Guy C. Johnson, of California.
Ellen G. Joyner, of North Carolina.
Ishmael Lara, of California.
B. Jerry Lujan, of New Mexico.
Margie M. Mallory, of Texas.
W. Lee Mattingly, of Massachusetts.
Roy Raymond Matson, of Virginia.
Michael L. Milligan, of New York.
Charles E. Pedonti, of Massachusetts.
Eleanor M. Ridge, of Massachusetts.
Diane C. Salisbury, of New York.
Marguerite M. Simonson, of Pennsylvania.
Mary Elizabeth Snapp, of Virginia.
Lyle A. van Ravenswaay, of Missouri.
Bobby L. Watson, of California.
Katherine M. White, of Arizona.
Warren E. Mills, of Massachusetts.

For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 5, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Philix Silvio Aragón, of New Mexico.
William Scott Watson, of Virginia.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 7 to class 6:

Leslie Alson Doak, of California.
Shaun Edward Donnelly, of Indiana.
Wayne Stephen Leininger, of Florida.
George H. Mitchell, Jr., of Virginia.
William Howard Moore, of Virginia.
John J. Tkacik, Jr., of Virginia.

For reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service information officer of class 6, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Donna Millons Culpepper, of Washington.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Charles Lynwood McKinnon, of the District of Columbia.
Elizabeth Ann Powers, of Pennsylvania.
H. Clarke Rodgers, Jr., of Georgia.

For promotion from a Foreign Service officer of class 8 to class 7:

Andrew Sciacchitano, of Illinois.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Sara E. Barr, of Florida.
Jonathan M. Bensky, of Virginia.
Steven M. Brattain, of Ohio.
Donald Camp, of Maryland.
John Davis Caswell, of Connecticut.
Michael A. Ceurvorst, of Iowa.
Philip Dale Dean, Jr., of Virginia.
Patrick DelVecchio, of Virginia.
Milton K. Drucker, of Massachusetts.
Franklin Huddle, Jr., of Virginia.
Edmund James Hull, of the District of Columbia.
Donald Carter Hunter, of New Jersey.
Donald C. Johnson, of Oregon.
Gerald Richard Lueders, of Nebraska.
Michael E. McNaull, of Washington.
Michael J. Metrinko, of Pennsylvania.
Brian J. Mohler, of New York.
Patrick J. Nichols, of Virginia.
John A. Polansky, Jr., of Texas.
Charles E. Redman, of Indiana.
Ronald MacDonnell Roberts, of California.
Karla R. Smith, of Florida.
David C. Summers, of Ohio.
Robert Craig Van Voorhees, of Michigan.
Michael R. Vick, of Virginia.
Steven Wagensell, of Rhode Island.
Paul T. Walters, of Ohio.
Kent M. Wiedemann, of California.
William N. Witting, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

David L. Arnett, of Louisiana.
William C. Dawson, Jr., of Kentucky.
Richard J. Kaplan, of Massachusetts.
Joel J. Levy, of Connecticut.
Karl F. Olsson, of Nebraska.
William G. Pelfrey, of Michigan.
Louise Taylor, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Edna M. Black, of Massachusetts.
Steven Robert Buckler, of Michigan.
Anne O. Cary, of Maryland.
Kathleen Chisholm, of Massachusetts.
Timothy John Dunn, of Illinois.
George Ernest Hamilton, of Texas.

For appointment as a Foreign Service information officer of class 8, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Barbara St. C. Calandra, of New York.

Foreign Service reserve officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Craig A. Arness, of Virginia.
Philip J. Balestrieri, of Virginia.
Janine M. Brookner, of New Jersey.
John H. Buehler, of Texas.
Stewart D. Burton, of Utah.
Charlotte Z. Bustos-Videla, of Virginia.
Virginia S. Carson, of the District of Columbia.
Allan Price Daw, of Virginia.
Allan V. Ellsbury, of Wyoming.
Victor H. Galt, of Virginia.
Norman D. Glick, of New York.
Vasia C. Gmirkin, of Nevada.
Russell S. Hibbs, of Nevada.
David M. Hoopes, of the District of Columbia.
Stephen M. Hourigan, of Virginia.
Miller N. Hudson, Jr., of New Mexico.
James R. Hughes, of Virginia.
Eugene L. Jeffers, Jr., of Maryland.
Robert H. Larson, of Virignia.
Nicholas G. Mariano, of Maryland.
Warren J. Marik, of Virginia.
Elizabeth Davenport McKune, of the District of Columbia.
James A. Moorhouse, of Virginia.
Felix N. Negretti, of Maryland.
Einar O. Olsen, of Virginia.
Morton M. Palmer III, of Virginia.
Jeffrey G. Peterson, of Virginia.
Ruth H. Phillips, of New York.
Bernard C. Pollock, of Virginia.
Andrew D. Rohlfing, of Virginia.
Thomas A. Ryan, of Virginia.
Frederic H. Sabin, of Virginia.
William C. Simenson, of Virgina.
James J. Soldow, of Florida.
Howell S. Teeple, of Texas.
Donald F. Vogel, of Virginia.
Dan S. Wages, of Virginia.
James C. Whittemore, of Virginia.
Robert H. Wilcox, of Maryland.
William W. Williams, of Colorado.
Geraldine J. Wittbrod, of Illinois.
Gerald A. Zingsheim, of Virginia.

For Service Reserve Offices to be Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Vincent W. Brown, of California.
Charles J. Nelson, of the District of Columbia.
William C. Poole, of Virginia.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America.

Francis J. Holeva, of California.
Camilo E. Leon, of Arizona.
Jack J. Rudolph, Jr., of California.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Christian T. Bonher	Bruce E. Tate
Otis B. Jones, Jr.	Walter Sapp
James E. Koehler	James W. Guin, Jr.
Richard P. Tittermary	William A. Danner
Wayne K. Gibson	David J. Doyle
Douglas K. McFadden	Walter J. Brudzinski
Thomas A. Trosvig	Arthur E. Adkins
Richard E. Frye II	Herman S. Pritchard
Dennis R. Shoebotham	David V. Romme

The following Reserve officers of the U.S. Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard in the grades indicated:

Commander

John M. Cece

Lieutenant commander

Kenneth J. Morris
Richard L. Schoel

Lieutenant

Raymond M. Paetzold	William H. Boland, Jr.
Craig T. Lynch	Darryl R. Hannon
Kyle E. Jones	Lewis C. Dunn

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Lawrence M. Jasmann

The following temporary officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to chief warrant officer, W2:

Thomas F. Weber
Charles O. Gill

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, July 31, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord.—Lamentations 3: 40.

Almighty God, who art the source of all our being and the sustainer of our daily lives, give us grace to grow in goodness, to increase in insight and to live in love that every talent Thou hast entrusted to us may be strengthened by faithful use. In all our getting help us to get wisdom—wisdom to see clearly, wisdom to make decisions courageously, and wisdom to seek to live on the higher ground of truth and good will.

Bless our Nation with Thy favor, we pray Thee, and in these troubled times help us to be true to the great ideals of our fathers that our country may ever be the home of freedom, justice, and true brotherhood.

In the spirit of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 23, 1974:

H.R. 11385. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise the programs of health services research and to extend the program of assistance for medical libraries.

On July 25, 1974:

H.R. 7824. An act to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide for the transfer of the legal services program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to a Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11143. An act to provide the authorization for fiscal year 1975 and succeeding fiscal years for the Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, and for other purposes.

On July 26, 1974:

H.R. 8543. An act for the relief of Viorica Anna Ghitescu, Alexander Ghitescu, and Serban George Ghitescu.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3477. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to school fare subsidy for transportation of schoolchildren within the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14592) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15472) entitled "An act making appropriations for Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," and that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 425) entitled "An act to provide for the cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the States with respect to the regulation of surface mining operations, and the acquisition and reclamation of abandoned mines, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HASKELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. BUCKLEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950; and

S.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

The message also announced that Mr. STEVENS was appointed as a conferee on the bill (S. 628) entitled "An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the annuity reduction made, in order to provide a surviving spouse with an annuity, during periods when the annuitant is not married" in lieu of Mr. FONG, excused.

The message also announced that Mr. STEVENS was appointed as a conferee on the bill (H.R. 14715) entitled "An act to clarify existing authority for employment of White House Office and Executive Residence personnel, and for other purposes" in lieu of Mr. FONG, excused.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN MILITARY ASSISTANCE SERVICE FUNDED PROGRAM

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, next week when the House considers the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1975, it will very likely contain an item of $1 billion for U.S. support of the military assistance service funded—MASF—program, the principal instrument for American military aid to the Republic of South Vietnam.

At the proper time I will offer an amendment to reduce the $1 billion figure to $700 million. This amendment will be consistent with actions of the House of Representatives over the past few months despite admonitions of calamity from the administration.

The House has previously acted responsibly in reducing the adminstration requests for MASF and has thereby contributed to the possibility of meaningful peace in Vietnam.

We in the Congress again have the responsibility to continue this effort, and for this purpose I will offer the amendment to strike the figure of $1 billion for the MASF program in fiscal year 1975 and insert in lieu thereof the figure $700 million—a figure comparable to the actual MASF expenditures made for South Vietnam in fiscal year 1974.

While it is true that in fiscal year 1974 the Congress provided a limitation of $1.009 billion for military assistance to South Vietnam, less than $750 million was actually applied against the fiscal year 1974 account. Any amount over $750 million would be an increase over fiscal year 1974. Believing as I do that some reduction must be made and after consultation with other members of the Appropriations Committee, I have selected the $700 million figure as one which is both realistic and which while constituting a reduction from the expenditure level of 1974, it is a mild reduction and one which is fully justified.

A number of fundamental considerations have led me to offer the $700 million figure. The 1-minute rule under which I speak does not permit a full discussion of any of these at this time, but I shall discuss these considerations tomorrow again under the 1-minute rule.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE BUDGET SHOULD BE CUT

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) and with his remarks, that the military assistance budget for South Vietnam, which will be part of our defense appropriation bill should be cut as outlined by the gentleman from Georgia. There is no question that we must indicate quite clearly to all that it is America's intent to cut and eventually eliminate these massive amounts of military aid which have been supplied to South Vietnam, so that ultimately a political and peaceful solution can be found for the difficulties in Vietnam, rather than intensification of the military activities which our military aid abets.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION ANNUAL REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. (62 Stat. 1073), I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1973.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 31, 1974.*

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADDITION TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that on tomorrow the first item of business will be the conference report on H.R. 14021, the legislative appropriations bill.

THE LATE HONORABLE FOREST A. HARNESS

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce today the death of a former Member of this great body, former Congressman Forest A. Harness of Indiana who passed away this week. Since that time he and his wife, the former Amy B. Rose, have lived in Sarasota, Fla.

Congressman Harness was a Member of the House of Representatives here beginning with the 70th Congress through and including the 80th Congress. In serving here, he served on the Committee on Armed Services, then known as the Committee on Military Affairs. After his service, in 1948 he practiced law, and then in 1952 became the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. He left that position in 1955 when appointed to the American Battle Monuments Commission, and retired from Government service altogether in 1960.

While in the Congress, Congressman Harness served on the Committee on Military Affairs, Committee on Rules, Subcommittee on Expenditures and Propaganda in the Federal Government.

He was also chairman of the committee which investigated the Federal Communications Commission. He also served on the Republican Policy Committee.

The Congressman was active in the American Legion since its inception, and served as commander of Post 6 in Kokomo, Ind., judge advocate and department commander for the State of Indiana.

I am proud to have known Congressman Harness and honored to have shared the same hometown.

To his widow I extend my deepest sympathy at this time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 421]

Arends	Chappell	Culver
Baker	Chisholm	Davis, Ga.
Blatnik	Clark	de la Garza
Brasco	Clay	Diggs
Carey, N.Y.	Conte	Drinan
Carter	Conyers	Evins, Tenn.
Foley	Hogan	Powell, Ohio
Gray	Holifield	Rees
Green, Oreg.	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, N.Y.
Green, Pa.	Kuykendall	Rostenkowski
Griffiths	Landrum	Steiger, Ariz.
Gunter	McSpadden	Symington
Hansen, Idaho	Meeds	Tiernan
Hansen, Wash.	O'Neill	Udall
Hébert	Pike	Vander Veen

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 389 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2510, CREATING FEDERAL OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT POLICY

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2510), to create an Office of Federal Procurement Policy within the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOLIFIELD, ST GERMAIN, FUQUA, HORTON, and ERLENBORN.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 564, RETURNING SMOKEY BEAR TO HIS PLACE OF BIRTH

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Concurrent Resolution 564, to declare the sense of Congress that Smokey Bear shall be returned on his death to his place of birth, Capitan, N. Mex.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8217, EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF EQUIPMENT AND REPAIRS FOR CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8217) to exempt from duty certain equipment and repairs for vessels operated by or for any agency of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 16, 1974.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the text of the Senate amendments was printed in the RECORD last week and Members had access to it at that time, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, H.R. 8217, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill (page 2, after line 6), insert the following:

SEC. 3. The last sentence of section 203(e)(2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (as added by section 20 of Public Law 93-233 and amended by section 2 of Public Law 93-256 and by section 2 of Public Law 93-329) is amended by striking out "August 1, 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 30, 1975".

SEC. 4. (a) The second sentence of section 204(b) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 is amended to read as follows: "Amounts appropriated as repayable advances and paid to the States under section 203 shall be repaid, without interest, as provided in section 905(d) of the Social Security Act."

(b) Section 903(b) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out paragraph (3).

SEC. 5. Section 1631 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES FOR INTERIM ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

"(g)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (d)(1) and subsection (b) as it relates to the payment of less than the correct amount of benefits, the Secretary may, upon written authorization by an individual, withhold benefits due with respect to that individual and may pay to a State (or a political subdivision thereof if agreed to by the Secretary and the State) from the benefits withheld an amount sufficient to reimburse the State (or political subdivision) for interim assistance furnished on behalf of the individual by the State (or political subdivision).

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'benefits' with respect to any individual means supplemental security income benefits under this title, and any State supplementary payments under section 1616 or under section 212 of Public Law 93-66 which the Secretary makes on behalf of a State (or political subdivision thereof), that the Secretary has determined to be due with respect to the individual at the time the Secretary makes the first payment of benefits. A cash advance made pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(A) shall not be considered as the first payment of benefits for purposes of the preceding sentence.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'interim assistance' with respect to any individual means assistance financed from State or local funds and furnished for meeting basic needs during the period, beginning with the month in which the individual filed an application for benefits (as defined in paragraph (2)), for which he was eligible for such benefits.

"(4) In order for a State to receive reimbursement under the provisions of paragraph (1), the State shall be in effect an agreement with the Secretary's which shall provide—

"(A) that if the Secretary makes payment to the State (or a political subdivision of the State as provided for under the agreement)

in reimbursement for interim assistance (as defined in paragraph (3)) for any individual in an amount greater than the reimbursement amount authorized by paragraph (1), the State (or political subdivision) shall pay to the individual the balance of such payment in excess of the reimbursable amount as expeditiously as possible, but in any event within ten working days or a shorter period specified in the agreement; and

"(B) that the State will comply with such other rules as the Secretary finds necessary to achieve efficient and effective administration of this subsection and to carry out the purposes of the program established by this title, including protection of hearing rights for any individual aggrieved by action taken by the State (or political subdivision), pursuant to this subsection.

"(5) The provisions of subsection (c) shall not be applicable to any disagreement concerning payment by the Secretary to a State pursuant to the preceding provisions of this subsection nor the amount retained by the State (or political subdivision).

"(6) The provisions of this subsection shall expire on June 30, 1976. At least sixty days prior to such expiration date, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report assessing the effects of actions taken pursuant to this subsection, including the adequacy of interim assistance provided and the efficiency and effectiveness of the administration of such provisions. Such report may include such recommendations as the Secretary deems appropriate.".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 1611 of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by inserting "(or, if greater, the amount, determined under section 1617)" immediately after "$1,752";

(2) in subsection (a)(2)(A), by inserting "(or, if greater, the amount determined under section 1617)" immediately after "$2,628";

(3) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting "(or, if greater, the amount determined under section 1617)" immediately after "$1,752"; and

(4) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting "(or, if greater, the amount determined under section 1617)" immediately after "$2,628".

(b) Part A of title XVI of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS IN BENEFITS

"SEC. 1617. Whenever benefit amounts under title II are increased by any percentage effective with any month as a result of determination made under section 215(i), each of the dollar amounts in effect for such month under subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(2)(A), (b)(1), (b)(2) of section 1611, and subsection (a)(1)(A) of section 211 of Public Law 93–66, as specified in such subsections or as previously increased under this section, shall be increased by the same percentage (and rounded, when not a multiple of $1.20, to the next higher multiple of $1.20), effective with respect to benefits for months after such month; and such dollar amounts as so increased shall be published in the Federal Register together with, and at the same time as, the material required by section 215(i)(2)(D) to be published therein by reason of such determination."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 15(c)(2) of Public Law 93–233 is amended by striking out "December 1, 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1975", and by striking out "July 1, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1967".

(b) Section 15(c)(5) of Public Law 93–233 is amended by striking out "March 1, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1975", and by striking out "October 1, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1976".

(c) Section 15(d) of Public Law 93–233 is amended by striking out "January 1, 1975, except that if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that additional time is required to prepare the report required by subsection (c), he may, by regulation, extend the applicability of the provisions of subsection (a) to cost accounting periods beginning after June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1976".

SEC. 8. Section 249B of the Social Security Amendments of 1972 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1977".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 1902(a)(14)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act (relating to certain cost-sharing fees required to be paid by some individuals under medicaid) is amended by striking out "shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "may".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective January 1, 1973.

SEC. 10. (a) Section 211(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "material participation by the owner or tenant" each time it occurs the following: "(as determined without regard to any activities of an agent of such owner or tenant)".

(b) Section 1402(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of net earnings from self-employment) is amended by inserting after "material participation by the owner or tenant" each time it occurs the following: "(as determined without regard to any activities of an agent of such owner or tenant)".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1973.

SEC. 11. (a) The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the operation and effect of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, with a view to determining whether such Act should be extended beyond December 31, 1975, and, if so, how the administration of such Act can be improved. The Joint Committee staff shall specifically consider whether exemption criteria and the statutory factors for determining excessive profits should be changed to make the Act fairer and more effective and more objective. The Joint Committee staff shall also consider whether the Renegotiation Board should be restructured.

(b) In conducting such study and investigation the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation shall consult with the staffs of the Renegotiation Board, the General Accounting Office, the Cost Accounting Standards Board, and the Joint Economic Committee.

(c) The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation shall submit the results of its study and investigation to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate on or before September 30, 1975, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate.

Mr. MILLS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the motion and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order on section 3 of this bill because it does not conform to the House germaneness rule, rule 28, clause 5(b)(1).

In no way can this section be germane to the House-passed H.R. 8217.

The House bill dealt with exempting from duty certain equipment and repairs for vessels operated by or for any agency of the United States where the entries were made in connection with vessels arriving before January 5, 1971.

Section 3 deals with the unemployment compensation program as it relates to extended benefits. This has nothing to do with the "repair of vessels."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is necessary to take time to explain why the Senate unemployment compensation amendment is nongermane to the House-passed tariff bill.

It is nongermane on its face, and I ask that my point of order be sustained.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I must admit that the point of order is well taken. I cannot resist the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PICKLE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PICKLE moves that the House reject section 3 of the proposed amendment to the Senate amendment to the text of the bill H.R. 8217.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to this section of the bill for several reasons.

On its face, the amendment sounds good, but closer examination will reveal why it is wrong for the House to acquiesce to the other body, which has—once again—come in at the last minute to suspend or waiver the provisions of the unemployment compensation laws.

The need for such a study is one reason why I oppose the Senate amendment. For the first time in 2 years we are having an open and full debate on what the Senate is doing to our unemployment compensation program.

For the fifth time in 2 years the other body is tinkering with the extended benefits program. For the fifth time in 2 years the House is being asked to go along blindly with the Senate. We are asked to do so despite promises from the Ways and Means Committee that a permanent solution is forthcoming. The employers of the country are being traded off again.

Just what is it that we are being asked to do?

The extended unemployment benefits program is complicated. Its basic goal is one with which no one quarrels. The goal is that when a State has abnormal unemployment rates, unemployment benefits are extended beyond the normal period for payments. In the unemployment compensation system, the time for extended benefits period is 13 weeks. The extended benefits are financed 50 percent from the State participating and 50 percent from a Federal trust fund.

Moneys in the State fund and Federal fund come from taxes on employers. To

pay the Federal fund—the FUTA—an extra tax is placed on the employers all across the Nation.

Under permanent law, a State gets to tap the Federal fund when two events occur. First the unemployment rate has to be above 4 percent, and second, the unemployment rate for a 13-week period has to be 120 percent of the same 13-week period of the previous year.

So, under the permanent law, when the unemployment rate drops below 4 percent, or becomes less than 120 percent of the previous year's unemployment, the State can no longer get Federal funds for extended benefits payment.

For the past 2 years, the Congress has waived, or eliminated, with temporary measures the 120-percent trigger mechanisms.

Today, we are being asked to waive the 120-percent trigger until April 30, 1975. The present waiver expires July 31, 1974.

The waiver of the 120-percent trigger was done originally to help those states with chronic high unemployment.

I do not quarrel with this original goal, but I do want Congress to know that taxes on employers are paying for these extra benefits.

The sum of it is that the House is being asked time after time to put more taxes on employers in various states without debate.

This is one reason why I ask the House to reject the Senate amendment.

The main reason that I ask the House to reject the Senate amendment is the facts of the situation.

As of June 15, 10 States were receiving extended benefits under the present waiver of the 120-percent trigger. Only three of these states had unemployment rates above 6 percent. Three had unemployment rates below 5 percent.

When the program was originally established, 4 percent unemployment was the goal.

Now, many economists feel 5 percent is the figure to shoot for.

So, it would seem that an abnormal unemployment situation does not exist for 7 States now draining the Federal fund at the expense of employers of the other states.

The House should put a stop to this practice, and establish a permanent system to help those states with unusually high unemployment.

Perhaps a better solution would be to move to a simple solution whereby extended benefits would be paid when the unemployment rate went above 6 percent.

Such a permanent system would bring four States and Puerto Rico under an extended benefits program. Two more States were so close to 6 percent plus as of June 15, that they, too, would probably qualify if this new system was adopted

The rates that I am using are the insured unemployment rates. Let us remember, the uninsured do not receive benefits no matter what. So those who ask the uninsured rate be counted in are using the poor in a devious way.

If we want to help the uninsured poor, a system for them should be considered. We should not be lulled into thinking we are assisting the uninsured, who are generally the lowest income sector of the economy, by tinkering with the insured unemployment benefits program.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think the House should reject the Senate nongermane amendment.

Legislation that is not fair to all the States should not be passed willy-nilly everytime the Senate asks for it.

The facts also show that the waiver of the 120-percent trigger until June 1, 1975, is not really needed.

I ask the House to vote against the Senate amendment, and to ask the Congress to come up with a permanent solution to the problem.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to be associated with the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

As I understand the situation, besides the fact that this is an ungermane amendment, and it certainly appears to be one to me, it does not seem fair that this extension of the unemployment compensation law should be enacted as a rider put on by the Senate. It should be a bill standing on its own feet—there should be hearings.

Mr. PICKLE. The gentleman from New Hampshire is correct, obviously the section is not germane. I would say to the gentleman that this has happened on about four or five occasions. The gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, and I have had colloquies on this matter before. I know that the intent is to try to correct a situation that is obviously and blatantly unfair. It is not right for some 37 States to pay for the extended benefits of 10 or 13 other States. This is what is happening today, and it has happened many times in the last 2 or 3 years.

Unless we handle this problem correctly it can go on and on by virtue of the waiver of this formula of the trigger here at the last moment as the Senate has done on many occasions before.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. PICKLE) for bringing this to the attention of the Members of the House.

As I understand it, the gentleman from Texas at one time served in the Texas employment security service, and as such has become an expert in this field. I do know that the gentleman has a national reputation in this field.

I think it is regrettable that we address this with an amendment tacked on by the Senate on a bill that really does not deal with this problem.

Mr. PICKLE. I certainly do not claim to be any sort of an expert in this field, but I was part of the Texas State program when we recommend the formula that established the unemployment extended benefits program.

I think it is good that our States that have abnormally high unemployment should be helped, and it is to the credit of all the States, that they have come together in years past and said, "We will join and help you." But the States that said they wanted to help did not say, "We will allow a few States to continue to take advantage of the program by waiving the formula." We ought to have a change in the formula now.

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

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to correct the record in one respect. This is not new legislation. It is merely an extension of legislation that has been on the books for some time.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania correcting me. This is not new legislation, but when this amendment was tacked onto this legislation, at that time there were no hearings to permit anyone to make their points in regards to the basic legislation to be extended.

Mr. PICKLE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CLEVELAND. So this just continues the situation without giving us the opportunity to be heard as to whether or not the formula that is now devised is working properly, or fairly to many States, such as New Hampshire.

Mr. PICKLE. The gentleman is correct. May I make one other point, and then I will reserve my time.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There have been hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means on this whole subject matter. Contrary to the observation of the gentleman from New Hampshire, we have had hearings this year.

Mr. PICKLE. I appreciate and I would not challenge the statement in a strict sense of the word, but the gentleman knows, and the Members of this House know, that in every instance we have come in at the last minute, in the last 2 or 3 years, and asked that the formula be waived.

Let me recap one statement, and then I will reserve my time. I do want the chairman of the committee to comment on this matter because the impression may be that one is trying to kill the extended unemployment benefit program.

I do think it ought not to be abused. The formula needs to be changed. Either the Members of the House must get together and recommend a formula, or the States must be able to say, "We have

come to some agreement." It is a little difficult for the States in the program to come to full accord for the simple reason that when 10 States get all the benefits and 40 other States pay for it then the States that get the free benefits are naturally not going to vote to do away with their own benefits. But we, the State officials, are close to an agreement in conference.

As it is now, when we waive the 120-percent formula, then all that has to occur is for the employment to be over 4 percent. That means that at least 23 States could come in and take advantage of any seasonal unemployment, so if we do not do something about it, we are going to have a situation where about one-half of the States will be drawing these benefits, and one-half or more will be paying for them. This is not right, and something must be done.

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

Mr. MILLS. The effect of the motion made by the gentleman from Texas, for whom I have very warm affection and great respect, would be to strike section 3 of the amendment that I proposed earlier. It would be an attack on the basic provisions of the Extended Unemployment Compensation Act. As I understand the gentleman from Texas, his principal objection is that if we vote to extend the authority of the States to waive the 120 percent requirement, the employers in all of the States will be required to help finance a portion of the extended benefits which will be payable only in those States that would be affected under the amendment. This objection to the proposal presently under consideration could be applied equally to the permanent provisions of the extended unemployment compensation legislation. This is an issue that we decided several years ago when the House voted to adopt the basic provisions of the law establishing the unemployment compensation program, which is a Federal-State program financed on a 50–50 basis from Federal and State unemployment tax receipts.

I think there was a general agreement then and there is general agreement now that the basic legislation, except for the flaw that exists on the State trigger provisions, is good and sound legislation.

The purpose of the provision to extend the temporary waiver authority through April 30, 1975, is to buy time in order that a better solution to the State trigger problem can be achieved. The Department of Labor along with the administrators of the State programs, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, is presently engaged in a study which will not yield any result immediately. This study should provide—and I think we should wait for the study—the basis for the development of alternative improvements in the State trigger provisions. I contend that we will be able to devise a much better alternative and bring it up for consideration early next year.

The gentleman from Texas apparently objects to the timing of the extension, which is of course as I said until April 30, 1975. With all that we have facing us in the Ways and Means Committee and with all that we have facing us in the House, it would be utterly impossible for our committee prior to recommendations from the Department of Labor and the Conference of State Administrators of Unemployment Compensation to develop a program that would be meaningful and that would be an improvement over the existing provisions.

I do not quarrel with the gentleman from Texas that changes are required. It is merely a matter of time. If his motion prevails, extended unemployment compensation comes to a halt in a number of States at the end of this week. I do not think the gentleman wants that. I do not think the House wants that because we are now without any question of a doubt at the edge of or already in a degree of recession in our economy.

I would hope that the House would allow our committee and the Department of Labor and the Conference of State Administrators of this program this much time to work out a proper solution. As I said before and I repeat, the present triggering device is not acceptable. We know it. But we have not had time to get advice from the people who know the subject matter as to what changes should be made.

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

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on this side agree with the position taken by the conference committee in acceptance of this amendment. We all agree constructive changes should be considered in connection with our unemployment compensation laws. As the chairman has stated, the Department of Labor is now undertaking an intensive study, and we hope it will have a report before us soon. The committee has had 2 days of hearings on this subject. We are aware of the problems, but time limitations did not allow us to get into the subject early enough to conduct the thorough review which is necessary.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman agree with me that it would be utterly impossible for us to conform this change and clear it through the House and Senate much earlier than April 30?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Yes. At the present time I would like to assure the House the committee is working very diligently and for long hours on a comprehensive tax reform bill. We hope to complete drafting decisions soon, but we have other pressing business to attend to, and I do not believe we have the time, Mr. Speaker, to get to this legislation this year.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman also agree with me that the next subject matter to come before the committee is national health insurance?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. It is my understanding that national health insurance legislation will be considered very soon.

Mr. MILLS. None of us want to see the program expire, including the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE), who contends that we should do something within a 60- or 90-day period, as I understand it. That the committee cannot possibly do. It is just a matter of a difference in the time involved. If the House would give us the time that we have asked for in this motion, I am satisfied we can work it out.

The gentleman refers to a statement that was made while I was absent last month that we would do something before the expiration of this present extension.

I think the statement was made sincerely by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN), but it has been utterly impossible for us to carry out that intention.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman, was it not known by the House committee and by its counterpart in the other body that this extension would be required on August 1 of 1974? If so, how do you plead to the fact that no action was taken prior to this time and the House is asked to resort to this dishonorable situation created by the other body in attaching to a bill in the House a totally nongermane amendment.

Mr. MILLS. There is no question about it being nongermane. I have to agree to the point of order stated by the gentleman from Texas. That is why we brought it back in disagreement.

But let me remind my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that the gentleman from Texas himself has said he does not want this legislation to expire this week. He wants a permanent solution; but the Department of Labor has not come up with its recommendation yet, neither has the person in the State of Iowa who administers it, along with the people in other States. We must have the benefit of their advice as to some alternative. I do not know what the alternative is.

Mr. GROSS. But the unanswered question is, why did not the committee bring to the floor of the House a simple extension, rather than go through, I say again, this dishonorable act on the part of the other body?

Mr. MILLS. It is not a dishonorable act.

Mr. GROSS. All right——

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman from Iowa will note, it was in executive session.

Mr. GROSS. I will retract and apologize for the word "dishonorable," but I do say it is highly objectionable. What we are asked to do here today is accept a totally ungermane amendment, something we have railed against for years and said we were going to stop, yet for the sake of expediency, we are again asked to roll over and play dead.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, no.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes, we have.

Mr. MILLS. We have not said that under the rule. We have said if the Senate acts on a matter not germane under the House rule, we have to bring it back so a separate vote can be developed if Members desire it. That is what we have done. As far as I am concerned, I do not object to what was said and done in this instance, because this is a most important matter. It involves several States. It may well involve the State of Iowa before the year is up. It could well involve other States before the year is up. No one knows how much unemployment we will be likely to experience before the end of this year. This has to be done in order to protect people who may be or who are already unemployed.

The gentleman from Texas does not want it to stop. What he wants us to do is develop an alternative to the triggering device in 60 days. The gentleman from Iowa knows the schedule of the House.

It is just a question of time. I think the gentleman from Texas would admit that if I yield.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is a question of time, but may I remind the chairman and Members of the House that we extended this program and waived it last fall. Now, 45 days ago we extended it again with the understanding by the gentleman's committee that we would take some positive action by today. I recognize I have come in on July 31. I do not control the bill and I can do nothing more than express myself here at this hour.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Texas has admitted that the group that administers these programs at the State level have not yet listed what the alternatives should be. Should not we have the advice of that group before we act?

Mr. PICKLE. Yes; I think we should. They have not given a formal vote. I think at this point it is good to point out to the gentleman a poll taken of all the States has now shown—I talked to the chairman of the interstate conference—that 27 States would prefer a simple change in the 6-percent figure; 34 States would rather have a 5-percent figure, and do away entirely with the 120-percent formula, but at least the majority of the States by official report to the chairman has reached a general agreement. The interstate conference is going to meet in September and they will officially take a position on this subject at that time.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman agree that a majority of States agree that this program has to be extended and it should not expire?

Mr. PICKLE. I believe so, and I agree that unemployment program should be extended, yes.

Mr. MILLS. So the difference between the gentleman and the committee is only a question of time?

Mr. PICKLE. A question of time and action, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat to the gentleman again this is the fifth time in 2 years that this program has been extended and we have seen no action on the program yet. If we do not take action, Mr. Chairman, the employers of the various States who are paying the program are going to protest. It may be you will want to take that out of the general treasury. I think as long as the States want to pay for it themselves, that is what ought to be done.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman from Texas consider, since we have debated the matter and since it is only a question of time—would the gentleman entertain a suggestion from me, since he has made his point, and since we are all in agreement that something has to be done and it cannot be done between now and midnight, would the gentleman entertain a suggestion that he withdraw his motion?

Mr. PICKLE. I would like to comment on this in the time that I have reserved, what I hope we can do basically on this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like an expression from the House that obviously what is being done is not fair, and we ought to take action, so that we will not stop these payments to States such as Massachusetts and New Jersey, both of which do have high unemployment rates and do qualify and should be given help. I would like to see a 60-day extension granted.

When the conference came in, the gentleman will remember that we considered what to do and extended the program until April 30. We changed the Senate recommendation from June 30 to April 30. We did cut off 3 months, but we really extended it for 9 months, and that is going to cost the employers of the United States nearly a half billion dollars—somewhere between $400 million and $500 million in the next 9 months.

I propose, if the House knocks this section out when it comes time for adoption of this report on the previous question, I would ask for a "no" vote. If the gentleman will agree to that section and continue it for 60 days and give us time to work on it.

Mr. MILLS. This seems to me a matter that the gentleman and I can resolve very quickly. The gentleman knows the situation we face in the Congress and what may happen or what may not happen. I have advised the gentleman of the situation in the Ways and Means Committee. He is willing to extend it for 60 days. I am really suggesting that the committee cannot come up with a solution until we get the advice of the Department of Labor, and the people who administer the program on the State level. There is no assurance whatsoever even if we had the time in the Congress that they could report back to us in 60 days.

What is the difference between 60 days and time enough for us to work out a proper solution to the problem.

Mr. PICKLE. I am saying to the gentleman that it will be something like $300 million for employers in 37 States.

Mr. MILLS. I know that whatever we do is going to cost the employers. It is not a question of saving the employers. They are going to have to pay something anyway, so I would hope that the gentleman would withdraw his motion.

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

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, will offer a motion today to recede from disagreement to the Senate amendment to the text of H.R. 8217 and concur with the Senate amendment as agreed to in conference. I urge strong support for this position and hope the House will concur.

I have a particular interest in one amendment which may be the subject of some controversy today, and I mention it now to ask this Chamber's support for an amendment to extend until April 30, 1975, the provision of the present law which permits States to participate in the extended unemployment compensation program if the rate of insured unemployment is 4 percent—without regard to other requirements of permanent law.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I have repeatedly stressed that a more workable program of long-term unemployment compensation be devised by this Congress. Our experience with the present triggering mechanism for the extended program has unquestionably shown that it is unrealistic, unworkable, and totally ineffective as an index of compensation requirements. It is incumbent upon the Congress to adopt an entirely different approach in benefit planning, one that is based not only on the number of people unemployed, but also on the amount of unemployment the individual is experiencing.

Four times, Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 years, Congress has on a temporary basis waived the requirement that in order to "trigger" on to the extended-benefits program a State's insured unemployment rate must not only equal or exceed 4 percent, but must also be 20 percent higher than that for the same month of the preceding 2 years. I think it is abundantly clear that the trigger mechanism does not take into account the steady, but very high unemployment situations faced by many States, such as my State of Massachusetts.

These suspensions, however, indicate a realization on the part of Congress that these States and the individuals in these States, are desperately in need of the extra 13 weeks of Federal-State-shared benefits. Workers who exhaust their 26 weeks of State benefits in Massachusetts and in 23 other States will have no recourse except welfare unless we take affirmative action to suspend this trigger mechanism again today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like this approach. No one in this Chamber likes this approach. It is a piecemeal and stopgap approach at best. It is an attempt to get around a provision in the permanent law which if allowed to operate would deny benefits where they are needed most. Perhaps criticism of what we are doing today is entirely justified, but in the absence of reform legislation, I frankly see no alternative. An overhaul of our Federal unemployment compensation program is long overdue. The Ways and

Means Committee began examining alternative approaches earlier this year. I thought that we were finally on the right track then and I applauded the committee's willingness to finally sit down and review a program that has perplexed and discouraged those of us from high unemployment States. I offered legislation at that time which I feel would form the nucleus of a sound and workable system of extended benefits and end once and for all the awkward and unworkable trigger mechanism. In the press for tax reform legislation from all sides, the committee was forced to suspend work on unemployment compensation legislation, and, in the absence of this legislation today we are again faced with the dilemma of what to do with a program which, if allowed to operate would deny benefits where they are most needed.

What we are asking for today is a 9-month suspension of the trigger-mechanisms. The distinguished chairman of our committee has promised that during that time legislation will be considered by our committee to resolve this issue.

I plead with you today to accede to this request. I cannot see how we can act otherwise without showing callous indifference to the welfare of the long-term unemployed in this Nation.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey needs the action that the Committee on Ways and Means has taken, and I wish that my good friend from the 88th Congress would withdraw his motion.

I am opposed to his motion, and I support the conference report of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently we had a debt ceiling bill before this body. To it we attached another extension and waiver of the extended benefit program, with the understanding of the committee that they would come back and make a formula recommendation before today.

No action was taken, and we are faced now on the very last day of the extension program with the waiver formula.

I know that the Committee on Ways and Means is very busy and has had some heavy problems before it. Therefore, I do not say that the gentleman is unmindful of the problem, but I must say that this is the fifth time in 2 years that the same thing has happened.

The States have paid the unemployment benefits and have joined hands voluntarily to pay for them. They are willing to do it, but I do not think they are willing to continue paying for what is seasonal unemployment. If we waive the formula by removing this 120 percent, then any State that has abnormal unemployment above the 4-percent level, can come in and get the extended unemployment benefits. There are some States which would qualify if we had either formula change recommended, such as the State of Massachusetts where there is a lot of unemployment, the State of New Jersey, and the State of Washington. There are some of those States that really must be helped, and I think it would be a tragedy to stop that, but it is not right for some of our other States to milk the fund. I will not mention them by name, but it is not right for about 10 other States to come in and claim extended benefits, and by waiving this formula. Then the 37 or 40 other States are paying the unemployment benefits for the other 13 States.

The chairman knows that and agrees with it.

It is for that reason that I think we ought to get at this thing, and if this amendment were adopted, then at the proper point, when the previous question was ordered, I would have a motion just to extend it for 60 days.

I am sympathetic with the problem we have, but something must be done. What we are doing is wrong, and it must be stopped.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. It is my understanding that the Conference of State Administrators and the Department of Labor will not be able to report back to us their recommendations on this subject matter until sometime in November.

Mr. PICKLE. I would have to differ with the gentleman on that. I have been told that this will be ready or should be acted on by early September, the first week in September.

At that point they would hope to have an official position ready.

Mr. MILLS. That is the State administrators, but the Department of Labor would not have a report ready.

Mr. PICKLE. The gentleman may be correct on that point.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further. I think the gentleman's motion is merely one as to time. I further suggest to the gentleman that if it is just a question of time, the gentleman and I are in agreement that something has to be done.

Mr. PICKLE. That is why I have offered my motion.

Mr. MILLS. That is right. The gentleman and I are in agreement that we need to extend the program and not allow it to lapse.

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

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

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

My problem with this procedure, as I have tried to express it before, is that the amendment dealing with the extension of unemployment compensation is made a rider to a bill to exempt from duty certain equipment and repairs for vessels operated by or for any agency of the United States, and so on.

This amendment cannot and did not, as admitted by the gentleman from Arkansas, stand the test of challenge for consideration on the floor of the House. This amendment ought not to be in this conference report, and I still have received no answer to the question as to why the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or its counterpart in the Senate did not bring forth days or weeks ago, knowing this act would expire, a simple resolution providing for its continuance, instead of subjecting the Members of the House to further humiliation by the other body resulting from the affixing a totally nongermane amendment. The House has a strict rule of germaneness and the Members of the House who go to conference with the Senate ought to insist that it be observed.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield, there is no question about its not being germane. I admitted that when the gentleman from Texas raised his point of order.

However, this is one body of Congress, and there is another body. We cannot in this body control the Senate. We do under the rules of the House say that if an amendment is adopted by the other body that is not germane, it can be brought back in disagreement and the House offered an opportunity to vote one way or the other on it.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing right now.

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

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I am a little unclear as to exactly where we stand because of the discussion on amending the non-germane amendment to provide for 50 days.

Am I correct that the gentleman from Texas intends to pursue this motion to reject the nongermane portion?

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the point of nongermaneness has already been ruled on, and we now face the vote on either to adopt or reject the section. Under the rules I cannot amend the conference report, except on motion of the previous question. If I could amend it, I would offer it now.

All the conferees did was change the dates. The other points are not in issue in conference or are not in controversy, so my only alternative is to await that procedure.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas to reject section 3 is adopted, then what is the intention of the gentleman from Texas insofar as dealing with that issue is concerned?

If that motion is adopted and we have rejected the nongermane portion which was added on by the other body, at what point does the gentleman get to the place where he attempts to deal with the 60 days?

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at the time the gentleman moves the previous question on the adoption of this conference report, I would ask for a no vote. If a no vote prevails, I would then be recognized, I would presume, for the purpose

of offering an amendment to section 3 to extend the benefit program for 60 days. That would give us time to work and a proper formula.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and urge adoption of the motion to reject section 3.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE) has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I have 2 minutes remaining, and in that time I wish to reply to the question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

I have tried repeatedly to advise the House that the Committee on Ways and Means cannot act within 60 days on this matter, because we need recommendations from the administrators at the State level, and we need recommendations from the Department of Labor, and those recommendations, I am told, will not be forthcoming perhaps from the State administrators until September and will not be forthcoming from the Department of Labor until November.

All we are talking about is the question of time. I can assure the gentleman that the committee is so loaded down now with tax legislation, national health insurance legislation, and other matters, that we could not possibly do anything, if the gentleman from Texas were to prevail, other than to come back to the House at the end of 60 days and ask for an extension of this program.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I agree with the gentleman from Arkansas that the committee does not have the time to handle this properly in such a short period of time. The two reports we need in order to do a competent job in this area will not be forthcoming in the next 60 days.

Mr. MILLS. So my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI), is joining me in expressing the hope that the House will vote down the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I am expressing the hope that the House will support the position of the conferees.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would hope the motion would prevail, but in the event it does not, and if the Interstate Commerce Commission reaches the end of its authority next month, between now and next April, would the committee try to give us a bill back as quickly as possible?

Mr. MILLS. That is absolutely certain. It would be the next thing we would go into, really.

Mr. PICKLE. I want an "aye" vote on the motion, but I am glad to have that assurance.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and seeking recognition.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman from Iowa on his feet at the time the question was put?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly was.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, regular order. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) was recognized prior to the gentleman from Iowa seeking recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair did not see the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and did not hear the gentleman from Iowa seeking recognition, but the Chair has to accept the word of a Member who states to the Chair that he was on his feet and seeking recognition at the time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and I was walking down the center aisle of the Chamber seeking recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa was seeking recognition for what purpose?

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

Mr. MILLS. Not on the previous question I hope?

Mr. GROSS. No; I wanted it on the vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I must make the point of order that the gentleman's request comes too late.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, you had already put the question, and announced the result.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it. The gentleman from Iowa states that he was on his feet and seeking recognition of the Chair to make the point of order that a quorum was not present, and to object to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Chair had also recognized me on the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair had not observed the gentleman from Iowa at the time when the gentleman from Iowa was seeking recognition to make the point of order that a quorum was not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present.

Therefore the Chair must recognize the gentleman from Iowa, and the Chair does recognize the gentleman from Iowa who objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and 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 63, nays 336, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

YEAS—63

Andrews, N.C.	Flynt	Price, Tex.
Archer	Fountain	Rarick
Armstrong	Froehlich	Roberts
Ashbrook	Fuqua	Robinson, Va.
Bafalis	Gross	Rose
Baker	Henderson	Rousselot
Beard	Kazen	Ruth
Bennett	Ketchum	Satterfield
Blackburn	Landgrebe	Sikes
Brinkley	McCollister	Steelman
Burleson, Tex.	Mahon	Steiger, Ariz.
Camp	Mann	Steiger, Wis.
Casey, Tex.	Martin, N.C.	Symms
Chamberlain	Milford	Taylor, N.C.
Cleveland	Mizell	Teague
Collier	Montgomery	Thomson, Wis.
Collins, Tex.	Patman	Thone
Crane	Pickle	White
Daniel, Dan	Poage	Wright
Davis, Wis.	Powell, Ohio	Wyman
Fisher	Preyer	Young, S.C.

NAYS—336

Abdnor	Dingell	Jones, N.C.
Abzug	Donohue	Jones, Okla.
Adams	Dorn	Jones, Tenn.
Addabbo	Downing	Jordan
Alexander	Drinan	Karth
Anderson, Calif.	Dulski	Kastenmeier
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan	Kemp
Andrews, N. Dak.	du Pont	King
Annunzio	Eckhardt	Kluczynski
Ashley	Edwards, Ala.	Koch
Aspin	Edwards, Calif.	Kuykendall
Badillo	Eilberg	Kyros
Barrett	Erlenborn	Lagomarsino
Bauman	Esch	Latta
Bell	Eshleman	Leggett
Bergland	Evans, Colo.	Lehman
Bevill	Fascell	Lent
Biaggi	Findley	Litton
Biester	Fish	Long, La.
Bingham	Flood	Long, Md.
Boggs	Flowers	Lott
Boland	Foley	Lujan
Bolling	Ford	Luken
Bowen	Forsythe	McClory
Brademas	Fraser	McCloskey
Bray	Frelinghuysen	McCormack
Breaux	Frenzel	McDade
Breckinridge	Frey	McEwen
Brooks	Fulton	McFall
Broomfield	Gaydos	McKay
Brotzman	Gettys	Macdonald
Brown, Calif.	Giaimo	Madden
Brown, Mich.	Gibbons	Madigan
Brown, Ohio	Gilman	Mallary
Broyhill, N.C.	Ginn	Maraziti
Broyhill, Va.	Goldwater	Martin, Nebr.
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Mathias, Calif.
Burgener	Goodling	Mathis, Ga.
Burke, Calif.	Grasso	Matsunaga
Burke, Fla.	Gray	Mayne
Burke, Mass.	Grover	Mazzoli
Burlison, Mo.	Gubser	Melcher
Burton, John	Gude	Metcalfe
Burton, Phillip	Guyer	Mezvinsky
Butler	Haley	Michel
Byron	Hamilton	Miller
Carney, Ohio	Hammer-schmidt	Mills
Cederberg	Hanley	Minish
Clancy	Hanna	Mink
Clark	Hanrahan	Minshall, Ohio
Clausen, Don H.	Harrington	Mitchell, Md.
Clawson, Del	Harsha	Mitchell, N.Y.
Cochran	Hastings	Moakley
Cohen	Hawkins	Mollohan
Collins, Ill.	Hébert	Moorhead, Calif.
Conable	Hechler, W. Va.	Moorhead, Pa.
Conlan	Heckler, Mass.	Morgan
Conyers	Heinz	Mosher
Corman	Helstoski	Moss
Cotter	Hicks	Murphy, Ill.
Coughlin	Hillis	Murphy, N.Y.
Cronin	Hinshaw	Murtha
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hogan	Myers
Daniels, Dominick V.	Holt	Natcher
Danielson	Holtzman	Nedzi
Davis, S.C.	Horton	Nelsen
Delaney	Hosmer	Nichols
Dellenback	Howard	Nix
Dellums	Huber	Obey
Denholm	Hudnut	O'Brien
Dennis	Hungate	O'Hara
Dent	Hunt	Owens
Derwinski	Hutchinson	Parris
Dickinson	Ichord	Passman
	Jarman	Patten
	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
	Johnson, Colo.	Perkins
	Johnson, Pa.	Pettis

Peyser	Seiberling	Van Deerlin
Pike	Shipley	Vander Jagt
Podell	Shoup	Vanik
Price, Ill.	Shriver	Veysey
Pritchard	Shuster	Vigorito
Quie	Sisk	Waggonner
Quillen	Skubitz	Waldie
Randall	Slack	Walsh
Rangel	Smith, Iowa	Wampler
Regula	Smith, N.Y.	Ware
Reid	Snyder	Whalen
Reuss	Spence	Whitehurst
Rhodes	Staggers	Whitten
Riegle	Stanton,	Widnall
Rinaldo	J. William	Wiggins
Robison, N.Y.	Stanton,	Williams
Rodino	James V.	Wilson, Bob
Roe	Stark	Wilson,
Rogers	Steed	Charles H.,
Roncalio, Wyo.	Steele	Calif.
Roncallo, N.Y.	Stephens	Wilson,
Rooney, Pa.	Stokes	Charles, Tex.
Rosenthal	Stratton	Winn
Roush	Stubblefield	Wolff
Roy	Stuckey	Wyatt
Roybal	Studds	Wydler
Runnels	Sullivan	Wylie
Ruppe	Symington	Yates
Ryan	Talcott	Yatron
St Germain	Taylor, Mo.	Young, Alaska
Sandman	Thompson, N.J.	Young, Fla.
Sarasin	Thornton	Young, Ga.
Sarbanes	Towell, Nev.	Young, Ill.
Scherle	Traxler	Young, Tex.
Schneebeli	Treen	Zablocki
Schroeder	Udall	Zion
Sebelius	Ullman	Zwach

NOT VOTING—35

Arends	Devine	Landrum
Blatnik	Diggs	McKinney
Brasco	Evins, Tenn.	McSpadden
Carey, N.Y.	Green, Oreg.	Meeds
Carter	Green, Pa.	O'Neill
Chappell	Griffiths	Railsback
Chisholm	Gunter	Rees
Clay	Hansen, Idaho	Rooney, N.Y.
Conte	Hansen, Wash.	Rostenkowski
Culver	Hays	Tiernan
Davis, Ga.	Holifield	Vander Veen
de la Garza	Jones, Ala.	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. O'Neill with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Vander Veen with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Meeds with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Landrum.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that under the rule the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have no intention of consuming 30 minutes of time.

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

Mr. MILLS. I do yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman yielding to me.

The reason for my wishing to converse with the chairman is that, as I understand it, the Senate amendment did provide for those eight States which are under the hold-harmless provision.

Is it correct that the Senate amendment to this bill did provide that for States that increase their benefits under the SSI for a cost-of-living increase comparable to what is mandated in this legislation for the Federal Government, they would be protected to the extent of 50 percent of that increase on the hold-harmless basis? In other words, that the Senate provision constituted a kind of compromise of a 50–50 compromise between the position originally taken by the Ways and Means Committee on this matter and the position taken by the House under the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say that I consider it most unfortunate that apparently the House has insisted on rejecting this 50–50 arrangement. Those States which are making special effort on behalf of the aged, the blind, and the disabled to keep up with the cost-of-living increases that are mandated, in line with social security cost-of-living increases, will not get the benefit of any Federal assistance in making up that cost-of-living increase. I would have supposed that this was a reasonable compromise between two conflicting positions on this issue.

I wish the chairman could explain to us how States in the position of New York and the other seven States affected can be expected to carry the entire load. Is it expected that the aged and blind in those States are going to have to wait until all other States have caught up to their level?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from New York is aware of the fact, I think, that the Congress—not only the Ways and Means Committee—the Congress as a whole has been very reluctant to tell the States what they have to do. We have never done that with respect to welfare payments. We have only suggested that we will go so far in matching State moneys, and whatever the States do, we will do it. There is no reason why the State of New York or any other State—and there are very few States that are involved in this issue—cannot go forward with increases to cover cost of living and so forth. We are paying now a major part, under the SSI program, of the benefits that are paid in the gentleman's State or my State. The States are saving generally a lot of money in this area, along with the program we adopted to help them known as revenue sharing.

As I recall, last fall the House specifically overruled the position that the gentleman suggested we now take. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to have to tell the States what they have to do.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman will yield briefly further, the Ways and Means Committee had recommended that the Federal Government pick up the entire additional burden.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

The point I am trying to make is that the House did not reject the proposal that the Senate had made for a 50–50 arrangement on sharing the costs of these cost-of-living increases. The House rejected a position that had been taken by the Committee on Ways and Means that the Federal Government would continue the hold-harmless provision to the entire extent, and I believe it was an amendment offered in the Senate by Senator MONDALE. The 50–50 arrangement would have been a reasonable compromise.

Mr. MILLS. The House did reject the proposition which is comparable to what the gentleman is talking about.

I just never will put myself in the position of telling the State legislature in New York what it ought to do about welfare. It has done enough, I think, already to take care of those people and I am not going to tell it to do more.

Neither am I going to agree to something in conference that the House had objected to in principle just a few months prior to our conference. I understand the gentleman's position, but I think the gentleman should get in touch with his own State legislature and his own Governor to see if they cannot provide these increases.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, I also know that New York State and seven other States affected have been the ones who have been making the greatest effort in this direction.

What this amounts to is that as to the cost of living increases, which are mandated through this legislation for SSI beneficiaries along with social security beneficiaries, the States in the hold-harmless position do not get the benefit of that legislation.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman knows that last November, while I was not here, the House did overrule the Committee on Ways and Means on a matter that is similar to this, and in principle, the same. Therefore, the gentleman is asking the conference committee on the part of the House why we did not agree in conference to something that the House in principle objected to. I am not, as a conferee, going to try to override the will of the House. I just cannot do it.

Therefore, the gentleman should take his case to the New York State Legislature. New York State is the beneficiary of a tremendous amount of Federal money under the revenue-sharing program.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not want to take the further time of the House. However, I would like to register the fact that I and I think other members of our delegation are unhappy as to what might have been a compromise position on this issue, but which was rejected.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the position of the conferees on our side as to other amendments is that they are noncontroversial. Some of them are in answer to requests of executive departments. Some are largely housekeeping items, and I certainly concur that we should approve the rest of this package.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania agrees with me that there is not one amendment agreed to in conference that was not supported by the department which asked for it. All of these amendments were supported by the departments, and all of them were supported by our own staff.

I must say that I do not like the way the Senate operates. I am not a Member of that body, but the Senate has a right under its rules to add amendments to House-passed bills, even though they may not be germane to the subject matter of the bill that we sent over.

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

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, we turned down other Senate actions which we felt were not in keeping with the legislation we brought to the floor for House approval.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include an explanation of the entire amendment, other than the sections I have already discussed, which I have offered:

EXPLANATION OF MOTION BY MR. MILLS

Mr. Speaker, let me take a minute to explain to the House the parliamentary situation with reference to the changes the Senate added to H.R. 8217, which was a bill relating to the tariff duties imposed on the equipment and repairs of certain U.S. vessels made in foreign parts.

As Members of the House will recall, the House bill was passed by the House unanimously on October 2 of last year.

The Senate added a series of completely non-germane provisions to this bill. It did not change the provisions of the bill itself. The changes which the Senate added covered a variety of subjects unrelated to the House bill. We found when we went to conference that all of the Senate changes, which I have indicated covered a number of different subjects, were embodied in one Senate amendment. In the light of this fact, and because all the changes are indeed non-germane to the bill itself, we brought back a Conference Report which states that the conferees could not reach agreement.

However, the conferees did discuss all of the changes and we did reach an understanding of what might be done with reference to each of the changes. It was clearly understood by the Senate conferees that the House would not accept certain of those changes but probably would accept other changes.

For example, we made it quite clear that we would not ask the House to accept the proposed change made by the Senate concerning the retirement income credit, even though it is very close to what the Ways and Means Committee very probably will propose to the House in a week or so in our tax reform bill. We made it clear that the Committee will have a tax reform bill, and that there will be a provision on this subject in that bill.

We did, however, suggest to the Senate conferees that we would offer a motion in which we would recommend that the House accept certain of the Senate changes.

The motion which I have presented to the House does, therefore, accept certain of the changes but rejects others of the changes.

I have already discussed the extended unemployment program extension.

I will now cover the other matters.

REPAYMENT OF ADVANCES UNDER THE EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

The Senate included an amendment, which is also included in the motion I have offered, relating to the repayment of funds advanced from the general fund of the Treasury to pay for benefits during the first 5 months of the operation of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971. Under existing law, these advances are to be repaid to the general fund of the Treasury by withholding from any State in which payments under the emergency unemployment compensation program were made, amounts which would otherwise be distributed to such States under Title IX of the Social Security Act. These distributions would be paid only when all of the accounts in the Federal unemployment trust fund are built up to their statutory limits and excess amounts of money in the unemployment trust fund are to be distributed to the States according to the Reed Act. It is not expected that this will happen in the foreseeable future. The amendment I have offered would provide that advances made to the States under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act are to be repaid to the general fund of the Treasury directly from the extended unemployment compensation account in the Federal unemployment trust fund whenever that account has an adequate balance to permit such repayment. This is the same procedure as applies to the repayment of advances under the emergency unemployment compensation program to finance the cost of benefits paid during the last 9 months of that program.

REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES FOR INTERIM ASSISTANCE TO SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME BENEFICIARIES

The motion which I have offered includes a Senate amendment affecting the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program. This provides authority for the Federal government to reimburse States for assistance provided to individuals who have applied for, but have not yet received SSI benefits. Existing law provides that an eligible individual shall be paid from the month of his application. During the early months of the program some applications have been substantially delayed and the applicants have needed immediate help. If that help was provided by a State or local welfare agency, that agency has had to look to the individual for repayment from the retroactive check that he received when his benefits were approved. This method of collection has proved unsatisfactory and a more direct approach is generally thought desirable. The provision simply allows the retroactive payment to be made to the States or localities if the applicant has so chosen instead of to the applicant. I have no doubt that such an election would be a prerequisite to the receipt of emergency non-Federal aid. The amendment has no cost as the amount payable would be exactly the same as under existing law. The language has been developed jointly by a committee of State welfare officials and the Social Security Administration.

AUTOMATIC COST OF LIVING INCREASE IN SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME BENEFITS

The Senate added an amendment to H.R. 8217 which would have done three things. First, it would have provided an automatic cost of living increase for Federal SSI beneficiaries whenever there was such an increase based on the cost of living in social security benefits. Under such an arrangement SSI beneficiaries would gain in Federal SSI and social security benefits whatever percentage the cost of living increase amounted to. This would not have any effect prior to July 1, 1975, and at that time only if the cost of living increase under social security goes into effect. It would on a continuing basis solve the problem of "pass through" of social security benefit increases insofar as the Federal SSI payment is concerned. This provision is included in the amendment which I have offered.

As I have indicated, the provision would have no cost in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the assumption that there will be a 5.5 percent cost of living increase July 1, 1975, estimates that there would be a $480 million increase in basic Federal SSI benefits during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976. There would be an offsetting savings in Federal funds of $93 million. The net cost for the fiscal year 1976 is accordingly $387 million. The Administration has proposed similar legislation with the same objectives and costs.

The other two parts of the Senate amendment were rejected by the House conferees. One of these would have required that States never reduce the amount of their supplementary payments. This seemed an unduly harsh requirement to place upon States since the amount of money which they would be required to spend (under penalty of loss of medicaid funds) cannot be estimated precisely. The third provision of the amendment would have reimbursed the so-called "hold harmless" States of one-half of any costs necessitated by the amendment. The House voted decisively on this question last November. The House conferees accordingly rejected these last two features of the Senate amendment and they do not appear in the amendment which I have proposed.

EXTENSION OF 100-PERCENT FEDERAL FINANCING FOR NURSING HOME INSPECTORS UNDER MEDICAID

Public Law 92–603 authorized 100-percent Federal funding of expenditures under medicaid for the training and compensation of inspectors of long-term care institutions between October 1972 and June 1974. The amendment would extend this provision through June 1977. This proposal has been recommended to the Congress by the Administration.

POSTPONEMENT OF STUDY REPORT ON TEACHING PHYSICIANS

Public Law 93–233 contained two provisions related to the method of paying for physicians' services in teaching hospitals under the medicare program. First, it deferred, until as late as July, 1975, the implementation of the 1972 amendment which provided, in part, that charges would be paid only where a teaching hospital patient is a "private patient." Second, it provided for the Secretary to contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct studies concerning appropriate methods of reimbursement under the medicare and medicaid programs for medical services in teaching hospitals and to submit its report by July 1, 1975. The amendment would postpone the due date for the report to July 1, 1976, and changes other dates to coincide with this change. The National Academy of Sciences, in planning the studies authorized by Public Law 93–233, has concluded that it will not be possible to conduct responsible studies of the scope contemplated within the time constraints that have been prescribed.

PERMITTING, NOT REQUIRING, STATES TO IMPOSE PREMIUMS ON THE MEDICALLY INDIGENT UNDER MEDICAID

Public Law 92–603 amended title XIX, medicaid, to require States to impose an enrollment fee, or premium, on the medically needy. The medically needy are persons who

have too much income to qualify for cash assistance, but not enough to pay for their medical care. The amendment would continue to allow States to impose a premium on the medically needy but it would not require them to do so if they do not believe it is feasible or cost effective.

As States have tried to implement this provision, many have found that it is extremely difficult and costly to administer. Medically needy persons typically apply for coverage when they are already facing medical costs and need care. It is difficult to keep track of them and to collect a regular premium payment. Further, at the point when medically needy persons do enter the system, they are often least able to make the premium payment.

EXCLUSION FROM SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE OF CERTAIN FARM RENTAL INCOME

In 1956, Congress enacted legislation providing social security coverage for farm rental income of a landowner when the landowner materially participates in the production of the commodities raised on his land. Several years after this provision was enacted, there were court decisions which held that material participation by the landowner could be established through the actions of his agent, and the Social Security Administration has conformed with these court decisions since 1961.

A problem has arisen in the case of landowners who enter into an agreement with a professional farm management company or other person who has the responsibility to choose a tenant and to manage and supervise the farm operation. In such a situation, the landowner often does not consider himself to be participating in the operation of the farm and views his income as investment income rather than income from farm self-employment.

In order to correct this situation, the Senate added an amendment to the bill which would exclude from coverage under social security farm rental income received by a landowner under an agreement between the landowner and another person under which the other person is to manage and supervise the production of commodities on the land if there is no personal participation in the operation of the farm by the landowner.

The amendment I have offered, while it differs technically from the Senate amendment, has the same general purpose and effect. It would restore the original intention of the provision covering farm rental income under the social security system in cases in which the landowner does not materially participate in the operation of the farm.

I wish to emphasize that this amendment makes no change in the law with regard to the coverage under the social security system of farm rental income in situations where the landowner does materially participate in the production of commodities on his land, which of course includes lease arrangements which provide for such material participation as in the past. The amendment is limited to excluding farm rental income only in instances in which the landowner completely turns over the management of his land to an agent, such as a professional farm management company and does not materially participate in the farming operation himself on that land.

RENEGOTIATION ACT STUDY

Mr. Speaker, as to the proposed study concerning the Renegotiation Act, the motion which I have offered simply changes the date on which the report of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is to be made from May 31, 1975, to September 30, 1975. This is simply because the various studies which are being made by the Renegotiation Board, the General Accounting Office, and the Joint Committee will be ready by the latter date.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

The arrangement made by the conferees on H.R. 8217 represents an effective compromise by the managers on the part of the House and by the managers for the other body. The package, which has the support of the administration, includes changes which are in each case reasonable and which, generally speaking, should be broadly beneficial.

H.R. 8217, the legislative vehicle for the conference report, would exempt from duty certain equipment for, and repairs of, vessels which were operated by or for U.S. agencies, where entries were made in connection with vessels arriving before January 5, 1971. The bill was approved unanimously by our committee, and was passed by the House in October of 1973.

In addition to this bill, the package produced by the conferees include nine amendments:

First. Under existing provisions, those who are eligible for supplemental security income, SSI, are entitled to receive Federal payments effective with application. However, SSI is a new program and the applications in many cases require months for processing. Applicants who are in dire need, therefore, have been turning to State welfare offices for emergency aid. If the State gives such assistance, it must seek reimbursement from the recipients, who are not likely to have any means of reimbursement until their first SSI checks come in. Under the conference proposal, applicants requiring emergency aid could sign agreements permitting the States to receive their initial SSI payments. The States would be required promptly to turn back to the applicants any difference between the amount of the SSI benefits and the emergency aid provided. The change was worked out between State and Federal agencies involved, and appears to be fair and equitable to all parties concerned.

Second. Under present law, social security benefits in the future are tied to the cost-of-living, through an automatic escalator provision which the House overwhelmingly approved. Under the conference proposal, Federal supplemental security income payments also would rise automatically by the same percentage as cost-of-living increases in social security benefits.

Third. When the Congress enacted the Federal-State extended unemployment compensation program, it provided that a State must pay extended benefits if its insured unemployment rate were at least 4 percent, and if that rate had increased 20 percent over the prior 2 years. Subsequent legislation, however, has permitted States temporarily to participate in the program without regard to the 20-percent increase criterion. That legislation expires at the end of this month. The conference proposal would extend it further, until April 30, 1975. It is expected that this extension will be sufficiently long to enable the committee to examine the entire unemployment insurance system thoroughly and to carefully consider proposals for permanent improvements.

Fourth. Another conference proposal related to unemployment insurance would amend a requirement that advances to States from the general fund of the Treasury to finance the payment of benefits for the first half of 1972 under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 must be repaid by withholding Reed Act distributions to those States. The conferees agreed to provide instead that these advances must be repaid whenever the extended unemployment account has a balance high enough to permit such repayment.

Fifth. The conferees also agreed on a proposal to extend until June 30, 1977, the authority for full Federal funding of expenditures for training and compensation of inspectors of long-term care institutions under the medicaid program.

Sixth. Public Law 92–233 made two changes relating to the method of paying for physicians' services in teaching hospitals under medicare. It deferred until July 1975, the implementation of a requirement that charges be paid only where the teaching hospital patient is a private patient. Second, it authorized a contract with the National Academy of Sciences for a study of reimbursement methods for medical services in teaching hospitals. The Academy is to report by July 1, 1975, but it has since become clear that more time is needed for the study, and the conferees agreed upon a deferral of the report deadline to March 1976, and a further postponement of the implementation of the reimbursement procedure until July 1976.

Seventh. A provision of Public Law 92–603 requires States to impose an enrollment fee, or premium, on the medically indigent as distinguished from cash assistance recipents. At the time, it was thought that this provision would result in substantial savings. However, many States have found that the administrative costs of implementing the provision will far exceed any possible savings. In addition, it has been noted that when medically needy persons are entitled to this type of aid, they are often unable to make a premium payment. Therefore, the conferees agreed to an amendment which would make optional the imposition of a premium by a State.

Eighth. The conferees also approved an amendment directing the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue taxation to conduct a study and investigation of the operation and effect of the Renegotiation Act, and to report its findings to the Committees on Ways and Means and Finance by September 30, 1975. This was in line with provisions which the Congress earlier enacted in extending the life of the Renegotiation Act.

Ninth. Finally, the conferees agreed to a provision to assure that an owner of farmland who does not participate materially in management or production of the land, but acts solely through an agent, will not have any rental income from that land counted as earned income for social security purposes.

There were other amendments which the Senate had attached to H.R. 8217. But the House conferees declined to accept them. We feel the amendments to which we did agree warrant the support of the House, and I therefore urge the approval of the conference package.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, attached by the Senate to the tariff bill H.R. 8217 are several nontariff provisions. Several of these provisions are reasonable: The provision that supplemental security income, SSI, benefits be raised automatically to keep pace with cost-of-living increases, and the requirement that such increases be timed to coincide with cost-of-living increases in social security.

But I urge conferees to reject the Senate move to revive the practice of Federal reimbursement for State welfare payments to the aged, blind, and disabled. In passing SSI in October 1972, Congress took a giant step of responsibility. It assumed the duty of giving basic income protection to all the needy aged, blind, and disabled, and it agreed that each such American should get the same number of dollars from the U.S. Treasury, no matter where he lived. We decided to stop paying $62 for an aged woman in Mississippi, but almost twice as much for one in Michigan, and to pay them both the same $130 monthly. Before the program started, we raised the figure to $140, and now, on July 1, to $146.

The Senate proposal would put us back in the business of giving more to some than to others, and it would discriminate in favor of the least needy. It would have the Federal Government give more to a person in Boston than in Baltimore, in San Francisco than in Cincinnati, in New York than in Chicago. This is wrong. The proposal would—

First. Require all States to pass along any future cost-of-living increases in the basic SSI floor payments, and would be enforced by loss of medicaid funds; and

Second. Pay half the cost of this for any State that already was spending as much on SSI supplements as its 1972 share of former welfare payments to the aged, blind, and disabled. There now are six such States: California, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, and Wisconsin; New Jersey and Rhode Island may reach this level of hold-harmless SSI spending in fiscal year 1975.

If the House should acquiesce, and if the cost of living were to go up 10 percent a year, it would mean that the Federal Treasury would pay an estimated $75 million in fiscal year 1976 to increase SSI supplementary payments in perhaps eight States, States where levels far exceed the average.

Consider how it would work out. The basic SSI floor would rise from $146 to $161 per individual, a gain of $15. This still would be below the poverty level, by $16.

But in Massachusetts, one of the hold-harmless States, an aged person on SSI already receives $268.96, 52 percent above the poverty line. Under the Senate amendment, his payment would rise $15, too—up to $284, 60 percent above the poverty line. And $7.50 of this increase would be paid by the Federal Government.

In California an aged couple now can receive a maximum of $440 a month in SSI plus the State supplement. This is almost double the poverty level. If the couple also has social security, its monthly guarantee is $20 higher, $460. This is $4 more than the maximum security benefit received anywhere in the country by someone who paid the maximum payroll taxes for all their working lives. Assuming a 10-percent boost in the cost of living, the Senate amendment would boost the California guarantee level for an aged couple on social security up to $482 per month, almost $5,800 per year in tax-free income.

If the object of the amendment is to help those poor persons most injured by inflation, those extra Federal dollars should go instead to help raise the basic SSI floor. If the full $7.50 per single person were added to the floor, it would finally be barely over the poverty line, by a margin of $1.50, although at higher cost.

If the States want their SSI recipients to get the benefit of cost-of-living increases, it is the States responsibility to provide the supplement. In 42 States this can be done without spending an extra penny. This welfare costs for the aged, blind and disabled are less today than in calendar 1972, thanks to SSI; and the cost-of-living boost in the basic floor would give them additional savings to pass along.

Once before, last November, there was an effort to turn the clock backward by returning to Federal matching for State supplements. The House voted 246 to 163 against that move, and on the floor Ways and Means Committee members voted almost 3 to 1 against it—16 to 6, with 3 not voting.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS).

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendment to the title of the bill was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 1974, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 12589, FEDERAL MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1974, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight, Thursday, August 1, 1974, to file the report on H.R. 12859, the Federal Mass Transportation Act of 1974, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

INFLATION POLICY STUDY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1251 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1251

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) relating to an inflation policy study. After general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that in addition to being a member of the Committee on Rules, I am also a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and because I am anxious not to give the impression that the Committee on Rules was handling too quickly a matter that affected the Joint Economic Committee, I provided, along with the committee—and the Committee on Rules cooperated fully—for an excessive amount of time for the consideration of this Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution is the brainchild, I think I might say, of the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANSFIELD, and the ranking Democrat and the ranking Republicans of the U.S. Senate, Senators PROXMIRE and JAVITS. It provides, as it passed the Senate unanimously, for a 6-month study—which is now somewhat foreshortened—of the problems of the American economy by the Joint Economic Committee or any of its subcommittees.

It provides also that the Joint Economic Committee may have the power of subpena for the purposes of this study, and it provides for $100,000 in connection with this study.

Mr. Speaker, I do have at least one request for time, but I am not aware of any controversy whatsoever on concurring in the Senate concurrent resolution.

Unless controversy develops, I propose, when the rule is adopted, to ask that the matter be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, thus limiting the general debate that would otherwise be available under the rule.

But if debate is desired and if there is controversy, I am perfectly happy to use whatever time the Members desire.

Having said that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as previously explained, House Resolution 1251 provides for the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 93, to provide funds for a study of inflation, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The primary purpose of this resolution is to authorize $100,000 to the Joint Economic Committee for an emergency study of the current state of the economy and the problems relating thereto, with special reference to inflation, including, but not limited to, such inflation-related problems as Federal spending; tight money and high interest; food, fuel, and other shortages; credit policies; export policies; international exchange rates; and indexing. The purpose of this study is to provide the Congress with specific recommendations for legislation to remedy the existing ills and improve the performance of the economy.

The joint committee is to report its findings to the Congress not later than December 31, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution passed the Senate on July 9, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed that the House is even considering this resolution. Why must the Congress spend an additional $100,000 to study inflation? That in itself is inflationary.

The fact is, this is simply reflective of the age-old practice of this body—do not face the problem: study it and hope it will go away. Have we learned nothing from our experiences with the energy crisis? The Congress was totally unable to meet the crisis with decisive legislation. As a result, the executive branch accomplished everything by fiat, and the Congress was left whimpering that not enough was done.

The country needs no additional studies on inflation. It needs action by its Congress. There are enough committees of the House and Senate to study the problem and report out corrective legislation before the end of the 93d Congress, The people cannot wait until next year for action on inflation. They must have it now.

I propose as a start, that the remaining appropriations bills be pared so that the budget can be balanced. I propose further that, when yet another increase in the public debt comes up for a vote this fall, it be voted down.

Action should be taken by the House Banking and Currency Committee to report out measures to shore up the moribund housing and mortgage market. The Ways and Means Committee should report out legislation to eliminate various tax loopholes and thereby raise needed revenues to produce a balanced budget.

The Agriculture Committee should develop a bill to increase farm production and hold down costs for the consumers.

These actions require no additional appropriations, no further studies, no lollygagging about—just plain, old work by the Members of this body. If inflation wasn't such a serious problem, this bill would be almost laughable. But these are serious times and the country is on the brink of a severe economic depression. High unemployment is already with us; runaway inflation is just around the corner: and few Americans can afford a chicken in every pot.

The President has already announced he will do nothing about inflation. A little jawboning to the general public and subsidies for the fat cats is the extent of his efforts. The country needs legislation from Congress of the magnitude, and with the swiftness, that characterized President Franklin Roosevelt's first 100 days in office. In this Congress last 100 days, we would do well to match his record. And, we can start by voting down this ridiculous resolution today.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO).

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, do not wish to have prolonged debate on this issue. I support a study on inflation by the Joint Economic Committee, but I think that it would be important to bring out some of the things that I think the Committee should particularly concentrate on. I am on the Committee on Education and Labor, and for the past few years we have been trying in that committee to come to grips with the problem of unemployment in this country. We have found that many of the theories which have been supported in the past by the economists of the country make it impossible to develop a meaningful employment policy.

I believe that those theories have been discredited by what is going on in the country today, but I also believe that it is important that the Joint Economic Committee address itself to those theories so that we can have a meaningful employment policy.

For example, there is a theory that was developed by a British economist by the name of A. W. Phillips, which says that it is impossible to have a program of full employment in our economy because if that were to happen we would have runaway inflation. Based on that theory, every time that we have tried to come up with a program of full public service employment, we have been defeated because there are people who say that we cannot have full employment because you would then have runaway inflation.

However, today the fact is that we have both runaway inflation and unemployment, so it is certainly clear that that theory does not work.

It is also clear that those economists who have been advising the administration and the Members of the Congress up to now have been consistently wrong, and we are not going to be able to have a policy to control inflation and to provide for full employment unless we repudiate those theories which have been discredited by experience.

This inflation study is basic to all that we may be doing in the next year, and in the year to come, and for that reason it is important that we go forward with this study but that we call in new people who will challenge the theories that have been expressed in the past few years, and who will come up with some meaningful approaches on how to deal with the problems of inflation and unemployment. I trust that this can be done and I urge the adoption of this resolution and urge the Joint Economic Committee to undertake the emergency study without delay.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and will tell him that there is no question but what the Joint Economic Committee has exactly the same thing in mind that the gentleman has stated, to look at the problem afresh without regard to those views that have been prevalent in the past.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) relating to an inflation policy study, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Missouri explain to the Members of the House how this procedure will affect them in their response and their debate?

Mr. BOLLING. As the gentleman from Missouri understands, it eliminates general debate and makes amendments under the 5-minute rule in order, and pro forma amendments.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. We can immediately proceed under the 5-minute rule of the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and Members can seek recognition for amendments?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct; it simply eliminates the general debate provision of the rule.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 93

Whereas the United States economy has been suffering from serious and persistent inflation; and

Whereas unemployment continues to be an economic problem, for the present as well as the near future; and

Whereas extremely high interest rates have caused serious dislocations in the housing industry, in small business, and in other sectors of the economy; and

Whereas the economy of the United States has been upset by shortages of basic resources; and

Whereas prospective shortages continue to be a cause of concern; and

Whereas solutions to these economic ills require the consideration of a large number of interrelated policy questions; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon the Congress to develop more effective economic policies for the Nation and to provide more effective means for coordinating public policy decisions to the end that the national economic welfare be better served; and

Whereas such requirements require that experts throughout the country be utilized for the purpose of obtaining the best available judgment on these important issues; and

Whereas the Joint Economic Committee of the United States Congress is charged by law with the responsibility of conducting a continuing study of matters relating to the economic reports of the President and with providing guidance to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to public economic policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Economic Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, as authorized by the Employment Act of 1946, shall undertake, as soon as possible—

(1) an emergency study of the current state of the economy and of the problems relating thereto, with special reference to inflation, including, but not limited to, such inflation-related problems as Federal spending; tight money and high interest; food, fuel, and other shortages; credit policies; export policies; international exchange rates; and indexing; and

(2) to provide the Congress with specific recommendations for legislation to remedy the existing ills and improve the performance of the economy.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the Joint Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from July 1, 1974, through December 31, 1974, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, (3) to hold hearings, (4) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, (5) to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (6) to take depositions and other testimony, (7) to procure the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and (8) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) Subpenas may be issued by the Joint Committee, or subcommittee thereof, over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the Joint Committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 3. The Joint Committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but not later than December 31, 1974.

SEC. 4. (a) The Joint Committee is authorized, from July 1, 1974, through December 31, 1974, to expend under this concurrent resolution not to exceed $100,000 of which amount not to exceed $35,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof.

(b) The expenses of the Joint Committee under this concurrent resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Joint Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand what cannot be done by the Joint Economic Committee in the absence of this particular resolution.

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

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

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To the best of my knowledge, there are two things that the Joint Economic Committee could do in the absence of this resolution. One is use subpena power, and another is to spend $100,000.

Mr. GROSS. I think the latter is probably the most important of the two objectives cited by the gentleman from Missouri. I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO), that another look might be taken at the situation in which we find ourselves in in this country. Inquiry might well be made into why a majority of the Members of the House and the other body have consistently followed the policy that we can spend our way out of debt and inflation.

I hope that for $100,000 the committee can provide the answers to all of the subject matter set forth here on inflation-related problems such as Federal spending and tight money. The latter is an interesting topic, as is the disappearance of the dollar.

I note the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is waiting and probably to give us some information on what is proposed to be done with respect to tight money. He may also offer some discourse in support of printing press money.

Perhaps we can also have a discourse on high interest rates; food, fuel, and other shortages; credit policies; export policies; international exchange rate; and indexing. I do not know what is proposed to be done by way of indexing, but I am sure that for $100,000 and additions to the staff they will be an answer to that too.

I note and it seems to me to be significant that there is no provision in the subject matter set forth in the bill for study of the annual foreign handout program, which runs in the neighborhood in all its ramifications of about $13 billion. I would hope that in the absence of an amendment to that effect, the Joint Economic Committee will give serious consideration to what has happened in the field of the foreign handouts which, as I say, is running at an annual rate of $13 billion to $15 billion and to a total of about $260 billion since it was inaugurated as the Marshall plan some years ago.

At any rate I do hope that everything will be lovely and the goose will hang high as far as the Joint Economic Committee is concerned when they get the $100,000 which is here proposed to be appropriated so we can be provided with all the reasons for and solutions to the fiscal situation that threatens national bankruptcy.

Does the gentleman wish me to yield to him?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I can barely resist the temptation to rise to the gentleman's bait. The subjects he raises are also interesting. If I were not conscious of the very monumental amount of business which is to follow this, I am afraid I would be tempted to debate them, but being a very restrained person I will resist.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend, the restrained gentleman from Missouri, for his contribution.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the expenditure of this $100,000 will be nothing more than a future contribution to the Nation's deficit and debt.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the committee for reporting this resolution. I think it is important.

I want to call attention to certain aspects of the current economic problems that I do not think have been dealt with sufficiently in prior studies. In the resolution adopted by the Democratic Caucus the other day, there was a call for the use of credit controls in order to rechannel credit to priority needs in the economy. I have always felt that this was an important tool of economic management, but the fact is that we do not know how to do it. We have not developed the technique. We do not know what kinds of institutions, what kinds of regulations would effectively accomplish the channeling of credit away from low priority needs to high priority needs.

In fact today we induce real distortions into the allocation of credit in a number of ways. One is the arbitrary ceiling on interest rates. Another is that more credit and resources are available to large corporations than are available to small businesses and consumers.

We all know the regressive aspects of our fiscal policy. However, our monetary policy is also regressive. The tightening

of credit is not distributed equitably throughout the economy.

While credit allocation sounds as though we will give preferential treatment to certain investments, we can only try to offset the tremendous advantages large corporations have in obtaining credit. A minimum goal would be to obtain neutrality between all investment alternatives.

Currently 70 percent of the impact of monetary policy fall on the housing industry. Yet housing is one of our highest priorities. We need to develop a system of making monetary policy work toward these social goals, not thwart them.

So one of my purposes in rising now is to urge that when the Joint Economic Committee undertakes this study, it pay special attention to finding means through which we can effectively channel credit to those sectors of the economy which need credit. We must also discourage the use of credit where it contributes to inflation. If a venture neither helps to meet high priority social needs nor breaks up inflationary bottlenecks, credit must be restricted.

The second matter I hope the Joint Economic Committee will look into is the growing disparity in income and resources between the rich and the poor in the United States. We often talk about the growing gap between the rich and the poor nations, but we have the same widening gap between the rich and the poor here at home. Inflation is accelerating that unhappy trend toward making the rich even more wealthy.

In undertaking this study of the economy, we must keep in mind our ultimate goals. The gentleman from New York spoke about the problem of achieving full employment while maintaining low levels of inflation.

We also need to deal with the more fundamental problem of inequality in America, inequality in access to income, inequality in access to credit, and inequality in access to full participation in the mainstream of the American economic system.

So I would add my concern and hope that in its study, the Joint Economic Committee will pay special attention to the problems of inequality and that it investigate legislative measures which can remove, rather than increase, the spread of income between the rich and the poor in the United States. Only as we move in that direction can we come up with an economic system which will redeem the hope of all the people in the future of our Nation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 93, which would provide funds to the Joint Economic Committee—not to exceed $100,000—to conduct a study of the Nation's inflation problems.

Inflation, as one interlocking part of the Nation's economic problem, has become the most worrisome of our domestic issues to the great majority of the American public. Every effort must be made by the Congress to get to the heart of the problem—to rediscover its root causes and analyze the reasons for its persistence. New economic developments, such as the energy crisis and changing patterns of world supply and consumption of food deserve consideration at this particular time. Such findings need new interpretations as they relate to the broad impact of inflation throughout the economy—from the basic industries such as farming, mining and the timber, through the processing and manufacturing stages to the wholesale and retail markets and the ultimate consumers, whether these consumers be the housewife buying groceries or shoes or a shortage industry trying to expand its productive capacity.

Interest rates and their impact on every consumer must be restudied. The whole range of governmental policy in budget, fiscal and monetary areas needs a thorough review in light of continuing deficit spending and tight control over capital growth. Congress own spending habits must be given new scrutiny as those habits relate to the overall problem of inflation and executive branch authority for carrying out programs affecting the economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee Monday began a mid-year review of the economy with Presidential economic adviser, Kenneth Rush, as the first witness. At that hearing, I suggested to the committee's vice chairman, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, that the Joint Economic Committee undertake to get the views on inflation of representatives of labor, farmers, housewives, the poor, the elderly, small businessmen, and others. Views of these citizens have not been sought at meetings held by the administration with big business, professional economists, and the president of the Teamsters. No program to curb inflation can hope to succeed with only that constituency and without the support of farmers, consumers, small businessmen, average workers, and so forth. I suggest that the Joint Economic Committee inflation study be accomplished through a series of hearings around the Nation, in the 10 Federal administrative regions, so as to give members of the public an opportunity to provide the Congress with their own views of the impact of current economic problems and their own suggestions as to what Government should be doing to solve those problems.

Mr. Speaker, I think such input from the general public is paramount if the public is going to support the tough decisions that this Government and the Nation must make to halt inflation and find workable long-term solutions to the problems of the economy which have dogged the Nation for the past decade. I was, therefore, pleased that Senator PROXMIRE favorably received my suggestion for regional hearings, and if it is approved by the distinguished committee chairman, Mr. PATMAN, and the remainder of the committee, the funds requested in Senate Concurrent Resolution 93 could be available to the committee for carrying out that proposed series of public hearings. It is for that reason that I most strongly support approval of Senate Concurrent Resolution 93.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. GROSS and by unanimous consent Mr. BROWN of Ohio was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give us some idea of what is already being expended on the Joint Economic Committee?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The current budget of the Joint Committee, unfortunately, is not one of the figures I have in my head, I must reply to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman agree with me that what Congress needs to do is stop spending billions for unessential programs? Inflation will not be stopped by creating a so-called budget control committee, or by an addition to the Joint Economic Committee for study? Is it not the fact that what we have to come back to in the end is to cut spending, as Mr. Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has told us almost every day recently?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Absolutely. I concur with the gentleman that there is a need to curb Federal spending, reduce the deficit and get control of the fiscal policy of this Nation. In addition to that, of course, there are somewhat more sophisticated problems, such as the money supply and what we should do with that; some things that relate to international trade and even some things, I may say to the gentleman, that relates to policies that might not precisely be called fiscal matters but relate to it such as housing loan guarantees and guarantees of personal deposits in banks, and things like that, which, if we get into deeper economic trouble than we are already in, would have the impact of being even more inflationary than some of our direct spending fiscal policies are currently. I think the gentleman would agree with me.

Mr. GROSS. It will all come back in the end, no matter how many studies are made, it will all come back in the end to contain spending within revenue.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That certainly would be one of the basic needs of getting to the problem.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

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

I want to say that I concur in what the gentleman says with respect to regional hearings on this issue. I would like specifically to ask whether the scope of this economic study is going to be broad enough to include a review of other forces which contribute to inflation, which occur from outside the

United States, which have an impact in the country.

For example, the effect of the OPEC policies; the effect of the cartel control of commodities by investor groups outside of the United States which control supply and thereby inflate the price of these commodities when made available to the consumers of America. Will the gentleman's study be broad enough to include that area of review?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would assume, if we get into regional studies, we will deal with those parts of the economy which are affected by trade abroad.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

(On request of Mr. VANIK and by unanimous consent Mr. BROWN of Ohio was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would assume, in our study, we would get input in our regional sessions from those activities in this country that are impacted by trade abroad, and certainly from those individuals and those companies which are impacted by the oil producing nations and their control of at least a third of our supply of the oil we utilize.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the problem extends beyond that. It extends to the control of such commodities as coffee, sugar, and other items that are in short supply and which appear to be controlled by cartel investments outside of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman. I agree with the recommendation of the gentleman. I would say to him that in addition to that, we should probably get into such things as our foreign trade policy, and what should be done regarding the foreign trade bill which, as I understand it, is being held up in the Senate. That will have an impact on how much we can sell abroad and on the rate of exchange. It will affect our trade balance and a great many other things, all of which have some direct benefit or negative impact on the inflationary situation in this country today.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. In response to the first question the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GROSS, asked in connection with the amount the committee spent, I understand from information coming to me that, the expenditure last year was over $800,000. Perhaps the gentleman will correct me if that is in error.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this concurrent resolution.

I think it is absolutely essential that we get on with this job.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), whom I respect very much, and I agree with much of what he said in terms of his concern about the causes of inflation, and very particularly, what might be done right now in terms of reducing Federal spending. I also think it is something that can be accomplished and ought to be accomplished.

I, for one, happen to think that the Presidential recommendation we heard the other day about a $5 billion Federal budget cut was really inadequate. I think we have to go far beyond that at this time.

I know from my conversations with Dr. Burns at the Federal Reserve that if we really want to talk about easing the restraints on inflation in the monetary policy area, with some hope of bringing down interest rates, we are going to have to do much more in the area of fiscal restraint than what we, in the Congress, have done so far or what we are contemplating at this time.

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to concur in what the gentleman has said. I also think the restraints on the budget are inadequate, with the present situation.

I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, if he is on the floor, that we need somewhat stronger fiscal restraint than is the situation so far.

Mr. RIEGLE. I might say to the gentleman from Ohio that I think if we want to be serious about what needs to be done in terms of real fiscal impact, overall economic impact as well as psychological impact, we are talking probably in terms of a budget cut of something like $10 billion or more.

I realize that is tough to accomplish, and that all of us would want to apply cuts of that magnitude in different areas of the budget.

What I would hope we could recognize is this: If we are not able category by category to agree on budget reductions where we would like to reduce the budget in the aggregate amount of 10 billion, I suggest that we must then think in terms of an across-the-board percentage budget cut, perhaps exempting some limited number of special situations where there is a particular and very great human need that would warrant an exemption from an across-the-board cut. However, by and large, having recognized the emergency economic situation, if we cannot get an agreement on area-by-area cuts, what we will have to do, I think, is agree on an across-the-board reduction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman's point is very well taken. If, in fact, we are going to balance the budget, there will have to be a cut of $11.4 billion.

Now, that is going to be very possible because the Federal Government does not do anything that is undesirable. We do things that are desirable, at least to some segment of the economy.

However, if we are going to get agreement on where those cuts must come or whether we are to have additional taxes, if that is the other thing we must do to balance the budget, then we are going to have to get the support of the average citizen in this country, the support of the people who are facing the inflationary problems, whether they be in industry which needs to expand or the housewife who is trying to buy food.

The way to do that, I think, is to take the problem to the people and get their input and to that extent for us to try to solve the problems.

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Mr. Speaker, I would say further on this issue that I do not know of a family or a business or a private institution that has not been required to undergo some sort of budget reduction at the present time. Everyone I speak to and talk to in the private sector, including individuals, is in that situation, and I think it is entirely reasonable for us at the Federal level not only to recognize the fact that we, too, can and should do this—and probably accomplish more by spending less with greater care—but there is an enormously important reason for us to do it right now. The fact is that we must act now to break this inflationary momentum.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one other thing. I think it is significant that this resolution calls for this work to be done by the end of this year. That is an immediate mandate to get on with this job and to assemble and evaluate all the facts. I think, in response to the question that was raised earlier, it clearly does not just center on domestic issues but it gets to issues and causes and influences of inflation that might come from abroad.

I think this mandate, as it is spelled out here, will give us an opportunity to have in our hands before this year is out the critical facts and information and understandings that we will not receive in any other way. Especially so now that we see the Cost of Living Council disbanded and out of business at the very time when we need it the most. That is really a very ironic and troubling fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) has expired.

(On request of Mr. REID and by unanimous consent, Mr. RIEGLE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Michigan for entering the well and for his support of this resolution, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO). I think this study is clearly needed.

There is one point, however, that has not, as I have understood the debate, been discussed. That is the fact that the United States today is very close to facing a serious depression—not recession, but depression.

In my judgment, there is a total absence today of Presidential leadership to take any steps at all to develop now a coherent policy utilizing both monetary and fiscal approaches while striving also for international monetary reforms.

There is no effective policy which I am aware of to deal with the energy crisis in this country. There is no alternative proposal being developed if we faced with a new oil embargo.

Inflation is out of sight in this country, and many are being driven to the wall, particularly senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, my point is this: that there is a suggestion made today that some Members of Congress meet with the President and develop within the next few weeks a policy of coherent action. I am afraid if we wait until the end of this year and if there is further delay, this country could be in a very serious depression, with millions of people being affected.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I support much of what the gentleman has said, and I agree that the step he suggests ought to be taken, as well as this step.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just want to welcome the expressions of Republican philosophy from that side of the aisle.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I might just say to the gentleman from Ohio that the last two speakers have had some training and background in that area.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it shows through. It shows through, and I want to congratulate both of them.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ILLINOIS

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of Illinois: Page 2, line 7 after ", but not limited to," "the causes of the current inflation and".

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would say that this resolution for an emergency economic study is timely, and I want to support it. I think that there is a slight oversight that should be corrected in the language as to the scope and coverage of this study. If this study is going to be directed to the problems of inflation, then it ought to also include the "causes" of the current inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Members of the House support this amendment, which is merely to clarify the scope of this study so as to give the Joint Economic Committee ample opportunity to not only look into the problem, but also to look into the causes which are really at the root of the problem.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would say that without any consultation with any of the other members on the committee I certainly will be delighted to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the amendment on this side, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution holds out the hope that as a result of what is called an emergency study the Congress may be provided with specific recommendations for legislation to remedy inflation and improve the performance of the economy. If I were to think that such a study would achieve that goal, I would be moved to say that the $100,000 requested to fund it was a meager price to pay.

But just 2 weeks after this resolution was introduced in the House, the Democratic caucus adopted a resolution on the economy. It is difficult to conceive of a situation in which an emergency study might recommend proposals, which if they disagreed seriously with the caucus position, would have much chance of legislative survival. Therefore, though the ostensible purpose of this resolution is to commission a study of inflation, if it does not conform in large measure to the caucus proposals it will be consigned to legislative oblivion and will be essentially useless. Moreover, considering the recommendations made on this topic by the Joint Economic Committee in the past, and the rejection of these proposals by the minority, is it not reasonable to assume that the recommendations to be forthcoming will hardly differ by a hair?

I would submit to my colleagues that what the Democratic caucus provided us is nothing more than a collection of warmed over panaceas which have failed to serve us in the past. In fact that characterization casts their proposals in a benign light which belies their essentially counterproductive approach. First on the list of priorities set by the resolution is the adoption of what was termed "a balanced tax reform package" to offset the harm done by inflation to the purchasing power of middle- and lower-income families.

The notion of a balanced tax reform package entails cuts for some and increases for others. A reasonable estimate of the cost of restoring the purchasing power of middle- and lower-income families through a tax cut comes to approximately $15 billion. I am frankly at a loss to find anywhere a statement on the part of the caucus about how the Treasury might raise the revenues to balance this cut. But should they come from among the traditional targets, they would surely include higher taxes on preference income, repeal of ADR and slashes in the investment tax credit. Yet, pushing aside the disruptive consequences of such action, the annual revenue generated would scarcely exceed $4 billion. This I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the guidance the Democratic caucus would provide majority members of the JEC.

The caucus also called upon us to expand unemployment compensation programs couched in the alarmist phraseology of a rising tide of unemployment. But what do they recommend? You will recall in May, when for the final time the Standby Energy Act was considered, the committee bill proposed an expanded unemployment program for those put out of work by energy shortages. The Manpower Administration estimated that that provision alone would cost more than $4 billion. Moreover, the eligibility standards set by that legislation held out the possibility of receiving benefits for nearly 2 years. In sum, the proposal given birth by the majority party would have provided dangerous inflationary impulses directly through massive Federal expenditure, and indirectly through establishing a substantial disincentive for unemployed workers to seek job retraining or to seek employment outside their immediate labor market.

Mr. Speaker, any serious recommendation on inflation will have to come to grips with the difficult tradeoffs of the nature which this example raises. But the majority members of the JEC armed with the caucus resolution would undertake the study with their membership in the House demanding essentially inflationary programs or worse. To deal with the problem of high interest rates and tight money, for example, the caucus recommends a program of credit rationing. In other words, at a time when most economists are suggesting the wisdom of getting the Government out of the regulation of the financial markets and reducing the barriers to competition in banking, the caucus would have us interject even greater rigidities.

Mr. Speaker, absent from the proposals the majority would presumably have the JEC adopt is any mention of the area in which Government reform would possibly be most helpful—the elimination of Government-imposed regulations which have had the effect of raising substantial barriers to competition in our economy. Literally hundreds of regulations which owe their existence to legislative action in agriculture, banking, labor, trade, Government operations, and taxation have encumbered the economy for years. At present they present massive resistence to changes in economic policy designed to lower prices and increase efficiency in production. Merely a partial list of the offending legislation would include the Jones Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, the Buy America Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, Federal Reserve Regulation Q, and the Connolly Hot Oil Act.

In this morning's Wall Street Journal, Hendrik Houthakker, professor of economics at Harvard University, presented

what he called a positive program to fight inflation, entailing the reform and elimination of these and other programs. I shall ask the Speaker to insert it in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. It is an outline of the kind of program those of us on the minority side would tend to support, and that we have advocated for years. Yet during the same period, programs adopted by the JEC have largely ignored such an approach, and I find it truly astounding, that not so much as lipservice is paid to them in the resolution on the economy adopted by the majority of this body.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I find it impossible to believe that the study advocated by this resolution would offer even the slightest hope for effective reform, and I must urge the defeat of this resolution.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 30, 1974]

A POSITIVE WAY TO FIGHT INFLATION

(By Hendrik S. Houthakker)

At the present time our efforts to fight inflation are pretty well confined to a single weapon: monetary policy. There are admirable plans to balance the budget and cut expenditures, but they face formidable obstacles and in any case it is not clear that fiscal irresponsibility is a major factor in the present inflation. Price-wage controls have turned out to be a dismal failure; they may well have made inflation worse rather than better. It is understandable, therefore, that the emphasis is on monetary policy, for it was excessive growth in the money supply that permitted the inflation to begin with.

Nevertheless it will be very difficult to bring inflation under control by monetary policy alone. The present growth rate of the money supply, probably somewhere around 6% per year, is certainly not low by historical standards, yet it already puts severe strains on the monetary system. At the same time this growth rate is consistent with an inflation rate of at least 7% and perhaps more. Therefore monetary policy would have to be tightened further if we are ever to go back to a reasonably noninflationary economy. It is doubtful whether the financial system could stand this.

Most people are probably not reconciled to living with inflation rates of 7% or more. We therefore need something more promising than the present approach. We have to recognize that inflation has become a long-run problem and calls for long-run solutions. Our economy has to be made less prone to inflation and more responsive to anti-inflationary policies.

This means, in particular, that institutional barriers to price declines have to be removed, or at least weakened. Stability of the general price level does not mean that all prices remain forever the same; on the contrary, some prices must rise and some must fall, largely in response to technological changes and to fluctuations in demand. In a competitive market prices are flexible in both directions; the recent precipitous decline in the price of electronic calculators is a good example of the reaction of a competitive market to changes in fundamental conditions.

The barriers to competition that exist in many markets usually originated in the desire to prevent such price falls rather than to raise prices. Many years ago a German economist called cartels "children of adversity"; the anticompetitive measures that were part of the New Deal, some of them still in force, are a case in point. A more recent example is the effort to reverse a sharp fall in livestock prices by providing government-guaranteed loans to producers, thus eliminating one of the few areas where relief to the hard-pressed consumer was in sight.

BARRIERS TO COMPETITION

To a large extent fiscal and monetary policy has the same effect. In a competitive market the normal reaction to a fall in demand is a decline in price, but where competition is weak the usual reaction is to cut the quantity supplied, leaving prices more or less unchanged; the steel market during the 1960s is a typical example. Reductions in supply lead in due course to reductions in employment, which is the accepted purpose of fiscal and monetary policy to counteract. Thus general economic policy serves to reinforce the downward price rigidity characteristic of noncompetitive markets. Of course in such markets cost increases are almost automatically passed on to the buyer, and fiscal and monetary policy also serve to validate that practice. Barriers to competition therefore make an economy more susceptible to inflation, in addition to creating inefficiencies of various kinds.

These barriers are not likely to be removed on a piecemeal basis, though the recent House vote against the sugar bill is an encouraging exception. Most of them are supported by powerful pressure groups who will respond with "why pick on us?" If these barriers can be removed at all, it has to be done comprehensively. An omnibus bill to this effect would have to include the following provisions:

In Agriculture it would amend marketing order legislation so as to prohibit restriction of interstate movements, and production quotas on individual producers. The bill would also repeal the Meat Import Act and replace dairy import quotas by tariffs, if needed at all. Export subsidies would be abolished, except when the domestic price is at support level. Agricultural cooperatives with sales exceeding $10 million per year would lose their antitrust exemption. Food stamps would be replaced by cash payments.

In the field of Transportation the bill would remove all route and other restrictions in existing trucking licenses. Changes in railroad rates would be approved automatically if they fall within a zone of reasonableness determined by variable costs. The Interstate Commerce Commission would lose the authority to grant general rate increases. The antitrust exemption of railroad and trucking rate bureaus would be terminated. The Federal Aviation Act would be amended to make discount air fares legal, and to bring capacity-limiting agreements under the antitrust laws. The Jones Act, which reserves coastal shipping to U.S. vessels, would be repealed. Subsidies for ship construction and operation would be abolished unless military need is proved.

In the area of Energy the bill would deregulate the wellhead price of new natural gas. It would outlaw state prorationing of oil and gas and repeal the Connolly Hot Oil Act. It would terminate crude petroleum allocations and oil price controls, and reform pipeline legislation so as to make oil pipelines effective common carriers. The present embargo on uranium imports would be rescinded.

In Banking there would be a general revision of Federal Reserve Regulation Q, including permission for banks to pay interest on demand deposits. The limitations on interest rates paid by savings institutions would be phased out. Interstate banking would be permitted subject to the antitrust laws. The accounting procedures of financial institutions would be subjected to more rigorous standards.

In the field of General Business resale price maintenance would be abolished. The antitrust laws would be amended to make refusal to sell a violation in the case of large corporations, thus reducing their market power. The Justice Department merger guidelines would be reformulated to emphasize the effect of mergers on competition rather than numerical standards. All corporations over a certain size would be required to have a minimum number of outside directors.

In the field of Labor unreasonable restrictions on union membership, such as prior apprenticeship or excessive entrance fees, would be prohibited. Union-operated hiring halls would be abolished. The Davis-Bacon Act and similar laws concerning wages paid under government contracts would be phased out. The bill would also reform unemployment insurance so as to make it less of a disincentive to work, and would exempt juveniles from minimum wage laws.

In Foreign Trade the Buy American Act would be phased out. A constitutional amendment to remove the obsolete prohibition against export duties would be initiated. The voluntary export agreements on textiles and steel would be terminated. Export-Import Bank credit would be allowed only where our exports are at an artificial disadvantage.

In the area of Government Operations present prohibitions against the sale of surpluses from the stockpile would be terminated, and so would the interest rate ceiling on long-term government bonds. The private express statutes which give a monopoly to the Postal Service would be repealed.

Finally, this omnibus anti-inflation bill would have provisions for administration by a special board and establishment of an adjustment assistance fund which could make limited grants to firms or workers seriously damaged by provisions of the bill, or guarantee loans to firms for restructuring made necessary by the bill.

Enactment of such a bill would not only have an immediate impact on the general price level, but would also make the U.S. economy more resistant to inflation in the longer run and stimulate productivity. It would have to be supplemented by other measures, one of which would permit the Treasury to issue cost-of-living bonds, whose interest and principal would be related to the consumer price index, thus making it easier for small investors to protect themselves against such inflation as is still to come.

EXPANDING INDUSTRIAL CAPACITY

Another important component of a positive strategy against inflation is the expansion of industrial capacity. It has become increasingly clear in recent years that capacity bottlenecks are a powerful contributor to inflationary pressures and may cause unemployment at the same time. In several basic industries, steel being the outstanding case, capacity has fallen far behind demand, thus opening the door for sharp price increases. There are various reasons for the shortage of capacity, but one measure that would help alleviate it is an overhaul of the corporate income tax to facilitate the financing of new investment.

In particular, dividends paid to domestic stockholders should be exempted from the corporate income tax, though not from the individual income tax. Dividends are factor payments just like wages, rent and interest, which are already subject to the tax on individuals only. The exemption of dividends would increase corporate cash flows and make equity issues more attractive to corporations as well as to investors, thus reduc-

ing pressures on the new issue market in fixed-interest securities. It would also cause a loss of federal revenue amounting to about $15 billion which could be made up by two other changes in the corporate income tax.

One of these would be a surcharge on corporations whose rate of return to net worth, averaged over a period of years, exceeds a certain figure (say 15%). In most cases persistently high rates of return are an indicator of great market power reinforced by a failure to expand capacity as much as cash flows allow. The averaging feature would protect corporations with fortuitously high profit from the surcharge, while the use of net worth as a divisor would be a safeguard against excessive depreciation. Since the surcharge would by itself encourage additions to capacity there would be less need for the investment tax credit, which could thus be eliminated or modified to make up a further part of the revenue loss. Additional individual income tax receipts from dividend income would also help.

These three legislative proposals—the comprehensive removal of barriers to competition, the issuance of cost-of-living bonds, and the corporate income tax reform—are independent of each other and should be evaluated separately. Together they constitute a program that will get us away from the present excessive reliance on monetary policy.

Given enough patience we can perhaps control inflation by bringing the economy to a virtual standstill or worse, but the cost in terms of lost output and employment will be staggering. By adding new weapons to the fight against inflation we can not only make success more probable and more timely, but we can also lay a better foundation for the performance of our economy in the future.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say that I hope this study will be approved by the Members, and that it will be completed, and that, when the study is completed, the House will study it very thoroughly, and follow its recommendations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The gentleman from Missouri hesitates to say what he is about to say, but the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from California, I believe, were together trying to pass a relatively innocuous resolution. There is a great deal of business before the House scheduled for this day. The gentleman from Missouri is perfectly competent to deal with partisan debate, and he has heard a good deal of it, and he is prepared to engage in it if it becomes essential. But the gentleman from Missouri is primarily interested in disposing of a resolution to allow a committee created under the Employment Act to make a simple study of a great problem, the solution to which seems to be rather different in the minds of different people.

If we are to pursue this a great deal further, the gentleman from Missouri would feel compelled to defend the position of the party that he represents, but I think it is rather silly to engage in this on a resolution which was introduced at the request of the majority leader by the ranking Democrat and the ranking Republican in the Senate. I should like to see the resolution pass, and incidental to that I should like to see the amendment offered by the gentleman who just had the floor adopted.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. McKINNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of the economic situation is apparent to everyone in this Chamber and to all Americans. Once the Joint Economic Committee begins its consideration of this subject, I would commend to their attention the record of the extensive hearings now being held by the Banking and Currency Committee on the subject of high interest rates now plaguing the American people.

The situation as regards tight money and the concurrent high interest rates is acute. It is destroying savings and loan liquidity and it has pulled the rug out from under the housing industry, virtually excluding the average American from homeownership and worsens as his savings are eaten up by inflation.

I hope that the Congress acts quickly, not only to establish this study and upon the Joint Economic Committee's recommendations in December, but also upon the many innovative proposals which have already been introduced and are pending action. One measure I especially hope will get consideration is aimed at giving tax credit on a dollar-for-dollar basis for the interest earned from passbook savings up to a maximum of $250. I introduced such a bill, H.R. 16121, in order to give incentive for savings which in itself is anti-inflationary but it will also act to encourage those with funds already in savings accounts to keep them there, blunting disintermediation and lessening some of the pressure on those banks and other financial institutions which provide mortgage money. This is especially a help at a time when the U.S. Treasury itself is competing for investment capital by offering high interest Treasury notes and tax-exempt bonds. There is no way that savings and loans, and mutual and thrift institutions can compete with such high interest offerings when the interest rates they can offer are federally regulated at lower than market levels.

I have great confidence in the abilities of the able members of the Joint Economic Committee to study the problem thoroughly and recommend a course of action. But there are steps that Congress can take now to reduce the rate on inflation. Giving tax credit for increased savings is just one of many suggestions which have already been made, not only by myself but by other Members of Congress. Most should be considered by both Houses before the end of this year when the JEC report is made. The American people urgently need our action now to begin to stem the inflation which increases almost daily. We can not be content to wait until December.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the resolution in the hope that the study will be beneficial and because of the magnitude of the problem of inflation. But, my constituents can tell Congress now how to reduce inflation. They are pressing for a balanced budget and have been for many years.

The popular Phillips or British theory that employment begets inflation has been disputed by many respected economists including Dr. Alan Greenspan who recently stated that he had never seen proof that reducing Federal spending increases unemployment. He stated that unemployment caused by excessive spending can be proved and pointed to the inflation-caused, major retrenchment underway in the consumer market and housing industry. The retrenchment, Greenspan said, is causing and will cause substantial unemployment.

Let me offer a simple example. As the price of refrigerators soars, the housewife stops buying refrigerators and refrigerator companies stop manufacturing refrigerators. Unemployment results. So, cutting inflation can increase employment.

Many respected economists like Herbert Stein, Alan Greenspan, and Dr. Arthur Burns agree that excessive Federal spending is the root cause of our current crippling inflation.

Congress must take strong action and I recommend passing a strong bill like H.R. 144 introduced by my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. H. R. GROSS, or H.R. 15375 which I introduced which would cut Federal spending 2 percent below income. We really do not need to appropriate $100,000 to reduce inflationary pressures. But, I will admit that the studies contemplated under this resolution, if properly carried out, could recommend future courses of action to avoid many of our present problems.

I yield back theb alance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I choose not to take a great deal of time this afternoon. I should like to applaud my distinguished colleague on this side of the aisle who offered an amendment to get the Joint Committee to deal with the issue of causes.

I tried to listen as diligently and as carefully as I could this afternoon to some of the proposals made. It seems to me they are symptomatic in approach, because they are only dealing in symptoms. If we are going to talk about causes, I should like to make a nonpartisan statement, because I think my statement constitutes accord for both the Republican and the Democratic Party. If we are going to talk about the causes of inflation, there are three major areas of misallocation we must examine. I hope this Joint Committee does that. They are, one, our exorbitant Defense budget; two, the lack of equity in our tax structure; and, finally, the major subsidies, huge subsidies, to major corporations in this country. Unless the Joint Committee addresses itself to the causes of inflation, looks at the question of how much

money we spend on defense, looks at the fact that middle-income Americans pay most of the taxes, whereas the wealthy and the major corporations of this country pay little or no taxes, and, finally, the extraordinary giveaways to major corporations in this country, it would seem to me that the Joint Committee is going to play partisan games dealing with symptomatic approaches, and we are never going to solve the problems of inflation.

I would simply admonish my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to bite the bullet and make some recommendations to come to this floor to talk about cutting the Defense budget, to talk about tax reform, and to talk about removing some of these huge giveaways to major corporations. Beyond that, we are, in fact, taking an ineffective approach to an extremely difficult problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

As the ranking minority House member of the Joint Economic Committee, I convene with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) and move to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YOUNG), and it should be adopted.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support Senate Concurrent Resolution 93, the inflation study by the Joint Economic Committee, but I do so with some skepticism.

Inflation is the number 1 problem today. We all know it, and so do our constituents. My skepticism arises from that knowledge and from the track record of the JEC.

Inflation needs congressional attention. Congress has done nothing and has no policy on the economy. Study will improve the Congress, or is likely to do so, since the only way we have to go is up.

The JEC has plenty of staff as it is. The extra $100,000 may be inflationary, but it wil be a minor transgression among our inflationary sins. The JEC has no legislative authority. I would rather see an inquiry handled by a legislative committee. I want to warn that some of us in the House will not tolerate another whitewash of our high spending, Congressional extravagance.

The majority party has to take full responsibility for years of overspending. One harmless study can't erase that sorry record. Nor can it cover the total absence of some economic policy. Congress can do something. It can tighten its belt. It can provide leadership and example. I cast my aye vote in hope, but I must admit my hope, based on our performance to date is a forlorn one.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, the fact that this resolution—which calls for a study by the Congress of the causes and effects of inflation—is now before us is in my opinion, a ringing indictment of the Congress continuing inaction and confusion on this crucial problem of inflation. It tells the American public that the majority in Congress do not yet understand that excessive Government spending is the cause of inflation and that the Congress is going to yet spend more money to "study" inflation. Passing this resolution will not symbolize action. To the contrary, it symbolizes more inaction.

We do not need to spend more of the taxpayers' money—on one more study of a phenomenon which has been studied endlessly—to tell us what we already know. Government spending is the cause of inflation. And, since the leadership of Government—executive and legislative—created the problem, it has the power to correct it. It can do so now. It does not need to wait on the results of this study.

If one wants to know why we have inflation, read the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each day and look at the excessive spending which the Congress is foisted upon the American taxpayers—spending which results in deficit spending for which the Government must both borrow more and more money at exorbitantly high interest rates and print additional paper money behind which there is no commensurate growth in national productivity.

Our economic history is clear on the fact that additional increases in money supply, unaccompanied by increases in national productivity, drive up prices. For every surge in money supply, there has been a direct, corresponding surge in prices. As a matter of fact, there has never been a dramatic price surge which has not been accompanied by a drastic increase in paper money supply or some similar form of artificial government manipulation of the marketplace. We need no new study by the Congress to tell us that.

The Federal Reserve Board has been pressured into issuing more paper money as a means to lessen the amount which the Government has to borrow to cover its deficits. When Government has a deficit—and it has one every year now—it can do one or both of two things: it can borrow the money, just like any other borrower, in the money markets of the country, and/or it can print new paper money with which to cover its debts unlike any other borrower. The way to correct both of these problems—for one takes crucially needed funds away from capital-starved industries and the other fuels the fires of inflation—is to deal with it at its primary source—Government spending.

We attack this basic problem of excessive spending by balancing the budget. The President should submit a revised budget message for the current fiscal year, recommending specific cuts of at least $10 billion. I would prefer $15 or $20 billion. He should veto all appropriations bills in excess of his spending requests, as revised. He should withhold the obligation of funds already approved but in excess of his spending requests. He must insist upon a balanced budget for the next fiscal year, a budget balanced on the basis of realistic projections of revenue. He should direct his department and agency heads to stop hiring more Government workers, allowing natural attrition—retirements, deaths, terminations, and resignations—to bring down Federal employment. He should direct the Federal Reserve Board of Governors to tie money supply directly to national productivity, or, at a minimum, to curtail the money supply growth rate to about 5 percent this year—a manageable level.

The Congress should insure a balanced budget and hold total spending down to the level of revenue—not a dollar more. It should authorize the President to withhold the obligation of funds when the exercise of that power would help control inflation and curtail spending, for with such a specific statutory grant of power to the President, his actions in this regard would not be invalidated by court orders. The Congress should legislate a requirement which limits the growth in paper money. The Congress should require that all new Federal programs be tested first—to see if they will work or not—before they are made the law of the land and applicable to everyone, eating our tax dollars in the process. The Congress should start its appropriations process for each fiscal year from a zero base; that is, every program would have to justify its continued funding, in order that only those programs which deserve tax dollars will continue to receive them. The Congress should impose revenue and budget ceilings in relation to aggregate national income.

The Congress alone has the constitutional power to tax and to appropriate money. We should exercise that power by holding the line both on spending and the taking of taxes necessary to support that spending. It is time to stop passing the buck on this issue to the administration, for that administration—while there are things as I have enumerated which it can and should do—is not the branch of Government which authorizes and appropriates money. We should exercise that authority instead of trying to sidestep the question by having it studied. What can a new study tell us that the revenue-raising and appropriations committees have not already explicitly or impliedly shown to us? Or, that countless economists and professors and hundreds of textbooks—and 200 years of national experience—have not told us? Nothing; or at best, very little.

The time has come for action—actions like slashing spending, actions like trimming the sails on the printing of more paper money. The time has long since passed when a study would have been appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this spending proposal and urge my colleagues to tell the American people the truth—we must cut the cost of Government in order to cut the cost of living. We owe it to the taxpayers of our country and to the future of our free enterprise system.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I did not want this occasion to pass without making an observation. The question was raised earlier about the current budget for the Joint Economic Committee. I understand from the committee staff the budget is $950,000 approximately already this year for

this committee's activities. By our action, we are here adding $100,000 of the taxpayers' money to that committee budget to allow them to conduct a study of the national economy, called "an emergency study," which will take 6 months—some "emergency," I must say.

I only wish, since the decision may be made to permit television to cover our debates, that the American people could see the confession of failure occurring here in the House this afternoon. By this resolution we are admitting that the Congress of the United States does not know what the economic problems are and that it will take 6 months and one-tenth of a million dollars to find out what these problems are. Apparently, we are all oblivious to the reality around us.

I must commend the Speaker because it took him only an hour the other day during his special order to explain in great detail what the economic problems were and who caused them. He assured us he was offering a complete program to solve all these ills, and his entire remarks only took an hour and did not cost a dime. So I hope when the Members get to vote on this they will consider the taxpayers and the free advice of our beloved Speaker. I do not think we need another study to tell us what we already know. If this resolution passes, I suggest we use the rollcall vote as "exhibit A" to show what is really wrong with our economy; that is the total unwillingness of the majority of the Congress to restrain their habit of constantly spending money we do not have for projects of dubious merit.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. I will always yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that I answered the question of the gentleman from California on the $800,000 budget of the Joint Economic Committee accurately. It is approximately $800,000 for the Joint Economic Committee as a whole. The other moneys expended are for a special study separately financed by the appropriations committees of the House and the Senate for the very excellent study made by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) through our Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy. So both the gentleman from Maryland and I are accurate and I do not contest anything else he wishes to say because I will reserve that for another forum.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. economy is sick. The present inflation is one of the worst in our history and it does not appear to be easing. As soon as one component of the Price Index starts to go down, another begins to rise. In the past year, we have suffered sharp increases in food and energy prices and now we face the unpleasant prospect of continuing sharp rises in industrial prices.

Meanwhile, unemployment, according to the experts, will rise during the second half of the year. Our economy is in a stagnant condition and prospects for recovery are dim. Agriculture is disrupted, our housing industry is in a shambles, and double digit interest rates are stifling the economy.

In the face of these problems, the administration is following a do-nothing policy. They have done nothing to cope with these threats to our economic well being. Not since the days of Herbert Hoover have I seen such a lack of competence to deal with the serious economic issues of the day.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, Congress must take the initiative and develop a program to save our economy from worse disruption. It is up to this body to develop economic policies for the Nation and to promote a better means of coordinating decisions so as to improve our economic welfare.

In the fact of our current difficulties, I am glad to see that the Senate has just passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 93 which would require the Joint Economic Committee to conduct an emergency study of the economy and to look into all of the important aspects of the present economic difficulties. The Committee would also be authorized to make specific recommendations to the Congress for dealing with our current ills by the end of the year. Admittedly, this is a very rigid schedule but, as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I would be happy to undertake it. It is a job that needs badly to be done. My colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee would be proud to undertake it. Accordingly, I urge that the House concur in the resolution.

If granted the authorization and financing of this resolution, I promise that the Joint Economic Committee will call in outstanding experts to advise on the major problems of the economy and on means of resolving them. It would be my hope to supplement this with studies directed to problem areas and undertaken for the purpose of providing the Congress with recommendations to be considered in forming economic policies for the year ahead. I would hope that the results of this undertaking would provide the Congress with additional insights and, hopefully, incentives to counteract the worsening chaos in our economy that the administration is responsible for.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 93, legislation authorizing funds for the Joint Economic Committee to conduct a 6-month emergency study of the current state of the economy.

While it does seem strange that we should be considering spending $100,000 for an economic analysis at a time when it is so important to keep a tight control of Federal spending, I am hopeful that this will be money well spent and that the committee will expeditiously come forward with some sound recommendations and remedies for our economic woes.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a severe economic crisis. With double-digit inflation, skyrocketing interest rates, climbing food prices and taxes, there is not a single citizen who is not concerned with the unrelenting increases in the cost of living.

In looking at the economic problems confronting our Nation we must also assess the economic stature of the rest of the world. Inflation is a worldwide problem which has been further complicated by energy shortages and the resultant severe rise in fuel prices. While it is little consolation to our wage earners, the inflation rate in the United States is among the lowest of any industrial nation in the world.

The fact remains, however, that most of our populace cannot tolerate the current rate of inflation. The critical economic burdens affecting us are, by far, the most troublesome of all of our domestic problems.

The administration has proposed a policy of economic restraint, advocating a tight rein on lending and vast reductions in Federal spending. While I agree with the necessity for strict monetary and fiscal policies, I feel that these remedies alone do not go to the root of the problem and will not provide us with the means for allowing our citizens to look forward to a prosperous, inflation-proof future.

Accordingly, the moneys we are authorizing for this Joint Economic Committee's study should be spent in fully investigating some solutions for stabilizing our economic seesaw. I urge the committee to specifically consider the following areas of economic concern:

The need for a unified depository of economic data, including an assessment of those materials and minerals which are, or may be, in short supply;

The need for a regional approach to our economic problems, taking into consideration growth of a region, rate of unemployment, and the need for economic stimulation;

The need for encouraging increased development of our energy sources. Fuel shortages, as the greatest contributor to economic instability, must be given the highest priority;

The need for assessing our economic policy in relation to international developments. While we enjoy one of the world's lowest inflation rates, we cannot help but be effected by the skyrocketing inflation rates of other nations. The plague of inflation travels and is not abated because an ocean separates us from the European community or from the hard-hit Eastern countries.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I support this funding of the Joint Economic Committee because it is incumbent upon the Congress to thoroughly and expeditiously investigate the economic concerns confronting us, to assess all of the relevant data and to seek sound paths for our future economic policy.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the economic situation which confronts the Nation today compels the Congress to take action, to help answer the questions of those Americans who ask why the United States has fallen on such hard times. What are the tough economic facts which confront us today? Mr. Speaker, inflation has continued to grow, exceeding all expectations by reaching

the 11 percent mark. Unemployment hovers above 5 percent, and gives no sign of abating. Interest rates have risen drastically, now at their highest level this century, and these rates have brought on a further worsening of the economy by affecting housing and the business markets. And the picture hardly looks brighter on the international scene, where shortages of materials, the balance of payments, and the value of the dollar threaten our future stability and well-being.

It is increasingly apparent to all of us in Congress as we witness this country's economic stagnation that the solutions to this complex problem are not easy. However, it is also apparent that we, as representatives of our constituents, must do more than hope that the economy will improve. We must do more than simply to ask hard-pressed consumers to save more money, or to implore business and labor to keep wage and price increases to a reasonable level. In recent months the administration's economic policies have reflected little more than such ineffectual requests, but we no longer tolerate these policies. The problems facing us are too severe.

Today I am pleased to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 93, a resolution authorizing an emergency study of the current state of the economy by the Joint Economic Committee. While I would like to see stronger legislation passed to rectify immediately the current problems, it is imperative that we first understand the situation as completely as possible. This emergency study will especially focus in on our rampant inflation, but it will also investigate related problems such as Federal spending, tight money, high interest rates, the shortages of materials, credit and export policies as well as international exchange rates and indexing. In conducting the study, the Joint Economic Committee will be authorized to hire additional staff, to engage consultants, to enter into contracts for further studies, and to consult experts throughout the Nation. In addition, the committee will be granted the power of subpena.

Mr. Speaker, this country's economy needs more than studies; it needs farsighted leadership. If the Nixon administration will not respond to our economic plight, then Congress must take on that responsibility. Our people can no longer tolerate an economy which worsens with each passing day. It is time for us to act.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. PODELL. 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 335, nays 66, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

YEAS—335

Abdnor	Frelinghuysen	Mills
Abzug	Frenzel	Minish
Adams	Frey	Mink
Addabbo	Froehlich	Minshall, Ohio
Alexander	Fulton	Mitchell, Md.
Anderson, Calif.	Fuqua	Mitchell, N.Y.
Andrews, N.C.	Gaydos	Mizell
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gettys	Moakley
Annunzio	Giaimo	Mollohan
Ashley	Gibbons	Moorhead, Calif.
Aspin	Gilman	Moorhead, Pa.
Badillo	Ginn	Morgan
Bafalis	Gonzalez	Mosher
Barrett	Goodling	Moss
Bell	Grasso	Murphy, Ill.
Bennett	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Bergland	Green, Pa.	Murtha
Bevill	Grover	Myers
Bingham	Gubser	Natcher
Blackburn	Gude	Nedzi
Blatnik	Haley	Nelsen
Boggs	Hamilton	Nichols
Boland	Hammer-schmidt	Obey
Bolling	Hanley	O'Hara
Bowen	Hanna	Owens
Brademas	Hanrahan	Parris
Breaux	Harrington	Patman
Breckinridge	Harsha	Patten
Brinkley	Hastings	Pepper
Brooks	Hawkins	Perkins
Broomfield	Hays	Pettis
Brotzman	Hébert	Peyser
Brown, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Pickle
Brown, Ohio	Heinz	Pike
Broyhill, N.C.	Helstoski	Poage
Broyhill, Va.	Hicks	Podell
Buchanan	Hillis	Preyer
Burgener	Hinshaw	Price, Ill.
Burke, Calif.	Hogan	Pritchard
Burke, Fla.	Holtzman	Quie
Burke, Mass.	Horton	Quillen
Burton, John	Hosmer	Railsback
Burton, Phillip	Howard	Randall
Butler	Hungate	Rangel
Camp	Hunt	Rees
Carney, Ohio	Hutchinson	Regula
Casey, Tex.	Ichord	Reid
Cederberg	Jarman	Reuss
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes
Clancy	Johnson, Colo.	Riegle
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Rinaldo
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, N.C.	Roberts
Clawson, Del	Jones, Okla.	Robison, N.Y.
Cleveland	Jordan	Rodino
Cochran	Karth	Roe
Cohen	Kastenmeier	Rogers
Collins, Ill.	Kazen	Roncalio, Wyo.
Conable	King	Roncallo, N.Y.
Corman	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Cotter	Koch	Rose
Cronin	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Daniel, Dan	Kyros	Roush
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Latta	Rousselot
Daniels, Dominick V.	Leggett	Roy
Danielson	Lehman	Roybal
Davis, S.C.	Lent	Runnels
Delaney	Litton	Ruth
Dellenback	Long, La.	Ryan
Dellums	Long, Md.	St Germain
Denholm	Lujan	Sandman
Dent	Luken	Sarasin
Dickinson	McClory	Sarbanes
Donohue	McCloskey	Satterfield
Downing	McCormack	Schneebeli
Drinan	McDade	Sebelius
Dulski	McEwen	Seiberling
Duncan	McFall	Shipley
du Pont	McKay	Shoup
Eckhardt	McKinney	Shriver
Edwards, Ala.	Macdonald	Sikes
Eilberg	Madden	Sisk
Erlenborn	Madigan	Skubitz
Esch	Mahon	Slack
Eshleman	Mallary	Smith, Iowa
Evans, Colo.	Mann	Snyder
Fascell	Maraziti	Staggers
Fisher	Martin, Nebr.	Stanton, J. William
Flood	Mathias, Calif.	Stanton, James V.
Flowers	Matsunaga	Stark
Foley	Mazzoli	Steele
Ford	Meeds	Steelman
Forsythe	Melcher	Steiger, Wis.
Fountain	Metcalfe	Stephens
	Mezvinsky	Stokes
	Michel	Stratton
	Milford	Stubblefield
	Miller	Stuckey
		Studds
		Sullivan
		Symington
		Talcott
		Taylor, N.C.
		Teague
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Thone
		Thornton
		Towell, Nev.
		Traxler
		Treen
		Udall
		Ullman
		Van Deerlin
		Vander Jagt
		Vanik
		Veysey
		Vigorito
		Waggonner
		Walsh
		Wampler
		Whalen
		White
		Whitehurst
		Whitten
		Widnall
		Wiggins
		Williams
		Wilson, Bob
		Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
		Wilson, Charles, Tex.
		Winn
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Wydler
		Wylie
		Wyman
		Yates
		Yatron
		Young, Fla.
		Young, Ga.
		Young, Ill.
		Young, Tex.
		Zablocki
		Zwach

NAYS—66

Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Mayne
Archer	Dorn	Montgomery
Armstrong	Findley	O'Brien
Ashbrook	Fish	Passman
Baker	Flynt	Powell, Ohio
Bauman	Goldwater	Price, Tex.
Beard	Gross	Rarick
Biaggi	Guyer	Robinson, Va.
Biester	Hechler, W. Va.	Ruppe
Bray	Henderson	Scherle
Brown, Mich.	Holt	Schroeder
Burleson, Tex.	Huber	Shuster
Burlison, Mo.	Hudnut	Smith, N.Y.
Byron	Jones, Tenn.	Spence
Collins, Tex.	Kemp	Steed
Conlan	Ketchum	Steiger, Ariz.
Coughlin	Lagomarsino	Symms
Crane	Landgrebe	Taylor, Mo.
Davis, Wis.	Lott	Ware
Dennis	McCollister	Young, Alaska
Derwinski	Martin, N.C.	Young, S.C.
Devine	Mathis, Ga.	Zion

NOT VOTING—33

Arends	Davis, Ga.	Holifield
Brasco	de la Garza	Jones, Ala.
Carey, N.Y.	Diggs	Landrum
Carter	Edwards, Calif.	McSpadden
Chappell	Evins, Tenn.	Nix
Chisholm	Fraser	O'Neill
Clay	Green, Oreg.	Rooney, N.Y.
Collier	Griffiths	Rostenkowski
Conte	Gunter	Tiernan
Conyers	Hansen, Idaho	Vander Veen
Culver	Hansen, Wash.	Waldie

So the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. McSpadden.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. O'Neill with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Vander Veen with Mr. Brasco.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Holifield.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Clay.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Gunter with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Chappell with Mrs. Griffiths.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 16136, AS AMENDED

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 16136), as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 69, EDUCATION AMENDMENT OF 1974

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 69) to extend and amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 23, 1974.)

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 69 extends and improves dozens of Federal aid to education programs. It also authorizes a number of new programs and makes much needed improvements in the administration of Federal aid programs.

If this conference report is not adopted today, there can be no appropriation bill for education this year, and school districts throughout the country will have to rely upon the continuing resolution for their Federal aid. As I pointed out in Monday's RECORD, this turn of events will mean that school districts will receive hundreds of thousands and, in some cases, millions of dollars less in Federal aid to education this year than they would if this bill is passed.

The reason for this loss of funds is that under the continuing resolution the administration is only required to spend at last year's appropriation level. This amount for title I, for instance, was only $1.719 billion; and from that amount the administration on its own has even withheld part from being allocated among the States. But, if the conference report is adopted and signed into law, the President has said that he will request and spend $1.885 billion for title I. This will mean that every State in the country will gain greatly needed dollars for education.

California will gain $18 million. Alabama will gain $5.7 million; Florida $7.8 million; Mississippi $5.2 million; and Virginia $4.8 million.

This conference report must be adopted if we are to continue the progress we have made in Federal aid to education.

I would like to cite for my colleagues some of the improvements contained in this conference report:

In the title I program, the major Federal aid program, we have adopted a more equitable formula for distributing funds which will be effective through fiscal 1978. This formula is a product of a long, protracted debate in the Congress, a debate which I am sure many Members do not want to go through again;

The impact aid program is extended through fiscal year 1978, and public housing children are included for the first time. But there is also included a provision that no school district will receive less in regular impact aid payments due to the inclusion of these children;

A consolidation of seven separate programs into two simplified programs is also contained in the conference report. This consolidation is the number one priority of the administration this year in education. It would be phased in over 2 years and would have to be forward funded and would have to be funded at the same level of appropriations as the separate programs were funded;

A greatly enlarged aid for the handicapped program is also included in the conference report. This program, which will provide $630 million in aid, is meant to assist the States in educating all their handicapped children; and

The adult education program is also extended, as is the Bilingual Education Act and the Indian Education Act.

The conference report also contains several new programs. The most notable of these is a reading improvement program to provide assistance to all children with reading deficiencies, regardless of the income of their family, and the community schools program, which is meant to encourage the better use of school buildings throughout the country. Grants are also provided for the first time to assist States in formulating equalization plans for the better distribution of their State and local resources for education.

The conference report also adopts a simplified application for States applying for Federal aid to education. This simplification is meant to cut down on the amount of paperwork involved in applying for Federal aid.

Those extensions of Federal aid programs and those improvements in their administration are the heart of this bill. Unfortunately, there are also in the conference report amendments dealing with busing. Those amendments by right should not have been attached to this bill, but rather should have been considered by the Judiciary Committees in each House. But, since they have been attached to our education bills, we have done the best we could to work our way to agreement with the Senate conferees.

I would like to point out to my colleagues, first of all, concerning these antibusing amendments that the vast bulk of these provisions were identical in both the Senate and House bills. Both bills contained prohibitions against busing beyond the next closest school. Both bills forbade the disregarding of district lines. Both bills said that the assignment of students to their neighborhood schools did not violate the 14th amendment. Both bills said that population changes should not serve as a basis for new lawsuits. And, both bills stated clearly that racial balance is not required in achieving desegregation.

The conference report retains all those provisions intact, verbatim. No one word is changed.

The conference report also adopts several antibusing amendments which were proposed and adopted on the Senate floor. Those amendments forbid any busing except when all other alternatives have been exhausted. They forbid any busing to start except at the beginning of a school year, and they forbid any busing except after a school district has been given reasonable opportunity to formulate a voluntary plan to achieve desegregation.

All of those amendments were adopted in the conference committee and are contained in this conference report.

The conference report also contains provisions allowing the reopening of court orders when the health of the child is imperiled or when its educational process is impaired. The termination of court orders regarding busing is also permitted if the school district is in compliance with the 14th amendment.

The conference report also contains the Ashbrook amendment which forbids the use of Federal funds for busing. The only change in that amendment as it passed the House is a clarification concerning impact aid.

Mr. Speaker, all these amendments show clearly that Congress does not favor the busing of schoolchildren in desegregation situations. These provisions are the farthest that the Congress has yet gone in expressing its will on busing.

But, I urge my colleagues to look upon this bill primarily as an education bill and not as an antibusing bill. I also urge my colleagues to remember that unless we adopt this conference report today, there will be no education bill this year. A year and a half of work will go down the drain and the education of millions of schoolchildren will be impeded.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to discuss in more detail the principal provisions of the conference report.

EXTENSIONS OF ACTS

In general, the conference report extends the programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Bilingual Education Act, the Adult Education Act, the impact aid laws, and the Indian Elementary and Secondary Education Act through fiscal year 1978. The Education of the Handicapped Act is extended through fiscal year 1977, the Emergency School Aid Act is extended through fiscal year 1976, and title III of the National Defense Education Act is extended through fiscal year 1977.

TITLE I, ESEA

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the major program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education. It provides funds to local school districts for compensatory education for educationally deprived children.

A major controversy concerning title I

for the past several years has been over the formula for the distribution of funds. I am pleased to say that the conference report on H.R. 69 adopts the formula which was written in the House Committee on Education and Labor and adopted overwhelmingly by the House last March. That formula, to my way of thinking, provides for the most equitable distribution of funds possible at this time in the title I program.

The formula distributes funds principally on the basis of the number of poor children in each school district as determined using the official Federal definition of poverty, the Orshansky index. The adoption of that index for title I will, over time, lead us in the direction of a uniform means of allocating these funds throughout the country.

But, I would like to point out that the formula in the bill is, and will continue to be, still weighted in favor of the wealthier States as is the title I formula in the present law. Under the new formula those States will receive more funds than the poorer States due to the inclusion of AFDC children in addition to these Orshansky children, due to these States' higher expenditures for education which will result in higher payments, and due to the farm-nonfarm differential in the computation of the Orshansky index which favors the more urbanized States. The formula in the conference report, nonetheless, is the best formula we could enact at this time.

The conference report also retains a provision guaranteeing every school district 85 percent of its previous year's allocation and a provision permitting the Commissioner of Education under a separate authorization of appropriations to grant additional assistance to school districts receiving less than 90 percent of their previous year's allocation. The purpose of that latter provision is twofold: To provide assistance to school districts which are hampered in maintaining the present level of support for their title I programs by the operation of the new formula; and also to provide funds to assist school districts which are in counties with declining numbers of title I children, but which themselves have increasing numbers of those children.

Providing some additional assistance to school districts in this last described status is necessary because of the manner in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare presently administers the title I program. Instead of allocating funds to local school districts, HEW has been allocating funds only to the county level, claiming that there is a lack of data to provide for allocations to local school districts. This means that unusual circumstances can develop in which the overall numbers of title I children in certain counties can be stationary or declining, while particular school districts within those counties can have increasing numbers of title I children; and, because HEW only allocates funds to the county level, those school districts with increasing numbers of poor children would be held to the same amount of funding as all the other school districts in the county.

This is an inequitable situation and one which should be redressed. This new authority is meant to assist the Commissioner in providing funds to those school districts until the Office of Education is able to obtain the data needed to distribute all the title I funds to the local school district level. The Office of Education should have been compiling that data for such use years ago, and this amendment is meant in no way to condone its present practice of allocating funds only to the county level.

As regards the use of the migrant student record transfer system in the program of aid to State agencies providing education for migratory children, the conference report provides that the Commissioner may use that system for distributing these funds if he determines that it provides the best data obtainable. We urge, however, that if the Commissioner shifts to this new method of allocating funds, the transition take place over time and after a careful study of the MSRTS. That system has not as yet been used to distribute funds and should be perfected before it is put into full use.

The conference report also amends title I to—

Provide local school districts with the discretionary authority to make schools "target schools" if they have the same proportions of poverty children as regular title I schools and yet are not within poverty areas;

Require that a "target school" be designated as such for 3 years;

Require that there be established both local school and districtwide advisory councils composed of a majority of members being parents of title I children; and

Provide that the Commissioner must bypass local and State educational agencies to provide assistance to children in private schools if those agencies cannot by statute, or are substantially failing to, provide such assistance.

The conference report also permits a limited study of the use of methods other than poverty for the purpose of determining "target schools" under title I. A maximum of 20 local school districts in the country are permitted to experiment with such methods in projects under the administration of the National Institute of Education. The conference report also allows the Commissioner to set aside up to one-half of 1 percent of the title I appropriation for the purpose of evaluating title I programs.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The conference report strengthens the Federal commitment to bilingual education by increasing the authorization of appropriations for the Bilingual Education Act, by more precisely defining the requirements for federally assisted bilingual education programs, by providing for the voluntary enrollment of English-speaking students in those programs, by requiring consultation with parents of limited English-speaking ability and teachers in developing the applications for those programs, and by expanding the list of eligible activities which can be funded to include supplementary activities such as adult education and preschool programs.

Of particular importance is the emphasis placed in these amendments to the Bilingual Education Act upon the training of personnel involved in bilingual programs. The conference report provides for both preservice training and inservice training of teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, teacher aides, and parents. The conference report contains all the training provisions under the act in one section. These sections had appeared as two separate sections of the Senate bill and did not appear in the House passed version of H.R. 69. By consolidating these sections of the Senate bill into one provision in the conference report, no change in substance was intended by the conference.

The administration of bilingual education programs was also improved by requiring the creation of an Office of Bilingual Education within the U.S. Office of Education. This Office must administer all programs relating to bilingual education within the USOE.

IMPACT AID

The impact aid laws, Public Law 81–815 and Public Law 81–874, are amended in several very significant respects. I would like to describe certain of these amendments.

Public Law 81–874 is amended to require that heavily impacted school districts, those school districts with 25 percent or more of their enrollments "A" children, must receive the full amount of their entitlements for these "A" children. The conference report also adopts an amendment clarifying that all Indian children living on Indian land which is now used for low-rent public housing are to be considered regular impact aid children and not as public housing children. It is expected that the Office of Education will make payments for all these children in both fiscal year 1974 and thereafter. There seems to have been some administrative confusion concerning the status of those Indian children in fiscal 1974, and this amendment is meant to make clear that payments must be made for them. Effective in fiscal 1976, all children on Indian land, including this land used for public housing, will be considered "A" children.

Also effective in fiscal year 1976 are a series of broad amendments revising the entitlements and payment rates for almost all "A" and "B" children. Those amendments have been delayed in effect until 1976 so that the Office of Education can collect data much more extensively than it has so far on the repercussions of the amendments.

A major amendment effective in 1976 requires that public housing children must be funded for the first time under the impact aid program. Funds for those children, however, unlike other impact aid money, must be used for categorical compensatory education programs. Those programs must be funded in the following order of priority. First of all, programs in title I funded areas which have been harmed by the adoption of the new title I formula must receive funds to maintain those programs. Second, if that first priority is met, then programs in title I eligible areas which are not funded with regular title I appropriations must be funded. And third, if both of the first

two priorities have been met, then other schools in the school district may be funded for compensatory education programs for educationally deprived children of low-income families.

It is expected that the U.S. Office of Education and the State educational agencies will monitor the expenditures of these funds for compensatory education. The title I personnel in both the U.S. Office of Education and the State educational agencies must be involved in this monitoring since they have the expertise developed over many years in dealing with compensatory education programs.

A method for assuring compliance with these requirements could be that a local school district receiving funds for these public housing children must submit a letter of compliance with the U.S. Office of Education and its State educational agency before it receives its impact aid funds. Then, USOE and the State educational agency would monitor its compliance. If the State educational agency has any administrative funds under title I which are not being expended, those funds could be used to assure compliance with these requirements.

The impact aid program is also amended to provide additional assistance for handicapped children of military personnel. It is expected that the same type of administrative procedure will be provided for those children as for the public housing children since their funds must also be used in an identifiable manner for categorical special programs for such children.

The conference report also adopts an amendment to Public Law 81–874 to allow States to consider impact aid as local resources in their distributions of State aid under State equalization programs. Some confusion seems to have arisen over one of the conditions under which States can consider that aid. The report states that impact aid can be considered—

Provided that a State may consider as local resources funds received under this title only in proportion to the share that local revenues covered under a State equalization program are of total local revenues.

The term "local revenues" in this context clearly means local revenues for education and not all local revenues for all local services.

CONSOLIDATION

The conference report adopts the consolidations of State formula programs which were contained in H.R. 69 as it passed the House. Those consolidations were put into two categories and seven separate Federal categorical aid programs.

Those consolidations, however, must be phased in over 2 years and cannot become effective in their first year before fiscal 1976. They also cannot become effective unless the appropriations for the consolidations are provided in an appropriation bill providing appropriations for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the consolidations are to be effective. Neither can the consolidations be effective unless the total appropriations for the consolidations are at least equal to the total appropriations for the separate programs before they were consolidated, to the level of appropriations for the consolidations in the previous fiscal year if they were funded in that fiscal year.

These "triggers" on consolidation are meant to assure the best administrative transition to consolidation possible and to assure that consolidation is not used as a device for cutting back on Federal aid to education. When these triggers refer to the consolidations as being "effective" or "in effect," it is meant that the consolidations are actually being funded in that year.

Since the consolidations must be phased in over 2 years with a requirement that 50 percent of the funds used for each program before consolidation must continue to be used for that program in the first year of the phase-in, it will be necessary to identify the sums used for each program in the year before the consolidation is first funded or in fiscal year 1974, whichever year has a higher amount. That determination may be somewhat difficult regarding the guidance and counseling program which is consolidated into the "library and learning resources" category.

According to the U.S. Office of Education, $26,599,689 is the projected expenditure by the States in the fiscal year 1974 for guidance, counseling, and testing under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The expenditures under the Commissioner's discretionary funds, section 306 of title III, ESEA, have not been precisely identified as yet. But, it could be reasonably presumed that the same proportion of funds were spent by the USOE for guidance, counseling, and testing as were expended by the States from their total title III, ESEA, allocations. Whatever the combination of those two sums, that amount would be the sum used for determining the phase-in for the consolidation of guidance, counseling, and testing. This same amount would also have to be used in combination with appropriations for title II, ESEA, and title III, NDEA to determine the level of appropriations needed to trigger the "Libraries and Learning Resources" consolidation.

The conference report also adopts a Special Projects Act to serve as an "incubator" for new categorical aid programs. Some of those new programs are the Community Schools Act, the Women's Educational Equity Act, and the Career Education Act. The conference report also requires an administrative consolidation of the paperwork involved in States applying for Federal aid to education. This administrative consolidation is meant to cut back on this paperwork and to be a step in the direction of the simplification of Federal administrative requirements.

EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

The conference report upgrades the National Center for Education Statistics by putting it in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education and by requiring that an Advisory Council on Education Statistics be appointed to review the general policies of the Center and to establish standards to insure that statistics and analyses disseminated by the Center are of the highest quality.

It is our hope that this reorganization will lead to a far better collection of education statistics than is presently being conducted. USOE, which presently performs this function, is now requiring the States and local school districts to fill out hundreds of different forms for education statistics, many of which are overlapping in their requests for information and many of which are of dubious importance. Then, once these statistics are collected, it is frequently 2, 4, or 7 years until the results are tabulated and disseminated. By that time the usefulness of such data is practically nil.

This reorganization will allow a fresh beginning for the collection of education statistics and will provide the opportunity for the policymakers at HEW to commit themselves to correcting the present sorry situation.

Recognizing the importance of library and learning resources to the educational process, I would strongly urge this new National Center to conduct an annual survey of academic libraries, school libraries and media centers, and public libraries. The Center should also conduct at least one survey of special libraries.

The conference report also requires numerous other improvements in the administration of Federal education programs. The most noteworthy is the requirement that all regulations for Federal education programs must be submitted to the Congress for review and that Congress must be given the opportunity to disapprove those regulations.

Also of importance is a provision setting a 5-year statute of limitations on the collection of allegedly misspent funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and a provision requiring the States to submit detailed fiscal data on their use of Federal funds. An amendment is also included requiring schools to give parents and students in post-secondary institutions a right to inspect their school files and restricting the release of this data to third parties.

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

In addition to extending all the Federal education programs for the handicapped, the conference report contains a very substantially increased authorization for aid to the States for the education of the handicapped for fiscal year 1975. It is the purpose of that authorization to provide massive aid to the States so that they can begin the monumental task of educating all their handicapped children. Many of the States are now coming under court orders to educate all these children.

OTHER PROGRAMS

The Adult Education Act is amended to eliminate the Commissioners set-aside of funds and to turn all the funds over to the States for operating programs. The act is also amended to permit the States to use up to 20 percent of their allocations for programs of high school equivalency.

The emergency school aid is amended to repeal the authority for the funding of education parks and to repeal the set-aside of funds for metropolitan projects.

A new program is authorized for grants to the States for the purpose of planning the equalization of their State and local revenues for education. Grants will vary by State from $100,000 to $1 million, depending upon the population of the State. I believe that this relatively small grant program offers one of the best opportunities for the Federal Government to help the States in remedying the root cause of much of the inequity that exists in providing educational opportunity today.

The Vocational Education Act is amended to authorize a new 1-year program of bilingual vocational education and to authorize a new 1-year vocational—manpower—training program.

A reading improvement program is also authorized for the purpose of assisting States and local school districts in helping to remedy reading disabilities of children regardless of their economic status.

STUDIES AND WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

The conference report also authorizes several studies on updating the information used for distributing funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for studying the premises of the Orshansky index of poverty, for analyzing the effects of late funding of education programs, for surveying athletic safety in the schools, and for reporting on crime in the schools. The conference report also contains several policy statements dealing with advance funding of education programs, museums, and equal educational opportunity.

A White House Conference on Education is authorized to be convened in 1977 for the purpose of renewing the national commitment to education.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to insert in the RECORD a short summary of the conference report:

FACTSHEET ON THE EDUCATION PROVISIONS OF H.R. 69 AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE

The conference report on H.R. 69 extends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the impact aid laws, the Adult Education Act, the Bilingual Education Act, and the Indian Education Act through fiscal year 1978. It also extends the Education of the Handicapped Act through fiscal year 1977 and the Emergency School Aid Act through fiscal year 1976.

TITLE I, E.S.E.A.

The Title I formula is amended to allocate funds on the basis of more current data. State agency programs for handicapped, migrant, and neglected and delinquent children will receive funds in accordance with the new formula and will continue to receive funds "off the top" in accordance with established practice. No State agency will receive less than its fiscal 1974 allocation. Each local education agency will receive at least 85% of its previous year's allocation. The 1975 authorization is estimated at $3.1 billion for LEA grants.

Part B of Title I, incentive grants to States with a high tax effort for education, is continued with a maximum appropriation of $50 million.

Part C, grants to areas with high concentrations of low income children, is extended through 1975.

Authority is contained in the bill for a separate authorization which permits the Commissioner in special circumstances to make grants to school districts which are receiving less than 90% of their previous year's allocation.

A by-pass for non-public school children is included.

OTHER TITLES

Titles II, III, and VIII of ESEA are extended through 1978 and Title III of NDEA is extended through fiscal year 1977. These programs may not be funded in any year in which there is a consolidation of programs as described below.

CONSOLIDATION

State operated programs are combined into the following divisions:

(a) "Libraries and Learning Resources" includes ESEA II, NDEA III, and the guidance and counseling portion of ESEA III.

(b) "Support and Innovation" includes the balance of ESEA III, Nutrition and Health and Dropout Prevention from Title VIII, and ESEA V.

Consolidation must be forward funded and during the first year there will be a 50% hold-harmless for each program.

A by-pass for non-public school children is included.

Total discretion is given to local educational agencies on spending under Libraries and Learning Resources. States distribute funds under Support and Innovation on a project grant basis.

Also adopted is a provision for a simplified State application for ESEA I, II, III, NDEA III, Adult Education, Vocational Education, and Education of the Handicapped.

The Special Projects Act is included which provides an "incubator" for new categorical programs. Under this concept new programs will be protected for a period and then will compete for funding without the protection of set-asides. These new programs include Women's Educational Equity, Career Education, Consumer's Education, Gifted and Talented, Community Schools, Metric Education, and Arts in Education.

IMPACT AID

Effective in fiscal 1976, amendments are accepted which will include guaranteed funding for public housing children of 25% of entitlement, equal to about $53 million in 1976, Entitlements for military children remain as in current law. Entitlement rates for civilian children are reduced slightly for those who live within the same county (from 50% to 45%) and for those who live within a different county in the same State (50% to 40%). Entitlements for those who live in a different State are eliminated except that those payments will be reduced over a number of years as the result of hold-harmless provisions.

School districts with 25% or more of their enrollments "a" children will be guaranteed the full amounts of their entitlements for these children.

No school district which receives more than 10% of its budget from impact aid will have its payments reduced less than 10% each year. Districts which receive less are guaranteed 80% of their previous year's payments. Also every district is guaranteed that it will not lose any regular impact aid funds due to the inclusion of public housing children.

Handicapped children of military personnel will be entitled to a payment of 1½ times that of other children. These funds must be used for the purposes of providing special education for these children.

Funds which a district receives as the result of public housing children must be used for programs of compensatory education.

ADULT EDUCATION

The Commissioner's 20% set-aside is deleted and all funds are to be allocated to the States. Up to 20% of a State's funds may be used for high school equivalency programs.

The program of adult education for Indians is continued through 1978.

HANDICAPPED

All existing programs for the handicapped are extended through fiscal year 1977. For fiscal 1975, $630 million is authorized to be allocated among the States on the basis of total population ages 3–21. These funds will be particularly helpful in meeting requirements for the education of all handicapped children facing many States as the result of court decisions.

States are required to show how they will meet the needs of those children.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Authorizations are increased and special emphasis is placed on the training of personnel. Funds are also provided to States to assist them in developing their capacities to develop programs of bilingual education.

A national assessment of the need for bilingual education is to be conducted in 1975 and 1977 and sent to the Congress.

Also included is a program of fellowships for students who will enter the field of training teachers in bilingual education.

READING

A new program of reading improvement is included. Funds are authorized for grants to local educational agencies and States for comprehensive programs of reading improvement and projects which show promise of overcoming reading deficiencies. Also included are funds for special emphasis projects in reading, for the training of reading teachers on public television, and for reading academies.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Included are two new programs which provide funds in fiscal 1975 for bilingual vocational training and bilingual vocational education.

INDIAN EDUCATION

The Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act is extended through 1978. Up to 10% of the funds are to be made available to Indian controlled schools.

An annual authorization of $2 million for special training programs for training teachers of Indian children is included and a program of fellowships for Indian students is also included.

OTHER PROGRAMS

The Emergency School Aid Act is continued through 1976. The authority to fund educational parks and the set-aside for metropolitan areas programs are repealed.

An amendment to authorize the CLEO program to assist disadvantaged students to prepare for and attend law schools is accepted.

The Ethnic Studies program is extended through 1978.

A program of grants to States to assist them in planning State equalization programs is included. Grants range from $100,000 to $1,000,000 per State depending upon population.

MISCELLANEOUS FEATURES

An upgraded National Center for Education Statistics within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education is created.

Regionalization of the Office of Education without an act of Congress authorizing such regionalization is forbidden.

Congress is afforded the opportunity to disapprove regulations for any Federal aid program for education.

Parents of students and students attending post-secondary institutions are afforded the right to inspect their school files and the release of documents in those files is restricted.

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

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I appreciate the chairman's yielding.

In my own city of Chicago, as an example, if what the gentleman is saying is true, can the city school system order forced busing of children from the south side of Chicago to the northwest side of Chicago?

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman mean city board of education has ordered it?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. My question is very simple. Can the Chicago Board of Education bus people from the south side of Chicago to the northwest side of Chicago? I know about the recent Supreme Court decision. That is a decision where the young people are taken from the city to the suburbs. But now I am talking about just within the city of Chicago.

Mr. PERKINS. If the city is not under a court order to bus and there is only de facto segregation within that school district, I would not see any reason why busing should be ordered by a court. If there has been no discrimination within the school district, I would see no reason why any court should order busing. And since this bill deals only with busing ordered by Federal courts and agencies, I do not see where the gentleman has a problem with this bill in Chicago.

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if I might try to respond to the question of the gentleman from Illinois, if I understand it, the bill under consideration does not forbid orders that may be entered into by a school district voluntarily. The bill has to do with busing that may be ordered by a Federal court or agency.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to state the reason that I put a statement in the RECORD on Monday showing how much every State in this Nation loses if we continue under this continuing resolution.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the chairman for his constructive efforts on behalf of this vital legislation. I would like to ask my chairman a question as to what was the action in conference with regard to the right of a parent in an experimental subject under title III of ESEA to remove a child from an experimental program if in fact they do not agree with what is being taught.

Mr. PERKINS. That was the Kemp amendment offered in the House, was it not? It was agreed in conference that a parent has the right at the secondary school or elementary school level to inspect those records and that a student in college has a right to inspect his own records.

It was also agreed to give parents the right to inspect the curriculum materials used in experimental programs. That particular amendment resulted from the gentleman's action.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to ask the distinguished chairman a question as to whether or not he is going to use the entire 30 minutes allocated to this side of the aisle or whether he is going to allocate any time to those of us who oppose this proposition. I think we are entitled to some time.

Mr. PERKINS. This is one of the most important conference reports that has ever been brought before this Chamber.

Mr. WAGGONNER. And the gentleman is filibustering it, too.

Mr. PERKINS. And I have not taken the time to adequately explain it but I will yield some time.

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

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

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

When we had this debate in the House on this bill, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the gentleman now in the well stated that there were three sections in the bill from which funds could be derived for programs to stop school dropouts which are very closely related to crime. Is that preserved?

Mr. PERKINS. It is preserved.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend Congressman AL QUIE, the ranking Republican member of the Education and Labor Committee, for the tremendous work which he put into achieving this conference report. Without AL's efforts, we would not be here today with as fine a piece of legislation as we have achieved.

I would also like to thank all the members of the General Subcommittee on Education and Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS for their fine work. Every one of them worked long and hard hours to achieve this conference report.

I would also like to thank Jack Jennings, counsel of the subcommittee, and Chris Cross, minority legislative associate, for their fine work.

Lastly, I would like to commend Senator PELL for the tremendous work which he did on the Senate side in achieving this fine piece of legislation. Senator PELL and his professional staff on the subcommittee, Steve Wexler, Jean Frohlicher, and Dick Smith, are to be highly commended for their work.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, although I know that the debate on the House floor today will focus almost exclusively on the issue of busing, I think the Members should also know that this legislation is the most important elementary and secondary education bill to be considered by the Congress in the last several years. Virtually the entire catalog of Federal programs to elementary and secondary schools are contained in this act.

Something in the neighborhood of $26 billion is authorized in the bill over the next 4 years. The authorization for this year alone is more than $7.4 billion. The entire appropriations process for these programs is being held in limbo pending the passage and signing of this act. It is no exaggeration to say that the failure of Congress and the White House to enact this conference report into law will bring chaos to the schools of this country and will result in a substantial lowering of resources available for education.

Those who would be most severely affected by the failure to enact this legislation are those who can least afford to suffer the loss of support. H.R. 69 authorizes very important programs for disadvantaged children, children of limited English-speaking ability, Indian children, handicapped children, and those children who reside in areas which are heavily impacted by the Federal Government. In each of these instances, Federal funds provide very important resources which States and local communities would find it almost impossible to replace. Let us examine some of these programs and their importance as we consider this conference report.

The most important program contained in this bill is title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This program, authorized first in 1965, is the major source of funds to provide compensatory education to students in our Nation's schools. In fiscal 1974 this program provided $1.720 billion in aid to some 13,000 school districts in every State in the Nation. The President's budget request for this program for fiscal 1975 is $1.885 billion, a $165 million increase from the fiscal 1974 figure.

There is no more important program for providing aid to the approximately nine million children in this country who are eligible for service under the act. The beneficial results of title I have been cataloged in a number of evaluations and studies. School district after school district, State after State can point with pride to the impressive gains achieved by their students as the result of receiving special Federal help. These gains have been particularly impressive in the 3 years of the program. To remove that support at this time would be to subject those nine million students to potential regression in their academic progress.

This act also authorizes several hundred million dollars in special aid to handicapped children through the extension of the Education of the Handicapped Act. The tremendous needs of this group of children has been forcefully demonstrated through court actions in many, many States. The actions of the conferees will lead to better service and greater opportunities for these oft-neglected children. In the current fiscal year alone, H.R. 69 provides $630 million in authorized grants for distribution among the States to serve the special needs of handicapped children.

While this legislation contains many far-reaching titles and programs covering elementary, secondary, adult, bilingual, Indian education, reading and impact aid, it also represents the culmination of 2 years of intensive work in another vital area, namely, the education of handicapped children. Educational practice which has effectively resulted in

the exclusion of over 50 percent of our school-aged handicapped children from an appropriate program in the public school systems is finally being turned around. In order to meet the pressing financial crunch in local communities resulting from the ever accelerating pace of both court orders and State legislation mandating the education of all handicapped children, the legislation alters the formula of title VI–B, Education of the Handicapped, Aid to the States, by providing funding based upon the number of all children within a State between the ages of 3 and 21 in the most recent year for which the satisfactory data is available, multiplied by $8.75. A full appropriation would make available $630 million for fiscal 1975.

Beyond that, this legislation enhances the State plan requirement for the education of handicapped children which is submitted to the Commissioner of Education by ordering the States to submit a detailed blueprint demonstrating how they will identify, evaluate, and serve all of the handicapped children within their jurisdiction. Moreover, vital, long overdue guarantees are mandated in the same State plan:

Provision that priority in the use of title VI–B funds go to children not now receiving an education program;

Provision of specific due process guarantees for the children served and their parents in all matters relevant to identification, evaluation, and placement;

Prohibition against the classification of children to promote racial or cultural discrimination; and

Provision that all handicapped children be educated in the least restrictive environment.

The bill also establishes provisions to assist States that are moving toward deinstitutionalization of handicapped children but are not required to do so by the legislation. Where States are attempting to move children from institutions back to their homes or facilities closer to their homes, the money formerly provided for their educational programs while they were in institutions will now be allowed to follow them to the local program. I sponsored the amendment which will permit a State, for the purposes of determining its allotment under the so-called 89–313 program—Public Law 89–313—to continue to count the children who leave the institutions supported by the State and enter educational programs which are the responsibility of the local school districts. The provision adopted by the conference assures that the money generated under this provision would go to the local school district providing the special education program.

The conferees also changed the amount of money a State would receive in the future under the 89–313 formula from 50 percent of the average per pupil expenditure in the State to 40 percent. So that no State would be penalized, the conference agreed to a hold harmless provision which provides that a State will not receive less than it received in the last fiscal year.

Finally, with respect to the handicapped, the conference accepted a concept that I have long been concerned about, that is, it is generally more expensive to provide educational programs for the handicapped than it is for the "normal" student. In this regard I offered an amendment which was adopted by the conference which will allow school systems receiving impact aid money to count a handicapped child as one and a half for the purposes of eligibility. Because of my concern that handicapped children receive the best educational program possible, in addition to allowing school districts to count children at a higher rate, the legislation also requires that they provide programs for handicapped children which are of sufficient size, scope and quality which show promise of substantial progress in meeting the unique needs of handicapped children.

In my judgment H.R. 69 is truly landmark legislation and will provide benefits which will not only assist the handicapped but all Americans as well.

H.R. 69 also authorizes an extension of both the Bilingual Education and Indian Education Acts. These two programs are the source of a considerable amount of assistance for programs and projects designed to assist children of limited English-speaking ability and Indian children. The needs of these groups, too, are critical and must not be neglected. To withdraw Federal funds will be to deny these children needed opportunities for receiving an adequate educational program.

A final target group who will benefit from this act are the children in school districts which suffer from Federal impact. The impact aid program, Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, is the oldest program of significant size which provides aid to elementary and secondary schools. As a result of the amendments adopted by the conference committee, this program now will assist districts with a heavy impact of public housing children as well as assisting those traditional impact districts who suffer tax loss as a result of the presence of a Federal installation. This change while of primary interest to urban areas, can be used only for compensatory education for educationally disadvantaged children as in title I.

These then are the major groups who will benefit from this act and whom we shall not deny support.

In addition to these target groups, the bill does a number of other things of which I am particularly proud. First, and in my view most importantly, the bill does provide for a significant consolidation of several programs of aid to elementary and secondary schools. This consolidation, which was authored by Congressman BELL, has great significance for returning a large measure of control over Federal programs to States and local school districts. It is a goal that those of us on this side of the aisle have been after for years.

The consolidation is in two parts. The first, Libraries and Learning Resources, combines the programs formerly authorized under ESEA title II with NDEA title III and the guidance and counseling portions of ESEA title III. The first-named act has provided since 1966 aid to schools to purchase library books and educational material. NDEA title III has been in effect since 1958 and provides funds for schools to purchase equipment. Quite obviously, these two authorities overlap; and as a result the school districts have been forced into dealing with two separate Federal programs with different sets of rules and requirements. The consolidation gives local districts complete authority on how to spend these funds, in my view, a very important issue of local control.

The other part of the consolidation includes the remaining portion of ESEA title III, which provides funds for innovative programs, together with two other innovative programs operated under title VIII of ESEA. These latter two programs provide funds for dropout prevention and programs for nutrition and health. Programs under this part will be totally administered by the States, and grants will be awarded on a project grant basis. Also included, with a ceiling, is the part in ESEA title V providing aid to State departments of education.

H.R. 69 has also made some fundamental changes in a number of existing programs which I believe are of major importance. First, a new formula for the distribution of funds under title I of ESEA has been adopted. In my view the new formula is much more equitable and will redress many of the imbalances which were created in recent years by a title I formula which has been based upon out-of-date data and a highly unreliable set of figures relating to welfare payments. The new formula treats the States much more evenhandedly.

In addition, the conferees agreed to changes which will increase programs for migrant students and permit State agencies for the handicapped to continue to count for the purposes of payment those students who they assist who have been deinstitutionalized. I am also pleased that the conferees have agreed to terminate the part C program of concentration grants after fiscal 1975. This action will result in making available more funds for the most important program under title I, programs operated in local school districts.

The impact aid changes agreed upon by the conferees represent probably the most important reform of that program to occur since it was enacted in 1950. For the first time school districts will be guaranteed of receiving payments for children who reside in public housing projects constructed with Federal funds, and for the first time the act will recognize the obvious differences in burden which result from the presence of various kinds of Federal employees.

Military personnel will continue to be counted as they are under present law, thereby recognizing the fact that these Federal employees represent the greatest burden on a community since for the most part they do not pay State taxes and if they reside on Federal property do not pay any real estate taxes.

The important distinctions are made in the case of civilian employees whose presence does not represent the same sort of burden on the community. Un-

der the conference agreement civilian employees who both live and work in the same county will be entitled to a payment rate of 45 percent of the local contribution rate. Under current law the rate is 50 percent. This very minor reduction, in my view, a reduction smaller than facts indicate, does represent a modest bow toward the fact that these employees are contributing in a positive way to the economy of the community. Civilian employees who do not live in the same county in which they work will have their entitlements reduced to 40 percent, again a rather minor adjustment. Finally, civilian employees who live in a different State will not be eligible for any entitlement, thereby acknowledging the fact that their situation is no different from that of a private-sector employee who crosses a State line in search of employment. This latter provision will be mitigated by an amendment added in the other body, which will phase those reductions over a period of time.

I am very pleased with these changes in impact aid and commend them for the support of my colleagues.

H.R. 69 also extends the Adult Education Act and makes some significant amendments to that act which I believe will be quite beneficial. First, it makes the program one entirely administered by the States. Under current law 20 percent of those funds are administered by the Commissioner on a discretionary basis. The allotment of all of these funds to the States is another positive step in returning control to States and local communities. Conference amendments also provide that adult education programs must be coordinated with the manpower programs and with reading programs for adults. The act will also permit a State to establish or designate an advisory council for adult education. Finally, the conference agreement provides that up to 20 percent of a State's allotment may be used for programs of equivalency for a certificate of graduation from a secondary school.

H.R. 69, in addition, continues a number of amendments to the Higher Education Act. Although several of these amendments are of a rather technical nature, others have a rather significant impact on such programs as the veterans' cost of instruction program and the Teacher Corps.

The veterans' cost of instruction program is amended to remove the barrier that has existed in the act to schools receiving funds after they had established the fact that they were serving larger numbers of veterans. This becomes particularly important since with the declining Armed Forces the actual number of veterans available is decreasing, thereby making it harder and harder for schools to qualify for payments.

The Teacher Corps amendment goes in the direction of permitting the Corps to involve experienced teachers, who might not otherwise be attracted to teach in heavily disadvantaged areas, in addition to recruiting inexperienced teachers who have been to date the focus of the program. In times of a declining market for teachers, I believe this provision is very important since it places the emphasis where it should be placed, on the retraining of already experienced professionals.

As is inevitable, when dealing with the other body, H.R. 69 also authorizes a number of new categorical programs. Although I have reluctance in supporting more categorical programs, I believe some of these have significant merit; and I commend them for your support.

The first and largest of these is the reading program contained in title VII. This program consists of several parts, the most important of which in my view is part B, which provides for the creation and execution of comprehensive State programs to deal with problems of reading. Since education is a fundamental State responsibility, I think it very important that this program recognize the State role and seeks to get them to commit their own energies and resources to alleviating reading problems at the elementary and secondary level.

H.R. 69 also contains a Senate creation known as the Special Projects Act. This is what might be called a holding company for new categorical programs. The Senate concept is that funds will be available for a 3-year period for a specified set of programs after which they would compete against one another and with other national priorities for funding but without set-asides to guarantee specific amounts. The idea is that if a program has merit then after 3 years of funding it should be able to stand on its own and achieve success. If it is not meritorious, it should fall and not continue to be artificially supported. Under the Special Projects Act, the Senate has created seven new programs. They are education of the gifted and talented, women's educational equity, career education, metric education, consumers' education, community schools, and arts education. Of these I believe the most meritorious are the programs for the gifted and talented, which will provide needed support for a group often overlooked, and the community schools program which was also in the House bill, which seeks to aid communities in making better use of their school facilities.

In addition to these program features in the bill, there are a number of other aspects of the legislation which I believe deserve some special mention. First of all, under title I there is a significant change in the migrant program. For the first time HEW will be directed to use statistics other than those rather inadequate ones provided by the Labor Department. The conference bill directs the Commissioner to use the system known as the Migrant Student Record Transfer System. It also permits him to use another system which is reasonably comparable to MSRTS.

One aspect of the title I migratory program that is unchanged by this bill is that which relates to children who were formerly migratory but who have settled into an area served by an agency carrying on a program or project under that program. As was the case prior to these amendments, such children may, with the consent of their parents, continue to be considered migratory children for a period of up to 5 years after they cease migrating and may thereby continue to participate in title I migratory programs. However, they may not be counted for the purpose of increasing a State's migrant allocation; and children who are presently migratory must be given priority in consideration for participation in title I migratory programs.

In determining the number of migrant children for the purposes of making allocations of migrant funds, the bill requires the Commissioner to use statistics made available by the Migrant Student Record Transfer System or such other system as he determines accurately and fully reflects the number of migrant students in a State. Although the Migrant Student Record Transfer System will provide accurate data for those States which have been participating in the program, it will not contain data for those areas—such as Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—which are not now included in the record transfer system. Therefore, it will be necessary for the Commissioner to make estimates as to the number of migratory children in those areas during that period in which those children are being added to the record transfer system.

Another title I amendment which is of particular concern to me is that which is known as the excess cost amendment. From its beginning title I has been viewed as being a program to provide additional services for disadvantaged children over and above those which a school district might normally provide. Through my efforts this concept was included in the law with specific language stating that title I is to be used only for excess costs.

A further amendment removes the situation in current law which operates to penalize a State which has special programs for particular groups of children. The primary concern of the conferees in adopting the amendment on excess cost was that the Federal Government not be in the position of creating a situation in which States and local districts are penalized if they choose on their own initiative to provide funds to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children, handicapped children, children with specific learning disabilities and children of limited English-speaking ability. It is the understanding of the conferees that special programs of this type do exist in a number of areas and are currently being hampered in their operation through the over-rigid application of the comparability provisions of the law. This amendment is intended to rectify that situation. It is not intended to be a device through which school districts and States can subvert the basic intention of title I comparability, to assure that regular services provided to children in title I schools are equivalent to those provided to children in nontitle I schools. It is my hope that the operation of this provision be monitored and audited very closely by the Office of Education, the HEW audit agency, and the General Accounting Office. Any abuse of this provision should be brought to the attention of the two committees immediately and without delay.

I would also like to make clear the fact

that the phrase "similarly disadvantaged children" in the definition of excess cost is meant to refer to children with similar needs. In other words, children with similar handicaps should be treated equally in both project and nonproject areas. It should also be made clear that the excess cost language does not require or imply a matching by State or local districts of Federal dollars for compensatory education.

H.R. 69 also specifically permits LEA's to use their title I funds for the training of teachers.

Title I also contains a provision directing the National Institute of Education to conduct a full and comprehensive study of State and Federal compensatory education programs, including specifically the study of whether funds may be distributed for title I on a basis which counts children who have severe educational needs rather than continuing to allocate money on the basis of census and welfare figures. I believe that it is crucial that we develop a more sensitive measure to get the funds to the children who need them regardless of their economic status. A middle-income child who needs help is almost as apt to be a burden on society as a child from the very lowest incomes. This amendment is a direct reflection of my concerns as expressed through the introduction of H.R. 5163 in the first session of this Congress.

With regard to impact aid, I would like to note particularly that the conference agreement includes language which removes another barrier to effective State action in education. The conferees have adopted language which permits States under carefully controlled circumstances to count Federal impact aid funds when they determine allocations for State aid programs. This amendment is particularly important now that so many States are taking strong affirmative action to deal with unequal expenditures in various school districts within the same State. Without this sort of amendment, the Federal Government could be guilty of providing unequal resources and thereby negating a State's efforts to redress this problem.

The conference agreement also contains an amendment which would effectively bar the regionalization of education programs by HEW unless they obtain positive congressional sanction for that action in legislation enacted subsequent to this bill. My colleagues know of my long disenchantment with regional offices. Although they may have merit in some areas, in education they represent another level of bureaucracy standing between the Congress and those who are to receive Federal aid. Personally, I would hope that we could deal with State departments of education rather than with regional offices. I am, of course, pleased that in his confirmation hearings last October Vice President FORD expressed his belief that regional offices should be abolished.

Finally, the conference report contains a number of provisions dealing with the privacy of student records and the rights of students and parents to have access to those records and the rights of parents to examine instructional material in federally funded programs. The amendments also prohibit the Office of Education from considering an application under ESEA unless the public was provided with an adequate opportunity to present their views on the programs applied for by the LEA. These amendments are long overdue.

Section 437(b)(3) provides an exception to the limitation on access to student records in the case of certain Federal and State authorities who have responsibility for auditing and evaluating Federal education programs and for enforcing Federal legal requirements related to those programs. However, the exception is limited by a proviso under which, unless the collection of personally identifiable data is specifically authorized by law, any data obtained by such officials may not include information which would permit the personal identification of students after the data so obtained has been assembled. Under this provision, GAO or HEW would be permitted to conduct longitudinal evaluations by using a code or other system that would permit the tracking of a student from one point in time to another in order to measure the effect of his participation in a particular program. But any such code or other means of identifying the student would have to be destroyed when all the data necessary to complete the evaluation is essembled.

With regard to the enforcement of Federal legal requirements, nothing in this section is to be interpreted as precluding the Secretary or other authorized officials from having such access to student records as may be necessary to insure that all conditions of participation in Federal education programs, such as compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, are being met. However, such officials must take all necessary steps to protect the confidentiality of such information and to prevent its use for any purpose other than the enforcement of such legal requirements.

In closing, I would like to compliment several people on the fine work that went into this bill.

I am particularly indebted to Chairman PERKINS for his fine leadership. It is not the slightest exaggeration to say that without his tenacious leadership and determination to get a bill we would never have concluded the conference. I am also very indebted to the work of my Republican colleagues who participated so fully and so actively. The contributions of AL BELL, JOHN ASHBROOK, ED FORSYTHE, and BILL STEIGER were all vital in formulating a final bill.

In this bill, perhaps more than most, the staff played a key role in developing the conference materials and in the laborious task of committing to language the actions of the conferees. I am particularly impressed with the fine work of Jack Jennings, the subcommittee counsel, who is one of the best professionals on Capitol Hill. Senate staff people, including Roy Millenson, Steve Wexler, Jean Frohlicher, and Dick Smith, were also of great assistance.

In this legislation we also had the very valuable resources of the Congressional Reference Service. The substantial contributions of that staff in dealing with the data and technical questions included in title I formulas and impact aid reform made it possible for us to grapple with these issues with substantial knowledge and with relative ease and assurance as to the outcome. The Education and Public Welfare Division, headed by Bill Robinson and Helen Miller, has one of the finest collections of CRS staffs. The work of Tish Busselle on title I was particularly outstanding. We regret the fact that she will soon depart for California. I also wish to acknowledge the work of Dave Osman and Paul Irwin on impact aid.

The final round of compliments I have reserved for the excellent work of certain HEW people who have worked long and hard to get a bill which contained administration priorities such as consolidation, title I reform, and impact aid reform. Charles Cooke, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation, and his staff, Sue Hause and Peter Gossens, have done yeomen work. The superb negotiating talents of Frank Carlucci are without comparison. He has the qualities which are irreplaceable—candor, humor, and political sensitivity.

I recognize that a substantial portion of this debate over the conference report may not deal with these critical education issues, but rather with the provisions of the bill relating to limitations on court orders in desegregation cases, and particularly busing.

For that reason I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday July 25, a side-by-side comparison of the features of the House-passed bill and the conference-approved bill relating to these provisions. It begins with a statement on page 25325 of the RECORD. Copies of that special order are at the committee desk if any Member wishes to study it. In brief summary, of the 24 provisions of the House bill relating to this matter, the Senate bill retained 17 intact and they were not in conference. The Senate had eliminated four provisions and amended three. In addition, the Senate added 10 sections dealing with desegregation orders, 9 of which strengthened the general position of the House and are included in the conference bill. The 10th—which I included among the three House provisions which were amended—was the Ashbrook amendment, which emerged from conference in stronger form than in the Senate amendment or in existing law. The remaining two amendments of House provisions both relate to the so-called Scott-Mansfield language, but the conference retained Scott-Mansfield in only one instance. It appears to say no more than that the provisions of the title relating to court orders are intended to conform to the requirements of the Constitution—in short, it simply states the established doctrine that a legislative enactment is presumed to be constitutional.

Of the four House provisions dropped by the Senate amendment, two—attorneys' fees and one provision relating to limitations on the duration of court orders—are not included in the conference bill, but their substance is to a considerable extent preserved in legal precedent which requires no statutory affirmation. In fact, the Senate bill would have nullified the practice of awarding attorneys' fees in certain instances, at least in cases brought under the provisions of this bill, so that in eliminating the Senate provision we preserved the discretionary power of the courts to make such awards to a prevailing party.

The other two provisions eliminated by the Senate, relating to reopening of old proceedings and to limitations on the duration of that part of a court order relating to busing, were retained in weakened form. However, here again it is worth noting that a court may always review an order in the form of a decree in equity—which these proceedings are—in the light of changed circumstances and upon motion of a proper party. So I believe that the House conferees did very good work in reaching a fair compromise of the limited matters in issue relating to busing.

And let us keep this central point in mind. The heart of the Esch amendment as approved by the House—the limitations on court orders and Federal agency compliance orders, particularly as they relate to busing—were retained intact by the Senate bill and were never before the conference. They are intact in this conference report bill. They go farther than the Congress has ever before gone in giving direction to the courts and to Federal agencies in shaping desegregation remedies. If the conference report is defeated, these provisions are lost; and we are left with no congressional direction to the courts.

In closing, let me say again that this is a good bill. It is the best bill that could be obtained under any circumstances. It contains many Republican objectives and in my mind warrants full and unqualified support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 69.

In has taken us almost 2 years to get this far and the school districts of our Nation cannot afford to lose it now.

H.R. 69 contains vital new programs. It contains needed improvements and expansion of other programs. And it goes a long way toward consolidating duplicative programs and eliminating administrative redtape.

I have received countless letters from parents and children who suffer from handicaps or from specific learning disabilities.

I have heard from parents of children who cannot read.

And I have heard from school districts concerned about their ability to help children who need bilingual services.

Mr. Speaker, approval of this conference report is vital if we are to fulfill our obligations to these children.

Until this bill is enacted, we cannot adopt a general appropriations bill for education.

And until this bill is enacted, we cannot reform the formula for distributing title I money.

H.R. 69 effects necessary improvements in the title I formula. Improvements, which I might add, particularly benefit the Southern and rural areas of our Nation.

Unless we approve this bill, Louisiana, for example, will lose over $6 million in title I money.

Alabama and Georgia will lose almost $5 million each.

Michigan will lose approximately $8 million.

What I have just stated represents the financial losses these States will sustain if we vote down this conference report and go the route of the continuing resolution.

And we will all lose the crucial new authorizations for aid to handicapped children.

The vote on this conference report should be based on the merits of these vital education programs not on the relatively minor changes in the House-passed antibusing provisions. But nevertheless in this regard, the very heart of the Esch amendment—limitations on court orders, and on the extent of busing—is in this conference bill. This is the farthest the Congress has ever gone in giving direction to the courts. To defeat this report would mean we lose that direction.

If opponents of the conference report believe so strongly that not one comma of the House language should have been changed, then they can continue in the future to approve the Esch language as amendments to appropriations bills.

But it would be tragic to sacrifice the $26 billion worth of programs for youngsters contained in this bill because of language that, as a practical matter, will have no effect on the ultimate disposition of the busing issue by the courts.

I urge my colleagues to approve the conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I first wish to compliment both the chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican member (Mr. QUIE) on the fine work of the conference. Indeed, this is a monumental education bill, and I commend them for their efforts. Many of the provisions of this bill are concepts that I have worked to develop during the past 2 years and will give new direction to education in this country.

It is, therefore, with great reluctance that I stand here and speak against the conference report, because the busing amendments, I believe, as brought back by the conference committee, will not perform the functions which the orginal Esch amendment proposed.

Unfortunately, I have not been given enough time to explain the situation in full to the Members of the House.

Suffice it to say that many of us feel that the application of the Scott-Mansfield language, although most of the Esch amendment has been left in, raises a cloud over effectiveness of the rest of the Esch amendment.

I would also like to emphasize that, contrary to previous speakers, it should be emphasized that should this conference report be voted down, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) will offer a motion to send the bill back to the Senate and ask for a conference.

The great majority of the House desire an education bill of this magnitude, and thrust, so I will stress that this, indeed, is a parliamentary situation rather than an attempt to, in any way, kill the education bill.

Let me say a word with reference to another matter. I believe the Supreme Court decision reaffirmed the concept of the Esch amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry; I would like to yield to the chairman of the committee, but I have only about 30 seconds of my time left.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the additional time, and I will be happy to yield to the chairman on his time, or as soon as I finish my statement, if I have time remaining.

The point is this, and it is a significant point, I think, for the Members to consider; I believe that we are at a turning point in this country. Throughout the country there is a growing feeling that there are other ways to provide quality education for our children, black and white, other than just busing. That is the thrust of the Esch amendment. I would hope that the Members of the House will move the bill back into conference, and then come out with a bill that contains the Esch amendment in a more clearly drawn manner. Then let us in the country move into programs where we can provide an education that will bring about equality of education for our children, whether they be black or white, without regressing further into the busing-antibusing polarization.

Again I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time, and I would yield now, if I had 10 seconds left, to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if the gentleman realizes that the Senate conferees will not go back into conference?

This is it. We have scraped the bottom of the barrel. There is no way where we can get anything further. These are all of the antibusing provisions we will get, and we will not get any more this year.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, will the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman yielding me this time.

There have been other precedents, I would say to our distinguished chairman, to refer this back to the Senate if this conference report is voted down. We can ask again to go to conference with the Senate. That is a procedural move, and we have done so in the past. The precedents state we can go back into conference with the Senate and I think it would be possible to do so.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH). We cannot let up now. The issue of forced busing must be resolved once and for all. We should not rest on the laurels of the recent Supreme Court decision. Therefore, I urge the defeat of the conference report. Some Members of the other party are saying these days that we should "send a message" to Washington. Let us today send a message to the other body and a beacon of hope to the American people. Let us defeat the conference report on ESEA. The House of Representatives should stand up and be counted on forced busing here and now.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset, those of us who oppose adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments, do so not in an attempt to do away with the education programs provided for in this legislation, but rather to improve on the quality of education in this country by passing effective antibusing language.

I am not taking issue with other features of the bill. In fact, I do support title I programs providing assistance for disadvantaged children, the impact aid program and education for the handicapped. I do know in particular what this legislation means in the way of funds for my own home State of Louisiana. But, we can maintain the House position on busing and, at the same time, have an education bill. If we vote down the conference report, the rules of the House allow us to, and we will immediately offer, a preferential motion to send the legislation back to the Senate for further action; thereby insuring that we will have an education bill.

But make no mistake about it, the vote on the conference report is a busing issue vote. A vote in favor of the report is a vote for continued forced busing. Let us not delude ourselves; the so-called antibusing amendments approved by the conference committee are illusory. The language approved by the House has been rendered meaningless.

If you do not believe me, listen to what I am going to read from the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, July 24, 1974. I want to see the conferees raise their heads with pride when I read this statement. It says:

> If the courts continue to hold that it is, as they have in the past, then the Senate conferees appear once again to have gotten their House counterparts to accept an agreement that appears to be against busing but really would not prohibit it.
>
> The compromise says essentially that courts cannot require that children be bused farther than the second-nearest school to their homes—except when the courts hold that such busing is necessary to protect the constitutional rights of black children.
>
> This important exception was proposed by Senate conferees. Senate sources who insist on anonymity admit that the purpose of this exception was to nullify completely the staunch anti-busing legislation proposed by the House conferees.

And the article went on to say:

> In this stance, the House reflects the nation's general antibusing stance. For instance, last September a Gallup poll reported only 5 percent of persons surveyed picked busing as the best way to integrate schools. At the same time only 18 percent of Americans, according to the poll, opposed public-school integration.
>
> For many Senate conferees, who find busing more acceptable, the question became: How can we include wording which will negate the antibusing provisions? They hit on the idea of an exception for busing to assure constitutional rights of black children, and House conferees bought it.
>
> In the view of one such Senate source, this gives the courts "free rein" to order busing and renders the busing prohibition meaningless.

And it does just exactly that.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) has just stood in the well here and told the Members the Senate would not go back to the conference. I would like to say to the Members of the House just go back and tell your constituents that you were unable to do so because the Senate would not let you. I want you to go home and tell them that you yielded to the domination of the U.S. Senate.

I would only call attention to what was done in conference with regard to the reopener provision. The changing of one word, "shall," to "may" has left that provision in effect a toothless tiger.

Mr. Speaker, when the education bill was initially considered in the House, the antibusing amendments were adopted overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis, which in my personal opinion was in keeping with the views of over 80 percent of the people in this country. You will recall on June 5 after agreeing to go to conference with the Senate on the bill, this House adopted by a vote of 270 to 103 a motion to instruct our House conferees to insist on one thing in the education bill and one thing alone: Retain the House antibusing amendment.

Again on June 27, this House adopted yet another motion to instruct the members of the House conference to insist on the busing amendment approved in the House; that vote was 281 to 128. There still being disagreement between the House and the Senate concerning this issue, I offered on July 22 another motion to instruct our House conferees to insist on the House-passed busing language; that motion carried 261 to 122.

Mr. Speaker, the record is only too clear. This House on four occasions—once upon adoption of the antibusing amendments and three times on instruction motions—has by more than a 2-to-1 majority on each occasion expressed our collective view on the question of forced busing. We are opposed to it.

We served notice on the Senate and the Nation as a whole that we would insist on our position. If we do not vote down the conference report on this basis, we have lost faith with ourselves and the American people. The integrity of the House is at stake. We must maintain the integrity of this body; we must keep the faith of ourselves and the American people.

Remember, too, that when this same amendment was considered in the Senate, it failed by only one vote of passage. The fact that the other body is so evenly divided on this same amendment is all the more reason the House should not give up its position. We know that at least 45 Members of the Senate support our position.

Mr. Speaker, the American people throughout the Nation are looking at what we do here today. They know that what is involved here is whether the House will vote to continue busing or vote to halt it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say this. Let no Member here think that the problems and hardships created by forced busing are over simply because of the Supreme Court's recent decision in the Detroit case. This Detroit decision means absolutely nothing, and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) knows it means absolutely nothing. It simply means, and the Court has said, that it is not ready yet to order busing to achieve racial balance between adjoining school districts. It does absolutely nothing to prohibit busing within a school district. It does nothing whatsoever to prohibit busing within a city, in the instance of Mr. ANNUNZIO's example. If anything can be concluded from the decision, it is that there is room for legislative action on this issue. The Court has provided us with this opportunity. Let us now make the most of it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974.

I would first like to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) for his great energy and perseverance. The conferees were asked to resolve over 200 points of disagreement between the House and Senate bills during our 6-week conference, and it is due in large part to the leader-

ship of the gentleman from Kentucky, who served as manager of the conference, that we succeeded in reaching agreement on this comprehensive education bill.

I would also like to pay a word of tribute to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on General Education, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) for their outstanding contributions to this truly bipartisan measure.

Mr. Speaker, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974 is a landmark piece of legislation. It continues our commitment to help the Nation's schools by extending and strengthening the programs authorized in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It reaffirms our commitment to equalize educational opportunities for what we might term the "vulnerable" among our young children—the poor, the disabled, and the handicapped. And it provides important new programs to improve the quality of education in our schools.

The measure extends title I, the Federal compensatory education for the disadvantaged and the largest Federal aid to education program. It authorizes assistance for school libraries, for educational equipment, for school innovation, and for State departments of education. It authorizes programs for the handicapped, bilingual education, and impact aid. It establishes a major new program for teaching reading to elementary and pre-school children. And the measure includes another important new measure, sponsored by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN), to support community school programs.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most significant feature of the legislation is the updated formula for title I, which I sponsored in the Education and Labor Committee. I am pleased that after the overwhelming support which the House gave to the committee title I formula, the formula was not a point of disagreement in the conference in fact the Senate had earlier, on the floor, adopted the House formula in its own bill.

The updated formula would distribute title I funds on the basis of the number of poor children according to: First, the Federal Government's official definition of poverty, known as the Orshansky index; and second, two-thirds of the children from families receiving AFDC payments in excess of the official definition of poverty for a nonfarm family of four.

This revised formula will mean that title I funds will now be distributed more equitably across the country.

The new formula will eliminate the distortions in the distribution of title I funds which have resulted from population shifts and from the dramatic increases in the AFDC factor that have occurred since title I was first enacted in 1965.

There is another reaction that the updated formula will provide a more equitable pattern of distribution than the present formula. The new formula will rely on census data which are more accurate and uniform nationwide as a basis of allocating compensatory education funds.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report includes another provision I authored in the committee to conduct a major study by the National Institute of Education of compensatory education programs and alternate methods for distributing such funds.

One of the real problems we encountered is considering H.R. 69 was the difficulty in obtaining reliable and useful information about compensatory education programs, especially about their effectiveness and about alternative methods for distributing such money.

The study authorized in the bill calls for an examination of all compensatory education programs, not only those provided under title I, but State programs as well.

The NIE is directed to study the fundamental purposes of compensatory education programs, evaluate their effectiveness in attaining these purposes and review as well the effect of concentrating such funds in the areas of reading and mathematics.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when we next consider the title I program, we will have the reliable data we need.

Mr. Speaker, the new title I formula, as I have already said, is the most important feature of this legislation. Local educational agencies and State departments of education have been operating for the last several years on continuing resolutions at substantially lower levels than they would receive under the title I formula included in the conference report. In the State of Indiana, for example, adoption of the conference report will mean almost $3 million more for title I programs. We have been operating too long with the uncertainties of continuing resolutions, hold-harmless provisions, and late appropriations, and one of the several reasons that I urge my colleagues to give their overwhelming support to this conference report is the revised and more equitable title I formula I have just discussed.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to say just a word about the importance of the conference report to the 7 million handicapped children in our society.

These children constitute a significant minority group in American life, and, unhappily, many of them have been denied the special educational services they need. Indeed, 1 million of them have been denied any education at all.

Mr. Speaker, two provisions of H.R. 69 will be particularly important to the handicapped. First, part B of title VI of H.R. 69 extends the Education of the Handicapped Act—Public Law 91-230—for 3 years. For fiscal year 1975, the bill authorizes appproximately $630 million to fund State grant programs for the education of handicapped children.

That is an impressive increase, Mr. Speaker, over the $47.5 million being spent in fiscal year 1974 for State grants.

Before my colleagues question if such an increase is justified, let me assure them that it is.

The conferees were persuaded by several reasons to approve such a large increase.

First, we were mindful of the shocking statistics to which I have already referred: Fully 60 percent of the handicapped youngsters in our society are not receiving the educational services they need.

Second, it costs, on the average, at least twice as much to educate a handicapped child as it does to educate a nonhandicapped child.

Third, court decisions all across the land have held during the last 2 years that handicapped children are entitled to the special educational services they need. Mr. Speaker, obviously the States will require assistance in order to implement the court decrees.

Therefore, in order to help the States implement these court orders, Mr. Speaker, the conferees have prudently decided on a large 1-year increase in funding for special education.

Mr. Speaker, the second provision contained in H.R. 69 which means a great deal to the handicapped children of America, extends Public Law 89-313, which amended title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide grants for State agencies serving handicapped children in State-supported or State-operated institutions.

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly mention the most important provisions of the Education of the Handicapped Act and title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as they apply to handicapped youngsters.

In 1966, Mr. Speaker, Congress recognized the special needs of America's then 5.5 million handicapped children, and added a new title VI to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provided a program of grants to States for the education of handicapped children, established a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, and created, within the Office of Education, a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

In 1970, Mr. Speaker, Congress realizing the handicapped youngsters deserved greater visibility in the Federal legislative process, repealed title VI effective July 1, 1971, and created a separate Education of the Handicapped Act.

In addition to the State grant program, Mr. Speaker, which the conference report would greatly expand for fiscal year 1975, the Education of the Handicapped Act also provides authority for:

Regional resource centers;

Centers for the deaf-blind;

Experimental preschool and early education programs;

Research and dissemination;

Training of personnel to work with handicapped children;

Media services and captioned films for the handicapped; and

Special program for children with specific learning disabilities.

Under the authority of the Education for the Handicapped Act, Mr. Speaker, $152 million was spent in fiscal 1974 to implement the State grant program and the other provisions which I have just itemized.

But, Mr. Speaker, because the majority of handicapped children are not receiving the services they need, and because the courts are increasingly ruling that handicapped children are entitled to appropriate educational services, the conferees agreed that much more must be done.

The conferees agreed, therefore, that for fiscal year 1975 only, the formula by which assistance grants are made to the States under part B of the Education for the Handicapped Act should be changed.

In place of the existing allotment formula, Mr. Speaker, the conferees agreed that in 1975 alone, the formula should be based on an entitlement grant to each State of $8.75 per child between the ages of 3 and 21.

We estimate that this entitlement approach will make available, in fiscal year 1975, $630 million to States for the education of the handicapped.

We have limited this approach to 1 year only, Mr. Speaker, because major legislation to assist States with the education of handicapped youngsters, H.R. 70, is now pending before the Select Subcommittee on Education which I have the honor to chair.

H.R. 70, Mr. Speaker, is a complex measure addressed to a very complicated problem, namely the determination of the excess costs involved in educating nonhandicapped children.

But because the States, Mr. Speaker, and the handicapped of our society need assistance today and cannot await the results of the intensive investigation now being conducted by my subcommittee, the conferees have determined that sound public policy dictates making available, for 1 year, until H.R. 70 is enacted, a significant increase in the moneys available to States for special education.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have also agreed to new provisions which will insure that the State grant funds are spent as effectively as possible for handicapped children.

These provisions require that—

Priority of title VI–B funds be assigned to children not now receiving educational services;

Due process be guaranteed for the children served with respect to identification, evaluation, and placement;

Classification of children not promote racial or cultural discrimination; and

All handicapped children be educated in the least restrictive environment.

TITLE I "SET-ASIDE" FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn my attention to another program continued by H.R. 69 which also means a great deal for the education of handicapped children.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to what is commonly termed the "Title I set-aside for the handicapped" in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Public Law 89–313, enacted in 1965, extended title I authority to include handicapped children attending State-supported schools.

And the 89th Congress took that action, Mr. Speaker, because we realized that, although the Education of the Handicapped Act and title I did an excellent job of providing financial support for disadvantaged and handicapped children attending local schools—which received the title I moneys—title I funds were not, as the law was originally written, available for handicapped children attending State-supported institutions.

The 90th Congress, Mr. Speaker, went a step further and approved a perfecting amendment under Public Law 90–247 which guaranteed the full funding of the earlier provisions of Public Law 89–313.

And we took that action because we knew that it costs far more to provide educational services to those children so severely handicapped that local educational agencies are often unable to meet their needs than it does to educate a handicapped or non-handicapped child attending a local school.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 69 continues the full set-aside for handicapped children in State-operated and State-supported schools, which the 89th, and then the 90th Congress endorsed.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report includes an important amendment to the title I set-aside program for the handicapped about which I should say a word.

As I have told my colleagues, the funds for the handicapped under title I are aimed at children in State-supported or State-operated institutions.

But educators and other experts on the education of handicapped children are now convinced that these children benefit greatly from receiving their education, to the extent possible, alongside nonhandicapped children.

The conferees have, therefore, accepted an amendment first proposed in the House by our distinguished colleague from Minnesota, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. QUIE, which would, for the first time, allow the funds formerly provided for institutional educational programs to follow the child to an educational program offered in an institution closer to his home or to a local school district.

The legislation does not require States to begin programs of deinstitutionalizing handicapped children, but by making the funds available to local programs, the bill encourages the States to do so.

This is a good amendment, Mr. Speaker, one that promises greatly to improve the quality of life for these children and their families.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that we are discussing the funding of programs for those children with the most severe and tragic physical, mental, and emotional problems.

And the educational services required by these children do not always focus on reading, writing, and arithmetic.

In some instances, the services require, first, that the child be taught to speak.

In other cases, the child must be taught to walk, or to bathe himself.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of programs require enormous expense, frequently involving costly equipment and 1-to-1 teacher-student ratios.

Indeed, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Mr. Speaker, estimates that it costs at least $2,000 annually to provide the services these children need.

And some States are reporting expenditures as high as $6,000.

Mr. Speaker, reasonable people may differ in how best to provide funding for those children with the most severe handicaps in State-supported institutions.

This is a well-conceived program endorsed by our predecessors in both the 89th and the 90th Congresses.

It is a program that we in the 93d should support.

LANDMARK LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, to reiterate, passage of H.R. 69 will be seen in the years ahead as landmark legislation.

H.R. 69 reaffirms the Federal commitment to equalizing education opportunity for poor and other vulnerable children.

It provides, also, for a study of the best means of allocating title I funds for disadvantaged youngsters, as well as for a White House Conference on Education.

But in stressing today, Mr. Speaker, the provisions to assist handicapped youngsters contained in H.R. 69, I do so because only 40 percent of the 7 million handicapped children in America are receiving the special educational services they need.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is time the Federal Government helped make good for handicapped children the rich promise of the American dream: That each individual will be able to achieve to the full extent of his or her abilities.

Because H.R. 69 will help us make that dream a reality, I urge my colleagues to join with me enthusiastically supporting the conference report on H.R. 69 when it comes before us for adoption.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it very clear that I too believe in quality education and I think it is very obvious that an improvement is badly needed in our education in our public schools in America today.

However, I do not think that busing is the answer. I am convinced that busing across district lines is still permitted regardless of this bill and of course regardless of the recent Supreme Court order.

Nor do I think education will be improved through the experiments and the psychological testing and the atheistic humanism that is still authorized in this bill without parental consent or knowledge.

What we are getting in this bill really is 1 ounce of Federal support, 1 pound of Federal regulations, and a ton of Federal Government and education bureaucracy. This is what we have to offer to the students and the moms and dads and the taxpayers of America.

Mr. Speaker, many members may be

persuaded to vote for this conference report because of the recent Supreme Court decision on busing, Milliken, Governor of Michigan, et al. against Bradley et al. From the newspaper headlines, one might think that this decision would prohibit or greatly restrict busing for racial purposes. But this is a false assumption. Not only does this decision allow busing within a school district, but it also allows court ordered busing across district lines.

The House version of H.R. 69 prohibited all cross-district busing and thus it was much more desirable than either the Senate version or the decision of the Supreme Court, which are themselves quite similar in nature and intent.

Thus the Supreme Court decision really has no bearing on H.R. 69. It only appears to have bearing because of the way the news media has played it up as a defeat for advocates of forced busing and as a concession to us opponents.

This raises the question of the timing of this Court decision. Why was the decision handed down now, just prior to consideration of this conference report?

The Supreme Court usually closes its session in June of each year. This year, however, they extended their session. Why? Was it because of Watergate and the possibility of impeachment actions against our President? Why did the Court hurriedly consider the case of the Presidential tapes, United States against Nixon, instead of waiting until its next regular session?

Is the Supreme Court above politics? Have its last two decisions, busing and the tapes, placed the Court in the mainstream of current political activities, thereby destroying its traditional image of being above gut politics?

The normal process of litigation was short-circuited in United States against Nixon by the willingness of the Supreme Court to accept a case that had not yet been argued before all of the competent lower courts. Historically it has been the function and practice of the Supreme Court to act cautiously, deliberately, not hastily, particularly in extremely important cases. For example, in ex parte Milligan, the Court decided that President Lincoln did not have the authority to suspend habeas corpus, nor to try civilians before military tribunals, 3 years after the trial had taken place and after Lincoln was dead. Similarly, the Supreme Court acted deliberately, not hastily, in Marbury against Madison.

It should be pointed out that, contrary to the impression given by the unanimity of the Court's decision in the tapes case, this decision is still controversial and questionable. For example, Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., author of "Impeachment: A Handbook," and an acknowledged expert in constitutional law, disagrees with the Court's decision in this case, as do many other recognized legal authorities.

So why did the Supreme Court extend its regular session and issue a hastily arrived at decision just as the House Judiciary Committee was considering articles of impeachment? At what time could that negative decision possibly be more damaging to our President, I ask you? On this most important of all important issues "the balance of power between the three branches of our Government" why did they not take much time for exhaustive deliberation?

The President is not above the Court or Congress, but neither is he below the Congress or the Court. Yet lowering the Presidency to a level below that of Congress and the Court is the result of this Supreme Court decision.

Now, in addition, consider the timing of the busing decision. The Supreme Court went into extended session because of the Presidential tapes case. But the busing decision was handed down after the tapes case. Why was not this case disposed of during the regular session of the Court? Why did the Court wait until now?

While one naturally hesitates in accusing the Supreme Court of playing politics, the timing of these two decisions certainly raises that question. However, regardless of the motives, the timing, the decisions of the Supreme Court, this conference report should be defeated on the busing question alone.

Yet, there is another, possibly more dangerous, aspect of this whole question of Federal involvement in primary and secondary education. That is, the elimination of the House-passed language guaranteeing the protection of the rights of students and parents.

Last October I introduced H.R. 10639, a bill I later offered as a substitute to H.R. 69, and which contained several provisions protecting the rights of parents. I received more than 1,300 letters from prominent educators, and from moms and dads across the country supporting my bill and protesting that many untested, unproven, and controversial programs—courses in behavior modification, atheistic humanism, and sensitivity training, for example—are being funded by the Federal Government under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Reasonable, responsible people consider these programs to be very dangerous but are powerless to exercise any choice over the nature of the education their children are receiving. In short, their rights as parents are being usurped.

To correct this, H.R. 10639 contained a provision requiring that schools obtain the "prior, informed, written consent" of parents or guardians before requiring a student to participate in a research or experimental program funded by the Federal Government. This provision passed the House as part of H.R. 69 in weakened form:

> Students would not be required to participate in experimental programs if their parents objected in writing, but schools would not be required to inform the parents that their children would be in such programs.

Even this weak provision was eliminated by the conferees.

Thus not only will parents not be informed that their children are being placed in experimental programs, but parents are not even being granted the legal right to withdraw their children from programs they believe to be damaging.

If the Federal Government is going to continue funding and promoting experimental programs in "modifying" the behavior of students in our public schools, the very least it can do is provide parents and students some protection by legally recognizing that the parents, the taxpayer yet have some rights in the education of their children. There are other defects in this bill both in content and in theory but I'll conclude by simply but most sincerely urge the Members to vote against this conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I trust the Members of this House will think a long time before they lightly dismiss the work of this conference. I can think of no worse exercise in futility than to have this conference report go down in flames over the issue of busing, which when we get all said and done is more form than substance.

The heart of the Esch amendment is continued in this bill. This bill contains far more in terms of effective antibusing provisions than any bill yet passed in this or any previous Congress, and yet apparently it does not go far enough. It goes further than I would like but as a conferee I voted to sustain the House position.

It contains significant revisions in the title I formula for distribution of funds all across the Nation. Yet apparently even on the part of some who gain it has gone too far in some areas and not far enough in others.

Let me level with the House. The distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota, both of whom fought long and hard to sustain the House position, I think if they were asked to report to this body would explain that there was almost no conference report, that there clearly was an indication by the other body and the conferees on the part of the other body that as a result of the adoption of the title I formula in this body and the adoption of the McClellan amendment, which is the title I formula, in the other body that there were certain of the conferees who lost funds who did not want a conference report. Let us not kid ourselves about the degree to which this conference almost fell down as a result of the significant shifts under the title I formula added by this body. So if we decide to reject H.R. 69 in its present form because of our desire to satisfy our constituency not on substance but on form, we make a tragic mistake.

There is one other provision which I think this body ought to consider, particularly those such as the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana or the distinguished gentleman from New York, and that is the Buckley amendment concerning the rights of parents and students to privacy and access to records. I know of no single issue on which the liberals and the conservatives alike can join more than on the need to protect the privacy

of the students' records and the right to allow access to those records on the part of the students and the parents which is now not the law. Adoption of the Buckley amendment was supported by the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Committee for Citizens in Education.

The Buckley amendment is consistent with the Kemp amendment which was adopted in the House and is an important part of what this report must be judged on.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York who has played such an important role in this matter of privacy. I commend him for his leadership.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

There is one aspect of the amendment which was not adopted and that was to provide an opportunity for a family to remove their child from an experimental program under title III, if they did not approve, and I wonder if the gentleman can share with me why it was that this aspect of the Kemp amendment was removed from the conference report.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. As you know, on pages 98 and 99, section 439 of the conference report reads:

> All instructional material, including teacher's manuals, films, tapes, or other supplementary instructional material which will be used in connection with any research or experimentation program or project shall be available for inspection by the parents or guardians of the children engaged in such program or project.

May I say to the gentleman from New York that we almost lost the Kemp amendment because there was no clear definition of what was experimental or a research project.

Second, this would in my view and in the view of the conferees be mischievous to allow the parents to come in and say they object without any reason whatsoever.

The key to that system working well is the existence of what was retained by the conferees, that is access to the materials so that the parent or guardian may make a judgment about what is done in an experimental project.

I would hope the gentleman from New York realizes the conferees worked very hard to keep the amendment in balance with the informational requirements associated with the evaluation of Federal programs with the needs of parents and students, so that when we take the Kemp amendment, section 439, with section 438 the Buckley amendment, in my view we have taken a giant step to insure a far greater access to records than we have had before as well as more protection of privacy.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the House conferees on H.R. 69, I want to convey to you and to my colleagues in the House my belief that we have brought from conference a good, solid bill. It contains the key features of the bill passed by the House, in some respects improved by the inclusion of some of the Senate provisions and in some cases modified by the necessary process of compromise.

The Senate having included the House formula on the allocation of title I funds in its bill, we succeeded in conference in further refining some of the detailed title I provisions. The essence of the House consolidation of State-operated programs was accepted by the Senate conferees. We accepted certain Senate reforms to impact aid, many of which constitute valuable refinements to the impact aid program.

In addition, the bill contains the provisions necessary to extend and modify the present programs as well as new sections establishing worthwhile programs in a variety of key educational areas: adult education, education of the handicapped, bilingual education, emergency school aid, Indian education, vocational education, and reading. I believe the educational package which comprises the bill represents a responsible and carefully considered extension and reform of the Elementary and Secondary School Act. I recommend the result to my colleagues in the House.

I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to two areas which I believe merit specific mention at this time.

In conference we adopted the essential elements of an amendment proposed in the other body by Senator Buckley, and strongly supported by the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Committee for Citizens in Education; this amendment represents the first steps toward providing much needed protection of the right to privacy of schoolchildren and their parents.

Called the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, it provides that no funds shall be made available under any Federal education program to any educational institution or agency which denies parents the right to inspect and review any and all official records, files and data related to their children, including all material incorporated into each student's cumulative record folder.

Furthermore, parents shall have an opportunity for a hearing to challenge the content of their child's school records, and thus be able to correct or delete any inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise inappropriate data contained therein.

In addition, no funds shall be made available to any educational agency or institution that permits the release of personally identifiable records or files without the written consent of their parents, except for certain designated local educational purposes. Authorized representatives of specifically designated agencies may have such access to records as may be necessary in connection with the audit and evaluation of federally supported programs or in connection with the enforcement of Federal legal requirements, but any data collected by such officials shall not include information which would permit the personal identification of such students or their parents after the data has been collected except when authorized by Federal law.

These provisions represent a first step toward establishing a responsible balance between the legitimate rights of Federal official to make sure Federal money is being spent wisely on the one hand, and the likewise legitimate rights of students and their parents to privacy on the other. The rights of students and parents are frequently infringed upon by overzealous Government agencies in their ever-increasing search for information. In this bill we now begin to redress the balance. I hope the House will pursue the effort to establish such protection, not only in the education field, but in other areas as well.

Allow me to draw your attention to another important part of the bill. It authorizes continuation of assistance to programs for migratory children. Based on estimates of eligible migrant children provided by the U.S. Office of Education and on projections of actual migrant student counts provided by the Migrant Student Record Transfer System, migrant allocations are estimated to increase more than threefold by 1976. This growth will result from a switch to use of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System and the inclusion of the children of migratory fishermen, Puerto Rican migrant children, and 5-year provision children.

Given these new estimates, the number of migrant students in the program is estimated to increase from 162,480 this year to 708,000 in 1976, with the estimated cost rising from $78.3 million in 1974 to $262.2 million in 1976.

Assuming a 1974 hold harmless for all other State agency programs, the growth in the migrant programs will represent a 40 percent increase in State agency allocations. Thus, assuming a constant total title I appropriation level in the 1975 budget request of $1.885 billion, this growth will result in a corresponding 11.17 percent decrease in the funds available for LEA grants in 1976 since State agency grants are paid at full entitlement off the top. In this way State agency grants will increase from $187.9 million in 1975 to $371.8 million in 1976, with LEA allocations decreasing by the 11.17 percent from $1.647 billion to $1.463 billion.

While not questioning the worth of the migrant programs, I am not sure that in funding them we want the LEA allocations to be cut this drastically. At this time I just want to flag this issue and promise my colleagues I will be looking into the potential impact of this decrease. We should examine alternatives and try to find some other way of providing the needed services to migrant children without sacrificing LEA allocations.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 69. This conference report extends the Elementary and Secondary Act, the impact aid laws, the Adult Education Act, the Bilingual Education Act, and the Indian Education Act through fiscal year 1978. Additionally, it extends the Education of the Handicapped Act through fiscal year 1977 and the Emergency School Aid Act through fiscal year 1976.

Like most major pieces of legislation before this body, the conference report on H.R. 69 is a compromise. I personally

do not agree with all of its provisions and worked hard, for a year in committee, and later here on the House floor, to forge what I strongly felt to be necessary revisions in the House version of ESEA. Specifically, I fought along with Mr. PEYSER to revise the title I formula to allocate funds on the basis of data different from the data currently in use. I emphatically felt, and still do, that no distribution formula should penalize the residents of New York and Erie County who have demonstrated an outstanding commitment to education, and who have consistently spent a great deal of money furthering education goals.

Although aspects of H.R. 69 have been controversial, and although the conference report before us today is not the perfect reflection of my own, or most of my colleagues, personal views on education, I believe the report is a responsible compromise, which is responsive to the needs of our educational community, and responsive to our national educational goals.

I would like to briefly discuss the provisions of H.R. 69 as reported by the committee on conference.

TITLE I. ESEA

The title I formula is amended to allocate funds on the basis of more current data. State agency programs for handicapped, migrant, and neglected and delinquent children will receive funds in accordance with the new formula and will continue to receive funds "off the top" in accordance with established practice. No State agency will receive less than its fiscal 1974 allocation. Each local education agency will receive at least 85 percent of its previous year's allocation. The 1975 authorization is estimated at $3.1 billion for LEA grants.

Part B of title I, incentive grants to States with a high tax effort for education, is continued with a maximum appropriation of $50 million.

Part C, grants to areas with high concentrations of low income children, is extended through 1975.

Authority is contained in the bill for a separate authorization which permits the Commissioner in special circumstances to make grants to school districts which are receiving less than 90 percent of their previous year's allocation.

A bypass for nonpublic schoolchildren is included.

OTHER TITLES

Titles II, III, and VIII of ESEA are extended through 1978 and title III of NDEA is extended through fiscal year 1977. These programs may not be funded in any year in which there is a consolidation of programs as described below.

CONSOLIDATION

State-operated programs are combined into the following divisions:

First. "Libraries and learning resources" included ESEA I, NDEA III, and the guidance and counseling portion of ESEA III.

Second. "Support and innovation" includes the balance of ESEA III, nutrition and health and dropout prevention from title VIII, and ESEA V.

Consolidation must be forward funded and during the first year there will be a 50 percent hold-harmless for each program.

A bypass for nonpublic schoolchildren is included.

Total discretion is given to local educational agencies on spending under libraries and learning resources. States distribute funds under support and innovation on a project grant basis.

Also adopted is a provision for a simplified State application for ESEA I, II, III, and NDEA III, adult education, vocational education, and education of the handicapped.

The Special Projects Act is included which provides an "incubator" for new categorical programs. Under this concept new programs will be protected for a period and then will compete for funding without the protection of set-asides. These new programs include women's educational equity, career education, consumer's education, gifted and talented, community schools, metric education, and arts in education.

IMPACT AID

Effective in fiscal 1976, amendments are accepted which will include guaranteed funding for public housing children of 25 percent of entitlement, equal to about $53 million in 1976. Entitlements for military children remain as in current law. Entitlement rates for civilian children are reduced slightly for those who live within the same county—from 50 percent to 45 percent—and for those who live within a different county in the same State—50 percent to 40 percent. Entitlements for those who live in a different State are eliminated except that those payments will be reduced over a number of years as the result of hold-harmless provisions.

School districts with 25 percent or more of their enrollments "a" children will be guaranteed the full amounts of their entitlements for these children.

No school district which receives more than 10 percent of its budget from impact aid will have its payments reduced less than 10 percent each year. Districts which receive less are guaranteed 80 percent of their previous year's payments. Also every district is guaranteed that it will not lose any regular impact aid funds due to the inclusion of public housing children.

Handicapped children of military personnel will be entitled to a payment of one and one-half times that of other children. These funds must be used for the purposes of providing special education for these children.

Funds which a district receives as the result of public housing children must be used for programs of compensatory education.

ADULT EDUCATION

The Commissioner's 20 percent set-aside is deleted and all funds are to be allocated to the States. Up to 20 percent of a State's funds may be used for high school equivalency programs.

The program of adult education for Indians is continued through 1978.

HANDICAPPED

All existing programs for the handicapped are extended through fiscal year 1977. For fiscal 1975, $630 million is authorized to be allocated among the States on the basis of total population ages 3 to 21. These funds will be particularly helpful in meeting requirements for the education of all handicapped children facing many States as the result of court decisions.

States are required to show how they will meet the needs of those children.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Authorizations are increased and special emphasis is placed on the training of personnel. Funds are also provided to States to assist them in developing their capacities to develop programs of bilingual education.

A national assessment of the need for bilingual education is to be conducted in 1975 and 1977 and sent to the Congress.

Also included is a program of fellowships for students who will enter the field of training teachers in bilingual education.

READING

A new program of reading improvement is included. Funds are authorized for grants to local educational agencies and States for comprehensive programs of reading improvement and projects which show promise of overcoming reading deficiencies. Also included are funds for special emphasis projects in reading, for the training of reading teachers on public television, and for reading academies.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Included are two new programs which provide funds in fiscal 1975 for bilingual vocational training and bilingual vocational education.

INDIAN EDUCATION

The Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act is extended through 1978. Up to 10 percent of the funds are to be made available to Indian controlled schools.

An annual authorization of $2 million for special training programs for training teachers of Indian children is included and a program of fellowships for Indian students is also included.

OTHER PROGRAMS

The Emergency School Aid Act is continued through 1976. The authority to fund educational parks and the set-aside for metropolitan areas programs are repealed.

An amendment to authorize the CLEO program to assist disadvantaged students to prepare for and attend law schools is accepted.

The ethnic studies program is extended through 1978.

A program of grants to States to assist them in planning State equalization programs is included. Grants range from $100,000 to $1,000,000 per State depending upon population.

MISCELLANEOUS FEATURES

An upgraded National Center for Education Statistics within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education is created.

Regionalization of the Office of Education without an act of Congress authorizing such regionalization is forbidden.

Congress is afforded the opportunity to disapprove regulations for any Federal aid program for education.

Parents of students and students attending postsecondary institutions are afforded the right to inspect their school files and the release of documents in those files is restricted.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the above provisions on H.R. 69 are representative of earnest, bipartisan efforts to update major Federal aid to education. As such, I urge my colleagues to approve the conference report before us.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am not happy to be here in the position I am in, because I have to announce that, after working on some of these education programs for 10 years, and on this particular bill for more than a year and a half now, and after participating to the maximum of my capability in the 100 or more hours of this conference, I have to announce that I am going to oppose the adoption of the conference committee report in its present form and hope that the privileged motion of the gentleman from Ohio will be adopted, which would enable us to refer this matter back to the Senate with the request that the original House antibusing provisions be reinstated.

Mr. Speaker, there are several parts of this bill which trouble me. First of all, if we are to be honest with ourselves we must admit that the new formula for title I is totally illogical and irrelevant to the present needs of education. It is sheer hypocrisy to say that this formula is designed to pump the bulk of Federal education funds to districts with concentrations of poor children, and then on the heels of the recent Supreme Court decision which outlines the very severe problem faced by the Detroit public schools, we pass a bill which increases the amount of funds for sparsely populated Keweenaw County by 251 percent while Wayne County's allocation would be increased by a mere 4 percent.

It is ridiculous for us to say we are passing legislation to help cities and suburbs when the areas which receive the most dramatic increases under this conference report are virtually all rural, sparsely populated regions. Let us just look at some other counties in my own State. Charlevoix will receive a 124-percent increase, Houghton a 136-percent increase, and Mackinac, a 101-percent increase—compared to the 4-percent increase for my own county of Wayne—which is where most of Michigan's population is concentrated.

I am certain that if my colleagues will inspect the printouts made available to the Committee by the Library of Congress, they will discover that this same pattern holds true for all the other States as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are also kidding ourselves when we say that there is language in this legislation which will assure the American public that there will be no more forced cross-district busing.

This body, on no less than three occasions, voted overwhelmingly to instruct its conferees to retain the House antibusing provisions. On June 5, by a vote of 270 to 103 we instructed our conferees to retain the House anti-busing language. We did it again on June 27 by a vote of 281 to 128 and again on July 22 by a vote of 261 to 122.

Nevertheless, the majority of our conferees gave in to the other body and adopted a watered-down version of the antibusing language instead—language that the Detroit News recently referred to in an editorial as mere "empty rhetoric." The News went on to say that the bill now before us contains "a provision inviting the courts to disregard such antibusing legislation if they wish to do so."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer my colleagues to another article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on July 24. This article quotes a source from the Senate who claims that the purpose of one part of this so-called compromise is to nullify completely the staunch antibusing legislation proposed by the House conferees. The article quotes another Senate source who feels that the language now before us "gives the courts 'free rein' to order busing and renders the busing prohibition meaningless."

Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision did not solve the busing issue once and for all. Attorneys on both sides of that case are speculating that the controversy will continue to plague our schoolchildren. We must therefore return this legislation to the Senate with our original antibusing language restored.

The majority of conferees also agreed to another provision—one that was not even included in the House version, and one to which I strenuously object. This is the so-called protection of the rights and privacy of parents and students language.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe in everyone's right to privacy. But I do not believe that this is an issue which should be addressed in a Federal aid to education bill.

Let us take a look at what we are voting on today. The bill we have before us provides that no Federal funds shall be available to any State or local school districts which did not comply with all kinds of rules and regulations relating to students' and teachers' records—including inspections, hearings, challenges, et cetera.

What do we accomplish by this?

Under the guise of protecting the right of parents and students, this provision in effect mandates Federal interference in the local administration of schools.

Interference with the local administration of schools has traditionally been the objection to Federal aid to education which has been espoused by anti-Federal aid to education groups. With the adoption of this conference report, it will become a self-fulfilling prophecy, because this provision will permit the U.S. Office of Education to meddle in the affairs of local school districts.

Mr. Speaker, if this provision becomes law, it would create a situation in which one parent, no matter what his or her motives may be, could, simply by making one allegation against a school district, jeopardize all Federal funds coming into either a local or State educational agency.

There is still another major part of this legislation which I cannot buy. This is title IV—the so-called consolidation of certain education programs. This was a gimmick which the Congress was coerced into accepting by the Nixon administration.

This so-called consolidation of programs is nothing more than a watered-down substitute version of Nixon's ill-fated special education revenue sharing plan which nobody on either side of the aisle would buy. This provision is included in the bill only because the President has persisted in threatening the committee with a veto unless we let him save face by giving him at least some consolidation.

Well, now we have consolidation—or at least we will if we adopt this conference report, and all I can say is that I hope this works out better than the rest of the things this administration has tried to get away with.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed in what our conferees agreed to with respect to the impact aid provisions of H.R. 69.

Ever since 1950, the Congress has acknowledged and accepted the responsibility of the Federal Government to compensate local educational agencies for property and business taxes which these districts were forced to forgo because of Federal property located within the district. The Congress has for over 20 years now reimbursed these districts for the revenue forgon and for the additional cost of education imposed by the influx of federally connected children. This was accomplished by two laws—Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. The House version of H.R. 69 extended these two laws along with all the other provisions of the bill.

Now, after 24 years of successful operations, this conference committee has recommended that we accept the Senate language on impact aid in lieu of the House version which was merely a simple extension.

What is the Senate version? Mr. Speaker, no one really knows what the Senate version will do. The only thing we know for sure about the Senate version is that it has taken a relatively simple and efficient Federal aid to education program and turned it into an administrative nightmare.

Aside from this, we have determined that it will also result in some disastrous cutbacks to some school districts which depend on impact aid funds for their very survival.

Let us examine just a few of these. The conference report before the House today would remove A entitlements from permanent law—despite the fact that

these entitlements have been embodied in permanent law since 1950. Under the conference report, however, authorization for category A grants will expire at the end of 1978.

The conference report would also eliminate entirely funds for out-of-State B children and reduce entitlements for out-of-county B children. Further, the conference report would decrease both the rate of Federal contributions and the percentage payment for all categories of children with the exception of military A children.

The conference report would also include public housing children in payments, but it would do so at the expense of present B children, not as an addition to the program. Finally, I would like to say something with respect to the big cities that have been lulled by the promise of more Federal dollars. Had the conference committee adopted the original House impact aid proposal and agreed to fund part C of title I, ESEA permanently, every single big city, would have received more Federal funds than they can now expect to receive. As things stand now, several big cities will lose millions of dollars under the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, because of these reasons I must reluctantly cast my vote against the conference report on H.R. 69, but I would like to emphasize to my colleagues that I do so not to kill this legislation, but only so we can set the wheels in motion to send it back to the Senate for improvement.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PARRIS).

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support the conference report on H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but I will do so with some serious reservations which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

The conference report is startlingly defective in two respects, the first being the failure of the conferees to agree to the House-passed language relating to the forced busing of schoolchildren.

For several years we have listened to the pleas of our constituents for the Congress to take decisive action to stop this method of social experimentation in our schools. I personally deplore the practice of court-ordered busing, and am deeply concerned over its impact upon both schoolchildren and parents alike. Early in the first session of this Congress, I sponsored a constitutional amendment to prohibit forced busing, but regretfully, the Judiciary Committee has to date taken no action to consider House Joint Resolution 190, or any other of the numerous antibusing constitutional amendments proposed by my colleagues.

For this reason I was immensely pleased by the decision of a vast majority of my colleagues in this body to place strong language in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with respect to busing. In addition, I strongly support the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which held court-ordered busing across county lines to be unlawful.

Mr. Speaker, on three separate occasions the House has instructed its conferees on this legislation to insist on the busing language we adopted. The intent of the House could not be more clear.

Yet the conference report we have before us today contains severely weakened Senate language which will permit the continued implementation of court-ordered busing. I have pledged to my constituents that I would do all in my power to put an end to this deplorable practice, and I do not believe that we can compromise on this issue. Therefore, I would hope and strongly urge my colleagues serving on the Judiciary Committee to turn their immediate attention to the various antibusing constitutional amendments now before them, so that we can put a stop to court-ordered busing once and for all.

Second, I am deeply disturbed by the so-called reform of the impact aid program contained in the conference report. I have contacted the various school divisions in my congressional district, and have been advised that the phaseout of category B children whose parents do not work in the State may well have a significant detrimental impact upon the operation of our school systems. For example, Fairfax County schools may lose as much as $2 to $3 million each year in the event appropriations for impact aid in fiscal 1976 do not meet 100 percent of entitlement. Let me take this opportunity to assure my colleagues and constituents that I will work for funding at 100 percent of entitlement for impact aid in upcoming fiscal years. And again, I would urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to take into consideration the substantial increase in taxes which the people of this Nation—and particularly in the Washington metropolitan area—will have to pay if impact aid funding is significantly reduced.

I do feel, however, that the importance of the other programs and funding authorized by this bill are of such importance that I must cast my vote in its favor. Additional funding for special education is most urgently needed in my congressional district, and H.R. 69 provides that vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues will feel as I do, and take appropriate action in upcoming months to guarantee a continued viable impact aid program, and to put an end to the court-ordered busing of our schoolchildren.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY).

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am on record supporting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act but I would like to make a few comments on this conference report and its effect on my State of California.

Under title VII a significant increase in the funding level would give California approximately a $4.5 million increase for bilingual education. We now have in California 71 language groups identified, with Spanish, Cantonese, Tagalong, Portuguese, and Japanese the most numerous groups. Title VII funds are now serving approximately 25,000 elementary and secondary school children and needless to say, it is a very important program. I have supported bilingual education from its inception and I commend this extension.

As a result of recent court decisions which will require full education services to all handicapped children, there is an urgent need for special education moneys in California. It has been estimated that in excess of $100 million per year will be needed to fulfill this requirement. Last year we received $4.4 million; if fully funded, H.R. 69 will provide $64.2 million to California schools to enable the school districts to begin the necessary improvement of their programs.

At this time, Title I is operating on a continuing resolution which means that California schools are receiving $4.9 million per year less than last year. The formula under this bill will provide a 10-percent increase—$133 million versus $121 million—for local educational agencies. In order to avoid cutbacks, we must pass this bill as quickly as possible.

This measure will consolidate six of the present categorical programs into two. This move will reduce redtape and give more discretion to local school districts, a move sought by the administration and by educators.

Finally, the conferees included language, which I proposed, to guarantee that there will be evaluations of the educational effectiveness of the projects funded in title I. I want to improve education with these funds—not just spend money. I am confident that when we renew title I 4 years from now, we will have a clearer directive.

Mr. Speaker, ESEA is not only important to California but also to the Nation and I earnestly encourage my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, no bill of this complexity will not have some feature which one or more of us will be concerned with, but on balance this is an excellent conference report and I urge its adoption.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much talk about busing, I thought I would like to put this in perspective. We are talking about 50 million students in America today, youngsters in school, elementary and secondary school. Of that, about 45 percent are bused. 22 million are bused every day to school—not desegregation busing, but just bused to school as a means of normal transportation. Of that percentage of the 22 million, there is no more than 3 percent of those who are under a desegregation busing program.

I think we ought to get this matter in proper perspective.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I regret to observe at this point that there are those among us who would toss into the dustbin the results of countless hours of labor by the chief architects of H.R. 69. Those of us who are concerned with the plight of impoverished youngsters, of teachers fighting against impossible odds to do their jobs well, and administrators and school boards who must work with woefully inadequate budgets, are aghast at the mean arguments advanced against this constructive and well-reasoned attempt to direct greater Federal attention to the needs of our schools.

We need this bill, not because it is perfect—it is not. We need this bill because without it we will break faith with those who look to Congress for relief and assistance that is impossible to achieve at the State and local levels of government. The testimony of hundreds of witnesses who are on the firing line is reflected in the bold initiatives of H.R. 69. We need stability in Federal authorizations, as provided in this bill. We need new programs to address ourselves to new priority issues that are emerging in the seventies.

We need to support this bill because it represents the framework for a new and revitalizing start in Federal support of elementary and secondary education. We will need to improve it as time goes on, but we need even more to replace anxiety with hope and despair with opportunity. I urge a resounding "yea" for adoption of this conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO).

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the conferees on H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974, have reported back to the House a bill with comprehensive strengthening amendments to title VII of ESEA, the Bilingual Education Act.

During debate on this legislation on March 27, I proposed to offer a package of bilingual amendments which included changing the title of the act to the Bilingual/Bicultural Act; creation of a Bureau of Bilingual Education in HEW with a Deputy Commissioner of Education as director; authorization of grants and fellowships for preservice and inservice training for bilingual teachers and individuals to train such teachers; an emphasis on cultural and historical studies of each particular language group to foster pride and a sense of identity; and other provisions to insure that children of limited English-speaking ability will be given every opportunity to receive the type of instruction that will enable and encourage them to finish their schooling.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that these amendments were necessary in light of our woeful failure to serve the educational needs of some 5 million youngsters in the schools of America who are not native-English speakers. Though we have had the Bilingual Education Act in force since 1967, the annual appropriations have been but a trickle in relation to the need. In New York City only 7,300 out of 250,000 Spanish-speaking youngsters are enrolled in federally funded bilingual programs. Less than 4 percent of the Chicano students in the Southwest are benefiting from bilingual education. And in fact, throughout the Nation only 111,000 schoolchildren are participating in this effort which may be their only reasonable chance to succeed in a school system oriented almost totally toward the native speaker of English.

There is nothing unique about an American citizen with a limited English-speaking ability, Mr. Speaker. The majority of us are descended from Germanic, Hispanic, Italian, Slavic, Scandinavian, Oriental, and other nationalities besides English. Even now there are more than 10 million Spanish-speaking people in this country. Yet despite our history and the present reality, it is an unfortunate fact that, until recently, teaching in any language other than English in the classroom has been illegal in many States.

The Bilingual Education Act of 1967 marked the beginning of the Federal attack on such discriminatory treatment of children from non-English-speaking backgrounds. I am pleased to note the movement now underway in various State legislatures to enact authorizing statutes and provide funding for bilingual programs as a supplement to our efforts here in the Congress. And the Supreme Court, in Lau against Nichols earlier this year added its imprimatur in a determination that failure to provide bilingual education for those who need it is a denial of equal rights under the law.

The original committee version of H.R. 69 did not broaden title VII nearly as much as necessary, and I had prepared a series of amendments closely approximating bilingual education provisions expected to be included in the Senate education bill. Consequently, on March 27 I engaged in a colloquy on the floor with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor who asked that I withdraw my amendments at that time on the premise that the committee had not had adequate time to consider them.

I did withdraw my amendments, Mr. Speaker, in exchange for the chairman's assurances that House conferees would give every consideration to a more comprehensive bilingual package in the Senate bill, and I am pleased to report that the gentleman from Kentucky has been as good as his word.

The conference report before us today includes provisions for training of bilingual teachers, paraprofessionals, teacher aides, and teacher trainers. Significantly, it authorizes at least 100 fellowships in fiscal 1975 for study leading to a graduate degree in the training of bilingual teachers.

The amended title VII of H.R. 69 authorizes bilingual curriculum development, improvement, and innovation, and it now includes heavy emphasis on studies of cultural heritage and cultural resources as an integral part of bilingual education. I am pleased as well that the bill requires educational agencies to consult with parents during the formulation of applications for bilingual programs and to place parents on advisory committees after the programs are instituted. This is very important in terms of home reinforcement for what students are learning and the schools are attempting, factors too often missing in families where English is not the mother tongue. Bilingual instruction for adults is likewise featured in these amendments, and I cannot stress too strongly my support for full implementation of this particular authorization.

The bill also now includes a requirement that the Office of Bilingual Education conduct a national assessment of the number of children throughout America who require bilingual instruction, with a mandate to report back to the Congress no later than July 1, 1977, on the target population, the number of teachers needed, and the costs that would be entailed in a 5-year plan to provide bilingual education, including adult education and vocational training, to all Americans whose educational or occupational advancement is hindered by deficiency in the English language.

Mr. Speaker, the implementation of these new provisions could and should be the long overdue catalyst in advancing us toward the goal of providing equal educational and occupational opportunity for an ignored segment of our heterogeneous population. Our difficulty continues to lie in obtaining adequate appropriations to reflect the authorization levels and the true national need for bilingual/bicultural education. I hope that the title VII amendments in H.R. 69 will become law and provide some stimulus toward sensitizing more Members of this Congress to the justification for vastly expanded Federal bilingual programs.

I cannot overlook the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there are provisions in this conference report with which I disagree. I deeply regret the cutback of title I funds for New York which my colleagues and I fought so strenuously in previous debate on the new formula. I continue to believe that busing restrictions have no place in an education bill, and I deplore the inability of this body to place its priorities on the quality of education for the children of this country rather than on negative aspects that reflect the fears and hostility of their constituents.

Nevertheless, I believe that on balance this conference report should be approved. The bilingual education amendments are a strong element in my support for the bill, and other excellent provisions such as a community schools program, expanded provisions for education of the handicapped, a broadened national reading improvement commitment, and other features merit the passage of H.R. 69. In addition, school systems around the country desperately need to know what programs and funds will be authorized for the approaching school year, and I urge the passage of the conference report forthwith in the interest of maximum use of our resources

for the educational advancement of the children of America.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of the conference report. I think perhaps the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) stated the situation accurately when he described this as such a complex and all-encompassing bill that it would be difficult to find any one member that agreed with every aspect of it. But on balance it is a very substantial improvement in not only the programs that it amends, but in the new ones which it commences.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is disconcerting, to say the least, to have worked for well over a year with a bill as comprehensive as this and a bill which deals with the advances in education that this one does and to have a portion of that bill, indeed only a fraction of the entire bill, that portion dealing with busing, dominate the debate. The controversy over busing rages as if busing were the only thing in the entire bill. The fact is, it is but a minor fraction of a bill that deals with elementary and secondary education, impact aid, adult education, Indian education, handicapped, bilingual education, vocational education, community education and many other improvements.

Others will address various aspects of the bill. I would like to apply my time specifically to adult education, Indian education and certain aspects of impact aid.

ADULT EDUCATION

There is little controversy over the need for a vigorous and expanding adult education program in this Nation. Nearly one-third of the adults in the United States have less than a high school education. Whether adult education consists of GED—high school equivalency—or basic education, adult education enlarges and enhances the opportunity for the individuals and for this society.

The adult education amendment in this conference report extends the Adult Education Act to 1978 and modernizes the present act. The bill provides for up to 20 percent of the funds to be spent for high school equivalency. This we felt brought a proper balance between the protection of the basic educational aspects and the somewhat more visible high school equivalency. One of the important changes is that we now specify the inclusion of institutionalized adults in the target population. Education and training in institutions can do more to reduce recidivism than any other thing.

While we lower the authorization, we feel it is more realistic to the appropriation history and we certainly do not wish it interpreted as any diminishment of our continuing support for adult education.

That is the important program which many Members of both parties joined me in sponsoring at the beginning of the 93d Congress and is now in the conference report. I thank all those who cosponsored and worked with it.

INDIAN EDUCATION

There are numerous sections which enhance the educational opportunities of Indian children. Certainly one of those must be bilingual education. A recent BIA survey estimates that three-quarters of the students in BIA schools need bilingual education. With the present paucity of bilingual education programs in BIA schools, we are taking young Indian children with a strong Indian cultural background and throwing them "cold turkey" into a Dick-and-Jane school setting. This is one—but a very important one—of the reasons that Indian children have dropout rates in excess of twice that of other students in American schools. In sum, the very important bilingual education program instituted by this conference bill will do a great deal for all Americans whose mother tongue is not English.

In addition, amendments to the Indian Education Act provide for increased funds for schools run by Indian controlled school boards, additional funds for professional and graduate training in law, medicine, engineering, and so forth, and also provide training for teachers of Indian students. There is provision for bilingual teacher training as well as for trained personnel in the special needs of Indian children.

IMPACT AID

Mr. Speaker, the conference bill makes many changes in the impact aid law. I must say that I must agree with most of these changes, but I want to direct my attention especially to the equalization provisions. The present law provides that a State may not count impact aid in equalization formulas. This has acted as a deterrent to State equalization efforts—an impediment most of us dislike. But, conversely, we did not want to see impact aid funds absorbed into total State needs without respect to the special needs of impacted districts. The provisions of the bill provide a formula which would allow impact funds to be, in effect, treated as local resources. This carries out the concept that impact aid is to compensate for withdrawal of tax base, but at the same time shall not deter a State which is really trying to create a realistic equalization formula.

The bill provides that "a state may consider as local resources funds received under this title only in proportion to the share that local revenues covered under a State equalization program are of total local revenues." That means that the funds which a State can use in its equalization formula are really a mirror of the State's efforts to adopt a realistic equalization formula. In States with high equalization formulas, those States would be entitled to count considerably more than those States which have equalization formulas but which do not really equalize at a very high level.

I have prepared an illustration of the effect of this provision on a district in a State with a high level of equalization and on a district in a State with a low level of equalization.

In addition to requiring the Commissioner's approval of State equalization formulas before the provisions of the bill become effective, the bill also provides that affected local educational agencies have an opportunity for a hearing prior to the adoption of any formula which would affect a reduction of impact aid funds in that district.

There are many other portions of this conference report which I consider to be extremely important but time does not permit a full discussion of them.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, this is a landmark education bill which will improve educational opportunity for all Americans. I urge its support.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to this body that we ought to get away from percentages. The formula was bad before. This is the wisest formula we can provide. Proof of it is that the Senate did adopt the House formula on title I.

I know there are those Members who wish we had a stronger reopening clause, but those Members who feel there ought to be stronger antibusing language should bear in mind that this is the strongest antibusing language that has ever been enacted, even though I do not like that.

Last, I would say that I have now been told by the Under Secretary of HEW, Mr. Carlucci, that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare supports this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota will agree with me that if we went back to conference, we would never be able to get or to obtain any stronger antibusing provisions than we now have in this bill. Am I correct?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PERKINS. And it would only be doing harm to every local school district in this Nation if we defeated this conference report. The schools would just be deteriorating, not having the funds they need to carry out the educational process.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 69, the education amendments of 1974. This legislation authorizes the continuance of vital education programs, and provides the basis for the implementation of progressive new programs essential to a successful learning experience. The generous increased allocation for fiscal year 1975 for the Education of the Handicapped Act, for example, while still not sufficient to provide viable educational opportunities to all of our seven million handicapped youngsters, will be welcomed by educators across the country who are straining to reach each handicapped child and respond to his unique needs. So, too, is the expansion of the bilingual education programs, which to date have been negligently underfinanced and consequently underutilized. In addition to increased authorization for bilingual education, H.R. 69 provides no less than 100 fellowships in the field of training teachers in bilingual education in fiscal year 1975, and establishes an Office of Bilingual

Education in the Office of Education. H.R. 69 also declares it to be the sense of Congress that museums be considered educational institutions and that the cost of their educational services be more frequently borne by the educational agencies and institutions benefiting from those services. I agree that the Federal Government should assume a more positive role in aiding museums to expand their influence in the field of education.

There is one section of H.R. 69 which is of special interest to me, and that is section 825, the safe schools study. Originally introduced by Congressman BELL and myself as separate legislation, this provision would require the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a full and complete study of the problem of crime in our Nation's schools, and evaluate the most practicable and effective solutions. The study would measure the cost of crime in our schools, and the real and potential effectiveness of methods schools can use, or are already using, to combat it. I first introduced safe schools legislation 3 years ago when it became apparent that the incidence of vandalism, personal assault, arson, theft and other related crimes were eroding the very foundations of our school systems. I recommended this study only when it became clear that an operational program such as I had first suggested would not be approved by the Congress at this session. It is my hope that the safe schools study will bring to light the serious extent and nature of school crime, and will help to develop effective solutions and restore peace to our troubled schools.

Although H.R. 69 contains commendable advances in the development of this Nation's educational system, the legislation takes some unfortunate steps backward. My initial objection lies in the formula change for the distribution of title I funds to educationally disadvantaged students. This revision will deprive children in New York State of $50 million in title I revenue. The reallocation of title I moneys to the rural areas of this country will shatter the hopes of millions of city youngsters who once held dreams of escaping the education deprivation/economic deprivation cycle. Those hopes will be frustrated because the opportunity for those ghetto children to compete and achieve on equal terms with their peers will be severely limited. I have argued long and hard against this formula change, and again wish to place on record my vehement opposition to the new formula.

The conference agreement to include public housing children in the appropriations for impact aid is a commendable and appreciated effort to restore some of the severely needed title I funds that will be lost by urban school districts. This funding, although only a drop in the bucket, would increase the share of impact aid for which New York would be eligible—the State currently receives only 3 percent of all impact aid moneys—and would thus provide for a more equitable regional distribution of ESEA moneys.

The restoration of parts B and C of title I—incentive grants, and special grants for high concentrations of low income families, respectively—is a most welcome compromise with the Senate. Although the gain that New York would realize from this restoration would be only a fraction of what they will lose as a result of the title I change, it will help to fill the expected void in educational funding. I must again express disappointment in H.R. 69 at this point, however, for part C of title I is a separate line item. This could all too easily result in a lost battle for appropriations for this vitally needed money.

With respect to the provisions relating to busing, I think the conferees are to be commended for working out a compromise which, while unfortunate in some respects, is far superior to the language of the original House bill.

Overall H.R. 69 is a positive piece of legislation, and I urge its acceptance by this body.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Education and Labor Committee, and those of us on the conference committee, worked long and hard on this legislation over the past year and a half. It is the result of many hours of balancing the interests of our big city schools and our rural areas, between wealthy and poorer States, and between the House and the Senate. There is no doubt that this bill is truly land mark legislation.

In addition to modifying the title I formula, the bill includes an expanded assistance program for the education of the handicapped, a new reading program, education for the gifted and talented, impact aid, community education, women's educational equity, bilingual education—an entire host of educational programs. With local school districts and the States faced with a tight money situation, it is imperative that this conference report be approved today so that these new programs may be begun, and existing programs be carried on without disruption. Education is a continuing process which demands planning in order to be successful. Chaos in funding will reduce our educational programs to ruin.

It would be unconscionable for this body to reject this bill because of a mistaken belief that the conference report is "weak" on busing. I would like to point out to the Members of this House that first, the conference report retains the Ashbrook amendment, which prohibits the use of Federal funds for busing.

Second, the conference report permits court orders requiring busing to be terminated if the judge finds that the school district is in conformity with the Constitution, and the judge believes that the school district will remain in conformity.

Third, the conference report retains language from both the House and Senate bills restricting busing to the next nearest school.

Fourth, it retains language which permits local school districts, parents and guardians to move to intervene in a suit if there is reason to believe that a desegregation plan would be harmful to the children's health or educational process.

Fifth, the conferees adopted four amendments which had been accepted on the Senate floor: First, a court order requiring busing cannot take effect until the beginning of the school year; second, before a court order may be handed down, the school district must be given a reasonable opportunity to formulate its own desegregation plan; third, desegregation plans required by court order may not ignore school district lines; and fourth, busing can not be included as a remedy unless the court finds that all other remedies are inadequate.

The conference report does adopt a provision of the Senate bill stating that nothing in the act is meant to diminish the authority of the Federal courts under the Constitution. I believe that this provision means that the Federal courts will have an opportunity to review the constitutionality of these provisions. Federal courts, however, have this power already, which may not be limited by law.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I shall include at the conclusion of my remarks a chart I had prepared for the benefit of my colleagues for Florida, indicating the increases in allocations by county under this conference report.

Summary of increased allocations under conference report on H.R. 69 for title I, compared to last year's allocation

County:	Percent change
Alachua	+117
Baker	+84
Bay	+133
Bradford	+170
Brevard	+104
Broward	+101
Calhoun	+43
Charlotte	+128
Citrus	+205
Clay	+111
Collier	+168
Columbia	+85
Dade	+83
De Soto	+95
Dixie	+61
Duval	+99
Escambia	+125
Flagler	+64
Franklin	+144
Gadsden	+85
Gilchrist	+32
Glades	+56
Gulf	+126
Hamilton	+81
Hardee	+162
Henry	+155
Hernando	+163
Highlands	+251
Hillsborough	+125
Holmes	−14
Indian River	+174
Jackson	+38
Jefferson	+58
Lafayette	+89
Lake	+123
Lee	+115
Leon	+133
Madison	+45
Manatee	+138
Marion	+122
Martin	+115
Monroe	+108
Nassau	+74
Okaloosa	+112
Okeechobee	+249
Orange	+116
Osceola	+168

Summary of increased allocations under conference report on H.R. 69 for title I, compared to last year's allocation—Cont.

	Percent change
Palm Beach	+105
Pasco	+169
Pinellas	+99
Polk	+166
Putnam	+149
St. Johns	+124
St. Lucie	+108
Santa Rosa	+135
Sarasota	+149
Seminole	+79
Sumter	+118
Suwannee	+92
Taylor	+108
Union	+76
Volusia	+124
Wakulla	+127
Walton	+45
Washington	+92
State total	+107

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill because elementary and secondary students, as well as adults all over the country, will benefit from the programs contained in H.R. 69. Education cannot be stagnant and by being forced to live under another continuing resolution education will not have a chance to keep up with today's problems and hopes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for the conference report on H.R. 69. This legislation contains authorizations for virtually every program of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education. It is a solid bill, representing countless hours of substantive work by the Education Committees of both the House and the Senate. The programs it authorizes play a major role in the educational life of our Nation. Further delay, as I am sure my colleagues have been told by their State and local government officials and school administrators, will present almost insurmountable planning difficulties to those who have been forced for too long to labor under the uncertainty of continuing resolutions.

I would like to discuss just a few of the key areas where H.R. 69 strengthens current Federal educational efforts.

There is a long needed revision of the title I formula for aid to educationally disadvantaged children. This compensatory education program is the heart of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act and constitutes the bulk of Federal education funds available to the States. For too long the money has been maldistributed, based on an outdated census and on an outmoded formula. The more equitable formula found in H.R. 69 is strengthened by the inclusion of a special incentive fund, which rewards those States who spend from their own resources above the national average to finance elementary and secondary education.

For the first time there will be required funding for category C impact aid children, those living in federally subsidized public housing. Certainly schools which are impacted with large numbers of these children have a greater need, and the special needs of these children are recognized in the requirement that this impact aid money be spent for compensatory programs and projects.

I am especially pleased that the bill replaces the current title VII with a greatly expanded and improved bilingual education program which includes: Increased funding for bilingual education projects on the elementary, secondary and preschool level; a bilingual vocational training program; an expanded program for the training of bilingual education teachers and other educational personnel; an in-depth research program by the National Institute of Education to develop better teaching methods and materials; a national survey of the number of children and adults with limited English speaking ability and the extent to which they are being served by Federal, State and local programs; and a strengthened independent National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education which will insure meaningful input from those most directly concerned with the implementation of the above programs.

Another vital step taken in this bill is the initiation of a major program for education for the handicapped. The bill also includes a new national reading improvement program and a consolidation provision which will simplify the paperwork and administration of the current categorical programs.

I ask my colleagues to approve the conference report so that we can get on with the task of educating our children.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, we in the House of Representatives will vote on the conference report on H.R. 69 which extends and amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is extremely important that we adopt this conference report today. H.R. 69 reaffirms our commitment to better educational opportunities for the underprivileged in our society. The consolidation program in the bill will make it easier to obtain Federal funds for our local school districts.

Far and away the most important provision in the bill is the section providing aid for physically, mentally and emotionally handicapped children. Today only about 40 percent of the more than 7 million handicapped children in the United States receive moneys under title I. This bill will extend coverage under this program to a great percentage of the handicapped children who are not receiving special assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to join me in providing this much needed assistance to the underprivileged and handicapped children of our society by voting for the conference report on H.R. 69.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, way back on March 27 of this year, this House approved H.R. 69, to extend and amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The bill passed by a margin of 380 to 26, and I was pleased to be among those voting in favor of the measure. I did so for several reasons: It provided assistance to school systems throughout my district according to a formula which will benefit the children there substantially. It contained impact aid provisions which are of critical importance to a number of school districts in the area I represent. And to top it all off, the icing on the cake was a set of antibusing provisions which offered real hope for releasing our Nation's children from the cruel burden of forced busing.

We all know the grim history of the bill following our approval of it on that day in March. The other body failed to approve language regarding busing which was identical to ours by a single vote, 46 to 47. They sent a much weaker busing "prohibition" to conference committee, and their conferees, representing those who had been part of that bare one-vote majority, consistently refused to accept the antibusing language which was so nearly approved by the other body as a whole. Three times this House voted overwhelmingly, by a 2-to-1 margin, to instruct our conferees to insist on the strong House antibusing language. But after a 2-month impasse, the conferees accepted what has been termed a "compromise" in this language.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to state now, for the RECORD, that this language is not worthy of being termed a "compromise," and that it is very little better than no antibusing language at all. The conference version of the bill before us this afternoon represents essentially the Senate version insofar as busing is concerned.

The Ashbrook amendment, which has been adopted by this House several times in recent years, would have prohibited the use of any Federal funds for busing. But the version now before us permits the use of impact aid funds for this express purpose. We cannot approve this language, and then go home and tell our constituents that we have done everything in our power to establish a Federal policy which rejects busing as a proper and viable method of treating America's schoolchildren.

The Esch amendment, adopted by this House overwhelmingly, would prohibit the busing of a child to any school other than that school closest or second closest to his home. On first glance, this provision appears to be contained in the bill now before us. But in fact, it includes an engraved invitation to the courts to ignore this provision entirely, simply by saying that the 5th or 14th amendments to the Constitution may be invoked as a reason for busing as far as the court may wish. Thus, instead of establishing a hard and fast congressional position in opposition to busing as a means of pursuing some absurd notion of mathematical racial balance in schools, we will instead be saying to the courts, "go ahead and bus to your heart's delight if your interpretation of the law differs from ours."

I think it is important to reflect for a moment on just what the Constitution says in this area. The 14th amendment states that no person shall be deprived of equal protection under the law, and in far too many cases around the country, Federal courts have ruled that a de facto situation where attendance at certain schools is heavily black or heavily white constitutes denial of this constitutionally guaranteed equal protection.

Now none of us will deny that in cases where school attendance district lines have been demonstrably drawn for the express purpose of creating schools which are predominantly black or white, the civil rights of those students are being violated. But this falls into the category known as de jure segregation, and is a completely different animal. And even here, the situation can be corrected by fairly and equitably redrawing the district boundaries to reflect neighborhood areas, not by busing these children miles from their homes.

The position of this House is clear. We have consistently voted according to a view of the Constitution which holds that efforts to consciously segregate schools on the part of localities is wrong, but that simply allowing a child to attend a school near his home does not constitute any willful effort to segregate schools, nor does it violate that child's civil rights.

In fact, to bus schoolchildren many miles from their homes simply to pursue a game of mathematical balancing is to violate the civil rights of those children, not the other way around. The very distinguished Senator from North Carolina, Mr. ERVIN, argued this point convincingly on the floor of the other body just 1 week ago. The Senator is a man widely regarded for his expertise and judgment when it comes to matters of constitutional law, and he told his fellow Senators:

> When a court orders a school board to bus children solely for the purpose of integrating their bodies rather than enlightening their minds, the court orders the school board to violate the equal protection clause in two respects.
>
> In the first place, the court states to the school board, "You must divide all the schoolchildren in this school attendance zone or district into two groups. You may let the first group attend their neighborhood schools in their school attendance zone or district, but you must deny the second group of children the right to attend their neighborhood schools in their attendance zone or district." That is an order from the court to the school board to violate the equal protection clause because it clearly orders the school board to treat in a different manner children similarly situated, in that all of them are residents of the attendance zone or district in question.
>
> In the second place, the court orders the school board in a schoolbusing decree to violate the equal protection clause in an additional way. The court says to the school board, "The reason you have to divide these children into these two groups and must deny equal protection of the law treatment to the second group is that you must bus the second group to schools elsewhere, either to increase the number of children of their race in the schools elsewhere or to decrease the number of children of their race in their neighborhood schools."
>
> Oceans of judicial sophistry cannot wash out the plain fact that is denying the children who are ordered to be bused the right to attend certain schools solely on account of their race, and that is exactly what the Supreme Court held in Brown against Board of Education of Topeka to be unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted extensively from the Senator from North Carolina's remarks because they express so well the truly relevant constitutional considerations to which I believe most of us subscribe.

By adopting the conference bill before us this afternoon we will be turning our backs on this position, and will instead be inviting the courts to go on ruling as they have so often in direct contravention to the interpretation so well articulated by Senator ERVIN. I, for one, cannot condone such a move.

Finally, the conference committee deleted a set of provisions now commonly known as the reopening clause. The House had adopted language which directed the courts to reopen cases where busing had already been ordered, and review those cases in light of these newly enacted laws regarding busing. The Senate replaced the word "shall" with the word "may," an alteration which renders the provision meaningless. The courts "may" already reopen such cases if they wish. The House language would direct them to do so, and would establish a uniform policy regarding busing and the courts throughout the Nation. But the language before us here this afternoon will merely say, "For those of you who have not yet come under a court order to bus, here is some relief. For those of you who have already been ordered to bus, tough luck."

Clearly, the antibusing language in the bill before us here today bears little resemblance to the strong provisions we adopted back in March.

Thus, while I continue to strongly support many of the other provisions of H.R. 69, I am going to vote "no" on final passage of the conference report. I do so in the knowledge that a bill will quickly be resubmitted, and that in the near future our school districts will benefit from the many aid provisions contained in this act. But I believe we must show the other body that we are not willing to give in on the drive to curb forced busing, and that we do not consider an arrangement in which we give the other body 90 percent of what it wants in this area a compromise. I urge the Members to vote down this bill, in order that we may move quickly to adopt a more acceptable measure in accordance with the wishes of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the House has received the conference report on H.R. 69 and today will vote on this important educational funding measure as agreed to by the conferees. The committee has worked diligently and deserves praise for the many forward-looking provisions they have included.

I rise to question the committee's action on impact aid to public schools: Public Law 81–874. This program, signed into law by President Truman, was designed to assist local school districts encompassing Federal installations so that they would not suffer financial losses. This administration has attempted to phase out impact aid, yet the fact remains that this program is the closest thing to revenue sharing and block grants to come before this Congress.

States like California with 46 percent of its land federally owned and my own Second Congressional District with over 50 percent Federal lands stand to lose a great deal of Federal financial support for our already money-troubled schools. Where will these school people go to absorb losses? California law recently enacted severely restricts the ability of local education agencies to increase their property tax rates, and the State has not demonstrated its willingness to increase State support to even keep pace with inflation.

Of particular concern to schools in my district are the changes agreed to in the civilian 3B categories. While the Second Congressional District of California had 3,235 ADA in fiscal year 1974 from military-connected families, there were 6,362 students in daily attendance from civilian families who worked on federally connected projects. Certainly, these rural and suburban districts can ill afford to lose between 10 and 20 percent of the Public Law 874 funds next year or any other.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the serious impact which the bill before us will have in connection with the impact aid program. I intend to support the legislation because it is an omnibus bill with a great deal of merit and value to not only the Second Congressional District of California, but to all of California and the Nation, but I do express the clear hope that ultimately a more adequate program of impacted aid under the provisions of Public Law 81–874 and Public Law 81–815 can be enacted by this Congress.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court recently issued a decision concerning the busing of schoolchildren. The Court ruled that children could not be bused across city lines in order to desegregate schools. The only time this would be permissible is in the case where the district lines had been drawn solely on the basis of race and, therefore, is unconstitutional. This decision is an attempt to solidify the neighborhood school system and by doing so, strengthen it by dealing with its problems in fuller detail than in the past.

In the education bill before us, there are provisions that adhere to and embrace the Supreme Court decision. These set forth the decree that children can not be bused to a school that is farther than the second closest to their homes. By doing this, the children would once again be in a neighborhood school environment, which is sound and productive. The provisions, of course, take into account constitutional and civil rights; however it makes clear that busing schoolchildren is not a productive solution to the problems that are facing a fair and sound education for all.

For many years I have opposed the busing of schoolchildren. I feel that it is more than an inconvience, it is potentially dangerous to the well being of the children; and is unproductive. The answer to the problems lies not in busing but in upgrading the educational facilities and providing an avenue of special training for those children who are in need of it; including such areas as reading disabilities, language problems, Spanish and Italian speaking teachers to help those children who have a problem with English. These are of course, but a few areas of need.

Many people, not only in my district, but throughout the country, choose their homes for their proximity to a school for their children. These people should have the right to be able to have their children attend school as close to home as possible. The neighborhood school creates less stress on a child and the parents. This harmony should not be upset, unless it is absolutely necessary; which it is not, as the Supreme Court has pointed out.

The busing of schoolchildren does not guarantee better education. In fact, there are no conclusive studies that suggests it does. Our experience with this question, has, I believe, shown us that busing is not a viable or productive alternative. It cannot and does not deal with the root of the problem of better education. Better education for all can only be achieved by supplying the needs in each school. It cannot be achieved by skirting the issue and moving people around and juggling them as if they were pieces on a chessboard. I support this education bill and urge by colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support of H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974. This bill extends the many excellent provisions such as adult, bilingual, and Indian education programs through 1978, thus giving a necessary sense of certainty to the future of these programs. I also commend the extension through 1977 of the Education of the Handicapped Act, and the extension through 1976 of the Emergency School Aid Act.

However, I must express my continued and vehement opposition to the busing provisions contained in this bill. I have always opposed any attempts at the forced busing of schoolchildren, but I feel that the many outstanding features of the rest of the bill outweigh the negative provisions on busing. I am, therefore, compelled to vote in favor of H.R. 69.

Despite my strong opposition to forced busing, I feel the conferees have reached a tolerable compromise on this much-disputed issue. This report would not allow a child to be bused farther than the next closest school, except in extreme cases. If we must have busing, this, at least is a livable alternative to the problem of disrupting a child's life by transporting him miles from his home.

We must always keep uppermost in our considerations the welfare of the children involved. Therefore, I certainly applaud the provision which states that if a child is to be bused, the parents must be notified by the beginning of the school year. It is most important that a child have a sense of security and permanence during the formative years. It is unsettling for a child to be separated from a familiar teacher and friends in the middle of a school year.

Also to be commended is the provision of the Special Projects Act which calls for new and much needed programs, including women's educational equity, career education, consumer education, and many more.

I am also happy to see a provision which withholds funds from institutions which deny parents the right to inspect their children's files, and gives parents the right to a hearing to contest school records. We cannot stand by and allow capricious and arbitrary grading and disciplinary policies. In this highly competitive age, parents and children should have the right to question records which can seriously affect their futures.

Similarly, I commend the provision which denies funds to schools which release records, without parental consent, to other than educational officials. Such a policy is a blatant violation of the individual's right to privacy. I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in support of this conference report.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House of Representatives to vote against the adoption of this conference report because of the language in title II dealing with the issue of forced busing.

Time and time again this body has voted to halt the forced busing of our schoolchildren. In three specific instances, we have instructed, by overwhelming votes, our conferees to insist on the strong antibusing langauage of the Esch amendment.

The House-passed language would prohibit forced busing of any student beyond the next nearest school. The House version would also require existing court-ordered busing cases to be reopened.

The report, as my colleagues know, does not contain this language. I urge its rejection, and I also urge the Congress to act on my constitutional amendment which will once and for all end forced busing.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Education Amendments of 1974. The passage of this bill is important to me as a strong supporter of education legislation; and it is equally important to the many, many migrant, bilingual, and low-income children of my district.

One of the most apparent drawbacks of an agricultural area has been the lack of proper education provided the children of migrant farmworkers. Because the work of migrants requires several changes of residence in the course of a year, the provision authorizing the use of the migrant student record transfer system will make it easier for the children to enroll in the schools of the school district into which their families have moved. This system should act as an inducement to the children to resume their education following a move, because it will virtually eliminate the hassle of having to wait for school records to be forwarded from the school previously attended.

An area of concern to the 113,000 Spanish surname residents of my district is that of bilingual education. H.R. 69 authorizes increased funding for the development of bilingual education programs. In order to motivate the children of non-English-speaking families to further their education, it is necessary for bilingual programs to be improved. If we fail to improve these programs, we will only be encouraging an increase in unemployment and an increase in the welfare rolls.

Unfortunately, the children of the 18,000 families in my district who earn less than $5,000 a year endure the brunt of their family's misfortune. If low-income children are not afforded incentives to further their education, we can safely assume that they will become menial laborers or welfare cases when they reach adulthood. Therefore, I believe the special grants provisions to be a worthy section of ESEA. It will help provide the necessary incentive to the children of low-income families.

To a degree, these three areas are interrelated in my district. I have in the past, as I do now, supported measures which will minimize the educational disadvantages of these students. I am encouraged by the estimates of increased title I funding for my district, and confident that under the scrutinous supervision of the State of California, and local agencies, we will be able to correct these problem areas.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the liberal majority of the U.S. Senate has shown callous indifference to the will of the people by destroying the House amendments against forced busing for racial balance in the schools. The provisions on busing that emerge today from the House-Senate conference committee are so weak as to be nearly worthless, because the Federal courts are expressly invited to continue imposing racial quotas requiring mass busing.

On three different occasions, the House instructed its conferees to insist on the strong antibusing amendments which the House attached to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. But our conferees weakened when confronted with the liberal pressure from the Senate, and they have returned with a report that is extremely distasteful.

Mr. Speaker, none of us wants to kill legislation that provides funding authority for many worthwhile education programs. I am particularly interested in the program sponsored by Senator J. GLENN BEALL, JR., of Maryland, to concentrate on developing reading skills in our children. However, it is equally important that we stop the tyranny of forced, mass busing that has disrupted education in school districts across the land. We must protect the neighborhood school as the best institution for the education of our children.

Let us send this conference report back to the Senate with instructions to accept the strong antibusing amendments originally adopted by the House. If the Senate kills this legislation by refusing to accept the House provisions against forced busing, then the Senate must answer to the public for its irresponsibility. The quality of education in school systems throughout this country has been damaged by mass busing plans ordered by Federal courts and bureaucrats of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In Maryland, Prince Georges County is forced to bus more than 20,000 students away from their neighborhood schools for racial balancing of enrollment in every school.

Anne Arundel County and other counties are under increasing pressure to abandon neighborhood schools for the

social experimentation of racial balancing.

Baltimore City is in a condition verging on civil crisis because Federal bureaucrats backed by court order are forcing mass transfers of students for racial balance.

Every poll I have seen shows that at least 80 percent of the American people, including the people of my Fourth Congressional District, are against forced busing for racial balance. Yet, the Senate has continued to substitute its judgment for that of the people, making a mockery of the concept of representative government.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the House to instruct the Senate in the meaning of representative government.

Mr HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to two major provisions of the conference report on H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1974.

The first of these provisions has to do with the forced busing of schoolchildren for the purpose of achieving racial balance.

The House of Representatives adopted by an overwhelming margin some very strong antibusing language when this bill was considered last spring. That language established a national policy that the neighborhood school principle was to be adhered to as faithfully as possible.

We provided seven means of desegregation which were to be exhausted before busing was even to be considered as a remedy, and even then, busing was proscribed beyond the next nearest school.

That was good language, strong language, effective language. This House thought so much of that language that on three separate occasions, we voted to instruct our conferees that our language be retained in the final conference report. The votes on those motions were 270 to 103 on June 5, 281 to 128 on June 27, and 261 to 122 on July 22.

There is no way the House could have made its position clearer on this issue, and yet we find our position severely compromised, if not totally emasculated, by a provision inserted by the Senate and acceded to by our thrice-instructed conferees.

That provision states that if all of these remedies, including busing to the next nearest school, fail in a court's opinion to guarantee the constitutional right of equal protection to our schoolchildren, then much more extensive busing will be permissible.

The Supreme Court last week ruled against busing across school district lines in the Detroit case, but apparently any amount of forced busing within a school district—no matter how great the distance—will continue to be permissible.

This is clearly not what the House intended, and it is a bitter pill for us to swallow, especially when we went to such great lengths to insist on our position.

Furthermore, the original House version included a "reopener" clause to allow school districts now under court busing orders to reopen their cases in an effort to find a means short of forced busing to comply with this bill's new desegregation standards.

That clause is nowhere to be found in this conference report, which means that school districts like the one in Prince Georges County, Md., will get no relief from the heavy administrative, transportation and social costs that massive busing involves.

To require these school districts already under court orders to continue extensive busing programs, and then allow other school districts with similar desegration problems to remedy them in less drastic and expensive ways is patently unfair, and this conference report is seriously deficient and quite hypocritical in this regard.

The second provision with which I take issue is that involving impacted aid for school systems with heavy concentrations of Federal employees' children.

When we passed this impact aid section last March 27, we did so by an overwhelming margin of 276 to 129, and that solid victory for extension of impact aid programs through 1977 was well deserved.

The Committee on Education and Labor had recommended phasing out the impact-aid programs at the end of fiscal 1975, despite the fact that other programs under ESEA were granted an extension to 1977. The basic unfairness of this proposal was obvious to a sizable majority of the House membership, and rightly so.

The basis for the committee's opposition to a longer extension for impact aid was a belief that these programs were providing unfair advantages for some school systems that were not afforded to other school systems, and that the impact aid program itself might be outmoded.

But the committee called for further study of these allegations to determine what the future of impact aid should be, and 1 year is simply not enough time to conduct the extensive and definitive study that should be made.

The House rectified this situation in March, with an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

But that language does not appear in the conference report before us today, and this is a second very serious deficiency.

Still, the conference report does not include programs that merit the enthusiastic support of the House. Programs for adult education, reading improvements, payments for certain veterans' instruction, education of the handicapped and the disadvantaged, and other worthwhile provisions compel me to support this conference report, even over my strong objection to the two sections mentioned earlier.

Education is probably the most important resource we have in this country, and it is incumbent upon this House and this Congress to provide the measure of Federal assistance required to insure its success and its continuing improvement.

This legislation in its present form is far from ideal, but it is apparently the best we shall have in this Congress, and I urge its passage.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 69, the Education Amendments of 1974.

On March 26, 1974, by a vote of 293 to 112, the House of Representatives adopted an amendment to this bill to ban the busing of schoolchildren except to the schools closest, or next closest, to their homes. The amendment also contained a "reopener" provision which would allow courts to reopen cases in which school districts are already busing in order to assure that desegregation plans are in compliance with the limitations imposed by this amendment.

In spite of this explicit amendment, House conferees ignored the will of the House and dropped completely the "reopener" provision. In addition to that, the conferees diluted the remaining language of the amendment to such that the courts are practically invited to nullify or ignore it.

I am disappointed with the action of the House conferees, because the House position against forced busing did not prevail, despite the fact that the conferees were instructed by the House on three separate occasions not to knuckle under the provisions of the Senate. Since the House conferees failed to uphold the House position, the issue of forced busing has not been resolved, and the view of the American people against forced busing has not prevailed in this conference report.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article that appeared on July 24 in the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Congress Conferees Sidestep Busing Issue." This article accurately analyzes the empty compromise over busing reached by the Conferees—a compromise which gives the appearance of prohibiting forced busing, but which in reality does not prohibit forced busing, and instead leaves the "basic controversy unresolved." The article follows:

CONGRESS CONFEREES SIDESTEP BUSING ISSUE: ALTHOUGH SENATE-HOUSE GROUPS AGREE, WORDING OF BILL LEAVES IT UP TO THE COURTS

(By Robert P. Hey)

WASHINGTON.—An inside look into the sought-after congressional compromise over busing shows that the basic controversy remains unresolved. Still at issue: Is busing required to protect the constitutional rights of black children?

If the courts continue to hold that it is, as they have in the past, then the Senate conferees appear once again to have gotten their House counterparts to accept an agreement that appears to be against busing but really would not prohibit it.

The compromise says essentially that courts cannot require that children be bused farther than the second-nearest school to their homes—except when the courts hold that such busing is necessary to protect the constitutional rights of black children.

This important exception was proposed by Senate conferees. Senate sources who insist

on anonymity admit that the purpose of this exception was to nullify completely the staunch anti-busing legislation proposed by the House conferees.

There's an additional reason for uncertainty over busing. For the past month those deeply involved in the busing issue have awaited the Supreme Court's pending decision or whether courts legally may require that children from one local school district be bused into another district. No one here is certain when this decision will come.

Sources here declare that this cross-district busing will be required if inner-city schools are to integrate, in those large cities now turning 50 percent or more black—Atlanta, Washington, and so on.

If the Supreme Court should reject court-ordered cross-district busing, sources here hold, it would not long be possible for such large cities to integrate their schools via busing or any other means.

At stake are the futures of hundreds of thousands of American schoolchildren. If the high court does not issue its ruling in a very few weeks, sources here say, it would not be possible for large-city school districts to integrate with nearby suburbs via busing until the middle of the coming school year, at the earliest.

SOURCE OF CONTROVERSY

In their meetings over the past month, congressional conferees nominally were working on the federal government's major bill authorizing aid to elementary and secondary education—$25 billion over four years. But the real controversy lay over the busing question.

Three times House members had instructed their conferees not to abandon the tought anti-busing measures passed by the House. The most recent such vote was July 21, by a 2-to-1 margin.

In this stance the House reflects the nation's general antibusing stance. For instance, last September a Gallup poll reported only 5 percent of persons surveyed picked busing as the best way to integrate schools. At the same time only 18 percent of Americans, according to the poll, opposed public-school integration.

For many Senate conferees, who find busing more acceptable, the question became: How can we include wording which will negate the antibusing provisions? They hit on the idea of an exception for busing to assure constitutional rights of black children, and House conferees bought it.

FREE REIN

In the view of one such Senate source, this gives the courts "free rein" to order busing and renders the busing prohibition meaningless. He notes that in the late 1960's the Supreme Court in a landmark busing case unanimously upheld court-ordered busing and said one reason it can be court-ordered is to protect the rights of black Americans guaranteed by the Constitution.

I am also deeply concerned by the failure of the conferees to adopt language in title III of the bill guaranteeing the rights of parents and students not to participate in behavior modification and sensitivity training programs. Many of these programs are of dubious and unproven value and I feel that parents should at least have the right to object in writing if they do not wish their children to participate.

It is deplorable that even this mild provision was completely eliminated by the conferees.

I, therefore, call upon my colleagues to reject this so-called compromise bill, send it back to the conference committee, and insist on these House-passed sections of the legislation, which so obviously reflect the will of the American people on these issues.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 69 is, with some exceptions essentially the bill the House passed in March. At that time, I spoke at length on the need for this legislation. I would like to take this opportunity to comment briefly on some of the issues affected by the measure.

Particularly important is that the bill provides a new entitlement formula for assistance to the educationally disadvantaged under title I. The new formula is far more realistic and responsive to the needs of our Nation's students.

I am pleased that the conference report includes the continuation of funding for Public Law 874 until 1978, when it will begin to be phased out. This, at least, gives local school boards the ability to budget with some authority, instead of the hypothetical guesswork they have had to contend with in the past. I would like to stress, however, that this transitional period in phasing out Public Law 874, must be used to develop an alternate formula so students will not be denied a quality education just because their parents are public servants.

The conferees adopted extensive revision of the existing bilingual education programs. Bilingual education has been recognized as essential if we are to provide an equal educational opportunity for all children. The legislation allows for a national assessment of our methods and techniques and clearly outlines the importance of keeping these children in the regular classroom and involving the parents in the program.

The conferees adopted most of the House provisions regarding consolidation of several of the programs in the bill. I strongly favor this approach and hope it is indicative of the future trend toward giving greater flexibility to local administrators and teachers even in those areas where funding is provided by the Federal Government.

Finally, let me conclude by saying that we are extremely late in reaching the point we are at today. This legislation has been before the Congress far too long. If there is one area of educational funding that must be immediately improved it is the lack of timeliness on the part of the Federal Government in making its financial commitments.

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

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will join a majority of my colleagues in approving the conference report on the bill H.R. 69. Our action will clear this legislation for the President's signature after many months of consideration in Congress. The complex bill before us is far from perfect. I disagree with several of the compromises which were reached in conference, most particularly on the issue of school desegregation.

Yet America's schools have operated for far too long under the uncertainty of continuing resolutions. Innovative educational programs and refinements of existing programs have awaited passage of a comprehensive education bill by Congress. The legislation before us authorizes nearly $25 billion in Federal aid to education. It makes great strides toward educating the handicapped, the non-English speaking, and children of migratory workers. It provides for a new national reading improvement program to end the problem of illiteracy in our Nation. It authorizes a White House Conference on Education, to be held in 1977, which will provide a foundation for educational policymaking in the years ahead. Important existing programs, including impact aid and Indian education, are refined and strengthened by H.R. 69.

There are, to be sure, provisions in this bill which raise serious questions of policy and constitutional law. I am deeply troubled by those sections which seek to regulate the remedies which courts may order in school desegregation cases, particularly the so-called antibusing provisions.

The House has had occasion in the past to debate this issue at length. When proposals were made which would unequivocally interfere with the judicial power to formulate a remedy for unconstitutional segregation, I have consistently voted against such attempts to arrest the desegregation process. I do not join with those who would impede the pursuit of equal educational opportunities without regard to race or color.

But the antibusing provisions we have before us are of a different order. They, in effect, would direct courts to desegregate schools using devices in an order of priority, with busing as a last resort. This, of course, is the manner in which judges have operated in the past. There is nothing inherently good or bad about busing; it is a tool to correct the racially discriminatory patterns of the past. If other remedial techniques are available which will satisfy the Constitution, then busing is unnecessary.

H.R. 69 is not designed to undermine the function of the courts in adjudicating constitutional rights. Section 203(b) states without reservation that—

> The provisions of this title are not intended to modify or diminish the authority of the courts of the United States to enforce fully the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

That language clearly demonstrates the congressional intent to leave with the courts the final determination of what the Constitution requires.

That the judicial branch is the final arbiter of constitutional controversies has been made only too plain in recent days. Whatever lingering doubts may have been harbored by those who would assign that responsibility elsewhere were laid to rest by the decision of the Supreme Court in United States against Nixon. In that case, a unanimous Court reminded the Congress as well as the President, as John Marshall observed over 170 years ago, that—

It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.

Thus the provisions of H.R. 69 which would, for example, restrict the use of busing, sections 215, 251, and 252; delay the implementation of desegregation orders, sections 218, 253, 258, and 259; prohibit interdistrict desegregation where the Constitution requires it, sections 216, and 257; and bar the use of Federal funds for transporting students, section 252, must be read restrictively to avoid an unconstitutional interference with the judicial function. While I deplore the inclusion of these provisions in the legislation before us, I trust that the courts will not allow them to be used in contravention of established legal precedent in the area of civil rights.

School desegregation cases have been in the courts for many years. They are not new to the judiciary. The scope of the constitutional right and remedy has been defined with some precision. We do not legislate in the area of novel doctrine. Only a few years ago the Supreme Court invalidated an antibusing law which "would inescapably operate to obstruct the remedies" constitutionally required to remove the vestiges of the dual school system based on race. (*North Carolina State Board of Education* v. *Swann*, 402 U.S. 43 (1971). It is that decision and others which compel us to include in this bill the exception set forth in section 203 (b). We could not do otherwise without being unfaithful to the Constitution.

I could support this legislation far more enthusiastically if it did not include the antibusing provisions I have discussed. Yet, I believe it would be far worse to recommit H.R. 69 and start all over again. The prospect of reverting to funding education programs through continuing resolutions for another year is a dismal one, indeed. More over, antibusing amendments could be attached to such resolutions as readily as they have been added to the legislation before us. I believe that the approval of this conference report is a necessary stop toward reaching the goal of providing an adequate education to all Americans.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that he was in doubt.

Mr. QUIE. 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 323, nays 83, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

YEAS—323

Abdnor	Badillo	Bowen
Abzug	Bafalis	Brademas
Adams	Barrett	Bray
Addabbo	Bell	Breaux
Anderson, Calif.	Bergland	Breckinridge
	Bevill	Brooks
Anderson, Ill.	Biester	Broomfield
Andrews, N.C.	Bingham	Brotzman
Andrews, N. Dak.	Blatnik	Brown, Calif.
	Boggs	Brown, Mich.
Ashley	Boland	Brown, Ohio
Aspin	Bolling	Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan	Howard	Reid
Burgener	Hudnut	Reuss
Burke, Calif.	Hungate	Rhodes
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Riegle
Burleson, Tex.	Ichord	Rinaldo
Burlison, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts
Burton, John	Johnson, Colo.	Robison, N.Y.
Burton, Phillip	Johnson, Pa.	Rodino
Byron	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Carney, Ohio	Jones, Okla.	Rogers
Casey, Tex.	Jordan	Roncalio, Wyo.
Cederberg	Karth	Roncalio, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Kastenmeier	Rooney, Pa.
Chappell	Kazen	Rose
Clark	Kemp	Rosenthal
Clausen, Don H.	Ketchum	Roush
	King	Roy
Cleveland	Kluczynski	Roybal
Cohen	Koch	Runnels
Collins, Ill.	Kyros	Ruppe
Conable	Lagomarsino	Ryan
Corman	Leggett	St Germain
Cotter	Lehman	Sarasin
Coughlin	Lent	Sarbanes
Cronin	Litton	Scherle
Daniels, Dominick V.	Long, La.	Schneebeli
	Long, Md.	Schroeder
Danielson	Lujan	Sebelius
Davis, S.C.	Luken	Seiberling
Davis, Wis.	McClory	Shipley
Delaney	McCloskey	Shoup
Dellenback	McCollister	Shriver
Denholm	McCormack	Sikes
Dennis	McDade	Sisk
Dent	McEwen	Skubitz
Derwinski	McFall	Slack
Dickinson	McKay	Smith, Iowa
Donohue	McKinney	Smith, N.Y.
Dorn	Macdonald	Staggers
Drinan	Madden	Stanton, J. William
Dulski	Madigan	
Duncan	Mallary	Stanton, James V.
du Pont	Mann	
Eckhardt	Maraziti	Stark
Edwards, Ala.	Mathias, Calif.	Steele
Edwards, Calif.	Matsunaga	Steiger, Wis.
Erlenborn	Mayne	Stephens
Eshleman	Mazzoli	Stokes
Evans, Colo.	Meeds	Stratton
Fascell	Melcher	Studds
Findley	Metcalfe	Sullivan
Fish	Mezvinsky	Symington
Fisher	Michel	Talcott
Flood	Milford	Taylor, Mo.
Flowers	Miller	Taylor, N.C.
Foley	Mills	Thompson, N.J.
Forsythe	Minish	Thomson, Wis.
Fountain	Mink	Thone
Fraser	Minshall, Ohio	Thornton
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell, Md.	Towell, Nev.
Frenzel	Mitchell, N.Y.	Traxler
Frey	Mollohan	Udall
Froehlich	Moorhead, Calif.	Ullman
Fuqua		Van Deerlin
Gaydos	Moorhead, Pa.	Vander Jagt
Giaimo	Morgan	Vanik
Gibbons	Mosher	Veysey
Gilman	Moss	Vigorito
Goldwater	Murphy, Ill.	Waldie
Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.	Walsh
Grasso	Murtha	Whalen
Gray	Myers	White
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Widnall
Grover	Nelsen	Wiggins
Gubser	Nichols	Williams
Gude	Nix	Wilson, Bob
Guyer	Obey	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Haley	O'Brien	
Hamilton	Owens	
Hammer-schmidt	Parris	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
	Patten	
Hanley	Pepper	Winn
Hanrahan	Perkins	Wolff
Harrington	Pettis	Wright
Harsha	Peyser	Wyatt
Hastings	Pickle	Wydler
Hawkins	Pike	Wylie
Hays	Podell	Wyman
Hechler, W. Va.	Powell, Ohio	Yates
Heckler, Mass.	Preyer	Yatron
Heinz	Price, Ill.	Young, Alaska
Helstoski	Price, Tex.	Young, Fla.
Henderson	Pritchard	Young, Ga.
Hicks	Quie	Young, Ill.
Hillis	Quillen	Young, Tex.
Hinshaw	Railsback	Zablocki
Hogan	Randall	Zion
Holtzman	Rangel	Zwach
Horton	Rees	
Hosmer	Regula	

NAYS—83

Alexander	Armstrong	Bauman
Annunzio	Ashbrook	Beard
Archer	Baker	Bennett
Biaggi	Fulton	Patman
Blackburn	Gettys	Poage
Brinkley	Ginn	Rarick
Broyhill, N.C.	Goodling	Robinson, Va.
Burke, Mass.	Gross	Rousselot
Butler	Hébert	Ruth
Camp	Holt	Sandman
Clancy	Huber	Satterfield
Clawson, Del	Hutchinson	Shuster
Cochran	Jarman	Snyder
Collier	Jones, Tenn.	Spence
Collins, Tex.	Kuykendall	Steed
Conlan	Landgrebe	Steelman
Conyers	Latta	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	Lott	Stubblefield
Daniel, Dan	Mahon	Stuckey
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Martin, Nebr.	Symms
	Martin, N.C.	Teague
Dellums	Mathis, Ga.	Treen
Devine	Mizell	Waggonner
Dingell	Moakley	Wampler
Downing	Montgomery	Ware
Esch	Nedzi	Whitehurst
Flynt	O'Hara	Whitten
Ford	Passman	Young, S.C.

NOT VOTING—28

Arends	Diggs	Jones, Ala.
Brasco	Eilberg	Landrum
Carey, N.Y.	Evins, Tenn.	McSpadden
Carter	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill
Chisholm	Griffiths	Rooney, N.Y.
Clay	Gunter	Rostenkowski
Conte	Hanna	Tiernan
Culver	Hansen, Idaho	Vander Veen
Davis, Ga.	Hansen, Wash.	
de la Garza	Holifield	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Carey of New York for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Davis of Georgia.

Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Clay with Mr. Brasco.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Hanna with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Gunter with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Holifield.

Mr. Vender Veen with Mr. Conte.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. McSpadden.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Evins of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate (S. 2665) entitled "An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association," with an amendment in which concurrence of the House is requested.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 570, AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 69

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PROVIDING FOR INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the Senate bill (S. 2665) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, with a Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Page 2, line 4, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "[No rule,]" and insert: "No provision of any law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and no rule,".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendments was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 570, AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 69

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 570).

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 69, Education Amendments of 1974.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING COMPREHENSIVE, COORDINATED APPROACH TO PROBLEMS OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 821) to improve the quality of juvenile justice in the United States and to provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 821

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974".

TITLE I—FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 101. (a) Section titled "Declaration and Purpose" in title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 197; 84 Stat. 1881; 87 Stat. 197), is amended by inserting immediately after the second paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"Congress finds further that the high incidence of delinquency in the United States today results in enormous annual cost and immeasurable loss in human life, personal security, and wasted human resources, and (2) that juvenile delinquency constitutes a growing threat to the national welfare requiring immediate and comprehensive action by the Federal Government to reduce and prevent delinquency."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"It is therefore the further declared policy of Congress to provide the necessary resources, leadership, and coordination of (1) develop and implement effective methods of preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency; (2) to develop and conduct effective programs to prevent delinquency, to divert juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system and to provide critically needed alternatives, to institutionalization; (3) to improve the quality of juvenile justice in the United States; and (4) to increase the capacity of State and local governments and public and private agencies to conduct effective juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and rehabilitation programs and to provide research, evaluation, and training services in the field of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 103. Section 601 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 197; 84 Stat. 1881; 87 Stat. 197), is further amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(p) the term 'community based' facility, program, or service, as used in part F, means a small, open group or home or other suitable place located near the adult offender's or juvenile's home or family and programs of community supervision and service which maintain community and consumer participation in the planning, operation, and evaluation of their programs which may include, but are not limited to, medical, educational, vocational, social, and psychological guidance, training, counseling, drug treatment, and other rehabilitative services;

"(q) the term 'Federal juvenile delinquency program' means any juvenile delinquincy program which is conducted directly, or indirectly, or is assisted by any Federal department or agency, including any program funded under this Act;

"(r) the term 'juvenile delinquency program' means any program or activity related to juvenile delinquency prevention, control, diversion, treatment, rehabilitation, planning, education, training, and research, including drug abuse programs; the improvement of the juvenile justice system; and any program or activity for neglected, abandoned, or dependent youth and other youth who are in danger of becoming delinquent."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY ACT

SEC. 201. Section 5031 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5031. Definitions

"For the purpose of this chapter, a 'juvenile' is a person who has not attained his eighteenth birthday, or for the purpose of proceedings and disposition under this chapter for an alleged act of juvenile delinquency, a person who has not attained his twenty-first birthday, and 'juvenile delinquency' is the violation of a law of the United States committed by a person prior to his eighteenth birthday which would have been a crime if committed by an adult."

DELINQUENCY PROCEEDINGS IN DISTRICT COURTS

SEC. 202. Section 5032 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5032. Delinquency proceedings in district courts; transfer for criminal prosecution

"A juvenile alleged to have committed an act of juvenile delinquency shall not be proceeded against in any court of the United States unless the Attorney General, after investigation, certifies to an appropriate district court of the United States that the juvenile court or other appropriate court of a State (1) does not have jurisdiction or refuses to assume jurisdiction over said juvenile with respects to such alleged act of juvenile delinquency, or (2) does not have available programs and services adequate for the needs of juveniles.

"If the Attorney General does not so certify, such juvenile shall be surrendered to the appropriate legal authorities of such State.

"If an alleged juvenile delinquent is not surrendered to the authorities of a State or the District of Columbia pursuant to this section, any proceedings against him shall be in an appropriate district court of the United States. For such purposes, the court may be convened at any time and place within the district, in chambers or otherwise. The Attorney General shall proceed by information, and no criminal prosecution shall be instituted for the alleged act of juvenile delinquency except as provided below.

"A juvenile who is alleged to have committed an act of juvenile delinquency and who is not surrendered to State authorities shall be proceeded against under this chapter unless he has requested in writing upon advice of counsel to be proceeded against as an adult, except that, with respect to a juvenile sixteen years and older alleged to have committed an act after his sixteenth birthday which if committed by an adult would be a felony punishable by a maximum penalty of ten years imprisonment or more, life imprisonment, or death, criminal prosecution on the basis of the alleged act may be begun by motion to transfer of the Attorney General in the appropriate district court of the United States, if such court finds, after hearing, such transfer would be in the interest of justice.

"Evidence of the following factors shall be considered, and findings with regard to each factor shall be made in the record, in assessing whether a transfer would be in the interest of justice: the age and social background of the juvenile; the nature of the alleged offense; the extent and nature of the juvenile's prior delinquency record; the juvenile's present intellectual development and psychological maturity; the nature of past treatment efforts and the juvenile's response to such efforts; the availability of programs

designed to treat the juvenile's behavioral problems.

"Reasonable notice of the transfer hearing shall be given to the juvenile, his parents, guardian, or custodian and to this counsel. The juvenile shall be assisted by counsel during the transfer hearing, and at every other critical stage of the proceedings.

"Once a juvenile has entered a plea of guilty or the proceeding has reached the stage that evidence has begun to be taken with respect to a crime or an alleged act of juvenile delinquency subsequent criminal prosecution or juvenile proceedings based upon such alleged act of delinquency shall be barred.

"Statements made by a juvenile prior to or during a transfer hearing under this section shall not be admissible at subsequent criminal prosecutions."

CUSTODY

SEC. 203. Section 5033 of title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5033. Custody prior to appearance before magistrate

"Whenever a juvenile is taken into custody for an alleged act of juvenile delinquency, the arresting officer shall immediately advise such juvenile of his legal rights, in language comprehensible to a juvenile, and shall immediately notify the Attorney General and the juvenile's parents, guardian, or custodian of such custody. The arresting officer shall also notify the parents, guardian, or custodian of the rights of the juvenile and of the nature of the alleged offense.

"The juvenile shall be taken before a magistrate forthwith. In no event shall the juvenile be detained for longer than a reasonable period of time before being brought before a magistrate."

DUTIES OF MAGISTRATE

SEC. 204. Section 5034 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5034. Duties of magistrate

"The magistrate shall insure that the juvenile is represented by counsel before proceeding with critical stages of the proceedings. Counsel shall be assigned to represent a juvenile when the juvenile and his parents, guardian, or custodian are financially unable to obtain adequate representation. In cases where the juvenile and his parents, guardian, or custodian are financially able to obtain adequate representation but have not retained counsel, the magistrate may assign counsel and order the payment of reasonable attorney's fees or may direct the juvenile, his parents, guardian, or custodian to retain private counsel within a specified period of time.

"The magistrate may appoint a guardian ad litem if a parent or guardian of the juvenile is not present, or if the magistrate has reason to believe that the parents or guardian will not cooperate with the juvenile in preparing for trial, or that the interests of the parents or guardian and those of the juvenile are adverse.

"If the juvenile has not been discharged before his initial appearance before the magistrate shall release the juvenile to his parents, guardian, custodian, or other responsible party (including, but not limited to, the director of a shelter-care facility) upon their promise to bring such juvenile before the appropriate court when requested by such court unless the magistrate determines, after hearing, at which the juvenile is represented by counsel, that the detention of such juvenile is required to secure his timely appearance before the appropriate court or to insure his safety or that of others."

DETENTION

SEC. 205. Section 5035 of this title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5035. Detention prior to disposition

"A juvenile alleged to be delinquent may be detained only in a juvenile facility or such other suitable place as the Attorney General may designate. Whenever possible, detention shall be in a foster home or community based facility located in or near his home community. The Attorney General shall not cause any juvenile alleged to be delinquent to be detained or confined in any institution in which the juvenile has regular contact with adult persons convicted of a crime or awaiting trial on criminal charges are confined. Insofar as possible, alleged delinquents shall be kept separate from adjudicated delinquents. Every juvenile in custody shall be provided with adequate food, heat, light, sanitary facilities, bedding, clothing, recreation, education, and medical care, including necessary psychiatric, psychological, or other care and treatment."

SPEEDY TRIAL

SEC. 206. Section 5036 of this title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5036. Speedy trial

"If an alleged delinquent who is in detention pending trial is not brought to trial within thirty days from the date upon which such detention was begun, the information shall be dismissed on motion of the alleged delinquent or at the direction of the court, unless the Attorney General shows that additional delay was caused by the juvenile or his counsel, or consented to by the juvenile and his counsel, or would be in the interest of justice in the particular case. Delays attributable solely to court calendar congestion may not be considered in the interest of justice. Except in extraordinary circumstances, an information dismissed under this section may not be reinstituted.

DISPOSITION

SEC. 207. Section 5037 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5037. Dispositional hearing

"(a) If a juvenile is adjudicated delinquent, a separate dispositional hearing shall be held no later than twenty court days after trial unless the court has ordered further study in accordance with subsection (c). Copies of the presentence report shall be provided to the attorneys for both the juvenile and the Government a reasonable time in advance of the hearing.

"(b) The court may suspend the adjudication of delinquency or the disposition of the delinquent on such conditions as it deems proper, place him on probation, or commit him to the custody of the Attorney General. Probation, commitment, or commitment in accordance with subsection (c) shall not extend beyond the juvenile's twenty-first birthday or the maximum term which could have been imposed on an adult convicted of the same offense, whichever is sooner, unless the juvenile has attained his ninteenth birthday at the time of disposition, in which case probation, commitment, or commitment in accordance with subsection (c) shall not exceed the lesser of two years or the maximum term which could have been imposed on an adult convicted of the same offense.

"(c) If the court desires more detailed information concerning an alleged or adjudicated delinquent, it may commit him, after notice and hearing at which the juvenile is represented by counsel, to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study by an appropriate agency. Such observation and study shall be conducted on an outpatient basis, unless the court determines that inpatient observation and study are necessary to obtain the desired information. In the case of an alleged juvenile delinquent, inpatient study may be ordered only with the consent of the juvenile and his attorney. The agency shall make a complete study of the alleged or adjudicated delinquent to ascertain his personal traits, his capabilities, his background, any previous delinquency or criminal experience, any mental or physical defect, and any other relevant factors. The Attorney General shall submit to the court and the attorneys for the juvenile and the Government the results of the study within thirty days after the commitment of the juvenile, unless the court grants additional time."

JUVENILE RECORDS

SEC. 208. Section 5038 is added, to read as follows:

"§ 5038. Use of juvenile records

"(a) Throughout the juvenile delinquency proceeding, the court shall safeguard the records from disclosure. Upon the completion of any juvenile delinquency proceeding whether or not there is an adjudication the district court shall order the entire file and record of such proceeding sealed. After such sealing, the court shall not release these records except to the extent necessary to meet the following circumstances:

"(1) inquiries received from another court of law;

"(2) inquiries from an agency preparing a presentence report for another court;

"(3) inquiries from law enforcement agencies where the request for information is related to the investigation of a crime or a position within that agency:

"(4) inquiries, in writing, from the director of a treatment agency or the director of a facility to which the juvenile has been committed by the court; and

"(5) inquiries from an agency considering the person for a position immediately and directly affecting the national security.

Unless otherwise authorized by this section, information about the sealed record may not be released when the request for information is related to an application for employment, license, bonding, or any civil right or privilege. Responses to such inquiries shall not be different from responses made about persons who have never been involved in a delinquency proceeding.

"(b) District courts exercising jurisdiction over any juvenile shall inform the juvenile, and his parent or guardian, in writing in clear and nontechnical language of rights relating to the sealing of his juvenile record.

"(c) During the course of any juvenile delinquency proceeding, all information and records relating to the proceeding, which are obtained or prepared in the discharge of an official duty by an employee of the court or agency, shall not be disclosed directly or indirectly to anyone other than the judge, counsel for the juvenile and the government, or others entitled under this section to receive sealed records.

"(d) Unless a juvenile who is taken into custody is prosecuted as an adult—

"(1) neither the fingerprints nor a photograph shall be taken, without the written consent of the judge; and

"(2) neither the name nor picture of any juvenile shall be made public by any medium of public information in connection with a juvenile delinquency proceeding."

COMMITMENT

SEC. 209. Section 5039 is added, to read as follows:

"§ 5039. Commitment

"No juvenile committed to the custody of the Attorney General may be placed or retained in an adult jail or correctional institution in which he has regular contact with adults incarcerated because they have been convicted of a crime or are awaiting trial on criminal charges.

"Every juvenile who has been committed shall be provided with adequate food, heat, light, sanitary facilities, bedding, clothing, recreation, counseling, education, training, and medical care, including necessary psychiatric, psychological, or other care and treatment.

"Whenever possible, the Attorney General shall commit a juvenile to a foster home or

community-based facility located in or near his home community."

SUPPORT

SEC. 210. Section 5040 is added, to read as follows:

"§ 5040. Support

"The Attorney General may contract with any public or private agency or individual and such community-based facilities as halfway houses and foster homes for the observation and study and the custody and care of juveniles in his custody. For these purposes, the Attorney General may promulgate such regulations as are necessary and may use the appropriation for 'support of United States' prisoners' or such other appropriations as he may designate."

PAROLE

SEC. 211. Section 5041 is added to read as follows:

"§ 5041. Parole

"The Board of Parole shall release from custody, on such conditions as it deems necessary, each juvenile delinquent who has been committed, as soon as the Board is satisfied that he is likely to remain at liberty without violating the law and when such release would be in the interest of justice."

REVOCATION

SEC. 212. Section 5042 is added to read as follows:

"§ 5042. Revocation of parole or probation

"Any juvenile parolee or probationer shall be accorded notice and a hearing with counsel before his parole or probation can be revoked."

SEC. 213. The table of sections of chapter 403 of this title is amended to read as follows:

"Sec.
"5031. Definitions.
"5032. Delinquency proceedings in district courts; transfer for criminal prosecution.
"5033. Custody prior to appearance before magistrate.
"5034. Duties of magistrate.
"5035. Detention prior to disposition.
"5036. Speedy trial.
"5037. Dispositional hearing.
"5038. Use of juvenile records.
"5039. Commitment.
"5040. Support.
"5041. Parole.
"5042. Revocation of parole or probation.".

TITLE III—JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION OFFICE

SEC. 301. Section 203(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 197; 84 Stat. 1881; 87 Stat. 197), is further amended by deleting the third full sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The State planning agency and any regional planning units within the State shall within their respective jurisdictions be representative of the law enforcement and criminal justice agencies including agencies directly related to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency, units of general local governments, and public agencies maintaining programs to reduce and control crime, and shall include representatives of citizen, professional, and community organizations including organizations directly related to delinquency prevention.".

SEC. 302. (a) Parts F, G, H, and I of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 197; 84 Stat. 1881; 87 Stat. 197), and all references thereto, are redesignated as parts G, H, I, and J, respectively.

(b) Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 197; 84 Stat. 1881; 87 Stat. 197), is further amended by adding after part E the following new part F:

"PART F—JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

"ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE

"SEC. 471. (a) There is hereby created within the Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (referred to in this Act as the 'Office').

"(b) The programs authorized in part F (hereinafter referred to as 'this part') and all other programs concerned with juvenile delinquency and administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration shall be administered or subject to the policy direction of the Office established under this section.

"(c) There shall be at the head of the Office an Assistant Administrator who shall be nominated by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(d) The Assistant Administrator shall exercise all necessary powers, subject to the direction of the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

"(e) There shall be in the Office a Deputy Assistant Administrator who shall be appointed by the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The Deputy Assistant Administrator shall perform such functions as the Assistant Administrator from time to time assigns or delegates, and shall act as Assistant Administrator during the absence or disability of the Assistant Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Assistant Administrator.

"(f) There shall be established in the Office a Deputy Assistant Administrator who shall be appointed by the Administrator whose function shall be to supervise and direct the National Institute for Juvenile Justice established under section 490 of this Act.

"(g) Section 5108(c)(10) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by deleting the word 'twenty-two' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'twenty-five'.

"PERSONNEL, SPECIAL PERSONNEL, EXPERTS, AND CONSULTANTS

"SEC. 472. (a) The Administrator is authorized to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as are necessary to perform the functions vested in him and to prescribe their functions.

"(b) The Administrator is authorized to select, appoint, and employ not to exceed three officers and to fix their compensation at rates not to exceed the rate now or hereafter prescribed for GS–18 of the General Schedule by section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(c) Upon the request of the Administrator, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of its personnel to the Assistant Administrator to assist him in carrying out his functions under this Act.

"(d) The Administrator may obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code, at rates not to exceed the rate now or hereafter prescribed for GS–18 of the General Schedule by section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"VOLUNTARY SERVICE

"SEC. 473. The Administrator is authorized to accept and employ, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, voluntary and uncompensated services notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b)).

"CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORTS

"SEC. 474. (a) The Administrator shall implement overall policy and develop objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities relating to prevention, diversion, training, treatment, rehabilitation, evaluation, research, and improvement of the juvenile justice system in the United States. In carrying out his functions, the Administrator shall consult with the Interdepartmental Council and the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

"(b) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to—

"(1) advise the President through the Attorney General as to all matters relating to federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs and Federal policies regarding juvenile delinquency;

"(2) assist operating agencies which have direct responsibilities or the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency in the development and promulgation of regulations, guidelines, requirements, criteria, standards, procedures, and budget requests in accordance with the policies, priorities, and objectives he establishes;

"(3) conduct and support evaluations and studies of the performance and results achieved by Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities and of the prospective performance and results that might be achieved by alternative programs and activities supplementary to or in lieu of those currently being administered;

"(4) implement Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities among Federal departments and agencies and between Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities and other Federal programs and activities which he determines may have an important bearing on the success of the entire Federal juvenile delinquency effort;

"(5) develop annually with the assistance of the Advisory Committee and submit to the President and the Congress, after the first year the legislation is enacted, prior to September 30, an analysis and evaluation of Federal juvenile delinquency programs conducted and assisted by Federal departments and agencies, the expenditures made, the results achieved, the plans developed, and problems in the operations and coordination of such programs. This report shall include recommendations for modifications in organization, management, personnel, standards, budget requests, and implementation plans necessary to increase the effectiveness of these programs;

"(6) develop annually with the assistance of the Advisory Committee and submit to the President and the Congress, after the first year the legislation is enacted, prior to March 1, a comprehensive plan for Federal juvenile delinquency programs, with particular emphasis on the prevention of juvenile delinquency and the development of programs and services which will encourage increased diversion of juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system; and

"(7) provide technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments, courts, public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals, in the planning, establishment, funding, operation, or evaluation of juvenile delinquency programs.

"(c) The Administrator may request departments and agencies engaged in any activity involving any Federal juvenile delinquency program to provide him with such information and reports, and to conduct such studies and surveys, as he may deem to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

"(d) The Administrator may delegate any of his functions under this part, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Administration.

"(e) The Administrator is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be agreed upon.

"(f) The Administrator is authorized to

transfer funds appropriated under this title to any agency of the Federal Government to develop or demonstrate new methods in juvenile delinquency prevention and rehabilitation and to supplement existing delinquency prevention and rehabilitation programs which the Assistant Administrator finds to be exceptionally effective or for which he finds there exists exceptional need.

"(g) The Administrator is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, any public or private agency, institution, or individual to carry out the purposes of this part.

"(h) All functions of the Administrator under this part shall be coordinated as appropriate with the functions of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.).

"JOINT FUNDING

"SEC. 475. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, where funds are made available by more than one Federal agency to be used by any agency, organization, institution, or individual to carry out a Federal juvenile delinquency program or activity, any one of the Federal agencies providing funds may be requested by the Administrator to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and the Administrator may order any such agency to waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined in such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirement of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

"INTERDEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL

"SEC. 476. (a) There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Council on Juvenile Delinquency (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council') composed of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or their respective designees, and representatives of such other agencies as the President shall designate.

"(b) The Attorney General or his designee shall serve as Chairman of the Council.

"(c) The function of the Council shall be to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

"(d) The Council shall meet a minimum of six times per year and the activities of the Council shall be included in the annual report required by section 474(b)(5) of this title.

"(e) The Chairman shall appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council and such personnel as are necessary to carry out the functions of the Council.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 477. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (hereinafter referred to as the 'Advisory Committee') which shall consist of twenty-one members.

"(b) The members of the Interdepartmental Council or their respective designee shall be ex officio members of the Committee.

"(c) The regular members of the Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the Attorney General from persons who by virtue of their training or experience have special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of juvenile justice, such as juvenile or family court judges; probation, correctional, or law enforcement personnel; and representatives of private voluntary organizations and community-based programs. The President shall designate the Chairman. A majority of the members of the Advisory Committee, including the Chairman, shall not be full-time employees of Federal, State, or local governments. At least seven members shall not have attained twenty-six years of age on the date of their appointment.

"(d) Members appointed by the President to the Committee shall serve for terms of four years and shall be eligible for reappointment except that for the first composition of the Advisory Committee, one-third of these members shall be appointed to one-year terms, one-third to two-year terms, and one-third to three-year terms; thereafter each term shall be four years. Any members appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"DUTIES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 478. (a) The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than four times a year.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall make recommendations to the Administrator at least annually with respect to planning, policy, priorities, operations, and management of all Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

"(c) The Chairman may designate a subcommittee of the members of the Advisory Committee to advise the Administrator on particular functions or aspects of the work of the Administration.

"(d) The Chairman shall designate a subcommittee of five members of the Committee to serve as members of an Advisory Committee for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice to perform the functions set forth in section 494 of this title.

"(e) The Chairman shall designate a subcommittee of five members of the Committee to serve as an Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice to perform the functions set forth in section 496 of this title.

"COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

"SEC. 479. (a) Members of the Advisory Committee who are employed by the Federal Government full time shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Advisory Committee.

"(b) Members of the Advisory Committee not employed full time by the Federal Government shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed the rate now or hereafter prescribed for GS–18 of the General Schedule by section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code, including traveltime for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Advisory Committee. Members shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Advisory Committee."

TITLE IV—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 401. Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 197; 84 Stat. 1881; 87 Stat. 197), is further amended by adding the following sections to new part F thereof:

"FORMULA GRANTS

"SEC. 480. The Administrator is authorized to make grants to States and local governments to assist them in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating projects directly or through contracts with public and private agencies for the development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in the area of juvenile delinquency and programs to improve the juvenile justice system.

"ALLOCATION

"SEC. 481. (a) In accordance with regulations promulgated under this part, funds shall be allocated annually among the States on the basis of relative population of people under age eighteen. No such allotment to any State shall be less than $200,000, except that for the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, no allotment shall be less than $50,000.

"(b) Except for funds appropriated for fiscal year 1975, if any amount so alloted remains unobligated at the end of the fiscal year, such funds shall be reallocated in a manner equitable and consistent with the purposes of this part. Funds appropriated for fiscal year 1975 may be obligated in accordance with subsection (a) until June 30, 1976, after which time they may be reallocated. Any amount so allocated shall be in addition to the amounts already allotted and available to the State, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam for the same period.

"(c) In accordance with regulations promulgated under this part, a portion of any allotment to any State under this part shall be available to develop a State plan and to pay that portion of the expenditures which are necessary for efficient administration. Not more than 15 per centum of the total annual allotment of such State shall be available for such purposes. The State shall make available needed funds for planning and administration to local governments within the State on an equitable basis.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 482. (a) In order to receive formula grants under this part, a State shall submit a plan for carrying out its purposes in accordance with the requirements set forth in section 303(a) of this title. In accordance with regulations established under this title, such plan must—

"(1) designate the State planning agency established by the State under section 203 of this title as the sole agency for supervising the preparation and administration of the plan;

"(2) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency designated in accordance with paragraph (1) (hereafter referred to in this part as the 'State planning agency') has or will have authority, by legislation if necessary, to implement such plan in conformity with this part;

"(3) provide for an advisory group appointed by the chief executive of the State to advise the State planning agency and its supervisory board (A) which shall consist of not less than twenty-one and not more than thirty-three persons who have training, experience, or special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of juvenile justice, (B) which shall include representation of units of local government, law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies such as law enforcement, correction or probation personnel, and juvenile or family court judges, and public agencies concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment such as welfare, social services, mental health, education or youth services departments, (C) which shall include representatives of private organizations: concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment; concerned with neglected or dependent children; concerned with the quality of juvenile justice, education, or social services for children; which utilize volunteers to work with delinquents or potential delinquents; community-based delinquency prevention or treatment programs; and organizations which represent employees affected by this Act, (D) a majority of whose members (including the Chairman shall not be full-time employees of the Federal, State, or local government, and (E) at least one-third of whose members shall be under the age of twenty-six at the time of appointment;

"(4) provide for the active consultation with and participation of local governments in the development of a State plan which adequately takes into account the needs and requests of local governments;

"(5) provide that at least 50 per centum of the funds received by the State under section 481 shall be expended through programs of local government insofar as they are consistent with the State plan, except that this provision may be waived at the discretion of the Administrator for any State if the services for delinquent or potentially delinquent youth are organized primarily on a statewide basis;

"(6) provide that the chief executive officer of the local government shall assign responsibility for the preparation and administration of the local government's part of a State plan, or for the supervision of the preparation and administration of the local government's part of the State plan, to that agency within the local government's structure (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'local agency') which can most effectively carry out the purposes of this part and shall provide for supervision of the programs funded under this part by that local agency;

"(7) provide for an equitable distribution of the assistance received under section 481 within the State;

"(8) set forth a detailed study of the State needs for an effective, comprehensive, coordinated approach to juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment and the improvement of the juvenile justice system. This plan shall include itemized estimated costs for the development and implementation of such programs;

"(9) provide for the active consultation with and participation of private agencies in the development and execution of the State plan; and provide for coordination and maximum utilization of existing juvenile delinquency programs and other related programs, such as education, health, and welfare within the State;

"(10) provide that not less than 75 per centum of the funds available to such State under section 481, whether expended directly by the State or by the local government or through contracts with public or private agencies, shall be used for advanced techniques in developing, maintaining, and expanding programs and services designed to prevent juvenile delinquency, to divert juveniles from the juvenile justice system, and to provide community-based alternatives to juvenile detention and correctional facilities. That advanced techniques include—

"(A) community-based programs and services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency through the development of foster-care and shelter-care homes, group homes, halfway houses, homemaker and home health services, and any other designated community-based diagnostic, treatment, or rehabilitative service;

"(B) community-based programs and services to work with parents and other family members to maintain and strengthen the family unit, so that the juvenile may be retained in his home;

"(C) youth service bureaus and other community-based programs to divert youth from the juvenile court or to support, counsel, or provide work and recreational opportunities for delinquents and youth in danger of becoming delinquent;

"(D) comprehensive programs of drug abuse education and prevention and programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicted youth and 'drug dependent' youth (as defined in section 2(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 (g)));

"(E) educational programs or supportive services designed to keep delinquents and other youth in elementary and secondary schools or in alternative learning situations;

"(F) expanded use of probation and recruitment and training of probation officers, other professional and paraprofessional personnel and volunteers to work effectively with youth;

"(G) youth initiated programs and outreach programs designed to assist youth who otherwise would not be reached by assistance programs;

"(H) provides for a statewide program through the use of probation subsidies, other subsidies, other financial incentives or disincentives to units of local government, or other effective means, that may include but are not limited to programs designed to—

"(A) reduce the number of commitments of juveniles to any form of juvenile facility as a percentage of the State juvenile population;

"(B) increase the use of nonsecure community-based facilities as a percentage of total commitments to juvenile facilities; and

"(C) discourage the use of secure incarceration and detention;

"(11) provides for the development of an adequate research, training, and evaluation capacity within the State;

"(12) provide within two years after submission of the plan that juveniles who are charged with or who have committed offenses that would not be criminal if committed by an adult, shall not be placed in juvenile detention or correctional facilities, but must be placed in shelter facilities;

"(13) provide that juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent shall not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have regular contact with adult persons incarcerated because they have been convicted of a crime or are awaiting trial on criminal charges;

"(14) provide for an adequate system of monitoring jails, detention facilities, and correctional facilities to insure that the requirements of section 482 (12) and (13) are met, and for annual reporting of the results of such monitoring to the Administrator;

"(15) provide assurances that assistance will be available on an equitable basis to deal with all disadvantaged youth including, but not limited to, females, minority youth, and mentally retarded or emotionally handicapped youth;

"(16) provide for procedures to be established for protecting the rights of recipients of services and for assuring appropriate privacy with regard to records relating to such services provided to any individual under the State plan;

"(17) provide that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by assistance under this Act. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for—

"(A) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise;

"(B) the continuation of collective bargaining rights;

"(C) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment;

"(D) assurances of employment to employees of any State or political subdivision thereof who will be affected by any program funded in whole or in part under provisions of this Act;

"(E) training or retraining programs.

The State plan shall provide for the terms and conditions of the protection arrangements established pursuant to this section;

"(18) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures necessary to assure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title;

"(19) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds made available under this part for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase, to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the programs described in this part, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds;

"(20) provide that the State planning agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its plan and submit to the Administrator an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs and activities carried out under the plan, and any modifications in the plan, including the survey of State and local needs, which it considers necessary; and

"(21) contain such other terms and conditions as the Administrator may reasonably prescribe to assure the effectiveness of the programs assisted under this title.

"(b) The Supervisory Board designated pursuant to section 482(a) after consultation with the advisory group referred to in section 482(a), shall approve the State plan and any modification thereof prior to submission to the Administrator.

"(c) The Administrator shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof that meets the requirements of this section.

"(d) In the event that any State fails to submit a plan, or submits a plan or any modification thereof, which the Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing in accordance with sections 509, 510, and 511, determines does not meet the requirements of this section, the Administrator shall make that State's allotment under the provisions of section 481(a) available to public and private agencies for special emphasis prevention and treatment programs as defined in section 483.

"(e) In the event the plan does not meet the requirements of this section due to oversight or neglect, rather than explicit and conscious decision, the Administrator shall endeavor to make that State's allotment under the provisions of section 481(a) available to public and private agencies in that State for special emphasis prevention and treatment programs as defined in section 483.

"(f) Any nonadjudicated juvenile shall not be made to partake in a program of behavior modification involving the use of drugs or electrical stimula or other potentially harmful treatment as a part of any such program authorized in whole or in part by this Act without the prior approval of his parents or guardians.

"SPECIAL EMPHASIS PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 483. (a) The Administrator is authorized to make grants to and enter into contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, or individuals to—

"(1) develop and implement new approaches, techniques, and methods with respect to juvenile delinquency programs;

"(2) develop and maintain community-based alternatives to traditional forms of institutionalization;

"(3) develop and implement effective means of diverting juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice and correctional system;

"(4) improve the capability of public and private agencies and organizations to provide services for delinquents and youths in danger of becoming delinquent; and

"(5) facilitate the adoption of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Standards for Juvenile Justice as set forth pursuant to section 496.

"(b) Not less than 25 per centum or more than 50 per centum of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to this part shall

be available only for special emphasis prevention and treatment grants and contracts made pursuant to this section.

"(c) At least 20 per centum of the funds available for grants and contracts made pursuant to this section shall be available for grants and contracts to private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or institutions who have had experience in dealing with youth.

"CONSIDERATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 484. (a) Any agency, institution, or individual desiring to receive a grant, or enter into any contract under section 483, shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Administrator may prescribe.

"(b) In accordance with guidelines established by the Administrator, each such application shall—

"(1) provide that the program for which assistance is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

"(2) set forth a program for carrying out one or more of the purposes set forth in section 482;

"(3) provide for the proper and efficient administration of such program;

"(4) provide for regular evaluation of the program;

"(5) indicate that the applicant has requested the review of the application from the State planning agency and local agency designated in section 482, when appropriate, and indicate the response of such agency to the request for review and comment on the application;

"(6) provide that regular reports on the program shall be sent to the Administrator and to the State planning agency and local agency, when appropriate; and

"(7) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title.

"(c) In determining whether or not to approve applications for grants under section 483, the Administrator shall consider—

"(1) the relative cost and effectiveness of the proposed program in effectuating the purposes of this part;

"(2) the extent to which the proposed program will incorporate new or innovative techniques

"(3) the extent to which the proposed program meets the objectives and priorities of the State plan, when a State plan has been approved by the Administrator under section 482(c) and when the location and scope of the program makes such consideration appropriate;

"(4) the increase in capacity of the public and private agency, institution, or individual to provide services to delinquents or youths in danger of becoming delinquents;

"(5) the extent to which the proposed project serves communities which have high rates of youth unemployment, school dropout, and delinquency; and

"(6) the extent to which the proposed program facilitates the implementation of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Standards for Juvenile Justice as set forth pursuant to section 496.

"GENERAL PROVISION

"Withholding

"SEC. 485. Whenever the Administrator, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, to a recipient of financial assistance under this title, finds—

"(1) that the program or activity for which such grant was made has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this title; or

"(2) that in the operation of the program or activity there is failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Administrator shall initiate such proceedings as are appropriate under sections 509, 510, and 511 of this title.

USE OF FUNDS

"SEC. 486. Funds paid to any State public or private agency, institution, or individual (whether directly or through a State or local agency) may be used for—

"(1) securing, developing, or operating the program designed to carry out the purposes of this part;

"(2) not more than 50 per centum of the cost of the construction of innovative community-based facilities for less than twenty persons (as defined in sections 601(f) and 601(p) of this title) which, in the judgment of the Administrator, are necessary for carrying out the purposes of this part.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 487. (a) In accordance with criteria established by the Administrator, it is the policy of Congress that programs funded under this title shall continue to receive financial assistance providing that the yearly evaluation of such programs is satisfactory.

"(b) At the discretion of the Administrator, when there is no other way to fund an essential juvenile delinquency program not funded under this part, the State may utilize 25 per centum of the formula grant funds available to it under this part to meet the non-Federal matching share requirement for any other Federal juvenile delinquency program grant.

"(c) Whenever the Administrator determines that it will contribute to the purposes of this part, he may require the recipient of any grant or contract to contribute money, facilities, or services.

"(d) Payments under this part, pursuant to a grant or contract, may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursements, in such installments and on such conditions as the Administrator may determine.".

TITLE V—NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE

SEC. 501. Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 197; 84 Stat. 1881; 87 Stat. 197) is further amended by adding the following sections to new part F thereof:

"SEC. 490. (a) There is hereby established within the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Office a National Institute for Juvenile Justice.

"(b) The National Institute for Juvenile Justice shall be under the supervision and direction of the Assistant Administrator, and shall be headed by a Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office appointed under section 471(f).

"(c) The activities of the National Institute for Juvenile Justice shall be coordinated with the activities of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in accordance with the requirements of section 471(b).

"INFORMATION FUNCTION

"SEC. 491. The National Institute for Juvenile Justice is authorized to—

"(1) serve as an information bank by collecting systemmatically and synthesizing the data and knowledge obtained from studies and research by public and private agencies, institutions, or individuals concerning all aspects of juvenile delinquency, including the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

"(2) serve as a clearinghouse and information center for the preparation, publication, and dissemination of all information regarding juvenile delinquency, including State and local juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment programs and plans, availability of resources, training and education programs, statistics, and other pertinent data and information.

"RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 492. The National Institute for Juvenile Justice is authorized to—

"(1) conduct, encourage, and coordinate research and evaluation into any aspect of juvenile delinquency, particularly with regard to new programs and methods which show promise of making a contribution toward the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

"(2) encourage the development of demonstration projects in new, innovative techniques and methods to prevent and treat juvenile delinquency;

"(3) provide for the evaluation of all juvenile delinquency programs assisted under this title in order to determine the results and the effectiveness of such programs;

"(4) provide for the evaluation of any other Federal, State, or local juvenile delinquency program, upon the request of the Administrator; and

"(5) disseminate the results of such evaluations and research and demonstration activities particularly to persons actively working in the field of juvenile delinquency.

"TRAINING FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 493. The National Institute for Juvenile Justice is authorized to—

"(1) develop, conduct, and provide for training programs for the training of professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer personnel, and other persons who are or who are preparing to work with juveniles and juvenile offenders;

"(2) develop, conduct, and provide for seminars, workshops, and training programs in the latest proven effective techniques and methods of preventing and treating juvenile delinquency for law enforcement officers, juvenile judges, and other court personnel, probation officers, correctional personnel, and other Federal, State, and local government personnel who are engaged in work relating to juvenile delinquency.

"INSTITUTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 494. The Advisory Committee for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice established in section 478(d) shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Deputy Assistant Administrator for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice concerning the overall policy and operations of the Institute.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 495. The Deputy Assistant Administrator for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice shall develop annually and submit to the Administrator after the first year the legislation is enacted, prior to June 30, a report on research, demonstration, training, and evaluation programs funded under this title, including a review of the results of such programs, an assessment of the application of such result to existing and to new juvenile delinquency programs, and detailed recommendations for future research, demonstration, training, and evaluation programs. The Administrator shall include a summary of these results and recommendations in his report to the President and Congress required by section 474(b)(5).

"DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE

"SEC. 496. (a) The National Institute for Juvenile Justice, under the supervision of the Advisory Committee on Standards for Juvenile Justice established in section 478(e), shall review existing reports, data, and standards, relating to the juvenile justice system in the United States.

"(b) Not later than one year after the passage of this section, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the President and the

Congress a report which, based on recommended standards for the administration of juvenile justice at the Federal, State, and local level—

"(1) recommends Federal action, including but not limited to administrative and legislative action, required to facilitate the adoption of these standards throughout the United States; and

"(2) recommends State and local action to facilitate the adoption of these standards for juvenile justice at the State and local level.

"(c) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Advisory Committee such information as the Committee deems necessary to carry out its functions under this section.

"SEC. 497. Records containing the identity of individual juveniles gathered for purposes pursuant to this title may under no circumstances be disclosed or transferred to any individual or other agency, public, or private."

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 601. Section 520 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 197; 84 Stat. 1881; 87 Stat. 197), is further amended by adding at the end thereof:

"In addition to any other appropriation authorizations contained in this title there is authorized for the purpose of part F: $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976.

"In addition to the funds appropriated under this section, the Administration shall maintain from other Law Enforcement Assistance Administration appropriations other than the appropriations for administration, the same level of financial assistance for juvenile delinquency programs assisted by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration during fiscal year 1972.".

TITLE VII—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

SEC. 701. Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding a new chapter 319 to read as follows:

"Chapter 319—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

"SEC. 4351. (a) There is hereby established within the Bureau of Prisons a National Institute of Corrections.

"(b) The overall policy and operations of the National Institute of Corrections shall be under the supervision of an Advisory Board. The Board shall consist of fifteen members. The following five individuals shall serve as members of the Commission ex officio: the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons or his designee, the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration or his designee, the Chairman of the United States Parole Board or his designee, the Director of the Federal Judicial Center or his designee, and the Assistant Secretary for Human Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or his designee.

"(c) The remaining ten members of the Board shall be selected as follows:

"(1) Five shall be appointed initially by the Attorney General of the United States for staggered terms; one member shall serve for one year, one member for two years, and three members for three years. Upon the expiration of each member's term, the Attorney General shall appoint successors who will each serve for a term of three years. Each member selected shall be qualified as a practitioner (Federal, State, or local) in the field of corrections, probation, or parole.

"(2) Five shall be appointed initially by the Attorney General of the United States for staggered terms; one member shall serve for one year, three members for two years, and one member for three years. Upon the expiration of each member's term the Attorney General shall appoint successors who will each serve for a term of three years. Each member selected shall be from the private sector, such as business, labor, and education having demonstrated an active interest in corrections, probation or parole.

"(d) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed officers or employees of the United States. Members of the Commission who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall serve without additional compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of the duties vested in the Board. Other members of the Board shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the Commission pursuant to this title, be entitled to receive compensation at the rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate authorized for GS–18 by section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including travel-time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence equal to that authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(c) The Board shall elect a chairman from among its members who shall serve for a term of one year. The members of the Board shall also elect one or more members as a vice-chairman.

"(f) The Board is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, technical, or other advisory committees to advise the Institute with respect to the administration of this title as it deems appropriate. Members of these committees not otherwise employed by the United States, while engaged in advising the Institute or attending meetings of the committees, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the rate fixed by the Board but not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate authorized for GS–18 by section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence equal to that authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(g) The Board is authorized to delegate its powers under this title to such person as it deems appropriate.

"(h) The Board shall be under the supervision of an officer to be known as the Director, who shall be appointed by the Attorney General after consultation with the Board. The Director shall have authority to supervise the organization, employees, enrollees, financial affairs, and all other operations of the Institute and may employ such staff, faculty, and administrative personnel, subject to the civil service and classification laws, as are necessary to the functioning of the Institute. The Director shall have the power to acquire and hold real and personal property for the Institute and may receive gifts, donations, and trusts on behalf of the Institute. The Director shall also have the power to appoint such technical or other advisory councils comprised of consultants to guide and advise the Board. The Director is authorized to delegate his powers under this title to such persons as he deems appropriate.

"SEC. 4352. (a) In addition to the other powers, express and implied, the National Institute of Corrections shall have authority:

"(1) to receive from or make grants to and enter into contracts with Federal, State, and general units of local government, public and private agencies, educational institutions, organizations, and individuals to carry out the purposes of this section and section 411;

"(2) to serve as a clearinghouse and information center for the collection, preparation, and dissemination of information on corrections, including, but not limited to programs for prevention of crime and recidivism, training of corrections personnel, and rehabilitation and treatment of criminal and juvenile offenders;

"(3) to assist and serve in a consulting capacity to Federal, State, and local courts, departments, and agencies in the development, maintenance, and coordination of programs, facilities, and services, training, treatment, and rehabilitation with respect to criminal and juvenile offenders;

"(4) to encourage and assist Federal, State, and local government programs and services, and programs and services of other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations in their efforts to develop and implement improved corrections programs;

"(5) to devise and conduct, in various geographical locations, seminars, workshops, and training programs for law enforcement officers, judges, and judicial personnel, probation and parole personnel, correctional personnel, welfare workers, and other persons, including lay, ex-offenders, and paraprofessional personnel, connected with the treatment and rehabilitation of criminal and juvenile offenders;

"(6) to develop technical training teams to aid in the development of seminars, workshops, and training programs within the several States and with the State and local agencies which work with prisoners, parolees, probationers, and other offenders;

"(7) to conduct, encourage, and coordinate research relating to corrections, including the causes, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of criminal offenders;

"(B) to formulate and disseminate correctional policy, goals, standards, and recommendations for Federal, State, and local correctional agencies, organizations, institutions, and personnel;

"(9) to conduct evaluation programs which study the effectiveness of new approaches, techniques, systems, programs, and devices employed to improve the corrections system;

"(10) to receive from any Federal department or agency such statistics, data, program reports, and other material as the Institute deems necessary to carry out its functions. Each such department or agency is authorized to cooperate with the Institute and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and furnish information to the Institute;

"(11) to arrange with and reimburse the heads of Federal departments and agencies for the use of personnel, facilities, or equipment of such departments and agencies;

"(12) to confer with and avail itself of the assistance, services, records, and facilities of State and local governments or other public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals;

"(13) to enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals, for the performance of any of the functions of the Institute; and

"(14) to procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code, at rates of compensation not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate authorized for GS–18 by section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(b) The Institute shall on or before the 31st day of December of each year, submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year to the President and to the Congress. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Institute's opera-

tions, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this title and may include such recommendations related to corrections as the Institute deems appropriate.

"(c) Each recipient of assistance under this shall keep such records as the Institute shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(d) The Institute, and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for purposes of audit and examinations to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this chapter.

"(e) The provision of this section shall apply to all recipients of assistance under this title, whether by direct grant or contract from primary grantees or contractors of the Institute.

"SEC. 4353. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be required to carry out the purposes of this chapter."

TITLE VIII—FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY

SEC. 801. (a) Section 203(j) of the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484 (j)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "or civil defense" in the first sentence of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "civil defense, or law enforcement and criminal justice";

(2) by striking out "or (4)" in the first sentence of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "(4), or (5)";

(3) by striking out "or paragraph (4)" in the last sentence of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "(4), or (5)";

(4) by inserting after paragraph (4) a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for purposes of law enforcement and criminal justice, including research, in any State shall be made by the Administrator, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, who shall allocate such property on the basis of need and utilization for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to such State agency for distribution to such State or to any unit of general local government or combination, as defined in section 601 (d) or (e) of the Crime Control Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 197), designated pursuant to regulations issued by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. No such property shall be transferred to any State agency until the Administrator, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, has received, from such State agency, a certification that such property is usable and needed for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes in the State, and such Administrator has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by such Administrator for the disposal of surplus property.";

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively;

(6) by striking out "and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator" in paragraph (6), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, and the Administrator, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration"; and

(7) by striking out "or paragraph (4)" in paragraph (6), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "(4), or (5)".

(b) Section 203(k)(4) of such Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(4)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" after the semicolon in clause (D);

(2) by striking out the comma after "law" in clause (E) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "or"; and

(3) by adding immediately after clause (E) the following new clause:

"(F) the Administrator, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, in the case of personal property transferred pursuant to subsection (j) for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes,".

(c) Section 203(n) or such Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(n), is amended—

(1) by striking out in the first sentence "and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Administrator, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the head of any Federal agency designated by any such officer; and

(2) by striking in next to the last sentence "law enforcement" and inserting in lieu thereof "law enforcement and criminal justice", and in the same sentence striking "or (j)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "(4), or (5)".

TITLE IX—EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATIONS

SEC. 901. Title I of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act is amended (1) in the caption thereof, by inserting "AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS" after "SERVICES"; (2) following the caption thereof, by inserting "PART A—COMMUNITY-BASED COORDINATED YOUTH SERVICES"; (3) in sections 101, 102(a), 102(b)(1), 102(b)(2), 103(a) (including paragraph (1) thereof), 104(a) (including paragraphs (1), (4), (5), (7), and (10) thereof) and 104(b), by striking out "title" and inserting "part" in lieu thereof; and (4) by inserting at the end of the title the following new part:

"PART B—DEMONSTRATIONS IN YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of assisting the demonstration of innovative approaches to youth development and the prevention and treatment of delinquent behavior (including payment of all or part of the costs of minor remodeling or alteration), the Secretary may make grants to any State (or political subdivision thereof), any agency thereof, and any nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization that submits to the Secretary, at such time and in such form and manner as the Secretary's regulations shall prescribe, an application containing a description of the purposes for which the grant is sought, and assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the applicant will use the grant for the purposes for which it is provided, and will comply with such requirements relating to the submission of reports, methods of fiscal accounting, the inspection and audit of records and other materials, and such other rules, regulations, standards, and procedures, as the Secretary may impose to assure the fulfillment of the purposes of this Act.

"(b) No demonstration may be assisted by a grant under this section for more than one year."

CONSULTATION

SEC. 902. (a) Section 408 of such Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary shall consult with the Attorney General for the purpose of coordinating the development and implementation of programs and activities funded under this Act with those related programs and activities funded under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968"; and by deleting subsection (b) thereof.

(b) Section 409 is repealed.

REPEAL OF MINIMUM STATE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 904. Section 403(b) of such Act is repealed, and section 403(a) of such Act is redesignated section 403.

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 905. Section 402 of such Act, as amended by this Act, is further amended in the first sentence by inserting after "fiscal year" the following: "and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1975".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HAWKINS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAWKINS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 821 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 15276, as passed, as follows:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) juveniles account for almost half the arrests for serious crimes in the United States today;

(2) understaffed, overcrowded juvenile courts, probation services, and correctional facilities are not able to provide individualized justice or effective help;

(3) present juvenile courts, foster and protective care programs, and shelter facilities are inadequate to meet the needs of the countless, abandoned, and dependent children, who, because of this failure to provide effective services, may become delinquents;

(4) existing programs have not adequately responded to the particular problems of the increasing numbers of young people who are addicted to or who abuse drugs, particularly nonopiate or polydrug abusers;

(5) juvenile delinquency can be prevented through programs designed to keep students in elementary and secondary schools through the prevention of unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

(6) States and local communities which experience directly the devastating failures of the juvenile justice system do not presently have sufficient technical expertise or adequate resources to deal comprehensively with the problems of juvenile delinquency;

(7) the adverse impact of juvenile delinquency results in enormous annual cost and immeasurable loss in human life, personal security, and wasted human resources;

(8) existing Federal programs have not provided the direction, coordination, resources, and leadership required to meet the crisis of delinquency; and

(9) juvenile delinquency constitutes a growing threat to the national welfare requiring immediate, comprehensive, and effective action by the Federal Government.

PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to provide the necessary resources, leadership, and coordination to develop and implement effective methods of preventing and treating juvenile delinquency;

(2) to increase the capacity of State and local governments and public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations to conduct innovative, effective delinquency prevention and treatment programs and to provide useful research, evaluation, and training services in the area of juvenile delinquency;

(3) to develop and implement effective programs and services to divert juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system

and to increase the capacity of State and local governments to provide critically needed alternatives to institutionalization;

(4) to develop and encourage the implementation of national standards for the administration of juvenile justice, including recommendations for administrative, budgetary, and legislative action at the Federal, State, and local level to facilitate the adoption of such standards;

(5) to establish a centralized research effort on the problems of juvenile delinquency, including an information clearinghouse to disseminate the findings of such research and all data related to juvenile delinquency;

(6) to provide for the thorough and prompt evaluation of all federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs;

(7) to provide technical assistance to public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals in developing and implementing juvenile delinquency programs;

(8) to assist States and local communities with resources to develop and implement programs to keep students in elementary and secondary schools and to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

(9) to establish training programs for persons, including professionals, paraprofessionals, and volunteers, who work with delinquents or potential delinquents or whose work or activities relate to juvenile delinquency programs;

(10) to establish a new Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(11) to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, to further the purposes of this Act; and

(12) to establish a Federal assistance program to deal with the problems of runaway youth.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "community-based" means a small, open group home or other suitable place located near the juvenile's home or family and programs of community supervision and service which maintain community and consumer participation in the planning, operation, and evaluation of their programs which may include medical, educational, vocational, social, and psychological guidance, training, counseling, drug treatment, alcoholism treatment, and other rehabilitative services;

(2) the term "construction" means acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings, or any combination of such activities (including architects' fees but not the cost of acquisition of land for buildings);

(3) the term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house such machinery, utilities, or equipment;

(4) the term "juvenile delinquency program" means any program or activity related to juvenile delinquency prevention, control, diversion, treatment, rehabilitation, planning, education, training, and research, including drug abuse programs, alcohol abuse programs, the improvement of the juvenile justice system, and any program or activity for neglected, abandoned, or dependent youth and other youth who are in danger of becoming delinquent;

(5) the term "local government" means any city, county, township, town, borough, parish village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State, and an Indian tribe and any combination of two or more such units acting jointly;

(6) the term "public agency" means any State, unit of local government, combination of such States or units, or any department, agency, or instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

(7) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(8) the term "State" means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(9) the term "Federal agency" means any agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government;

(10) the term "drug dependent" has the meaning given it by section 2(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 202(g));

(11) the term "Administration" means the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Administration established by section 101(a);

(12) the term "Director" means the Director of the Administration;

(13) the term "State agnecy" means an agency designated under section 214(a)(1);

(14) the term "local agency" means any local agency which is assigned responsibility under section 214(a)(6);

(15) the term "Institute" means the Institute for Continuing Studies of the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency established by section 301(a);

(16) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Institute; and

(17) the term "Council" means the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention established by section 501.

TITLE I—JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ADMINISTRATION

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 101. (a) There hereby is established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Administration.

(b) There shall be at the head of the Administration a Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary. The salary of the Director shall be fixed by the Secretary.

(c) The Director shall be the chief executive of the Administration and shall exercise all necessary powers.

(d) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary. The salary of the Deputy Director shall be fixed by the Secretary. The Deputy Director shall perform such functions as the Director from time to time assigns or delegates, and shall act as Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 102. The Secretary may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as are necessary to perform the functions vested in him and to prescribe their functions.

VOLUNTARY SERVICES

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b)), the Secretary may accept and employ voluntary and uncompensated services in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORTS

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary shall establish overall policy and develop objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities relating to prevention, diversion, training, treatment, rehabilitation, evaluation, research, and improvement of the juvenile justice system in the United States. In carrying out his functions, the Secretary shall consult with the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) advise the President as to all matters relating to federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs and Federal policies regarding juvenile delinquency;

(2) assist operating agencies which have direct responsibilities for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency in the development and promulgation of rules, guidelines, requirements, criteria, standards, procedures, and budget requests in accordance with the policies, priorities, and objectives he establishes;

(3) conduct and support, in cooperation with the Institute for Continuing Studies of the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, evaluations and studies of the performance and results achieved by Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities and of the prospective performance and results that might be achieved by alternative programs and activities supplementary to or in lieu of those currently being administered;

(4) coordinate Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities among Federal agencies and between Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities and other Federal programs and activities which he determines may have an important bearing on the success of the entire Federal juvenile delinquency effort;

(5) develop annually, submit to the Council for review, and thereafter submit to the President and the Congress, no later than September 30, a report which shall include an analysis and evaluation of Federal juvenile delinquency programs conducted and assisted by Federal agencies, the expenditures made, the results achieved, the plans developed, and problems in the operations and coordination of such programs, and recommendations for modifications in organization, management, personnel, standards, budget requests, and implementation plans necessary to increase the effectiveness of such programs;

(6) develop annually, submit to the Council for review, and thereafter submit to the President and the Congress, no later than March 1, a comprehensive plan for juvenile delinquency programs administered by any Federal agency, with particular emphasis on the prevention of juvenile delinquency and the development of programs and services which will encourage increased diversion of juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system; and

(7) provide technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments, courts, public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals, in the planning, establishment, funding, operation, or evaluation of juvenile delinquency programs.

(c) The President shall, no later than 90 days after receiving each annual report under subsection (b)(5), submit a report to the Congress and to the Council containing a detailed statement of any action taken or anticipated with respect to recommendations made by each such annual report.

(d)(1) The first report submitted to the President and the Congress by the Secretary under subsection (b)(5) shall contain, in addition to information required by subsection (b)(5), a detailed statement of criteria developed by the Secretary for identifying the characteristics of juvenile delinquency, juvenile delinquency prevention, diversion of youths from the juvenile justice system, and the training treatment, and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents.

(2) The second such report shall contain, in addition to information required by subsection (b)(5), an identification of Federal programs which are related to juvenile delinquency prevention or treatment, together with a statement of the moneys expended for each such program during the most recent complete fiscal year. Such identification shall be made by the Secretary through the use of criteria developed under paragraph (1).

(e) The third report submitted to the President and the Congress by the Secretary

under subsection (b)(6) shall contain, in addition to the comprehensive plan required by subsection (b)(6), a detailed statement of procedures to be used with respect to the submission of juvenile delinquency development statements to the Secretary by Federal agencies under section 105. Such statement submitted by the Secretary shall include a description of information, data, and analyses which shall be contained in each such development statement.

(f) The Secretary may require Federal agencies engaged in any activity involving any Federal juvenile delinquency program to provide him with such information and reports, and to conduct such studies and surveys, as he may deem to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(g) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions until this title, except the making of rules, to any officer or employee of the Administration.

(h) The Secretary may utilize the services and facilities of any Federal agency and of any other public agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be agreed upon.

(i) The Secretary may transfer funds appropriated under this Act to any Federal agency to develop or demonstrate new methods in juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment and to supplement existing delinquency prevention and treatment programs which the Director finds to be exceptionally effective or for which he finds there exists exceptional need.

(j) The Secretary may make grants to, or enter into contracts with, any public or private agency, institution, or individual to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(k) All functions of the Secretary under this Act shall be administered through the Administration.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY DEVELOPMENT STATEMENTS

SEC. 105. (a) The Secretary shall require each Federal agency which administers a Federal juvenile delinquency program which meets any criterion developed by the Secretary under section 104(d)(1) to submit to the Secretary a juvenile delinquency development statement. Such statement shall be in addition to any information, report, study, or survey which the Secretary may require under section 104(f).

(b) Each juvenile delinquency development statement submitted to the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be submitted in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary under section 104(e) and shall contain such information, data, and analyses as the Secretary may require under section 104(e). Such analyses shall include an analysis of the extent to which the juvenile delinquency program of the Federal agency submitting such development statement conforms with and furthers Federal juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment goals and policies.

(c) The Secretary shall review and comment upon each juvenile delinquency development statement transmitted to him under subsection (a). Such development statement, together with the comments of the Secretary, shall be included by the Federal agency involved in every recommendation or request made by such agency for Federal legislation which significantly affects juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment.

JOINT FUNDING

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, where funds are made available by more than one Federal agency to be used by any agency, organization, institution, or individual to carry out a Federal juvenile delinquency program or activity, any one of the Federal agencies providing funds may be designated by the Secretary to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and the Secretary may order any such agency to waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined in rules prescribed by the Secretary) which is inconsistent with the similar requirement of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

TITLE II—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

PART A—GRANT PROGRAMS

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 211. The Secretary may make grants to States and local governments to assist them in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating projects directly or through contracts with public and private agencies for the development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in the area of juvenile delinquency and programs to improve the juvenile justice system.

ALLOCATION

SEC. 212. (a) In accordance with rules prescribed under this title, funds shall be allocated annually among the States on the basis of relative population of people under 18 years of age. No such allotment to any State shall be less than $150,000, except that for the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, no allotment shall be less than $50,000.

(b) Except for funds appropriated for fiscal year 1975, if any amount so allotted remains unobligated at the end of the fiscal year, such funds shall be reallocated in a manner equitable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Funds appropriated for fiscal year 1975 may be obligated in accordance with subsection (a) until June 30, 1976, after which time they may be reallocated. Any amount so reallocated shall be in addition to the amounts already allotted and available to the States, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the same period.

(c) In accordance with rules prescribed under this title, a portion of any allotment to any State under this part shall be available to develop a State plan and to pay that portion of the expenditures which are necessary for efficient administration. Not more than 15 percent of the total annual allotment of such State shall be available for such purposes. The State shall make available needed funds for planning and administration to local governments within the State on an equitable basis.

(d) Financial assistance extended under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 90 percent of the approved costs of any assisted programs or activities. The non-Federal share shall be made only through the use of cash or other monetary instruments.

SPECIAL EMPHASIS PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS; AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 213. (a) Not less than 25 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to this title shall be available only for special emphasis prevention and treatment grants and contracts made pursuant to this section and section 215.

(b) Among applicants for grants and contracts under this section, priority shall be given to public and private nonprofit organizations or institutions which have had experience in dealing with youth. Not less than 20 percent of the funds available for grants and contracts made pursuant to his section shall be available for grants and contracts to such private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or institutions.

(c) The Secretary may make grants to and enter into contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, or individuals to—

(1) develop and implement new approaches, techniques, and methods with respect to juvenile delinquency programs;

(2) develop and maintain community-based alternatives to traditional forms of institutionalization;

(3) develop and implement programs to keep students in elementary and secondary schools and to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

(4) develop and implement effective means of diverting juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice and correctional system;

(5) improve the capability of public and private agencies and organizations to provide services for delinquents and youths in danger of becoming delinquent; and

(6) facilitate the adoption of the recommendations of the Institute as set forth pursuant to section 309.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 214. (a) In order to receive formula grants under this part, a State shall submit a plan for carrying out its purposes. In accordance with rules prescribed under this title, such plan shall—

(1) establish or designate a single State agency, or designate any other agency, as the sole agency responsible for the preparation and administration of the plan;

(2) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency has or will have authority, by legislation if necessary, to implement such plan in conformity with this part;

(3) provide for supervision of the programs funded under this Act by the State agency by a State supervisory board appointed by the chief executive officer of the State (A) which shall consist of not less than 15 persons who have training, experience, or special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of juvenile justice; (B) which shall include representation of units of local government, law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies such as law enforcement, correction or probation personnel, and juvenile or family court judges, and public agencies concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment such as welfare, social services, mental health, education, youth service departments, or alternative youth systems; (C) which shall include representatives of private organizations concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment; concerned with neglected or dependent children; concerned with the quality of juvenile justice, education, or social services for children; which utilize volunteers to work with delinquents or potential delinquents; community-based delinquency prevention or treatment programs; and organizations which represent employees affected by this Act; (D) a majority of whose members (including the Chairman) shall not be full-time employees of the Federal Government, the State, or any local government; (E) at least one-third of whose members shall be under the age of 26 at the time of appointment and of whom at least two shall have been under the jurisdiction of the justice system; and (F) which shall have the authority to approve, after consultation with private agencies and alternative youth systems, any proposed modification of a State plan before such proposed modification is submitted to the Secretary;

(4) provide for the active consultation with and participation of local governments in the development of a State plan which adequately takes into account the needs and requests of local governments;

(5) provide that at least 75 percent of the funds received by the State under section

212 shall be expended through programs of local government insofar as they are consistent with the State plan, except that this provision may be waived at the discretion of the Secretary for any State if the services for delinquent or potentially delinquent youth are organized primarily on a statewide basis;

(6) provide that the chief executive officer of the local government shall assign responsibility for the preparation and administration of the local government's part of the State plan, or for the supervision of the preparation and administration of the local government's part of the State plan, to that agency within the local government's structure which can most effectively carry out the purposes of this Act and shall provide for supervision of the programs funded under this Act by the local agency by a board which meets the appropriate requirements of paragraph (3);

(7) provide, to the maximum extent feasible, for an equitable distribution of the assistance received under section 212 within the State;

(8) set forth a detailed study of the State needs for an effective, comprehensive, coordinated approach to juvenile delinquency and treatment and the improvement of the juvenile justice system, including an itemized estimated cost for the development and implementation of such programs;

(9) provide that not less than 75 percent of the funds available to such State or to any local government of such State under this part, whether expended directly by the State or by the local government or through contracts with public or private agencies, shall be used for advanced techniques in conjunction with the development, maintenance, and expansion of programs and services designed to prevent juvenile delinquency, to divert juveniles from the juvenile justice system, and to provide community-based alternatives to juvenile detention and correctional facilities; such advanced techniques shall include community-based programs and services relating to various aspects of juvenile delinquency, youth service bureaus to assist delinquent and other youth, drug abuse education and prevention programs, alcohol abuse education and prevention programs, programs to encourage youth to remain in school, improvement of probation programs and services, statewide programs designed to increase the use of nonsecure community-based facilities for the commitment of juveniles, and youth-initiated programs and outreach programs designed to assist youth who otherwise would not be reached by assistance programs;

(10) encourage the development of an adequate research, training, and evaluation capacity within the State;

(11) encourage the placement of juveniles in shelter facilities, rather than juvenile detention or correctional facilities, if such juveniles are charged with or have committed offenses which would not be criminal if committed by an adult; discourage the incarceration of juveniles with adults; and encourage the establishment of monitoring systems designed to augment the commitment policies described in this paragraph;

(12) provide assurances that assistance will be available on an equitable basis to deal with all disadvantaged youth, including females, minority youth, and mentally, emotionally, or physically handicapped youth;

(13) provide for procedures which will be established for protecting under Federal, State, and local law the rights of recipients of services and which will assure appropriate privacy with regard to records relating to such services provided to any individual under the State plan;

(14) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures necessary to assure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title;

(15) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds made available under this part for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase (but not supplant), to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the programs described in this part, and will in no event replace such State, local, and other non-Federal funds;

(16) provide that the State agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its plan and submit to the Secretary an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs and activities carried out under the plan, and any modifications in the plan, including the survey of State and local needs, which it considers necessary;

(17) contains such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may reasonably prescribe to assure the effectiveness of the programs assisted under this title; and

(18) provide that fair and equitable arrangements are made to protect the interests of employees affected by assistance under this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof that meets the requirements of subsection (a).

(c) In the event that any State fails to submit a plan, or submits a plan, or any modification thereof which the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, determines does not meet the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary shall make the allotment of such State under the provisions of section 212 available to the public and private agencies in such State for programs under sections 213 and 215.

APPLICATIONS

SEC. 215. (a) Any agency, institution, or individual desiring to receive a grant, or enter into any contract under this section or section 213, shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information, as the Secretary may prescribe.

(b) In accordance with guidelines established by the Secretary, each such application shall—

(1) provide that the program for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) set forth a program for carrying out one or more of the purposes set forth in section 214;

(3) provide for the proper and efficient administration of such program;

(4) provide for regular evaluation of the program;

(5) indicate that the applicant has requested the review of the application from the State agency or local agency designated under section 214, when appropriate;

(6) indicate the response of the State agency or the local agency to the request for review and comment on the application;

(7) provide that regular reports on the program shall be sent to the Secretary and to the State agency and local agency, when appropriate; and

(8) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title.

(c) In determining whether or not to approve applications for grants under this title, the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the relative cost and effectiveness of the proposed program in effectuating the purposes of this Act;

(2) the extent to which the proposed program will incorporate new or innovative techniques;

(3) the extent to which the proposed program meets the objectives and priorities of the State plan, when a State plan has been approved by the Secretary under section 214 (b) and when the location and scope of the program make such consideration appropriate;

(4) the increase in capacity of the public and private agency, institution, or individual to provide services to delinquents or youths in danger of becoming delinquent;

(5) the extent to which the proposed project serves communities which have high rates of youth unemployment, school dropout, and delinquency; and

(6) the extent to which the proposed programs facilitate the implementation of the recommendations of the Institute as set forth pursuant to section 309.

PART B—GENERAL PROVISIONS

WITHHOLDING

SEC. 221. Whenever the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a recipient of a grant under this title, finds—

(1) that the program or activity for which such grant was made has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this title, or

(2) that in the operation of the program or activity there is failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Secretary shall notify such recipient of his findings and no further payments may be made to such recipient under this title (or in his discretion that the State agency shall not make further payments to specified programs affected by the failure) by the Secretary until he is satisfied that such noncompliance has been, or will promptly be, corrected.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 222. (a) Funds paid to any State public or private agency, institution, or individual (whether directly or through a State agency or local agency) may be used for—

(1) securing, developing, or operating the program designed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and

(2) not more than 50 percent of the cost of the construction of innovative community-based facilities for less than 20 persons which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Except as provided by subsection (a), no funds paid to any public or private agency, institution, or individual under this title (whether directly or through a State agency or local agency) may be used for construction.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 223. (a) In accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, it is the policy of the Congress that programs funded under this title shall continue to receive financial assistance, except that such assistance shall not continue if the yearly evaluation of such programs is not satisfactory.

(b) At the discretion of the Secretary, when there is no other way to fund an essential juvenile delinquency program, the State may utilize 25 percent of the funds available to it under this Act to meet the non-Federal matching share requirements for any other Federal juvenile delinquency program grant.

(c) Whenever the Secretary determines that it will contribute to the purposes of this Act, he may require the recipient of any grant or contract to contribute money, facilities, or services up to 25 percent of the cost of the project involved.

(d) Payments under this title, pursuant to a grant or contract, may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursements, in such installments and on such conditions as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE III—INSTITUTE FOR CONTINUING STUDIES OF THE PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby established an institute to be known as the Institute for Continuing Studies of the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. The Institute shall be administered by the Secretary through the Administration.

(b) It shall be the purpose of the Institute to provide a coordinating center for the collection, preparation, and dissemination of useful data regarding the treatment and control of juvenile offenders, and it shall also be the purpose of the Institute to provide training for representatives of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers, teachers and other educational personnel, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, probation personnel, correctional personnel, and other persons, including lay personnel, connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 302. The Institute shall—

(1) serve as an information bank by collecting systematically and synthesizing the data and knowledge obtained from studies and research by public and private agencies, institutions, or individuals concerning all aspects of juveline delinquency, including the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(2) serve as a clearinghouse and information center for the preparation, publication, and dissemination of all information regarding juvenile delinquency, including State and local iuvenile delinquency prevention and treatment programs and plans, availability of resources, training and educational programs, statistics, and other pertinent data and information;

(3) disseminate pertinent data and studies (including a periodic journal) to individuals, agencies, and organizations concerned with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(4) prepare, in cooperation with educational institutions, Federal, State, and local agencies, and appropriate individuals and private agencies, such studies as it considers to be necessary with respect to the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and related matters, including recommendations designed to promote effective prevention and treatment;

(5) devise and conduct in various geographical locations, seminars and workshops providing continuing studies for persons engaged in working directly with juveniles and juvenile offenders;

(6) devise and conduct a training program, in accordance with the provisions of sections 305, 306, and 307, of short-term instruction in the latest proven-effective methods of prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency for correctional and law enforcement personnel, teachers and other educational personnel, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, probation officers, and other persons (including lay personnel) connected with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

(7) develop technical training teams to aid in the development of training programs in the States and to assist State and local agencies which work directly with juveniles and juvenile offenders;

(8) conduct, encourage, and coordinate research and evaluation into any aspect of juvenile delinquency, particularly with respect to new programs and methods which show promise of making a contribution toward the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(9) encourage the development of demonstration projects in new and innovative techniques and methods to prevent and treat juvenile delinquency;

(10) provide for the evaluation of all programs assisted under this Act in order to determine the results and the effectiveness of such programs;

(11) provide for the evaluation of any other Federal, State, or local juvenile delinquency program, as deemed necessary by the Secretary; and

(12) disseminate the results of such evaluations and research and demonstration activities, particularly to persons actively working in the field of juvenile delinquency.

POWERS

SEC. 303. (a) The functions, powers, and duties specified in this Act to be carried out by the Institute shall not be transferred elsewhere or within any Federal agency unless specifically hereafter authorized by the Congress. In addition to the other powers, express and implied, the Institute may—

(1) request any Federal agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other material as the Institute deems necessary to carry out its functions;

(2) arrange with and reimburse the heads of Federal agencies for the use of personnel or facilities or equipment of such agencies;

(3) confer with and avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of State, municipal, or other public or private local agencies;

(4) enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals, for the partial performance of any functions of the Institute; and

(5) compensate consultants and members of technical advisory councils who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States, at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator of the Institute but not exceeding $75 per diem and while away from home, or regular place of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(b) Any Federal agency which receives a request from the Institute under subsection (a)(1) may cooperate with the Institute and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and furnish information and advice to the Institute.

ADMINISTRATOR AND STAFF

SEC. 304. (a) The Institute shall have an Administrator who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary.

(b) The Administrator shall have responsibility for the administration of the organization, employees, enrollees, financial affairs, and other operations of the Institute. He may employ such staff, faculty, and administrative personnel as are necessary for the functioning of the Institute.

(c) The Administrator shall have the power to—

(1) acquire and hold real and personal property for the Institute;

(2) receive gifts, donations, and trusts on behalf of the Institute; and

(3) appoint such technical or other advisory councils comprised of consultants to guide and advise the Secretary.

(d) The Administrator may delegate his power under the Act to such employees of the Institute as he deems appropriate.

ESTABLISHMENT OF TRAINING PROGRAM

SEC. 305. (a) The Secretary shall establish within the Institute a training program designed to train enrollees with respect to methods and techniques for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

(b) Enrollees in the training program established under this section shall be drawn from correctional and law enforcement personnel, teachers and other educational personnel, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, probation officers, and other persons (including lay personnel) connected with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

CURRICULUM FOR TRAINING PROGRAM

SEC. 306. The Secretary shall design and supervise a curriculum for the training program established by section 305 which shall utilize an interdisciplinary approach with respect to the prevention of juvenile delinquency, the treatment of juvenile delinquents, and the diversion of youths from the juvenile justice system. Such curriculum shall be appropriate to the needs of the enrollees of the training program.

ENROLLMENT FOR TRAINING PROGRAM

SEC. 307. (a) Any person seeking to enroll in the training program established under section 305 shall transmit an application to the Administrator, in such form and according to such procedures as the Administrator may prescribe.

(b) The Administrator shall make the final determination with respect to the admittance of any person to the training program. The Administrator, in making such determination, shall seek to assure that persons admitted to the training program are broadly representative of the categories described in section 305(b).

(c) While studying at the Institute and while traveling in connection with his study (including authorized field trips), each person enrolled in the Institute shall be allowed travel expenses and a per diem allowance in the same manner as prescribed for persons employed intermittently in the Government service under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 308. The Administrator shall develop annually and submit to the President and each House of the Congress, prior to June 30, a report on the activities of the Institute and on research, demonstration, training, and evaluation programs funded under this title, including a review of the results of such programs, an assessment of the application of such results to existing and new juvenile delinquency programs, and detailed recommendations for future research, demonstration, training, and evaluation programs.

DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE

SEC. 309. The Institute, under the supervision of the Secretary, shall conduct a study for the development of standards for juvenile justice. The Institute shall, no later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the President and to each House of the Congress a report based upon such study. Such report shall contain a detailed statement of recommended standards for the administration of juvenile justice at the Federal, State, and local level, and shall recommend—

(1) Federal action, including administrative budgetary, and legislative action, required to facilitate the adoption of such standards throughout the United States; and

(2) State and local action to facilitate the adoption of such standards for juvenile justice at the State and local level.

INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 310. Each Federal agency shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

RECORDS

SEC. 311. Records containing the identity of any juvenile gathered for purposes pursuant to this title may under no circumstances be disclosed or transferred to any individual or to any public or private agency.

TITLE IV—RUNAWAY YOUTH ACT

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Runaway Youth Act".

FINDINGS

SEC. 402. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the number of juveniles who leave and remain away from home without parental permission has increased to alarming proportions, creating a substantial law enforcement problem for the communities inundated, and significantly endangering the young people who are without resources and live on the street;

(2) the exact nature of the problem is not well defined because national statistics on the size and profile of the runaway youth population are not tabulated;

(3) many such young people, because of their age and situation, are urgently in need of temporary shelter and counseling services;

(4) the problem of locating, detaining, and returning runaway children should not be the responsibility of already overburdened police departments and juvenile justice authorities; and

(5) in view of the interstate nature of the problem, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to develop accurate reporting of the problem nationally and to develop an effective system of temporary care outside the law enforcement structure.

RULES

SEC. 403. The Secretary may prescribe such rules as he considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

PART A—GRANT PROGRAM

PURPOSES OF GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 411. The Secretary is authorized to make grants and to provide technical assistance to localities and nonprofit private agencies in accordance with the provisions of this part. Grants under this part shall be made for the purpose of developing local facilities to deal primarily with the immediate needs of runaway youth in a manner which is outside the law enforcement structure and juvenile justice system. The size of such grant shall be determined by the number of runaway youth in the community and the existing availability of services. Among applicants priority shall be given to private organizations or institutions which have had past experience in dealing with runaway youth.

ELIGIBILITY

SEC. 412. (a) To be eligible for assistance under this part, an applicant shall propose to establish, strengthen, or fund an existing or proposed runaway house, a locally controlled facility providing temporary shelter, and counseling services to juveniles who have left home without permission of their parents or guardians.

(b) In order to qualify for assistance under this part, an applicant shall submit a plan to the Secretary meeting the following requirements and including the following information. Each house—

(1) shall be located in an area which is demonstrably frequented by or easily reachable by runaway youth;

(2) shall have a maximum capacity of no more than 20 children, with a ratio of staff to children of sufficient portion to assure adequate supervision and treatment;

(3) shall develop adequate plans for contacting the child's parents or relatives (if such action is required by State law) and assuring the safe return of the child according to the best interests of the child, for contacting local government officials pursuant to informal arrangements established with such officials by the runaway house, and for providing for other appropriate alternative living arrangements;

(4) shall develop an adequate plan for assuring proper relations with law enforcement personnel, and the return of runaway youths from correctional institutions;

(5) shall develop an adequate plan for aftercare counseling involving runaway youth and their parents within the State in which the runaway house is located and for assuring, as possible, that aftercase services will be provided to those children who are returned beyond the State in which the runaway house is located;

(6) shall keep adequate statistical records profiling the children and parents which it serves, except that records maintained on individual runaway youths shall not be disclosed without parental consent to anyone other than another agency compiling statistical records or a government agency involved in the disposition of criminal charges against an individual runaway youth, and reports or other documents based on such statistical records shall not disclose the identity of individual runaway youths;

(7) shall submit annual reports to the Secretary detailing how the house has been able to meet the goals of its plans and reporting the statistical summaries required by paragraph (6);

(8) shall demonstrate its ability to operate under accounting procedures and fiscal control devices as required by the Secretary;

(9) shall submit a budget estimate with respect to the plan submitted by such house under this subsection; and

(10) shall supply such other information as the Secretary reasonably deems necessary.

APPROVAL BY SECRETARY

SEC. 413. An application by a State, locality, or nonprofit private agency for a grant under this part may be approved by the Secretary only if it is consistent with the applicable provisions of this part and meets the requirements set forth in section 412. Priority shall be given to grants smaller than $75,000. In considering grant applications under this part, priority shall be given to any applicant whose program budget is smaller than $100,000.

GRANTS TO PRIVATE AGENCIES; STAFFING

SEC. 414. Nothing in this part shall be construed to deny grants to nonprofit private agencies which are fully controlled by private boards or persons but which in other respects meet the requirements of this part and agree to be legally responsible for the operation of the runaway house. Nothing in this part shall give the Federal Government control over the staffing and personnel decisions of facilities receiving Federal funds.

REPORTS

SEC. 415. The Secretary shall annually report to the Congress on the status and accomplishments of the runaway houses which are funded under this part, with particular attention to—

(1) their effectiveness in alleviating the problems of runaway youth;

(2) their ability to reunite children with their families and to encourage the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services;

(3) their effectiveness in strengthening family relationships and encouraging stable living conditions for children; and

(4) their effectiveness in helping youth decide upon a future course of action.

FEDERAL SHARE

SEC. 416. (a) The Federal share for the acquisition and renovation of existing structures, the provision of counseling services, staff training, and the general costs of operations of such facility's budget for any fiscal year shall be 90 percent. The non-Federal share may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated by the Secretary, including plant, equipment, or services.

(b) Payments under this section may be made in installments, in advance, or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

PART B—STATISTICAL SURVEY

SURVEY; REPORT

SEC. 421. The Secretary shall gather information and carry out a comprehensive statistical survey defining the major characteristic of the runaway youth population and determining the areas of the Nation most affected. Such survey shall include the age, sex, and socioeconomic background of runaway youth, the places from which and to which children run, and the relationship between running away and other illegal behavior. The Secretary shall report the results of such information gathering and survey to the Congress not later than June 30, 1975.

RECORDS

SEC. 422. Records containing the identity of individual runaway youths gathered for statistical purposes pursuant to section 421 may under no circumstances be disclosed or transferred to any individual or to any public or private agency.

TITLE V—COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 501. There is hereby established, as an independent organization in the executive branch of the Federal Government, a council to be known as the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 502. (a) The Council shall consist of six regular members appointed under subsection (c) and an additional number of ex officio members designated by subsection (b).

(b)(1) The following individuals shall be ex officio members of the Council:

(A) the Secretary (or the Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, if so designated by the Secretary);

(B) the Director of the Administration;

(C) the Attorney General or his designee;

(D) the Secretary of Labor (or the Under Secretary of Labor, if so designated by such Secretary);

(E) the Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention or his designee;

(F) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (or the Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, if so designated by such Secretary); and

(G) the Administrator of the Institute.

(2) Any individual designated under paragraph (1)(C) or paragraph (1)(E) shall be selected from individuals who exercise significant decisionmaking authority in the Federal agency involved.

(c) The regular members of the Council shall be appointed by the President from persons who by virtue of their training or experience have special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of juvenile justice. At least three members shall not have attained 26 years of age on the date of their appointment.

(d)(1) Except as provided by paragraphs (2) and (3), members of the Council appointed by the President under subsection (c) shall be appointed for terms of four years.

(2) Of the members first appointed to the Council under subsection (c)—

(A) two shall be appointed for terms of one year,

(B) two shall be appointed for terms of two years, and

(C) two shall be appointed for terms of three years, to be designated by the President at the time of appointment. Such members shall be appointed within ninety days after the date of the enactment of this title.

(3) Any member appointed to fill a va-

cancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of his term until a successor has taken office.

(e) Members of the Council shall be eligible for reappointment to the Council.

(f) The Secretary shall serve as Chairman of the Council. The Director shall serve as Vice Chairman of the Council. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman.

(g) The Council shall meet at least six times per year to receive reports and recommendations and to take such actions as may be considered appropriate by members of the Council. A description of the activities of the Council shall be included in the annual report required by section 104(b)(5).

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 503. (a) The Council shall, through a subcommittee designated by the Chairman, review the activities and administration of the Institute and shall make recommendations with respect to such activities and administration.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY; STAFF

SEC. 504. (a) The Chairman shall, with the approval of the Council, appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council.

(b) The Executive Secretary shall be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the Council.

(c) The Executive Secretary may, with the approval of the Council, appoint and fix the salary of such personnel as he considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

SEC. 505. (a) Members of the Council who are full-time employees of the Federal Government shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the functions of the Council.

(b) Members of the Council who are not full-time employees of the Federal Government shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $100 per day, including travel-time for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Council. Members shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the functions of the Council.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 601. (a) To carry out the purposes of title I, II, and III there is authorized to be appropriated $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, and $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978.

(b) Not more than 5 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this Act may be used for the purposes authorized under title I.

(c) Not more than 10 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this Act may be used for purposes authorized under title III.

(d)(1) To carry out the purposes of part A of title IV there is authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, 1976, and 1977, the sum of $10,000,000.

(2) To carry out the purposes of part B of title IV there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000.

(e) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of title V.

NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) No financial assistance for any program under this Act shall be provided unless the grant, contract, or agreement with respect to such program specifically provides that no person with responsibilities in the operation of such program will discriminate with respect to any such program because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation, or beliefs.

(b) No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be subjected to discrimination under, or be denied employment in connection with any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act. The provisions of the preceding sentence shall be enforced in accordance with section 603 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Section 603 of such Act shall apply with respect to any action taken to enforce such sentence. This section shall not be construed as affecting any other legal remedy that a person may have if such person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, subjected to discrimination under, or denied employment in connection with any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 603. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), the foregoing provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 104(b)(5), section 104(b)(6), and section 310 shall take effect at the close of December 31, 1974. Section 105 shall take effect at the close of August 31, 1977.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problems of juvenile delinqency, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 821, IMPROVING QUALITY OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist upon its amendments to S. 821, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, HAWKINS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Messrs. QUIE, and STEIGER of Wisconsin.

AMENDING THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1227 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1227

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15582) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to enable Congress to concur in or disapprove international agreements for cooperation in regard to certain nuclear technology. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN). Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1227 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 15582, a bill amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

H.R. 15582 amends subsection 123(d) of the act to provide for a revised procedure by which certain proposed international agreements for peaceful cooperation in nuclear energy will receive congressional treatment in the manner now provided for military agreements—specifically, the requirement of a 60-day congressional review. The bill also provides that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is required to report its views and recommendations, together with a proposed concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress favors, or does not favor, as the case may be, the proposed agreement for cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, the House's consideration of H.R. 15582 is particularly timely because on June 14 and 17, the President announced his intention to enter into cooperative nuclear power agreements with Egypt and Israel, respectively. H.R. 15582 provides the Congress with a clear-cut mechanism for responsible participation in these nuclear areas. I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1227 in order that we may discuss, debate and pass H.R. 15582.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1227, as previously explained, provides for the consideration of H.R. 15582, amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. This is an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

This bill was introduced after the President announced in June his intention to enter into a cooperative nuclear power agreement with Egypt and Israel.

The bill amends section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide for a revised procedure by which certain proposed international agreements for peaceful cooperation in nuclear energy will, in effect, receive congressional treatment in the manner now provided for military agreements.

The bill strengthens the framework of procedures by placing agreements for power reactors with a capacity of more than 5 thermal megawatts, and special nuclear material associated therewith, on the same level as military agreements, for which a 60-day review is presently required under subsection 123d of the act. That subsection also provides that a congressional concurrent resolution of disfavor would legally bar execution of a proposed agreement. Additionally, the Joint Committee is to report its views within the first 30 days of any such 60-day period, together with a proposed concurrent resolution expressing congressional favor or disfavor.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I urge the adopiton of the resolution.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 15582, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to enable Congress to concur in or disapprove international agreements for cooperation in regard to certain nuclear technology.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15582, with Mr. FORD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORD). Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) will be recogized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15582, the bill now under consideration will strengthen the procedures for congressional review of certain international agreements for peaceful cooperation in the field of nuclear energy. This bill has the unanimous support of all members of the Joint Committee, and the other body has passed a companion bill, S. 3698, by a unanimous vote of 96 to nothing. It will, when enacted into law, govern the procedures for review of the anticipated agreements with Egypt, Israel, and Iran.

The Atomic Energy Act's present requirements in subsection 123 have served their purpose to date. There has been no evidence of unlawful diversions or unwarranted use of special nuclear material in regard to existing agreements for cooperation. Section 123 provides for adequate disclosures, a guaranty of security safeguards, a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material transferred pursuant to an agreement would not be used for noncivil purposes, and a guaranty of nontransferability to unauthorized parties. Further, under subsection 123b, the President must not only approve and authorize the proposed agreement, but is required to make a determination in writing that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

Nevertheless, the present authority of the Congress with respect to civil agreements is not clear. Section 123c merely provides for a 30-day period before the Joint Committee, and is silent as to congressional remedies. The Joint Committee has taken its responsibility seriously, and has conducted about 90 hearings on proposed agreements. Nevertheless, the committee considered it prudent to provide an adequate, clear-cut mechanism for responsible congressional participation in these sensitive nuclear areas.

H.R. 15582 would accomplish just that, by placing power reactors with a capacity of more than 5 thermal megawatts, and special nuclear material associated therewith, under the ambit of subsection 123d, where language already exists to require a 60-day review, and which provides that a concurrent resolution of disfavor by both Houses would legally bar the execution of a proposed agreement. An additional proviso will require the Joint Committee to report its views and recommendations within the first 30 days of any such 60-day period, and thus give the full Congress ample time to consider any proposed concurrent resolution.

In my view, H.R. 15582 satisfies the concern of the many Members who have expressed themselves on this matter, and I urge their affirmation of this proposal.

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

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to give this Congress more oversight than it now has with respect to agreements for cooperation with other countries with respect to nuclear reactors, nuclear material, and things of that nature. At the present time we have many of these agreements.

Each one of them, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, has come up before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and has laid there for 30 days before it could be executed and put into effect.

Under the procedures of this bill, if it is adopted, those agreements will come up for 60 days instead of 30 days. Within the first 30 days the Joint Committee will have to make a recommendation to the Congress as a whole as to whether or not the agreement should be approved or disapproved and send a disapproval or an approval resolution to each of the Houses of Congress.

If both Houses of Congress pass a disapproval resolution, that ends the matter there. The agreement does not go into effect. If the Congress gets into a time bind and wants to implement one of these agreements before the 60 days expire, then it can pass the resolution of approval and thereby waive whatever balance of time there is within the 60-day limit.

Incidentally, this kind of arrangement for review of any agreement for cooperation would be in effect if there are to be the Israeli and Egyptian reactors that the President talked about in his recent trip to the Mideast.

Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, in urging favorable consideration of H.R. 15582.

This bill has the unanimous and unqualified support of the joint committee. There have been over a dozen bills, resolutions, and amendments proposed in the House and Senate in the last 3 weeks with essentially the same objectives as this bill. The Senate passed a companion bill without a single dissenting vote. I believe the provisions of H.R. 15582 express the will of the Congress, and do so in the manner most consistent with the overall tone and content of the Atomic Energy Act.

Strengthened provisions for congressional review and approval of proposed agreements for cooperation appear to be desired by the Congress in time to govern the treatment of the upcoming agreements now being negotiated with Egypt, Israel and Iran. Such agreements will probably be submitted a few weeks from now.

This bill has the desirable feature of not requiring congressional action on innocuous agreements such as agreements for cooperation in the use of radioisotopes for medical, industrial, or agricultural research. These will continue to go into effect 30 days after submittal if Congress takes no action.

Let us not lose sight of where we are today with respect to worldwide utilization of atomic energy.

There are now in operation 21 U.S.-type nuclear powerplants in 9 foreign countries with a total capacity of 7 million kilowatts. There are another 90 such plants under construction or on order in 16 foreign countries. These would generate 75 million kilowatts of electricity.

Now, if we look at all kinds of foreign reactors—test, research, and power—throughout the world we find there are 518 of them in operation, under construction, or planned, in 49 countries. Atomic energy has come into its own on a global basis. There is strenuous competition among the seven countries who can supply reactors for electric power generation. At a cost of as much as $600 million for a single reactor, this business can be and is a tremendous asset to the U.S. balance of payments. The same is true for nuclear fuel and other related activities of the nuclear industry.

But in our role as an international supplier of nuclear technology, we must continue to assure that that technology is indeed used for peaceful purposes alone. We cannot prevent other nations from disseminating this technology without adequate safeguards, but we can assure that the reactors and fuel we sell are not diverted for military purposes. We have done so successfully so far.

This bill will provide Congress with an expanded role in developing the terms of agreements for sharing nuclear technology. Our watchfulness will help to insure that the Commission continues its careful safeguards programs.

I support H.R. 15582, and urge its passage.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the Indian explosion of a nuclear explosive and some of the agreements to export nuclear reactors which have been made of unknown content with Egypt and possibly with Iran, I think, have aroused tremendous interest in the need for closer congressional control over nuclear agreements and for subsequent strengthening of international nuclear safeguards to prevent a diversion of nuclear material.

Nuclear reactors, through the production of plutonium, can lead to nuclear weapons. The United States has sold nuclear reactors to 33 countries. Of these 33 countries, 21 have not ratified the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Among these 21 nonratifiers are India, South Africa, Brazil, Indonesia, and South Korea.

Now, consider the following scenario: With our help, country A develops nuclear power, declaring it has absolutely no intention of developing nuclear weapons; neighboring country B does not believe country A. And even if its leaders did believe country A, internal political pressures would force country B to go after nuclear weapons as soon as possible. As soon as it transpires that country B is going after nuclear weapons, country A will undergo the same internal pressures to develop its own nuclear weapons despite its previous intentions or disclaimers. Then neighboring country C feels threatened and states that it needs nuclear weapons to protect itself from the threats of countries A and B. And so it goes on with neighboring countries D, E, and F.

We can substitute for these alphabetical letters the countries of Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq, as well as Egypt and Israel, and we will see the dangers of nuclear proliferation once some of these countries get nuclear technology.

Under this conceivable chain reaction situation, it becomes increasingly inevitable that some dictator, terrorist, or demagog who somehow acquires nuclear weapons will use them, possibly touching off a nuclear world war III. We must keep in mind that all the major wars of this century have started from military actions involving small nations.

Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of this bill I intend to offer an amendment to provide that no nuclear agreement or amendment to any nuclear agreement, if the agreement or amendment is entered into after July 1 of this year, shall take effect unless approved by an act of Congress. My amendment provides the simplest procedure to assure strong congressional control and the monitoring of nuclear agreements

No agreement will go through unless both Houses of Congress act positive to approve the agreement or the amendment to a nuclear agreement by an act of Congress.

Under this Joint Committee's bill, nuclear agreements can be stopped only if both Houses of Congress act to forbid the agreement. So that the agreement has a green light unless we move to stop it. In all of the nuclear agreements we have made with the 33 countries, not once has anything come to this floor of Congress for a vote.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment raises no constitutional issues, because it requires an act of Congress approving nuclear agreements before such an agreement can go through. The Joint Committee bill, by providing a congressional veto of nuclear agreements by congressional action, is proposing a procedure of dubious constitutionality, because article I, section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution states as follows:

> Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives * * *

Now, Mr. Chairman, this makes no exception except for adjournment. Every resolution under the law must go to the President for signature. There is only one exception that is implicit, and that is in Hollingsworth against Virginia in 1798, which indicates a constitutional amendment does not require the President's signature. That is the only one.

Since the concurrent resolution is not signed by the President, the Joint Committee is proposing a procedure of dubious constitutionality which could fail us at a moment when we most need it.

Other bills and laws have used this process of a concurrent resolution. The courts have not ruled on the constitutionality of this procedure. As I said, my amendment would solve this constitutional problem.

My amendment needs no complicated antifilibuster provisions, no confusing timetables, and no requirements that the Joint Atomic Energy Committee shall report such and such a resolution by such and such a date. If the administration wants a nuclear agreement to go through, it will lobby to have Congress approve the agreement, under the procedure of my amendment. If the nuclear agreement is a good one, with atomic safeguards, Congress will approve the agreement.

What is the administration afraid of? My amendment, incidentally, because it covers any nuclear agreement since July 1, will assure that the proposed Mideast nuclear agreements among Egypt, Israel, and Iran would be subject to congressional approval.

Finally, my amendment preserves the House prerogative that no nuclear agreement can go through without the approval of the House as well as the Senate. I think this body has been ignored for too long.

Again, the purpose of my amendment is to make sure that everything that has to do with a nuclear agreement will come to the floor of this body for a vote. This is not to stop nuclear agreements. I have no intention of trying to stop them. I am merely making sure that Congress will have a chance to pass on them to provide the rules under which they will be made.

The impact of requiring congressional action in this is to make sure that better agreements are drafted, knowing that they have to come to the Congress for scrutiny and approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Joint Committee, knows, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) knows, I have consistently favored the orderly, careful development of the civilian nuclear power program, both at home and abroad. I also want the gentlemen to know that I support the concept behind this bill. Yet the same world events which have dramatized the need for this legislation have given me some concern over a few of its provisions. I would therefore like to address two questions to the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee, or to Mr. HOSMER:

First. My first question concerns the provision that only reactors of 5 thermal megawatts or more be subject to congressional approval. According to my information, 31 such reactors have been sold to other countries by the United States since the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act in 1954. It is variously reported that the weapons potential of these small reactors directly relates to the degree of uranium enrichment required by a particular reactor. As a consequence, I am told, small, heavy water reactors using only slightly enriched uranium might produce sufficient plutonium for a weapon within 3 to 4 years, while those other small reactors, such as are mainly used in this country, and which require very highly enriched uranium could take as long as 50 years to yield sufficient plutonium to manufacture a simple bomb.

In light of the comparatively small burden which approval of these agreements for small research reactors would place on the Joint Committee and Congress, and in view of the uncertainty over the weapons potential of such devices, could the distinguished chairman (Mr. HOSMER) further enlighten us as to the committee's rationale in determining that reactors of less than 5 megawatts need not be approved or disapproved by Congress?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be delighted to explain the situation, as I understand it, to the gentleman.

These are very small research reactors that are involved here, and we looked very carefully into this threshold in relation to the amount of nuisance and bother it would be, not only to ourselves,

but to the people overseas with whom we are dealing. And we were able to determine that there was little if any uncertainty about weapons potentiality of such small reactors, and it is truly negligible.

It is true that by using highly optimistic numbers as to how much plutonium is needed to make a bomb, and assuming the research reactor was using low enriched or natural uranium, and was operated for maximum plutonium production, and then assigning the country in question a highly advanced capability for reprocessing that plutonium, we could come up with a scare time such as 3 or 4 years to accumulate enough plutonium to make one small bomb. But the United States does not make research reactors using these low enrichment fuels that would lend themselves to that purpose. We only use the high enrichment fuel elements for the reactors of this kind that we export. Also International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards are applied to all U.S. exports in addition to those that the United States itself provides for in these agreements for cooperation. They apply whether they be as to reactors or fuel or both. The international safeguards are essentially the U.S. safeguards, and we have no evidence of any violation or subterfuge so far.

The plutonium that was obtained for the Indian reactor was from an unsafeguarded reactor that the Canadians sold to the Indians. The safeguarded reactors in every case that are under safeguards do not have that possibility for diversion.

Second, as to the burden, we would be in a sense closing a door that is almost shut anyway, since the emphasis today is no longer on small research reactors but on power reactors, where the committee's threshold is fully operative.

In other words, there is not going to be much more export business on these small reactors. In addition to that, the bill addresses itself to the association of fuel with the reactors, so that if one were to cover all reactors, then Congress would be reviewing the exports of replacement fuel, and thus the burden is actually magnified because of the 31 already in operation in these various places.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman.

If the gentleman will yield further, the Joint Committee has been notified of an export under an agreement for cooperation with Sweden of 13.34 kilograms of highly enriched uranium to be used to refuel a research reactor. We would not want in each of these cases of these 31 reactors or possibly more to have each brought up to the Congress and then go through all of these procedures because, as was explained, the burden is large in relation to any gain we would get.

Finally, under the committee bill, section 123(c) of the Atomic Energy Act remains in force, and under that section the Atomic Energy Commission is required to forward agreements for all exports under 5 megawatts thermal to the Joint Committee for a 30-day review. It is not as formal a procedure as the one in the case of larger reactors in the pending bill.

The committee has always announced the receipt of these proposals in the RECORD for all Members, and one would hope that those interested would have ample time to review the scope of such an agreement and make their views known to the committee.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. May I say to the gentleman I certainly appreciate the time and attention he has given to fleshing out the committee report in these areas. If the gentleman is willing to yield for a second question, I would also like to inquire about the criteria which the Joint Committee and Congress ought to employ to assure that sufficient safeguard guarantees are required in a bilateral or multilateral agreement. In the committee report on H.R. 15582, there is a summary of particular safeguard and security assurances which are presently required by the Atomic Energy Act.

Could the gentleman advise how the Members of this body can best review proposed future international agreements, so as to assure, as fully as possible, that all safeguard and security guarantees are carried out? What criteria does the gentleman expect the Joint Committee and the Congress to employ, so that our constituents are assured that every precaution has been taken against illicit diversion of nuclear materials or sabotage of nuclear reactors provided to other nations.

Mr. HOSMER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I believe we would want to have the Congress see whether the proposed agreements meet the provisions of subsections 123 (a) and (b) of the Atomic Energy Act; 123(a) specifies that the proposed agreement must include terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; a guaranty by the cooperating party that the specified safeguards will be maintained; a guaranty of peaceful uses only; and a guaranty of nontransfer to authorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party; 123(b) in addition to that requires that the President certify in writing that he approves and authorizes the execution of the agreement, and that the agreement will promote and not unreasonably risk common defense and security.

In addition to that the Congress would want to review the specific safeguards to be imposed. Normally, as I indicated earlier, these are the IAEA safeguards, which are in effect the U.S. safeguards. But there are additional places such as in the agreement with Egypt and Israel where we might want to insist that we obtain additional safeguards because of the regional situation and we would want to see if these were included in the agreement as presented to us once it got here.

Lastly, I think we would want the Congress to keep a careful eye on U.S. fuel enrichment capacity to insure that domestic needs are not jeopardized by these proposed exports in the case of nuclear fuel. As with other materials these will be in short supply as the nuclear reactors grow around the world and we want to make certain that the United States has the fuel before we engage in exports which would tend to diminish our own supply.

These are the kinds of things we on the committee have always looked at in the past and I believe that the Congress would want to look at them in the future as the new provisions for closer scrutiny and more opportunity by the total membership are adopted so we may take a look at these things.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman again for his full and complete answer. His answer does reassure me relative to the legislation which I believe I can now fully support.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some information on the effect of this bill upon the recent agreements between the United States and Egypt and the United States and Israel. What effect will this bill have upon these agreements?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Since these two agreements are still under negotiation and have not been submitted to the Congress by the joint committee they would be covered by this legislation.

Mr. WOLFF. What about the fuel for the reactors? Will this be covered?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Definitely it will be under safeguard provisions in the agreements. One of the strong features of all agreements are the safeguard provisions and that would cover the reactors and the fuels.

Mr. WOLFF. One final point, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if in view of this we will take up a bill, a comprehensive bill here that will take into consideration all future agreements? I wonder, in view of the interest that a great many Members have regarding the situation with Israel and Egypt, if the chairman will entertain a concurrent resolution regarding the new agreements between Egypt and the United States and Israel and the United States?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I really do not see any reason for a concurrent resolution at this stage, because when the agreements are submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the House will be notified and the other body will be notified. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold open hearings on these agreements and all Members will be notified in time if they wish to testify on the agreements and they will be permitted to do so, and then the committee within 30 days, under the legislation we are considering, would be compelled to report to the House and to the other body for either approval of disapproval.

Mr. WOLFF. I understand from the gentleman then that there will be hearings on the new agreements?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Definitely. Contrary to the prevailing view with few exceptions every agreement that has been entered into in the field of nuclear

energy with other nations has been subject to hearings and open hearings. There have been rare occasions when they were not, and there was no particular reason why they were not except at the time they were not considered that important and there was not significant enough interest that anyone sought hearings on them.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman. In view of the sensitivity of the situation in the Middle East, I am happy to learn that hearings will be conducted. I congratulate the gentleman on bringing the bill to the attention of the Members.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I had a question. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the diligence with which the gentleman has pursued this matter. I know the committee has done a very good and thorough job. I still do not understand why it would not be more in order or would not be more appropriate, rather than have sort of a veto by the Congress, rather than approve the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG), to have affirmative action required by the Congress. It sort of puts a greater burden on us. It will require a little more effort, a little more attention by all of us; but I would think with the high risk involved, not only in these two situation, but in others that will follow on, why we would not be willing to meet our responsibility to hear, to digest and understand these questions. Does the gentleman get the point of the question?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I get the point of the gentleman. We are limited in time, but I would like to allay the gentleman's fears. The legislation under consideration provides that we report to the House within 30 days, before the 60 days expires. If any Member of the Congress wanted to offer a resolution of disapproval, he certainly could. We are not putting that in here, because the gentleman is talking about a lot more than the type of agreements between Israel and Iran and Egypt. The gentleman is talking about research reactors scattered all over the world. If we had to have action every time one of these agreements was made with these small 5 megawatt reactors, we would do nothing but add to the nuclear energy problem.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Could we have it beyond the 5 megawatts?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I think we were extraordinarily cautious. I think it is possible to have a concurrent resolution on any agreement under the provisions of this act that we are working on today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I assume the gentleman would agree that giving these reactors both to Israel and Egypt is giving them a part of the world's trouble with all its turmoil and high risk.

I am not suggesting that the gentleman's committee is not paying attention to it; but I do think if our Government had to go the other way in affirmative action by the Congress, there would be greater safeguards.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Since I have promised time to another I do not want to take any more time on this. Under the 5-minute rule I will be glad to debate the matter with the gentleman.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to a couple of points that have been made here during the discussion in the last 5 or 10 minutes and see if I can help shed a little light on this subject. I want particularly to speak to the expression of deep concern by the gentleman from New York who has just now recommended positive action by Congress. I want to say that I very much share his concern with respect to safeguarding nuclear reactors that we sell to foreign countries.

I think there are several points we should understand, however. One is that no action by this Congress is going to provide absolute control over the development of nuclear reactors in other countries. The United States is not the only exporter of nuclear reactors. The reactor the Indians used in their explosion was bought from Canada. In fact, we do not even make that kind of reactor in this country.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. Who supplied the heavy water, however, for that Indian reactor?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer the question of the gentlewoman for certain, but I suspect it was the Canadians.

Ms. ABZUG. I am advised we did in 1956. We sold to India 42,000 pounds of heavy water at a cost of $1,176,000.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, insofar as the supply of heavy water is concerned, in the beginning what is now called heavy water was supplied by the United States, but subsequently and for quite some time India has had its own heavy water manufacturing capacity. They do it domestically in India.

Mr. McCORMACK. The rationale behind my response was that the Canadian Government, because it manufactures and exports reactors requiring heavy water, and presently manufactures and exports heavy water, was the probable vendor in the case of their reactor.

The next point I wish to talk about is the 5-megawatt thermal threshold. It makes sense to set a threshold someplace, because one can make extremely small reactors which are obviously no hazard with respect to producing weapons materials.

Setting a 5-megawatt thermal threshold makes it virtually impossible to make a weapon. A normal nuclear power reactor produces about 4,000 thermal megawatts. Thus, a 5-megawatt reactor is about one-thousandth of that size. It is very small by comparison.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about the limitation and exemption of reactors under 5 megawatts.

For example, Dr. Henry Kendall, professor of physics at MIT, testified before one of our subcommittees. He testified that a simple implosion bomb requires from 1 to 8 kilograms of plutonium, depending on design. A 5-megawatt reactor, if operated 300 days per year, would produce 1.35 kilograms of plutonium per year, or 4.05 kilograms over a 3-year period—enough to manufacture a bomb.

So I think these are not toys we are dealing with. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Washington is a scientist and a physicist with a good background and I am just a simple lawyer and Member of Congress. But I am frightened and concerned, perhaps because I am just a simple lawyer and Member of Congress.

If we are going to require the approval of the Congress, why should we exempt reactors of 5 megawatts or less.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to answer the gentlewoman from New York. The reason, of course, is that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has always been informed of the export of research reactors, and this information has been available to Congress. The committee has seen no reason to take the time of Congress to review the export of such research tools.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, let me make one more point, and then if the gentleman has a question I shall be glad to answer it. I want to make just this one fact clear in our minds.

If we control the fuel from a nuclear reactor, both before it goes into the reactor and after it comes out, then we control whether or not weapons will be made. Under the agreements we can write with any country, we can control that fuel to any degree we wish. For instance, we can put it under international safeguards which may allow for reprocessing of the fuel in that country, in which case they may have access to it; or we can require that the fuel elements be shipped out of the country and then processed some place else, in which case they have no access to it at all.

With respect to the agreements with Israel and Egypt that are coming before us under this act in the future, I have already indicated to the members of the Joint Committee and to the Atomic Energy Commission that I will insist that the United States physically control those fuel elements both before they go in the reactor and after they come out of the reactor.

Therefore, there will be no way for any of these countries, short of breaking off diplomatic relations with us and undertaking what would very nearly be a hostile act, to get control of the materials. Those fuel elements can be shipped out and reprocessed in this country or in Brussels, under which conditions the host country would have no access whatever to them.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. This is quite a different circumstance, though. Have not other countries taken our technology, taken our materials, and then booted us out and went on and did what they wanted to do? This has happened to us. It has happened to the Russians.

Is not the gentleman concerned about the use of very small reactors by terrorist groups who may grab them? It is perfectly true that they are not going to declare a major war with all the material accumulated.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will go back to what we said before: There is no way to put the cap back on the bottle of the nuclear genie. That cap was taken off in 1942, and it is never going to be put back on again. We do not have exclusive control over other nations' nuclear programs. No country in the world has control over the manufacture or sale of reactors. If it did, then the gentleman's point would have great validity.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The point I want to make is that most of the countries who are dealing with these other sources of nuclear reactors and nuclear power are getting their know-how and their expertise from the United States. For example, France reactor technology is United States-licensed from General Electric and Westinghouse, and Japan and Italy, like France, both have U.S.-licensed reactor technology.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say that the gentleman is completely in error.

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

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I viewed our President's promise to provide Egypt and Israel with nuclear reactors with a sense of incredulity.

The proliferation of nuclear technology has always been risky, but it is particularly alarming in this case due to the volatile history of the recipients.

In a section of the world where the threat of terrorist activities is part of the way of life, the potential for sabotage in a nuclear powerplant is very real.

Contemplate the ramifications of ignorant and desperate men gaining control of nuclear materials.

We must eliminate such possibilities, not encourage them.

India's ostensibly "peaceful" explosion of a nuclear device is one frightening example of how knowledge of nuclear technology can be used to develop a power capable of massive destruction.

Even atomic energy advocates of the proposed sales of nuclear reactors, admit there is no positive guarantee that safeguards will work—that nuclear fuel will not be diverted for use in the development of a nuclear bomb.

It is urgent, therefore, that any decision to grant nuclear aid to any foreign country should be tightly controlled and thoroughly considered by Congress.

In view of increasing demands for new energy sources, it is predictable that nuclear technology will be made available to more and more countries during the years to come.

We, therefore, must not be reckless or offhand about agreements involving nuclear aid.

Such agreements, if not carefully monitored, can too easily be violated.

And the nuclear technological knowledge we have shared, with faith in its intended application for constructive purposes, can be turned instead into a powerful means for belligerent action.

The critical decisions involving the proliferation of nuclear technology will affect the future of all men.

For this reason I believe it is essential for Congress to be well-informed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of all aspects involved in any agreement, and to have final say regarding the acceptability of all nuclear aid pacts.

The power to veto such Presidential proposals is not only essential, but a right clearly granted to Congress in the Constitution, with respect to foreign affairs.

I therefore give H.R. 15582 my full support, and for the sake of our fellow men, urge all my distinguished colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any time under general debate, but in view of the remarks that were just delivered here in the well by my very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), I think very briefly we should set within its historical perspective the issue that we are talking about this afternoon.

The United States—and this fact may have been mentioned earlier in the debate—has been, of course, for more than a score of years now committed to the dissemination of the benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy or nuclear energy, and we have formal agreements in this area with a number of countries on an individual, bilateral basis, and also in cooperation with two international organizations, the International Atomic Energy Association and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I thought it might be interesting to merely point out for the record that, excluding the reactors which are now located here in the United States, there are 518 reactors of all types in operation or under construction or planned in other countries around the world. In addition to that and in addition to our own country, the United States, there are six nations which have already entered the international market for nuclear power reactors. These countries are the United Kingdom, West Germany, France, Canada, Sweden, and the Soviet Union. In addition to the countries I have just named, Japan has actively bid on power reactor contracts overseas, and Italy has supplied components.

I have just mentioned that for the benefit of my good friend, the gentleman from California, and I wish to reassure him that really when we talk about this business of selling nuclear reactors to other countries—in this case Israel and Egypt—we are not talking about something that is new. There are 518 of these things around the world now, and 6 countries are engaged in this business.

As we found out the other day, when Iran bought five natural uranium reactors from France for $1.1 billion, there are other countries which are actively engaged in the dissemination of nuclear power. The United States is not doing anything dangerous in the sense that we are suddenly beginning to disseminate nuclear power in a manner that we have not already followed for more than 20 years. This may help, I think, to keep this discussion on a level plane, as I hope it will be.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the fact that so many countries have this technology and that it has been disseminated is due to the fact that the United States has been so loose in its willingness to spread this technology around the world; is that not the truth of the matter? And this is because Congress has taken very little interest in these matters in the past?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the gentleman from Maryland. I respect the gentleman very much, but I could not agree with his characterization of this as a "loose" arrangement. We have some very carefully worked out, highly technical, bilateral agreements with these countries, providing for certain safeguards.

We do cooperate with and we are a member of the International Atomic Energy Association, one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, and we do pay a great deal of attention to how these reactors are used and for what purposes, and we take pains to guard against the illegal diversion of enriched uranium and special nuclear materials for purposes other than peaceful uses.

So to say we are careless and indifferent, I think, is to simply ignore the facts that are now in the record.

Mr. Chairman, I append herewith a document which details the foreign suppliers of nuclear power reactors and

gives some of the other important statistics:

FOREIGN SUPPLIERS OF NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS

In addition to the United States, there are a number of other countries which presently have the capability to supply large power reactors to foreign customers. A brief rundown on these countries follows:

United Kingdom—Supplied natural uranium reactors to Japan (166 Mwe) and Italy (150 Mwe) many years ago. Have been actively involved—without success to date—in efforts to sell advanced gas reactors and steam cooled heavy water reactors.

West Germany—Supplied 318 Mwe natural uranium heavy water reactor to Argentina; 692 Mwe water reactor to Austria; 920 Mwe water reactor to Switzerland; and 450 Mwe water reactor to Netherlands.

Canada—In addition to 40 Mwt research reactor, has supplied India with two CANDU type power reactors (220 Mwe each). Also supplied Pakistan with 125 Mwe natural uranium, heavy water reactor. Is also planning to supply 600 Mwe CANDU reactor to Argentina.

Sweden—Supplying 660 Mwe water reactor to Finland.

France—Supplied 480 Mwe natural uranium gas cooled reactor to Spain. Press reports indicate five power reactors will be supplied to Iran.

Japan—Has bid on foreign sales, but has not as yet sold reactor plant.

Italy—Has supplied large components and systems, but not complete reactors as yet.

Russia—Supplied two water reactors (880 Mwe each) to Bulgaria; two water reactors (834 Mwe each) to Czechoslovakia; and two water reactors (880 Mwe each) to East Germany. Also supplying two water reactors (440 Mwe each) to Finland.

In sum, six foreign countries (UK, West Germany, France, Canada, Sweden and USSR) have already sold power reactors abroad; Japan has bid on power reactors overseas, but has not sold one yet; and Italy has supplied components. It can be expected that additional industrialized countries will acquire this capability in the future. Further details are provided in the attached table:

FOREIGN REACTOR SALES BY NON-UNITED STATES FIRMS

Supplier country, firm, and reactor sales [1]

West Germany; Kraftwerk Union AG; Tulln, Austria.

West Germany; Kraftwerk Union AG; Borselle, Netherlands.

West Germany; Kraftwerk Union AG; Gosgen, Switzerland.

West Germany; Siemens AG; Atucha,[2] Argentina.

Remarks

Stiff competition in many foreign competitions, most of which U.S. vendors have won.

France; Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique; Vandellos,[3] Spain.

Remarks

No recent activity in foreign market but with rapidly building (U.S.-licensed) LWR manufacturing capability may be expected in future.

Sweden; ASEA ATOM; Oikiluoto, Finland.

Remarks

The Finnish sale was initial venture in foreign market. May be expected to continue to compete, especially in Europe.

Canada; Atomic Energy of Canada, Limited (AECL); Rapp-1 & Rapp-2, India.

Canada; AECL/Italimpianti; Rio Tercero, Argentina.

Canada; AECL; Kori-3 & Kori-4, Korea.*

Canada; Canadian General Elec.; Kanupp, Pakistan.

Remarks

Very active sales activity with significant interest especially from nations just going nuclear and with desire for fuel supply independence, local industry participation or political ends.

United Kingdom; none.[4]

Remarks

If UK can make domestic program decisions and get promptly underway, may be a world supplier. Especially likely if choice is US-licensed LWR.

USSR; Atomenergo Export; Loviisa–1 [5], Finland, Loviisa–2.

Remarks

Indications Soviets might be willing to supply reactors in West. LWR technology considered inferior, if Western technology equally available & politically acceptable to customer.

Japan: none.[6]

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York if I have time left.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to ask a question, and perhaps it has been answered prior to my getting on the floor, in regard to India's recent explosion of a nuclear device which apparently India was able to manufacture from plutonium, or materials gathered from the Canadian nuclear reactor that it has had for some years.

Is India a member of the International Atomic Organization that is supposed to look after this sort of thing?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I believe yes, that is correct; India is a member of the IAEA. But, as I think the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) explained a little earlier, this particular arrangement with Canada whereby this Canadian reactor was furnished to India, along with heavy water, was not under any safeguard agreement. So actually I do not think you can accuse India of violating any international agreement.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as I pointed out, although India is a member of the IAEA, it is not a signatory of the Atomic Energy Treaty.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORD). The Chair will state that he is sorry, but having announced the absence of a quorum, we will have to go through the quorum call.

The Chair again announces that he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I think that the discussion here today indicates how serious are some of the problems that are inherent in the transfer of nuclear materials, a problem we have had for a long time but which has been dramatized by the recent proposed agreements between Egypt and Israel.

I do not share the optimism of some of the Members of Congress who have spoken about the fact that we can exempt all reactors under 5 megawatts. I previously quoted from Dr. Kendall, who says that one can manufacture a nuclear bomb with that material if one uses it for 3 years. I then pointed out to some members of the committee that between 1955 and 1973, the United States exported 105 nuclear reactors of all sizes and types, 58 of which were 5-megawatt size or smaller, so that by this exemption we are going to probably exempt half of all we may be exporting.

On the other hand, it has been argued by some of my colleagues that we do no longer export these smaller heavy water reactors. I want to inform you that, in the last 2 months, Canada has taken six orders for exports of heavy water and developed a new and efficent and cheaper method isolating and processing heavy water. I am sure that this event will call into play the great American spirit of competition, and before long we too will be exporting small heavy water reactors, as we did in the past.

I strongly support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG), which will require the concurrence of both Houses of Congress on nuclear agreements. I have advocated such congressional approval and nuclear limitation.

I believe we have underestimated the impact and the effect of our continuing proliferation of nuclear reactors, nuclear materials, and nuclear weapons to the

---

[1] Outside own country.

[2] A heavy water moderated type FRG neither user domestically nor actively markets in foreign countries but they did bid it (on request) as addition to LWR type in Brazil during the most recent project competition.

[3] The single foreign sale of a power reactor. This gas-graphite natural U reactor is of type abandoned by France for even its own domestic program. Sold to Spain under extremely concessionary terms.

* Only letter of intent.

[4] This ignores the early loss-leader sales of small plants to Italy (Latina) and Japan (Tsuruga–1).

[5] Only sale outside of Bloc.

[6] Have bid in international competition, but not recently. Only sale to date is turbogenerator for Mexican nuclear plants. If manufacturing capacity can keep ahead of rapidly growing domestic program, they may be active competition in future.

nations of the world. I can understand India wanting to get into the act, but the fact is that the real problem we confront here today—and I wish there were more Members on the floor—is, are we, by insisting upon exporting this kind of technology, going to blow up the world and blow ourselves up? We have never been willing to face that reality.

I am glad the committee is coming in with some proposal to bring before the Congress the agreements for the transfer of nuclear materials or reactors. But I believe it does not go far enough. We should require the affirmative concurrence of the House and Senate to any agreements. I would hope that the amendment which will be offered this afternoon will be agreed upon and acted upon favorably by this House.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee for yielding, and I would like to commend him and the Joint Committee for recommending this legislation.

I think we have all been shocked by the proposals announced by the President for the granting of nuclear power reactors to Egypt and Israel. Those proposals were made without consultation with the Congress, and I think they have brought home to us the extreme sensitivity of this area and extreme danger involved in some of these proposals.

I recognize that this legislation would apply to those proposals and that the agreements themselves are a long way off. At the appropriate time, I will offer an amendment which would insure that without derogating in any way from the responsibility of the Joint Committee to report a resolution approving or disapproving agreements, the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee would be required to submit their recommendations on such agreements within the same period of time that the Joint Committee is required to submit its report, namely, within 30 days.

Obviously, these agreements involve delicate questions of foreign policy, and it seems to me a way should be provided, a regular and routine way should be provided, so that the House and the Senate would have the benefit of the input of their respective committees which are primarily concerned with the international relations aspects.

The proposed agreements in the Middle East illustrate the point that, to the degree possible, all the international relations expertise should be brought to bear in the consideration of such agreements.

As was mentioned earlier, technical safeguards alone will not be sufficient. We will have to consider the impact on other nations and their desire for similar agreements, and we will measure the danger of a nation simply breaking the agreement and proceeding on its own.

Such considerations, surely, are considerations on which the Congress should have the benefit of the views of those committees that are studying all the time problems of international policy. That is why I will offer my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am authorized to say that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (Mr. MORGAN) concurs in my amendment and will support it at the appropriate time.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CONLAN).

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems foolish that a loophole in current law permits U.S. nuclear agreements with foreign nations without congressional approval if they are for supposed peaceful reasons, while requiring Congress to be consulted if nuclear weaponry is involved.

As we learned from India's recent nuclear detonation, there is a thin line indeed between simply generating electricity with uranium-powered reactors and exploding atomic bombs.

That thin line is plutonium, the trigger for deadly atomic bombs, which can easily be extracted by anyone wanting to build such bombs from the irradiated wastes of almost any atomic power plant.

In fact, the type of atomic reactor President Nixon recently agreed to sell Egypt and Israel last month is very similar to the one India bought from Canada about 20 years ago, and which provided the plutonium used in India's A-bomb last May.

But it is not enough for Congress simply to amend current legislation to provide for "approval-by-inaction" of nonmilitary atomic agreements with foreign nations. This is the same cop-out procedure Congress uses to let its own pay increases proposed periodically by the President slip by unnoticed.

Congress must make a specific "yes" or "no" decision on every proposed atomic deal if it is properly to insure that such deals are in the best national interest, and that adequate safeguards and controls are required before they are finalized and approved.

For instance, before any foreign buyer obtains nuclear materials and technology for producing electricity, I would expect Congress to require evidence that safer and more abundant energy sources were not available before transfer or sale of U.S. atomic fuel and know-how could be approved.

I would also expect Congress to make sure that foreign governments are required to sign and ratify the nuclear nonproliferation treaty before atom deals could be made with the United States; that foreign buyers are forbidden from diverting nuclear materials obtained from the United States to other parties; and that reprocessing of nuclear fuel obtained from the United States is done under U.S. supervision, at the buyer's expense, to insure that plutonium is not set aside for use in atomic weapons.

This proposed Long amendment, requiring Congress specifically to approve or disapprove all foreign nuclear agreements, is a necessary first step toward insuring these controls and safeguards. Congress has abdicated too much authority to officials at the State Department, the U.S. Export-Import Bank, and other Federal agencies, who in the past have authorized or funded atomic agreements and nuclear sales and projects without approval of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

It is time to reassert our authority and to help limit the unnecessary spread of atomic materials.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15582, a bill to provide a vehicle by which Congress can increase and better exercise its powers in foreign affairs, through concurring or disagreeing with all atomic energy agreements between the United States and foreign nations.

This particular piece of legislation is the culmination of an effort which I initiated more than 6 weeks ago. Immediately after the President's alarming announcement that he had entered this Nation into major nuclear technology agreements with Israel and Egypt, I introduced a resolution making it the sense of Congress that any nuclear technology agreements shall not be agreed to without the expressed consent of a majority of both Houses of Congress.

What this legislation does is take my original effort and carry it several important steps further by including the following provisions:

First. Increases from 30 to 60 days the period of time during which Congress can act to veto a nuclear agreement which involves a nuclear reactor larger than 5 megawatts.

Second. Provides that a congressional veto of such agreements can be achieved through a concurrent resolution rather than an act of Congress.

Third. Requires that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy submit to the full Congress within 30 days a report either in favor of or against a proposed agreement and in the effect of a disagreement, a concurrent resolution expressing this shall accompany the report.

While it is true that this legislation was sparked by the recent Egypt-Israel agreements, the need for this kind of legislation has existed far longer. The fact is that the United States has entered into some 20 of these agreements without even an iota of advice from the Congress. None of these agreements were accompanied by even the most basic of safeguards, a tragic gamble, which in our present turbulent world, cannot be tolerated any longer.

The fallacy of not acquiring any effective safeguards in these kinds of agreements was clearly pointed out in the recent deal between India and Canada. Here we found an agreement supposedly for the peaceful use of nuclear energy suddenly violated when India took these materials and developed and exploded a nuclear weapon.

Our concerns here should be as genuine. Who can guarantee that a similar situation might not occur in the highly unstable and explosive Middle East. What assurances can be made, for example, that Palestinian terrorist groups might not steal these nuclear materials and use them to make nuclear weapons to destroy Israel?

The concerns and questions I raise are

not merely an exercise in hypothetical rhetoric, they are realistic concerns which deserve the attention of all of you today. This legislation represents an important first step, and I contend that these answers can be better found in an agreement which has been duly deliberated and ratified by both Houses of Congress.

Still another important purpose could be served with the passage of this legislation. For far too long the Congress has been forced to take a back seat on many of the key foreign policy decisions which this Nation has made. The executive branch has been systematically usurping traditionally legislative powers, thus allowing them to take unprecedented liberties in the conducting of foreign relations. Yet now we are talking about nuclear agreements, which if abused could have incredible consequences for the world community. We must not hasten into any of these agreements for we, as well as our children may have to live or die with these decisions.

It has been said that the future of man may rest with the development of nuclear energy—but in today's world with few means to control its use—it is a highly volatile commodity. I think it is time that we began to take a closer look at our activities in this field. Rather than expanding our commitments, perhaps we should be limiting them. Rather than disseminating the nuclear materials, perhaps we should make certain that they are not as available.

Whatever the case, this legislation will insure that more views are entered into the determination of the merits of these agreements. If you wish to restore a balance of power in this Government and if you want to give all nuclear technology agreements full and careful deliberations, then I strongly recommend your support of this legislation today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, recent events have reawakened a serious concern about the wholesale proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Since the beginning of the atoms for peace program initiated in the 1950's by President Eisenhower, the United States had quietly concluded agreements with over 30 countries for assistance in the development of nuclear power. Then on May 18 India detonated a 14-kiloton device. This poverty-ravaged country, despite its limited technological and fiscal resources, was able to construct a nuclear explosive device by diverting plutonium from an electricity generating reactor provided to them by the Canadian Government under "stringent safeguards." On the heels of this shocking event President Nixon announced proposed agreements to supply Egypt and Israel with the same type of power reactors. Each of these 600 megawatt reactors is capable of producing enough plutonium each year to power up to 50 atomic bombs.

Up to this time Congress has had virtually no say on the number or extent of these agreements. Although we can reject agreements for military exchanges under section 123(d) of the 1954 Atomic Energy Act, we have no such power over agreements for peaceful purposes. As India's diversion has made apparent, that distinction is now academic.

The legislation before us today is an attempt to restore these powers of review to Congress. I commend Chairman PRICE and the Joint Committee for their timely action, which gives us a chance to institute congressional authority before the negotiations with Egypt and Israel are completed.

It is essential that Congress have a full voice in approving these agreements of such potential import. The Mideast proposals especially raise significant questions which must receive full debate and responsible action in both Houses of Congress. There is no assurance that the long-prayed-for peace in this volatile area is secure, or that a change in governments would not bring a repudiation of the safeguard agreements. The risks of diversion into nuclear weapons, sabotage or theft by terrorists, or a military strike on a nuclear plant in the event hostilities are resumed are all to grimly obvious. We must also consider the wisdom of exporting a technology which is not accepted as completely safe in our own country. One of the touted safeguards to prevent diversion of plutonium for military use is to have the fuel rods returned to the United States for reprocessing. But there is no guarantee that this highly radioactive material can be safely transported even within this country, a danger that is compounded by moving such material abroad. Another question we must address is why, in the first place, we are providing nuclear powerplants to the oil center of the world. It is interesting to note that President Eisenhower, in his Atoms for Peace speech before the United Nations in 1953, stated that one of the primary purposes of the peaceful exchange of nuclear technology "would be to provide abundant electrical energy in the power-starved areas of the world." Egypt, with sufficient oil and the Aswan Dam hydroelectric generator now operating at only half power—5 billion kilowatts—hardly qualifies. We should at least explore the alternatives of assisting these countries in the development of other forms of energy which are safer and more environmentally sound, such as solar power or fuller development of hydroelectric power.

Unfortunately, the bill before us does not insure that Congress will have a chance to pass on these serious questions. Under H.R. 15582 proposed agreements will go into effect automatically after the 60-day layover period unless there is a negative vote in both Houses. There are no safeguards to prevent a filibuster or other procedural delay from preventing action within the necessary time period. Approval by just one House would likewise insure automatic approval.

These deficiencies could be corrected by providing that either House may veto a proposed agreement by simple resolution within the 60 days, or at least instituting safeguards against procedural delays. Passage of H.R. 15582 without any strengthening amendments will be an almost meaningless gesture.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, nuclear technology is not something which should be dispensed frivolously. It is potentially the most destructive knowledge known to mankind today.

The transfer of nuclear technology on an international level should be highly sensitive business and must not be conducted like an exchange of business machinery. When engaging in such high-level negotiations, the United States should act only after careful consideration has been given by the Congress to the proposed technology transfer.

Unfortunately, under present law, that does not occur. The transfer of "peaceful" nuclear material is not subject to the same stringent safeguards as the transfer of "military" nuclear technology. H.R. 15582, the bill now before us, would extend these safeguards to include large, peaceful nuclear reactors. Under the language of the bill, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would be required to submit a written report approving or disapproving the proposed agreements concerning large nuclear reactors. Congressional disapproval of the proposed agreement by a concurrent resolution would bar its execution.

Mr. Chairman, these are times when the proliferation of nuclear weapons is not a distant fear but rather a terrible reality. Recently, an important "neutral" country which cannot feed its own people exploded a nuclear device. In addition, the President promised nuclear reactors—which could produce material for nuclear explosives—to two major participants in the smouldering Mideast conflict.

In these times of sensitive, and carefully achieved strategic relationships, we should not encourage new players to join, and possibly upset, the existing balance of terror. Therefore, the Congress must play a more active role in the serious field of atomic power. If this proposed amendment to the Atomic Energy Act becomes law, then the will of the people—expressed through their elected representatives—could prevent the transfer of nuclear technology which might proliferate nuclear arms in areas of continued international instability.

Clearly, the world has evolved to the point where every exchange of nuclear information and technology—whether peaceful or military—has enormous repercussions. We must weigh all of our high level nuclear negotiations with the greatest of care. The passage of H.R. 15582 would assure this reflective element in the decisionmaking process. I strongly support the bill.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill pending before us, H.R. 15582. If enacted into law, this bill would establish a procedure for enabling the Congress to concur in—or to disapprove—each of the international agreements proposed to be entered into between the United States and a foreign country which would result in us helping them build nuclear powerplants.

I support this measure for several reasons.

First of all, I think the principal embodied in the bill—that the Congress, as the elected representatives of the American people, ought to have a greater voice on those matters which affect the peace and security of the world—is an important one.

No matter how worthy the motives of those who have made—and will make—such commitments on behalf of our Government, the Congress ought to have an established procedure for review of the merits and risks involved with each particular project to be undertaken pursuant to such agreements. I take this opportunity to commend the President and to laud the Secretary of State for the strides which have been made by the United States—under their leadership—in securing a more durable peace in the Middle East.

But, in our system of checks and balances and equal branches of government, the Congress has a similar duty and responsibility to insure the peace and to foster the security of peoples against aggression, measures which cannot be more adequately insured when the substance which forms the mass for nuclear weapons—plutonium—is manufactured as a byproduct of the operation of nuclear powerplants, and is, therefore, accessible to any nation which has shown a disregard for preserving the peace.

In our constitutional system, and this is my second reason for supporting the bill before us, the Congress—acting through the Senate—is given the power to pass upon formal treaties entered into through negotiations of the Executive. The Senate exercises the advice and consent function of the Congress as to treaties and must approve them by a two-thirds affirmative vote.

Similarly, the Congress under article 1, section 8, of the Constitution has the power to regulate commerce between the Nations, a power carried out not only through the Senate's advice and consent power but also through the separate authorization and appropriations processes of both Houses—the House and Senate.

It is in keeping with these constitutional powers and the spirit embodied in them, that the Congress ought to be afforded the opportunity to pass upon the substantive merits of all treaties involving nuclear power.

And, we are considering a major question affecting the peace, when we consider agreements like those negotiated with both Israel and Egypt during the President's and Secretary's recent official travels there. This is my third reason for supporting the bill before us. The two agreements now pending—Egypt and Israel—reflect the seriousness of such considerations.

During his trip last month to the Middle East, the President announced the intention of the administration to assist Israel and Egypt with their separate electric power generation programs by supplying each with a 600-megawatt—600 million watt—light water reactor, together with the nuclear fuel necessary for its operation.

Contracts for actual purchases by Egypt and Israel hinge on successful negotiation of international agreements with each, including safeguard arrangements. The development of nuclear power in both these countries is important to developing the resources with which to build their respective economies—which, taken by itself, is a worthy goal.

But safeguard standards must be considered as extremely important by us. Why? Because of the risk that plutonium—as a byproduct of nuclear fission within the reactors—may be secretly extracted from the spent fuel after it is taken from the reactor. A 600-megawatt reactor—as proposed in these agreements—produces about 275 pounds of plutonium each year of operation. That is enough material for about 20 crude nuclear weapons if used for such a purpose.

Safeguards are also needed to protect against theft of the material by terrorist groups.

Although final agreements have not yet been negotiated, Egypt and Israel have already signed preliminary sales contracts for fuel with the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission—AEC. The AEC had set a June 30 cutoff date for fuel contracts because of the tight supply of enriched uranium.

Present law—the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended—requires agreements for export of nuclear reactors or materials to follow a prescribed procedure. The AEC must submit a proposed agreement together with its recommendations to the President for approval of the export of the reactor or materials.

After the President makes a written determination that the agreement will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security, he must submit the proposed agreement—along with his approval and written determination—to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, a joint House-Senate committee of the Congress.

At this point, however, the law differentiates between military agreements for peaceful cooperation. An agreement for peaceful cooperation may take effect 30 days after it has been submitted to the Joint Committee. There are no special provisions for a congressional disapproval procedure regarding those peaceful agreements. Agreements for military cooperation, on the other hand, are subject to more lengthy congressional consideration—60 days—and may be prevented from going into effect if Congress passes a concurrent resolution of disapproval within the 60-day period.

The bill before us would amend the Atomic Energy Act to revise the procedure for congressional treatment of those proposed international agreements for peaceful cooperation in nuclear energy involving a reactor of more than 5 megawatts and special materials associated with it. This means that the Presidentially approved agreement must be submitted to Congress for a 60-day review period and will not take effect if Congress within that period passes a concurrent resolution of disapproval. The same procedure will apply to proposed amendments to agreements. In the simplest of terms, congressional review is insured for virtually all agreements—for all military and for almost all peaceful cooperation ones.

The administration does not support this bill. I cannot agree with them on this matter. In a manner not too dissimilar from the constitutional requirement of the Senate to advise and consent on treaties negotiated by the President and administration, I believe we should have a similar statutory review mechanism for those agreements negotiated by the President and administration involving nuclear energy—military or peaceful.

Considering that the prime ingredient of nuclear weapons—plutonium—is an unavoidable byproduct of all nuclear fission of this type—no matter how benevolent the purpose of the power generation, and considering the need to stabilize and reduce world tensions by curtailing, to the degree warranted, the proliferation of offensive weaponry, I think Congress should exercise this oversight function. I think it would well serve the cause of peace.

I urge the enactment of this bill.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15582, to enable Congress to concur in or disapprove executive agreements involving the transfer of nuclear technology. I would also like to commend the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and its distinguished chairman, Mr. MELVIN PRICE, for their expeditious work on this legislation, in getting it to the House floor as promptly as possible.

The basic intent of H.R. 15582 is drawn from legislation which I introduced last month which would subject disapproval power by the Congress. A list of the 23 Members who cosponsored my bill follows my remarks. I introduced this measure in response to the President's pledge to provide nuclear technology to Egypt and Israel. I feel very strongly that American nuclear technology must not be introduced into other areas, and certainly not into the world's most volatile area, the Middle East, without the most careful scrutiny by the American people and their representatives in Congress. The intent of my bill, and the legislation before us today, is to insure the utmost caution and deliberation before we add new members to the "nuclear club."

India's recent nuclear blast confirms the fact that the capability of developing nuclear weapons has become more widespread. Nuclear power designated for peaceful uses can be diverted toward military ends. I feel that this body should view with considerable concern this new medium of exchange in international foreign policy, whereby nuclear technology has been substituted as a bargaining tool in place of dollar assistance. Congress serves as the guardian of the best interests of the people of the United States. Certainly, the proliferation of nuclear technology carries the potential to run counter to the well-being of this Nation. We would be shirking our responsibility, both as a coequal branch of Government and as representatives of the American people, if we failed to pass this bill.

The volatile nature of the Middle East raises grave concern that the introduction of nuclear power may serve as a

prelude to an extremely destructive force that may ultimately jeopardize U.S. security. The rise of terrorism in the Middle East throws an even graver pall over the President's pledge to provide nuclear technology. What kind of nightmare would enfold should the nuclear technology we are providing ever reach the hands of terrorist forces? Once the nuclear chain is started, it is beyond our control. We may indeed trust the word of President Sadat and Rabin, but we have no assurances from those who may follow in their footsteps. We cannot afford to play nuclear roulette whatever the prize.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 15582 and then to exercise the power which this legislation provides to insure a searching review of the potentially far reaching accords which the Executive has proposed.

Cosponsors of the Wolff bill, H.R. 15453, to subject nuclear technology agreements to a disapproval power by the Congress.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Representatives Abzug, Addabbo, Badillo, Conyers, Ford, Froehlich, Grasso, Grover, Gude, Hechler of West Virginia, Heckler of Massachusetts, Holtzman, Lehman, Metcalfe, Moakley, Nedzi, Rinaldo, Rose, Rosenthal, Roybal, Seiberling, Waldie, and Yatron.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting H.R. 15582 because any international agreement involving nuclear aid should be subject to public scrutiny and congressional review.

This Congress is now aware that the President's "statement of intent" commits us to the sale of nuclear reactors and fuel to Egypt in quantities sufficient "to guarantee substantial additional quantities of electrical power to support its growing development needs." Bilateral negotiations for this atomic aid are already proceeding. Similar arrangements have been worked out with Israel, which has had a bilateral nuclear research treaty with this country since July 12, 1955.

State Department officials assure us that in the bilateral negotiations the United States will require safeguards to prevent diversion of radioactive byproducts for the construction of nuclear weaponry. This is supposed to include international inspection and provision that byproducts be properly disposed.

But Mr. Chairman, I seriously question the wisdom of introducing nuclear power of any sort to an area so politically unstable as the Middle East. I wonder whether any safeguards can reasonably insure us that we will not just be fueling the fires of conflict and heightening the instability of the area.

This nuclear aid agreement disturbs me greatly when I consider that the plutonium byproducts of a nuclear energy powerplant can be diverted for the construction of nuclear weaponry with relative technological ease. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission officials indicate that the raw materials for the bomb India exploded just this year came from a Canadian plant, similar to those that are proposed to be constructed in the Middle East.

Now I do not doubt that the goal in offering nuclear aid is a positive one with a reasonable rationale. As a nation we must be willing to demonstrate our desire for peace and concern for the people of the Middle East in practical, constructive terms.

A valid argument can be made for Egypt's need of greater electrical power by 1980. With the largest Arab population increasing at a 3-percent growth rate, power from the Aswan Dam and lesser facilities will be insufficient to meet the growing power needs of the people in the near future.

When nuclear power becomes one of the bargaining tools, our zeal for settlement must be tempered with deliberate caution. Unfortunately, nuclear power is principally a force for destruction. Until I am convinced that sufficient safeguards on nuclear power in the Middle East are even possible, I cannot favor such aid.

Considering these high stakes, H.R. 15582 is a necessity to insure crucial congressional and public scrutiny in any nuclear agreement. Congressional approval—at least Senate confirmation—must be a requirement.

I do not believe that Congress should act as an obstacle to foreign policy initiatives or retreat into an isolationistic posture. But it would be a disservice to give anything less than full review to international agreements involving nuclear power.

Congress must have a role in all international agreements in which the United States plays a major part. Congress should be kept abreast of current developments in these negotiations. Often such negotiations involves agreements—whether nuclear or monetary in nature—or other concessions and terms that must be subject to the approval or at least the cognizance of the Congress. The thinking of Congress should be sought during negotiations to insure that agreements do conform to the wishes of the people.

Mr. Chairman, lest I sound overly negative, would point out that I believe prospects for a permanent peace in the Middle East appear brighter today than in a good many years. The role of the United States has, for the most part, been a positive one, encouraging the first fragile sprouts of what we hope will be a new era of understanding in a land where at times only guns have spoken.

The recent disengagement between Israel and Syria should be recognized as a diplomatic triumph. The procurement of this agreement after 28 exhausting days of intense negotiation stands as a tribute to the personal diplomacy of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, and his perseverence in the face of what many considered insurmountable obstacles.

I am hopeful that this Government will continue its progress toward peace, not only in the Middle East, but also in other areas of the world. The effort for peace is never ending, and one that requires constant vigilance. Someday, with proper diligence, nuclear power, in spite of its destructive potential, may be a generator of peace and cooperation for our friends in the Middle East and the rest of the world. However, that day is not here yet for the Middle East.

This Congress must accept its responsibility and pass H.R. 15582.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG). A substantive revision in the statutory procedures for approval of nuclear aid agreements with foreign countries is long overdue. In 1954, when the Atomic Energy Act was signed into law, few Americans contemplated the possibility of sophisticated nuclear technology proliferating into scores of industrialized and less-developed nations throughout the world. Given a nuclear reactor and, perhaps, a little technological assistance, numerous nations now have the capacity to produce a nuclear weapon which could kill millions of people and contaminate a sizable land area for thousands of years.

The problem of nuclear proliferation has been made more acute by two dramatic developments occurring within the past several months. On May 18, India detonated a nuclear device using plutonium fuel siphoned off from a nuclear reactor provided by Canada. India called its nuclear detonation peaceful, but the fact is that this action seriously raised tensions in a part of the world which only recently was the scene of all-out warfare.

An event with even greater implications took place on June 14 when President Nixon announced that the United States would sell a nuclear reactor and related materials to Egypt. Three days later, President Nixon agreed to provide similar aid to Israel. Many Americans, in and out of Congress, were understandably shocked by these Presidential pronouncements. Only a few months after a tenuous peace had been secured in the volatile Middle East, stability between Israel and its neighbors was being seriously jeopardized. As the Jerusalem Post pointed out in an editorial of June 18:

One more element of danger and uncertainty has been injected into a situation that will not necessarily always remain under U.S. control.

It is the specter of nuclear war in the Middle East, waged by both sides using American plutonium, which has led to an expeditious reassessment of our procedures for approving nuclear aid agreements. Present law, in effect since 1954, requires no congressional authorization for any nuclear assistance provided to foreign nations. A proposal for military aid can be killed through concurrent resolution passed by both Houses within 60 days, but no such authority for congressional rejection exists in the case of proposed agreements for "peaceful purposes." Senator PASTORE, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, observed during debate in the Senate on July 10:

Under the present law, the Joint Committee cannot do very much about it. [The proposed agreement.] All we do is hold hearings. We have the arrangement inserted in the RECORD and that is where it stands.

I consider it an outrage that the American people, through their elected representatives in Congress, have no power to decide for or against granting nuclear assistance to nations in the Middle East. With the potential power to blow nations off the map at stake, more than the executive branch should participate in making such decisions. The legislation reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does go far toward restoring Congress to its rightful place in this decisionmaking process. The adoption of H.R. 15582 will at least give Congress the power to say "no" to most nuclear aid agreements, rather than only those which have been identified as "military" in nature.

Yet legislative authority in our system of Government means more than merely the power to say "no." Unless both Houses of Congress explicitly approve a proposal before it, that proposal cannot become law. The committee bill does not give Congress a full voice in ruling on nuclear assistance agreements. Under its provisions, the failure of either House to explicitly disapprove a pending agreement within 60 days would permit that agreement to take effect. This unusual procedure would permit Congress to legislate through inaction or disagreement.

Moreover, small reactors would not be covered under the committee bill. Over a period of several years, plutonium collected from such a reactor could be used to produce a nuclear weapon. Given this possibility, congressional authority over nuclear aid agreements should not be dependent upon the size of the reactor involved.

The substitute bill introduced by Congressman LONG, which I have cosponsored, would plug the loopholes contained in the committee bill. The Long substitute requires that both Houses of Congress must approve a proposed agreement for nuclear aid before it could be implemented. The substitute covers all forms of nuclear aid, irrespective of magnitude or expressed intent. Under its provisions, American nuclear aid will not be given to any foreign country unless Congress gives its positive consent.

The justification for such legislation is clear. Under the Constitution, the most minor piece of legislation must gain the approval of both the House and Senate before it can become law. If the two Houses disagree or if either House fails to act, the legislation dies. Why should an area as grave as nuclear aid be subject to a more lax legislative process? Why should our constitutional power to say "yes" be compromised in matters which warrant the fullest possible legislative consideration? I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this amendment to provide the American people with the authority in this momentous area which is rightfully theirs.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is revised to read as follows:

"d. The proposed agreement for cooperation, together with the approval and determination of the President, if arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c., or if entailing implementation of sections 53, 54, 103, or 104 in relation to a reactor that may be capable of producing more than five thermal megawatts or special nuclear material for use in connection therewith, has been submitted to the Congress and referred to the Joint Committee and a period of sixty days has elapsed while Congress is in session (in computing such sixty days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days), but any such proposed agreement for cooperation shall not become effective if during such sixty-day period the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the proposed agreement for cooperation: *Provided, however,* That prior to the elapse of the first thirty days of any such sixty-day period the Joint Committee shall submit a report to the Congress of its views and recommendations respecting the proposed agreement and an accompanying proposed concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress favors, or does not favor, as the case may be, the proposed agreement for cooperation."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LONG OF MARYLAND

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONG of Maryland: Page 2, strike out all after "therewith," in line 3 down through line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall have no force or effect unless and until specifically approved by Act of Congress.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is very simple.

The Members will notice that the bill, as presented by the committee, is a rather long one and tries to meet all sorts of situations; but mine, on the other hand, is very simple. It simply says that no nuclear agreement shall take effect until it is approved by Congress, instead of saying that nuclear agreements can be made unless we move to stop them.

As I pointed out before, the United States has sold nuclear reactors to 33 countries, of which 21 have not ratified the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Not one of these agreements has ever come to the floor of this Congress, to either body, for debate.

The purpose of my amendment is to make sure that every agreement comes to the House for debate.

I feel that the real integrity in the Government of the United States is on the floor of Congress. Here is where everything is done, and it is done in the light of the public, with the press listening and the whole world watching. This is the place where everyone can know what is happening to the country and to the issues which may determine the future of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I pointed out previously that once a country gets nuclear power and other countries suspect it is going to go on into nuclear weapons, it becomes politically and absolutely impossible for that other country to avoid going after nuclear weapons itself. First, they have got to get nuclear power. The people in the country, including all the opinion leaders, will insist that they do it.

Therefore, we must do something to bring greater control to Congress, because we might get this chain reaction which could touch off a war which could destroy us all.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman's amendment. I think it is a very useful amendment.

I think it is important to point out that in the past many of the reactors that we gave or sold were disseminated under other conditions, and the agreements that were made thereunder were made under much more peaceful and more tranquil conditions than we now have. The reactors we are talking about would go to the Middle East, which for the past generation has been an inferno. This requires a far more cautious and a more prudent consideration.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the way Congress can meet its responsibility is merely to say that these agreements have to be brought before Congress and an affirmative vote is required before an agreement can be entered into. I cannot see any logical agrument against that position.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman feels that way.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is proposing an amendment that may settle a question that has always troubled me about this kind of language.

The language of the bill and of the act which it amends provides that it is necessary to interpose a concurrent resolution in order to stop the disseminating of such nuclear materials.

I have always been concerned about the provisions of Article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States, where in the second sentence the article states as follows:

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary * * * shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take effect, shall be approved by him * * *.

Now, it would seem to me that a literal reading of the Constitution would permit the President in all instances to veto the concurrent resolution, subsequent to its passage.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. I pointed out to the Members in general debate that this whole thing could collapse at the time we need it the most.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Exactly.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. There has never been an occasion in which this concurrent resolution has been upheld constitutionally without a Presidential signature.

Mr. ECKHARDT. And, of course, quite obviously the President is proposing the proposition in the first place, so one might expect his veto. Does the gentleman not agree?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Yes, I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the gentleman from Maryland in support of his amendment. I think this is something that deserves the full attention of the Congress and not just our negative action.

I have heard the explanations made by the State Department as to the safeguards and how they would work, and yet when it comes to a full explanation, we are not satisfied. We have asked them and I have asked them at various times: "What happens to these safeguards if we are not in the country any more? What happens if we are not in Egypt at the time and we may not be there in the future?"

Mr. Chairman, I think Congress should take a look at this situation.

Mr. Chairman, serious questions exist in consideration of today's legislation, both in the area of checks and balances within our Government, and the spread of technical nuclear assistance for supposedly peaceful purposes.

The recent explosion of a nuclear device by India should be a message to this Congress: It is all too easy to convert nuclear energy technology into nuclear weapons technology.

Plutonium, the substance used to develop nuclear weapons, is a direct by-product of nuclear reactors, such as the ones recently offered to Egypt and Israel. The need for strong safeguards to protect against the misuse of plutonium is obviously necessary. The present safeguards are ambiguous. They may not adequately protect the world from the possibility of plutonium getting into the wrong hands.

It is time to put a check on Executive power with regard to nuclear agreements. We have already armed half the world with conventional weapons—let us not do the same with nuclear material. We must make sure that nuclear materials do not wind up in the wrong hands: One way to help do this is for the Congress to be involved in the decision.

The complexity and consequences of the issues at stake compel a reasonable government to take a reasoned approach to this situation. Common sense dictates that the introduction of material which could lead to nuclear weapons in an area that the President describes as a "powder keg," deserve, at the bare minimum, very careful scrutiny and explicit congressional approval.

The United States has given peaceful nuclear aid to some 30 nations. All this has been done without direct congressional participation. Yet, how can we be sure that the safeguards for the production, storage, and transfer are adequate and/or complied with? How can we be sure the material does not end up in the wrong hands—say the Palestinians? An irresponsible group in control of nuclear materials could hold the world in blackmail.

Perhaps most important is the fact that we are giving and proposing nuclear aid to countries that have not signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Egypt, and Israel are two such nations; others who have not signed the treaty are Japan, Italy, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, Switzerland, Turkey, Colombia, Indonesia, South Korea, and Venezuela. While most of these nations are not significant powers, the capability to develop a nuclear bomb is not remote, since the process is a relatively simple one. India exemplifies this, with its "peaceful purpose" explosion.

The Washington Post reported on June 25 that "by the end of this century, a million kilograms of plutonium will be shipped annually by planes, trains, ships, and trucks between thousands of nuclear plants in more than 50 countries."

A serious situation is developing. With all of the critical unanswered questions it is imperative the Congress be involved in the decisions, not just by the right of veto but by a requirement of legislative approval.

In that context, the Congress ought to examine, with meticulous care, any and all proposed nuclear agreements—it is our responsibility to the Constitution and to peace in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) has expired.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

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

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland, (Mr. LONG). I think the amendment adds to the bill for two reasons: First, it will cover the pending proposal relating to reactors with respect to Egypt and Israel which the current bill before us may not cover because of timing. Second, it perfects the mechanism whereby Congress can make its will known.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think this bill, which I would hope on final passage to support, would be improved by the inclusion of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman in the well, Mr. LONG of Maryland, to know that I too favor his amendment. I think it is a good amendment, and should be supported by the Members.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

In the absence of any genuine nuclear disarmament moves by the great powers, it is obvious that other nations will seek entry into the nuclear club as a status symbol and a power credential. Much as I oppose India's decision to go the nuclear road, I can understand that nation's resentment at being lectured by representatives of nuclear powers who have done nothing of a substantive nature to reverse the nuclear arms race.

As many as 24 nations, some small and unstable, will possess atomic weapons within 10 years, according to Herbert F. York, a former member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, March 1974. "If any of these were to make a technical, political or military mistake," says York, "there would be a good chance that the whole civilized world could go up in nuclear smoke."

Access to plutonium is the key factor in a nation's or private group's ability to make a nuclear bomb, and nearly every nuclear reactor produces usable plutonium.

The United States has been in the lead in making nuclear materials available to other nations, large and small. It has already sent some 75 nuclear reactors to 25 other countries. I should say that the executive branch of the Government has done this. Under the existing provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, the Executive Department simply submitted each proposed agreement to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and after 30 days it was put into effect. Now the United States is proposing to offer Egypt a 600 megawatt nuclear reactor.

Of course, the United States is not the only great power that is handing out nuclear reactors without thought of the possible consequences. France has signed a $4 to $5 billion agreement with Iran to supply it with five 1,000 megawatt nuclear reactors.

Senator HENRY JACKSON asserted on July 10 in Senate debate that:

> Each of the reactors planned for Egypt and Israel (by the United States) will produce enough plutonium each year they operate for at least 20 nuclear explosive devices.

Japan has expressed the intention of building 16 nuclear reactor powerplants in the near future. The United Kingdom supplied natural uranium reactors to Japan and to Italy many years ago. West Germany supplied a huge water reactor to Argentina and one to Austria, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. Sweden supplied a reactor to Finland. Canada supplied India with a reactor, which that nation then used to obtain the material for the nuclear device that it exploded recently.

There is clearly a need for the creation of an international agency that would

devise an iron-clad system of control over plutonium supplies to guarantee that they do not fall into irresponsible hands. What we have now does not work. The very least we in the Congress must do now is to insist on control over what happens to the plutonium obtained from nuclear reactors given to other nations by the United States. That is the purpose behind the amendment being introduced today. That is also the purpose behind a resolution of inquiry I have introduced, now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in which I am seeking to find out what safeguards, if any, the U.S. executive branch is demanding in exchange for giving nuclear reactors to Egypt and other nations.

With all the facts they can command, and they are overwhelming as well as terrifying, responsible nuclear scientists are trying to alert us to the danger of a nuclear holocaust. If we do not fear such an eventuality, we are foolish beyond belief. If we do not act to do everything possible to prevent it, we are acquiescing to the end of civilization.

We in Congress have not really faced up to our responsibility. And time is running out.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

I believe there is general agreement in this House that the U.S. Government should not march around the world dispensing nuclear technology without congressional scrutiny and approval. The example of India, which successfully constructed an atomic bomb, is too fresh in our memories to allow us to believe that nuclear technology cannot be turned into nuclear weapons. We simply must realize that when we grant a nation materials for nuclear powerplants we are also granting them membership in the nuclear arms fraternity. Considering that many of these nations are less than stable politically, and are not signatories of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the wisdom of any technology transfer appears questionable indeed.

The issue before us now is what form of congressional approval will be required to approve transfers made by the executive branch. The language adopted by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy states that these agreements shall take effect if Congress does not pass a concurrent resolution disapproving the action within 60 days after the proposed transfer is placed before it. In effect, this very nicely lets Congress off the hook. Simply by delaying a vote for 60 days, Congress can shift the responsibility for the spread of nuclear weapons off to the executive branch. It represents the same type of "passing the buck" that was incorporated into the war powers bill.

In spite of all the talk about the reassertion of congressional authority, it seems that we still are willing to allow the executive branch to make decisions that are properly ours. The proliferation of nuclear weapons is far too important an issue for Congress to evade. The American people have a right to know where their representatives stand on each transfer of nuclear technology. They can only get this information if Congress is required to specifically approve such transfers. The Long amendment will force us to make these decisions; the committee language will permit us to evade them.

I consider it vitally important that we accept the Long amendment and our own constitutional responsibilities. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of both.

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

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

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman in the well and, as a cosponsor of the pending amendment, I likewise support the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only right, proper, and fair that the Congress have the affirmative obligation to take action on these matters. It has been my experience in the last 18 months that the Congress cannot even clear its collective throats within 60 days, and to fail to exercise its responsibilities in an affirmative way would be yet another example of the abdication of its proper obligations. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. KETCHUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding, and to commend the gentleman for the remarks he has made. I believe the amendment is an excellent one, and should be adopted.

Plutonium and nuclear technology are some of the most dangerous things among the gifts of this government, and certainly they should be subject to a thorough government scrutiny and not the kind of illusionary checkup before us in this legislation.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) should be adopted.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM) for the very thoughtful and penetrating remarks the gentleman has made in support of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from California on the remarks he has made, and on the action he is taking today in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the purpose of H.R. 15582 to give Congress greater control over the sharing of nuclear power technology with foreign nations but I do not believe the bill goes far enough in the direction of Congressional control of such matters.

Therefore, I approve the concept offered by Congressman LONG as a substitute. My position through the years has been consistent in this matter; for I have always opposed sharing this technology with other countries.

I believe the human race is already imperiled by nuclear weapons; and to spread the chances of nuclear war is disastrous folly. I do not believe adequate safeguards have been established to prevent the peaceful use of nuclear power from being used as a base for nuclear war. I doubt that adequate safeguards can in fact be found or established.

Mr. Chairman, in the July 1974 edition of "Not Man Apart" there is an article which discusses the sharing of nuclear technology with foreign nations; and concludes that the export of such technology is "incompatible with the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, undermines world peace and renders the very survival of humankind doubtful." The article under the title of "Sharing the Risk of Disaster" says in part:

SHARING THE RISK OF DISASTER

BOOM! (India.) BOOM! BOOM! (France.) BOOM! (China.) BOOM! (Great Britain.)

Detonation of five "nuclear devices" by four nations within the span of a few weeks makes one wonder—

What ever happened to nuclear non-proliferation?

World peace and human survival may hinge upon the answer to that question.

If the concept of nuclear non-proliferation isn't as robust as we might wish, the blame for that falls not so much on militarists as it does on industrialists. Captains of industry have rushed in where field marshalls feared to tread.

Carried to its ultimate conclusion, nonproliferation would imply an atomic monopoly by the first nation to harness the power of the atom. Many Americans once actually believed that if only the US could guard its "secrets" well enough, it could retain an atomic monopoly. But Russia exploded that idea disconcertingly soon, and in short order the two superpowers discovered a mutual interest in limiting membership in "the nuclear club" to as few nations (besides themselves) as possible.

What worried the US and the USSR was the prospect of a proliferation in the number of nations with the capability of building atomic bombs. In hindsight, however, it is clear that virtually any country that could get its hands on some reactor fuel (and from this, get plutonium) could build bombs; given the raw materials to start with, the technology of bomb-building simply isn't that difficult.

If non-proliferation was ever to amount to more than a desperate hope, fissionable material would have to be kept out of the hands of nations (and terrorists, and lunatics, and so on) who didn't already possess it. But such a dog-in-the-manger attitude was hard for members of "the nuclear club" to justify to non-members, and it flew in the face of America's longing to erase the memory of Hiroshima by instituting an "atoms for peace" program—a program of exporting "peaceful" nuclear hardware, fuel, and technology.

Although the atom can be split, it is a foolish mistake to assume that it is divisible into peaceful and warlike segments. Nuclear fuel and nuclear explosives are essentially the same thing; burned slowly it can serve as a fuel, burned fast it explodes. A nation that acquires "the peaceful atom" has, for all practical purposes, acquired the bomb.

India (of all countries) drove that point home very forcibly in recent weeks by clan-

destinely converting "peaceful" nuclear materials (obtained from Canada) into nuclear explosives. Is it any wonder that Pakistan, India's neighbor and traditional enemy, finds it impossible to believe Indian assurances that it is interested only in the peaceful employment of atomic explosives? Is it any wonder that Pakistan hastily announced a crash program to match India's nuclear capability?

If there is any part of the world where nonproliferation is even more devoutly to be desired than on the Indian subcontinent, it is the Middle East. So what happens? President Nixon promises nuclear hardware, fuel, and know-how to both Arabs and Israelis, whose enmity has for decades periodically flared into open conflict. As a result of this diplomatic master stroke, another war in the Middle East will probably involve nuclear-armed antagonists.

This is what "the peaceful atom" has brought us to!

Arabs, Israelis, Pakistanis, and other aspirants to membership in "the nuclear club" will undoubtedly promise the suppliers of nuclear materials not to misuse them—just as India undoubtedly promised Canada. And just as convincingly as India, other new members of "the nuclear club" will proclaim that their atomic testing is exclusively for peaceful purposes.

A point-of-no-return is likely to be reached beyond which proliferation is irreversible. Suppose, for example, that the US has second thoughts about exporting "the peaceful atom" to Country X. By that time the hardware has already been delivered, and atomic technology is currently accessible in virtually all modern societies. The US's only recourse is to quit shipping reactor fuel to Country X—which merely alienates Country X and induces it to switch to a competitive source of supply.

In a world where the relations among nations remain anarchic, nuclear proliferation is mortally dangerous. Yet it proceeds apace. Had not India's atomic blast shocked Canada into deferring action, it would probably, before now, have concluded an agreement to supply Romania with 20 nuclear reactors and fuel. If Romania is knocking for admission to "the nuclear club," can there be any nation, large or small, that isn't thinking of doing likewise?

As I conclude my remarks, I should like to say that the only argument I have heard here in opposition to this point of view has been that the nuclear genie has had itself uncapped. The bottle top is already off. What kind of an excuse is that?

What kind of an excuse is it to say that because the danger is already horrendous throughout the world that we ought to by our funds, by our technology, by our power, and by our industry spread it further?

That would be like saying that since somebody has already thrown a cup of gasoline and lit a match, how can it do any harm for somebody else to throw another cup of gasoline on the fire?

We are dealing with the survival of mankind. To be a part, to be a parcel, of forwarding things that can destroy mankind is just to me unthinkable.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 425]

Addabbo	Evins, Tenn.	Moorhead, Pa.
Alexander	Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.
Archer	Fountain	Nelsen
Arends	Fulton	O'Neill
Biaggi	Gettys	Owens
Blatnik	Giaimo	Pepper
Brasco	Gray	Rangel
Breaux	Green, Oreg.	Rarick
Butler	Griffiths	Rhodes
Carey, N.Y.	Gunter	Riegle
Carter	Hanna	Roncallo, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hansen, Idaho	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, Pa.
Clark	Harsha	Rose
Clay	Hébert	Rostenkowski
Conte	Hogan	Seiberling
Conyers	Holifield	Shuster
Culver	Ichord	Steiger, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Teague
de la Garza	Jones, Tenn.	Tiernan
Diggs	Landrum	Udall
Downing	McSpadden	Vander Jagt
Drinan	Madigan	Vander Veen
Edwards, Calif.	Martin, Nebr.	Waldie
Eilberg	Mathis, Ga.	Whitten
Eshleman	Meeds	Widnall

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 15582, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 356 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Illinois had been recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

The bill that we bring to the floor this afternoon was, when it was introduced, acclaimed by most Members of the House as being a step in the right direction, to further impose congressional supervision or control over agreements for cooperation in the nuclear field. Almost unanimously, every Member of this House indicated his support of this legislation.

I think that the legislation is good legislation, as the Members will see if they read from line 12 through line 19 on page 2 of the bill.

I shall read it. The bill provides: "That prior to the elapse of the first 30 days of any such 60-day period the Joint Committee shall submit a report to the Congress of its views and recommendations respecting the proposed agreement and an accompanying proposed concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress favors, or does not favor, as the case may be, the proposed agreement for cooperation."

We gave a lot of attention and a lot of thought to writing this legislation because we knew that if we went too far in it, it would be subject to Presidential veto, and probably rightly so, because we are treading pretty close to a question of the constitutional powers of the separate bodies of the Government. I would think that the Executive might have a good point if he did veto a legislative proposal that went any further than we are going in this bill. The amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Maryland certainly poses that problem and the danger of a veto of a program or of a plan that almost every Member of this Congress 30 days ago accepted with open arms.

We thought we were going in the right direction and this is what the Congress wanted to do. By the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG), we are putting the United States out of the international trade area in this particular field.

The committee's proposal concentrates on items of significance and does not make it mandatory that Congress spend time on actions which are not vital from the standpoint of safeguards.

Contrary to some of the statements heard today, the Congress has not been kept in ignorance about agreements for cooperation. If any Member of the Congress is not familiar with them, it is because he does not read carefully the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Every agreement for cooperation is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Hearings are held on them, and with very few exceptions, except those relating only to medical isotopes and research, these hearings are open hearings. Over 90 percent of these have been open hearings. The committee has always informed the House it is going to hold these hearings. Here is a list of our hearings:

PUBLIC AND EXECUTIVE HEARINGS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Argentina: July 29, 1955—Exec., June 22, 1960—Exec., June 20, 1964—Open.

Australia: March 1, 1961—Exec., August 6, 1957—Exec., March 20, 1967—Open.

Austria: March 20, 1967—Open.

Berlin Reactor: March 6, 1957—Exec.

Brazil: July 27, 1965—Open., May 20, 1964—Exec., June 22, 1960—Exec., July 16, 1958—Exec., June 8, 1955—Exec.

Canada: June 22, 1960—Exec., July 6, 1955—Exec., June 14, 1955—Exec.

China (Rep. of): August 25, 1966—Open, June 30, 1964—Open, June 22, 1960—Exec.

Colombia: June 8, 1955—Exec., March 20, 1967—Open.

Denmark: June 25, 1968—Open, July 16, 1958—Exec.

Euratom: June 22, 1973—Open, September 5, 1963—Open, June 22, 1960—Exec., January 21, 1959—Open, March 28, 1957—Exec., March 9, 1956—Exec.

France: June 30, 1964—Open, March 1, 1961—Exec., July 24, 1957—Exec.

Germany: July 24, 1957—Exec.

Greece: June 30, 1964—Open, June 22, 1960—Exec.

India: September 5, 1963—Open, June 25, 1963—Exec.

Indonesia: January 27, 1966—Open, June 22, 1960—Exec.

Iaea: April 29, 1965—Open, June 30, 1959—Open.

Iran: June 30, 1964—Open, March 28, 1957—Exec.

Ireland: June 25, 1968—Open, March 1, 1961—Exec.

Israel: August 25, 1966—Open, April 29,

1965—Open, May 20, 1964—Exec., June 22, 1960—Exec.
Italy: July 24, 1957—Exec.
Japan: June 25, 1968—Open, July 16, 1958—Exec.
Korea: June 4, 1965—Open.
Netherlands: July 24, 1957—Exec.
New Zealand: June 22, 1960—Exec.
Norway: March 28, 1957—Exec.
Peru: July 24, 1957—Exec.
Philippines: June 25, 1968—Open, June 28, 1966—Open, June 22, 1960—Exec., June 6, 1955—Exec., June 8, 1955—Exec.
Portugal: May 20, 1964—Exec., June 22, 1960—Exec.
Russia: May 26, 1966—Open, June 22, 1960—Exec., March 30, 1960—Exec.
South Africa: June 9, 1967—Exec., July 24, 1957—Exec.
Spain: January 27, 1966—Open.
Sweden: August 25, 1966—Open.
Switzerland: January 27, 1966—Open, June 22, 1960—Exec., July 29, 1955—Exec.
Thailand: June 30, 1964—Open, June 22, 1960—Exec.
Turkey: May 26, 1966—Open, June 4, 1965—Open, June 8, 1955—Exec.
United Kingdom: April 4, 1966—Exec., June 28, 1966—Open, June 17, 1965—Exec., July 19, 1965—Exec. July 6, 1955—Exec., June 14, 1955—Exec.
Viet-Nam: June 30, 1964—Open.
Yugoslavia: June 22, 1960—Exec., March 30, 1960—Exec.

So if any Member has been in ignorance of these agreements for cooperation, it is because he was not following the RECORD, or was not concerned with them at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very serious amendment, one that the House should reject. If there is any Member in the House who is concerned about congressional overlook, he should support the committee's position, because in that way we do tighten and get greater control over the agreements for cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to explain precisely how this amendment differs from the original bill.

In the original bill, if an international agreement with respect to transmitting atomic energy potential is anticipated—and the way the bill reads, it amends the whole section, section d., so it applies both to military and civilian export of atomic material—if such is anticipated, then the President must report it to Congress and unless a concurrent resolution is passed by Congress disapproving the agreement, the President may go forward with such plan.

The difficulty with that is that a concurrent resolution, under section 7 of article I of the Constitution, is subject to a veto, because the Constitution says quite clearly that anything requiring the concurrence of both bodies must go to the President. That means that Congress right to stop the sending of nuclear materials is really illusory. Because the President has desired to do so in the first place, the concurrent resolution is subject to veto, and one might expect him then to veto it.

Now, under the Long amendment, when such nuclear materials are to be sent to another nation under such an agreement there must be specific, affirmative action by Congress. That is what it provides. If we really want to keep a handle on this activity and really control it in Congress, the only way to do it is by agreeing to the Long amendment. The other way is totally illusory. The other way would simply permit the President at that time to veto.

Now, it may be argued—and some constitutional authorities do so argue—that the condition subsequent of concurrent resolution may be provided for in the original act and therefore is a limitation on the authority granted by the original legislation. It is argued that this makes this kind of a concurrent resolution not a matter subject to veto. It is like an administrative act which is a condition of the original legislation.

But, can you imagine the President not vetoing and not insisting that he has authority to veto? So what in the world do we do? Do we then go into a long constitutional hassle over what power the President has to veto? He controls the Executive Department. He ships the goods. By the time the case is tested the matter becomes moot.

The only way to control the power to export nuclear potential, either for peaceful or military use, is to simply say that before it is done Congress must act affirmatively. That is what the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) does.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. Chairman, I think the problem here is that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG), has offered an amendment with the idea that it would inhibit the proliferation of nuclear weapons, if his amendment, requiring an affirmative vote by Congress in each case of an agreement for cooperation with another country, is passed.

Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that this issue was met in 1954 when we first passed the Atomic Energy Act. At that time we realized that whenever you had intercourse with other countries in the nuclear area there is an opportunity for information and materials to be diverted from peaceful channels to warlike channels—the bomb.

So we approached the problem in how best to prevent this diversion, and we found out that you cannot do it by agreement. Treaties are broken. Agreements are broken. But you can prevent diversion by other means, and another method, and that is by your agreement establishing a system whereby after the agreement is written, and when anything moves between one country and another under it, there are inspections and there are safeguards. So it is not to scrutinize an agreement for cooperation much further than to make sure it includes safeguards in it, and just so long as it includes inspections in it. Then you have a situation whereby if those inspections and if those safeguards are thoroughly enforced then the diversion of nuclear materials into weapons channels is inhibited.

It is not needed by the Congress to examine minutely each one of these agreements, that is needed by Congress to support the proper safeguards. And we have indeed established these safeguards in this area that are quite effective. We have imposed them also via the International Atomic Energy Agency which imposes worldwide safeguards and inspections. That also addressed the problem. That is where the safety of the world lies. There has never been a diversion of nuclear weapons that I know of under these safeguards. The only situation I know of where there has been a diversion is with the Indian bomb. They made their own material in India, and built their own bomb.

I suggest that this amendment will be quite mischievous, and I ask for its defeat.

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO POSITIVE ACTION AMENDMENT

H.R. 15582 will require a review and report to Congress by the Joint Committee on each proposed agreement and the Congress will have ample time to decide whether or not it wishes to act. Congress should have the option to act on each significant agreement, but we should also have the option not to act on trivial matters.

I want to guard against what may be viewed as an unwarranted intrusion into the prerogatives of the executive branch. H.R. 15582 is not veto-proof, but it applies language which, though not tested, has been in the Atomic Energy Act since 1958, and has earlier roots. I submit that this proposed amendment will make the whole arrangement more susceptible to a veto, and the President may be standing on good constitutional ground in vetoing the bill.

Let me quote from a Supreme Court opinion. Mr. Justice Sutherland, in the case of *U.S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright*, 299 U.S. 304 (1936), wrote:

> It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such an authority plus the very delicate, plenary and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the federal government in the field of international relations . . . Congressional legislation which is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved.

If we do not act, then I think the benefit of the doubt ought to go to the administration. I do not think we ought to kill a negotiated international agreement by inaction. Under H.R. 15582, one House of Congress could not frustrate the combined will of the President and the other House. Under this amendment

each House would have a veto power. These agreements would have to undergo a more exacting procedure than the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. This seems to me to be an imbalance.

Increasing the difficulty of obtaining congressional sanction of an agreement will discourage our atoms-for-peace program. But such a development would not cut off access to nuclear energy from any nation, since this technology is available from a number of other nations. For example, England, Canada, France, the Soviet Union and Germany have active foreign nuclear cooperation programs. These nations have already entered into many cooperative nuclear projects with other nations. I might add that some of these nations such as, for example, France, West Germany, and Canada are actively seeking foreign reactor sales. Such foreign sales are obviously an excellent source of foreign exchange funds. Our present nuclear program envisages, for example, an income of over $30 billion in the next two decades from the provision of uranium enriching services alone.

This amendment may have emotional appeal, but what it amounts to is an overreaction to a short-term situation. Let us do something which is practical and effective, but leaves us with a logical procedure. Let us adopt the procedures proposed by the Joint Committee, and defeat this overreaching amendment.

Today peaceful nuclear traffic with other countries has the potential of earning several billions of dollars of foreign exchange. Already, this year alone, we are earning more than half a billion dollars for the sale of nuclear fuel overseas. Safeguards insure no diversions to weapons use. This is under agreements for cooperation of longstanding which have worked well. To now nitpick and impose this kind of barrier to legitimate commerce is unnecessary and will place the United States in considerable competitive disadvantage in an increasingly competitive situation in the world nuclear power business.

To require affirmative action many times each year to enter or amend these agreements for cooperation will impose an impossible burden on our nuclear business without making a single contribution to the cause of nonproliferation.

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman in opposition to the amendment, and point out what we would be buying in terms of legislative workload, if we were to adopt this amendment: We already have 30 agreements for cooperation and inspection, and each one of those is subject to periodic renewal or to amendment, or to review of the International Atomic Energy Association protocol, and the like.

For example, we already have no less than 11 such agreements submitted by the AEC in 1974. It is my understanding that they expect to submit seven more during the present year. Most of those are entirely innocuous agreements that should not occupy the important time of this body, and before we undertake to commit both Houses of Congress to mandatory specific action on each one of these items, I think we ought to be asking ourselves whether that is legislating in a responsible manner.

Let me remind this body that substantially similar legislation to that which this Committee is proposing today passed the other body unanimously. The vote was 96 to 0. An amendment almost identical to that offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) was rejected. Then the Senate went on to pass this bill unanimously.

I hope that the Members will join the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in opposing this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG). It had not been my intention to join in debate on this matter, but I have become troubled about, first, the problem of the Congress abdicating its responsibility; and, second, the inattention of the other body to its constitutional duty to concern itself with the ratification of treaties, the confirmation and appointment of ministers, ambassadors, and other high officers of Government.

The President has just returned from abroad. During that trip he had given away, according to what I was informed in the press, a number of things: He has given rights to other countries to engage in air traffic into the United States. I inquired of the State Department. They had no awareness of the President's commitments to an airline in another nation for landing rights parenthetically at a time when two major U.S. carriers are in severe economic difficulty. The President gave away, or was reported to have given away, in one country one atomic powerplant, fuel, equipment, and technology, and in the next country two atomic powerplants and two sets of technology and fuels.

What is wrong with the Congress having a say as to what is given away in terms of nuclear technology and nuclear powerplants, and things of that kind? Nothing that I can discern. Certainly the workload of the Congress is going to be added to by this action, but I do not think it is too much to expect that the Congress would carry out its constitutional responsibility of seeing that the property of the people be properly conserved. In this we exercise a power that is given to the Congress expressly in the Constitution.

The gentleman from California, my good friend (Mr. HOSMER), in his remarks has indicated that treaties and agreements are broken. He is right, this is true. Certainly the peril is most extreme in cases of gifts and arrangements where United States is going to give away nuclear powerplants and equipment and fuel?

The fuel, plutonium which is a particularly essential part of nuclear powerplants, is not only the most toxic substance which is known, but it also has the capacity of being used for atomic bombs. The country is becoming troubled at this time that there is a strong possibility that this may be the subject of hijacking and theft by extremist forces inside this country and perhaps elsewhere around the world. To kill millions one does not need to convert it into an atomic bomb; all he has got to do is explode a device which scatters plutonium around through the atmosphere. It has an enormously long half-life and will persist and poison people for thousands of years.

India has just made an atom bomb. Countries disregard their agreements; countries break their treaties; and I can foresee no reason why countries should not disregard the treaties and agreements which have already been made with regard to the transfer of fissionable material; the transfer of technology, and the creation of atomic plants and other things for peaceful use. It is not too much to ask that the Congress look at these gifts before they are made. The Long amendment gives us that opportunity. We will then have meaningful controls as opposed to the kind of illusory device that the committee has submitted to us.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I understood the gentleman correctly, but did the gentleman state the President went overseas and gave away a reactor?

Mr. DINGELL. It was so reported in the press. I do not know whether the press is accurate or not, but all I know is that the Congress in those matters was not consulted. The President also gave away a helicopter.

Mr. LUJAN. If the gentleman is under that impression, let me tell the gentleman the President did not give the reactor away. He just gave them the right to buy the reactor and some fuel.

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad. The gentleman has corrected my impression, I am delighted, but in any event the Congress should have been consulted and under the Long amendment the Congress would have been consulted. I believe we should operate in that way rather than under the illusory controls we have in the present legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to make one point. What the gentleman from Michigan has just said, although the remarks have a number of errors in them, is completely beside the point. The point is that when we have an agreement between this country and another country to ratify, are we going to

have to do it by a positive action of this House and the other House and take all that time or should we have the opportunity to do it at our will, in other words if we want to? The Long amendment says we have to take a positive action on every single agreement and take our time on that. I ask should we have the option to do it when we want to? I suggest we defeat the Long amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG). I cannot sit silent without responding to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCCORMACK) who just remarked the provisions on the committee bill would save time. My goodness, who should be concerned about taking more time on a matter so important as giving away our nuclear technology. This is an important matter. This concerns our precious and invaluable nuclear materials. We saw what happened in India. It may happen elsewhere if we let the executive branch make agreements without congressional approval.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), on the other side of the aisle, referred to the vote in the Senate. Who cares what the Senate did or does? Let us not worry about the Senate. Rather let us preserve the prerogatives and prestige of the House.

The gentleman from Maryland has offered an amendment which simply says in a few words that any agreement must be approved by Congress. That means both bodies of Congress.

This amendment provides for a very simple procedure to ensure strong congressional control of nuclear agreements. Under the committee bill there is no assurance that Congress will ever get a chance to vote on nuclear agreements. Rather the committee bill is deceptive. It tries to give the impression that Congress will be assured a vote on nuclear agreements. Really it provides only for Congress to pass a concurrent resolution stating that it does not favor the proposed agreement for cooperation. Big deal!

Just think, that even if a resolution is reported, how do we know that the leadership will bring that resolution to a vote? The facts are that if we look back over the past years and look at nuclear agreements for civil uses such as, for example, the proposed Mideast nuclear agreement, the Joint Atomic Energy Committee could have reported a bill disapproving such agreements, but it has never done so. If we follow the committee bill out, how do we know that Congress will actually get the chance to vote disapproval if it so desires?

The Long amendment has some meaning. It preserves the prerogatives of the House of Representatives. If adopted, it means that no nuclear agreement could go through without approval of the House, as well as Senate approval.

Under the committee proposal, the House could vote its disapproval, but if the Senate approved or, note this—did nothing—the nuclear agreement would go through.

Moreover, I think we should look very dimly at any kind of proceeding that calls for congressional action on a nuclear agreement by concurrent resolution. It is of doubtful constitutionality because concurrent resolutions are not signed by the President. If we followed the committee bill, the President could refuse to obey a resolution even though passed by both Houses disapproving a nuclear agreement. He could do this by citing its questionable constitutional status. If the President took such a course, Congress could estop such a nuclear agreement only by passing a new law over the President's veto.

In my judgment we are indebted to the gentleman for offering this amendment because it affects any nuclear agreement entered into after July 1, 1974, and insures that the proposed Mideast nuclear agreements such as those with Egypt, Israel, and Iran would be covered. This means they would have to be approved by both bodies of Congress to take effect.

Mr. Chairman, in the wake of President Nixon's announcement that he intends to negotiate cooperative nuclear power agreements with Egypt and Israel we must pass an amendment that will require affirmative approval by both bodies of Congress. That will stop the Executive from any capricious action. The committee procedure of a concurrent resolution or a veto simply by an action of joint disapproval is not enough because if the Houses are divided and one happens not to act, these international nuclear agreements would thereby escape any congressional approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the Chair was in doubt.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 191, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—194

Abzug	Burke, Calif.	Drinan
Adams	Burke, Fla.	Duncan
Addabbo	Burke, Mass.	Eckhardt
Alexander	Burton, John	Edwards, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Burton, Phillip	Evans, Colo.
Andrews, N.C.	Byron	Fascell
Archer	Camp	Fish
Ashbrook	Carney, Ohio	Flowers
Ashley	Casey, Tex.	Foley
Aspin	Clancy	Ford
Badillo	Clark	Fountain
Bafalis	Collins, Ill.	Fraser
Baker	Conlan	Giaimo
Bauman	Conyers	Gilman
Bennett	Corman	Ginn
Bergland	Cotter	Gonzalez
Bingham	Coughlin	Grasso
Blatnik	Crane	Green, Pa.
Boggs	Cronin	Grover
Boland	Daniels, Dominick V.	Gude
Brademas	Danielson	Hamilton
Breaux	Davis, S.C.	Hanrahan
Brooks	Delaney	Harrington
Broomfield	Dellums	Hawkins
Brown, Calif.	Denholm	Hays
Brown, Ohio	Dent	Hechler, W. Va.
Broyhill, N.C.	Dingell	Heckler, Mass.
Burgener	Donohue	Helstoski
		Henderson
Hogan	Mcorhead, Calif.	Shipley
Holt		Shoup
Holtzman	Moorhead, Pa.	Shuster
Horton	Mosher	Smith, Iowa
Howard	Moss	Smith, N.Y.
Huber	Murphy, N.Y.	Spence
Hungate	Nedzi	Staggers
Jones, N.C.	Nix	Stark
Jordan	Obey	Steele
Karth	O'Hara	Steelman
Kastenmeier	Parris	Stokes
Kazen	Pettis	Stuckey
Kemp	Peyser	Studds
Ketchum	Pike	Sullivan
Koch	Podell	Symms
Kyros	Randall	Thompson, N.J.
Lagomarsino	Rangel	Thornton
Leggett	Rees	Traxler
Lehman	Regula	Udall
Lent	Reid	Van Deerlin
Litton	Reuss	Vanik
Long, La.	Riegle	Veysey
Long, Md.	Rinaldo	Vigorito
McKay	Rodino	Waldie
Madden	Roe	Wampler
Mann	Rogers	Whalen
Matsunaga	Roncallo, N.Y.	White
Mazzoli	Rosenthal	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Melcher	Roush	
Metcalfe	Rousselot	
Mezvinsky	Roy	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Miller	Roybal	Wolff
Mills	Runnels	Yates
Minish	Ryan	Young, Fla.
Mink	St Germain	Young, Ga.
Mitchell, Md.	Sarbanes	Young, S.C.
Mizell	Schroeder	
Moakley	Seiberling	

NOES—191

Abdnor	Gaydos	Myers
Anderson, Ill.	Gettys	Natcher
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gibbons	Nichols
Annunzio	Goldwater	O'Brien
Armstrong	Goodling	Passman
Barrett	Gray	Patman
Beard	Gross	Patten
Bell	Gubser	Perkins
Bevill	Guyer	Pickle
Biester	Haley	Poage
Blackburn	Hammer-schmidt	Powell, Ohio
Bolling	Hanley	Preyer
Bowen	Harsha	Price, Ill.
Bray	Hastings	Price, Tex.
Breckinridge	Heinz	Quie
Brinkley	Hicks	Quillen
Brotzman	Hillis	Rhodes
Brown, Mich.	Hinshaw	Roberts
Broyhill, Va.	Hosmer	Robinson, Va.
Buchanan	Hudnut	Robison, N.Y.
Burleson, Tex.	Hunt	Roncalio, Wyo.
Burlison, Mo.	Hutchinson	Ruppe
Butler	Ichord	Ruth
Cederberg	Jarman	Sandman
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Sarasin
Chappell	Johnson, Colo.	Satterfield
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Pa.	Scherle
Clawson, Del	Jones, Okla.	Schneebeli
Cleveland	King	Sebelius
Cochran	Kluczynski	Shriver
Cohen	Kuykendall	Sikes
Collier	Landgrebe	Sisk
Collins, Tex.	Latta	Skubitz
Conable	Lott	Slack
Daniel, Dan	Lujan	Snyder
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	McClory	Stanton, J. William
Davis, Wis.	McCloskey	Steed
Dellenback	McCollister	Steiger, Ariz.
Dennis	McCormack	Steiger, Wis.
Derwinski	McDade	Stephens
Devine	McEwen	Stratton
Dickinson	McFall	Stubblefield
Dorn	McKinney	Talcott
Downing	Macdonald	Taylor, Mo.
Dulski	Madigan	Taylor, N.C.
du Pont	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Edwards, Ala.	Mallary	Thone
Erlenborn	Maraziti	Towell, Nev.
Esch	Martin, N.C.	Treen
Findley	Mathias, Calif.	Ullman
Fisher	Mathis, Ga.	Vander Jagt
Flood	Mayne	Waggonner
Flynt	Michel	Walsh
Forsythe	Milford	Ware
Frelinghuysen	Minshall, Ohio	Whitehurst
Frenzel	Mitchell, N.Y.	Whitten
Frey	Mollohan	Widnall
Froehlich	Montgomery	Wiggins
Fuqua	Morgan	Williams
	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
	Murtha	Winn

Wright	Wyman	Zablocki
Wyatt	Yatron	Zion
Wydler	Young, Alaska	
Wylie	Young, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—49

Arends	Griffiths	Pepper
Biaggi	Gunter	Pritchard
Brasco	Hanna	Railsback
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Idaho	Rarick
Carter	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Hébert	Rooney, Pa.
Clay	Holifield	Rose
Conte	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Stanton, James V.
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Symington
de la Garza	Luken	Teague
Diggs	McSpadden	Tiernan
Eilberg	Martin, Nebr.	Vander Veen
Eshleman	Meeds	Young, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	Nelsen	Zwach
Fulton	O'Neill	
Green, Oreg.	Owens	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. This Act shall apply to proposed agreements for cooperation and to proposed amendments to agreements for cooperation hereafter submitted to the Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LONG OF MARYLAND

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONG of Maryland: Page 2, strike out lines 20 through 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to any agreement or any amendment to any agreement, if the agreement or the amendment is proposed or entered into after July 1, 1974."

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the amendment does not correct anything, and actually the amendment does not mean anything. The committee is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for accepting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL) having assumed the Chair, Mr. FORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15582) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to enable Congress to concur in or disapprove international agreements for cooperation in regard to certain nuclear technology, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOSMER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOSMER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 15582 to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 8, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—373

Abdnor	Broyhill, Va.	Dennis
Abzug	Buchanan	Dent
Adams	Burgener	Derwinski
Addabbo	Burke, Calif.	Devine
Alexander	Burke, Fla.	Dickinson
Anderson, Calif.	Burke, Mass.	Dingell
Anderson, Ill.	Burleson, Tex.	Donohue
Andrews, N.C.	Burlison, Mo.	Dorn
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burton, John	Downing
Annunzio	Burton, Phillip	Drinan
Archer	Butler	Dulski
Armstrong	Byron	Duncan
Ashbrook	Camp	du Pont
Ashley	Carney, Ohio	Eckhardt
Aspin	Casey, Tex.	Edwards, Ala.
Badillo	Cederberg	Edwards, Calif.
Bafalis	Chamberlain	Erlenborn
Baker	Chappell	Esch
Barrett	Clancy	Evans, Colo.
Bauman	Clark	Fascell
Beard	Clausen, Don H.	Findley
Bell	Clawson, Del	Fish
Bennett	Cleveland	Fisher
Bergland	Cochran	Flood
Bevill	Cohen	Flowers
Biester	Collier	Flynt
Bingham	Collins, Ill.	Foley
Blackburn	Collins, Tex.	Ford
Blatnik	Conable	Forsythe
Boggs	Conlan	Fountain
Boland	Conyers	Fraser
Bolling	Corman	Frenzel
Bowen	Cotter	Frey
Brademas	Crane	Froehlich
Bray	Cronin	Fuqua
Breaux	Daniel, Dan	Gaydos
Breckinridge	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Gettys
Brinkley	Daniels, Dominick V.	Giaimo
Brooks	Danielson	Gibbons
Broomfield	Davis, S.C.	Gilman
Brotzman	Delaney	Ginn
Brown, Calif.	Dellenback	Goldwater
Brown, Mich.	Dellums	Gonzalez
Brown, Ohio	Denholm	Goodling
Broyhill, N.C.		Grasso
		Gray
		Green, Pa.
		Grover
		Gude
		Guyer
		Haley
		Hamilton
		Hanley
		Hanna
		Hanrahan
		Harrington
		Harsha
		Hastings
		Hawkins
		Hays
		Hechler, W. Va.
		Heckler, Mass.
		Heinz
		Helstoski
		Henderson
		Hicks
		Hillis
		Hinshaw
		Hogan
		Holt
		Holtzman
		Horton
		Howard
		Huber
		Hudnut
		Hungate
		Hunt
		Hutchinson
		Ichord
		Jarman
		Johnson, Calif.
		Johnson, Colo.
		Johnson, Pa.
		Jones, N.C.
		Jones, Okla.
		Jordan
		Karth
		Kastenmeier
		Kazen
		Kemp
		Ketchum
		King
		Kluczynski
		Koch
		Kuykendall
		Kyros
		Lagomarsino
		Latta
		Leggett
		Lehman
		Lent
		Litton
		Long, La.
		Long, Md.
		Lott
		Lujan
		McCloskey
		McCollister
		McCormack
		McFall
		McKay
		McKinney
		Macdonald
		Madden
		Madigan
		Mahon
		Mallary
		Maraziti
		Martin, N.C.
		Mathias, Calif.
		Mathis, Ga.
		Matsunaga
		Mayne
		Mazzoli
		Melcher
		Metcalfe
		Mezvinsky
		Michel
		Milford
		Miller
		Mills
		Minish
		Mink
		Minshall, Ohio
		Mitchell, Md.
		Mitchell, N.Y.
		Mizell
		Moakley
		Mollohan
		Montgomery
		Moorhead, Calif.
		Moorhead, Pa.
		Morgan
		Mosher
		Moss
		Murphy, Ill.
		Murphy, N.Y.
		Murtha
		Myers
		Natcher
		Nedzi
		Nichols
		Nix
		Obey
		O'Brien
		O'Hara
		Parris
		Passman
		Patman
		Patten
		Pepper
		Perkins
		Pettis
		Peyser
		Pickle
		Pike
		Poage
		Podell
		Preyer
		Price, Ill.
		Price, Tex.
		Pritchard
		Quie
		Randall
		Rangel
		Rarick
		Rees
		Regula
		Reid
		Reuss
		Rhodes
		Riegle
		Rinaldo
		Roberts
		Robinson, Va.
		Robison, N.Y.
		Rodino
		Roe
		Rogers
		Roncallo, Wyo.
		Roncallo, N.Y.
		Rosenthal
		Roush
		Rousselot
		Roy
		Roybal
		Runnels
		Ruppe
		Ruth
		Ryan
		St Germain
		Sandman
		Sarasin
		Sarbanes
		Satterfield
		Scherle
		Schroeder
		Sebelius
		Seiberling
		Shipley
		Shoup
		Shriver
		Shuster
		Sikes
		Sisk
		Skubitz
		Slack
		Smith, Iowa
		Smith, N.Y.
		Snyder
		Spence
		Staggers
		Stanton, J. William
		Stanton, James V.
		Stark
		Steed
		Steele
		Steelman
		Steiger, Ariz.
		Steiger, Wis.
		Stephens
		Stokes
		Stratton
		Stubblefield
		Stuckey
		Studds
		Sullivan
		Symms
		Talcott
		Taylor, Mo.
		Taylor, N.C.
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Thone
		Thornton
		Towell, Nev.
		Traxler
		Treen
		Udall
		Ullman
		Van Deerlin
		Vander Jagt
		Vanik
		Veysey
		Vigorito
		Waggonner
		Waldie
		Walsh
		Wampler
		Whalen
		White
		Whitehurst
		Widnall
		Wiggins
		Williams
		Wilson, Bob
		Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
		Wilson, Charles, Tex.
		Winn
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Wydler
		Wylie
		Wyman
		Yates
		Yatron
		Young, Alaska
		Young, Fla.
		Young, Ga.
		Young, Ill.
		Young, S.C.
		Zablocki
		Zion

NOES—8

Davis, Wis.	Gubser	Powell, Ohio
Frelinghuysen	Hosmer	Ware
Gross	Landgrebe	

NOT VOTING—53

Arends	Eshleman	Landrum
Biaggi	Evins, Tenn.	Luken
Brasco	Fulton	McClory
Carey, N.Y.	Green, Oreg.	McDade
Carter	Griffiths	McEwen
Chisholm	Gunter	McSpadden
Clay	Hammer-schmidt	Mann
Conte	Hansen, Idaho	Martin, Nebr.
Coughlin	Hansen, Wash.	Meeds
Culver	Hébert	Nelsen
Davis, Ga.	Holifield	O'Neill
de la Garza	Jones, Ala.	Owens
Diggs	Jones, Tenn.	Quillen
Eilberg		Railsback

Rooney, N.Y.	Schneebeli	Vander Veen
Rooney, Pa.	Symington	Whitten
Rose	Teague	Young, Tex.
Rostenkowski	Tiernan	Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Culver.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Diggs with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. de la Garza with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Luken.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Mann.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Vander Veen with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Owens with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Rose with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Young of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3698) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to enable Congress to concur in or disapprove international agreements for cooperation in regard to certain nuclear technology, a bill similar to H.R. 15582, just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3698

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is revised to read as follows:

"d. The proposed agreement for cooperation, together with the approval and determination of the President, if arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c., or if entailing implementation of sections 53, 54, 103, or 104 in relation to a reactor that may be capable of producing more than five thermal megawatts or special nuclear material for use in connection therewith, has been submitted to the Congress and referred to the Joint Committee and a period of sixty days has elapsed while Congress is in session (in computing such sixty days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days), but any such proposed agreement for cooperation shall not become effective if during such sixty-day period the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the proposed agreement for cooperation: *Provided,* That prior to the elapse of the first thirty days of any such sixty-day period the Joint Committee shall submit a report to the Congress of its views and recommendations respecting the proposed agreement and an accompanying proposed concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress favors, or does not favor, as the case may be, the proposed agreement for cooperation. Any such concurrent resolution so reported shall become the pending business of the House in question (in the case of the Senate the time for debate shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents) within twenty-five days and shall be voted on within five calendar days thereafter, unless such House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.".

SEC. 2. This Act shall apply to proposed agreements for cooperation and to proposed amendments to agreements for cooperation hereafter submitted to the Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PRICE of Illinois moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill S. 3698, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 15582, as passed, as follows:

That subsection 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is revised to read as follows:

"d. The proposed agreement for cooperation, together with the approval and determination of the President, if arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c., or if entailing implementation of sections 53, 54, 103, or 104 in relation to a reactor that may be capable of producing more than five thermal megawatts or special nuclear material for use in connection therewith, shall have no force or effect unless and until specifically approved by Act of Congress.

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to any agreement or any amendment to any agreement, if the agreement or the amendment is proposed or entered into after July 1, 1974.

The motion 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. 15582) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that the first item of business tomorrow, as announced earlier today, will be the legislative appropriations conference report.

Following that, we will take up H.R. 15046, the U.S. Information Agency authorization.

This will be followed by a conference report on the District of Columbia election campaign bill.

Following that we will begin to schedule, as printed in the Whip Notice, the Export Administration Act and so forth.

There are also eligible for tomorrow sometime during the day two conference reports from the Committee on Agriculture.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE U.S. GROUP OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section I, pubic law 689, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Assembly the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HAYS, chairman, Mr. RODINO, Mr. CLARK, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. GUBSER.

WE MUST NOT CONTINUE THE ERRORS AND CRISIS REACTIONS OF THE PAST

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic factors of our economy is its laws of supply and demand.

In the past couple years, this Nation has suffered numerous instances where these basic laws of our free enterprise system have been thrown out of whack, creating in their wake inflationary influences. To name a few, we have had an energy shortage, a wheat shortage, a timber shortage, and a scrap iron shortage. We are now in the midst of a meat glut, to boot.

Mr. Speaker, each of these happenings, whether glut or shortage, has fueled the the inflationary fires. These events, however, have not been creatures entirely of their own making. Indeed, while the administration has given birth to some of them, the Congress has also nurtured and cultivated them.

For sure, Congress has had the good sense to pass the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, which ended the ancient government programs of price supports and guaranteed loans and payments. In doing so, we ended a long series of inflationary payouts: $3.31 billion of payments in fiscal year 1972 were eliminated the next year. Programs which paid farmers to keep supply down by not growing food were also put on the shelf. Yet, the administration put through the Russian wheat deal, and we

have recently passed the livestock bill. Both of these acts are deliterious influences upon the natural market forces which should govern the agricultural economy.

While the oil embargo has been the primary cause of our energy shortage, we in Congress long have promoted overseas energy production by massive tax subsidies for intangible drilling expenses, overseas depletion, and foreign tax credits. We even promote the export of our own dwindling energy supplies through the tax subsidies contained in the DISC tax laws.

Under the same DISC program, we subsidize the export of our valuable timber and scrap metal while our housing industries and steel users shudder under the spiralling costs of these commodities in our own Nation—costs which have risen so fast that they have caused massive increases in the costs of housing and manufactured goods and cut many consumers out of the market.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Congress must look both fore and aft as it examines the causes of inflation. The Democratic Steering and Policy Committee resolution adopted by the full Democratic caucus called for the creation of a mechanism for coordinated, long-term planning regarding the resources of this Nation. Earlier this year, Representative LITTON introduced a bill to establish a Department of Social, Economic, and Natural Resource Planning. Fourteen of my colleagues and I have since cosponsored this measure with the hope that it can go a long way in getting us together for the future. But as we search for long range answers to inflationary forces, I suggest that we cannot continue the errors and crisis reactions of the past.

REQUEST TO PRINT ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN McLAUGHLIN

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

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in my earnest opinion there is nothing as important at this moment in history as protecting the President and the presidency of the United States from these wanton and unwarranted attacks that are being leveled against President Nixon and the high office he occupies.

For the sake of the Republic, for the sake of civilized government, for the sake of my kids and grandkids, this precious balance of authority must be preserved from those spoilers who know not what they do.

Tens of millions of dollars of public and media monies have been expended to finance this vendetta against Richard Nixon. There is no way in the world to match this avalanche of acrimony, even if we would.

Now I have been called a conservative. So you will understand why I had to pause and consider when the Public Printer advised me that it would cost an additional $973 to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a magnificent address by Dr. John McLaughlin on impeachment madness and common sense. I concluded that it would be a very small price to pay to bring a little religion to that subject, so I ask unanimous consent to insert the address notwithstanding that cost.

THE RULE OF REASON MUST GOVERN THE IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have before it the articles of impeachment ordered reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The time draws near for this House to exercise one of the most solemn tasks ever assigned by constitutional process to any assemblage—deciding the fate of a democratically elected head of state.

Like most Americans, I spent many hours during the past days watching and listening to the proceedings of the Committee on the Judiciary, as it debated the issue of impeachment and the particular provisions of the articles.

I was moved by the great burden borne individually by those members who decided—on the basis of presumed innocence or guilt, on the basis of factual evidence and learned conclusions—how they would vote on each article.

While some may have had predetermined opinions on how they would vote—even before the proceedings began—most, I am sure, must have made up their minds as that evidence was debated and weighed. I commend them for their remarks and their conscientious dedication to the Constitution.

It is now the constitutional responsibility of each of us—as Members of the House to which that document fundamental to our freedom assigns the task of impeachment—to weigh the evidence and to come to conclusions on this issue.

I have already studied hundreds of pages of testimony and other evidence submitted both in support of and in opposition to the allegations embodied in the final articles reported. This is, I am aware, but a mere beginning of what I must read, hear, and reflect upon during the coming weeks, for I have not yet—nor should I have—made up my mind on how I will vote.

I think it is most appropriate, at this point, prior to the commencement of proceedings before the full House, to raise an imperative which we must not overlook as we go through the coming weeks. I speak of the necessity of the rule of reason prevailing in this Chamber—both as we debate the issue and as we cast the decisive votes.

In an address on the Fourth of July 1973, entitled "The Fragility of Freedom," Mr. Chief Justice Burger—whose task it may become to preside over the trial of the President in the Senate—if the House should impeach—reflected upon the temper—the tone—of our Nation's political climate during the 1960's, a period inextricably intertwined with ours today:

> That mindless violence of the 1960's seems to have stemmed in part from a confused idea that human beings will be happier and life will be better if they "act out what they feel"—as soon as they feel it—in short, to elevate emotion over reason.

In light of the task which will soon be before us, those words are of great weight.

In our deliberations and in our final vote, the rule of reason must prevail over all other motivations.

Because we live in the present—in this moment of time—it is easy for some to overlook the gravity with which history will judge our actions—the actions of the House as a body of government and an institution of free men and the actions of each of us.

Impeachment is a grave action, for impeachment deals with the fate of a man elected by a free people. It is not simply an administration at stake if a grievously improper decision is arrived at; it could be the stability of freedom and society itself.

The careful research of the historians—men who will never personally know us, nor we them—will reveal the truth, the validity, the accuracy of what we do here. If emotion prevails—emotion which is a quiet form of that violence in the political process to which Mr. Chief Justice Burger referred, manifesting itself in deeds arising from political, or partisan, or even personal motives or aspirations—it will stand glaringly in the light of history's search for the truth.

A vote on impeachment must be based on conscience—arising from the weight of evidence. It must not be based on consensus. Justice is not determined by majority opinion. But I hope to act in such a way that, if all of my constituents were to have the vast information before them—which I will have by the time we come to a final vote—that they would come to the same conclusions evidenced in my final vote.

I think a vote for or against impeachment stands a better test if viewed in this frame of reference and I believe we should all adhere to it.

AMERICA'S SENIOR CITIZENS, OUR PRICELESS RESOURCE

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most valuable resources that this Nation has is our senior citizens. I have long advocated that we make it possible for them to take an active part in community life. Not only is it healthy for them to keep active, but they make contributions which benefit a broad cross-section of the citizens of the community.

Many of my colleagues in the House have joined me in introducing legislation which would establish a permanent Select Committee on Aging to make it

easier for the Congress to assist this broad class of Americans. So far our efforts have been unsuccessful in forming this new committee. I, for one, will continue until we do succeed.

The most important reason for establishing such a committee would be to create a focal point for communications between the various factions interested in the special problems of the aging. These Americans are in need of special and unique assistance, and some means must be devised to provide that assistance while holding costs down. As one of my good friends in California said recently:

How wonderful it will be, when we can see the end of a state of affairs all too familiar to many of the aging—a wasteful, frustrating, heartbreaking situation I call—the right hand giveth, and the left hand taketh away. It seems that such a Select Committee on Aging is the means for keeping both hands pulling together.

Many of our older Americans are already helping themselves, and by doing so, they are also helping their communities. One of the efforts I am most closely associated with, and most familiar with is the tricounty foster grandparent program. It gives me a particular feeling of pride to report to the Congress on the work that these wonderful people are doing. I would like to mention Lillie Bourriague, the director of the program, who has brought a unique rapport to her position, and has made the program go.

Mr. Speaker, I insert two short articles giving details of this program in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Valley Press, June 5, 1974]

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS VOLUNTEER TIME TO TEENAGERS

(By Lois Martin)

Some of the most rewarding experiences in the lives of several local senior citizens are those derived from the time they spend as volunteers in the Foster Grandparent program.

This program is a supplement to organizations working with children with exceptional needs—court wards, groups in charge of mentally and physically handicapped children and day care centers for children of Spanish speaking parents.

It is funded by ACTION along with other agencies such as VISTA, the Peace Corps and SCORE-all volunteer governmental programs.

Men and women over 60 give their time to the program which provides an adult figure without authority, to meet the needs of these young people in a variety of ways. Primarily the needs are for love and understanding. And, the grandmothers and grandfathers have lots to give.

The seniors work 20 hours in the facility where they are most comfortable, whether it be young children, older wards of the court or the handicapped, everyone in the program," explained Lillie Bouriague, director of the tri-county program.

In order to qualify for the program, they must be of low income and in good health. They are paid a stipend of $1.60 per hour for their time.

"Even though they must be of low income, most of them end up putting much of their stipend back into the program by way of the purchases they make for the children they are working with," explained Phyllis Wallace, the Santa Cruz county director of the program.

Those who give four hours of their time each day, obviously do it for more reasons than to supplement their Social Security payments.

They become emotionally involved with the children they work with and therefore derive a great deal of fulfillment from their hours with them.

There seems to be less of a generation gap between the young people and the seniors than with adults in their thirties and forties, according to the directors.

"Most have developed a gentle sense of humor and can laugh with the young people, rather than at them. They often enjoy just listening to the recollections of the grandparents because they've read about them in their history books," Lillie said.

In the case of those grandparents who give their time to the juvenile hall at the county's probation center on Graham Hill road, their primary function is to be a friend to the boys and girls who have been made wards of the court.

One of the best loved grandmothers at the local facility is Roberta Swiger, affectionately called "Bert" by her young friends in the boys unit.

She entered the program when it began in 1972 following the death of her husband. Like many widows, she was somewhat lost at that time and realized she needed something to do wtih her spare time.

Bert greets the new arrivals with a friendly . . . "Hello, My name is Bert. I'm a foster grandparent and I'm here just as a friend. I'm not a heavy. I have no authority. I don't give any discipline. I'm not working for the 'fuzz' and I'm not writing a book. If you need to talk to someone or want help of any kind, come and get me. If you don't want to be bothered, just tell me to 'bug off.' The choice is yours."

She believes that listening, understanding and caring are the prerequisites to fill the roll of a foster grandparent. She has found that they really need someone to talk to . . . to spill out their feelings to a non-authoritarian figure more than anything. This seems to be true with the boys more than the girls, she believes.

"I think boys need more love because it is harder for them to ask for it because we raise them not to show emotions. They need to relax and to become like a small child with their mother. Boys appreciate the affection they receive more, because they find it harder to ask for it. They seem to be more astute at recognizing the difference between phoniness and sincerity," Bert said.

Tom Mote has also been with the program since its inception—first in the boys unit, then the girls and now in the SCAPP section (Santa Cruz Adolescent Placement Program) where the wards must stay for observation 90 days prior to their placement in foster homes or returned to their own homes.

Here they attend school classes and work on various projects and are helped back to a homelike atmosphere. They earn passes to go out with a counselor or parent and are helped in adjusting to regular society again.

"I help them just by being there and talking with them and helping them on their various projects. Just having a friend to talk to helps them curtail their frustration. They get real high strung when they're shut in all the time.

"They relate to us in a different way than the counselors—more like they might to a parent. It seems to have a quieting effect on them," Tom said.

Tom formerly worked in the Meals on Wheels program of Project Scout to supplement his income and give him something to do with his time after retirement. He wasn't sure he'd fit in to the Foster Grandparent program, since he had no children of his own, but was willing to try.

"Working with these young people has given me a new lease on life and something more to think about beside myself and my own problems. I'm sure it will actually lengthen my life because if your mind is active, your body won't deteriorate so fast," he said.

Bert believes she has learned a great deal about herself from the experience of being a foster grandmother, primarily that she needs someone to care for and the young people she has worked with at the probation center have filled that need.

"It gives me a real sense of belonging and being needed. Some of them are so mixed up, and have been through so much for their young years. Some come from such bad family environments which they have no control over. I give them as much understanding as I can and it really takes a lot of heart," she said.

"Many times I get hurt and go home crying, but I love it. I wouldn't trade the hours I spend here for anything."

It is hoped that the program will soon be expanded as there is now a waiting list of potential grandparents for the program. Seniors interested in the program may gain more information by calling 423-6249.

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS FULFILL EXCEPTIONAL NEED

(By Virginia Brailsford)

"Exceptional love and attention" from five volunteer foster grandparents has been a daily bonus this year for young people attending the Training Farm for the Retarded on Spring Valley Rd.

The foster grandparents, participating in "ACTION", a federal program, visit the farm each day for four hours, to serve as companions to mentally retarded children. The young people range in age from 14 to 21 and can be assigned to the foster grandparents by Walter Nicol, the school's head teacher.

"But more often than not, the visitors become involved with more than one child," he said.

In addition to listening to youthful problems and helping with school learning situations under the supervision of teachers, the "grandparents" share their own special skills and backgrounds.

Consequently, they may be found helping out in the greenhouse, in the work shop, the crafts department, or in the barnyard with chickens, lambs or rabbits. Their help is equally in demand in the domestic department. Or they can be found on the ball-field, playing baseball with the youngsters.

Mrs. Frances Soady, foster grandparent who joined the school in September at the inception of the program, is an example of sharing of hobbies. She often helps in the greenhouse, where the children carefully plant, tend, pot and water a wide variety of garden annuals, including herbs. Her enthusiasm for growing things extends to the young gardeners.

The children's pride in the horticultural project is heightened by a small stipend earned for greenhouse duties, Mrs. Soady explained. Each week, a "store" is simulated so that the children may have the experience of making small purchases and handling money.

Another enthusiastic volunteer, is Arthur Gordon of Aptos. A former business writer and dog breeder, he assists with the farm operation. "A favorite task for the children is nursing a motherless lamb," Gordon said. Keeping the pens clean for pigs, rabbits, chickens and other pets is also part of the farm learning activity for youngsters. Gordon helps a teacher with supervision.

Many of the trainees belong to Future Farmers of America and have won numerous

ribbons for exhibiting livestock at fairs, Gordon said. "Although some may not be able to master abstract ideas, they grasp simpler skills."

All are termed "trainable" retarded. Many are mongoloids.

Recalling when he joined the foster grandparents program last winter, Gordon said, "I wondered if I could 'reach' the retarded. However there was no problem. Many clutch you in their eagerness for love and attention."

He added thoughtfully, "I discovered, it's a question whether I am doing something for the children, or whether they are helping me. . . . It's wonderful, what they have done for me."

The grandparents, all over 60 years of age, are selected for their patience, love of children, and calm manner, according to Phyllis Wallace, supervisor of the foster grandparent program in Santa Cruz County. "They are assigned by the school principal to specific children in one of the area schools for handicapped children." (Other schools are Calabasas, Kennedy Center, and Duncan Holbert School.)

More foster grandparents are needed.

"There aren't enough to go around," she said.

Another grandparent, relatively new to the program, is Mrs. Bess Maiorino who is involved with reading, homemaking, or horticulture or wherever she's needed.

Mrs. Maiorino believes she has a particular understanding of the handicapped. She grew up with a little girl, a friend, who was retarded. Later she tutored one of her own four children who had a speech impediment until he overcame it and won an outstanding award in English. With 11 grandchildren of her own, she finds the association with Spring Valley Farm rewarding.

"When I started, there was one boy who didn't talk and refused to be touched. He seems to have had unfortunate experiences in foster homes. Now he's less shy and is talking more," she said.

Noting the accomplishments of the girls, she said, "They model the clothes they made at the school's April 22 open house. They were well-behaved and attractive. You wouldn't have known that anything was different about them. When they appeared, I cried."

Another grandmother, Mrs. Isaacs, has been teaching sewing since last fall. A former business woman, she is 70 and helps wherever needed at the school. She lost her husband two years ago and finds the farm fills a definite need in her own life, in addition to her two grandchildren.

"Those at the training school are a lovable group," she said.

"They are different from 'normal' children in surprising ways. There is no jealousy, no antagonism between them. They always help each other."

Mrs. Isaacs recounted a humorous incident, illustrating the effect that unusual situations can have on exceptional children. She and another grandmother had been assigned as "goalposts" in a ball game. Feeling weary, she sat down to rest. One of the boys who rarely speaks began to laugh, saying, "Look, the goalpost sat down."

The senior member of the grandparent team was Mrs. Marie Farrar, a former school cafeteria manager who taught cooking in the school domestic department. Now 72, she has resigned due to health problems.

There are now 23 foster grandparents in the Watsonville area, working with children who have exceptional needs, in such schools as the Training Farm, or at hospitals or day care centers.

The national foster grandparent program, established in 1965, was funded locally in 1972.

Mrs. Lillie Bourriague, former director of Project Scout, is director of the tri-county foster grandparent program. There are 65 volunteers in the three counties and more are needed as the program expands, she said.

"Not only do special schools for the handicapped benefit, and the children receive special attention and love, but the grandparents themselves are living a complete new life," Mrs. Bourriague said.

Grandparents benefit monetarily through the federally financed program. They receive a stipend which is not subject to federal or state tax. Volunteers also have a daily hot lunch, transportation expenses, a physical examination, and $1.60 an hour wage. They may work up to 20 hours a week, and receive a two-week paid vacation, plus sick leave.

"Many older people who find their Social Security benefits are not adequate to cover expenses these days may not know of the foster grandparent program," Mrs. Bourriague said.

Volunteers are carefully screened and trained, she explained. "A necessary quality is the ability to give love and patient understanding to a child with exceptional needs."

To be eligible, volunteers must be over 60 years, and need to supplement retirement income.

If more information is wished regarding the foster grandparent program, persons may call the Santa Cruz office, 505 Lincoln St., at 423-6249, or the Salinas office at 422-8526.

THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House today has requested a conference with the other body on H.R. 15276, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. The prompt action taken by the House and the other body on H.R. 15276 and S. 821, underscores the deep concern and commitment that this Congress has to correct the serious problem of juvenile delinquency which now exists in this country, a problem which jeopardizes the most important resource this Nation has, its youth.

I would like to express my interest in the action taken by the other body to place overall administration of the block grant juvenile delinquency prevention program in LEAA. As you will recall, when the House debated H.R. 15276 on July 1, 144 Members including myself, indicated support for LEAA administration. While I recognize the duty of the conferees to faithfully represent the final House position on the legislation during the conference, I sincerely hope that the House conferees will be able to give favorable consideration to the position taken by the other body on this matter.

During the debate on July 1, I expressed my belief that the block grant programs for juvenile delinquency prevention provided in H.R. 15276 could best be administered by LEAA. In the past 5 years, LEAA has been responsible for the management of a block grant program representing the single greatest effort of the Federal Government to meet this Nation's criminal justice problems. With its assistance and cooperation, State planning agencies throughout the country are developing the comprehensive planning capabilities and mechanisms essential for utilizing these block grants in the manner needed to meet their particular criminal justice problems. In addition, last year this Congress mandated LEAA to develop a comprehensive juvenile justice program, which is now going forward to both the State and Federal level. To me, therefore, LEAA and the SPA's seem in the best position to assure that this new program for juvenile delinquency prevention is promptly and effectively implemented, including careful coordination between it and the other State and Federal juvenile justice efforts.

In closing I would like to commend the gentlemen from California (Mr. HAWKINS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity of the House Education and Labor Committee, for the dedicated work of his subcommittee on H.R. 15276. I would also like to commend the gentlemen from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and the gentlemen from Wisconsin, (Mr. STEIGER) for their efforts to achieve final enactment of this highly significant legislation. As the ranking Republican of the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Judiciary Committee, which has general oversight of LEAA, I pledge my support and cooperation with the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity in secing that the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act are fully and effectively implemented by LEAA, should it be given that authority.

IMPEACHMENT DECISION

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, since announcing my decision to vote in favor of certain impeachment articles, I have been subjected to a great deal of personal abuse from some of my friends and colleagues in the Congress, from my political workers and contributors and, most sadly of all, from some of my personal friends.

I have been contacted by thousands of people from my own State of Maryland and from nearly every other State in the Union. Many of these letters, telegrams and phone calls have come from my fellow Republicans, condemning my decision, and addressing me as "JUDAS" HOGAN and "BENEDICT ARNOLD" HOGAN and "BRUTUS" HOGAN, and asking what I would do with my "30 pieces of silver."

To those people, I make a simple request: Study the evidence as I have studied it, and then look yourself in the eye and say, "Richard Nixon has done no wrong. He deserves to remain as President of the United States."

To my fellow Republicans who have asked, "How can you vote to impeach a Republican President?" I ask them in turn, "How can I vote to excuse the wrongdoing of a Republican President?"

Should my allegiance to the Republican Party transcend my oath of allegiance to my country and my loyalty to my own conscience? Of course not.

I can understand that some will disagree with my decision, but I cannot understand those who deny me the right to vote according to the dictates of my own conscience.

Some of my long time Republican supporters and workers, who have written to me in times past commending me for my courage in standing up and fighting for the causes in which they believe, now condemn me for speaking out on an issue on which they do not agree with me.

All throughout our history, beginning at the time of our Founding Fathers, American politicians have seen their duty from different perspectives and have come to different conclusions. Some will do so on this historic issue.

Some, like many of my Republican colleagues on this committee, will look at the evidence and not see what I and six other Republicans on the Judiciary Committee see. I respect these opponents of impeachment for their position even though I disagree with it. I know how hard they have worked for the past several months, and I know the excruciating agony of decisionmaking they have endured, as I have endured. I know they have come to their decision honestly, in response to their consciences' urging, as I have.

But some of our colleagues in the House will not bother looking at the evidence, but will vote for impeachment or against impeachment on a strictly political basis. While I cannot admire this approach to a decision of such vital importance to our Nation, I know the realities of political life.

To my fellow Republicans who have not studied the evidence, but have already made up their minds to oppose impeachment for the sake of the Republican Party, I want to proffer this thought: While this political scandal called Watergate is the shame of America, it is even more poignantly the shame of the Republican Party.

While the travesties of Watergate were perpetrated outside the regular channels of Republican Party organizations, they were all committed by Republicans for the benefit of a Republican President. Each of the 20 Presidential aides who have been convicted was a Republican.

It seems to me, in addition to our responsibility to the country, we also have a responsibility to our party to rectify these wrongs.

Do we want to be the party loyalists who in ringing rhetoric condemn the wrongdoings and scandals of the Democratic Party and excuse them when they are done by Republicans?

During the years I was an FBI agent, I was repeatedly amazed that a mother could never believe that her son had committed a crime. "My son would not do such a thing," she would say.

On Christmas Eve, I arrested a bank robber at his mother's home, and, in a Christmas present box, we found the loot taken in the bank robbery. But his mother would not believe it. In spite of all the evidence against him, his mother still would not accept the reality that her son had committed a crime. "My son would not do such a thing."

Aren't some of my fellow Republicans being equally illogical on this question of impeachment? To those partisans who seem to put party loyalty above all else—and I do not include my esteemed Republican colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee in that category—I would like to speak in the language those Republicans know best—the language of politics.

Confidence in politicians—especially Republican politicians—is at an all-time low ebb. Our Government is reeling from the scandals of Watergate because of this mistrust. The person who bears most of the responsibility for this sad condition is the President of the United States, the subject of this impeachment inquiry.

A year or so ago, it would have been unthinkable for me to even consider the possibility of removing the President from office, but we on the House Judiciary Committee have been thinking this unthinkable thought, and now, after having thoroughly studied the evidence for several weeks, it strikes me that it is unthinkable that we not remove him from office.

If he continues in office, will the people have trust in their Government? Will voters have confidence in politicians who put their party above their country? If we do not purge ourselves of the disease of Watergate, will our party and the two-party system itself survive?

While the House Judiciary Committee was holding hearings on the confirmation of Vice President GERALD FORD, I said at one point that—

> As far as I'm concerned, there is no single thing that can do more toward restoring the American people's confidence in government than for them to get to know (the Vice President) as well as those of us in the House know him.

We subjected GERALD FORD to the most searching investigation and scrutiny of any politician in history. No man is better equipped than JERRY FORD by virtue of his integrity, his honesty and his dedication to his country's welfare to lead us out of the quagmire of Watergate and to restore the people's confidence in government and politics.

We should not fear this transition of leadership. We should welcome and demand it.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, two recent events have again raised the issue of continued proliferation of nuclear weapons. On May 18, India exploded a nuclear device made with radioactive materials diverted from a Canadian reactor which was built for "peaceful purposes." Later, in June, the President announced his intention to enter into cooperative nuclear power agreements with both Egypt and Israel. It appears as if the "nuclear genie" which was partially bottled by the nuclear test ban, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the SALT I agreements has been uncorked. And from the comments of the Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, the bottle might stay permanently uncapped if the Soviet Union and the United States cannot soon come to agreement on SALT II.

The President's intentions to negotiate nuclear agreements with Egypt and Israel focus important considerations, international and constitutional. The legislation before us condenses these issues. H.R. 15582, which enables Congress to either concur or disapprove of international agreements for cooperation in regard to certain nuclear technology, asserts that Congress will not duck responsibility for the proliferation of nuclear technology, but instead face this responsibility squarely. This is especially true if Congress is to continue in the spirit of the war powers resolution and the Congressional Budget Priorities Act in reasserting congressional authority. It seems apparent that any action which commits the resources or abilities of the United States in some way must have congressional concurrence. What could possibly excuse the Congress from this responsibility in the commitment of its nuclear technology?

There are clear constitutional grounds for this amendment to the Atomic Energy Act. The argument that executive agreements do not need congressional concurrence because of the special inherent powers of the Executive to conduct foreign policy has never been strong. The only reason that congressional approval was not sought for executive agreements was that Congress usually did not chose to exercise its authority. Raoul Berger, the distinguished constitutional lawyer, stated in his authoritative book on executive privilege:

> However impenetrable the intentions of the Framers . . . they made clear beyond doubt that the specific objective of the treaty clause was to preclude the President from entering into international agreements without the participation of the Senate.

This measure does not prevent the President from negotiating these necessary agreements in any way. We are assuring that Congress will carefully examine these agreements and concur in them. Under present law, the President submits any nuclear reactor agreements to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee which has only the authority to examine them for 30 days, with no provision at all for congressional consideration. To allow such procedures for continued congressional abdication of power to go on would be totally irresponsible. Congress has the clear responsibility not only to the American people, but to the people of the world, to consider carefully the implications of nuclear agreements such as these.

We carry not only a constitutional responsibility but an international responsibility. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 recognized the fact that the United States

as then leading depository of nuclear technology had the obligation to safeguard the proliferation of atomic materials for peaceful purposes. We also recognized that in keeping with the most time honored traditions of the United States, we should share the advantages of the peaceful use of atomic energy with the nations of the world.

It is essential to be realistic about the prospects for further development of nuclear technology around the world. With the world's resources of oil and coal rapidly being depleted, and economic expansion moving forward at ever increasing rates, especially among the developing countries, we can not reasonably expect to monopolize the use of nuclear power sources. The risks involved in making nuclear technology available to Egypt and Israel for peaceful purposes are self-evident. But if we do not provide energy producing reactors, the odds are great that these countries will get them somewhere else, without the safeguards which the U.S. would require.

Israel already has two reactors, a small research reactor of 5 MW and a French built 26 MW reactor which is capable of producing plutonium for weapons already. Egypt also has a small 2 MW reactor provided by the Soviet Union.

The State Department has stated that the French have already expressed interest in bidding on an Egyptian reactor and the Germans have expressed interest in an Israeli reactor. The question is not whether these nations will obtain nuclear technology but what safeguards will be attached to the acquisition of these reactors.

It is essential that the Congress assure itself and the Nation of the strictness of safeguards to prevent nuclear materials from being diverted to nonpeaceful uses. Restrictions must include:

First. Giving the United States full control over production, shipment, and reprocessing of the uranium and plutonium fuels.

Second. Detailing measures for physical security against theft of nuclear materials.

Third. Preventing the transfer of highly enriched nuclear material.

This last will help to prevent the type of loophole through which India claimed its blast was done for the peaceful purposes laid down by Canada.

While at this time I do not want to get too far beyond the question of whether Congress will or will not take part in nuclear exchange decisions, the implication of that decision will carry beyond legislation to the question of our basic foreign policy. What is the U.S. role to be in aiding other nations meet their future energy requirements, especially when our own are far from assured? In what direction should our efforts lead—nuclear power, solar research, increased oil production? Will our aid be negotiated through bi- or multilateral channels and will political considerations be attached to it?

Mr. Speaker, positive action on this measure today will aid Congress in considering these issues fully and responsibly. Congress' obligation, both to the international community and to the American public, is clear. We must provide ourselves with the tools to share equally with the President the responsibility for these key decisions.

THE AMBASSADOR'S ASSESSMENT OF VIETNAM

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's most distinguished diplomats, Ambassador Graham Martin, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 25. As our country's representative to the Republic of Vietnam, Ambassador Martin has upheld the highest standards of ability and integrity.

I know that many of my colleagues will be heartened by the ambassador's confidence in Vietnam's future. I know, too, that most Americans will agree that we should leave Vietnam economically viable, secure against aggression and externally supported subversion, and able to choose its government in freedom.

Great sacrifices have been made to secure peace and freedom in Vietnam. It is doubly heartening, therefore, to hear our Ambassador's assessment that we shall be able to close the story of our involvement with success and with pride. I insert in the RECORD the text of Ambassador Graham Martin's remarks to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 25, 1974:

REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR GRAHAM MARTIN

Mr. Chairman, I very much welcome the opportunity to present to this Committee some impressions of the very great changes that have taken place in the Republic of Vietnam since my arrival there a year ago this week. It has been an interesting year, in many ways a fascinating year and, in a few ways, a frustrating year.

But it has also been a rewarding year, because I am able to report to you that if the level of economic assistance for the Republic of Vietnam recommended and urged by Secretary Kissinger is authorized and appropriated by the Congress we can confidently anticipate that in a very few years we will be able to regard our Vietnam involvement as closed. If the Secretary's recommendations are heeded our involvement will be closed in the way that the great majority of Americans quite obviously want it closed—leaving the Republic of Vietnam economically viable, militarily capable of defending itself with its own manpower against both external aggression and externally supported internal subversion, and free to choose its own leaders and its own government as its citizens themselves may freely determine.

I am confident that this is the way we will eventually leave. If the requested level is not forthcoming it will just take us longer. For my part, I deeply believe the quicker we reach this goal, the better off we will be. It was for this reason I had publicly suggested that the appropriate economic aid level for the Republic of Vietnam for FY 1975 should be $850 million rather than the $750 million finally recommended by the Administration.

Although I still think the $850 million level would permit us to more quickly leave Vietnam, I regretfully conclude that there is small chance of my persuading you to raise the Administration's requested $750 million to that level. One senior member of the House did observe that if we could have gotten a majority of the Congress to visit Vietnam this year and see for themselves the actual current realities, we would have little difficulty in getting a clear majority for $900 million. To my great regret the members of this Committee have been unable to visit the Republic of Vietnam in the past year.

I think it very important to note that what we are requesting is less than three-fourths of the amount of economic aid which will be furnished to North Vietnam this year by the PRC, and the Soviet Bloc. Our present estimate indicates that more than $1.2 billion in purely economic aid will be delivered to North Vietnam in this calendar year.

Perhaps it would make a contribution to perspective to recall that when the Paris Agreement was signed in January 1973, no one who was familiar with the complexity and depth of emotion involved in the Vietnam problem expected a perfect peace overnight. However, there was a general consensus that the Agreement provided a good framework on which peace could be built, and there was widespread hope that this peace could be achieved in a reasonable period of time.

In the subsequent 18 months, however, it has become increasingly clear that the Communist side is not yet really serious about implementing the Agreement. Instead, the aging Hanoi leaders are still trying to seize full power in the South through a combination of military, political, and economic pressure. They are also attempting to achieve a cut-back in U.S. military and economic assistance to the South, which they hope would accelerate the collapse of the structure of South Vietnamese society which their doctrine and ideology predicted as inevitable with the departure of American armed forces. But this collapse has not happened, Mr. Chairman, and I am convinced that it will not happen. To document this conviction, let me examine briefly the current political, military, and economic situation in South Vietnam.

Politically the South Vietnamese Government is stronger than ever. It is effective. It exercises normal governmental control over more than 90% of the population and all important towns and economically productive areas. Most significantly, it is perceived to be legitimate by the vast majority of the South Vietnamese people, and it has their full support in its continuing struggle with the Communists. In sharp contrast, the Communists are politically weaker than ever, with control over less than one percent of the population, and very little popular support.

Militarily, the South Vietnamese are also strong. Their armed forces have demonstrated their ability to defend the country by stopping the 1972 North Vietnamese offensive without U.S. ground support, and by maintaining the military status quo since the signing of the Agreement, in spite of serious enemy attacks, without any U.S. combat help or advice. Even with the North Vietnamese military build-up since the Agreement, I am confident the South Vietnamese can continue to handle the military threat on their own, provided we continue to replace military supplies on the permitted one-for-one basis.

Economically, however, South Vietnam has serious problems. The economic decline of the past two years was initiated by the 1972 North Vietnamese offensive and the disruption and refugee burden it created. It was exacerbated by the sharp decline in the value of overall U.S. aid and economic inputs. And it has been further compounded by rapid in-

crease in the price of the major South Vietnamese imports, which consist primarily of petroleum products, fertilizer, and foodstuffs.

The immediate, short-range economic picture may look unfavorable, but its very severity has, up to this point, contributed to the political unity, as all Vietnamese have tightened their belts. There has been no panic, no political unrest, but a steadfast, pervasive determination to surmount this latest obstacle to their goal of a better life, in freedom, for themselves and their children. They have largely preserved the free economy and have permitted the normal forces of a market economy to work.

Thus, we find the price of gasoline at about $1.62 a gallon, one of the highest in the world. Since all imports that were not absolutely essential have been eliminated, new aid will be channeled more than ever before into development and investment projects which will increase the productive capacity and create more jobs. South Vietnam's longer range economic prospects, therefore, are quite good. In fact, all the essential conditions are present in South Vietnam for an economic breakthrough along the lines achieved in Taiwan and South Korea, and in an even shorter time frame.

Overcoming these short-term economic problems and hastening the day of self-sufficiency are the immediate objectives of our FY–1975 economic assistance proposals for South Vietnam. Perhaps of even greater importance are the political and military implications of these proposals. I shall allude to these a bit later.

On the purely economic side, we should note that for the past decade our assistance has been concentrated on a stabilization effort, designed primarily to help the South Vietnamese support the war effort and meet war-related contingencies such as caring for war victims. Wartime conditions and priorities forced the neglect of longer range economic development projects. The South Vietnamese have had some success during the past year in placing more emphasis on the economic future rather than the present. This South Vietnamese Government has responded to the economic crisis in part by eliminating all unnecessary imports, and all U.S. aid-financed imports have become production and development oriented. Now, with our FY–1975 request, we hope to put still greater emphasis on longer range reconstruction and development programs so that the South Vietnamese economy can move as quickly as possible toward self-sufficiency. If the amounts of assistance envisaged in the projections given the Committee by Secretary Kissinger can be provided, I am certain that at the end of this decade South Vietnam will need no more than nominal amounts of further U.S. economic aid.

If we have the wisdom and foresight to make the large initial investment in economic aid I have recommended for the next two years, FY–1975 and FY–1976, I am completely confident that we can reach this goal much sooner. While the FY–1975 emphasis on development will be somewhat more expensive initially, without it South Vietnam's import substitution program would be delayed, economic self-sufficiency would remain a mirage, and the need for outside assistance would be open-ended. One example provides a dramatic illustration. The FY–1975 proposal includes $80 million for the construction of a fertilizer plant.

At the same time, we are spending nearly $120 million per year to help the South Vietnamese import the fertilizer necessary to sustain food production. Yet, until the fertilizer plant is built, we cannot cut off funds for fertilizer imports, since to do so would cause a sharp decline in food production and the consequent prospect of either famine or a massive U.S. food supply program. Neither alternative would appear an attractive option.

The program requested can serve as a sound basis for the U.S. phase-down effort; and in the long run it will be less costly to the American taxpayer than the stabilization programs of the wartime period.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address two particular questions which I know have been of concern to a good many members of Congress.

First is the assertion made frequently in recent months that eliminating or sharply cutting our aid to South Vietnam will bring peace by forcing the South Vietnamese to negotiate a settlement. This may be true if the kind of peace desired is that of abject surrender to Communist aggression, or the peace which would follow a bloody Communist military victory. But this is not the kind of peace for which we have invested so much all these years, nor the kind of peace which would be in our interest or in the interest of the South Vietnamese people.

In fact, it has not been the South Vietnamese Government which has been blocking implementation of the Paris Agreement and further progress toward peace. It is the Republic of Vietnam which has everything to gain by a full, complete, and rapid implementation of the Paris Agreements. Plain logic makes this conclusion inescapable. It is the North Vietnamese who do not dare the impartial internationally supervised rejection of their claims that they have more than minimal support in South Vietnam which would be the automatic result of the elections required by the Paris Agreements.

Consequently, short of the patently impossible attempt to force their surrender or military defeat, there is no way we can pressure the South Vietnamese alone to make a real peace. The best hope for a genuine negotiated settlement and eventual reconciliation in Vietnam is to maintain the balance of forces, both military and economic, which has permitted the progress made thus far.

Secondly, I am aware of the argument that is being made that in view of the continuing hostilities it might not be possible to achieve South Vietnamese economic self-sufficiency in a reasonable time frame, no matter how much aid we give.

I understand the argument. It has a certain logic. Cautious bureaucrats in the Executive Branch have been using it for years. It still rankles me that I was unable to prevail over it some years ago before I left Southeast Asia in 1967. It was a mistake then. It will be an even greater mistake now. But it overlooks the new factors that, one, there is now no possible way Hanoi can overthrow Saigon by any variation of a fair political contest, and, two, it is now crystal clear that the North Vietnamese cannot conquer South Vietnam militarily.

Their last hope, therefore, is to achieve such a reduction of economic aid to South Vietnam that it will effect the political unity and the military morale and effectiveness of the South Vietnamese Armed Forces. If we do not permit this to happen, if we provide the full amount Secretary Kissinger has recommended, we can confidently anticipate a considerable reduction in the level of violence in South Vietnam and, perhaps, progress toward a real settlement.

I strongly believe, Mr. Chairman, that we should end American involvement in Vietnam, and we should end it as quickly as possible. How we end it, however, is of crucial importance. I believe our objective must be to end it leaving a South Vietnam economically viable, militarily capable of defending itself, free to choose its own government and its own leaders, and able to work out its own eventual reconciliation with its enemies in the North.

Moreover, I believe this objective can be achieved in the time frame we have projected. Whether or not we are able to walk away from such a South Vietnam as I have described, with the evidence of American commitments fully discharged, may well have a decisive impact on our future role in the community of nations, and on our ability to help build a worldwide structure of peace for our children and grandchildren. I deeply believe this to be true, Mr. Chairman, as Secretary Kissinger expressed much more eloquently in his statement to this Committee on June 7.

THE PRESIDENTIAL OATH OF OFFICE

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

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, each of us has been impressed by the high quality of work done by the House Judiciary Committee. Outstanding among the statements made was one by my distinguished colleague and good friend, GEORGE E. DANIELSON, concerning the President's obligation under his oath of office. I wish to share it with my colleagues:

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this is possibly, probably—I can make that stronger—it is certainly the most important article that this committee may pass out.

The offense charged in this article is truly a high crime and misdemeanor within the purest meaning of those words as established in Anglo-American jurisprudence over a period of now some 600 years. The offenses charged against the President in this article are uniquely Presidential offenses. No one else can commit them. You or I, the most lowly citizen, can obstruct justice. You or I, the most lowly citizen, can violate any of the statutes in our criminal code. But only the President can violate the oath of office of the President. Only the President can abuse the powers of the Office of the President. When our Founding Fathers put our Constitution together, it was no accident that they separated the powers. Against the backdrop of 400 years of history of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence they realized the need to have a device, a constitutional means of removing from office a chief magistrate who had violated his solemn oath of office. And I respectfully submit that the impeachment clause of our Constitution which, fortunately, we have to use now for only the second time, is that means.

These are high crimes and misdemeanors, meaning that they are crimes against the very structure of the state, against the system of government, the system that has brought to the American people and has preserved for the American people the freedoms and liberties which we so cherish. This is uniquely a Presidential offense, Mr. Chairman, and the most important subject of this hearing.

There are some—and I would like to respond right now—there are some among us, there are many conscientious, dedicated Americans who harbor a feeling of fear and apprehension at this proceeding. They seem—I submit that it is a sensitivity to the travail through which our Republic is now passing, but they feel, they recognize, they sense that this is a most grave responsibility and proceeding and some of them say that this should not be done because it might harm the Presidency. Mr. Chairman, I submit that only the President can harm the Presidency. No one but the President can destroy the Presidency. And it is our re-

sponsibility, acting under the impeachment clause, to preserve and protect the Presidency as we preserve and protect every other part of our marvelous structure of government, and we do it through this—do it through this process.

Someone, in his opening statement, referred to this as being a situation of "We, the people" acting. "We, the people," are acting through this procedure, through the provisions put into our Constitution.

The American people, Mr. President, are entitled to and want a government which they can honor and respect, and they should have it. The American people, Mr. President, are eager to revere their President. They are entitled to a President whom they can revere.

Mr. Chairman, I ask, "Is not the violation of the solemn oath of office an impeachable offense?" It is not found in our criminal code. It is implicit in our Constitution but it is necessarily implicit in the Constitution for otherwise why would there be an oath of office?

The offenses charged in this proposed article I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, are offenses which go directly to the breach of a solemn oath of office. Can anyone argue that if the President breaches his oath of office, he should not be removed?

I say not. And I respectfully submit that this point of order should be denied.

RAPE CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the crime of rape is a violent crime. It is not primarily a sexual act; it in no way reflects any sort of sexual union. Rape is hostility and rage that uses sex as an outlet to humiliate and degrade. Sexual desire is not the motivating factor in rape—it is the chosen mode of the expression of anger and hostility. In 85 percent of all rapes some form of overt violence is used to force a woman into intercourse; whether it is beating, hitting, choking, or scratching. In addition, verbal abuse and coercion accompanies nearly all rapes.

On page 156 in "Patterns in Forcible Rape" by Dr. Menachem Amir, he notes that—

In almost 90 percent of the cases where victim and offender were of the same age level, the rape event involved the use of force. Among the cases where there were gross differences—in at least plus or minus 10 years—between offenders and victims, force was used in 94 percent of the situations where the offender was at least 10 years younger and in only 71 percent when he was at least 10 years older than his victim.

These statistics do not support the statement Judge Levittan made in her address. In addition, Dr. Amir found—

It should be noted that a *significant* association was found between type of rape and degree of violence in the rape situation. Most excessive degrees of violence occurred in group rape (emphasis his).

Group rapes occurred in 43 percent of the cases Dr. Amir studied. Glueck's New York study found the use of physical force in 57 percent of the cases studied and that in 43 percent of the cases the threat of a weapon was used. In 3 percent of the cases Glueck studied, the victim was murdered. Dr. Amir's study showed that sexual humiliation, fellatio, cunnilingus—or both—and pederasty occurred in over one-quarter of the rape cases he studied. In nearly 10 percent of all cases, the victim was sodomized. I can think of nothing more brutal or violent.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, crimes of violence are rising in this country. The leading element of this increase, above murder and assault, is forcible rape. Last year, there were 51,000 rapes reported in the United States, a dramatic 60 percent increase from 5 years ago. And rape is the least reported crime. No other group of victims are so often disbelieved as women who have been raped. During the 1960's, the incidence of reported rape rose over 65 percent, while in this period the number of convictions for rape rose only 36 percent. Indeed only 13.3 percent of those men tried for rape were convicted in 1972, the lowest conviction rate for any violent crime. One reason convictions for rape are so low is the stringent corraborative evidence requirements. In the courtroom, the victim often must publicly testify as to her past sexual relationships. The offender does not have to testify at all since he cannot be forced to incriminate himself. Moreover, his past behavior and even prior rape convictions are not admissible as evidence.

FBI criminologists estimate that only 1 out of 10 rapes is even reported. Rape is a subject rarely spoken about in public until very recently; because of public ignorance and attitudes it is extremely humiliating for a victim to come forth and report the rape. Silence, however, only perpetuates the shame, guilt, and neglect that already accompany rape. As one woman told a psychologist long after her rape:

I told people about the robbery and the stabbing, but I didn't tell anyone about the rape. I felt dirty and ashamed.

This type of societal attitude is deplorable and must be changed. There needs to be public education on the subject of rape and treatment for its victims and the offenders. There is a need for strong legislation in this area as well.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 14223, cosponsored by Representative YVONNE BRAITHWAITE BURKE, which would establish a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape within the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. It would provide financial assistance for research and demonstration programs into the causes, consequences, prevention, treatment, and control of rape. It is necessary to study and evaluate existing laws dealing with rape, the causes and social conditions that encourage rape, and the traditional social attitudes toward rape victims so that rape can be prevented, rapists convicted, and counseling centers for rape victims can effectively help these women.

This legislation is concerned with funding projects that would offer treatment to rape victims and offenders as well as funding public education programs and self-defense courses. It would be the duty of the National Center to compile, analyze, and publish a study to be submitted to Congress annually. The study would make recommendations based on the research and demonstration projects the Center conducted. In addition, the Center would compile and publish training materials for programs and personnel engaged in preventing rape and treating rape victims. The Center would also function as an information clearinghouse with regard to the prevention and control of rape, the treatment and counseling of the victims and their families, and the rehabilitation of offenders.

The Women's Crisis Center in Ann Arbor, Mich., was the first agency in this country established specifically to counsel rape victims. It is a nonprofit, peer counseling service, organized and controlled by women in the community. They organized several years ago in response to the spiraling increases in rape and the needs of its victims. They have written and designed a 16-page pamphlet called Freedom from Rape, which deals with the varied aspects of rape—the myths that surround it, how to prevent an attack, what to expect from the police and medical personnel, and the criminal and civil trial. One article in particular deals with many of the myths and misconceptions many of us believe about rape and the women who have been raped. This article is fully researched and supported by various studies done in the United States—most notably, the Philadelphia study Dr. Menachem Amir published in 1971.

More and more women are beginning to speak out about this horrifyingly brutal experience and share their insights with other women and men. It is time all Americans had a better understanding of the true realities of rape. I believe this article goes a long way to clarifying the real issues. I would like to commend to my colleagues the following excerpt from "Freedom From Rape":

MYTHS ABOUT RAPE

An extensive study of the general problem of rape was published in 1971 by Menachem Amir. The results were rather startling for it showed that many of our beliefs about rapists were only myths. These myths are numerous, varied, and often contradictory.

1. Perhaps the most common myth is the widely held belief that a rapist is a sexually-unfulfilled man carried away by a sudden uncontrollable surge of desire. The actual facts: Dr. Amir's study showed that 90 percent of group rapes were planned in advance and that 58 percent of the rapes committed by a single man were planned. Generally rape is NOT a crime of impulse. As to the myth that rapists are sexually-unfulfilled, Dr. William Prendergast of the New Jersey State Prison states that *all* of the rapists that he has studied had available sexual relationships. Sixty percent of the men in Dr. Amir's study were, in fact, married and led normal sexual lives at home.

2. A second myth is that all rapists are pathologically sick and perverted men. Evidence does not support this view of the rapist. According to Dr. Amir, men convicted of rape were found to have normal sexual personalities, differing from the norm only in their greater tendency to express violence and rage. Sex, therefore, is not the motivating factor in rape—it is merely the chosen mode of expression. Alan Taylor, a parole officer who has worked with rapists in the prison facilities at San Luis Obispo, California, said

about the men, "Those men were the most normal men there."

3. Another popular myth is that most rapes occur in dark back alleys or to women who hitchhike. Some people feel the solution to rape is for women to spend their lives staying at home. But Dr. Amir's study clearly shows the fallacy in this type of thinking. Over *one third* of rapes are committed by a man who forces his way into the victim's home! And over half of all rapes committed occur in a residence.

4. Most people believe that the typical rapist is a stranger to the victim. This just isn't so. Women can't even trust the men they are acquainted with. A full 48 percent of the rapists that Dr. Amir studied were known by the victim. Some were merely casual friends, others were close relatives.

5. The age-old myth that black men rape white women at every opportunity is still perpetuated even though Dr. Amir reports that in 93.2 percent of rape cases both the man and the woman are of the *same* race. In fact, white men attack black women more often than black men attack white women. (3.6 percent compared to 3.3 percent respectively).

6. Many people are inclined to believe that a raped woman was at fault somehow—that she probably provoked the attack. This provocation, considered a mitigating factor in a courtroom, may consist of only a gesture or a way of dressing. Even using this extreme scale, the Federal Commission on Crimes of Violence reports that only 4 percent of reported rapes involved any precipitative behavior on the part of the women. In some cases precipitative behavior is nothing more than walking and dressing in a way that is socially defined as attractive. Our society lauds women who are sexy—but those unlucky enough to be raped are dismissed as tramps.

7. Some persons really believe that rape is impossible without consent, that a normal man cannot rape a normal woman unless he has assistance. Unfortunately, it is simply not true that a woman who does not want to be raped can always prevent it. She may be knocked unconscious, or may submit because she fears for her life if she struggles. Most men are physically stronger than most women, and the attacker usually has the advantage of surprise. There have been instances where experienced policewomen, trained in self-defense and emergency situations, have been raped, despite all their efforts at resistance. There are many men, especially in American prisons, who are attacked and sexually assaulted by their fellow men—despite their superior strength.

8. Another myth, upheld even by the law, is that a woman cannot be raped by her husband. This legal fallacy is a direct result of the age-old concept of a woman as the property of her husband. Any act of sexual intercourse to which the woman does not consent is rape.

9. The common male belief that women, in fact, enjoy rape when it occurs would be hilarious if it wasn't such a tragic and destructive myth. The very idea that a woman could enjoy being attacked by a man she is not attracted to, that she could enjoy being exposed to injury or death, that she could enjoy being treated in a humiliating and brutal fashion is preposterous.

ITALIAN-SPEAKING CHILDREN DESERVE MORE THAN "SINK OR SWIM" SCHOOLS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, much progress has been made in recent years to recognize and meet the special needs of groups that have suffered injustices in the past for ethnic and other reasons. I have wholeheartedly supported the efforts of policymakers to rectify social and educational inequality of opportunity. I am, however, opposed to programs that disregard and penalize some Americans, including Italian-Americans.

An often overlooked reality is that Italian-Americans encounter illegal discrimination, particularly in the realm of education. They face special difficulties with administrators of professional schools, particularly in medical schools. They are also woefully under-represented on university faculties. Most disconcerting of all is the plight of children of Italian immigrants. Italian-speaking, they are all too often thrown into the English-speaking classrooms on a sink-or-swim basis.

This callous neglect by the Federal Government of the bilingual needs of these children is shocking. Approximately 25,000 Italian immigrants enter this country each year. Recent surveys conducted by the Office of Educational Program Research and Statistics reflect a steady increase in school enrollment of Italian dominant children. They are the third largest group encountering difficulties with English. They are also the most disregarded in the field of education.

The reason is clear. These people are being locked out because they are not the proper ethnic group—not because they lack the talent, or the preparation, or because their numbers are so few. Throughout our history Italian-Americans have constituted a very important minority group.

Almost 6,000 language-deficient Italian-American children do not get bilingual training in the city schools, according to the New York City Board of Education. That means 6,000 young men and women who will be marked for life by a lack of education. Failure to provide a child with instruction in the only language he knows, Italian, blocks the child's opportunity to become all that he is capable of becoming. Academic failure, reflected in lower reading scores, is quite common in such instances. So are the barriers he will face in trying to find a job.

I call upon the Federal Government to remedy its callous neglect of the bilingual needs of these new Americans. It is a demoralizing experience for them to be thrust into a totally alien environment. It is also a denial of their right to educational opportunities and a violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

With the more than $35 million provided in the past under the Bilingual Educational Act, no Federal funds were spent on Italian programs. I hope the same will not be true of the $60 million earmarked for bilingual education for 1974–75. Thus far, five New York City school districts have submitted ESEA proposals to HEW for Federal funds that include Italian programs. They are districts 11, 20, 21, 30, and 32. I hope additional plans are submitted, and I strongly urge that all of these proposals be given the Federal funds they require.

My support for these proposals has been made known to the Secretary of HEW, and I trust the proposals will be given immediate consideration.

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FUND AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Representative PIERRE S. DUPONT, and I will jointly offer two amendments to the foreign aid legislation that will come before the Foreign Affairs Committee—on which both of us sit—this week in markup sessions. Our amendments concern the $100 million special requirements funds—the SRF—requested by the administration as a component of its Middle Eastern assistance package for this year.

PRESIDENTIAL REQUEST

When the President asked the Congress to authorize and appropriate $100 million for the SRF, he wrote:

> This fund will be used for new needs that may arise as the outlines of a peaceful settlement take shape, including provisions for peace-keeping forces, refugee aid or settlement, and development projects.

Daniel Parker, Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development—U.S. AID—enlarged on this theme when he testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee:

> [W]e are requesting $100 million for a Special Requirements Fund to permit us to respond effectively in support of our foreign policy to the rapidly changing political situation in [the Middle East].

The relevant section of "The Draft Legislation Requested by the Executive" is, in my view, overbroad. It reads:

> Sec. 904. (a) Special Requirements Fund.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed $100,000,000 to meet special requirements arising from time to time in carrying out the purposes of this part, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes. The funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available for use by the President for assistance authorized by this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to the furnishing of such assistance. Such funds are authorized to remain available until expended.
>
> (b) The President shall keep the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives currently informed on the programming and obligation of funds under subsection (a).

My colleagues should note two things in particular about this proposed language. In the first place, under this draft legislation, the President is not restricted to the form of assistance to be provided. The President is permitted to offer—at his discretion—economic development assistance, security supporting assistance, or even military assistance. It seems to me that the type of assistance to be provided is critically important to the Congress and should not be left en-

tirely to the Executive. In addition, the Congress is being asked to authorize and appropriate a program about which it knows little or nothing. The amendment which my colleague from Delaware and I will be offering addresses itself to these concerns.

The principle of the SRF is founded on two realities, which I appreciate and, in principle, I support.

NEED FOR SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FUND

The first reality is that a solution to the Middle Eastern conflict is of critical importance to the United States. The 1973 war in the region illustrates my point in two respects. Over a 25-year period, a regional subsystem developed in which various countries became the client-states of the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union. At certain points in the recent past, the two superpowers were able to use their influence to contain the regional conflict; but three times, since 1956, the superpowers were either unwilling or unable to reduce the increasing tensions, and war was the result. This situation became all the more ominous with the 1973 war, when both countries felt so committed to their respective allies that the superpowers were almost drawn into a fateful, head-to-head conflict. While I am skeptical that the military alert of October 24, 1973 was justified or necessary, I do believe that the potential for a serious confrontation, demonstrated by the October crisis, was sufficiently grave to point out the absolute importance of a general Middle East settlement.

Also, the petroleum embargo imposed by the Arab producers should serve to warn the United States, as well as other industrial nations, that raw material producers are not defenseless international actors. The Arab contingent of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—OPEC—has based its energy policies on matters related to the political questions of a Middle East settlement. While for some oil-producing states economics were the principle motivations for price increases and reductions in supply, other states—such as Saudi Arabia—were primarily motivated by the political goal of securing a favorable Mideast settlement. The Arabs sought a favorable settlement to the conflict, and had the means—through the embargo—to force U.S. action. The oil embargo, the military alert, and the quarter century of warfare in the region convince me of the necessity that the United States take the initiative in working with interested nations in securing a general settlement.

The second reality upon which I support the SRF is the principle that countries intent on internal development are comparatively less likely to engage themselves in unproductive external conflicts. Evidence for this proposition may be found in the Egyptian example. President Sadat has indicated in recent months his desire to attend to the pressing internal needs of his country. His cooperation in the Israel-Egyptian disengagement was made possible, in part at least, by the U.S. intentions to provide assistance in the reconstruction of the Suez Canal and Canal Zone areas and in the importation of certain commodities in Egyptian economic development. It is my belief that this same proposition holds for the other countries in the region—Syria, Jordan, and Israel. These countries must be confident of their security, and it is for this reason that U.S. mediation will be important. But just as significant will be the assistance that this country may provide to turn these nation's attentions from war to more constructive purposes.

Thus, I believe that carefully formulated development assistance programs to countries in the Middle East will lubricate the negotiating process that has begun, and may improve the chance for a lasting settlement. This conclusion causes me to support a foreign assistance package for the Middle East.

AID TO SYRIA

The administration's request for the special requirements fund and the testimony in support of that request, is ambiguous on one major point: The recipient of SRF moneys. The President has not said one word on this issue. There has been, however, considerable speculation in the press. An April 28, 1974, dispatch by the Philadelphia Inquirer suggests that the:

> $100 million contingency fund could be tapped for economic aid to Syria if it is cooperative in upcoming peace negotiations.

At first, Dr. Kissinger was equivocal about the possibility that Syria was the designated recipient of the SRF; but he would not rule it out in any event. In a late April article, appearing in the Washington Star-News, Jeremiah O'Leary reported on a press briefing given by a State Department spokesman, John King. Mr. O'Leary wrote:

> Diplomatic observers saw considerable influence in King's statement that he would "not exclude Syria from the aid package." Before yesterday, the State Department had said only that it would be premature to discuss any post-settlement aid program involving the Syrians.

Finally, Dr. Kissinger suggested more concrete plans for the SRF when he appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee. As a correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor reported:

> Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger is urging Congress to support the momentum of peace in the Middle East with new foreign-aid programs.
>
> Specifically, he links a $100 million request in the foreign-assistance bill now before the House to use in Syria, including reconstruction of the town of Kuneitra on the Golan Heights.

I do not suggest that administration witnesses were guilty of duplicity when they could not—or would not—explain their plans for programing and obligating SRF moneys. The Middle East situation is still in a state of flux, and I am sensitive to the difficulties the administration must experience as it attempts to negotiate simultaneously with foreign nations and with the Congress.

Yet, it remains a fact that the Congress is being asked to authorize and appropriate $100 million for a program without knowing any of the specifics of the proposal.

I believe that the United States should provide assistance to Syria if there is reason to believe that such assistance would facilitate diplomatic efforts in the area. Just as the involvement of Egypt was critical to the initiation of peace talks, Syria will be critical to the successful conclusion of such talks. As such I support the principle of the special requirement fund.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL NEEDED

Still, this ill-defined program—indicated by the broad authority contained in the SRF section—should be more carefully drawn. Specifically, an amendment to the foreign aid bill should assert congressional authority over the particulars of any assistance programs to be provided under the SRF.

I believe that the amendments to be offered, jointly, by Representative DUPONT and myself, serve that purpose.

Our first amendment restricts the use of SRF moneys to economic development assistance. By design, under our proposal, the administration would be prohibited from providing security supporting assistance or military assistance. If the United States is intent on promoting peace in the Middle East, it would be wholly inconsistent for us to provide assistance which would increase the military capabilities of any of the countries, as either of these other forms of assistance would do. The rationale for U.S. assistance is to contribute to the willingness of those countries to concentrate their effects on internal development. Only economic development assistance is justifiable.

The second amendment requires a complete report of the President as to the particulars of any assistance grant to be made under the SRF. The President would be required to report the intended recipient, the amount of money to be received by that recipient, and the purpose for each assistance to be funded by the SRF.

The second amendment also contains the provision that would prohibit the President from obligating or expending moneys from the fund unless the Congress has passed, within 45 legislative days after the report, a concurrent resolution approving the proposed SRF assistances in all its particulars—as to recipient, amount, and purpose. It is a primary responsibility of the Congress to authorize and appropriate moneys for foreign and military assistance programs. In its present form, the administration SRF request calls for an inordinate delegation of congressional authority. Our amendment does not assault the principle of Presidential execution of foreign policy; it only asserts congressional prerogatives in the formulation of policy, and the expenditure of funds.

One hundred million dollars is a great deal of money. The Middle East is still a volatile region. It would be the height of irresponsibility for the Congress to issue a carte blanche to the administration when so many delicate issues are at stake.

By authorizing the special requirements fund, with the controls that our amendments would impose, the Congress would indicate its support for the

principle of a special requirements fund, while reserving ultimate congressional approval until such time as the specifics are fully fleshed.

The special requirements fund may, in the end, prove to be of great value; but the risk to all concerned is too great to approve the establishment of the Fund without adequate congressional authority.

Copies of our amendments follow:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. —
(Offered by Mr. Harrington)

Page 3, line 11, after "$100,000,000" insert the following: "to furnish assistance under chapter 2 of part I of this Act (development assistance)".

Page 3, line 16, strike out "this Act" and insert "such chapter 2" in lieu thereof.

Page 3, strike out lines 20 through 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The President may only obligate or expend, for each foreign country, funds authorized under this section after—

"(1) he reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee of Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate concerning (A) the name of such foreign country, (B) the amount of such funds to be made available to such country, and (C) the purpose for which such funds are to be made available to such country; and

"(2) the Congress, within 45 legislative days after receiving any report under paragraph (1), passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the provisions of the report provided by clauses (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1)."

H.R. 11500

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

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased that the House has succeeded in passing strict controls over strip mining operations. I joined in the fight for H.R. 11500 amid strong industry opposition because our environment and our citizens have not received enough protection from large coal interests.

Although Illinois ranks third among the States in the production of strip mined coal, there are no active strip mines in my district at the present time. Areas in my district have previously been stripped, but in recent years, strip mining has ceased.

Yet, coal reserves are still abundant, and citizens of the village of Catlin in the northern part of my district are again threatened by the quest for coal. Citizens of the Catlin area have organized into the Association for the Preservation of Catlin Township and are struggling to prevent the devastation of valuable farmland. A large coal corporation has bought several thousand acres of very productive farmland in Catlin Township with the intention of stripping the land to remove the underlying coal. The proposed strip mine would surround the village of Catlin on the north, east, and west. The coal corporation involved has stated that they have "a long tradition of responsiveness to public input," but in reality, they have proven otherwise.

In March of 1973, two representatives of the Association for the Preservation of Catlin Township testified before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. They told of their situation and testified of the need for strong legislation to preserve valuable land and to protect citizens from strip mine operators. Many of their suggestions have been incorporated into the language of H.R. 11500.

Now, H.R. 11500 has passed the House and will hopefully soon become law and give these struggling citizens some relief.

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE EXPORT CONTROLS ON CRIME EQUIPMENT

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Thursday, August 1, 1974, I intend to offer the following amendment to H.R. 15264, the Export Administration Act. I am pleased to report that today the other body passed this amendment. The proposal is designed to license, monitor, and control the export of crime control devices to countries which might use such equipment to threaten fundamental human and civil liberties.

The amendment follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK TO H.R. 15264, AS REPORTED

On page 3, immediately after line 7, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) Section 4 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 U.S.C. App. 2403) is amended to include the following new subsection:

"(f)(1) The Secretary of Commerce, after consulting with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of State, shall establish regulations for the licensing of exports of all police, law enforcement, or security equipment manufactured for use in surveillance, eavesdropping, crowd control, interrogations, or penal retribution.

"(2) Any license proposed to be issued under this subsection shall be reviewed by the Attorney General and shall be submitted to the Congress. The Congress shall have a period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of both Houses after the date on which the license is transmitted to the Congress to disapprove the issuance of a license by the adoption in either House of a resolution disapproving the proposed license.

"(3) The Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of State, may by regulation exempt individual countries and specific categories of police, law enforcement, or security equipment from the congressional review and disapproval authority set forth in paragraph (2) if he finds and determines export of the equipment would not threaten fundamental human and civil liberties."

On page 3, line 8, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

VETERANS' PENSION LEGISLATION

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs opened public hearings on the subject of veterans' pension benefits. Both the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), chairman of the full committee, are to be commended for recognizing the need for action in this important area of veterans legislation.

The 200 bills that are the subject of these hearings attest to the great interest of Members of the House of Representatives in providing a measure of relief for older veterans living on fixed incomes and trying to exist despite continually rising costs of living.

I have given considerable thought to the subject of non-service-connected pensions. Two areas, in particular, are deserving of our prompt attention. First, we must insure that the older veteran who is now on the pension rolls receives an increase in his monthly payment that is commensurate with the increased cost of living. Second, we must make certain that increases in social security do not result in the termination of pension benefits for veterans of World War I and other wars.

To provide some relief in these areas of interest, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that will permit veterans who are receiving pensions under Public Law 86–211 and who have reached the age of 75 years to receive the so-called housebound pension allowance of $44 monthly payable in addition to their basic rate of pension. Veterans who are already in receipt of the greater allowances for aid and attendance would not be eligible for this payment.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the bill will increase the income limits of current law by $400, thus insuring that no veteran will have his pension terminated as the result of the 11-percent increase in social security payments received in 1974.

I am hopeful that the hearings that began this morning, Mr. Speaker, will result in favorable action on my bill or other legislation to provide more generous pension benefits for older veterans. For the information of Members, a copy of my bill follows:

H.R. 16180

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 415 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (b)(1) is amended—

(1) by deleting "$2600" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$3000".

(2) by deleting the period after "8 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", but in no event shall the monthly rate of pension be less than $4.".

(b) Subsection (c) of such section 415 is amended—

(1) by deleting "$2600" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$3000".

(2) by deleting the period after "5 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", but in no event shall the monthly rate of pension be less than $4.".

(c) Subsection (d) of such section 415 is amended—

(1) by deleting "$3800" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$4200".

(2) by deleting the period after "3 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", but in no event shall the monthly rate of pension be less than $6.".

SEC. 2. Section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (b) is amended—

(1) by deleting "$2600" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$3000".

(2) by deleting the period after "8 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", but in no event shall the monthly rate of pension be less than $10.".

(b) Subsection (c) of such section 521 is amended by deleting "$3800" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$4200".

(c) Subsection (e) of such section 521 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The monthly rate payable to any veteran under subsection (b) or (c) shall be increased by $44 if the veteran—

"(1) has a disability rated as permanent and total and—

"(A) has an additional disability or disabilities independently ratable at 60 per centum or more, or

"(B) by reason of his disability or disabilities, is permanently housebound but does not qualify for the aid and attendance rate under subsection (d); or

"(2) has attained age 75 and does not qualify for the aid and attendance rate under subsection (d)."

SEC. 3. Section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (b) is amended by deleting "$2,600" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,000".

(b) Subsection (c) is amended by deleting "$3,800" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,200".

SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on January 1, 1975, except that the amendments made by section 2(c) shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following enactment.

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. HEINZ), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. TALCOTT, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. COHEN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. HOGAN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CLEVELAND, for 15 minutes, today.

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

Mr. CORMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PODELL, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SHIPLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. LANDGREBE, to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $973.

Mr. KEMP to extend his remarks following the remarks of Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. FLYNT, his remarks immediately following those of Mr. WAGGONNER today on consideration of the conference report on H.R. 69.

Ms. ABZUG to extend her remarks following Mr. LONG of Maryland during the offering of the Long amendment.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN.
Mr. TREEN.
Mr. KEMP in three instances.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. HANRAHAN.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. SYMMS in two instances.
Mr. RHODES.
Mr. VEYSEY.
Mr. DENNIS.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. MIZELL in five instances.
Mr. HUBER.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. PRITCHARD.
Mr. SARASIN.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri.
Mr. HEINZ.
Mr. BAUMAN in five instances.

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

Mrs. BOGGS in two instances.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. FRASER in five instances.
Ms. ABZUG in 10 instances.
Mr. BOWEN.
Mr. SARBANES in five instances.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California in 10 instances.
Mrs. MINK in two instances.
Mr. KOCH in five instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. HUNGATE.
Mr. LEHMAN in three instances.
Mr. PEPPER in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in four instances.
Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.
Mr. STOKES
Mr. O'HARA.
Mrs. SULLIVAN.
Mr. ROGERS.
Mr. MAHON.
Mr. TIERNAN in three instances.
Mr. MILFORD.
Mr. PODELL.
Mr. ECKHARDT.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5094. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy United States marshal, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14592. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15472. An act making appropriations for Agriculture Environmental and Consumer Protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
Chairman.

Examined and found truly enrolled.
July 31, 1974.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On July 30, 1974:

H.R. 15461. An act to secure to the Congress additional time in which to consider the proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court transmitted to the Congress on April 22, 1974.

On July 31, 1974:

H.R. 5094. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy United States marshal, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14592. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 1, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

June 30, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Permanent staff:		
John F. O'Neal	General counsel	$18,000.00
Hyde H. Murray	Associate counsel	17,985.72
John V. Rainbolt	do	14,301.18
Fowler C. West	Staff director	15,715.50
Louis T. Easley	Press assistant	14,301.18
Steven S. Allen	Staff consultant	8,526.32
Marjorie B. Johnson	Staff assistant	9,427.36
Peggy L. Pecore	do	9,427.36
Betty M. Prezioso	do	9,427.36
Mary L. Ross (beginning Mar. 1, 1974).	Printing editor	6,000.00
Martha S. Hannah (through Jan. 30, 1974).	Staff assistant	1,571.21
George Misslbeck (through Feb. 28, 1974).	Printing editor	3,946.32
Investigative staff:		
Mildred P. Baxley	Staff assistant	9,427.26
Mary P. Shaw	do	7,677.16
Doris Lucile Farmarco	do	7,667.16
Julia W. Kogut	do	8,857.75
Glenda L. Temple	do	8,857.75
Nan Strolmenger Hunter (through March 31, 1974).	Staff Assistant	1,702.52
Lydia Vacing	Staff assistant	1,611.86
Anita Brown	do	6,973.37
Stephen J. Pringle	do	6,286.20
Emily Katherine Wulff	do	3,234.18
Linda J. Coomer (beginning Apr. 1, 1974).	do	2,124.99
Diane M. Keyser (beginning Apr. 1, 1974).	do	2,625.00
Janet Jaenke (beginning May 27, 1974).	do	528.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Additional funds authorized	150,000.00
Total	300,000.00
Amount of expendiutres previously reported	108,175.46
Amount expended from Dec. 31, 1973 to June 30, 1974	71,339.19
Total amount expended Jan. 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974	179,514.65
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	120,485.35

W.R. POAGE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Keith F. Mainland	Clerk and staff director	$18,000.00
Jay B. Howe	Reemployed annuitant	3,702.00
G. Homer Skarin	Staff assistant	18,000.00
Eugene B. Wilhelm	Reemployed annuitant	4,110.00
Samuel R. Preston	Staff assistant	18,000.00
Hunter L. Spillan	do	18,000.00
Henry A. Neil, Jr.	do	18,000.00
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	18,000.00
George E. Evans	do	18,000.00
Earl C. Silsby	do	18,000.00
Peter J. Murphy, Jr.	do	18,000.00
Edward E. Lombard	do	18,000.00
John M. Garrity	do	16,171.74
Robert B. Foster	do	15,721.74
Milton B. Meredith	do	16,897.14
Thomas J. Kingfield	do	14,218.62
Donald E. Richbourg	do	14,218.62
Robert C. Nicholas	Staff assistant	$13,953.42
George A. Urian	do	12,196.74
Dempsey B. Mizelle	do	13,727.22
Charles W. Snodgrass	do	13,017.06
John G. Plashal	do	9,638.58
Bryon S. Nielson	do	10,125.48
J. David Wilson	do	13,286.22
Americo S. Miconi	do	12,617.10
Derek J. Vanderschaaf	do	16,136.16
Robert L. Knisely	do	8,696.40
Richard N. Malow	do	13,543.26
Frederick F. Pfluger	do	17,313.12
John G. Osthaus	do	10,977.00
Paul E. Thomson	do	9,663.18
Charles G. Hardin	do	8,943.54
Edwin F. Powers	do	12,024.72
Gordon E. Casey	do	14,432.76
C. William Smith	Staff assistant (from Mar. 17).	7,366.67
Nicholas G. Cavarocchi	Staff assistant (from Mar. 16).	9,870.83
Karen J. Schubeck	Staff assistant	7,654.17
Lawrence C. Miller	Editor	15,741.60
Paul V. Farmer	Assistant editor	11,229.96
Gerard J. Chouinard	Administrative assistant.	9,963.18
Austin G. Smith	Clerical assistant	9,062.40
Dale M. Shulaw	do	7,895.82
Gemma M. Weiblinger	Administrative assistant to Labor-HEW subcommittee.	5,895.66
Virginia M. Keyser	Clerical assistant	6,644.10
Jane A. Meredith	do	5,567.16
Betty A. Swanson	Clerical assistant (to Mar. 8).	2,795.18
Eva K. Harris	Clerical assistant	5,010.92
Marcia L. Matts	do	6,283.14
Sandra A. Gilbert	do	7,333.92
Patricia A. Kemp	Clerical assistant (from Feb. 11).	4,977.79
Christine Stockman	Clerical assistant (from Apr. 8).	2,536.12
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	6,823.20
Francis M. Hugo	Minority clerk	15,750.00
B. Enid Morrison	Staff assistant to minority.	13,375.02
Mary H. Smallwood	Clerical assistant (majority).	8,134.98
Samuel A. Mabry	do	8,134.98
Catherine M. Voytko	do	7,807.50
T. Robert Garretson	do	7,807.50
Naomi A. Rich	do	8,066.08
Laura E. Lineberry	do	7,391.58
Susan L. Shaw	do	7,807.50
George F. Allen	do	8,134.98
Robert M. Walker	Clerical assistant (majority) (to May 31).	5,238.50
Michael J. O'Neil	Clerical assistant (majority).	11,524.68
Freda J. Sheppard	do	8,749.98
Diane Rihely	Clerical assistant (majority) (from Mar. 15).	2,986.10
David K. Kehl	Clerical assistant (minority).	8,833.32
Patience S. Vaccaro	do	8,500.02
Anna L. Lamendola	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Mar. 31).	3,457.35
Lawrence E. Siegel	Clerical assistant (minority).	10,859.24
Charles M. Seeger	do	11,524.68
Stephen T. Adams	do	11,500.02
Karen S. Vagley	do	10,500.00
Beverly B. Thierwechter	do	7,000.00
Mary Ann Bond	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Jan. 31).	1,055.61
Warren S. Chase	Clerical assistant (minority) to Feb. 21).	2,968.49
Dorothea Dickinson	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Mar. 1).	6,984.68
Gordon A. Achilles	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Feb. 3).	8,222.24
Robert F. Dugan	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Feb. 1).	9,375.00
David Clement	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Mar. 27).	4,700.00
Grace E. Warren	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Apr. 1).	4,500.00
Jimmy R. Fairchild	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Apr. 1).	5,028.96
Gladys Meir	Clerical assistant (minority) (from May 1).	1,666.66

Amount of expenditures previously reported	752,896.77
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	845,660.29
Total amount expended from July 1, 1973, to June 30, 1974	1,598,557.06

GEORGE MAHON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Cornelius R. Anderson	Chief, surveys and investigations staff.	$18,000.00
Leroy R. Kirkpatrick	Director, surveys and investigations staff (to Apr. 30).	12,000.00
David A. Schmidt	1st assistant director, surveys and investigations staff (to Apr. 30) (director from May 1).	17,873.92
Dennis F. Creedon, Jr.	2d assistant director, surveys and investigations staff (to Apr. 30) (1st assistant director from May 1).	17,384.84
Marion S. Ramey	2d assistant director, surveys and investigations staff (from May 1).	5,780.00
Genevieve A. Mealy	Administrative assistant.	6,328.00
Frances May	Secretary	7,680.00
Sharon K. Tinsley	Secretary (to Feb. 10)	1,100.00
Ann M. Stull	Secretary (from Feb. 1)	3,708.35
Agriculture, Department of—		
R. W. Brannon	Investigator	19,275.80
John S. Robison	do	4,740.88
Air Force Audit Agency:		
Donald J. Gibb	do	13,334.50
Army Audit Agency:		
Stephen E. Keefer	do	3,741.78
Commerce, Department of:		
Edward Lombard	do	5,834.88
William E. Hickey	do	4,994.57
Defense Contract Audit Agency: Maurice A. Herron	do	7,640.33
Federal Aviation Administration:		
Ronald N. Bell	do	10,719.79
General Services Administration: Kevin F. Flanagan	do	7,797.83
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Francis Stepka	do	17,406.16
Contract employees:		
Leonard M. Walters	do	10,000.00
Andrew J. Shannon	do	12,500.00
Mary Alice Sauer	Administrative assistant.	3,800.00
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Stuart W. Angevine	Investigator	14,313.84
William M. Baker	do	11,919.60
Carl L. Bennett	do	14,994.96
Willis Bennett, Jr.	do	14,313.84
Lane M. Bonner, Jr.	do	6,921.60
Andrew P. Bosko	do	13,292.16
Ronald B. Carpenter	do	14,313.84
Gerard C. Carroll	do	14,313.84
W. Dana Carson	do	14,994.96
Bernard E. Currigan	do	10,918.56
John F. Connaughton	do	12,170.40
W. Lee Colwell	do	4,379.20
Robert M. Franklin	do	14,313.84
Paul K. Funkhouser	do	4,313.76
John G. Goedtel	do	14,654.40
James H. Geer	do	7,223.04
Eugene C. Gies	do	14,144.88
William P. Haynes	do	12,941.28
Russell N. Kamin	do	10,708.00
Edwin J. Kelly	do	13,632.72
Martin F. Maher	do	1,743.60
Joseph Malyniak, Jr.	do	13,973.28
James P. Mansfield	do	14,313.84
Richard F. McElliece	do	14,654.40
Joseph E. Michalski	do	14,654.40
Earle J. Morris	do	13,973.28
John J. Radican	do	13,973.28
Marion S. Ramey	do	11,076.80
Thomas C. Renaghan	do	11,919.60
Edward V. Schaum	do	14,313.84
Charles E. Szoka	do	14,313.84
Raymond E. Talley	do	13,292.16
John A. Van Wagenen	do	9,670.32
William H. Welch, Jr.	do	14,994.96
H. Branch Wood	do	14,994.96
Ann K. Stull	Clerk-typist	712.08
Marie L. Strittmatter	do	3,931.76

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Federal Bureau of Investigation—Continued		
Pamela Munro	Clerk-typist	$309.60
Rebecca F. Singleton	do	3,467.52
Health Benefits (FBI)		5,072.69
Life Insurance (FBI)		1,534.86
Retirement (FBI)		26,769.60
FICA (FBI)		262.59
Travel expenses		296,325.74
Miscellaneous expenses		10,333.78
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		$1,624,865.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		764,610.52
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974		827,626.10
Total amount expended from July 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974		1,592,236.62
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974		32,628.38

GEORGE MAHON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

July 3, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frank M. Slatinshek	Chief counsel	$6,300.00
William H. Cook	Counsel	17,950.00
John J. Ford	Professional staff member.	17,950.00
Ralph Marshall	do	16,851.00
George Norris	Counsel	16,182.78
James F. Shumate	do	16,182.78
William H. Hogan, Jr	do	13,364.58
Anthony R. Battista	Professional staff member (from Jan. 21).	13,333.33
A. A. Tinajero	Professional staff member.	13,000.00
G. Kim Wincup	Counsel (from Jan. 28).	7,650.00
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	14,526.72
Michael A. West	Executive secretary (from June 11).	833.33
H. Hollister Cantus	Professional staff member (through Jan. 13).	852.20
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	10,604.52
L. Louise Ellis	do	10,604.52
Edna E. Johnson	do	10,604.52
Innis E. McDonald	do	7,960.62
Ann R. Willett	do	6,624.18
Emma M. Brown	do	6,624.18
Nancy S. Jones	do	6,146.08
Mary Ann McKibben	do	5,542.10
Rita D. Argenta	do	5,749.98
Jane E. Keating	Secretary (from June 11).	666.67
Diane W. Bowman	Secretary (through June 10).	4,906.83
William B. Short	Clerical staff assistant	8,716.02
James A. Deakins	do	8,018.76
Issiah Hardy	do	6,000.00
Staff, Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee (pursuant to H. Res. 185, 93d Cong.):		
John F. Lally	Assistant counsel	16,851.00
Rose C. Beck	Secretary	7,960.62
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	6,972.84
Joyce C. Bova	Secretary	6,050.46
Jane E. Keating	Secretary (from June 1 through June 10).	333.33
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 264 and H. Res. 790		$375,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		147,293.56
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30		45,629.94
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30		45,629.94
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1974		182,976.50

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Paul Nelson	Clerk and staff director	$18,000.00
Orman S. Fink	Staff director, minority	18,000.00
Curtis A. Prins	Chief investigator	18,000.00
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member.	18,000.00
Benet D. Gellman	Counsel	18,000.00
Joseph C. Lewis	Professional staff member.	18,000.00
Graham T. Northup	do	18,000.00
Mary W. Layton	Secretary to minority	12,498.36
Donald G. Vaughn	Administrative assistant.	10,805.34
Total		149,303.70
Investigative staff:		
Richard C. Barnes	Professional staff member.	11,621.40
Annette M. Bouchard	Secretary	1,949.88
James P. Caldwell	Professional staff member.	14,143.95
L. Marie Chaillet	Minority secretary	8,381.58
Davis O'Connell Couch.	Counsel	12,081.30
Ben W. Crain	Staff economist	933.33
Jane N. D'Arista	Professional staff member.	9,363.82
Dolores K. Dougherty.	Research associate	9,271.36
Michael P. Flaherty	Assistant counsel	11,015.52
Helen Hitz	Administrative assistant.	11,896.86
Lorraine G. Inman	Secretary	6,506.25
Joseph J. Jasinski.	Professional staff member.	17,022.00
Richard M. Kay	Assistant clerk	4,190.82
Mary E. Kirk	do	7,149.60
Joann Kniphfer	Secretary	6,024.48
Ellen Marie Larkin	Research assistant	5,071.56
Robert Edward Loftus.	Professional staff member.	12,048.54
Linda Lea Lord	Secretary	729.17
Mary-Helen McGrath.	do	6,107.10
Kelsay Ray Meek	Professional staff member.	16,659.78
Mildred S. Mitchell	Assistant clerk	10,715.28
Miriam Wolman Rokow.	Clerk	5,666.68
Michael A. Rattigan	Research assistant	373.33
Margaret L. Rayhawk	Research associate	10,488.84
Kathy Lee Rohrig	Secretary	4,693.35
Yan Michael Ross	Minority counsel	16,239.36
James Charles Sivon	Research assistant	490.00
Merrill Stevenson	Assistant clerk	8,812.44
Jeanne Carolyn Smith	Secretary	6,507.86
Richard L. Still	Professional staff member.	17,025.12
Catherine M. Taber	Secretary	5,762.34
Thomas Wallin	Research assistant, minority.	266.67
Robert E. Weintraub	Staff economist	18,000.00
David Irving Weil	Economic research assistant.	850.00
Stephen M. Welch	Research assistant	5,238.48
Total		283,298.15
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 306 and 800		$1,342,800.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		542,055.66
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974		347,488.31
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974		889,543.97
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974		453,256.03

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Housing Subcommittee:		
Brent B. Barriere	Assistant clerk	$1,213.89
Marilyn A. Donahue	Minority secretary	6,286.20
David Glick	Counsel	18,000.00
George Gross	do	18,000.00
Emily Hightower	Executive secretary	9,817.56
Mercer L. Jackson	Minority staff member	17,287.08
Raymond K. James	Counsel	17,810.88
Bonnie V. Lockett	Secretary	3,290.27
Benjamin B. McKeever.	Counsel	17,810.88
Gerald R. McMurray	Staff director	18,000.00
Wanda Jean Raupach	Secretary	8,450.42
Dorothy J. Rayburn	Assistant clerk	1,250.00
Phillip L. Schulman	do	2,628.90
Catherine M. Smith	Minority secretary	6,286.20
Mary Elizabeth Sullivan.	Assistant clerk	5,238.48
Regina Anne Sullivan	do	420.00
Anthony Valanzano	Minority counsel	17,287.08
Doris M. Young	Assistant clerk	11,005.98
Total		180,083.82
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 306, 93d Cong. and H. Res. 800, 93d Cong. 2d)		$795,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		362,074.67
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974		188,061.57
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974		550,136.24
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974		245,363.76

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
Standing committee:		
Robert B. Washington, Jr.	Chl (P)	$18,000.00
Dorothy E. Quarker	Senior consultant (P)	18,000.00
John E. Hogan	Minority counsel (P)	18,000.00
James T. Clark	Legislative counsel (P)	16,929.88
Ruby G. Martin	Associate counsel (P)	14,230.84
Dale MacIver	Staff assistant (C)	13,996.88
Daniel M. Freeman	do	12,215.22
Jacqueline E. Wells	do	11,691.36
Linda L. Smith	do	10,736.50
Maria L. Otero	Office administrator (C).	9,863.52
Alvin D. Loving, Sr	Staff assistant (C), transferred to investigative committee Mar. 15, 1974.	3,125.00
Ralph Ulmer	Professional staff member, minority (P), transferred to investigative committee Mar. 15, 1974.	3,167.50

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leonard Hilder	Research assistant, minority (P), effective Mar. 16, 1974.	$7,318.64
Joseph D. Krischten	Subcommittee consultant (C), effective Mar. 16, 1974; terminated May 31, 1974.	4,823.78
Jacquelyn E. Hams	Staff assistant (C), effective June 1, 1974; terminated June 30, 1974.	2,700.00
Total		164,799.12
Investigative committee:		
Wilbur G. Hughes	Investigator	8,024.44
Jean G. Stultz	Staff assistant	7,805.94
Yvonne R. Chappelle	Research assistant	7,500.00
La Vonne M. Manley	Staff assistant	7,468.36
Joan M. Middleton	do	7,333.92
Jane I. Parker	do	6,499.98
Lorraine W. McDaniels	do	6,401.44
Grace M. DeMaio	Clerk	5,867.98
Susan G. Walter	Clerk, terminated May 31, 1974.	4,854.77
Louise Winston	Clerk	5,067.82
Theodore Richardson	do	5,067.82
Dorothy M. Anderson	Clerk, terminated May 31, 1974.	4,413.42
Diana E. Jones	Clerk, terminated Feb. 15, 1974; effective Feb. 11, 1974.	1,244.15
Shirley L. Harris	Clerk, terminated Mar. 10, 1974.	698.47
Marguerite Gras	Clerk, effective Mar. 10, 1974.	3,237.50
Alvin D. Loving, Sr.	Staff assistant, effective Mar. 16, 1974.	4,375.00
Minority staff:		
Wanda Worsham	Minority staff assistant	7,333.92
Leonard O. Hilder	Minority research assistant transferred to standing committee Mar. 15, 1974.	5,227.60
Ralph Ulmer	Minority professional staff member effective Mar. 16, 1974.	4,434.50
Subcommittee staff:		
Subcommittee on Business, Commerce, and Taxation:		
Rebecca D. Moore	Subcommittee consultant.	7,857.78
Margaret G. Hoffman	Subcommittee research assistant.	5,238.48
Subcommittee on Education:		
Joseph D. Clair	Subcommittee counsel	11,524.68
Michael I. Duberstein	Subcommittee research assistant.	1,571.58
Subcommittee on Government operations:		
Jacques Depuy	Subcommittee counsel	8,499.98
Davit Litt	Subcommittee research assistant, terminated Mar. 6, 1974.	550.00
Dorothy C. Bullitt	Subcommittee research assistant, effective Apr. 1, 1974; terminated Apr. 30, 1974.	1,133.33
Patrick R. Liddle	Subcommittee research assistant, effective May 1, 1974; terminated May 31, 1974.	500.00
Joy D'Amore	Subcommittee research assistant, effective June 17, 1974.	194.45
Subcommittee on Judiciary:		
Howard Lee	Subcommittee consultant.	7,058.76
Muriel Pugh	Subcommittee research assistant, terminated Feb. 10, 1974.	1,341.67
Michael Beard	Subcommittee research assistant, effective Feb. 11, 1974.	4,695.83
Subcommittee on Labor, Social Services, and the International Community:		
Joseph D. Kirschten	Subcommittee consultant, terminated Mar. 15, 1974 (transferred to standing).	4,823.78
Karen Fleischer	Subcommittee research assistant.	2,599.28
Subcommittee on Revenue and Financial Affairs:		
Stephen C. Swaim	Subcommittee consultant.	8,905.44
Margi H. Mosbaek	Subcommittee research assistant.	3,666.96
Total		173,018.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$298,058.51
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	179,237.05
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	118,821.46

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—STANDING COMMITTEE

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald M. Baker	Chief clerk and associate counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	$18,000.00
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	14,772.60
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Research director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
William F. Gaul	Associate general counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Hartwell D. Reed, Jr.	General counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Benjamin F. Reeves	Assistant to chairman and assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Austin P. Sullivan, Jr.	Legislative director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	15,529.14
Marian R. Wyman	Special assistant to chairman (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Minority staff:		
Robert C. Andringa	Minority staff director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Charles W. Radcliffe	Minority counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Dorothy L. Strunk	Minority legislative clerk (from Mar. 1 to June 30, 1974).	4,966.68
Louise W. Finke (deceased).	Assistant to minority staff director (from Jan. 1 to Feb. 27, 1974).	3,029.26

	Contingent fund
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	
Amount of expenditures previously reported	$398,995.38
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	200,297.68
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974	599,293.06
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	Contingent fund

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING STAFF

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carole J. Ansheles	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	$4,399.98
Patricia R. Bowley	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	8,400.00
William H. Cable	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	13,515.36
Gerard C. Cauley	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from May 23 to June 30, 1974).	633.33
Katherine Kennedy Clark	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	10,178.34
Elizabeth A. Cornett	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	10,175.70
Lelia T. Cornwell	do	9,215.12
A. Jefferson Dodds	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from May 20 to June 30, 1974).	683.33
Edward J. Dunphy	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer (from May 28 to June 30, 1974).	550.00
Eric M. Hall	Assistant Clerk (temporary) (from Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1974).	1,571.55
Douglas P. Katcher	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	4,020.93
Shirley R. Mills	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	9,215.12
Lewis D. Morris, Jr.	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1974).	500.00
Barbara E. Morrison	Secretary (from June 24 to June 30, 1974).	223.61
Michael Lee Moye	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 24 to June 30, 1974).	116.67
David E. Pinkard	Assistant clerk (temporary) (from Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1974).	1,500.00
David S. Putnam	Staff assistant (from Jan. to June 30, 1974).	5,644.50
Timothy T. Reese	Assistant (clerk from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	4,714.68
Petter Schott	do	4,602.06
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary (from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1974).	8,261.64
Maureen J. Smith	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from May 27 to June 30, 1974).	566.67
Thomas A. Stevenson	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from May 14 to June 30, 1974).	783.33
Jeanne E. Thomson	Legislative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	11,095.50
John Evertt Warren	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	6,286.20
Denise R. Wilson	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 24 to June 30, 1974).	116.67
Minority:		
Kim Allinger	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,033.32
Edith Carter Baum	Minority counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	16,583.32
Christopher T. Cross	Minority legislative associate (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Susan C. DeMarr	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,187.48
Vicki Fleming	Minority research assistant (from June 17 to June 30, 1974).	330.55
Martin L. LaVor	Minority legislative associate (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	15,891.06
John B. Lee	Minority research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	6,625.02
Maureen A. Moroch	Secretary (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1974).	3,125.01
Richard H. Mosse	Assistant minority counsel (from Apr. 14 to June 30, 1974).	5,988.88
Jo Anne Pierson	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,583.34
Silvia J. Rodriguez	do	6,181.44

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING STAFF—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Minority—Continued		
John Charles Sheerin	Minority counsel for labor (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	$18,000.00
Yvonne Franklin Smith.	Minority legislative associate (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	10,481.22
Dorothy L. Strunk	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to Feb. 28, 1974).	2,433.34
Patricia Ann Sullivan	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	6,139.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,241,259.81
Amount of expenditures previously reported	472,161.30
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	263,965.11
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973, to June 30, 1974	736,126.41
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	505,133.40

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 1

(Representative Carl D. Perkins, Chairman)

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Diane B. Adair	Staff assistant (from June 12 to June 30, 1974).	$395.83
Ruth Epperson	Staff assistant (from Mar. 23 to Apr. 5, 1974).	650.00
Eydie Gaskins	Special assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	9,583.50
John F. Jennings	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00
Tonie E. Painter	Staff assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	3,666.96
Ivan Swift	Legislative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	11,355.12
Joseph V. Vicidomino	Assistant clerk (from June 3 to June 30, 1974).	466.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$174,824.24
Amount of expenditures previously reported	77,123.19
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	47,198.80
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973, to June 30, 1974	124,321.99
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	50,502.25

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 2

(Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., Chairman)

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeunesse M. Beaumont	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	$9,358.14
Donald J. Kaniewski	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	3,354.72
Cheryl G. Matcho	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,238.48
Richard A. Millner	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to April 30, 1974).	513.32
Robert E. Moss	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	14,990.57
Daniel H. Pollitt	Special counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	4,000.02
Susan H. Pollitt	Assistant clerk (from June 10 to June 30, 1974).	227.50
Jan Lee Roller	Assistant clerk (June 1 to June 30, 1974).	541.67
Audrey Rugg	do	541.67
Richard Shaffer	Research assistant (from June 15 to June 30, 1974).	288.89
Bruce H. Stern	Research assistant (from Apr. 1 to May 31, 1974).	650.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$176,933.51
Amount of expenditures previously reported	79,380.55
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	41,831.82
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	121,212.37
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	55,721.14

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, No. 3

July 15, 1974.

(Representative John H. Dent, Chairman)

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Barbara A. Dinuson	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	$4,099.98
Julie Dominick	Research assistant (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1974).	3,750.00
Adrienne Fields	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	9,638.58
Cynthia L. Fox	Secretary (from June 17 to June 30, 1974).	313.25
Ernest J. Mannino	Research assistant (from June 1 to June 30, 1974).	750.00
Robert E. Vagley	Director (from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1974).	18,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$164,183.08
Amount of expenditures previously reported	66,407.73
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	39,670.05
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	106,077.78
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	58,105.30

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 4

Representative Dominick V. Daniels, Chairman

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph D. Alviani	Associate counsel (Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	$8,619.26
Alexandra J. Kisla	Research staff assistant (Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	6,810.06
Daniel H. Krivit	Counsel (Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	16,448.88
Denniese L. Medlin	Legislative assistant (Apr. 1 to June 30, 1974).	2,550.00
Laura S. Wyman	Research assistant (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1974).	2,278.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$167,282.82
Amount of expenditures previously reported	71,135.57
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	38,083.13
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	109,218.70
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	58,064.12

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 5

(Representative John Brademas, Chairman)

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jack G. Duncan	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	$16,227.00
Eleanor M. Finver	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	4,293.88
James J. Harvey	Deputy assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	8,926.66
Frederick V. Mulhauser	Research assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,625.00
Christine M. Orth	Staff assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,923.34
Gladys Marie Walker	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,701.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$174,948.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	76,441.74
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	52,012.06
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	128,453.80
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	46,494.20

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 6

(Representative James G. O'Hara, Chairman)

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
Rosanne Aceto	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to Mar. 15, 1974).	$1,858.88
Mary Elizabeth Clark	Assistant clerk (from June 9 to June 30, 1974).	366.67
Alfred Carl Franklin	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	11,676.48
James B. Harrison	Staff director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	15,476.82
Aims C. McGinness, Jr.	Research assistant (from Mar. 1 to Apr. 30, 1974).	1,400.00
Bernard Michael Murphy	Research associate (from June 3 to June 30, 1974).	566.22
Bonnie L. Stricklin	Assistant clerk (from May 6 to June 30, 1974).	1,100.00
Elnora H. Teets	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	6,939.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$174,819.60
Amount of expenditures previously reported	78,223.54
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	43,395.11
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973, to June 30, 1974	121,618.65
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	53,200.95

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, NO. 7

Representative Augustus F. Hawkins, Chairman

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Constance J. Falwell	Research assistant (from Feb. 1 to May 10, 1974).	$583.33
Susan Durkee Grayson	Special assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	8,775.00
Bertram M. Gross	Staff assistant (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1974).	1,000.00
Mary F. Higginbotham	Staff assistant (from Jan. 1 to Feb. 28, 1974).	2,737.50
William L. Higgs	Staff assistant (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,666.66
Lloyd (Al) Johnson	Staff director (from Mar. 1 to June 30, 1974).	10,000.00
Carole M. Schanzer	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	6,924.70
Mary L. Whitsett	Assistant clerk (from May 11 to June 30, 1974).	1,416.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$168,781.56
Amount of expenditures previously reported	74,854.03
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	41,177.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1974	$116,031.66
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	52,749.90

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL LABOR, NO. 8

July 15, 1974.

(Representative William D. Ford, Chairman)

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Virginia E. Anstead	Secretary (from Jan. 1 to Jan. 31, 1974).	$1,000.00
Nina J. Arnhols	Assistant clerk (from Mar. 18 to Mar. 31, 1974).	306.94
Roy P. Dyson	Research aid (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	4,625.49
Lanston E. Eldred	Research assistant (from June 17 to June 30, 1974).	373.33
Michael J. Ferrell	Special assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	6,000.00
Eugene I. Gessow	Research assistant (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1974).	1,850.00
Thomas R. Jolly	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	14,880.91
Daniel F. Joy	Research assistant (from Feb. 1 to Feb. 28, 1974).	1,400.00
Patricia R. Morse	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	7,633.93
Daniel H. Pollitt	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	2,500.02
Heidi Schmidt	Staff assistant (from June 10 to June 30, 1974).	420.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$176,967.38
Amount of expenditures previously reported	73,861.72
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	47,477.26
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	121,338.98
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	55,628.40

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS, NO. 9
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

(Representative John H. Dent, Chairman)

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vance J. Anderson	Counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	$14,453.32
Kathleen Berish	Stenographer (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	3,666.66
Suzanne Hays	Staff assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	5,500.02
S. Howard Kline	Assistant clerk (from May 22 to June 30, 1974).	422.50
Richard E. McCormick, Jr.	Staff assistant (from May 1 to June 30, 1974).	$800.00
Russell J. Mueller	Actuary and minority legislative associate (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	14,667.78
Robin Reid	Minority secretary (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974).	4,716.55
Frances M. Turk	Clerk (from Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1974).	3,405.03

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$220,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	107,638.16
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	49,140.53
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	156,778.69
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	63,221.31

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

July 11, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marian A. Czarnecki	Chief of staff	$18,000.00
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	18,000.00
Harry C. Cromer	Staff consultant (terminated June 15, 1974).	16,500.00
Everett E. Bierman	Staff consultant	16,452.78
John J. Brady, Jr.	do	15,607.80
John H. Sullivan	do	15,607.80
John Chapman Chester	do	15,107.76
Robert K. Boyer	do	13,096.26
Peter A. Abbruzzese	do	13,945.62
Lewis Gulick	do	14,643.96
Charles Paolillo	Staff consultant (effective June 1, 1974).	2,733.33
Sanford T. Rainwater	Legal consultant (terminated Jan. 31, 1974).	1,000.00
John P. Salzberg	Special consultant (effective Mar. 15, 1974).	5,888.90
Frederick M. Kaiser	Special consultant (effective June 1, 1974).	1,000.00
Ray Sparks	Editor	11,225.10
George R. Berdes	Subcommittee staff consultant.	14,526.72
Robert B. Boettcher	do	14,526.72
Goler T. Butcher	Subcommittee staff consultant (terminated April 8, 1974).	7,908.99
R. Michael Finley	Subcommittee staff consultant.	13,096.26
Clifford P. Hackett	do	14,562.72
Michael H. Van Dusen	do	13,811.49
Thomas R. Kennedy	do	14,026.08
George M. Ingram IV	do	11,000.88
Leslie Ann Yates	Subcommittee staff consultant (effective April 1, 1974).	3,750.00
Helen C. Mattas	Senior staff assistant	13,602.60
Mary Louise O'Brien	Staff assistant	12,138.84
Paula L. Peak	do	10,478.52
Thelma H. Shirkey	do	6,966.30
Arlene M. Atwater	do	6,596.94
Shirley A. McManus	do	7,553.88
Donna Gail Wynn	do	5,644.32
Jeanne M. Salvia	do	6,045.06
Karen Patterson Brennan	do	5,638.50
Josephine R. Weber	do	5,538.48
Diane Miesel Stoner	do	4,595.58
Nancy K. Stout	do	6,024.30
Joan C. Sullivan	do	5,749.98
Ellen B. Pinnes	Staff assistant (terminated April 31, 1974).	2,000.01

COMMITTEE ON ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeraldine C. Nolan	Staff assistant (effective February 1, 1974).	$3,958.35
Noel Daoust	Staff assistant (effective April 8, 1974).	2,075.00
Nancy M. Carman	Staff assistant (effective June 5, 1974).	613.89
Andrew B. Vanyo	Clerical assistant	5,578.26
Robert A. Stoner	Publications assistant	5,095.62
Dona Sims	Special assistant (effective June 1, 1974).	708.33
Eugene M. Principato	Clerical assistant (effective June 15, 1974).	266.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,168,735.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	476,985.31
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	261,258.37
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974	
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	430,491.32

THOMAS E. MORGAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, Jan. 1 through June 30, 1974:	
Full committee	$4,869.29
Special investigative staff	67,823.04
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee	41,748.15
Government Activities Subcommittee	56,475.11
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	70,730.06
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee	60,888.99
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee	75,172.06
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	52,847.48
Special Studies Subcommittee	63,330.64
Total	493,884.82

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
Standing committee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:		
Herbert Roback	Staff director	$18,000.00
Elmer W. Henderson	General counsel	18,000.00
Miles Q. Romney	Counsel-administrator	18,000.00
Douglas G. Dahlin	Associate counsel	14,405.88
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto	Staff member	10,175.88
Ann E. McLachlan	do	9,863.04
Catherine S. Cash	do	8,868.66
Marilyn F. Jarvis	do	8,748.18
Lilian M. Phillips	do	8,041.92
John Philip Carlson	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Warren B. Buhler	Minority professional staff member.	13,096.26
Clara Katherine Armstrong	Minority research assistant.	9,077.04
Total		154,276.86
Standing committee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman: Total expenses.		4,869.29

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special investigative staff, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman:		
Stephen M. Daniels	Minority staff member	$10,007.82
Richard L. Thompson	Minority staff member (through Jan. 31 and from Feb. 5).	9,785.42
Lawrence T. Graham	Minority staff member	10,007.82
James L. McInerney	do	9,953.16
Sheila G. Nathanson	Minority secretary	5,239.08
Karen L. Tauber	do	5,019.44
Eileen W. Theim	Staff member	6,884.70
Susan E. Early	Staff member (from June 1, 1974).	916.67
Ralph T. Doty	Clerical staff	5,352.72
Paul N. Nelson	do	4,656.21
Total		67,823.04
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman:		
Charles Goodwin	Subcommittee counsel	7,494.00
Michael T. McGinn	Defense analyst	9,499.98
Catherine L. Koeberlein.	Research assistant	9,314.88
Mary Etta Haga	Clerk-stenographer	5,810.70
Wanda C. Johnson	do	5,500.44
Michael A. Vorhaus	Clerical staff	3,250.02
Expenses		878.13
Total		41,748.15
Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, Chairman:		
William M. Jones	Subcommittee staff director.	15,421.74
William H. Copenhaver.	Counsel	14,667.78
C. Don Stephens	Research analyst	12,083.52
Lynne Higginbotham	Clerk-stenographer	8,082.84
Kathryn J. Lokos	Secretary	4,452.72
Expenses		1,766.51
Total		56,475.11
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, Chairman:		
James R. Naughton	Counsel	17,500.02
Delphis C. Goldberg	Professional staff member.	17,500.02
Gilbert S. Goldhammer.	Consultant	11,748.00
Gary E. Bombardier	Professional staff member.	9,429.30
Pamela R. Horsmon	Clerk-stenographer	5,810.70
Margaret M. Goldhammer.	Secretary	4,877.28
Expenses		3,864.74
Total		70,730.06
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Henry S. Reuss, Chairman:		
Phineas Indritz	Counsel	5,236.00
David B. Finnegan	Associate counsel	15,418.98
David H. Baris	Legal assistant (through June 16, 1974).	8,122.21
Robert J. Hellman	Staff analyst	7,000.02
Josephine Scheiber	Research analyst	9,294.24
Ruth M. Wallick	Stenographer	7,247.10
Frances B. Lee	do	5,100.96
Ardith R. Davis	Stenographer (from May 28, 1974).	870.84
Expenses		2,598.64
Total		60,888.99
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. William S. Moorhead, Chairman:		
William G. Phillips	Subcommittee staff director.	17,500.02
Norman G. Cornish	Deputy subcommittee staff director.	17,500.02
Harold F. Whittington	Professional staff member.	13,958.26
L. James Kronfeld	Counsel	13,096.26
Martha M. Doty	Clerk	6,024.30
Nancy E. Wenzel	Secretary	4,349.98
Expenses		2,743.22
Total		75,172.06

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. Wm. J. Randall, Chairman:		
Erskine Stewart	Subcommittee staff director.	$14,667.78
William G. Lawrence	Associate counsel	10,477.02
Wanda J. Reif	Professional staff member.	10,477.02
Gerald J. Laporte	Research assistant (from June 1, 1974).	1,083.33
D. Faye Taylor	Clerk	6,024.30
Eleanor M. Vanyo	Secretary	5,315,40
Expenses		4,802.63
Total		52,847.48
Special Studies Subcommittee, Hon. Floyd V. Hicks, Chairman:		
Joseph C. Luman	Subcommittee staff director.	14,667.78
Jacob N. Wasserman	Counsel	16,598.58
Dean S. Kalivas	Professional staff member.	10,477.02
James L. Gyory	Investigator	9,429.30
Louise Chubb	Clerk (from Feb. 4, 1974).	4,777.50
Geraldine A. Fitzgerald	Secretary	4,924.20
Expenses		2,456.26
Total		63,330.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 277 and H. Res. 846	$2,111,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	955,018.16
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	493,884.82
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	1,448,902.98
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	1,448,902.98
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	662,097.02

CHET HOLIFIELD, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John T. Walker	Staff director	$18,000.00
Frank B. Ryan	Director, information systems.	18,000.00
Robert Gray	Chief auditor	18,000.00
John Warren McGarry	Attorney	18,000.00
John Blair	Assistant to the staff director.	15,107.76
Ralph Smith	Minority clerk	18,000.00
Ralph Murphy	Assistant clerk (minority).	13,455.96
Evelyn H. Wilson	Office manager	8,505.81
Mary Stolle	Assistant clerk	8,505.81
Robert Anton	Assistant legal counsel	7,857.78
Johanna Lucas	Assistant clerk	6,609.30
M. Lynn Hayes	Assistant clerk (minority).	5,762.41
Linda Nave	Assistant clerk (minority).	320.13
Sabastian Tom	Clerk, E. & M. Subcommittee.	9,243.54
Judith H. Simmons	Assistant clerk accounts subcommittee.	4,732.44
Gurney S. Jaynes	Assistant clerk	8,643.54
Joseph T. Ventura	Clerk, personnel subcommittee.	9,953.16
John L. Boos	Clerk, Library and Memorials Subcommittee.	11,679.11
Cynthia Cortese	Assistant clerk	5,250.00
Pamela M. Bussen	Assistant clerk, Personnel Subcommittee.	2,083.33
Barbara Lee Gialmo	Assistant clerk, Elections Subcommittee.	5,576.58

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vicki Sue Moser	Assistant clerk	$5,507.76
William E. Sudow	Clerk, Printing Subcommittee.	10,285.02
Thomas M. Pappas	Clerk, Accounts Subcommittee.	10,215.06
Linda Bentz	Assistant clerk, Printing Subcommittee.	3,143.32
Ronald Merenbach	Assistant clerk	1,100.09
Ollievia Frasier	do	1,923.92
John D. Ford	Assistant clerk, Elections Subcommittee.	2,030.43
James Burnes	Assistant clerk	4,833.32
Richard Oleszewski	Clerk, Elections Subcommittee.	4,999.98
Linda Rogers	Assistant clerk, Police Subcommittee.	4,819.44
Candis Whitley	Assistant clerk	1,883.33
Sharon Kite	do	4,999.98
Norman Shore	do	5,500.45
William Baranowski	do	3,177.79
Constance Falwell	Assistant clerk, E. & M. Subcommittee.	2,250.00
Grace Cohilas	Assistant clerk	2,577.79
Elizabeth Ray	do	2,108.34
Nancy Brown	Assistant clerk, E. & M. Subcommittee.	1,466.67
Jim Hart	Assistant clerk	820.00
Dovie Cherry	Assistant clerk, Police Subcommittee.	1,213.89
Lawton Stevens	Assistant clerk	854.17
Mark Maloney	do	655.33
Michael McWherter	do	611.64
Michael Meth	do	433.33
Becky Ransom	do	420.00
Andrew Ingram	do	650.00
John B. Maxwell	do	200.00
Brian Yochum	do	305.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.	$770,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	319,547.46
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	161,769.36
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974.	481,316.82
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	288,683.18

WAYNE L. HAYS, Chairman.

HOUSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Richard Bates	Communications terminal operator.	$3,770.40
Louise Yates	Senior secretary	3,719.82
Noah M. St. Clair	Senior systems programer.	10,338.48
Timothy Gunther	Programer	6,624.84
David L. Brazeal	Computer systems analyst.	8,789.07
Diane C. Hitz	Communications terminal operator.	3,770.40
William R. Hill	Senior computer systems analyst.	10,266.05
Benjamin R. Candler	Programer analyst	8,064.12
Antionette P. Gauthier	Communications control coordinator.	4,850.17
Robert J. Mumma	Senior computer operator.	5,594.10
Curtis L. Merrick	Section manager	12,094.68
Vernon J. Walters	Programer analyst	7,741.62
Jasper T. Wagliardo	Section manager	11,352.36
Charles E. Graham	Deputy director	18,000.00
Edmund S. Mesko	Information systems specialist.	10,777.68
Dwight H. Pfaehler	Senior information systems specialist.	7,797.68
Gerald L. Barnes	Junior programer	5,239.56
William Freeman	Senior computer systems analyst.	10,666.80
Don Anderson	Systems factors analyst.	$5,923.02
Barbara Burda	Senior production control specialist.	4,831.50
Don L. Robinson	Junior system factors analyst.	7,212.08
Jimmy Powell	Programer analyst	5,272.36
Anne Wightman	do	6,286.74
Norman Young	Senior section manager.	12,901.38
Thomas Hawk	Communications control coordinator.	5,319.18
Robert Cohen	Information systems specialist.	9,903.90
John T. Reed	Senior computer systems analyst.	10,664.04
Berthine Washington	Data preparation specialist.	3,875.46
Howard Ulep	Group manager	12,094.68
Ada Taylor	Communications terminal operator.	2,189.22
Robert Klukas	Section manager	10,683.00
K. Michael Frazier	Programer	6,286.50
Frank Robertson	Section manager	2,348.42
Sheldon Grosberg	Management assistant	12,527.52
Stephen Stofko	Group manager	13,739.52
Patricia Ann Costlow	Senior communications control coordinator.	5,213.33
Marsha Madden	Junior system factors specialist.	5,701.35
Frank W. Byrd	Senior computer operations coordinator.	6,083.52
Diane Lee Yudiskas	Programer analyst	162.93
Deloris Gilliam	Junior computer operator.	3,605.16
Mary Ryan Conroy	Administrative control coordinator.	4,326.81
Martha Crouse	Communications control coordinator.	4,892.82
Robert Garrett	Section manager	12,000.27
Margaret Hyland	Junior secretary	4,738.44
Steven B. Newman	Communications control coordinator.	4,301.70
Elmer Whiting	Computer operator	5,471.64
Linda Hall	Clerk-typist	3,479.20
Dianne Oshetski	Secretary	4,588.82
Frances Pratt	do	4,875.65
Francine Cromwell	Executive secretary	5,882.52
Katherine Diamond	Senior data preparation specialist.	4,027.50
Ed Fairleigh	Junior computer operator.	4,329.48
Samuel Rogers	Senior computer operator.	5,632.66
Donald Morris	Group manager	12,238.96
Louis Johannes	Administrative clerk	4,027.50
Lewis DuBusc	Section manager	11,696.52
Barbara Swart	Junior programer	4,165.14
Susan Starr	System factors analyst	9,420.22
David Underwood	Section manager	11,371.98
Marie Williams	Senior information systems specialist.	9,733.63
Sandra Levine	Junior communications terminal operator.	1,241.70
Stephanie Everett	Senior communications terminal operator.	3,477.99
Wilbur D. Smith	Senior information systems specialist.	11,413.05
Kendall Free	Computer systems analyst.	9,030.12
Gerald Murphy	Section manager	11,068.83
Katherine Bye	Technical research assistant.	5,014.32
Paul Pritchett	Production control coordinator.	4,605.06
Hettie Prater	Technical aide	6,915.36
Ruth Ann Wauters	Junior systems programer.	8,308.26
Stuart Edwards	Computer systems analyst.	9,622.98
Thomas Brown	Section manager	9,472.17
Barbara Daniel	Junior secretary	2,956.28
Richard Maynard	Senior operation research analyst.	12,040.68
Gerald McGuire	Group manager	12,901.38
Gerald Morrone	Computer systems analyst.	9,321.36
Luis Amigo	Programer analyst	7,338.81
Sandra Burke	Technical writer	6,084.00
Lolita Werhan	Junior secretary	3,876.30
Sandra May	Junior communications terminal operator.	1,903.94
James Daley	Programer analyst	7,820.04
Mark Shriver	Computer operator	5,149.44
Mary McNair	Junior data preparation specialist.	3,210.18
Walter Haggerty	Section manager	12,384.84
Wesley C. Jenkins	Computer systems analyst.	9,903.90
Susan Zweighaft	Programer	6,489.48
Robert Silberski	Junior technical aide	6,692.16
Donna Jean Fears	Junior programer	1,052.83
Jim Cowart	Programer	$4,630.60
Cletis Harper	Section manager	9,612.66
Paul M. Kunkel	Production control coordinator.	3,869.60
Kathryn Lyons	Junior communications terminal operator.	2,255.45
Dorothy Ellis	Data preparation specialist.	3,592.86
Amos Hilton	Production control specialist.	3,592.86
Cheryl Trovato	Junior system factors specialist.	5,817.36
Barbara Seymour	Data preparation specialist.	3,725.10
Candace Butler	Junior communications control coordinator.	4,003.53
Nancy Gordon	Junior system factors specialist.	6,084.00
James P. Howell	Junior communications terminal operator.	3,775.68
Stanley Croydon	Junior information systems specialist.	7,428.98
Joseph Evalt	Senior information	11,102.52
Colleen Gorgon	Junior typist systems specialist.	3,204.00
Carol Ann Ruga	Junior secretary	1,970.88
Thomas Leonardo	Computer systems specialist.	9,320.52
Karen Burzinski	Clerk typist	3,168.40
Raymond Ney	Data control specialist	1,068.00
Neil Armann	Information systems specialist.	11,080.50
Carl Schmidt	Systems programer	9,040.02
Henry Collins	Computer systems specialist.	11,371.98
Brian Connolly	Junior systems programer.	8,313.48
Terry Mahn	Programer	6,083.52
Lea Fowlie	Communications terminal operator.	3,646.43
Robert Reardon	Senior systems programer.	10,231.09
Michele Eastridge	Junior typist	1,174.19
Kathleen Mohajer	Junior system factors specialist.	4,731.63
Susan Groseclose	Junior secretary	3,100.65
Richard Fields	Manager	8,419.08
Ethlyn Brooks	Senior information systems specialist.	6,720.01
Helen G. Kenny	System factors analyst	5,876.01
Karen Blake	Communications terminal operator.	2,438.88
May Ellen Yarrington	Senior production control specialist.	2,304.63
Shirley Samuels	Senior clerk	1,361.18
Sharon E. Davis	Junior communications terminal operator.	1,549.58
Patrick Cullen	do	1,528.91
Patricia Bell	Typist	1,714.86
Patricia Dowling	Junior programer analyst.	2,735.28
Marian Lane	Senior data preparation specialist.	1,543.88
James Haga	Information systems specialist.	1,657.34
Jeffery Holcomb	Courier	729.80
Martin Collins	Computer systems specialist.	1,236.80
Michael Jones	Senior clerk	2,673.15
Janet Louise Conrad	Junior communications terminal operator.	959.73
Sylestene Walker	do	959.73
Katherine Kim	Junior typist	778.55
Aaron Greenberg	System factors analyst	1,542.26
Denise Asparagus	Junior data preparation specialist.	535.73
Elizabeth Scattergood	Junior communications terminal operator.	433.88
Marilyn Epstein	Programer	504.74
Kenneth L. Johnson	Senior computer operator.	463.40
Brenda Tereyla	Clerk	220.97
Michael Dougherty	Senior information systems specialist.	652.85
Jeremy D. Frey	Technical assistant	124.60
Susan Earley	do	124.60
Jocelyn White	do	124.60
Gregory Twitchell	do	124.60
Marc Shafroth	do	124.60
Michael Frankhuizen	do	124.60
Marilyn Knox	Junior typist	91.97
Amanda Leech	do	124.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$4,800,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,711,505.30
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	1,174,408.24
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973, to June 30, 1974	2,885,913.54
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	1,914,086.46

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

July 12, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from **January 3 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total** funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sidney L. McFarland	Terminated Mar. 31, 1974 as staff director and chief clerk.	$1,998.00
Lewis A. Sigler	Terminated Jan. 31, 1974 as general counsel.	429.00
Charles R. Conklin	Staff director and chief clerk.	18,000.00
Lee McElvain	General counsel	18,000.00
William L. Shafer	Consultant on mines, mining and public lands.	18,000.00
Charles Leppert, Jr.	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Patricia A. Murray	Full committee clerk	12,060.69
Patricia B. Freeman	Administrative assistant.	10,729.62
Miriam L. Waddell	Secretary-clerk	8,392.50
Sandra Marie Metcalfe	do	8,103.90
Jack Daum	Staff consultant (minority).	12,000.00
Joanne Suter Burgess	Secretary-clerk (minority)-transfer to investment staff as of May 1, 1974.	3,841.56
Majorie J. Reynolds	Secretary-clerk (minority) as of May 1, 1974.	2,083.34
Jim T. Casey	Consultant on water and power resources.	18,000.00
Mary Lee Gennari	Clerk, Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources.	6,774.06
Nancy Lou Larson	Clerk, Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.	9,809.78
Kathryn C. Loeffler	Clerk-receptionist	5,619.24
Adrian Winkel	Consultant on Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.	16,851.00
Maurice J. Shean	do	16,851.00
David W. Luken	Terminated Apr. 30, 1974 as staff consultant—minority.	5,833.32
Marston Becker	Printing clerk	10,139.07
Edward Gaddis	Staff assistant	6,055.35
Bertha D. Drotos	Secretary-clerk (majority).	6,850.26
Rebecca D. Shapiro	Clerk, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.	5,619.24
Pamela Warfield	Clerk, Subcommittee on Environment.	5,924.90
Stanley E. Scoville	Staff counsel, Submittee on the Environment.	10,999.98
Franklin Ducheneaux	Consultant, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.	13,298.13
Thomas S. Dunmire	Staff consultant (minority).	5,802.00
Robert A. Hunt	Consultant, Subcommittee on Public Lands (terminated Apr. 30, 1974).	9,080.08
Bruce Driver	Staff counsel (minority).	10,500.00
James A. Rock	Staff consultant (minority).	11,250.00
Clay E. Peters	do	11,250.00
Nancy G. Drake	Clerk, Subcommittee on Public Lands.	7,071.96
Sharon Peck Cockayne	Secretary, Subcommittee on Public Lands.	5,561.09
John D. Curtis	Terminated May 31, 1974 as staff assistant, Subcommittee on Environment.	7,083.35 7,083.35
Betty Nevitt	Clerk, Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation.	6,810.06
Dale Pontius	Staff assistant, Subcommittee on Environment.	8,916.68
Betty Jo Hunt	Staff assistant, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.	7,857.78
Norman R. Williams	Consultant, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining.	12,499.98
Thomas L. Laughlin	Staff assistant, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining.	6,000.00
Gail Whitestone	Secretary-clerk (minority).	4,708.32
Sandra Ann Hugg	Terminated Apr. 30, 1974 as secretary, Subcommittee on Environment.	$2,[illegible]19.24
David R. Brown	Staff assistant, Subcommittee on Public Lands (as of Mar. 18, 1974.	4,148.60
Cleveland Pinnix	Consultant, Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation (as of Apr. 14, 1974).	4,919.45
Joanne Suter Burgess	Secretary-clerk (minority) as of May 1, 1974.	2,020.84
Michael Jackson	Staff consultant (minority) as of May 1, 1974.	2,500.00
Deborah Medlar	From May 17, 1974 to June 21, 1974 as secretary, Subcommittee on Environment.	729.17
Elizabeth K. Medeiros	Clerk, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining. (as of June 21, 1974).	4,377.22
Ann F. Zumwalt	Intern, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.	166.67
Sidney McFarland	Consultant under contract.	3,600.00
Lewis A. Sigler	do	6,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,496,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	497,993.03
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	362,002.31
Total amount expended from June 19, to June 30, 1974	362,002.31
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	636,004.66

JAMES A. HALEY, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

July 10, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from **January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total** funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee (majority):		
Robert M. Horner (P)	Professional staff assistant.	$11,358.00
William H. Hecht (P)	Executive staff assistant	16,361.10
Alfred M. Nittle (P)	Legislative counsel	18,000,00
Robert A. Crandall (P)	Counsel	16,000.02
Richard A. Shaw (C)	Chief investigator (resigned June 23, 1974).	11,533.33
William G. Shaw (P)	Research director	12,168.00
V. Bernice King (C)	Financial secretary	10,597.41
Mary M. Valente (C)	Administrative secretary.	10,615.20
John F. Lewis (P)	Professional staff assistant.	15,286.20
Standing committee (minority):		
DeWitt White (P)	Legal counsel	17,749.98
Herbert Romerstein (C)	Chief investigator	16,083.78
James L. Gallagher (C)	Research analyst	13,142.52
Investigative committee (majority):		
William H. Stapleton	Staff director	7,842.00
Margie D. Biggerstaff	Secretary	5,865.00
Daniel Butler	Documents clerk	6,082.20
S. Janice Coil	Secretary	6,952.89
Elizabeth S. Crawford	Clerk	97.22
Anniel Cunningham	Chief files and reference section.	9,956.10
Florence Doyle	Secretary	5,564.52
Helen M. Gittings	Editor	10,360.86
Doris Jaeck	Information analyst	5,918.85
Mildred V. James	Clerk-typist	4,184.32
Norma H. Lewis	Secretary (resigned Apr. 14, 1974).	$3,455.33
Tina V. Markey	Information classifier	3,580.02
Anita S. Maggio	Clerk	3,776.94
Terry M. Morgan	Information classifier (appointed Jan. 14, 1974).	3,247.20
Virginia Masino	Receptionist	5,020.37
John E. Manning	Investigator (resigned June 30, 1974).	11,478.00
David J. Murray	Assistant documents clerk (resigned Apr. 9, 1974).	1,969.01
Maureen P. Ontrich	Information analyst (resigned Mar. 31, 1974).	2,583.06
P. Lamar Payne	Assistant documents clerk (summer help, appointed June 10, 1974).	379.17
Alma T. Pfaff	Research analyst	7,009.29
Stuart Pott	Investigator	8,137.25
S. Louise Rees	Research analyst	7,500.00
Audrey Rollins	Secretary	5,562.86
Jane Y. Rumsey	Clerk-typist (summer help, appointed Apr. 1, 1974).	1,708.53
Albert H. Solomon, Jr.	Investigator	10,650.00
John N. Stratton	do	9,242.52
S. Jane Strawser	Secretary (appointed May 20, 1974).	1,252.78
Barbara C. Sweeny	Editor	5,543.22
Susan K. Tonkinson	Information analyst	5,126.28
Investigative committee (minority):		
George C. Armstrong	Investigator	8,425.50
Browardine Broyhill	Research assistant (resigned Mar. 31, 1974).	1,178.67
Donna Francisco	Research assistant (appointed Apr. 4, 1974).	1,875.00
Richard Norusis	Investigator	9,006.54
Linda Spirt	Secretary	7,430.28
William T. Poole	Research analyst	7,999.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$950,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	446,398.16
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1974	212,942.81
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	659,340.97
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	290,659.03

RICHARD I. ICHORD, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from **January 1 to July 1, 1974, inclusive, together with total** funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$18,000.00
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	17,475.24
Marcella F. Johnson	Assistant clerk	11,401.08
Frank W. Mahon	Printing editor	11,499.42
Eleanor A. Dinkins	Clerical assistant	9,142.86
Mary Ryan	do	9,142.86
Laura F. Elder	do	7,150.98
Edwin E. Thomas	Staff assistant	8,113.58
Lewis E. Berry (minority).	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Professional staff:		
William J. Dixon	Professsional staff member.	18,000.00
Robert F. Guthrie	do	18,000.00
Charles B. Curtis	do	18,000.00
Lee S. Hyde	do	18,000.00
Jeffrey H. Schwartz	do	14,048.13
Elizabeth Harrison	do	14,048.13
John Gamble	Counsel	15,202.95

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 182, 303, 916:		
Henry Thomas Greene	Staff assistant (minority).	$13,727.34
Barbara L. Bullard	Clerical assistant (minority).	8,521.06
Darlene G. McMullen	do	6,510.64
Jan B. Vlcek	Staff assistant (minority).	12,287.40
Bertram J. Levine	do	12,287.40
Thomas C. Sawyer	Staff assistant (minority) (from Apr. 1, 1974).	6,476.85
Joseph T. Kelley	Staff assistant (minority) (from May 1, 1974).	1,500.00
Joanne E. Bell	Clerical assistant	6,000.00
Violet M. McCarthy	do	7,710.84
Ann P. Jordan	do	5,662.50
Barboura C. Flues	do	6,857.52
Clarence E. Martin III	Assistant counsel (from May 20, 1974).	1,700.33
Martin Auerbach	Staff assistant (to June 16, 1974).	4,831.04
Jo Anne Glisson	Clerical assistant	5,505.16
John L. Duncan	do	7,857.78
Susan Tomasky	Clerical assistant (from June 1, 1974).	666.67
Walter J. Graham, Jr.	Staff assistant	14,959.62
Steve Lawton	do	14,959.62
Michael R. Lemov	do	14,959.62
Richard Krolik	do	14,959.62
Marilyn Barber	Clerical assistant (from June 1, 1974).	585.33
Elizabeth Bailey	Clerical assistant	4,750.02
Michael J. Russo	Clerical assistant (from June 19, 1974).	200.00
Douglas Stoddart	Clerical assistant (from June 10, 1974).	466.67
Michael J. Pucillo	Clerical assistant (from June 1, 1974).	500.00
Thomas A. Mesereau, Jr.	Staff assistant (from Feb. 1, 1974).	4,166.65
Special Subcommittee on Investigations:		
Daniel J. Manelli	Chief counsel	18,000.00
William T. Druhan	Staff assistant	16,375.02
James R. Connor	Special assistant	15,183.66
Benjamin J. Smethurst.	do	16,375.02
Mark J. Raabe	Staff attorney	15,688.86
Michael J. Parker	do	12,783.48
Albert J. McGrath	Special assistant	8,821.62
Lynne D. Finney	Staff attorney	13,096.26
Raymond C. Cole	Special assistant	11,015.52
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	9,142.86
Russell D. Mosher	Staff assistant	6,088.26
Diane G. Kirchenbauer	Clerical assistant	6,682.32
Michael F. Barrett	Staff attorney	15,688.86
Elizabeth A. Eastman	Clerical assistant	7,706.04
Special securities study group:		
Robert L. Stern	Special cosultant (to Jan. 31, 1974).	2,663.23
Harvey Rowan	Staff attorney	14,746.40
Marion S. Ryan	Clerical assistant	5,228.04
Vicky Austin	Clerical assistant (to Apr. 30, 1974).	3,485.36
Lisa A. Wiles	Clerical assistant (from May 1, 1974).	1,666.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,819,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	814,269.17
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	440,182.24
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	1,254,451.41
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	564,548.59

HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Chairman.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jerome M. Zeifman	General counsel	$18,000.00
Garner J. Cline	Associate general counsel.	18,000.00
Herbert Fuchs	Counsel	18,000.00
William P. Shattuck	do	18,000.00
H. Christopher Nolde	do	17,810.88
Franklin G. Polk	Associate counsel	17,601.36
Alan A. Parker	Counsel	16,500.00
Roger Pauley	Associate counsel (through Feb. 10, 1974).	3,492.33
Thomas E. Mooney	Associate counsel	14,458.26
Alexander B. Cook	Associate counsel (from Mar. 1, 1974).	9,219.76
Frances F. Christy	Legislative analyst	12,048.54
Mary G. Sourwine	Clerical staff	10,429.32
Jane C. Caldwell	Clerical staff (through Apr. 30, 1974).	6,705.44
Gertrude Clara Burak	Clerical staff	8,948.04
Pearl Chellman	do	7,851.00
Alma Haardt	do	7,801.02
Alice M. Smith	Clerical staff (from June 1, 1974).	1,114.58
Investigating staff:		
Lynn Alcock	Clerical staff	7,249.98
Deborah Alt	do	5,500.02
Veronica Amick	Clerical staff (from June 17, 1974).	388.89
Maurice A. Barboza	Counsel	11,626.02
Michael W. Blommer	Associate counsel	14,414.82
Robert L. Brown	Assistant counsel	7,999.98
Alan F. Coffey, Jr.	Associate counsel (from Mar. 25, 1974).	5,600.00
Daniel L. Cohen	Counsel	11,476.98
Alexander B. Cook	Associate counsel (through Feb. 28, 1974).	4,609.88
Lizzie M. Daniels	Clerical staff	4,849.98
Eva J. Denev	do	8,207.52
William P. Dixon	Counsel	13,310.52
Arthur P. Endres, Jr.	do	11,601.98
James F. Falco	do	13,072.50
James B. Farr	Messenger-clerk	5,392.50
Theresa M. Gallo	Clerical staff	6,083.33
Constantine J. Gekas	Associate counsel (from Jan. 23, 1974).	9,216.67
Linda C. Gersten	Clerical staff	9,467.52
Roberta Haeberle	Clerical staff (from June 24, 1974).	155.56
Timothy J. Hart	Assistant counsel (from May 6, 1974).	2,215.27
James D. Hoard	Staff analyst (from Feb. 11, 1974).	4,861.13
Sharon B. Hughes	Clerical staff	5,115.00
Thomas W. Hutchison	Counsel	11,749.98
Alice M. Jackson	Clerical staff	6,137.52
Frederick Jett	Counsel (through Apr. 20, 1974).	366.67
Susan Kapuza	Clerical staff (from Mar. 17, 1974).	2,055.55
Jeffrey Kayden	Clerical staff	3,600.00
Michael Kelemonick	do	7,801.02
Olga Kirk	do	5,749.98
Bruce Lehman	Counsel (from Jan. 21, 1974).	8,888.91
Stephen P. Lynch	Research assistant	5,250.00
Florence T. McGrady	Clerical staff	7,801.02
Betty Jean McKay	do	5,010.00
Mary E. Manners	do	3,750.00
Michael P. Murphy	do	4,053.86
Nancy L. Parke	do	5,529.00
Joan Porter	Clerical staff (through Mar. 15, 1974).	2,077.07
Cheri Robinson	Clerical staff (from Apr. 15, 1974).	1,583.33
Ruth O. Robinson	Assistant counsel	12,499.98
Dennis S. Rutkus	Staff analyst	7,333.92
Dawn M. Ruuspakka	Clerical staff	4,828.02
Arden B. Schell	Assistant counsel	9,006.48
Holly C. Shaw	Clerical staff	2,444.45
Judith M. Shellenberger.	do	4,902.87
Alice M. Smith	do	4,947.90
Jared B. Stamell	Assistant counsel	10,977.00
Peter Straub	do	3,963.67
Robert J. Trainor	Counsel	11,476.98
Jean LaRue Traylor	Assistant counsel (through Mar. 31, 1974).	4,500.00
Louis S. Vance	Messenger	5,669.46
Dorothy Wadley	Clerical staff	6,137.52
Karen Walsh	do	3,928.98
Marice C. Werth	Clerical staff (from Mar. 25, 1974).	2,133.34
Mary Y. Westergren	Clerical staff (through May 15, 1974).	2,812.50
Minnie White	Clerical staff (through June 30, 1974).	9,429.30
Janice A. Zarro	Assistant counsel	7,999.98
Virginia Allred	Clerical staff (from Feb. 9, 1974).	5,522.24
Fred H. Altshuler	Counsel (from Jan. 16, 1974).	$9,854.18
Barbara A. Bacon	Clerical staff (from Feb. 25, 1974).	836.15
Ernest Banchero	Clerical staff	5,183.34
Maureen Barden	Research assistant	7,741.65
Carolyn K. Beahm	Clerical staff (through March 1, 1974).	1,186.10
Thomas D. Bell	Counsel (from Jan. 7, 1974).	9,425.00
David L. Bennet	Clerical staff (from Jan. 1, 1974).	4,449.99
Elsie A. Biggs	Clerical staff (from Mar. 9, 1974).	3,266.67
William P. Bishop	Counsel (from Jan. 29, 1974).	5,911.13
Philip Boone, Jr.	Clerical staff	4,241.66
Nancy H. Brooks	Clerical staff (from Jan. 28, 1974).	5,276.40
Jeannette Brown	Clerical staff (through Feb. 15, 1974).	1,166.67
Martha K. L. Brown	Clerical staff (from Jan. 21, 1974).	4,444.43
Cheryl R. Budd	Clerical staff	1,167.48
Julia Busalacchi	Clerical staff (from Apr. 25, 1974).	2,108.33
Susan Butler	Clerical staff (from Mar. 17, 1974).	1,808.89
Barbara Campbell	Research assistant (from May 5, 1974).	1,883.33
Doris G. Cassidy	Clerical staff	1,824.98
Richard L. Cates	Senior associate special counsel.	18,000.00
Robert H. Charles	Security assistant (from May 6, 1974).	2,291.67
Abbie L. Cole	Technician (Mar. 15, through Apr. 30, 1974).	2,555.56
Michael M. Conway	Counsel (from Jan. 1, 1974).	8,444.43
Donald R. Coppock	Information officer (from Jan. 23, 1974).	5,103.40
Rufus Cormier, Jr.	Special assistant (from Jan. 22, 1974).	9,683.33
Edward L. Dale	Counsel (from Jan. 22, 1974).	9,716.65
Lois D'Andre	Administrative assistant (through Feb. 1, 1974).	1,550.00
John B. Davidson	Counsel (from Feb. 4, 1974).	8,166.68
Evan A. Davis	Counsel (from Jan. 23, 1974).	14,044.46
Lance Davis	Clerical staff (from May 25, 1974).	720.00
Susan Davis	Clerical staff (from Apr. 1, 1974).	2,499.99
Beatrice E. Dillard	Clerical staff (from Feb. 4, 1974).	4,370.83
John M. Doar	Special counsel	18,000.00
Patricia A. Donohue	Clerical staff (through Mar. 1, 1974).	2,363.89
Marie Drayer	Clerical staff (from Feb. 7–June 28, 1974).	4,930.57
Elizabeth M. Dunigan	Research assistant (from Jan. 28, 1974).	4,249.98
Valerie P. DuVal	Clerical staff (from Feb. 1, 1974).	5,208.35
Charles E. Feeley	Clerical staff	4,216.66
Barbara Fletcher	Clerical staff (from Jan. 21, 1974).	6,666.67
Jonathan Flint	Research assistant (from Jan. 29, 1974).	4,222.21
Gayle D. Falin	Clerical staff	4,708.35
David C. Forrester	Clerical staff (from Jan. 28, 1974).	3,516.66
Samuel A. Garrison	Counsel	17,500.00
Gregory M. Gill	Clerical staff (from Feb. 14, 1974).	3,320.55
Richard Gill	Counsel (from Jan. 22, 1974).	14,133.35
Paul Goodrich	Counsel (through May 21, 1974) (from June 1–15, 1974).	4,303.33
Patricia Gray	Clerical staff (from Jan. 7, 1974).	5,380.55
James Haardt	Clerical staff (from May 5, 1974).	1,120.00
Judy Haberek	Clerical staff (from Jan. 28, 1974).	4,213.87
Charlene R. Haley	Clerical staff (Feb. 25 through Mar. 11, 1974).	94.44
Dagmar S. Hamilton	Counsel (through June 28, 1974).	10,877.76
David S. Hanes	Assistant to special counsel (through May 31, 1974).	11,458.35
Timothy Harr	Research assistant (from June 3, 1974).	894.44

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth S. Hays	Clerical staff (from May 6, 1974).	$1,100.00
Robert K. Hedrick, Jr.	Clerical staff	4,299.99
Janet Howard	Administrative assistant.	8,066.66
Michael H. Hughes	Clerical staff	4,483.32
Roberta Johansen	Research assistant (from Jan. 14, 1974).	6,587.20
Florence C. Johnson	Clerical staff (Jan. 21 through Mar. 31, 1974).	2,236.10
Yolanda Johnson	Clerical staff (from June 10, 1974).	262.50
Ilene Katz	Clerical staff (from Mar. 1, 1974).	4,125.01
John E. Kennahan	Counsel	15,791.68
Lawrence Keives	Research assistant (from Jan. 1, 1974).	6,888.91
Terry Kirkpatrick	Counsel (from Feb. 16, 1974).	6,937.52
Helen F. Klein	Research assistant (Jan. 23 through Feb. 2, 1974).	300.00
Kris M. Kononen	Clerical staff (from Feb. 2, 1974).	4,552.80
John Labovitz	Counsel (from Feb. 1, 1974).	13,014.18
Patsy Ann Leigh	Clerical staff (from Mar. 6, 1974).	3,513.90
Alyn H. Levin	Clerical staff (from Feb. 9, 1974).	3,352.76
Lawrence Lucchino	Counsel (from Feb. 2, 1974).	7,297.24
Phyllis MacKown	Clerical staff (from Jan. 10, 1974).	7,027.79
R. L. Smith McKeithen	Counsel (from Feb. 4, 1974).	9,800.00
Alan Marer	Counsel (Mar. 11 through June 25, 1974).	9,333.35
Elizabeth J. Marra	Clerical staff (from Jan. 19, 1974).	4,808.33
Benjamin C. Marshall Sr.	Security officer (from Jan. 14, 1974).	9,380.57
Catherine Marshall	Research assistant (from June 17, 1974).	280.00
E. Anne Meiselman	Clerical staff (Feb. 14 through Mar. 24, 1974).	1,050.00
Michael J. Murphy	Clerical staff (from Jan. 28, 1974).	3,562.50
Robert J. Murphy, Jr.	Staff assistant	4,624.99
Ricki L. Ninomiya	Clerical staff (from Mar. 4, 1974).	3,249.99
Bernard W. Nussbaum.	Senior associate special counsel (from Jan. 17, 1974).	16,400.00
James B. Oliphant	Counsel (from Jan. 21, 1974).	11,555.57
Jan Orloff	Research assistant (from Feb. 11, 1974).	5,638.87
Ann J. Palmer	Clerical staff (from June 3, 1974 through June 17, 1974).	466.67
Thomas J. Payne	Staff assistant	11,630.01
John Peterson	Research assistant (from Feb. 11, 1974).	4,791.67
Elizabeth Pond	Clerical staff (from Jan. 18, 1974).	5,206.93
Richard H. Porter	Counsel (from Feb. 6, 1974).	8,659.74
Lillian V. Pride	Clerical staff (Feb. 2, through Feb. 5, 1974).	94.44
Muriel Pugh	Research assistant (from Feb. 11, 1974).	5,055.55
George G. Rayborn, Jr.	Counsel (from Jan. 17, 1974).	12,072.20
Sally A. Regal	Research assistant	4,733.32
James M. Reum	Counsel (from Feb. 1, 1974).	9,166.65
Joan A. Reynolds	Clerical staff (from Feb. 16 through June 16, 1974).	4,537.50
Jane Ricca	Clerical staff (from Feb. 11, 1974).	5,833.33
Elise Ritter	Clerical staff (from May 16, 1974).	900.00
Hillary Rodham	Counsel (from Jan. 14, 1974).	8,813.87
Linda Rogerson	Clerical staff (from Mar. 15, 1974).	3,533.33
Marguerite M. Roney	Audio specialist (Apr. 1 through Apr. 30, 1974).	1,458.33
Robert D. Sack	Associate special counsel (from Jan. 17, 1974).	15,488.87
Nancy R. Schaefer	Clerical staff (from Jan. 14, 1974).	5,697.21
Diane I. Schneider	Clerical staff (Feb. 15 through June 7, 1974).	3,390.00
Alan E. Schwartz	Clerical staff (from May 8, 1974).	$1,207.22
Sara L. Shafer	Clerical staff (from Jan. 7, 1974).	5,447.49
Stephen A. Sharp	Counsel (from Feb. 3, 1974).	7,893.33
Robert A. Shelton	Associate counsel for administration (Jan. 1 through June 30, 1974).	16,208.33
Katherine R. Siddall	Clerical staff (from Feb. 15, 1974).	1,893.06
Eileen Silverstein	Counsel (from June 7, 1974).	1,333.34
Carl H. Simms	Security assistant (from May 1, 1974).	2,875.00
Barbara Simon	Clerical staff (Apr. 29 through May 17, 1974).	1,240.00
Doris G. Smith	Clerical staff (from Jan. 3, 1974).	5,358.33
Mary Ann Spaeth	Clerical staff (from Apr. 1, 1974).	1,991.67
Roscoe B. Starek, III	Counsel (from Jan. 22, 1974).	7,950.00
Gary W. Sutton	Counsel (from Jan. 28, 1974).	10,624.98
Nina Sweetwood	Clerical staff	4,216.66
Edward S. Szukelewicz	Counsel (from Jan. 28, 1974).	7,950.90
Theodore R. Tetzlaff	Counsel (Feb. 11, 1974 through Mar. 24, 1974).	3,361.12
Sue M. Trabosh	Clerical staff (from Jan. 14, 1974).	6,113.88
Nina J. Turitz	Clerical staff	4,216.66
James S. Walker	Counsel (from Apr. 1, 1974).	5,675.01
Ben A. Wallis, Jr.	Counsel (from Feb. 13, 1974).	9,966.68
Olga E. Watkins	Clerical staff (from Jan. 18, 1974).	6,338.91
Gary M. Weaver	Clerical staff	3,499.98
William F. Weld	Counsel (from Jan. 14, 1974).	10,901.37
Muriel J. White	Clerical staff (Feb. 14 through May 17, 1974).	2,872.24
William A. White	Associate counsel	11,749.98
John S. Whitman	Counsel (from June 3, 1974).	1,555.56
Josephine C. Will	Clerical staff (Jan. 21 through Jan. 31, 1974).	325.00
Denise R. Wilson	Clerical staff (from May 28, 1974).	325.00
Joseph Woods	Senior association special counsel (Jan. 14 through May 22, 1974).	12,900.00
Joanne Woods	Research assistant (from June 10, 1974).	554.17
Yvonne Zecca	Clerical staff (from Mar. 7, 1974).	1,140.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,585,217.75
Amount of expenditures previously reported	554,680.06
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	1,312,028.06
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	1,866,708.12
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	718,509.63

PETER W. RODINO, Jr., Chairman.

Funds for Preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and Revision of the Laws

A. Preparation of New Edition of United States Code (no year):		
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1973		$131,808.61
Expended Jan. 1–June 30, 1974		27,310.31
Balance June 30, 1974		104,498.30
B. Preparation of New Edition of District of Columbia Code:		
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1973		153,562.90
Expended Jan. 1–June 30, 1974		7,764.12
Balance June 30, 1974		145,798.78
C. Revision of the Laws, 1974:		
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1973		21,980.00
Expended Jan. 1–June 30, 1974		7,764.12
Balance June 30, 1974		14,215.88

PETER W. RODINO, JR., Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Ernest J. Corrado	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Ned P. Everett	Counsel	17,534.34
Francis D. Heyward	do	12,136.32
Leonard L. Sutter	do	15,421.74
Frances P. Still	Chief clerk	4,959.84
W. Bernard Winfield	Clerk	13,072.98
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	10,602.42
Richard N. Sharood	Minority counsel	16,523.28
Charles A. Bedell	do	11,000.00
Virginia L. Noah	Minority clerk	10,464.74
Investigative committee staff:		
Mary C. McDonnell	Counsel	11,556.32
Frank M. Potter, Jr.	do	11,182.18
Carl L. Perian	Professional staff member.	14,870.94
Donald A. Watt	Editor	11,135.58
Terrence W. Modglin	Clerk	5,881.42
Ruth I. Hoffman	Assistant clerk	7,710.84
Jacquelyn M. Westcott	Stenographer-clerk	7,327.92
Eleanor P. Mohler	Secretary	6,941.04
Mabel Duran	do	6,908.28
Marvadell Zeeb	Secretary (appointment Jan. 1, 1974).	5,461.69
Boyd T. Bashore	Clerk (appointment May 1, 1974).	3,500.00
Gwndolyn H. Lockhart	Assistant minority clerk.	7,160.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$494,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	203,063.19
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	116,675.48
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974	319,738.67
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	174,761.33

LEONOR F. SULLIVAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
John B. Martiny	Chief counsel	$13,686.00
Victor C. Smiroldo	Staff director and counsel.	17,916.66
Theodore J. Kazy	Assistant staff director	17,916.66
Roy C. Mesker	Staff assistant	17,916.66
Francis C. Fortune	Coordinator	15,175.02
Robert E. Lockhart	Assistant counsel	15,649.98
Barbara M. Wells	Executive secretary	9,730.02
Maria R. Pendleton	Administrative clerk	9,604.98
Dorothy L. Peters	Document clerk	8,340.00
Special fund staff:		
Edward T. Hugler	Investigator	14,625.00
Alton M. Howard	Printing editor	11,350.02
John Gabusi	Staff assistant	9,750.00
Margaret Napier	Secretary	6,445.02
Jo Ann Ciaravella	do	6,250.02
Patricia Perdue	do	4,274.98
Catharin Thomas (through Apr. 30).	Assistant document clerk.	3,460.00
Diane Bakall (as of May 20).	Clerk-typist	683.33
Edward M. Sibble (as of May 20).	Intern	546.67
Andrew Sangeorge (as of June 14).	do	226.67

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee:		
Paul Newton	Investigator	$12,000.00
Patricia Pankonin	Secretary	6,000.00
Evelena Carroll (as of June 10).	Clerk-typist	437.50
Julia McNair (through May 17 and June 1 through June 14).	Secretary	3,355.57
Deborah Willey (as of June 17).	Intern	186.67
Postal Service Subcommittee:		
Richard Barton	Staff assistant	13,999.98
Cassandra Cox	Secretary	4,750.02
Rosemary Storey (as of Mar. 18).	Associate staff assistant.	3,433.33
Joy Smucker (as of June 1).	Intern	400.00
Robert Husson (as of June 1).	do	400.00
Postal Facilities, Mail, and Labor Management:		
George B. Gould	Staff assistant	14,500.02
Michael Cavanagh	Associate staff assistant.	6,000.00
Paula Hemphill (as of May 24).	Secretary	1,181.94
Janet Jerz (through May 31).	do	4,599.98
Karen Ingoldsby (as of June 16).	Intern	200.00
Retirement and Employee Benefits:		
Donald Terry (through Mar. 1 and as of May 28).	Assistant counsel	5,483.34
Robert Neuman (through Mar. 1–May 31).	do	6,000.00
Michael O'Connor (through Mar. 1).	Staff aide	3,050.00
Joseph Skillin (as of Mar. 1).	Staff assistant	4,400.00
Bruce Mansel Gwinn	do	4,999.98
Wendy Weisheit	Secretary	3,649.98
Census and Statistics:		
Richard Bullock	Staff assistant	13,999.98
Bettie LaMotte	Secretary	6,250.02
Austin Bray, Jr. (through Apr. 15).	Assistant counsel	4,593.75
Ronald McCluskey (from Apr. 16 through May 31).	do	1,968.75
Minority:		
Anthony J. Raymond	Staff assistant	12,900.00
Ray H. Coultrap	do	7,900.02
Kathryn Bates	Secretary	6,925.02
Margaret Barry	do	5,749.98
Lawrence Portwood (as of June 17).	Intern	186.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,173,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	486,885.36
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to Jul 1, 1974	268,827.11
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to to June 30, 1974	755,712.47
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	417,787.53

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

June 30, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Lester Edelman	Counsel	18,000.00
Lloyd A. Rivard	Engineer consultant	18,000.00
Carl H. Schwartz, Jr.	Consultant—projects and programs.	5,538.00
James. L. Oberstar	Administrator	18,000.00
Dorothy A. Beam	Executive staff assistant.	$13,135.23
Meriam A. Buckley	Calendar clerk	10,685.28
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Staff assistant	9,613.49
Ruth Costello	do	10,046.42
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Richard C. Peet	Associate minority counsel.	18,000.00
Erla S. Youmans	Minority executive staff assistant.	10,874.82
Investigating staff:		
Phyllis B. Stone	Staff assistant	5,408.77
Peggy C. Pasquini	do	5,893.30
Joan Marie Kovalic	do	9,250.02
Thomas L. Anderson	do	6,024.30
Patricia Carol Cross	Staff assistant (terminated Jan. 11, 1974).	272.11
Catherine A. Evans	Staff assistant	5,668.30
Roger B. Furey	do	2,988.22
J. Ann Joseph	do	4,557.48
Robert Whitfield	Staff assistant (terminated Jan. 31, 1974).	1,047.70
Machele Miller	Staff assistant	5,518.09
Shirley Ruhe	do	7,333.92
Robert F. Spence	do	10,028.52
Toby J. Stein	do	4,884.97
Clyde E. Woodle, Jr	do	9,782.67
Olga Wynnyk	do	4,190.82
Charilyn W. Cowan	Staff assistant (effective Jan. 10, 1974).	3,800.02
Christine E. Teal	Staff assistant (effective Feb. 5, 1974) (terminated Apr. 30, 1974).	2,030.55
Harry Lee Stout	Staff assistant (effective Mar. 1, 1974).	4,666.68
Gail Ann Chase	Staff assistant (effective May 13, 1974).	1,066.67
Douglas W. Marshall	Staff assistant (effective May 20, 1974).	820.00
Catherine Lawson Hagaman.	Staff assistant (effective June 3, 1974).	833.33
Kevin J. Jennier	do	933.33
Elisabeth Forshay	Staff assistant (effective June 13, 1974).	575.00
Gordon E. Wood	Assistant minority counsel.	16,763.22
Sheldon S. Gilbert	do	16,523.28
Patricia A. Hill	Minority staff assistant	6,925.05
Richard C. Barnett	do	7,925.70
Brenda G. Jones	do	2,237.11
Alexandra R. Sassoon	do	5,346.23
Joanne Morrone Frantzich.	do	5,323.73
Cheryl Ann Meyers	do	5,080.48
Florence B. Edelen	Minority staff assistant (effective Apr. 15, 1974).	2,427.77
James Walter Brown	Minority staff assistant (effective June 10, 1974).	700.00
Errol Lee Tyler	Associate counsel	15,715.50
Joseph A. Italino	Editorial assistant	12,152.41
Marie M. Lynch	Clerk, Subcommittee on Water Resources.	7,907.27
Nancy B. Vitali	Clerk, Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.	8,721.93
Subcommittee on Economic Development:		
Robert Paul	Consultant, environment and economic development.	18,000.00
Carl J. Lorenz	Counsel	17,432.04
Margaret McCarthy	Staff assistant (terminated Jan. 31, 1974).	846.89
Anne Louise Howard	Staff assistant	5,668.12
Ann D. Clineburg	do	6,286.20
John Jeffery Carter	do	4,583.33
Nancy Denholm	Staff assistant (effective Feb. 19, 1974).	3,116.65
Subcommittee on Energy:		
Salvatore J. D'Amico	Counsel	17,936.64
Henry G. Edler	Technical adviser	18,000.00
Carole Dahlstedt	Clerk	8,381.58
Stephanie G. Negley	Staff assistant	6,286.20
Subcommittee on Investigations and Review:		
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	18,000.00
John P. O'Hara	Associate counsel	17,432.04
Robert G. Lawrence	do	18,000.00
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	18,000.00
William O. Nolen	Investigator	11,621.40
George P. Karseboom	Professional staff member.	15,688.86
Charles A. Krouse	do	15,688.86
B. Craig Raupe	do	15,663.12
Charles W. Prisk	Staff engineer (effective Jan. 1, 1974).	5,838.00
Walter L. Mazan	Professional staff member (effective June 15, 1974).	1,060.00
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	$11,015.52
Betty Hay Wright	Administrative assistant.	10,464.72
Agnes M. Ganum	Staff assistant	7,523.46
Shirley B. Novotny	do	7,263.36
Virginia Middledorf	do	6,600.54
John Brooks Harrington.	Staff assistant (effective Jan. 10, 1974).	1,710.00
Paul R. S. Yates	Minority staff director	17,624.82
Martha F. Downie	Minority staff assistant	7,995.33
Consultants:		
Stephen Clapp	Consultant	800.00
F. Robert Edman	do	10,900.00
Peter Jutro	do	1,060.00
Richard C. Royce	do	8,400.00
Max Taher	do	7,800.00
Chung-ming Wong	do	6,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 285	$1,519,700.00
H. Res. 987	1,394,480.00
Total	2,914,180.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,060,137.06
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1974	639,915.67
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973, to June 30, 1974.	1,700,052.73
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	1,214,127.27

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

July 22, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Dorothy Ballenger	Secretary	$7,857.78
Laurie C. Battle	Staff director and counsel.	18,000.00
Margaret Anne Bundick	Staff assistant	8,261.64
William D. Crosby, Jr	Minority counsel	13,218.60
Jonna Lynne Cullen	Assistant minority counsel.	9,996.60
Donald Gregory Nicosia	Majority counsel	9,429.30
Nancy J. Smith	Intern	233.33
Linda L. Trotter	Secretary	6,286.20
Winifred L. Watts	Administrative assistant.	11,015.52
Total		84,298.97

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,326.69
Amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 3, 1974	1,245.12
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1974	3,571.81
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	1,428.19

RAY J. MADDEN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John L. Swigert, Jr.	Executive director	$18,000.00
James E. Wilson, Jr.	Deputy director	18,000.00
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel	18,000.00
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	18,000.00
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	18,000.00
Mary Ann Robert	Administrative specialist.	8,373.92
Carol F. Rodgers	Secretary	7,832.42
June C. Stafford	do	7,950.00
Patricia J. Schwartz	do	6,049.25
Carl Swartz	Minority staff	13,882.02
Rebecca S. Wheeler	Secretary	4,966.68
Michael A. Superata	Minority staff (from Apr. 1, 1974).	5,250.00
Joseph Del Riego	Minority staff (to Jan. 19, 1974).	1,410.03
Investigative staff (H. Res. 793):		
William G. Wells, Jr.	Technical consultant	17,230.16
Helen Lee Fletcher	Secretary (from Mar. 27, 1974)	3,916.67
George W. Fisher	Special assistant to chairman.	18,000.00
Francis J. Giroux	Printing clerk	10,175.88
Harold A. Gould	Technical consultant	18,000.00
J. Thomas Ratchford	Science consultant	17,457.80
Leon F. Drozd, Jr.	Assistant to the chief clerk (from May 1, 1974).	3,000.00
Judith Ann Everett	Secretary	4,699.98
John D. Holmfeld	Science policy consultant	14,110.13
L. Kirk Hall	Technical specialist	8,059.00
Thomas N. Tate	Technical consultant and counsel.	14,280.63
Peggy Glynn Welch	Secretary	4,249.98
Mark D. Friedrichs	Research assistant (from Feb. 1, 1974)	2,500.00
William G. Carter	Publications clerk	4,993.35
Suzanne M. Stamper	Secretary (to June 21, 21, 1974)	4,675.00
Barbara A. Sutton	Secretary (from Mar. 16, 1974).	2,292.50
Linda Gene Craig	Secretary (to Mar. 31, 1974)	2,250.00
Martha N. Rees	Secretary (to Jan. 31, 1974).	1,245.46
Thomas H. Tackaberry	Research assistant (from June 3, 1974).	583.33
Ellen M. Barney	Clerical assistant (from June 20, 1974).	232.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$780,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	328,981.92
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	198,771.74
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973, to June 30, 1974	527,753.66
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	252,246.34

OLIN M. TEAGUE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

July 8, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Swanner	Staff director	$18,000.00
William F. Arbogast	Assistant staff director.	15,000.00
Mariann R. Mackenzie.	Secretary	12,572.40
Pamela Gray	Assistant clerk (May 28–June 30, 1974).	755.56
Nancy Nicholas	Assistant clerk (June 1–June 30, 1974).	500.00
Lynn Graham	Assistant clerk (June 19–30, 1974).	300.00
J. Charlene Brimmer	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1–May 31, 1974).	4,583.35

Funds authorized appropriated for committee expenditures H. Res 219 Mar. 20, 1973)	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,758.91
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	+677.39
Total amount expended from Mar. 20, 1973 to June 30, 1974	8,436.30
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	16,563.70

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

July 10, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	$18,000.00
Donald C. Knapp	Counsel	18,000.00
John R. Holden	Professional staff member (minority).	18,000.00
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aide	18,000.00
Arthur M. Gottschalk	Professional aide (minority).	12,202.44
Mack G. Fleming	Assistant counsel (from Apr. 8, 1974).	8,300.00
Helen A. Biondi	Clerk	11,664.00
Marjorie J. Kidd	Clerk stenographer	8,082.84
Patsy R. Kelley	Clerk stenographer, minority (to Jan. 22, 1974).	768.48
Candis L. Graves	Clerk stenographer	5,762.34
Morvie Ann Colby	do	8,451.36
Audrey P. Burnett	do	6,369.72
Barbara Lee Neff	Clerk stenographer, minority (from Feb. 1, 1974).	5,208.35
Investigative staff:		
Philip Eugene Howard	Investigator	17,888.88
Vance L. Gilliam	Records clerk	5,036.64
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk stenographer	3,666.96
Margaret Hulehan	do	5,762.34
Anne Steadman	do	6,705.00
Diane Sue Gaujot	Clerk stenographer (minority).	5,237.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$270,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	107,962.22
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	56,198.71
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974	164,160.93
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	105,839.07

WM. J. BRYAN DORN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

July 3, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Martin, Jr.	Chief counsel (P)	$18,000.00
Richard C. Wilbur	Minority counsel (P)	18,000.00
John Patrick Baker	Assistant chief counsel (P).	17,749.98
William Fullerton	Professional staff (P)	17,749.98
Robert B. Hill	do	14,710.14
William Kane	Professional staff (P) March/11.	7,001.38
James W. Kelley	Professional staff (P)	17,749.98
Harold Lamar	do	17,749.98
Arthur Singleton, Jr.	do	17,749.98
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	9,432.33
Virginia Butler	do	10,631.68
William C. Byrd	Staff assistant (C)	$7,345.72
Marie Crane	do	9,793.93
Connie Faulkner	do	5,183.58
Hughlon Greene	do	9,973.98
Charles Hawkins	do	17,749.98
Grace Kagan	do	11,077.53
June Kendall	do	13,217.20
Marilyn Lee	Staff assistant (C) from June 1.	958.33
Elizabeth Lieblich	Staff assistant (C)	6,068.42
Walter B. Little	do	9,973.98
Danna Palmer	do	5,874.96
Doris Parker	do	5,915.86
Marsha Powell	do	5,648.71
Jean Ratliff	do	7,080.69
Karen Schwarz	do	6,750.00
Gloria Shaver	do	10,580.35
Margo Shildkret	do	4,774.98
Carole Vazis	do	8,329.20
Under H. Res. 945, 93d Cong.:		
John Meagher		17,749.98
Robert Leonard (from Jan. 15).		9,222.24
Marilyn Lee (Feb. 1–May 31).		3,833.32
Robbye Meador (June 5–June 18).		202.22
Jan Wallace (June 5–June 18).		202.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$520,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	69,732.97
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	38,044.09
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974	107,777.06
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	412,222.94

WILBUR D. MILLS, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

July 10, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles S. Sheldon II	Chief of staff	$18,000.00
Melvin M. Miller	Deputy chief of staff	18,000.00
Gerald J. Grady	Professional staff member.	16,774.98
Spencer M. Beresford	Counsel	18,000.00
Linda H. Kamm	do	13,866.65
Robert C. Ketcham	Special counsel	15,715.50
Roger H. Davidson	Professional staff member.	16,999.98
Terence T. Finn	Staff consultant	10,725.00
Mary E. Zalar	Professional staff member.	8,250.00
Linda G. Stephenson	Chief clerk (to May 31).	6,711.55
Shirley A. Kalich	Secretary (to February 3).	1,109.16
Rose M. Sanko	Secretary (to March 19).	4,282.47
Carmen T. Bagherzadeh	Secretary (to February 24).	1,650.01
John Bannon Bachula	Research assistant	6,443.10
Ellen E. Leake	Secretary (begin February 11).	4,277.79
Barbara K. Rodriguez	Chief clerk (begin February 11).	4,486.12
Lorren V. Roth	Secretary (begin February 25).	3,058.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	343,410.88
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	219,391.23
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973, to June 30, 1974	562,802.11
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	937,197.89

RICHARD BOLLING, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RESTAURANT

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Campbell	Staff director	$11,095.66
Susan Cory Lawrence	Secretary—Resigned Mar. 15, 1974.	1,743.28
Denise Ann Bell	Secretary—Reported May 1, 1974.	1,116.66
Total		13,955.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$68,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	30,717.41
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	14,065.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973, to June 30, 1974	44,783.37
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	23,216.63

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Chairman.

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Emilia E. Parrish	Secretary	$6,499.98
Susan Burnette	do	625.00
William A. Keel, Jr.	Research analyst	18,000.00
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	12,499.98
Donna M. Watson	Secretary	5,375.01
Henry A. Robinson	Counsel	17,750.01
Peter D. H. Stockton	Staff assistant	4,500.00
Lois Liberty	Printing editor	9,000.00
Thomas G. Powers	Counsel	9,000.00
Elizabeth Cingel	Secretary	4,125.00
Justinus Gould	Counsel	17,500.02
William F. Demarest	do	9,000.00
Mary Eileen Hohman	Secretary	4,000.02
Howard Greenberg	Staff director	18,000.00
Lucille C. Hicks	Secretary	6,750.00
Kenneth H. Davison	Staff assistant	4,166.65
Michael J. Ward	Counsel	6,649.98
Linda Louise Hardin	Secretary	6,249.99
Charles D. Loyd	General counsel	3,000.00
James R. Phalen	Minority counsel	13,500.00
Paul Kritzer	Assistant minority counsel.	11,625.00
Elmira R. Stewart	Secretary, minority	4,625.01
Willa C. Rawls	do	5,874.99
Carol Ann Ward	do	5,124.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$994,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	470,182.77
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1974	217,777.48
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973, to June 30, 1974	687,960.25
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	306,039.75

JOE L. EVINS, Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Eugene F. Peters	Executive director	$18,000.00
Raymond L. Gooch	Staff counsel	15,977.40
Cynthia K. Watkins	Office manager	7,999.98
Donald G. Tacheron	Director of research	17,749.98
George Meader	Counsel	300.00
Ann Holoka	Staff assistant	3,666.95
Beverly Jean Muncy	Stenographer	2,328.21
Barbara C. Lyle	Receptionist/typist	3,479.16
Robert J. Kelley	Administrative officer	10,824.10
Susan B. Perry	Staff assistant	692.65
James F. McAllister	Administrative officer	14,405.88
Gerard C. Snow	do	6,428.72
March E. Dyer	Placement assistant (to Feb. 28).	1,484.24
Betty A. Franklin	do	1,500.00
John Gilman Stewart	Temporary clerk (to May 31).	5,000.00
Lee A. Riedel	Placement assistant (to Mar. 1).	1,378.14
William F. Walsh	Temporary clerk (to Jan. 31).	750.00
William B. Blacklow	Staff assistant	7,103.34
Mark L. Greenberg	Placement assistant (to Apr. 11).	2,311.48
Grace Seckler	Placement assistant	4,125.00
Sally K. Murphy	Placement assistant (to Jan. 31).	611.16
Sybil Anne Capps	Placement assistant	4,407.76
Simeon R. Orlowski	Temporary clerk (to April 30).	633.32
John Turner Donelan	Temporary clerk to Jan. 31).	312.50
Earl Francis Rieger	Counsel	9,333.33
Samuel Merrick	Staff assistant	7,500.00
Patricia Neal Gray	Temporary clerk	3,000.00
Linda Jo Richards	Stenographer	3,547.22
Francis J. Keenan	Professional staff	14,041.65
Mary C. Mundee	Placement assistant	3,041.68
Denise M. Berkley	Temporary clerk (Feb. 19 and 20).	41.67
David Robert Solomon	Placement assistant (from Feb. 20).	2,729.17
James Joseph Abrams	Placement assistant (from Feb. 25).	2,800.01
Dolores A. Cotter	Temporary clerk (Mar. 4–10).	145.83
Debra Dawn Rollyson	Temporary clerk (Mar. 25–27).	62.50
Margaret A. Borellis	Temporary clerk (Mar. 21–31).	208.33
Kathy Sue Hockenberry	Temporary clerk (Mar. 25–Apr. 1).	125.00
Henry David Rosso	Temporary clerk (Apr. 4–16).	281.67
Nancy Louise Emery	Placement assistant (from Apr 5).	1,552.79
David W. Schmucker	Placement assistant (Apr. 15–June 18).	1,333.33
Gerald P. McCartin	Temporary clerk (May 1–June 3).	2,000.00
J. E. Vandelly	do	3,000.00
Melanie E. Wolfram	Temporary clerk (May 9–31).	427.77
Julie S. Gross	Temporary clerk (May 1–June 30).	1,500.00
Laura May	Temporary clerk (May 20–26).	136.11
Peter B. Crouch	Temporary clerk (June 1–30).	1,500.00
Victor D. Petaccio	do	2,100.00
David W. Savercool	Temporary clerk (from June 3).	466.67
Susan Ellen Shapiro	Temporary clerk (June 1 to 30).	1,000.00
Terrence John McCartin	Temporary clerk (from June 1).	750.00
Nina Swan Davis	Placement assistant (from June 27).	88.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$530,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	213,621.02
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	211,868.51
Total amount expended from July 1, 1973, to June 30, 1974	$425,489.53
Invoices received, pending payment	6,698.96
Obligated, but not billed: Approximately	7,500.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	104,510.47

LEE METCALF, Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

July 11, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold J. Warren	Staff director and counsel.	$18,000.00
Cary H. Copeland	Assistant staff director	13,514.94
Robert S. Riggs	Professional staff	5,971.92
Robert B. Geddie, Jr.	do	7,857.78
J. Michael Hemphill	do	12,286.38
Ruth Baskerville	Secretary	5,272.02
Edward A. Sokol	Professional staff	9,167.40
Ed McMurphy	Clerk	660.35
William Kling, Jr.	do	588.57

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$152,105.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	71,269.50
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	75,476.58
Total amount expended from July 1, 1973, to June 30, 1974	146,746.08
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	5,358.92

JOHN SPARKMAN, Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

July 15, 1974.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1974, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurence N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	$19,999.98
Lincoln Arnold	Deputy chief of staff	18,000.00
Herbert L. Chabot	Assistant chief of staff	18,000.00
Arthur S. Fefferman	Chief economist	18,000.00
Bernard M. Shapiro	Legislation counsel	17,842.50
Harrison B. McCawley	Refund counsel	16,886.27
James H. Symons	Statistical analyst	18,000.00
John Germanis	do	15,869.73
Michael D. Bird	Economist	18,000.00
Albert Buckberg	do	17,842.50
Leon W. Klud	do	12,296.65
James W. Wetzler	do	9,372.93
Howard J. Silberstone	Legislation attorney	16,366.23
Robert A. Warden	do	16,366.23
Robert A. Blum	do	14,411.65
Thomas R. White III	do	15,846.25
Mark L. McConaghy	do	13,933.73

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James L. Billinger	Legislation attorney	$13,544.15
Paul W. Oosterhuis	do	8,006.68
Joseph P. Spellman	Refund attorney	12,556.67
Carl E. Bates	do	12,531.67
Joseph E. Fink	Statistical clerk	12,515.00
Cynthia F. Wallace	do	6,925.40
Allan S. Rosenbaum	Accountant	13,247.08
Joanne B. McDermott	Secretary	10,227.48
Linda R. Savage	do	7,923.35
Blanche F. Nagro	do	7,569.58
Jamie L. Daley	do	7,187.10
Marcia B. Rowzie	do	7,047.92
Jacqueline S. Pfeiffer	do	7,022.92
June M. Matthews	do	6,508.32
Amelia Del Carmen	do	6,374.17
Alexa B. Gage	do	6,103.73
Maria L. Winter	do	5,939.60
Ellen I. Woodriff	do	5,594.17
Sharon F. Malcom	do	5,109.60
Michael Cook	Clerk	4,875.02
John J. King	Administrative assistant (as of Jan. 3, 1974).	10,961.10
Richard L. Bacon	Legislation attorney (as of Mar. 21, 1974).	8,888.90
Don L. Ricketts	Legislation attorney (as of Mar. 18 1974).	7,522.23
Meade Emory	Legislation attorney (as of June 4, 1974).	2,475.00
Donald C. Evans	Legislation attorney (to Jan. 12, 1974).	897.53
Norma E. Kershner	Secretary (as of Feb. 25, 1974).	4,200.00
Elizabeth A. Dale	Secretary (as of Feb. 13, 1974).	4,600.00
Elizabeth Ruth	Secretary (from Jan. 15 to Mar. 8, 1974).	2,089.92
Theresa Sbarra	Secretary (to Feb. 7, 1974).	1,141.45
Peter J. Davis	Econometrician (as of Apr. 22, 1974).	2,587.50
Herman Wommack	Clerk (as of May 28, 1974).	733.34
Guy Richard Eigenbrode.	Clerk (as of June 3, 1974).	622.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,021,180.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	456,313.52
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1974	512,372.11
Total amount expended from July 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974	968,685.63
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1974	52,494.37

RUSSELL B. LONG, Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2611. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting notice of the proposed disposal of certain lethal chemical warfare agents and munitions, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2612. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92-403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2613. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on benefit provisions, financial data, and key issues relating to Federal retirement systems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 16077. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend through fiscal year 1975 the scholarship program for the National Health Service Corps and the loan program for health professions students; (Rept. No. 93-1240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 16168. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 15172. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to prescribe the fee for execution of an application for a passport and to continue to transfer to the U.S. Postal Service the execution fee for each application accepted by that Service (Rept. No. 93-1242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13320. A bill to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (Rept. No. 93-1243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PIKE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16136. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. House Concurrent Resolution 564. Concurrent resolution to declare the sense of Congress that Smokey Bear shall be returned on his death to his place of birth, Capitan, N. Mex. (Rept. No. 93-1245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7486. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Boston National Historical Park in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8352. A bill to establish the Cascade Head Scenic-Research Area in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 16177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $5,000 exemption from income tax, in the case of an individual or a married couple, for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 16178. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to repeal the recently added provision for the establishment of Professional Standards Review Organizations to review services covered under the medicare and medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. DOWNING):

H.R. 16179. A bill to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 in order to strengthen the import restrictions which may be imposed to deter foreign countries from conducting fishing operations which adversely affect international fishery conservation programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 16180. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the income limitations relating to the payment of pension and dependency and indemnity compensation and to provide supplemental pension payments to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H.R. 16181. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16182. A bill to incorporate the United States Submarine Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16183. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, by adding a section 552a to safeguard individual privacy from the misuse of Federal records and to provide that individuals be granted access to records concerning them which are maintained by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.R. 16184. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 90 miles to the Interstate System and provide for the inclusion of a critical north-south highway corridor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURTHA (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. DULSKI):

H.R. 16185. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 337 miles to the Interstate System and provide for the inclusion of a critical north-south highway corridor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16186. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 320 miles to the Interstate System and provide for the inclusion of a critical north-south highway corridor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURTHA (for himself, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DULSKI):

H.R. 16187. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 272 miles to the Interstate System and provide for the inclusion of a critical north-south highway corridor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURTHA (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. DULSKI):

H.R. 16188. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 522 miles to the Interstate System and provide for the inclusion of a critical north-south highway corridor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 16189. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers with respect to the labeling and advertising of special dietary foods, such as vitamins and minerals, et cetera; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DRINAN, Ms. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 16190. A bill to regulate lobbying and related activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 16191. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 16192. A bill to allow an additional income exemption for a taxpayer or his spouse

who is deaf or deaf-blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 16193. A bill to prohibit certain conflicts of interest between financial institutions and corporations regulated by certain agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 16194. A bill to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act by designating certain lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, to provide for study of certain additional lands for such inclusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GUDE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. HEINZ):

H.R. 16195. A bill to require candidates for Federal office, Members of the Congress, and officers and employees of the United States to file statements with the Comptroller General with respect to their income and financial transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LENT, Mr. KYROS, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 16196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the interest on deposits in certain savings institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBER:

H.R. 16197. A bill to establish a Commission on Medical Malpractice Awards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 16198. A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish fire safety requirements for locomotives in order to minimize the danger of fires along railroad right-of-ways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16199. A bill to amend section 4945 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that nothing in that provision authorizes the limitation of the grants awarded by a private foundation to a fixed percentage of the number of applicants for such grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 16200. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, marital status, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 16201. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DELANEY, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. PEYSER):

H.R. 16202. A bill to establish in the Department of Housing and Urban Development a housing enforcement assistance program to aid cities and other municipalities in the more effective enforcement of housing codes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 16203. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in, Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 16204. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assure the development of a national health policy and of effective area and State health planning and resources development programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 16205. A bill to provide emergency deficiency assistance to producers of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 16206. A bill to require that discharge certificates issued to members of the armed forces not indicate the conditions or reasons for discharge, to limit the separation of enlisted members under conditions other than honorable and to improve the procedures for the review of discharges and dismissals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 16207. A bill to provide for emergency relief for small business concerns in connection with fixed price Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. QUIE):

H. Con. Res. 570. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 69; ordered to be printed.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 571. Concurrent resolution for negotiations on the Turkish opium ban; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Con. Res. 572. Concurrent resolution calling for a domestic summit to develop a unified plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCOLLISTER:

H. Con. Res. 573. Concurrent resolution calling for a domestic summit to develop a unified plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEINZ (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 1281. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Res. 1282. Resolution providing for additional copies of the committee print, a staff study entitled "Terrorism"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. REES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WAGGONNER):

H. Res. 1283. 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 16208. A bill for the relief of the estate of Earnest Nancy Brindley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 16209. A bill for the relief of Chae Won Yang, Myung Jae Yang, Yoo Jung Yang, Jee Sun Yang, Yoo Sun Yang, and Hong Suk Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 16210. A bill for the relief of Maria Elena San Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FEDERAL FOOLISHNESS

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have discussed in the Senate my friend, Jack Rider, who operates Stations WFTC and WRNS, in Kinston, N.C.

If there is a more forthright broadcaster in America, it has not been my privilege to listen to him. Jack writes and presents a daily editorial, called "Editorially Speaking," for his stations. And, as I have said before, when Jack Rider speaks out, the people for miles around listen attentively and, for the most part, approvingly.

On July 17, Jack Rider presented an editorial that has come to my attention. As I read it, it was my immediate judgment that other Senators would be interested in his comment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jack Rider's "Editorially Speaking" of July 17 be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING

(By Jack Rider)

Government is by consent of the governed, and I can only wonder how long the people are going to keep consenting to far worse invasions against their freedom than King George ever dreamed about in his wildest fantasies. Consider this: Monday we and thousands of other people who have from time to time sold anything to the Du Pont Company received a form letter, which cost the Du Pont Company about 50 cents to get out to every supplier it has all across the nation. The cost of this red-tape compliance, of course, has to be added to all the products Du Pont manufacturers . . . but the political cost is far, far worse than the fractional increase it causes in the price of Dacron or