



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 17, 1974

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

Unto thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul. Let integrity and uprightness preserve me; for I wait on Thee.—Psalm 25: 1, 12.

*Lord of all being, throned afar,
Thy glory flames from sun and star;
Center and soul of every sphere,
Yet to each living heart how near.”*

Our Father God, we pray that Thy blessing may rest upon the Members of this House of Representatives helping them to make decisions wisely and justly for the welfare of our people. Grant that they may so live their lives and so do their work that they may bring good to others, honor to Thee, and respect to themselves.

Be with our President, our Speaker, and those who work in the executive, the judicial, and the legislative branches of our Government. May the light of Thy presence glow in the hearts of all our leaders enabling them to be loyal to the truth, to obey Thy Commandments, and to discharge their duties for the benefit of all mankind.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow us all the days of our lives and we will dwell in Thy presence forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1961. An act for the relief of Mildred Christine Ford;

H.R. 2514. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gavina A. Palacay;

H.R. 5477. An act for the relief of Charito Fernandez Bautista; and

H.R. 7685. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Greco.

The message also 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. 2537. An act for the relief of Lidia Myslinska Bokosky;

H.R. 4590. An act for the relief of Melissa Catamay Gutierrez;

H.R. 5667. An act for the relief of Linda Julie Dickson (nee Waters);

H.R. 11143. An act to redesignate the Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped as the Committee for Purchases From the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, to authorize the appropriation of funds for such committee for fiscal year 1974 and succeeding fiscal years, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11221. An act to provide full deposit insurance for public units and to increase deposit insurance from \$20,000 to \$50,000.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11221) entitled "An act to provide full deposit insurance for public units and to increase deposit insurance from \$20,000 to \$50,000," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. BROCK 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. 12412) entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize an appropriation to provide disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance to Pakistan, Nicaragua, and the Sahelian nations of Africa," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. McGEE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. JAVITS 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. 12799) entitled "An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. JAVITS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3203) entitled "An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act to extend its coverage and protection to employees of nonprofit hospitals, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference requested by the

House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 585. An act to amend section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that radios be capable of receiving both amplitude modulated (AM) and frequency modulated (FM) broadcasts;

S. 864. An act for the relief of Victor Henrique Carlos Gibson;

S. 1412. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands are held by the United States in trust for the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of the Lake Traverse Indian Reservation in North and South Dakota;

S. 1486. An act to regulate commerce by authorizing and establishing programs and activities to promote the export of American goods, products, and services and by increasing the recognition of international economic policy considerations in Federal decisionmaking and for other purposes;

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Caridad R. Balanon;

S. 2840. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study of foreign direct and portfolio investment in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3270. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; and

S.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to grant the status of permanent residence to Ivy May Glockner formerly Ivy May Richmond nee Pond.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the bill on the Consent Calendar.

WAIVER OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CLAIMS REGARDING CERTAIN ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 1803) to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of erroneous payments of pay and allowances to certain officers and employees of the legislative branch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1803
An act to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of erroneous

payments of pay and allowances to certain officers and employees of the legislative branch

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5584 of title 5, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out "executive" wherever it appears in such section.

(2) In subsection (b) (2)—

(A) immediately after "(2)" insert the following: "except in the case of employees of the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or the Botanic Garden,"; and

(B) strike out "or" at the end thereof.

(3) In subsection (b) (3)—

(A) immediately after "(3)" insert the following: "except in the case of employees of the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or the Botanic Garden,"; and

(B) strike out the period at the end thereof and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or".

(4) At the end of subsection (b), add the following new clause:

"(4) in the case of employees of the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or the Botanic Garden, if application for waiver is received in his office after the expiration of 3 years immediately following the date on which the erroneous payment of pay or allowances was discovered or 3 years following the date on which this clause (4) is enacted into law, whichever is later."

(5) At the end of the section, add the following new subsection:

"(g) For the purpose of this section 'agency' means—

"(1) an Executive agency;

"(2) the Government Printing Office;

"(3) the Library of Congress;

"(4) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; and

"(5) the Botanic Garden."

SEC. 2. (a) A claim of the United States against a person arising out of an erroneous payment of any pay or allowance, other than travel and transportation expenses and allowances, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, to the Vice President, a Senator, or an officer or employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, the collection of which would be against equity and good conscience and not in the best interests of the United States, may be waived in whole or in part by the Secretary of the Senate, if the claim is not the subject of an exception made by the Comptroller General in the account of any accountable officer or official. Claims for waiver shall be investigated by the Financial Clerk of the Senate who shall submit a written report of his investigation to the Secretary of the Senate. Claims for waiver of amounts in excess of \$500 shall also be investigated by the Comptroller General of the United States who shall submit a written report of his investigation to the Secretary of the Senate.

(b) The Secretary of the Senate may not exercise his authority under this section to waive any claim—

(1) if, in his opinion, there exists, in connection with the claim, an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the Vice President, the Senator, or such officer or employee or any other person having an interest in obtaining a waiver of the claim; or

(2) if the application for waiver is received in his office after the expiration of 3 years immediately following the date on which the erroneous payment of pay was discovered.

(c) In the audit and settlement of accounts of any accountable officer or officials,

full credit shall be given for any amounts with respect to which collection by the United States is waived under this section.

(d) An erroneous payment, the collection of which is waived under this section, is considered a valid payment for all purposes.

(e) This section does not affect any authority under any other law to litigate, settle, compromise, or waive any claim of the United States.

(f) The Secretary of the Senate shall promulgate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 5584 of title 5, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out "executive" wherever it appears in such section.

(2) In subsection (b) (2)—

(A) immediately after "(2)" insert the following: "except in the case of employees of the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or the Botanic Garden,"; and

(B) strike out "or" at the end thereof.

(3) In subsection (b) (3)—

(A) immediately after "(3)" insert the following: "except in the case of employees of the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or the Botanic Garden,"; and

(B) strike out "the effective date of the amendment authorizing the waiver of allowances, whichever is later." and insert in lieu thereof "October 2, 1972, whichever is later; or".

(4) At the end of subsection (b), add the following new clause:

"(4) in the case of employees of the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or the Botanic Garden, if application for waiver is received in his office after the expiration of 3 years immediately following the date on which the erroneous payment of pay or allowances was discovered or 3 years immediately following the date on which this clause (4) is enacted into law, whichever is later."

(5) At the end of the section, add the following new subsection:

"(g) For the purpose of this section, 'agency' means—

"(1) an Executive agency;

"(2) the Government Printing Office;

"(3) the Library of Congress;

"(4) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; and

"(5) the Botanic Garden."

SEC. 2. (a) A claim of the United States against a person arising out of an erroneous payment of any pay or allowances, other than travel and transportation expenses and allowances, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, to the Vice President, a Senator, or to an officer or employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, the collection of which would be against equity and good conscience and not in the best interests of the United States, may be waived in whole or in part by the Secretary of the Senate, if the claim is not the subject of an exception made by the Comptroller General in the account of any accountable officer or official. Claims for waiver shall be investigated by the Financial Clerk of the Senate who shall submit a written report of his investigation to the Secretary of the Senate. An application for waiver of a claim in an amount aggregating more than \$500 shall also be investigated by the Comptroller General of the United States who shall submit a written report of his investigation to the Secretary of the Senate.

(b) The Secretary of the Senate may not exercise his authority under this section to waive any claim—

(1) if, in his opinion, there exists, in connection with the claim, an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the Vice President, the Senator, or such officer or employee or any other person having an interest in obtaining a waiver of the claim; or

(2) if the application for waiver is received in his office after the expiration of 3 years immediately following the date on which the erroneous payment of pay was discovered.

(c) In the audit and settlement of accounts of any accountable officer or officials,

(b) The Secretary of the Senate may not

exercise his authority under this section to waive any claim—

(1) if, in his opinion, there exists, in connection with the claim, an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the Vice President, the Senator, the officer or employee, or any other person having an interest in obtaining a waiver of the claim; or

(2) if the application for waiver is received in his office after the expiration of 3 years immediately following the date on which the erroneous payment of pay or allowances was discovered.

(c) In the audit and settlement of accounts of any accountable officer or official, full credit shall be given for any amounts with respect to which collection by the United States is waived under this section.

(d) An erroneous payment, the collection of which is waived under this section, is deemed a valid payment for all purposes.

(e) This section does not affect any authority under any other law to litigate, settle, compromise, or waive any claim of the United States.

(f) The Secretary of the Senate shall promulgate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 3. (a) A claim of the United States against a person arising out of an erroneous payment of any pay or allowances, other than travel and transportation expenses and allowances, on or after the date of enactment of this section, to an officer or employee whose pay is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the collection of which would be against equity and good conscience and not in the best interests of the United States, may be waived in whole or in part by the Speaker of the House, if the claim is not the subject of an exception made by the Comptroller General in the account of any accountable officer or official.

(b) An application for waiver of a claim shall be investigated by the Clerk of the House of Representatives who shall submit a written report of his investigation to the Speaker of the House.

(c) The Speaker of the House may not exercise his authority under this section to waive any claim—

(1) if, in his opinion, there exists, in connection with the claim, an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the officer or employee or any other person having an interest in obtaining a waiver of the claim; or

(2) if the application for waiver is received in his office after the expiration of 3 years immediately following the date on which the erroneous payment of pay or allowances was discovered.

(d) In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any accountable officer or official, full credit shall be given for any amounts with respect to which collection by the United States is waived under this section.

(e) An erroneous payment, the collection of which is waived under this section, is deemed a valid payment for all purposes.

(f) This section does not affect any authority under any other law to litigate, settle, compromise, or waive any claim of the United States.

(g) The Speaker of the House shall prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This being the only eligible bill on the Consent Calendar, this ends the call of the Consent Calendar.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 15361 AND H.R. 14903

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 15361, to establish a program of community development block grants, to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development and for other purposes; and on H.R. 14903, to increase the availability of urgently needed mortgage credit for the financing of housing, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14434, ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1975

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14434) 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, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, STEED, SLACK, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. MCFALL, CEDERBERG, DAVIS of Wisconsin, ROBISON of New York, McDADE, and RUTH.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14434, ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 14434) 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 SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14434, ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order in the House on Wednesday, June 19,

to consider the conference report on the bill H.R. 14434, 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 SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

MORE POSTAL MISMANAGEMENT

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Postal Service is not at all bashful about asking Congress and the taxpayers to finance its mismanagement.

Back in July 1973, the Postal Service negotiated, if that is the word, a 2-year contract with four postal unions. Under the agreement the Postal Service is obligated to grant each of some 600,000 employees a \$1,100 a year pay increase plus four cost-of-living increases. In addition, the Postal Service will pay the full cost of life insurance and 65 percent of health insurance. And there will be no layoffs or reductions in force during the term of the contract.

The cost of this package is projected by the Postmaster General at \$1.4 billion for fiscal year 1975 and later years. The cost will be considerably higher because of the higher level of cost-of-living increases. In the first 9 months of the contract cost-of-living adjustments have already totaled \$514 for each employee.

To pay for it, the Postal Service, in September 1973, proposed a postal rate increase and sent the proposal to the Postal Rate Commission. The Rate Commission did not act within 90 days, in fact it still has not acted, and so the Postal Service announced rates would be increased on a temporary basis on January 5, 1974.

But they failed to reckon with, or persuade, the Cost of Living Council which rejected the temporary rate increases and ordered the Postal Service to cut back the adjustments by \$236 million.

In public hearings, Postal Service managers called the Cost of Living Council action a "political sham" and "the worst kind of hypocrisy."

But instead of living with the Cost of Living Council order as a fact of business life, the Postal Service demanded that Congress give them what the Council had denied them. And the Congress did just that. In the last supplemental it agreed to fork over \$220 million to finance postal mismanagement.

FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN BIKE TRAILS

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today I

am reintroducing H.R. 11749 and H.R. 11750 to amend the National Scenic Trails System Act to authorize a feasibility study for the establishment of certain bike trails. This brings the total cosponsorship to 81 of these identical bills.

The routes suggested for study, among the most scenic and historic in the country, are:

Along U.S. Highway 1, extending approximately 2,450 miles from Kent, Maine, to Key West, Fla.;

Along U.S. Highway 30, extending approximately 3,350 miles from Atlantic City, N.J. to Astoria, Oreg.;

Along U.S. Highway 101, extending approximately 1,530 miles from Olympia, Wash., to San Diego, Calif.

The Department of the Interior has already designated 46 national recreation trails in 22 States and the District of Columbia. States could take advantage of the \$120 million appropriated in the 1973 Federal-Aid Highway Act to establish a network of State bicycle trails eventually interconnecting with federally sponsored trails envisioned in this legislation, resulting in a nationwide trails system.

Biking for recreation, sightseeing, exercise, and even commuting has been a major transportation mode in Europe for many years. I believe it is an "idea whose time has come" here in America. Last year, there were more bicycles sold than automobiles and the majority were sold to adults.

The House Interior Committee's Parks and Recreation Subcommittee had scheduled hearings on this legislation for June 18 in conjunction with the other bills affecting the National Scenic Trails Systems Act. Unfortunately, those hearings have been postponed to a yet unknown date because of the pressure of other legislation.

The significant interest in this legislation in the Congress attests to the popularity of biking today. I urge my colleagues to join with me in pressing for early hearings on these bills.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONTE. 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. 296]

Abdnor	Collier	Eckhardt
Ashley	Conyers	Erleneborn
Aspin	Corman	Esch
Badillo	Cotter	Fascell
Bingham	Cronin	Findley
Blatnik	Daniels	Flynt
Brasco	Dominick V.	Fraser
Brown, Mich.	Davis, Ga.	Frey
Broyhill, N.C.	Dellums	Froehlich
Burke, Calif.	Dennis	Grasso
Carey, N.Y.	Diggs	Gray
Chisholm	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Clark	Donohue	Green, Pa.
Clausen,	Dorn	Grover
Don H.	Downing	Gunter
Cohen	Dulski	Guyer

Hansen, Wash.	Matsunaga	St Germain
Harrington	Metcalf	Sandman
Harsha	Milford	Sarbanes
Hastings	Mills	Scherie
Hebert	Minshall, Ohio	Smith, Iowa
Heckler, Mass.	Mitchell, Md.	Steele
Hełstoski	Moorhead, Pa.	Steelman
Howard	Murphy, N.Y.	Stratton
Huber	Nelsen	Stuckey
Jarman	Nix	Studds
Jones, Okla.	O'Hara	Talcott
Jones, Tenn.	Pepper	Teague
Kemp	Pettis	Thompson, N.J.
Kyros	Podell	Udall
Landrum	Powell, Ohio	Vander Jagt
Lehman	Railsback	Veysey
Lent	Rangel	Ware
McCollister	Reid	Wright
McFall	Rhodes	Yatron
McKinney	Roncalli, N.Y.	Young, Fla.
McSpadden	Rookey, N.Y.	Young, Ga.
Macdonald	Roy	Young, S.C.
Mallary	Royal	
Maraziti	Ruppe	

THE SPEAKER. On this rollcall 317 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XXVII, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

After all motions to suspend the rules have been entertained and debated and after those motions, to be determined by nonrecord votes have been disposed of, the Chair will then put the question on each motion on which the further proceedings were postponed.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1974

MR. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report 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.

The Clerk read the title of the conference report.

THE SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

MR. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of June 13, 1974.)

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota will be recognized for 20 minutes. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

MR. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am bringing up for consideration today the conference report on H.R. 14354, which amends the National School Lunch Act in order to authorize the use of certain funds to purchase agricultural commodi-

ties for distribution to schools and for other purposes.

This bill originated in the House Education and Labor Committee. It was approved by the House of Representatives on May 7 by a vote of 359 to 38. Certain amendments to the bill were approved in the other body on May 21, 1974, and the bill was passed by a voice vote.

The conferees on the bill met on June 5 and approved without disagreement the conference report now before you.

This bill strengthens and supports the school lunch and child nutrition programs in a period of escalating costs which threaten the continued successful operation of these programs. Each of the provisions in the bill is entirely consistent with the national policy set forth many years ago by the Congress to the effect that the highest priority shall be given to fulfilling the nutritional needs of our Nation's children.

I will now comment briefly on each of the provisions of the bill as reported by the conferees of both Houses:

First, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to purchase during the fiscal year 1975 food commodities for donation to maintain the annually programmed level of assistance for the child nutrition programs and title VII of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

This is a 1-year extension of the special authority which the Congress granted to the Secretary for the fiscal year 1974. It will require that the Secretary provide a level of commodity assistance at 7 cents per meal, approximately the same as provided during the current year.

Second, the bill provides that, for the fiscal year 1975 and subsequent fiscal years, schools will receive a minimum of 10 cents per lunch, in donated foods, or in cash payments in lieu thereof. This will assure that schools can continue to receive a fair level of commodity assistance plus cash grants in periods when agricultural surpluses are limited. These federally donated foods are needed to guarantee the schools that there will be a foundation upon which they can rest their nutritional programs.

Third, the bill makes permanent the authority which the States now have to serve reduced price lunches to children from families with incomes up to 75 percent above the official income poverty guidelines, set by the Secretary of Agriculture.

This provision was only partially implemented in this fiscal year because it did not become effective until January 1, 1974. However, schools in 38 States did begin the program with substantial increases in participation among children from lower middle-income families. In New Jersey alone, over 15,000 children have been able to participate in the lunch program as a result of this expansion of eligibility for the reduced price lunch program.

Fourth, the authorization for school food service equipment will be increased from \$20 million to \$40 million for fiscal year 1976 and for succeeding fiscal years. Under current law, the authorization is \$40 million for fiscal years 1973-1975, but

would drop to \$20 million in fiscal year 1976.

Fifth, the required expenditure for the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children will be increased from \$40 million to \$100 million for fiscal year 1975 only.

Sixth, finally, the bill contains an amendment to correct a technical error in the last child nutrition bill enacted. Public Law 93-150.

When this bill is enacted into law, I foresee these positive and beneficial gains to the child nutrition programs:

First, the uncertainty as to the continuance of the commodity distribution program will be removed. The Department of Agriculture is already in the process of purchasing \$45 million worth of ground beef with shipments to the States beginning in mid-July. Further, just a week ago, on June 10, the Department announced plans to purchase cheese for the school lunch program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture will also be able to purchase other foods for the schools in the year ahead under the special purchase authority contained in this bill.

Second, the minimum level of 10 cents per lunch assistance in the form of commodities, or possibly in cash in lieu thereof, will help offset the sharp increases in food prices which have seriously affected the school lunch operations.

Third, hundreds of thousands of children from the lower middle-income families will have the opportunity for the first time to participate in the lunch program at prices their families can afford to pay.

Fourth, the increased authorization for nonfood assistance appropriations is essential in order to continue recent progress toward extending the school lunch program to those schools which have not been able to initiate a food service program.

In the past five years, some 12,000 schools have been able to begin food service operations because of the availability of Federal nonfood assistance funds. However, some 5 million children attend schools without a lunch program.

In conclusion, I wish to state that this is a good bill and one which deserves your full support. In the larger view, what this bill does is to safeguard and improve the nutritional quality of the lunches served to children in school, and at the same time, to offer wider markets to those who produce the food supplies of the Nation.

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

MR. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled as to why this conference report is called up under the suspension rules. Can the gentleman tell me why?

MR. PERKINS. Yes, I will be delighted to tell my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, why this conference report is being called up under the suspension rules.

We have, as I stated, increased the value of the commodities to be distributed to the school lunch program in fiscal

year 1975. The total additional cost for the school lunch program for fiscal year 1975 is \$135 million. An additional \$60 million is added for the WIC program. In addition, there is a direction to the Secretary to purchase commodities at market prices. The purchase of commodities is in process now—with the buying of beef, cheese, and milk products.

Purchases are now being made and will be made with section 32 funds and Commodity Credit Corporation funds. The use of section 32 funds for the commodities section and the possible additional utilization of such funds for the WIC program might be considered by some as an appropriation. We have taken similar action on several other occasions, so that we can be assured the money will be available now. We need the funds now. In other words, we do not necessarily go through the Committee on Appropriations in the initial stage. Section 32 must, however subsequently, be reimbursed.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have brought up this conference report in this fashion.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will it also be for the reason that the committee does not want the Members to offer amendments or vote on amendments already contained in this conference report in any way?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that this is a conference report and regardless of the request for suspension it would not be subject to amendment. The legislation has been considered at some length and we felt that the bill had been fairly considered by the Members of this body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated by the concern that the Committee on Labor and Education has for all of the Members of the House of Representatives, and by the fact that the gentleman feels that the members of the Committee on Labor and Education are all-seeing and all-knowing.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 14354, although it is a far more extensive bill than the one we passed which dealt exclusively with an extension of authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase commodities which are not in surplus for the support of the school lunch and similar food programs within the jurisdiction of our committee. The Committee on Agriculture in the other body was concerned also with the level of support for the school lunch program and the special supplemental food program for mothers and infants at nutritional risk.

I think there should be little or no controversy about the increase in the authorization of appropriations and appropriation from section 32 funds for the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children to \$100 million. This program has the capability of preventing mental deficiency and

other handicapping conditions in children caused by inadequate prenatal and postnatal nutrition. Accordingly, its potential for enormous savings of public funds—to say nothing of humanitarian considerations—more than justifies this action.

Similarly, the provision for maintaining the authorization under the Child Nutrition Act for nonfood assistance at \$40 million for fiscal 1975 is designed to facilitate a continued and orderly extension of school food services to schools which do not have those services available. Without this action the authorization would have dropped to \$20 million, as against a \$22-million appropriation for this fiscal year.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I note my colleague mentioned that this conference report is different than the House version. About how many dollars worth? My understanding is, if I am correct, that it is about \$135 million more than the House version.

Mr. QUIE. I would say that is approximately right.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. \$135 million?

Mr. QUIE. Give or take a million.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So that means the bill calls for an expenditure about \$1.8 billion—something like that—as a total cost?

Mr. QUIE. The total cost of the whole program?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So this bill is over the President's budget. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So if we really wanted to be conscientious as a Congress of our responsibility to keep expenses under control, we should vote down the conference report in the hope that we can get back to the same version that the House originally sent out. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. If you are only conscious of money and of keeping the budget under control, then that would be the case. If you are concerned about the additional cost to the school food program and the cost to the young people of the country, then you should support the conference report, as I will.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate that. But the gentleman says "only money."

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Or only cost to our hard working taxpayers. The fact of the matter is that this bill eventually has to come out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You know we are all concerned about young children having adequate food. But this issue is not exactly allied to the infants that we are talking about. As the gentleman in the well has already stated, it is over the House version by \$135 million, so if an individual were trying to be conscientious about keeping bills within the budget or at least using that as a guideline, he could in fact, with justification, vote against this conference report on the basis that it does exceed the budget.

Mr. QUIE. I would say that a person could still be for school lunches because he knows there would be something like 17 cents available for everyone without it and 20 cents for everyone with it.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman pointing out the fact that this does exceed the House version by a substantial amount. For those who are claiming to be conscientious of the taxpayer's pocketbook this is another case where we are adding on another substantial amount to the overall budget so we are going to have to face up to that fact at the end of the year.

I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding and helping me to make that point.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) said that the increase was necessary because of inflation. Did the gentleman hear the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I heard the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GROSS. So what this additional \$135 million means is that under the circumstances inflation is feeding upon inflation. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. QUIE. Well, when you look at what you are saying, if I understand it correctly, it is that by increasing this payment, then that adds to the inflation as well, so that is inflation feeding on inflation. You would have to say that it is a small part of it. When you look at all the forces of inflation, this is a very small part of the forces of inflation. So the question comes are you going to consider this a part of the forces of inflation which add to it, because I believe that its impact on inflation is very small, as I mentioned.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, would it not be fair to perhaps put this problem in some perspective that, yes, this bill does represent an increase over the President's budget if we do not, however, recognize the effect that substantial increases in food prices have had upon the families across the United States, and also upon the school lunch program, and the effect that we are seeing, as I understand it, as I have been listening to the gentleman from California (Mr. Rousset) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) is that those who participate in the school lunch program are going to be forced to pay more for their school lunches, rather than attempting to minimize the burden that extra costs have placed upon the school lunch program.

Would that be a fair statement to make?

Mr. QUIE. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has explained that correctly, that that would be the case. The costs have gone up substantially, as one looks

at the agricultural picture today with the farmers receiving lower prices in relationship to their costs. We will now wait and see what kind of action the Government takes in regard to that, other than forcing farmers to reduce their production which will push the prices up even more to the consumers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not look at this thing as some people look at it, that some people in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota will benefit from it, because this is not adding to that agricultural situation, this is merely a program to help the parents of school-age children pay for the costs of the school lunch program.

Of course, it also involves the Older Americans Act, and there are a great many people who need that assistance.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, would it also not be fair to point out that, whether or not we pass this version of the bill, there will be costs above the budget as a result of the decision the Department of Agriculture has taken insofar as meat and cheese are concerned? And they are not budgeted costs. The Department of Agriculture clearly has moved into consideration of that problem of cheese and meat products, especially because of the very real drop in cheese and meat prices. So that regardless of whether this conference report is adopted or not, the budgetary costs as a result of those decisions, if nothing else, will have an impact upon the budget.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. In fact, there will be a number of other actions which either the administration or this Congress will take that are going to increase the cost of the budget.

But what I do concern myself about, however, is that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) raised the point about the budget, and I think the gentleman is right in raising it, because the other body has cut the President's budget by \$10 billion, and I do not know how you can cut \$10 billion and still keep adding on to other programs without cutting some place else. So what this body and the other body had better be looking for, I think, is that if we vote for an increase here then we will have to vote for a decrease in some other appropriation bill where we can cut back on our spending; either that, or increase the taxes, although there has been talk of reducing the taxes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the point I wanted to make is that I remember very well the explanation that was made on this subject on the House bill before it went to the other body, and we were told that the total amount in our bill on the House floor was \$135 million cheaper than this one, and that was all that was needed. And what I was attempting to find out, and what I wanted to know, is why all of a sudden we have this big increase just because it has gone over to the Senate.

My belief is that we should vote this down. I know it probably will not be done, but we should vote the bill down and say to the other body that we cannot keep tacking additional dollars on every single bill because they add to

that huge deficit. And that is the only point I was trying to make, or would like to make.

Even the gentleman from Wisconsin supported the bill that came out of the House. We should take into account increases caused by inflation, especially when it comes back from a conference with \$135 million added on to it. All we are doing here is adding one more piece on top of the whole pile, and if we do that with other bills then, at the end of the year, it all adds up to a budgetary deficit.

So any Member who wants to help contribute toward reducing that deficit, and cutting back on these things, should vote this conference report down, and say to the other body that we want to stick to the House version which the gentleman from Wisconsin said was adequate.

Mr. QUIE. I will just say that when we met in conference, we did agree to a higher figure, and the House now has to say whether they support the House conferees in accepting the higher figure, which we thought was justified to meet the Federal programs, or whether they want to stay within the budget.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I welcome the return of more red meat to the school lunch program, but in this \$125 million expenditure are we thinking as much about the diet of schoolchildren, or are we thinking about the plight of the cattlemen or meat producers who are experiencing a sagging market? They asked for a free market in meat products, and now I think we might be moving toward Government involvement. Are we thinking about the diet of children or are we thinking about the special problems of the meat producers?

Mr. QUIE. I would say that the concern here was entirely concern for the children and the school lunch program in the conference. The plight of the farmer did not even come up for consideration. That is a separate problem. They are having their problems, and this legislation is not going to help them.

The problem of the farmer is not something next year. It is now. Any action taken by the Government to help the farmer has got to be done now, not with this legislation.

So what we are looking at here is the costs of lunches for the schoolchildren which have gone up, and are we then going to make the adjustment here in the Federal legislation?

I do not oppose helping the farmer. We ought to help the farmer but it is not in this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In response to the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio, in the Committee on Agriculture we had testimony that indicated that a \$45 million pur-

chase was insignificant in terms of the total amount of meat purchases made by the Government, and it was not made with the intent of bolstering a sagging market.

Mr. QUIE. We should also realize that any purchases until the end of this month are for fiscal year 1974 at all. So anything done by the Government in any purchase of commodities that they ought to be making, that is going to help the farmer, is not coming out of this legislation.

We should also bear in mind that what is purchased now will not be used for the school year this year. That is over with, and we are talking about the next school year making it available for the children.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I should just like to get back to the conference report. I do support the conference report. I think it ought to be adopted today in spite of what I recognize as a figure higher than that which was in the House-passed bill. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is my understanding correct? Since this bill is for fiscal year 1975, have we not just read that the number of pupils at the grammar school level is decreasing?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Then why do we need to add \$135 million, if we really look at it hard-nosed for 1975, when the population is beginning to go down in the school population at the grammar school level?

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the gentleman we are looking at the total figure—

Mr. ROUSSELOT. For the American taxpayer.

Mr. QUIE. Yes, for the American taxpayer, but to the schoolchildren this amounts to 10 cents a meal. If there are fewer children, there are fewer meals at 10 cents apiece, so it does not have anything to do with the number of children. If the number is cut in half, they still get it at 10 cents apiece.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate that, but the point I am trying to make is that at a time when pupil population is going down, and the House is trying to do a better job than the Senate on holding a line on increases—as a matter of fact, we were told by the gentleman from Minnesota who is now in the well that the bill that came out of the House was adequate—why can we not make a stand and say to the Senate: We just cannot keep adding on, especially at a time when the pupil population at the grammar school level is going down?

Mr. QUIE. The reason why we cannot

is because the cost of meals for the children who are there is going up.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it was a little over 50 years ago this same debate was taking place on the floor of the German Parliament. This note that I hold in my hand is a 10,000-mark note. By 1923 this 10,000-mark note would not buy one school lunch for one small child in Germany. This is exactly what the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) is talking about, with regard to the debasement of our currency.

I think Congress would do the school-children of this country a favor if we would hold this counterfeiting of our money by Government edict down and make an effort to save the value of the dollar. The double-digit inflation does great harm to the value of our money. No one can deny that. If we just go down to 14th Street we can print more Government counterfeit money but it will make all our money less in value. How long will it be before our dollar is worth less than this 10,000-mark German note? Which, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely worthless.

Mr. QUIE. No one knows how long that will take but I doubt that raising this amount from 7 cents to 10 cents is the kicker that will do it, especially if Congress will take this into consideration and reduce expenditures some place else. As I indicated earlier we have a responsibility to hold expenditures within what can be raised. We are developing the mechanism to do that now. As a matter of fact that conference report ought to be before the Congress before too long. Congress has not done it before but the machinery will not be in operation for that until 1975, but it behoves this Congress in working on appropriations for 1975 to consider all these matters. I expect there will be some other bills besides this that will increase expenditures which will also put some pressure on us to make our choice as to where we will make the cuts from.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks used by the gentleman are the same as those which were used by the German politicians, that we will have to make our cuts some place else. I have not seen Congress face this situation. Some of us have been trying but we certainly have not been victorious because of the majority of the House, due to an apparent lack of understanding of inflation on the part of the membership of this body.

Mr. QUIE. I recognize Congress has not faced it but I hope Congress will.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman.

I cannot understand why we can be

spending billions to kill people and spending billions for war machines and I do not see very many people rise very often to object to that, but now when we want to give something to feed the hungry American schoolchildren there is a great deal of objection made about how it will break the country. If those same Members would get up and offer cuts to be taken out of the military might and out of foreign aid maybe we would give more consideration to their arguments in this matter.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in my remaining time let me say the gentlemen who have raised the economy question in this I have also noted in the past have pushed for reductions in defense expenditures, too. So what the gentleman has said about expenditures may be true, but the gentlemen who spoke today have voted to cut defense expenditures as well.

Let me now complete my statement. I am not aware of any controversy about making permanent the right of a State to set income guidelines for eligibility for reduced price school lunches at levels up to 75 percent of the Secretary's income poverty level. This device has worked well in permitting State and regional variations in the cost of living to be taken into account while preserving a desirable degree of uniformity in eligibility standards.

The really major change made by the conference bill is in the treatment of commodity purchases, and cash in lieu of commodities, for the school lunch program. It amends the House-approved bill to make mandatory the purchase of commodities for donation to maintain the annually programmed level of support for the School Lunch Act, the Child Nutrition Act, and title VII—nutrition for the elderly—of the Older Americans Act. Of course, the Secretary is left free to determine the annual programmed level for donated commodities.

However, with respect to the School Lunch Act, the national average value of donated foods, or cash payments in lieu of donated foods, is fixed at a minimum of 10 cents per lunch for fiscal year 1975 and succeeding years, with an adjustment in the years after fiscal 1975 to reflect changes in the cost of food away from home of the Consumer Price Index.

Currently, the Department of Agriculture has been budgeting—the "annual programmed level"—about 7 cents per school lunch in donated commodities—or \$290 million for fiscal 1975. Under the conference bill, the Secretary will be required to purchase and distribute the full \$290 million in commodities during fiscal 1975—and to distribute in cash or if possible commodities an additional amount sufficient to bring the total to not less than 10 cents per meal. This additional 3 cents could amount to as much as \$120 million, so we are not talking about insignificant amounts in terms of increased outlays for the school lunch program.

Mr. Speaker, in fiscal 1972 Federal contributions in cash and commodities to child feeding programs—including school lunch and breakfast, nonschool programs, and the special milk program—totaled \$2,933,600,000. The estimate for fiscal

1974 approaches \$3.7 billion, a 25-percent increase in 2 years. In this same period the number of school lunches served has remained fairly constant at just over 24 million. There are two major variables. One is the increased number of free or reduced-price lunches served, from nearly 1.3 billion in fiscal 1972 to nearly 1.5 billion in fiscal 1974, with an increase in the number of children receiving such meals from 7.8 million in fiscal 1972 to 8.9 million in fiscal 1974—an increase of over 1 million in 2 years. The other is the increases in support per meal. Total Federal support for all school lunches increased from 18.7 cents in 1972 to 27.3 cents in 1974, and for the free and reduced-price lunches from 38.5 to 46 cents in that period. When we are talking about 4 billion lunches, a 1 cent increase in support becomes a \$40 million item.

Along with the lunch program, the school breakfast program has grown from 169.3 million breakfasts served in 1972 with average Federal support of 14.5 cents to around 255 million breakfasts in 1974 at a Federal cost of 27.5 cents.

I support these programs and the increased Federal assistance for them, and have helped shape the legislation which has made this possible. But I am convinced that it is now time to stop legislating piece-meal in the field of child nutrition. I think that the Congress should now take a very careful look at the operation of these programs, and their effectiveness in meeting nutritional needs, and perhaps develop more comprehensive legislation which would not require amendment every 6 months. In some respects the conference report bill is a step in that direction, and I urge its approval.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would hate to see the day come in this country when we cannot provide an additional 3 cents to support the school lunch program—to make sure we have an adequate and nutritious diet for schoolchildren—and when we have to say we are spending too much money and throwing that money away. This additional 3 cents in commodity or cash assistance for the next fiscal year is absolutely essential to the general welfare of the schoolchildren in this country who participate in the school lunch program.

If we undertake to price schoolchildren—especially the middle-class youngsters—out of the school lunch program, we will be doing a great deal of harm and it will cost many hundreds of millions in other ways, in my judgment.

We add here an extra \$20 million for nonfood assistance, for equipment in poor urban and rural areas where school lunch equipment is lacking. This could allow thousands of additional participants who need and want school lunches to benefit.

The cost of this bill is going to depend in large part on the number of schoolchildren who go to school and are served by the school lunch program. It is my opinion that we should vote for the welfare of these schoolchildren and strengthen the school lunch program for the children of this country. We are go-

ing to make this country more viable by voting for and supporting this program.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering legislation to extend for 1 year, through June 30, 1975, authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase commodities at nonsurplus or market price for distribution to programs carried out under the School Lunch Act, the Child Nutrition Act, and title VII of the Older Americans Act. It seems to me that this is a proper time to discuss our practice of providing free school lunches to those students coming from disadvantaged households. For some time now we have been providing many students with a hot lunch, for some the only hot meal they receive during the day. I think that this is a worthy program, and it is one that should be continued.

However, I find it disturbing that many parents are undercutting the ground rules of the program by certifying that their child or children are eligible when in fact their family income exceeds the cutoff level. It seems to me that we should take a careful look at the free lunch program and seriously consider Congressman LEHMAN's proposal to provide all students with free lunches, regardless of the income level of the family. I think an argument can be made for this proposal, and I urge my colleagues to give some thought and study to this idea.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the bill H.R. 14354.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. 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. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XXVII and the prior announcement of the Chair, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

Does the gentleman from California withdraw his point of order that there is no quorum?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PERKINS. Did the Chair rule that we had a two-thirds vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the request of the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Was it the ruling of the Chair that the bill was passed?

The SPEAKER. No. The Chair announced that in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds had voted in the affirmative, and then a point of order was made and the vote was objected to.

Mr. PERKINS. So the motion is withdrawn and the vote goes over until later in the day?

The SPEAKER. The objection to the vote on the ground a quorum was not present caused the further consideration

to be postponed. The point of no quorum was then withdrawn.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WYDLER. If a Member at this point should ask for a record vote, would we be able to have a count on that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman should have taken that action before the Chair announced the postponement.

Mr. WYDLER. I understand, but I am just trying to determine whether it would now be in order.

The SPEAKER. It would not be, because action on the bill has been postponed.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the Chair.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12356) to authorize appropriations for the Indian Claims Commission for fiscal year 1975, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12356

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of Congress assembled, That there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Indian Claims Commission Act (25 U.S.C. 70), during fiscal year 1975, not to exceed \$1,450,000 to continue the program of the Indian Claims Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the legislation before us is to authorize appropriations for fiscal year, 1975, for the Indian Claims Commission in the amount of \$1,450,000. The Members will note that we have been coming in the past few years before the House for an authorization each fiscal year, rather than the procedure which we employed heretofore of passing authorizations sometimes 10 years and 5 years in advance.

The reason that this has been done is that the members of the committee have deemed it better that the Congress have greater oversight on this matter, so that we can move it to a conclusion by 1977 when the authorizing legislation will expire.

The Indian Claims Commission was created by this body and the other body in 1946.

It was at that time for a period of 10 years. It has been extended four times since that time, and will now expire in 1977. The purpose of the Indian Claims Commission is, very generally, to adjudicate claims based on lands ceded by Indian tribes to the United States without compensation, or for what may be

considered to be inadequate compensation prior to 1946.

These claims used to be adjudicated sometimes by the court of claims by specific authorization of the Congress or by specific act of the Congress. The Indian Claims Commission has taken over that function. As I said earlier, the committee is very concerned that this legislation not be extended again; that when it terminates or expires in 1977, that will be the last time. It is not the intent of this committee to come before this body again and ask for an extension of the Indian Claims Commission.

Indeed, in the last extension legislation we made provisions for turning over any unresolved matters which might be pending at that time before the Indian Claims Commission to the court of claims. During the life of the Indian Claims Commission, the Commission has docketed some 611 claims and has disposed of 413 of these claims. It has made awards in the amount of \$468,523,000,- 555.22.

This bill authorizes \$1,450,000 for the operation of the Indian Claims Commission in fiscal year 1975. It is \$286,000 over the authorized amount for fiscal year 1974, plus some supplemental authorizations and appropriations. The additions come generally, I would say, in the fields of salary increases and additional rent, which has been brought about by the new interpretations of GSA. The authorization here is needed by the Appropriations Committee to make its presentation, hopefully yet this month, so that appropriations will be available for the fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy; I know of no one who is opposed to the legislation, and I urge that the House pass this bill.

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that it is not contemplated that the life of the Indian Claims Commission be extended after 1977. I would say to the gentleman that I have been here quite a few years, and I have heard the same statement made time after time after time, that it was not contemplated or, even more precisely, that the life of the Commission would not be extended.

Yet, the number of the members of the Commission has been increased; the funds have been increased from time to time, and of course always extended. So we come out with the same end result—the Indian Claims Commission goes on and on and on and on—proof positive that there is nothing so permanent in the Federal Government as something temporary.

Mr. Speaker, I hope with all my heart—I will not be here next year—I hope that what the gentleman says today, and his report states, that this bureaucracy will be brought to an end in 1977, that someone really means it, and the Interior Committee is going to insist that the Indian Claims Commission end at that time.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Iowa that even in his

absence I shall maintain the position and posture which I just stated on the floor here. I have not been privileged to serve as long as the gentleman from Iowa has, or as long as the Indian Claims Commission has been around, but I did have the opportunity to work on the last extension, and at that time wrote in the provision for sending any unadjudicated claims to the U.S. Court of Claims so that there would be no mistake that our intention was absolutely in terms of not extending the life of the Commission.

I certainly intend to carry that out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WYLIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. Yes, I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WYLIE. Why should not Congress turn over the unadjudicated claims or the claims still pending on the docket now to the U.S. Court of Claims now?

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I will answer the gentleman by saying that, first of all, this is a very specialized group of claims. The Indian Claims Commission is composed of a group of experts in this field, and I am sure that they can with dispatch, with certainly more dispatch than the Court of Claims, dispose of these cases. Therefore, we would like to give them every opportunity to do so. They assure us that it is their intention to be finished or very nearly finished with the still pending claims by 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I think at this time it would be counterproductive simply to turn these claims over to the Court of Claims, where they would have to staff up if they were going to resolve these matters with as much dispatch as the Indian Claims Commission.

Mr. WYLIE. If the gentleman will yield further, I would just make the observation that the Indian Claims Commission has not worked with very much dispatch. It came into being in 1946, and there are still 198 cases pending before it. I welcome the gentleman's suggestion, therefore, that they will expedite the consideration of claims pending before it, but their work up to this time runs counter to early resolution of pending claims.

Additionally, the gentleman has suggested that any claims remaining will be turned over to the U.S. Court of Claims in 1977?

Mr. MEEDS. That is correct.

Mr. WYLIE. Yet, you suggest that the Indian Claims Commission is more qualified to handle the cases than the U.S. Court of Claims. The thought occurred to me, as the gentleman was speaking, that if the U.S. Court of Claims is qualified to handle the claims from 1977, however many there might be, then it should be qualified to handle them now. It is indeed an existing statutory organization. It just seems to me that we could avoid duplication of effort and save some money.

Since the Indian Claims Commission has not worked with expedition, I thought perhaps the U.S. Court of Claims might even act more expeditiously.

Mr. MEEDS. To answer the gentleman, when the authorizing legislation terminates in 1977, if the Indian Claims Com-

mission has not completed its work by then, we will have an opportunity to see how fast the Court of Claims can clean up the matter.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I will not follow the same ground that has been covered by the distinguished gentleman from Washington. He outlined the pertinent facts very adequately.

This bill authorizes appropriations of \$1,450,000 for the Indian Claims Commission for fiscal year 1975.

Congress established the Indian Claims Commission in 1946 to hear and settle, for once and for all time, all Indian tribal claims against the United States. These claims are legal and moral in nature and are, in general, for lands ceded by the tribes to the United States without compensation or with inadequate compensation. Other claims are of an accounting nature, in which the Indians allege that the United States inadequately performed its function as trustee, thereby causing damage to the trust assets of the tribe.

As of December 1973, the Commission had docketed a total of 611 claims. Of these, 177 has been dismissed, 231 had resulted in awards totaling \$469,325,350.48, and 203 were in various stages of adjudication and appeal.

Under the act of 1946, the Commission was required to complete its work within 10 years. However, the Commission was unable to meet that requirement, and four times the Congress has extended the time limit for a period of 5 years. At the time of the last extension, in 1972, the Congress provided that the Commission would expire in 1977. No further extensions were contemplated. Any unfinished business would be transferred to the Court of Claims for completion. Congress also provided that appropriations for the Commission be enacted annually, thereby allowing closer congressional oversight of the Commission's progress.

Mr. Speaker, the amount authorized by H.R. 12356 will keep the Commission operating at its present level. In the course of hearings on this bill, the Commission reported that it expects to complete all its remaining work by 1977, as required by law. This legislation is essential to continue a job that must be completed.

I would additionally point out a couple of important facts, one, that the committee bill fixes a definite amount rather than an open-ended authorization, as was contained in the original bill, so that it does spell out a sum not to exceed \$1,450,000 rather than the language, "Such sums as may be necessary."

I would also point out that there is a letter in the report from Mr. Kuyendall of the Office of Management and Budget, indicating OMB support for the amount appropriated herein.

The greatest increases over the previous year's budget would be for two things:

One is a sum of about \$80,000 for rent because the Indian Claims Commission is moving, at the request of GSA, into a

facility that carries a much higher rental.

Second, we provide for increased personnel costs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Members support this legislation, because it is essential to the completion of the work of the Claims Commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12356, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3007) to authorize appropriations for the Indian Claims Commission for fiscal year 1975, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3007

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,450,000 to carry out the provisions of the Indian Claims Commission Act (25 U.S.C. 70), during fiscal year 1975.

Sec. 2. The first sentence of the last paragraph in section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050; 25 U.S.C. 70a) is hereby amended by striking the semicolon and the word "the" after the words "section 250 of title 28" and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *Provided*, That expenditures for food, rations, or provisions shall not be deemed payments on the claim. The".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEDS

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEEDS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3007 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12356, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12356) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC FOOD ASSISTANCE
PROGRAMS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14992) to continue domestic food assistance programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14992

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, as amended (87 Stat. 221, as amended, 7 U.S.C. 612c), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, until July 1, 1975, to (1) use funds available under provisions of section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), and not otherwise expended or necessary for such purposes 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 section 32 and seafood commodities and their products to maintain the level of assistance required by domestic food assistance programs that are authorized by law, including but not limited to distribution to needy families pending the transition to the food stamp program, institutions, supplemental feeding programs wherever located, disaster relief, summer camps for children, and Indian reservations not requesting a food stamp program, and (2) if stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not available, use the funds of the Corporation to purchase agricultural commodities and their products of the types customarily available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to meet such requirements."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today authorizes, for an additional year, continued purchase authority for agricultural commodities and their products—with the addition of seafood—for distribution to needy families pending the transition of all jurisdictions to the food stamp program, institutions, supplemental feeding programs, disaster relief, summer camps for children, and Indian reservations not requesting a food stamp program.

A wide variety of foods are made available to needy persons, schools, and other institutions through the commodity distribution programs. Foods are acquired by the Federal Government and delivered without charge to State agencies. State and local organizations handle intrastate distribution.

The foods distributed include wheat flour, rolled oats, cornmeal, and nonfat dry milk. Other foods are obtained through surplus removal programs. Some foods are purchased to meet specific user program requirements, such as the nutritional combination of foods for distribution to needy families and food purchases for use in school lunches. Foods from these several sources have different

categories of users, and the food products distributed vary over time, depending on their availability and marketing conditions. With limitations on the number of "surplus" foods available, the distribution of nonsurplus items has increased.

Historically, these commodities were distributed through the authority of the various surplus removal sections of the agricultural laws. Without surpluses, however, these statutes lie dormant.

The Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973—Public Law 93-86—provided the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to purchase commodities needed for the commodity distribution programs when such commodities are not in surplus. However, this authority would expire on June 30, 1974.

States and the Department are currently implementing a congressional mandate to switch all remaining food distribution counties into the food stamp program. Of the 778 counties which were still operating food distribution programs last August, all but 52 will meet the June 30 deadline to complete the change-over, according to the Department of Agriculture. The States of New Hampshire, Missouri, and Virginia will be unable to complete the transition to food stamps by the end of June.

Likewise, problems exist in meeting the deadline with regard to Indian tribes, and in Puerto Rico where the Department has approved a plan to phase in food stamps on an orderly basis with completion to be as soon as possible during the coming fiscal year. Also, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will be required to operate a food distribution program beyond June 30.

Extension of special purchase authority would also enable the continuation of the supplemental food program through the next year as the Department considers alternative means to assist the women and children taking part in that program and completes its evaluation of the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children.

The House has already enacted H.R. 14354 to extend authority for special purchase for the school lunch program and other programs within the jurisdiction of the Education and Labor Committee. H.R. 14992 provides similar authority with regard to programs currently within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, including distribution to needy families pending transition to the food stamp program— institutions, supplemental feeding programs, disaster relief, summer camps for children, and Indian reservations not requesting a food stamp program.

A special ad hoc Subcommittee on Legislation To Extend the Commodity Food Distribution Authority, which I chaired, held several days of hearings, then unanimously reported the bill to the full committee. So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, there is no dissent from the basic concept of the bill before us today. All witnesses before the subcommittee, including those from the administration, agreed that authority to extend these programs for an additional year

was necessary, and that such action must be taken before the end of this fiscal year in order to avoid hardship.

I urge the adoption of the bill before us so we can continue this needed assistance to these traditional beneficiaries under these important programs.

Mr. WYLIE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. On the first page, line 6, of the bill it says:

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, until July, 1975, to (1) use funds available under provisions of section 32 of Public Law 320, Sseventy-fourth Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), and not otherwise expended or necessary for such purposes to purchase, without regard to the provisions of existing law . . .

Would the gentleman tell us how much money we are talking about?

Mr. FOLEY. The money that would be required to handle this particular aspect of the program is about \$60 million to \$70 million in the next fiscal year. If you include the money from the section 32 funds that would be required to meet the cost of H.R. 14354 for the school lunch program, that is a substantially greater sum or about \$200 million additional.

Mr. WYLIE. The gentleman's answer to my question is—

Mr. FOLEY \$60 million to \$70 million.

Mr. WYLIE. Funds available?

Mr. FOLEY. For this bill.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Why is seafood contained in this legislation?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOLEY. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the first time seafood has been referred to in this legislation?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. It is the first time. Seafood commodities are included because of an amendment offered by the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER).

The reason for that amendment is that the purchase of seafood products is not authorized under existing statutes as they are not considered products of agriculture unless they are fish products from inland fishponds or farms.

Now, although seafood products are not presently considered products of agriculture, seafood is often a very important alternative source of protein. From the standpoint of the Department of Agriculture it is also often available at a lower cost than other products. So it seems purchased for these programs wise to give the Department the authority to purchase seafood commodities when those products are often attractively priced, and can meet the needs of the program most effectively.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14992.

This bill would extend for 1 year, un-

til July 1, 1975, the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds available under provisions of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, to purchase, without regard to the provisions of existing law governing the expenditure of public funds, agricultural commodities and their products, and seafood commodities and their products in order to maintain the level of assistance required by domestic food assistance programs that are authorized by law. This bill also provides that if stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not available, the Secretary may use the funds of the Corporation to purchase agricultural commodities and products of the types customarily available for donation under section 416 of the Agriculture Act of 1949.

Members of the House may wish to note that this bill is one of three pieces of legislation dealing with food program benefits being considered here in this Chamber today and tomorrow.

Earlier this afternoon the House considered the conference report on H.R. 14354 which originated in the Committee on Education and Labor. That bill dealt with food donations to schools and other related outlets within the jurisdiction of that committee.

Tomorrow the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 15124 which originated in the Committee on Ways and Means. That bill would extend for 1 year the present law applicable to supplemental security income recipients in regard to food stamp program benefits.

This bill, H.R. 14992, which originated in the Committee on Agriculture, deals only with the food donation programs within the scope of our legislative jurisdiction.

H.R. 14992 is needed, Mr. Speaker, because without any further legislative action, the Secretary's authority to provide food aid to many needy families, institutions, supplemental feeding programs, disaster relief, summer camps for children, and certain Indian reservations will expire in just 13 more days.

None of us wish to see this happen, so I hope the House will act favorably and quickly so we can move to reconcile our differences in similar legislation proposed by the other body.

This bill is the result of the work of a special ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. POAGE). The subcommittee was chaired by the able gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) and included myself, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MATHIS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BERGLAND), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. THONE).

This bill, together with three committee amendments, was approved by the full Committee on Agriculture without significant controversy.

Both the subcommittee and then the full committee by a 21 to 6 vote approved my amendment to authorize the purchase of seafood commodities and their products as well as agricultural commodities and their products. As we con-

sidered this provision, we learned that there was some question as to the scope of the Secretary's authority under present law to acquire and donate these equally nutritious foods. I believe the intent of our committee is clear that under this bill the Secretary can and should act to provide eligible recipients with seafood commodities and their products.

The full committee by a vote of 17 to 9 included an amendment making the Secretary's authority discretionary rather than mandatory. This amendment was supported by the Department of Agriculture which needs the necessary flexibility to properly administer this part of the food program.

The final committee amendment removed any reference to school food programs which are now covered in the conference report on H.R. 14354.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this bill is needed and it is needed now. The present law runs out in less than 2 weeks, so I hope the House will approve H.R. 14992.

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

Mr. WAMPLER. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as has been previously noted, this is the first time seafood has been included in this very important program. I wish to commend the committee, and particularly the gentleman in the well (Mr. WAMPLER) for their diligence in getting this valuable food substance in the bill. Seafood is comparatively low in price, and it is high in protein. It will be helpful to the children and to the other people who receive it, and it also will be a shot in the arm for the seafood industry.

Mr. WAMPLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, as it has been well pointed out, the jurisdiction over this general subject matter is rather divided in the House, and there are three bills, all of which relate to the same general subject, all of which are in order, and all of which are before the House today or tomorrow.

This bill attempts to cover only those matters that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

At the time the House considered the bill from the Committee on Education and Labor, I pointed out that that bill, in my judgment, infringed on the agricultural program. That bill was carefully tailored to 1 year, and this bill is carefully tailored to 1 year. Were it a longer period, I would feel that I would have to object to the legislation, but inasmuch as we have carefully confined this extension to 1 year, it seems to me reasonable that we take the year in which to bring ourselves in line with the new regulations established by the Committee on Ways and Means.

So I would suggest that both this bill and the legislation from the other com-

mittee do not more than carry out the present program for another year, with one slight exception.

Our committee did not know at the time that we considered the bill that there would be a provision in the conference report that would impose mandatory instructions on the Secretary of Agriculture. That was not in the House bill as brought to us by the other committee. Our committee sought to conform this bill with that of the other committee, and we did so. But now that committee has accepted in conference these provisions that were not in their original bill. This may present some problem when we go to conference.

But I wanted the House to recognize that the Committee on Agriculture was not trying to cause friction between the committees, but rather we were trying to achieve a situation in which our legislation and the other legislation would be coordinated and would be of the same nature. So we cannot promise the Members just what will come out of the conference. We do think it is of vital importance that this legislation and the other legislation both limit this to 1 year, during which time I hope that we can recognize that our agricultural programs should be separated from our relief or social welfare programs.

It is not that we are raising any objections to the social objectives, but they should not be charged to agriculture, and to the extent that this bill gets its money from funds set aside for agriculture we are taking from agriculture the resources we are using to carry out the welfare program. We are not fighting against the welfare program but we are saying it should not be done at the expense of farmers because farmers get a very small portion of that welfare program.

If I am still chairman of the Agriculture Committee in the future I will object to any further extension of using agricultural funds for these purposes. I think we have to do it at the present time, as the gentleman from Washington has so well pointed out.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am always delighted that each time I appear on this floor I have a cheering section. It reinforces me and I am able to do a better job.

I just want to point out that here again we are creating another bureaucracy and even though this bill calls for a 1-year extension I have learned from long, long experience that there is nothing as permanent as a temporary program. I recall that in 1937 and 1938, in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we enacted temporary taxes. They are still on the books today.

This commodity food distribution program came into being when we had a large surplus. Today that is no longer the case. What we are proposing to do in this bill is go out on the open market and buy foods and give them away on a welfare program.

I would like to point out, although I do not think it is necessary for me to point this out to the Members, we are doing

this in direct competition with the people at home who should be furnishing the food for those we provide for under this bill. Why should they not have the privilege of furnishing this food, because after all, they are the local taxpayers?

I suggested to one of the gentlemen during the hearings on this bill that I personally believe the dollar we spend at home will buy far more food than the dollar we first send to Washington. He was not willing to agree with me on that, but I still believe I am correct.

Apparently the director of the bureau of Government donated food in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, heard of some of the questions I asked during these hearings. He wrote me what I consider to be a rather nasty letter.

Of course I am used to getting that kind. I have a way of answering them also. I want to read just one sentence that the gentleman wrote in his letter:

Last of all, I completely fail to understand how an elected official could take such a callous attitude about keeping down the local tax burden.

How ridiculous can one become at the State level. It seems to be OK for us to raise taxes, but their attitude is: "Do not require us to raise taxes in our territory. We do not mind having you people in Washington look bad but we want to look good here."

This was my first reply to that letter:

I am not only amazed but genuinely concerned when a public official advocates more Federal Government spending in order that you at the State level can keep down local taxes. Apparently you have not learned that before Uncle Sam can take a dollar out of his pocket, you and I must first put it there.

Frankly, I am a bit weary of having almost daily requests from Harrisburg for more Federal funds. I happen to believe the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is in a far stronger fiscal position than the Federal Government.

Call this what one will, it is simply one more welfare program. I do not care how we define it.

I am not sufficiently naive to think that this bill is not going to pass. I think this is a bad bill and I simply did want to point out, as I said before, here is one more temporary program that we are going to make permanent. As already has been pointed out by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture, this is one more welfare program which is charged to the farmers of America. To my way of thinking, this is not proper procedure. All of these programs should be in the Department of Welfare, rather than in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14992. This legislation has been approved by the Committee on Agriculture to assist several States and territories.

I also support that seafood and all its products be included. There was no reason why this should not have been included in the beginning. It is not only

proper in equity and justice that seafoods be included in this program; but it is wise, both nutritionally and economically. All will gain by this legislation and I am glad to have cooperated in this endeavor.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Commodities Distribution, the Honorable THOMAS FOLEY and the other distinguished members of that subcommittee for their work on the bill. H.R. 14992. This measure would provide for the continuation of domestic food assistance programs by means of extending the Department of Agriculture's special authority for 1 year to purchase agricultural commodities which are not in surplus.

These food commodities which have been distributed by the Department since the early 1930's have played an invaluable role in providing wholesome meals to needy families, youngsters in non-profit school lunch programs, children and adults in camps and other nonprofit institutions. Indeed, without this assistance, many of these programs would have been confronted with enormous financial problems, possibly resulting in the termination of many nutritional services.

I am delighted to see that this measure contains provisions similar to the proposal I introduced on March 5. It amends section 4(a) of Public Law 93-86 by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, until July 1, 1975, to use funds available under provision of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress (7 U.S.C. 612c) to purchase, without regard to the provision of existing law governing the expenditures of public funds, agricultural commodities customarily purchased under section 32 and seafood commodities in order to maintain the level of assistance required by domestic food assistance programs that are authorized by law. This would benefit poor families—pending transition to the food stamp program—nonprofit institutions, supplemental feeding programs, disaster relief victims, summer camps for children, and Indian reservations not requesting a food stamp program.

My bill had also included provision for the distribution of food commodities for school lunches. However, with the passage of H.R. 14354 to extend the authorization of special purchases for the school lunch program, it was not needed in the bill now before us.

Originally, the Federal Government sought ways to dispose of surplus foods, thus creating a clientele of needy recipients who have come to depend on the extra foods. Now that the giant surpluses of food are no longer available, the Government cannot suddenly orphan the child that it has adopted for so long. I am pleased to see that this bill will authorize the Department of Agriculture to continue to purchase and distribute food supplies which have become essential to hundreds of thousands of hungry people. As long as there are people suffering from malnutrition in this country, the Federal Government must help bear the cost of feeding them.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, just as I did earlier in connection with the School Lunch Act, I rise in support of this bill,

but only with the understanding that this is the last year we will be operating this program by purchasing food products through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

This bill will continue the Federal Government in the business of food purchase and distribution—a business that can be better operated by the private sector at a lesser cost to the taxpayer. Again, I have no objection to the programs that will ultimately benefit by the purchase and distribution of this food. These beneficiaries include children in summer camps, people made homeless by natural disasters, and the poor and elderly in various institutions.

These programs are beneficial and as long as a majority of our society supports such efforts, Congress shall continue to appropriate funds for them.

However, as I did in connection with the School Lunch Act, I object here to the Federal Government getting into the food purchase and distribution business in direct competition with private industry.

In this case as in the School Lunch Act program, the interests of the beneficiaries and the American taxpayer would be better served if a check for the cost of the food products was turned over to the localities and they were permitted to go out into the marketplace themselves and purchase their products.

Whenever the Government gets into a business ordinarily handled in the private sector costs go up. This is particularly true in the food purchase and distribution business because of the very low profit margins on which such private sector firms operate. I hope this is the last time this body will have to vote for keeping the Federal Government in a business better operated by private firms.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 14992, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3458), to amend the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, the Food Stamp Act of 1964, and for other purposes, a similar bill to H.R. 14992, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3458

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled. That section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, as amended (87 Stat. 221, as amended, 7 U.S.C. 612c note), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall (1) use funds available under provisions of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), 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 section 32 for donation to maintain the traditional level of assistance for food assistance programs as are authorized by law, including but not limited to school lunch, institutions, supplemental feeding, disaster relief, and, until July 1, 1976, the family commodity distribution program on Indian reservations not requesting the food stamp program, and (2) if stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not available, use the funds of the Corporation to purchase agricultural commodities and the products thereof of the types customarily available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to meet such requirements: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this subsection supersedes the requirements of section 10(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, except as to Indian reservations."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3(h) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 703, as amended, 7 U.S.C. 2011–2026), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such term, with respect to any tribe, means (1) the Secretary of the Interior whenever the Secretary of the Interior has responsibility for administering a food stamp program for such tribe under an agreement entered into under this Act, (2) the official governing body of any tribe whenever such tribe has responsibility for administering its own food stamp program under this Act, or (3) any State whenever such State agrees to accept responsibility for administering a food stamp program for such tribe within such State under an agreement entered into under this Act".

(b) Section 3 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections (o) and (p):

"(o) The term 'tribe' means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or community, including any 'Native village' as defined in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (85 Stat. 688), for which the Federal Government provides special programs because of the identity of the tribe, band, nation, or community as Indian.

"(p) The term 'Indian reservation' means any area recognized as such by the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by inserting "or an Indian reservation, as the case may be," immediately after "within the State".

(b) Section 4 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is further amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and by adding after subsection (a) a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) (1) Upon request to the Secretary by the appropriate officials of any tribe, such tribe is authorized to administer a food stamp program under this Act on behalf of the eligible households of such tribe living on an Indian reservation. Such program shall be administered by the tribe in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"(2) The Secretary of the Interior or any State is authorized to administer a food stamp program on behalf of any tribe residing on an Indian reservation. Any such program shall be administered in accordance

with an agreement entered into between the tribe and the Secretary of the Interior or the State within which the Indian reservation is located. Where an Indian reservation is located in more than one State, an agreement with a State shall pertain only to members of the tribe residing within the boundaries of such State.

"(3) In accordance with regulations issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection or in accordance with an agreement entered into under paragraph (2) of this subsection, as appropriate, a food stamp program may be administered by a tribe or by the Secretary of the Interior or a State on behalf of part or all the members of such tribe eligible to participate in such program."

(c) Subsection (d) of section 4 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No regulation which pertains only to the administration of the food stamp program on Indian reservations may be issued without prior consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and authorized representatives of the tribes affected."

SEC. 4. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Subsections (a) and (b) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, each State shall be responsible for financing, from funds available to the State or political subdivision thereof, the costs of carrying out the administrative responsibilities assigned to it under the provisions of this Act.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to pay to each State agency an amount equal to 62.5 per centum of all administrative costs, including, but not limited to, the cost of (1) the certification of households; (2) the acceptance, storage, and protection of coupons after their delivery to receiving points within the States; (3) the issuance of such coupons to eligible households; (4) the outreach and fair hearing requirements of section 10 of this Act; and (5) the control and accounting of coupons: *Provided*, That each State shall report at least annually to the Secretary on the effectiveness of its administration of the program and no such payment shall be made to any State unless the Secretary is satisfied pursuant to regulations which he shall issue that an adequate number of qualified personnel are employed by the State in the program to administer the program efficiently and effectively.

(b) A new subsection (c) is added at the end thereof as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall pay any tribe administering a food stamp program on any Indian reservation an amount equal to 100 per centum of all expenses incurred by such tribe attributable to the administration of such program and shall reimburse the Department of the Interior or any State administering a food stamp program on any Indian reservation for all expenses incurred by such Department or State in accordance with any agreement entered into under section 4(b) of this Act."

SEC. 5. Section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended (80 Stat. 885, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1771–1786), is amended as follows:

(a) The first sentence is amended by striking ", not to exceed \$120,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "such sums as may be necessary".

(b) Section 3 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for subsequent fiscal years, the minimum rate of reimbursement for a half-pint of milk served in schools and other eligible institutions shall not be less than 5 cents per half-pint served to eligible children, and such minimum rate of reimbursement shall be

adjusted on an annual basis each fiscal year thereafter, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, to reflect changes in the series of 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."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FOLEY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOLEY moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill (S. 3458), and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 14992, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To continue domestic food assistance programs, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 14992) was laid on the table.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill (S. 3458) and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POAGE, STUBBLEFIELD, FOLEY, WAMPLER, and GOODLING.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15296) to authorize the Commissioner of Education to carry out a program to assist persons from disadvantaged backgrounds to undertake training for the legal profession.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15296

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds appropriated for part D of title IX of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 (Public Law 93–192), shall remain available for obligation through September 15, 1974, for the purpose of supporting a program to assist persons from disadvantaged backgrounds to prepare and be educated for the legal profession.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the program authorized by this Act, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to private nonprofit organizations representative of legal education and the legal profes-

sion for the purpose of (1) selecting and counseling such persons; (2) paying stipends to such persons and in such amounts as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate; and (3) paying for any administrative expenses incurred in the carrying out of activities authorized by this Act.

SEC. 3. The activities authorized by this Act may be carried out without regard to the requirements and limitations set forth in sections 961, 962, and 963 of part D of title IX of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman from Oregon opposed to the bill?

Mr. DELLENBACK. The gentleman is not opposed to the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed and I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I think a few words are in order to explain to the House what this bill does, and to seek to allay some concerns over things it does not do.

The bill creates no new program. There has been in operation, since fiscal year 1971, a program jointly funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and managed by the Council on Legal Education Opportunity—CLEO—to assist young people from a variety of disadvantaged backgrounds to prepare themselves to enter law school and to complete a legal education. The program has functioned through the financing of summer institutes to assist promising college undergraduates to prepare for law school entrance, and through the provision of stipends to persons admitted to law school to enable them to meet the costs of legal education. The American Bar Association, the National Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, and the Law School Admission Test Council have all participated in the work of CLEO, and 130 of the 150 accredited law schools in the country have students who were helped to prepare for school through the CLEO program.

Since the basic OEO funding authority for the program was scheduled to end at the close of this fiscal year—and, in fact, has now done so, the Congress, in 1972, enacted legislation which, among other things, was intended to provide an on-going authority for the CLEO program. This legislation, part D, of title IX of the Higher Education Act as amended, provides for graduate and professional fellowships for persons from

disadvantaged backgrounds. Part D specifies the amount of stipends and calls for dependency allowances, travel allowances, and for a rather generous institutional award in connection with each fellowship.

The CLEO program has operated, quite successfully, at a level of approximately \$1,000 per student-year, plus administrative costs and the cost of summer institutes. For an annual expenditure in the neighborhood of \$750,000, CLEO has been able to prepare and maintain approximately 550 students in any given year, at one point or another of their legal education.

That \$750,000 has already been appropriated for fiscal year 1974, and is available for obligation for the coming year's program.

However, if that appropriated amount has to be spent under the provisions of part D, the cost will go from slightly over \$1,000 per student to just under \$8,000 per student—half of which will be \$4,200 institutional award, which in the case of the CLEO program, the institutions are willing to forego, but which the law makes mandatory.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we have here an on-going program, which has been operated to the satisfaction of both students and institutions, at a cost in the neighborhood of \$1,000 per student-year, and which can continue at that cost, except that a strict reading of the statutory authority under which it will now function would require an eight-fold increase in the cost per student-year. If the CLEO program can continue under the provisions which have governed it to date, they can handle some 550 students during the coming year, including both new entrants and students continuing from previous years. If we do not permit this, the program will continue, the same amount of money will be spent, but instead of 550 students, there will be less than 100 who can continue.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am curious about this program of taking care of so-called disadvantaged persons with respect to a law degree.

I should like to ask the gentleman, what is the formula for being a disadvantaged person in terms of this bill?

Mr. O'HARA. Essentially, it is an income test. This program is a carryover from the poverty program, and it has to do with family income or financial income, which is the first criterion for eligibility to participate in the program. There has to be low income, to start off with, and then since there are about 11 low-income people applying for every available spot, the deans of the law schools that operate these summer institutes further screen the applicants and try to select those with the greatest academic promise from among the applicants.

Mr. GROSS. Why not doctors?

Mr. O'HARA. I do not know. There is no reason for why not doctors, I would suppose. But I know of no such program.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, there ought to be some answers as to why this is limited to the legal profession. Are we short of lawyers in this country?

Mr. O'HARA. I do not believe there is a great undersupply of lawyers.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not the fact that many young men are unable to get into law schools this year because they are full?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes, it certainly is.

Mr. GROSS. Why did the gentleman pick out lawyers?

Mr. O'HARA. I think the explanation in answer to the question lies in the history of the program, how it originated. It originated as part of the legal services program operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, one aspect of the legal services program. Then when the OEO was going to expire, this particular ongoing program, which had been run by the American Bar Association, the National Bar Association, and the others I mentioned, was incorporated into the 1972 education amendments. I do not think it represented any conscious judgment that disadvantaged students seeking to qualify for law school are any more or less deserving than students seeking to qualify for medical school.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not the fact that we are probably in shorter supply of blacksmiths than we are of lawyers in this country, people who can shoe horses and do general blacksmithing?

Mr. O'HARA. I do not know whether we are in short supply of either blacksmiths or lawyers.

I do not think the idea is based on that.

Mr. GROSS. What is the idea based on, then? Is it not to put them in a position where they can make a living?

Mr. O'HARA. To answer the gentleman, I do not believe the purpose of the program is to maximize the number of lawyers. I think the purpose of the program is to assist students who have come from disadvantaged backgrounds and who would not otherwise have the opportunity to qualify for or successfully complete law school. It is to achieve equality for those seeking admission and to help them in competing once they get into law school.

Mr. GROSS. These disadvantaged persons must have a degree before they qualify for this program; is that not correct?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Then what is a disadvantaged person if they must have a degree to qualify?

Mr. O'HARA. It takes more than a college degree to enter law school these days.

Mr. GROSS. All right. I agree with that statement, but are they truly disadvantaged persons if they already have a degree?

Mr. O'HARA. That depends on their background. If they are from low-income families, if they have had interrupted educations, if they have some sort of handicap, then I think one can say they are disadvantaged people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what does the gentleman mean by "handicapped"? The gentleman is not predicating this on the "handicapped," is he?

Mr. O'HARA. No, I am not.

Mr. GROSS. All right. Let us dispose of this here and now, and let us not shed any tears over the handicapped as

the term applies to this particular program.

What I do not understand is this: What is the cost per year? What are we willing to dish out to these disadvantaged people who already have college degrees? How much per year is it proposed to dish out to them to further complete their education toward a law degree?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will answer his question.

If the bill passes, they will get \$1,000 a year. If the bill does not pass, they will get \$2,800 a year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thought the gentleman said that on page 2 of the report it was pointed out that the Office of Education testified that the average part D fellowship will cost almost \$8,000 a year.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is correct. If this bill does not pass, we will have to give each student a minimum stipend of \$2,800, plus \$300 for each dependent plus travel, and we will have to give each law school that takes such a student \$4,200 per student.

Under the present system, if the bill passes, we will not give the law schools anything, and we will only give the students \$1,000 a year instead of \$2,800 plus.

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

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gentleman's response, this bill which we have before us today would reduce the stipend from \$2,800 per student to \$1,000 per student?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WYLIE. What happens if this bill does not pass?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I will answer by saying this:

The program will go ahead. The same amount of money will be spent, but it will be spent at the rate of \$2,800 plus for each student, plus \$4,200 for each institution or each law school for the assistance to each student.

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman: How long will the present program continue?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the program is authorized and appropriated for through the coming fiscal year. Our committee anticipates giving a thorough review to the program during this last remaining year of the program, and we, the Congress, will decide whether or not to continue the program beyond this coming year.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean the fiscal year 1975, the fiscal year that begins on July 1?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WYLIE. So it would continue for 1 year beyond the time now, under the existing legislation which provides for \$2,800 per student?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, if the gen-

tleman from Iowa will yield further, the program would continue for 1 additional year.

The money is already appropriated for next year, and that is all I intend to provide.

Mr. WYLIE. At \$2,800 a year?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; I intend to make it possible to spend the money at a less-per-student rate next year. That is all I am trying to do with this bill.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the questions which my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, has raised are good questions. They are valid questions, questions that go to the heart of the program itself. They are questions that are part of those questions, if I may say this to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, which have been raised within the subcommittee.

In addition to those questions, there are other questions which are valid, such as these: In the actual administration of the program, we ask not only what has been used as the test for "disadvantaged," but has it been fairly applied? Have we really a program which has lived up to our original expectations and hopes?

Mr. Speaker, I will say to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, granted those are very good questions, the issue that is before us today is not really the consideration of those questions, because under past legislation, authorization legislation and appropriation legislation, the program is going to go forward. We suddenly find that in the amendments of 1972 there was an inadvertence. There was not only the continuation of this program, which was inadvertent, but, inadvertently, it was lumped under a graduate fellowship section of the law which mandates that not only would there be a stipend of \$2,800 a year for each participant, but, in addition to that, there would be a transportation allowance for each participant. In addition to that, there is the dependency allowance for each participant, and in addition to that, there is a grant of at least \$4,200 to the institution where this participant participates.

So we would find that this had been going forward at the relatively modest cost to the Federal Government of \$1,000 per student, with the balance being picked up by the law school or the balance being taken care of from other sources, and thus, with \$1,000 per student, we were able to go forward with the program and we would find that under presently existing laws, with money already appropriated, it would require each participant to receive, directly or indirectly, about \$8,000 per participant.

The passage of this bill today, I will say to my good friend and colleague, will not mean the discontinuation of the program. It will continue anyway. It will not mean the appropriation of one more dollar. We have already appropriated those dollars.

Mr. GROSS. If you found all of these

things wrong with this program, why in Heaven's name did you not come here today, with legislation to repeal the law and get rid of it? I do not understand why you are in the business of emphasizing more lawyers when we are already surfeited with them and when the law schools are full and those that can pay their way cannot get into the law schools because they are full. I have had requests to help two applicants in the last month, and I could not help them because the law schools are full. Why should we be in this business at all?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DELLENBACK. It is not my feeling that the program is a bad program. I feel, frankly, it is a good program.

Mr. GROSS. I took it for granted that the gentleman felt it is a good program or he would have taken the other course that was suggested, namely, that the law be repealed.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Exactly.

Mr. GROSS. And we ought not to be spending money on this kind of a proposition.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If my friend will yield, I may reply.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The point I make, Mr. Gross, is I think the program is a good program, but I say that there has been a series of questions raised.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you think it is a good program?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Because basically the history of the program has shown that the program may have somewhere between 1,300 and 1,500 people who are not disadvantaged, and there is a difference between saying a disadvantaged person and a person from a disadvantaged background. There is a need for well qualified lawyers from all across the warp and woof of society. This has made it possible for otherwise well qualified people to be qualified as lawyers; not to make more lawyers available but to be sure that of those lawyers that are going to be made available they come from all sources.

Mr. GROSS. That is what it does. It makes more lawyers available, and the gentleman knows that we have enough.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LANDGREBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have a couple of questions that have already been answered, but I think we can ask them again.

Do you not think there is something fishy about a bill which is brought to the floor that suggests we will reduce spending from \$2,800 to \$1,000 on any person or project?

Mr. GROSS. Coming from the Education and Labor Committee, yes. I think it needs to be questioned.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Again the gentleman mentioned this. Is the need for lawyers in this country so great that we ought to run this country further into

debt spending money even if it has already been appropriated?

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly the point.

Mr. LANDGREBE. One more question. Although the gentleman has already answered this, I would like to reemphasize it.

Would it not make a lot more sense to come in here, and under suspension, simply repeal the entire program?

Mr. GROSS. That is right. That is the question I asked a few moments ago and got no answer.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I was heartened when I read this reduces the financing from \$2,800 to \$1,000, but my question is to either the gentleman from Oregon or the gentleman from—

Mr. GROSS. But the rest of the money should not be spent.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am sure it will be spent, because they will find a way. However, my question is: Why cannot these legal students, if they are such disadvantaged people, get scholarships under other Federal programs? Why do we have to have a special program? This is a special program that came out of the Office of Economic Opportunity which created nothing but problems all across the country. That is another issue which this is a spinoff from. This is a spinoff from the OEO. Why cannot these so-called disadvantaged people—and I am not convinced that all of them are—but why can they not get this under other normal Federal scholarship programs?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Will the gentleman yield very briefly?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If I may say so to my colleague in answer to him, under the program which has been carried forward they have been able to go to other sources to get most of the cost of going to law school. This has supplied supplemental funding in the amount of \$1,000 a youngster to join with the others.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. But then we are not cutting off any disadvantaged person from going to law school if the law school will admit them. As the gentleman from Iowa has already pointed out, the law schools are already well oversubscribed as to people attending them. They will not be, in fact, cut off if we do not pass this bill because they are able to get it from another area. Is that correct?

Mr. DELLENBACK. The answer is "No."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) for a statement, let me simply say to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) that whether or not we pass the bill the \$750,000 that is appropriated is going to be spent. If we pass this bill we will spend it at the rate of about \$1,000 per student, and if we do not pass the bill it will be spent at the rate of about \$8,000 per student. The difference is between the number of students that would be assisted one way versus the other way. If

we defeat this bill we do not end the program. The program goes on. The program does not need this bill. But if we do not pass this bill what we are doing is providing for expenditure at the rate of \$8,000 per student instead of \$1,000 per student.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I think it is extremely important that the questions that have been asked be answered, as I said in response to the comments that were made by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) a few moments ago.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) is also raising some good questions, and they should be faced up to.

It is the very fact that there have been a series of such questions asked that have led the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) to declare that as quickly as we complete the hearings which are now under way in our subcommittee dealing with the whole question of student aid, we will look at this whole issue in order to try to make some order out of chaos. At that time, we will proceed to look at this particular program from the viewpoint of:

Is it basically a good program?

Has it been well administered?

Should we continue the program? These are representative of the sorts of questions that can be raised.

Quite frankly, we would welcome at that time whatever testimony the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) or anyone else might want to inject into the deliberations on this program and the Federal role in its continuation.

But I would urge my colleagues that we understand clearly what is really before us today. It is not the question of whether this program will continue. That has already been acted on by the Congress. It is not whether or not there will be one additional dollar appropriated, because it has already been appropriated in prior appropriation legislation. The issue that is basically before us is:

Whether or not the program will continue in force and effect as it has been operative under prior authorizations and prior appropriations, or whether—because of something that was included in the 1972 amendments—there be a rather drastic change in the way the stipend funds are awarded.

We are really debating whether or not these participants who have been perfectly satisfied to receive \$1,000 a year to continue their legal education—and coupled this incremental subsidy with financial assistance from the law schools involved as well as private sources—will suddenly be forced to receive in the area of an average of \$8,000. Some of this increased financial aid will go directly to the student, with the majority of it going to the institution. If ever there could be inefficient utilization of Federal dollars, this will be such inefficient utilization.

Consequently, I would urge that we see this bill for exactly what it is. Let's raise the questions which are in our minds and in our hearts, but realize that these questions, if applied in this instance to yield a "no" vote, will be counterproductive. Those of you who see a difference in one direction which can lead to a "no" vote will be walking off in an entirely different direction.

So I would urge that we consider this bill for what it would accomplish at this point in time.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So the better course would be to defeat this bill today and let the Committee on Education and Labor come in with a bill to repeal it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If I may say in response to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that is not what is going to happen. The decisions are going to be made within the next couple of weeks as to how, under the present program, the dollars would be allocated. If we were to defeat this bill today, what would occur, since the authorizing legislation is on the books and the funds already appropriated and the program underway, is that those who administer the program would be forced to go ahead and in the next 2 weeks allocate the money on this concentrated basis in much larger amounts. There is not going to be time, if we defeat this bill today, to follow the course that the gentleman is suggesting.

The comments that the gentleman would have to make should be brought before the subcommittee at the time it holds further hearings.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Am I not correct in assuming that the purpose of this legislation, the chairman of the subcommittee, has stated, is simply to reduce the per-student stipend from \$2,800 to a maximum of \$1,000?

Mr. DELLENBACK. That is the net effect of the legislation, not from just \$2,800 to \$1,000, but the \$2,800, plus the \$4,200, plus travel, plus dependency, to reduce that to one single \$1,000 per student.

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman will yield further, I have another question.

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

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

Another question on the minds of some of my colleagues is, Does this continue the authorization beyond the fiscal year 1975?

Mr. DELLENBACK. No, it does not. The authorization is already there for fiscal year 1975 and through the fiscal year 1975. This does not change that.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Of course, I yield.

Mr. KEMP. Is it not the intent of the subcommittee to hold hearings in the

near future and to go into the questions that are being raised on the floor today, which are perfectly justifiable and of very much concern to many of us, as to the purpose of the program?

Mr. DELLENBACK. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill we are now considering is quite limited, but this is a bill which it is important be enacted this month. I endorse H.R. 15296, which I introduced along with Mr. O'HARA on June 10, without any reservations and feel that all our colleagues can support it as well. I appreciate the cooperation of Mr. O'HARA, the able chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, in getting the bill to the floor as rapidly as he has.

As has already been mentioned, the effect of this bill is quite simple. It is to allow for the continued Federal support of a successful privately sponsored program, using funds already appropriated by Congress in the 1974 Labor-HEW Appropriations Act.

The program for which this appropriation was made is known as CLEO, the Council for Legal Education Opportunity. This council was formed in 1968 and sponsored by the American Bar Association, American Association of Law Schools, National Bar Association, and the Law School Admission Council. Beginning in 1971, CLEO received financial support from OEO and the Office of Education. CLEO serves as the catalyst to assist some 130 accredited law schools recruit, prepare, and support approximately 200 students from disadvantaged backgrounds each year. At the present time there are approximately 550 CLEO students enrolled in one or another of the 3 years of law school.

In past years, the CLEO appropriation and subsequent grant were authorized under the OEO legislation. After the responsibility for the CLEO grant was transferred to the Office of Education, it was necessary to create authorizing legislation to allow for continued appropriations. This was the intent behind a small provision in part D of title IX of the Higher Education Act.

Once the \$750,000 was appropriated under this authority, however, it became evident that the grant could serve only a very limited and reduced number of students because of the restrictions and requirements of part D. Specifically, as I mentioned the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP), part D requires stipends to students in the amount of \$2,800, plus \$300 per dependent, plus travel expenses, plus at least \$4,200 to the institution. No one, including CLEO and the participating law schools, feels that these vastly increased amounts are necessary. In fact, the current practice is to give each CLEO student only \$1,000 per year. This bill would allow the current practice to continue next year, and would result in many more students being assisted with the same number of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, some Members have raised questions about the soundness of providing Federal funds to assist disadvantaged students in the pursuit of a legal education. There are complex questions that should be explored before

further approximations are made in support of the CLEO program. Personally, I do not share most of the concerns of some of our colleagues and strongly endorse efforts to educate competent attorneys representative of every segment of society.

Nevertheless, Mr. O'HARA has assured us on a number of occasions that he does intend to explore all of the issues related to this controversial area. We will look at traditional discretionary practices and at so-called reverse discrimination. We will explore current admission policies and the tests and criteria used in the admission selection process. But those questions do not have a bearing on this very limited bill.

I would remind my colleagues, once again, that we are not authorizing any new program. Nor are we approving any new funds. We are simply continuing in force and effect the ground rules under which already appropriated moneys can be used this coming fiscal year. Because of the merits of the legislation and the urgency of taking action in the next few days before the end of this fiscal year, I urge the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It still is not clear to me whether or not we are going to educate the same number of students at last year's costs. The gentleman said the money has already been appropriated. Are we going to spend less money per person, or are we going to educate more students, or are we going to educate less students with the same amount of money?

Mr. DELLENBACK. The limitation on the number of students being educated is already determined, not by this program, but by the law schools' admission policies. It will be a question of whether law school students who have already been admitted are going to get help from this program, or whether a series of young people who have been admitted and who are counting on \$1,000 and also counting on being enrolled are suddenly going to be thrown into chaos, with a substantial number being affected.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15296 makes responsible technical changes in the CLEO program. It changes the ground rules for spending funds already appropriated in a way which will maximize the use of Federal expenditures. Because the limited objective of this bill, it would reduce the per student stipend from \$2,800 to a maximum of \$1,000 a technical change, is competently handled, I support this bill. Although we are now discussing the merits of a technical change in the CLEO program, I feel it is appropriate to stress at this time the urgent necessity to discuss the merits of the CLEO program itself. During hearings and mark-up sessions on H.R. 15296, fundamental questions regarding the substance of CLEO were not

resolved, because this bill was not seen as the vehicle for resolving such questions. I agree that this bill is not the vehicle for resolving such questions. This bill has, however, focused attention upon the deeper issues involved in admissions to law schools—and the committee must move to consider these issues at the earliest possible moment. The rapid advancement and resultant complexity of our society has created the necessity for greater numbers of highly trained professionals. Our society has realized this need. Our law schools are flooded yearly with tens of thousands of applications for admissions from individuals who for the most part are highly qualified. If the needs of our society are to be fulfilled as efficiently and effectively as possible, it is incumbent upon law schools to select from their applicants those students who are most qualified, and most likely to successfully complete their course of study and become effective members of the legal profession.

The CLEO program provides students from low-income, disadvantaged backgrounds an access to law school by training them in a remedial summer institute, and then making arrangements with participating law schools for these students to be admitted to law school. Because the number of seats in our law schools is very limited, it is essential that the most qualified students fill these seats. To the extent that the CLEO program places less qualified students in our law schools, I think the program should be changed or rescinded. If the CLEO program favors lesser qualified students over more qualified students, if it is discriminatory in its practices and therefore unconstitutional, I feel Congress should vigorously scrutinize this program before the end of the session. I am glad to know that Representative O'HARA will hold hearings in our Subcommittee of Education and Labor. In light of the Supreme Court's recent non-decision of the *Defunis* case, congressional inquiry into the admission policies of law schools is certainly an urgent necessity.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, after listening to this debate and studying this legislation, it looks to me as though we should rename this act the Train More Lawyers Welfare Reform Act of 1974, because after all, Mr. Speaker, there are only 221 lawyers in the House of Representatives and only 67 over in the Senate. Therefore, it looks as though if we cut this down to \$1,000, we could spread it around more and train more lawyers to run for Congress and run for the Senate. I am sure the American people would like that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to indicate my strong support for H.R. 15296, and to compliment the distinguished chairman of our Higher Education Subcommittee for his

efforts in connection with the bill before us.

The Higher Education Subcommittee, under the able Chairmanship of Congressman O'HARA, is presently involved in both oversight and legislative hearings and other activities which will lay the foundation for further strengthening and perfecting Federal aid to college students and our institutions of higher education.

Chairman O'HARA and the ranking minority member—JOHN DELLENBACK, of Oregon—and all the members of the subcommittee have been tirelessly involved in this effort and again I want to commend them.

The bill before us provides a temporary or interim solution to an immediate problem. Passage of this legislation will allow already appropriated funds to be utilized in an ongoing program as they have been utilized in past years.

With the passage of H.R. 15296, we will continue to support the CLEO program which involves the preparation of students in disadvantaged backgrounds for entry into law schools and completion of legal education.

We can assist 550 students through this program with the passage of this bill. If we do not take this action, the program will be limited to fewer than 100 students. It seems to me both efficiency and economy tell us that we should approve H.R. 15296.

As I have indicated, it is a temporary solution and it will allow for continued work and study on the part of Chairman O'HARA and his subcommittee on the program as it was amended by the 1972 education amendments.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 15296.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15296.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XXVII and the prior announcement of the Chair, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

Does the gentleman from Iowa withdraw his point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause

3(b), rule XXVII, the Chair will now put the question, on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Voters will be taken in the following order:

Conference report on H.R. 14354 (de novo).

H.R. 15296 (de novo).

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1974

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14354).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the bill H.R. 14354.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. 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 345, nays 15, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—345

Abzug	Carney, Ohio	Fish
Adams	Carter	Fisher
Addabbo	Casey, Tex.	Flood
Alexander	Cederberg	Flowers
Anderson	Chamberlain	Foley
Calif.	Chappell	Ford
Anderson, Ill.	Clancy	Forsythe
Andrews, N.C.	Clark	Fountain
Andrews, N.D.	Clawson, Del.	Fraser
N. Dak.	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Annunzio	Cleveland	Frenzel
Archer	Cochran	Fulton
Armstrong	Collins, Ill.	Fuqua
Aspin	Collins, Tex.	Gaydos
Baker	Conable	Gettys
Barrett	Conlan	Giaimo
Bauman	Conte	Gibbons
Beard	Cotter	Gilman
Bell	Coughlin	Ginn
Bennett	Cronin	Goldwater
Bergland	Culver	Gonzalez
Bevill	Daniel, Dan	Grasso
Biaggi	Daniel, Robert	Griffiths
Blester	W., Jr.	Gubser
Blackburn	Danielson	Gude
Blatnik	Davis, S.C.	Haley
Boggs	Davis, Wis.	Hamilton
Boland	de la Garza	Hammer
Bolling	Delaney	schmidt
Bowen	Dellenback	Hanley
Brademas	Dellums	Hanna
Bray	Denholm	Hanrahan
Breaux	Dennis	Hansen, Idaho
Breckinridge	Dent	Hansen, Wash.
Brinkley	Derwinski	Harsha
Brooks	Dickinson	Hawkins
Brotzman	Diggs	Hays
Brown, Calif.	Dingell	Hechler, W. Va.
Brown, Ohio	Downing	Heckler, Mass.
Broyhill, N.C.	Drinan	Heinz
Broyhill, Va.	Duncan	Henderson
Buchanan	du Pont	Hicks
Burgener	Eckhardt	Hillis
Burke, Fla.	Edwards, Ala.	Hinshaw
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, Calif.	Hogan
Burleson, Tex.	Eilberg	Holifield
Burlison, Mo.	Esch	Holt
Burton	Eshleman	Holtzman
Butler	Evans, Colo.	Horton
Byron	Evans, Tenn.	Hosmer

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—345

Hudnut	Murphy, Ill.	Snyder
Hungate	Murtha	Spence
Hunt	Myers	Stanton
Hutchinson	Natcher	J. William
Ichord	Nedzi	Stanton
Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	James V.
Johnson, Colo.	Obey	Stark
Johnson, Pa.	O'Brien	Steed
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara	Steele
Jones, N.C.	O'Neill	Steiger, Wis.
Jordan	Owens	Stephens
Karth	Parris	Stokes
Kastenmeier	Passman	Stratton
Kazan	Patman	Stubbfield
Kemp	Patten	Studs
Ketchum	Perkins	Sullivan
King	Peyser	Taylor, Mo.
Kluczynski	Pickle	Taylor, N.C.
Koch	Pike	Teague
Kuykendall	Poage	Thompson, N.J.
Kyros	Podell	Thomson, Wis.
Lagomarsino	Powell, Ohio	Thone
Latta	Preyer	Thornton
Leggett	Price, Ill.	Tierman
Litton	Pritchard	Towell, Nev.
Long, La.	Quie	Traxler
Long, Md.	Quillen	Treen
Lott	Rallsback	Ullman
Lujan	Randall	Van Deerlin
Luken	Rarick	Vander Jagt
McClory	Rees	Vander Veen
McCloskey	Regula	Vanlik
McCollister	Reuss	Vigorito
McCormack	Riegle	Wagonner
McDade	Rinaldo	Walde
McEwen	Roberts	Walsh
McFall	Robinson, Va.	Wampler
McKay	Robison, N.Y.	Ware
McKinney	Rodino	Whalen
Madden	Roe	White
Madigan	Rogers	Whitehurst
Mahon	Roncalio, Wyo.	Whitten
Mallary	Rooney, Pa.	Widnall
Mann	Rose	Wiggins
Martin, N.C.	Rosenthal	Williams
Mathias, Calif.	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Bob
Mathis, Ga.	Roush	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Matsunaga	Royal	Wilson, Wilson.
Mayne	Runnels	Charles, Tex.
Mazzoli	Ruth	Wolff
Meeds	Ryan	Wynn
Melcher	Sandman	Zablocki
Mezvinsky	Sarasin	Zion
Miller	Sarbanes	Zwach
Minish	Satterfield	
Mink	Schneebeli	
Mitchell, N.Y.	Schroeder	
Mizell	Sebelius	
Moakley	Seiberling	
Mollohan	Shipley	
Montgomery	Shoup	
Moorhead,	Shriver	
Calif.	Sikes	
Moorhead, Pa.	Sisk	
Morgan	Skubitz	
Mosher	Slack	
Moss	Smith, N.Y.	
		NAYS—15
Arends	Flynt	Michel
Ashbrook	Goodling	Rousselot
Bafalis	Gross	Shuster
Crane	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Symms
		NOT VOTING—73
Abdnor	Froehlich	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashley	Gray	Nix
Badillo	Green, Oreg.	Pepper
Bingham	Green, Pa.	Pettis
Brasco	Grover	Price, Tex.
Brown, Mich.	Gunter	Rangel
Burke, Calif.	Guyer	Reid
Camp	Harrington	Rhodes
Carey, N.Y.	Hastings	Roncalio, N.Y.
Chisholm	Hebert	Rooney, N.Y.
Clausen,	Helstoski	Roy
Don H.	Huber	Ruppe
Cohen	Jones, Okla.	St Germain
Collier	Jones, Tenn.	Scherle
Conyers	Landrum	Smith, Iowa
Corman	Lehman	Staggers
Daniels,	Lent	Steelman
Dominick V.	McSpadden	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald	Talcott
Donohue	Maraziti	Udall
Dorn	Metcalfe	Veysey
Dulski	Milford	Wright
Eriksen	Mills	Yatron
Fascell	Minshall, Ohio	Young, Fla.
Frey	Mitchell, Md.	Young, Ga.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Heilstoski.
 Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Abdnor.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Milford.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Froehlich.
 Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Lent.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Macdonald.
 Mr. Rangel with Mr. Lehman.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Guyer.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. Donohue.
 Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. McSpadden.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Pettis.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Cohen.
 Mr. Roy with Mr. Maraziti.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Young of Florida.
 Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Price of Texas.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Yatron with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Gunter.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Rhodes.
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Huber.
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Scherle.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Talcott.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Steelman.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 15296).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15296).

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 53, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—310

Abzug	Bevill	Burton
Adams	Biaggi	Butler
Addabbo	Blester	Byron
Alexander	Bingham	Camp
Anderson, Calif.	Blackburn	Carney, Ohio
Anderson, Ill.	Blatnik	Carter
Andrews, N.C.	Boggs	Casey, Tex.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Boiand	Cederberg
Annunzio	Boiling	Chamberlain
Arends	Bowen	Chappell
Armstrong	Brademas	Clancy
Ashbrook	Braux	Clark
Aspin	Breaux	Clay
Bafalis	Breckinridge	Cleveland
Baker	Brooks	Cochran
Barrett	Broomfield	Collins, Ill.
Bauman	Brotzman	Conan
Beard	Brown, Calif.	Conte
Bell	Brown, Ohio	Conyers
Bennett	Broyhill, N.C.	Cotter
Bergland	Broyhill, Va.	Coughlin
	Buchanan	Crane
	Burke, Mass.	Cronin

Culver	Kemp	Roe
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Ketchum	Rogers
Danielson	Koch	Roncalio, Wyo.
Davis, S.C.	Kyros	Rookey, Pa.
de la Garza	Lagomarsino	Rosenthal
Delaney	Leggett	Rostenkowski
Dellenback	Littton	Roush
Denholm	Long, La.	Royal
Dennis	Long, Md.	Runnels
Dent	Lujan	Ryan
Derwinski	Luken	Sandman
Diggs	McClory	Sarasin
Dingell	McCloskey	Sarbanes
Drinan	McCormack	Schroeder
du Pont	McDade	Sebelius
Eckhardt	McFall	Seiberling
Edwards, Calif.	McKay	Shipley
Ellberg	McKinney	Shoup
Esch	Madden	Shriver
Eshleman	Madigan	Sisk
Evans, Colo.	Mahon	Skubitz
Findley	Mathias, Calif.	Slack
Fish	Martin, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Flood	Martin, Nebr.	Spence
Flowers	Matsunaga	Staggers
Foley	Mayne	Stanton
Ford	Mazzoli	James V.
Forsythe	Meeds	Stark
Fountain	Melcher	Steed
Fraser	Mezvinsky	Steele
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Steiger, Wis.
Frenzel	Minish	Stephens
Fulton	Mink	Stokes
Fuqua	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stratton
Gaydos	Mizell	Stubblefield
Gettys	Moakley	Studds
Giaimo	Mollohan	Symington
Gibbons	Moorhead, Calif.	Taylor, N.C.
Goldwater	Moorhead, Pa.	Teague
Gonzalez	Moorhead, Pa.	Thompson, N.J.
Grasso	Morgan	Thomson, Wis.
Griffiths	Mosher	Thone
Gude	Moss	Thornton
Haley	Murphy, Ill.	Tiernan
Hamilton	Murtha	Towell, Nev.
Hanley	Myers	Traxler
Hanna	Natcher	Treen
Hanrahan	Nedzi	Ullman
Hansen, Idaho	Neisen	Van Deelin
Hansen, Wash.	Nichols	Vanik
Harsha	Obey	Vigorito
Hawkins	O'Brien	Waggoner
Hays	O'Hara	Walde
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill	Walsh
Heckler, Mass.	Owens	Wampler
Heinz	Parris	Ware
Henderson	Passman	Whalen
Hicks	Patman	White
Hillis	Patten	Whitehurst
Hogan	Perkins	Widnall
Holfeld	Peyser	Wiggins
Holt	Pickle	Williams
Holtzman	Pike	Wilson, Bob
Horton	Podell	Wilson
Hosmer	Powell, Ohio	Charles H., Calif.
Howard	Preyer	Wilson
Hudnut	Price, Ill.	Charles, Tex.
Hungate	Pritchard	Winn
Hutchinson	Quie	Wolf
Jarman	Quillen	Wylie
Johnson, Calif.	Randall	Wyman
Johnson, Colo.	Rees	Yates
Johnson, Pa.	Regula	Yatron
Jones, Ala.	Reuss	Young, Alaska
Jones, N.C.	Riegle	Young, Ill.
Jordan	Rinaldo	Young, S.C.
Karth	Roberts	Young, Tex.
Kastenmeier	Robison, N.Y.	Zablocki
Kazan	Rodino	Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—53

Archer	Ginn	Poage
Brinkley	Goodling	Price, Tex.
Burgener	Gross	Rarick
Burke, Fla.	Gubser	Robinson, Va.
Burleson, Tex.	Hammer-	Roussetot
Burlison, Mo.	schmidt	Ruth
Clawson, Del.	Hinshaw	Satterfield
Collins, Tex.	Ichord	Schneebeli
Conable	King	Shuster
Daniel, Dan	Kuykendall	Slkes
Davis, Wis.	Landgrebe	Snyder
Devine	Latta	Steiger, Ariz.
Dickinson	Lott	Symms
Downing	McEwen	Taylor, Mo.
Duncan	Mallary	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Ala.	Mathis, Ga.	Whitten
Fisher	Miller	Wyatt
Flynt	Montgomery	Wydler

NOT VOTING—70

Abdnor	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Nix
Badillo	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Brasco	Grover	Pettis
Burke, Calif.	Gunter	Rangel
Carey, N.Y.	Harrington	Rhodes
Chisholm	Hastings	Roncallo, N.Y.
Clausen,	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Don H.	Heilstoski	Roy
Cohen	Huber	Ruppe
Collier	Jones, Okla.	St Germain
Corman	Jones, Tenn.	Scherle
Daniels,	Landrum	Smith, Iowa
Dominick V.	Lehman	Steelman
Davis, Ga.	Lent	Stuckey
Donohue	McSpadden	Sullivan
Dorn	Macdonald	Talcott
Dulski	Maraziti	Udall
Erlenborn	Metcalfe	Vander Veen
Fascell	Milford	Veysey
Frey	Mills	Wright
Froehlich	Minshall, Ohio	Young, Fla.
Gilman	Mitchell, Md.	Young, Ga.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Roy.
 Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Vander Veen.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Dorn.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Heilstoski.
 Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Young of Florida.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Maraziti.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Rangel with Mr. Donohue.
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Gilman.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Cohen.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Pepper.
 Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Huber.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Lehman.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Froehlich.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Pettis.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Guyer.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Milford.
 Mr. Gunter with Mr. Lent.
 Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
 Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Scherle.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Steelman.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mrs. Burke of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THIRTY-THIRD WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF MR. AND MRS. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that today is the 33d wedding anniversary of the majority leader, "Tip" O'Neill, and "Millie" O'Neill. I am sure the entire House joins me in wishing them happiness and many more anniversaries.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall on the conference report on H.R. 14354, National School Lunch Act Amendments of 1974, I had been in a committee meeting. When I got here, the rollcall had ended. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, had I been here on the rollcall on the conference report to accompany H.R. 14354 on the National School Lunch Act Amendments of 1974, I would have voted "aye," and I respectfully request that the RECORD so show.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain that on the last vote on the bill H.R. 15296, professional education fellowship program, I was, unfortunately, detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

FM RADIO DESERVES A CHANCE

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, there are some 3,000 FM radio stations in this country, and nearly all our non-commercial radio is on the FM band.

Yet the pity is, we are all too frequently denied the opportunity to listen to these often distinctive stations because our radios—especially those in our cars—are not necessarily equipped to receive FM signals.

There is no reason why all but the least expensive radios should not have an all-channel reception capability. The real cost of adding FM to an AM-only radio is less than \$10, despite the inflated price tags seen in new car showrooms.

Congressman CLARENCE BROWN and I are coauthors of H.R. 8266, which would direct the Federal Communications Commission to undertake a rulemaking leading to promulgation of an all-channel reception requirement. A similar bill was approved by the Senate last week, and hearings on our companion legislation will be scheduled shortly.

A pertinent column was published Friday in the Los Angeles Times, and I include it at this point with my remarks: [From the Los Angeles Times, June 14, 1974]

A STEP FORWARD FOR FM RADIO

(By Charles Champlin)

You realize you have experienced a larger stretch of history than you might care to admit when a child says, "What did you watch on television when you were little?" And you have to confess that you didn't because there wasn't any.

The days without television now seem mistily distant, yet millions of us have been eyewitnesses to the awkward birth of the medium and the explosive growth, thrilling and often exasperating, which has followed.

The same generation of us watched the

awkward birth of FM radio, with its marvelous promise of better, static-free sound and of multiple-choice alternatives to the ad-heavy pulsing of AM radio.

The difference, of course, is that the explosive growth of FM radio never took place. The prime problem was that television was too near at hand, swamping all radio as it swamped the movies, and forcing radio, too, into evolutionary changes to survive. The other problem was that nobody figured how to get enough FM receivers sold in time to provide viable audiences for the new stations, which shrank unheard or became automated background sound.

But the promise of FM is still there and, years later, it may yet find and deserve the sizeable listenerships it ought always to have had. Something like 90% of the homes in the United States have at least one FM receiver, and in the Los Angeles area roughly one-third of the cars are now FM-equipped.

A bill is now moving through Congress which would make it mandatory to include the FM band in all radios priced at more than \$15. A similar bill in the mid-1960s directed manufacturers to include UHF as well as VHF capabilities in all television sets, and the law has probably made a life-or-death difference to many public television stations in particular. FM operations could be helped comparably.

FM may well always be minority radio, but the whole point of FM, as of UHF and cable, is to deliver the public media (and us) from the tyrannies and confinements of the mass market and to let radio and television—like the movies—find their full potential and their ultimate usefulness by doing what is narrowly vital as well as what is broadly appealing.

The outreaching powers of FM struck me the other day at a lunch with men representing two newly cooperating brands of zeal.

Harry Ashmore is the veteran Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist, now executive vice president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara. Abram Chasins, who for a quarter-century was music director at WQXR, New York City's best, is now contributing his experience as director of developments at USC's KUSC-FM.

Starting Sunday at 7 p.m. KUSC-FM will broadcast tapes of the provocative talks, conversations, forums which are the life-stuff of the Santa Barbara center. The first program will feature Ashmore speculating on "Where Have All the Liberals Gone?" and Robert Hutchins, president emeritus of the center, talking about "How to Make a University Out of a Multiversity."

The programs will repeat on Thursday at 5 p.m. On the last Sunday of every month, the program will be "Center Update," hosted by Ashmore and setting forth the views of the center's resident and visiting fellows on the issues dominating the news.

If he can discover some foundation support, Chasins hopes to expand the link between KUSC and the center, doing live broadcasts of some of the sessions, producing its own tapes of other sessions.

Hutchins, who once wryly remarked that "You meet such interested people" when you have foundation money to disperse, also once called his Fund for the Republic from which the center grew, a wholly disowned subsidiary of the Ford Foundation. The center is in fact now independent and, says Ashmore, is raising half its annual budget from its public memberships and publications. It remains the most useful kind of maverick group, able to contemplate the public good from outside the slipstreams of special interest. In its own zealous, noncommercial commitment to radio at its most earnest and uncompromising, KUSC-FM is a nicely matching outlet. What remains to be heard

is whether worthy also means dull. But the founding partners are anything but solemn and they share, I think, a horror of boring us.

LIVESTOCK FEEDERS INSURANCE FUND

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide long-term, low-interest-rate capital to hard-pressed livestock producers in Kansas and throughout the Nation. My bill will go to the House Agriculture Committee where I understand hearings are scheduled next week on similar proposals.

My bill would set up a new "Livestock Feeders Insurance Fund" as part of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. This insured loan fund would be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to any hard-pressed cattle and hog producers who meet these four criteria:

First, he is a citizen of the United States;

Second, he is or has been engaged in livestock producing operations to an extent and in a manner determined by the Secretary as necessary to assure reasonable prospects of success in livestock producing endeavors financed by loans insured under this legislation;

Third, he is unable to obtain sufficient credit to finance his actual needs in the livestock producing business at reasonable rates and terms, as determined by the Secretary after considering prevailing private and cooperative rates and terms in the community in or near which the applicant resides for loans for similar purposes and periods of time; and

Fourth, he has, if he has received previously a loan insured under this legislation, performed successfully the terms of such loan.

Other main provisions of my bill are:

Interest rates would be set at 3 percent per year.

Loans could be made for periods of up to 25 years.

Individual loans could not exceed \$500,000.

The total loan program would not exceed \$3 billion.

This legislation is one of the three suggestions I made to Presidential Economic Counsellor Kenneth Rush last Friday when I sent him this telegram:

Mr. KENNETH RUSH,
Councillor to President for Economic Policy,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to express my deep concern for the terrible crisis now facing the livestock producers of Kansas and the Nation. The time for discussing the problem is past. The time for action is now. I therefore propose these three steps be taken immediately.

1. The President should remove the current suspension of meat import quotas. This action would reduce the amount of foreign meat to the levels authorized by the Meat Import Act of 1964 by nearly one-half billion pounds annually.

2. The administration should intensify its efforts to get the food industry to pass on to

consumers the low prices that livestock producers are receiving. This will help increase per capita consumption and will benefit both the general public and livestock producers.

3. The administration should lend its full support to legislation pending in Congress to provide low interest loans (3% per year) for long-term loans, up to 25 years, to livestock producers who now face an immediate and irreparable danger that could cause a severe economic recession throughout rural America.

No announcement emanating from the White House conference to be held Monday could do more to bolster the morale and the economy of the cattle industry than a white House endorsement of these recommendations.

I assure you that "straight talk" to the balance of the industry-packing house and chain organizations that the benefits of reduced cattle prices must be reflected in the retail price of meat to the consumer would be welcomed by the public generally and would encourage the sale of red meat.

JOE SKUBITZ.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must do its part to help save this great segment of our Nation's agriculture.

I sincerely hope early action will be forthcoming.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS CELEBRATES 30TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, this year the Polish-American Congress is celebrating its 30th anniversary.

As Polonia's umbrella organization since 1944, the Polish-American Congress has concerned itself with the welfare of Americans of Polish descent in political, national, religious, social, professional, and civic organizations by supporting and protecting the publications, schools, and parishes which teach the Polish language and culture, and through general support of industry and trade in the United States conducted by persons of Polish extraction.

In its early years, the Polish-American Congress devoted all of its energies to matters pertaining to the people of Poland, by assisting them in the demand for establishment of their national independence. It has continued to inform the American public of Poland's historic role, aims, needs, rights to independence, and the integrity of its frontiers. It has encouraged a closer and deeper cooperation of American democracy with the people of Poland in the fields of ideological, cultural, social, and economic life.

Mr. Speaker, on the domestic front, the Polish-American Congress has concerned itself with the improvement of the welfare of Americans of Polish origin by supporting their schools, parishes, and press. In addition, the Polish-American Congress has placed emphasis on educational cultural matters. Its role in making the ethnic heritage studies program a reality is a prime example. Activities in the cultural field include leadership in the Millennium, Jamestown, the Kopernik Quincentennial celebrations, and the coordination of Polonia's input in the

American Revolutionary Bicentennial celebrations. The socioeconomic problems of the Polish community have come under particular scrutiny, and a number of plans to improve neighborhoods, provide better job opportunities, and prevent discrimination against the Polish people have been implemented. As a result of these activities, increasingly qualified representatives of the Polonia are being selected for high Federal and State offices.

The contributions of Polish-Americans to this country are well known to all in the House of Representatives. I know that in my travels to my southwestern Pennsylvania district, the strong role played by Polish-Americans in civic affairs is quite evident. The Polish-American Congress acts as an umbrella organization and represents the interest of Polish-Americans throughout America. It has long been an effective and resourceful organization, and I would like to congratulate the PAC on its 30th anniversary. I am sure that future years will see a continuation of its leadership role among Polish-Americans.

STOP THE ROLLER COASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years the American people have been riding an economic roller coaster. At dizzying speeds they have gone through a series of ups and downs that has left them frustrated, angry, and suffering from financial whiplash.

The bust-or-boom policies of Federal experts have drained their savings and sapped their faith in the ability of Government to lead in time of crisis. They feel Government ponders instead of producing. It contemplates instead of creating. It reacts instead of acting.

The helter-skelter ride must be stopped and the spinning economy stabilized. I have some ideas I think will help and I would like to present them for your consideration. Some of them already have been introduced in Congress and include long- and short-range objectives. All, however, are based on the concept that greater economic security is the Nation's No. 1 need today.

For example, I propose an immediate curtailment of the exportation of any food product overseas that will have an adverse effect on the American consumer. This, I know, will not sit well with the U.S. Department of State. That Department has jurisdiction over treaties and agreements with foreign governments and frequently uses our exportation of food as a lever to win political concessions. Nevertheless, I believe the embargoes I advocate are imperative if the Nation is to avoid pitfalls such as the wheat deal of 1972.

That agreement, negotiated by the State Department as part of its desire to arrange a détente with Russia, permitted the Soviets to make massive purchases of wheat which exhausted our domestic supply. In its zeal to thaw the

cold war, the State Department turned the heat on the American consumer.

The wheat sale triggered a shortage at home and touched off sharp price hikes in the cost of bread and other baked goods. As I predicted at that time, other shortages developed. The soaring price of available grain forced many cattle and poultry farmers to cut back on production. Meat disappeared from supermarkets and family dinner tables.

The Nation has never fully recovered from that jolt. Food prices are still on the rise, although they dip now and then as the economic roller coaster continues to rocket on its way. Last year the United States shipped nearly \$10 billion worth of food abroad, a 92-percent increase over 1972. Why? One reason was to reverse the trend in the Nation's balance of trade, which was embarrassingly red after successive deficits in 1971 and 1972. Deficits of \$2 and \$6 billion respectively were posted in those years, the first time the United States had gone "in the hole" for nearly a century.

There is talk of another wheat shortage this summer. It is reported 60 percent of the 1973-74 crop already has been sold to foreign consumers along with 50 percent of the rice crop, including 25 percent to Vietnamese soldiers under the food-for-peace program.

The American family food budget has been devastated by the events of the past few years. Overall, the price of food jumped 22 percent last year, leaving the family with the alternative of eating less or paying more. Many families had no choice. Hamstrung by increased costs in other consumer products, they ate less because they could not pay more.

I propose the establishment of a national reserve for basic foodstuffs, including wheat and other grains. The level should be sufficient to assure Americans of their need as well as an additional safeguard against natural disasters, such as drought. Overseas shipments of any commodity included in the reserve would be halted automatically if the supply dropped below the established level. Purchases by foreign governments would be controlled, based on previous buying records. Exceptions could be made in emergencies, however.

Similar controls also should be established on our natural resources, such as coal, timber, or fuels as well as on critical material, such as scrap iron. We know now the Government lacked the facts to properly deal with the energy crisis. In the future, it must be provided authoritative data regarding the present and future needs of any vital industry.

A new look must be taken at other Federal programs and projects which have a direct or indirect bearing on the economy. A major reform, for instance, is needed in the social security program. We should lower the age of retirement to open up jobs for younger people but we must also guarantee the retiree a livable income. He should not have to look for "moonlight" work to supplement his social security check.

Also, steps must be taken to alleviate the financial burden now placed on low- and middle-income wage earners to sup-

port the social security program. I have already introduced in Congress legislation which would make the Government a third party in underwriting the cost. By sharing the burden now placed on the employee-employer; a 2-percent reduction in their tax could be achieved.

The continued high level of unemployment is of primary concern to our economy. Each year for the past several years, the Federal budget has been based on the full employment concept; that is, a 4-percent unemployment level. We have been nowhere near that level for 5 years. Unemployment has ranged between 5 and 6 percent, resulting in a built-in deficit for the full employment budget.

Congress already has a program to lower unemployment. It is a streamlined version of the WPA in that an individual is not reduced to being just a paper picker or pothole filler. He can use his training and talents in any field for the benefit of local, county, or State governments, during the period he might be furloughed from a job in private industry or business. The public service employment program—PEP—also has a built-in incentive for the nonskilled worker to improve his position.

Individuals employed under PEP are not Government employees per se, although the program is tax supported. They can return to the private sector once conditions improve and resume their careers. However, what is most important is that while their careers are interrupted they are not out of work. They are not on a free dole, their talents do not stagnate, and they continue to pay taxes.

At the present time, PEP is grossly underfunded and limited in scope. The first appropriation spread approximately \$1.2 billion among 50 States over a 3-year period. The program provided 300,000 jobs, including 135 in Allegheny County. A drop in the bucket in the face of high unemployment.

But, PEP's track record is commendable and I support its expansion. I would like to see additional funding made available that would automatically be triggered to areas, nationally or locally, where unemployment reached a totally unacceptable level, such as 5.5 percent. That means nearly 6 million people out of jobs. Similarly, when working conditions improve, the flow of money would gradually be eased.

Of course, the question arises where the money for these programs will be found. I have several suggestions. Cut out the sacred cows in the bureaucracy, slash the foreign aid program to the bone, and reduce military expenditures which do not involve national security.

Two years ago I published a report on the thousands of committees, commissions, and advisory groups in the Federal Government which cost taxpayers in excess of \$75 million a year. Many of them are not necessary and should be abolished.

I have never voted for the foreign aid program because I sincerely believe we no longer can support it. We have given away more than \$260 billion since the

end of World War II and now we have a national debt greater than the combined debt of all other nations in the world. The total is beyond comprehension—\$500,000,000,000.

Military spending can be reduced without jeopardizing our Nation's safety. There are more than 600,000 American servicemen, plus their dependents, deployed in far-flung bases around the world. They pump billions into the economy of other nations. Do we really need them in those areas? I believe most of them could be returned home to shore up our country's economy. We have more military officers now than at the end of World War II when our Armed Forces were at their peak. Do we need them all? Is the spending of \$600,000 to convert a Government plane into the personal flying hotel for a general in the interest of national defense?

I am firmly convinced our Government must make a critical self-examination and make it now. It must temper its idealistic international policies with the hard reality of our national needs. The roller coaster has been rocketing on for too long. It is time to stop it.

PLIGHT OF THE CATTLE PRODUCERS

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. beef industry is in dire straits, and immediate action is required to remedy the situation. While beef production costs have increased dramatically over the past several years and retail prices have only slipped slightly—some 10 percent—cattle prices have dropped from last year's high of 53 cents per pound to under 35 cents per pound. Cattle producers have suffered losses before, for one or two "crop periods"—120 days each—but the current trend is into its third crop period and little improvement is foreseen into the late summer and fall. As a comparison of the economic vice that now grips the beef producers, during the month ended on May 15, the USDA's index of prices received by farmers for meat animals fell 8 to 159 percent of the 1967 average, whereas prices paid by farmers for feed dropped only 3 to 173 percent of the 1967 average.

The result is that hundreds of beef producers are facing bankruptcy throughout mid-America. The operators of feedlots are reducing their operations, as witnessed by the fact that 40 percent fewer animals were placed in feeder pens during May. Some cattlemen are facing the prospect of a reduction in their breeder herds or even total liquidation of their businesses and livelihoods.

The implications are onerous, not just for the cattle producers who are facing an upheaval in their way of life, or for the other segments of the business—the packinghouses and their labor force, trucking industry, grain farmer, financial community—who will be affected by the reduction in business, but also for

the consumer. With the prospect of cattlemen reducing their breeder herds and going out of business, the future holds a dramatic reversal of the current trend and a return to the short supplies and high beef prices of last fall and winter. It takes 28 to 30 months to move beef from the breeding farm to the retailer, so the actions taken by the beef industry today can determine supplies several years hence.

In large part, actions by the Government several years ago led to the current crisis. The Soviet wheat deal is a prime example of the Federal Government taking action in pursuit of goals in one area—detente—without considering the repercussions for other areas. It was the unprecedented sale of wheat at concessionary prices to the Soviet Union that unduly depleted domestic wheat supplies and which commenced the dramatic surge not only in wheat prices, but of all farm produce in general. The next step was price controls and the beef freeze, and then a consumer boycott of meat. The high beef prices and the boycott induced the consumer to find substitutes for beef, and he has yet to return to his former level of beef consumption.

It is mandatory that immediate action be taken to relieve the impending disaster being faced by the beef producers. While the United States has kept open its borders to beef imports, both the European Common Market and Japan have placed a ban on beef imports. Our Government must move to see that those nations relax their restrictions and to assure that this country does not become the dumping grounds for excess and subsidized beef products.

The administration must use "jawboning" with packers and retailers to help the producers. The precipitous fall in on-the-hoof prices has been accompanied by only a slight decline in retail prices. The Federal Trade Commission should immediately look into the cause for this price inflexibility. An appropriate reduction in retail prices could entice the consumer back to beef products and help soak up the excess supply.

Similarly, additional purchases by the military and for school lunch programs could also help alleviate the current supply overhang. It could have the long-term benefit of providing these programs with supplies to be drawn on when market supplies become tight again.

Finally, the Government must provide financial aid to cattlemen to help them weather the current crunch. Bankruptcy of even a small segment of the cattle industry could have repercussions on other segments of the farm economy and the financial institutions that support them, and subsequently on the entire economy. The country's long-term interests and the efficient working of the free market system lie with numerous cattle producers, rather than a few large operations, which might be the result of widespread failures. The Government must take immediate and effective action to alleviate the current crisis, both in the interest of the cattlemen and in the interest of the consumer.

SIMAS KUDIRKA AND LITHUANIAN FREEDOM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 15, Lithuanian Americans joined with Lithuanians throughout the free world in observing the anniversary of the forced and illegal annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union in 1940, and the subsequent mass deportations of thousands of Lithuanians to Siberian concentration camps. Today the subjugation of Lithuania continues through Soviet efforts to obliterate the national and cultural self-identity of the Lithuanian people. In Lithuania, religious and political persecution remain commonplace.

This particular anniversary of the annexation of 1940 acquires special significance in view of President Nixon's plans to visit Moscow for a week of discussions beginning June 27. It is likely that the President's policy of détente will encourage Soviet leaders to press for U.S. recognition of the annexation of Lithuania and other Baltic States. To make such a concession would be to give credence to a historical falsehood, to compromise basic principles of international law, and to demean the legal and moral basis of Lithuanian cultural, religious, and political autonomy. At a time when the desire of the Soviets for détente affords us a chance to loosen the hold of the Soviet Government on its citizens, this would be an inexcusable error.

In recent years, the plight of the Lithuanian people has been dramatized by the case of Simas Kudirka, a Lithuanian seaman who, on November 23, 1970, leaped from a Soviet fishing vessel to the deck of a U.S. Coast Guard cutter while they were anchored alongside each other at Martha's Vineyard, Mass. Kudirka was returned to the Soviets to be subsequently sentenced to a 10-year term in a Soviet prison camp.

In view of this unconscionable denial of asylum to Simas Kudirka, our Government must bear a special responsibility for his welfare. In February of this year, I was pleased to cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 436, introduced by Representative HANRAHAN, requesting the President to urge the Soviet authorities to release Simas Kudirka. Since that time, evidence has been uncovered showing that Kudirka may be legally an American citizen by virtue of the fact that his mother, Marija Kudirka, was an American citizen at the time of his birth.

Therefore, the Kudirka case may involve not the right of a Russian refugee to asylum in the United States, but the rights of an American citizen in a foreign country. In addition, Mrs. Kudirka's efforts to obtain an exit visa have been stymied and she has been subject to repeated intimidation by the KGB. The fate of the Kudirkas is of immense symbolic significance to the Lithuanian people. I urge that the Congress call upon the President to urge the Soviet leadership to release Simas Kudirka and permit him and his mother to obtain exit

visas. We could give no more effective assurance to the Lithuanian people that their struggle remains our own.

BIRTHDAY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, this year we observe the 45th birthday of a modern American tradition—social security. It was in 1929 that the first State social security system began and some 6 years later that the Congress approved President Roosevelt's request for a national program.

That program has served us well. It has achieved much of its purpose. It is here to stay. It is also, as even its staunchest admirers must admit, in trouble.

It is not bankrupt as some have indicated. No beneficiary is about to find his check cut off because of insufficient funds.

Yet there are reasons to believe that the situation will not always be so encouraging.

A relatively few years ago there were 22 people paying into social security for every 1 person drawing from it; today that ratio is down to 3 to 1 and by 1990, or sooner, we are told that the ratio will be 1 to 1. Obviously the system cannot survive that ratio without a new kind of funding or without great increases in payroll taxes.

I do not believe we can defend much additional burden on the wage earner to support this system.

Already half the families in America are paying more in social security taxes than they are in personal income taxes. This is particularly hard on the low- and middle-income wage earner, who because the tax is proportional rather than graduated, pays a higher percentage of his income than do higher income participants.

While the contributor is unhappy, the recipient is also complaining and with some justification.

The fixed income, senior citizen is hit harder by inflation than any part of our economy. It is almost impossible for his income to keep up with increases in prices.

It is a staggering truth that in many parts of this Nation older men and women must immediately pay out of their monthly social security check as much as 60 to 65 percent for rent alone.

The system, of course, discourages older people from seeking employment by sharp reductions in social security benefits for every dollar they earn over \$2,880. Instead a typical recipient will find that because of these penalties an additional \$2,000 in outside income will actually net only \$833.

The earnings test provision also leads to what many Americans view as inequities. Wealthy retirees, whose income includes interest from investments only, can draw full social security without the penalty. This has led to the proposal by such people as Milton Friedman and Sen-

ator GOLDWATER that the earnings test be repealed.

Many have avoided discussing the problems of social security because they fear that their questions will be misunderstood as opposition to the program. That should not be.

I, for one, am fully committed to the continuation and the strengthening of social security. However, I do not believe that requires blind adherence to every present approach to administering this program. It does not mean we must approach its future with the idea that every question about present policy is blasphemous.

Surely we have learned that making our Federal programs work for the people they are meant to serve involves constant questioning and frequent changes.

There are good things to report about social security.

For instance, in the period 1937 to 1973 the program collected \$449 billion in taxes and paid out \$392 billion in benefits while retaining a surplus of \$47 billion to secure the trust fund. That means that only \$10 billion was spent in administering the program or less than 2½ percent in overhead—a good record for any Federal or private operation.

It is true, also, that social security has largely met the need envisioned by those postdepression era planners. It has provided security for many older Americans.

Those who say that the money invested in stocks and bonds would have produced a higher return ignore more than the risk such investments involve. They also ignore the fact that private insurance or investment programs do not provide a combination of old-age pension, disability insurance, health insurance, and after-retirement benefits to widows and dependent children—certainly not at comparable rates.

This success does not dispel concerns for the future; nor does it answer that problem of the wage earner who realizes that he is not actually paying for his retirement but rather for his parents.

We are confronted with an aging society. We have, fortunately, an improving mortality rate; we live longer as a nation. We also have a declining birth rate—good for the environment but bad for the collection of social security taxes.

Simply stated: We are going to have more people drawing out of social security and many fewer paying into it.

In fact the 29 million now on social security will grow to 45 million in the next 35 years.

We are not adequately planning for this expansion. It is difficult to find a good legislatively backed study of the system underway.

The work being done at Brookings by such people as Bailey and Henry Aaron—yes there is also an economist by that name—is only a part of the picture.

Government economists have even built-in troubles for us. Their actuarial projections assume a 3-percent rate of inflation in the next 4 years although the current is around 11 percent. If they are wrong, as surely they must be, we are going to be confronted with a new increase in social security taxes much

earlier than anyone has been willing to predict.

What are we to do?

Should we change to a strictly graduated tax; should we provide for a Government contribution—appropriation—to the trust fund; should we go to a mandatory system of income insurance?

We must devote to this question the kind of national effort that should have gotten underway in the 1960's regarding energy. We should have seen the crunch coming. We should have planned for it.

We know what the result of that failure was. Now we should learn our lesson and put our minds to work on the future of social security.

We should avoid dealing with it years from now when our decision will be made, like many of those about energy, in the midst of an emergency.

We who are friends of social security should be at the forefront of those insisting that the questions about the future of the system be answered.

I have communicated my concerns to several sources in Government and out. There are centers for dealing effectively with national issues such as this. For instance, the Institute of Policy Sciences at Duke University has the potential for bringing together Government officials, business executives, professionals from many disciplines, and academicians. The Rockefeller-sponsored study of national issues should certainly give its attention to the future of social security. I intend to maintain a continuing effort of suggesting to business groups, research institutes and private foundations that they include on the agenda of their future projects studies of this matter.

I invite my colleagues to call on those in the wide constituencies they serve to organize the kind of national dialog on this question that we so obviously need.

We have good "lead time" on this problem.

Let us take advantage of it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for the period June 18 through June 21, 1974, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. SKUBIRZ, for 5 minutes, on June 17.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. CULVER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KOCH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PREYER, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. KEMP, to revise and extend his remarks immediately following those of Mr. DELLENBACK.

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

Mr. HANRAHAN in two instances.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. MICHEL in five instances.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in four instances.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio in three instances.

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia in five instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. CULVER in six instances.

Mr. WON PAT.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. MEEDS.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. DIGGS in three instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia in 12 instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. BERGLAND in three instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. BADILLO in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

S. 585. An act to amend section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that radios be capable of receiving both amplitude modulated (AM) and frequency modulated (FM) broadcasts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 864. An act for the relief of Victor Henrique Carlos Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1412. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands are held by the United States in trust for the Sisseton-Wahpeton

Sioux Tribe of the Lake Traverse Indian Reservation in North and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1486. An act to regulate commerce by authorizing and establishing programs and activities to promote the export of American goods, products, and services and by increasing the recognition of international economic policy considerations in Federal decisionmaking and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Caridad R. Balonan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2840. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study of foreign direct and portfolio investment in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3270. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to grant the status of permanent residence to Ivy May Glockner formerly Ivy May Richmond nee Pond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 18, 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:

2454. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain acts making permanent appropriations and authorizing annual appropriations for the support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2455. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement in various watersheds, none of which involves a project with a structure which provides more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended [16 U.S.C. 1005]; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2456. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report on an item of excess military equipment programmed for delivery to Ethiopia on a grant basis, in addition to those previously reported for fiscal year 1974, pursuant to section 8(d) of the Foreign Military Sales Act Amendments of 1971, as amended [22 U.S.C. 2321b(d)]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2457. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report on political contributions made by David E. Mark, Ambassador-designate to Burundi, and Robert P. Smith, Ambassador-designate to Malta, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 93-126; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2458. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2459. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting pt. II of the statistical report of contributions and expenditures made during the 1972 election campaigns for the U.S. House of Representa-

tives, prepared pursuant to the provisions of section 308(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 [2 U.S.C. 438(a)(7)] (H. Doc. No. 93-284, pt. II); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2460. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the proceedings of a National Workshop on Sanctuaries, November 28-30, 1973, to accompany the previously transmitted first annual report on marine sanctuaries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2461. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 14, United States Code, to provide a subsistence allowance for members of the Coast Guard officer candidate program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2462. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement in various watersheds, each of which involves a project with at least one structure which provides more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended [16 U.S.C. 1005]; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. McFALL: Pursuant to the order of the House on June 13, 1974, the Committee on Appropriations filed a report on June 14, 1974, to accompany H.R. 15405. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 17, 1974]

Mr. TEAGUE: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 14920. A bill to further the conduct of research, development, and demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies, to establish a geothermal energy coordination and management project, to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to provide for the funding of activities relating to geothermal energy, to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for the carrying out of research and development in geothermal energy technology, to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for the utilization of geothermal resources, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 14903. A bill to increase the availability of urgently needed mortgage credit for the financing of housing, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. 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 (Rept. No. 93-1114). 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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on June 13, 1974, the following bill was introduced on June 14, 1974]

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 15405. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

[Submitted June 17, 1974]

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

H.R. 15406. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to refine the procedures for adjustments in military compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 15407. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas (for himself, Mr. FETTS, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 15408. A bill to amend pt. B of title XI of the Social Security Act to provide a more effective administration of professional standards review of health care services, to expand the Professional Standards Review Organization activity to include review of services performed by or in federally operated health care institutions, and to protect the confidentiality of medical records; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax rules now applicable to savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, et cetera, shall be applicable to the comparable mortgage programs now undertaken by national mortgage associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 15410. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for Federal participation in the costs of the social security program, with a substantial increase in the contribution and benefit base and with appropriate reductions in social security taxes to reflect the Federal Government's participation in such costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 15411. A bill to provide property tax relief to elderly homeowners through direct reimbursements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 15412. A bill to provide for more effective regulation of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 15413. A bill to permit the transportation of passengers by foreign vessels between ports in the United States if such transportation is not in direct competition with U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 15414. A bill to amend section 5051 of Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the Federal excise tax on beer); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN (for himself, Mr.

BARRETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DENT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NIX, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 15415. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 15416. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Atomic Weapons Rewards Act of 1955, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 15417. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary to provide epileptics medicine for the treatment of epilepsy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Ms.

ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARASIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BUTLER):

H.R. 15418. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to authorize a feasibility study for the establishment of certain bicycle trails; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr.

MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. WINN, Mr. FREY, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MANN, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 15419. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to authorize a feasibility study for the establishment of certain bicycle trails; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 15420. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 with respect to price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BLATNIK, Mrs. BOOGS, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. FASCELL):

H.R. 15421. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the special procedure for expediting benefit payments (where such payments are not regularly made when due) shall apply to benefits based on disability in the same way it applies to other benefits under such title if entitlement has already been established and the benefits involved have been paid for 1 or more months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LUKE, Mr. McSPADDEN, Mr. MATTHIAS of California, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. McCORMACK, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 15422. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the special procedure for expediting benefit payments (where such payments are not regularly made when due) shall apply to benefits based on disability in the same way it applies to other benefits under such title if entitlement has already been established and the benefits involved have been paid for 1 or more months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARABANES, Mr. JAMES V.

STANTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 15423. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the special procedure for expediting benefit payments (where such payments are not regularly made when due) shall apply to benefits based on disability in the same way it applies to other benefits under such title if entitlement has already been established and the benefits involved have been paid for 1 or more months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MANN, Mr. BRINKLEY, and Mr. GINN):

H.R. 15424. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the forestry incentive program administered under title X of such act and to increase the size of a tract which may be affected by such program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SLACK, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. DORN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. FREY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 15425. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the forestry incentive program administered under title X of such act and to increase the size of a tract which may be affected by such program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 15426. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a loan insurance program for livestock producers and feeders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 15427. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 15428. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 15429. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under pt. A (the hospital insurance program) for care and treatment furnished at a central radiation therapy treatment facility, and to provide full payment under pt. B

(the supplementary medical insurance program) for radiation therapy services furnished by physicians to inpatients or outpatients of any hospital or any such facility; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1061. Joint resolution making further urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 543. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning how it should receive foreign policy information during the period from the impeachment of the President by the House of Representatives until the Senate votes on such impeachment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 544. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the President not signing any agreement with a foreign country or international organization during the period from his impeachment by the House of Representatives until the Senate votes on such impeachment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 545. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the President not traveling abroad on Government business during the period from his impeachment by the House of Representatives until the Senate votes on such impeachment, and concerning a foreign head of state not making an official visit to the United States during such period; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LENT, Mr. SARASIN, and Mr. STEELE):

H. Con. Res. 546. 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. O'NEILL (for himself, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. GROVER):

H. Res. 1177. Resolution to condemn terrorist killings of schoolchildren in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H. Res. 1178. Resolution to declare a moratorium on the deelectrification of rail lines and study all implications of electrification of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Res. 1179. Resolution to rescind the Executive order lifting restrictions on beef imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H. Res. 1180. Resolution requesting that each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands conduct a survey or study to determine the views of their citizens with respect to abortion laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

499. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, relative to the terrorist killings in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

500. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the designation of American Business Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 15430. A bill to require the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to reopen and redetermine the claims of George Radin against the Government of Italy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15431. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Callahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Res. 1181. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 15403) entitled "A bill for the relief of Marlin Toy Products, Inc., to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

449. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ruth E. Bandy and other employees of the District of Columbia Manpower Administration, Washington, D.C., relative to the competitive service status of positions in the District of Columbia Manpower Administration after its conversion to the District of Columbia government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

450. Also, petition of the Creek County Bar Association, Sapulpa, Okla., relative to no-fault automobile insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE—Monday, June 17, 1974

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

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

Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favor, and further us with Thy continual help; that in

all our works begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy name and finally, by Thy mercy, obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the

Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1974.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama,