Mr. MILLER in three instances.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. MYERS.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. THONE in two instances.

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. PARRIS.

Mr. ASHEROOK in two instances.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. DRINAN in 10 instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming in 10 instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. METCALFE.

Mr. REID.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. VIGORITO.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. DORN in three instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. OWENS in five instances.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. DANIELSON in two instances.

Mr. FAUNTROY in five instances.

Ms. SCHROEDER.

Mr. GINN.

Mr. CLARK.

Mr. ST GERMAIN.

Mr. REES.

Mr. HAYS.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. MANN in 10 instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

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

S. 1865. An act to authorize and encourage establishment of, and to render assistance to, environmental centers in the several States and regions of the Nation, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

S. 3523. An act to establish a National Commission on Supplies and Shortages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 17, 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:

2450. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on loan, guarantee, and insurance transactions supported by Eximbank to Yugoslavia, Romania, the U.S.S.R., and Poland during April 1974; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2451. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1154(d)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2452. A letter from the Assistant to the Governor of the Canal Zone, transmitting a revised draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to prescribe regulations relating to the purchase, possession, consumption, use, and transportation of alcoholic beverages in the canal zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2453. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improving administration of the uniform plan of health insurance for Federal employees who retired before July 1, 1960; 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. PERKINS: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14354 (Rept. No. 93-1104). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14723. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 to change the date on which the President must report to Congress concerning Government assisted services to rural areas (Rept. No. 93-1105). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 15296. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to carry out a program to assist persons from disadvantaged backgrounds to undertake training for the legal profession (Rept. No. 93-1106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7917. A bill to provide minimum disclosure standards for written consumer product warranties against defect or malfunction; to define minimum

Federal content standards for such warranties; to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act in order to improve its consumer protection activities; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 15404. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary; and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1176. Resolution waiving points of order against certain provisions contained in H.R. 15404. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1109). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14992. A bill to continue domestic food assistance programs, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOOREHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. MINISE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COTTER, Mr. STARK, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 15361. A bill to establish a program of community development block grants, to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. BURGNER, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 15362. A bill to establish a program of community development block grants, to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 15363. A bill to establish a District of Columbia Community Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. DORN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DENT, Mr. EHLBERG, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. MARAZITI):

H.R. 15364. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide hospital and medical care to certain members of the Armed Forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr.

MURTHA, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 15365. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide hospital and medical care to certain members of the Armed Forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 15366. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide service pension to certain veterans of World War I and pension to the widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 15367. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that cooperative housing corporations and condominium owners' or homeowners' associations will not be taxed on receipt of membership income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15368. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service under the civil service retirement system certain periods of service performed in the employ of the United States by persons before becoming U.S. citizens; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ERLÉNBOERN (for himself and Mr. MEYERS):

H.R. 15369. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, and title 18, United States Code, to reform Federal election activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 15370. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 15371. 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 Mrs. GRIFFITHS (for herself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WIGGINS, and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.R. 15372. A bill to amend the act to incorporate Little League Baseball to provide that the league shall be open to girls as well as to boys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 15373. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the exemption for purposes of the Federal estate tax from \$60,000 to \$120,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 15374. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 15375. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress, and to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 15376. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the revocation or suspension of registration of practitioners who furnish maintenance or detoxification treatment without being registered to do so; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 15377. 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. LUKEN (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 15378. A bill to provide for public ownership of all documents prepared for or by any elected Federal official in connection with the performance of the duties of such official; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 15379. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of educational assistance allowances; to provide for the payment of tuition, the extension of educational assistance entitlement, acceleration of payment of educational assistance allowances, and expansion of the work-study program; to establish a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center and a Vietnam Era Advisory Committee; and to otherwise improve the educational and training assistance program for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 15380. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for regular physical examinations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 15381. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself and Mr. BOWEN):

H.R. 15382. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to provide for emergency loans to certain producers and processors whose livestock and poultry have been condemned because of chemical contamination; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. WYDLER, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. REES, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOOREHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BELL, Mr. KEMP, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 15383. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 15384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for annual adjustments in the amount of personal exemptions and the amount of the standard deduction to reflect increases in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SARASIN (for himself, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 15385. A bill to amend the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 to allow adequate time for citizen participation in public hearings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 15386. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide an exemption from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of that act for certain full-time babysitters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr.

CONTE, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H.R. 15387. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 15388. A bill to amend the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 to authorize additional funds to restore fisheries affected by resource disasters to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 15389. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, hurricanes, large thunderstorms, and other types of short-term weather phenomena, and to develop methods for predicting, detecting, and monitoring such atmospheric behavior; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina:

H.R. 15390. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to insure that no State will be apportioned less than 80 per centum of its tax contribution to the Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 15391. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the special dependency requirements for entitlement to husband's and widower's insurance benefits, so that such benefits will be payable on the same basis as benefits for wives and widows; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENITEZ (for himself, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. DE LUCA):

H.R. 15392. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate family planning services and supplies from the ceiling presently imposed on the total amount of Federal payments which may be made to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam in any fiscal year under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 15393. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to require that information relating to foreign travel by Members of Congress be open to public inspection and published periodically in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 15394. A bill to authorize the provision of assistance to foreign countries in exchange for strategic or critical raw materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUNTER:

H.R. 15395. A bill requiring studies to be made prior to leasing Outer Continental for oil drilling or exploration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 15396. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that condominium owners' or homeowners' associations will not be taxed on receipt of membership income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself, Mr.

CONTE, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, and Mr. STEED):

H.R. 15397. A bill to authorize the provision of assistance to foreign countries in exchange for strategic or critical raw materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 15398. A bill to provide assistance for community planning needs required by development of mineral resources for energy production and to amend the procedure specified in the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 relating to royalties paid on shale oil produced on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 15399. A bill to establish a Commission on Economic and Natural Resources Planning in the executive branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 15400. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency replacement payments to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increases in such benefits, to insure that all beneficiaries receive such increases, to prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits in limited circumstances directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third-party payee), to provide for expeditious action on applications for benefits, to amend eligibility requirements for separated spouses, to allow judicial review of eligibility determinations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 15401. A bill to provide for adequate reserves of certain agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 15402. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 15404. A bill asking appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H.J. Res. 1059. Joint resolution to establish

the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.J. Res. 1060. Joint resolution to designate July 1974 as "July Belongs to Blueberries Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS:

H. Con. Res. 538. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. Con. Res. 539. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the annexation of the Baltic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 540. Concurrent resolution for negotiations on the Turkish opium ban; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H. Con. Res. 541. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H. Con. Res. 542. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. Res. 1172. Resolution to condemn terrorist killings of schoolchildren in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 1173. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the participation of the United States in an international effort to reduce the risk of famine and to lessen human suffering; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 1174. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. SARASIN, and Mr. STEELMAN):

H. Res. 1175. Resolution providing for television and radio coverage of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on any resolution to impeach the President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. KASTENMEIER introduced a bill (H.R. 15403) for the relief of Marlin Toy Products, Inc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, June 13, 1974

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

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

Our Father, we do not pray for easy lives, but that we may be strong "to bear the strain of toil and fret of care." We do not pray for tasks equal to our powers, but for powers equal to our tasks. Trans-

figure every duty, great or small, into service to Thee. May we give love, comradeship, and assistance to all with whom we work. Grant us new power, enduring faith, and abiding joy this day that we may "more perfectly love Thee and magnify Thy holy name."

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of

the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 12, 1974, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.