lowing Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated: Mr. McGovern, Mr. Bentsen, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Robert C. Byrd.

There will then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited to 5 minutes each, at the conclusion of which the Senate may take up the conference report on H.R. 14715, White House employment. Presumably there will be a rollcall vote on the adoption of that conference report.

At some point during the session tomorrow Mr. Ribicoff, I am advised, will offer a motion to invoke cloture on the consumer protection bill, S. 707. The vote on that motion to occur on Thursday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:57 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 6, 1974, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 5, 1974:

Nattional Corporation for Housing Partnerships

Henry F. Trione, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships for the term expiring October 27, 1977. (Reappointment)

In the Air Force

The following officer under the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 8066 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under Subsection (a) of Section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Richard F. Shaefer, [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, August 5, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Fear the Lord and serve Him in truth with all your heart; for consider what great things He has done for you.—I Samuel 12: 24.

Almighty and eternal God, our refuge and strength in times of trouble, look with Thy favor upon all who serve in the Congress of our United States of America. Grant unto them wisdom to walk worthily in Thy wonderful ways and so direct their decisions and elevate their endeavors that justice may be done at home and abroad, that peace may come to our world, and that good will may be established among the nations.

Make us strong in spirit as a republic, great in goodness as a people, and firm in our faith in Thee as Thy children.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 12884. An act to designate certain lands as wilderness;

H.R. 14723. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 to change the date on which the President must report to Congress concerning Government assisted services to rural areas;

H.R. 14883. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 2-year period, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15155. An act making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15405. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15155) entitled "An act making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes" disagreed to the House; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Stennis, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Robert C. Byrd, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Young, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Case, and Mr. Randolph to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15405) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Robert C. Byrd, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Bible, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Case, Mr. Young, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Mathias, and Mr. Schweiker to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 821) entitled "An act 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" agrees to a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Bayh, Mr. Eastland, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Hart, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Hugh Scott, Mr. Cook, and Mr. Mathias to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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 House to the bill (S. 2296) entitled "An act to provide for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to protect, develop, and enhance the environment of certain of the Nation's lands and resources, 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. 14012) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes" and that the Senate agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 31, 37, 69 and that it receded from its amendment numbered 51, to the foregoing bill.

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

S. 857. An act to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to plan museum support facilities;

S. 2189. An act to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954;

S. 3537. An act to modify section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1085);

S. 3578. An act for the relief of Anita Tomasi;

S.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to salute Chautauqua Institution on the occasion of its one hundredth anniversary; and

S. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Public Financing of Federal Elections."

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE TO GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13267) to authorize Federal agricultural assistance to Guam for certain purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I find in the report accompanying this bill, submitted by the Committee on Agriculture, that the cost of this bill is not at all clear. As a matter of fact, the bill is open ended.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, unless further information is provided, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 2634 OF TITLE X, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SHIPMENT AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE OF MOTOR VEHICLES OWNED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16006) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the shipment at Government expense of motor vehicles owned by members of the Armed Forces, and to amend chapter 10 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize certain travel and transportation allowances to members of the uniformed services incapacitated by illness.

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

H.R. 16006

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2634(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (2);

(2) striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(4) in the case of movement, the major portion of which is by shipping services described in clause (1) or (2), by other surface transportation between customary ports of embarkation and debarkation if such means of transport does not exceed the cost to the United States of other authorized means.".

SEC. 2. Section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) When there has been a shipping error, or when orders directing a change of permanent station have been canceled, revoked, or modified after receipt by the member, a motor vehicle transported pursuant to this section may also be reshipped or transshipped in accordance with this section.".

SEC. 3. (1) Subsection (b) of section 554, title 37, United States Code, is amended by—

(A) inserting "ill," before "or absent for a period of more than 29 days in a missing status—"; and

(B) striking out "(if injured)" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "(if injured or ill)".

(2) Subsection (c) of section 554, title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or ill" before "status,".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by section 3 of this Act shall apply with respect to members of the uniformed services incapacitated by illness on or after January 1, 1974.

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

DESIGNATING THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN COLUMBIA, MO., AS THE "HARRY S. TRUMAN MEMORIAL VETERANS' HOSPITAL"

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10212) to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital in Columbia, Mo., as the "Harry S. Truman Memorial Veterans' Hospital," and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 10212

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, Missouri, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Harry S. Truman Memorial Veterans' Hospital". Any reference to such hospital in any law, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to it as the Harry S. Truman Memorial Veterans' Hospital.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to provide such memorial at the above-named hospital as he may deem suitable to preserve the remembrance of the late Harry S. Truman.

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

AMENDING TITLE 38 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE TO CORRECT AN INEQUITY IN THE LAW RELATING TO ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT FOR AUTOMOBILES USED BY DISABLED VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12367) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to correct an inequity in the law relating to the provisions of adaptive equipment for automobiles used by disabled veterans and servicemen.

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

H.R. 12367

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1902(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "previously or" immediately before "subsequently".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect January 11, 1971.

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

DISCONTINUING OR MODIFYING CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF LAW

The Clerk read the bill (H.R. 14718) to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law.

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

H.R. 14718

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following reporting requirements, which relate to the submission of certain reports to Congress or other Government authority, are hereby repealed, as follows:

"REPORTS UNDER MORE THAN ONE AGENCY

"(1) The annual report to the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress concerning grants for basic scientific research (72 Stat. 1793; 42 U.S.C. 1893).

"(2) The report from time to time to the Congress, by the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Navy, concerning the conditions specified in section 1 of Public Law 83–547 involving facilities to provide water for irrigation, etc., from the San Margarita River, California (68 Stat. 578).

"REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"(3) The annual report to Congress showing total expenditures for food and other subsistence supplies, for resale to employees of the Department of Commerce and other Federal agencies, and their dependents in Alaska and other points outside of the continental United States, and the proceeds from such resales (63 Stat. 908; 15 U.S.C. 1514(b)).

"(4) The annual report to Congress, through the Treasury Department, of claims not to exceed $500 settled under the Act of June 5, 1920, and the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due the claimants (41 Stat. 1504; 33 U.S.C. 853).

"REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

"(5) The annual report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Air Force on the number of officers in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force and the justification therefor (10 U.S.C. 8031(c)).

"(6) The quarterly report by the Secretary of the Army to the Congress on the number of officers in the executive part of the Department of the Army, the number of commissioned officers on or with the Army General Staff, and the justification therefor (10 U.S.C. 3031(c)).

"(7) The quarterly reports by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning items ordered, but yet to be delivered, against reserves of unobligated amounts of allocations for military assistance and, those reports required not less often than each quarter containing a detailed breakdown, on a delivery or service rendered basis, on all military assistance funds allocated and available to the Department of Defense as of the end of the preceeding quarter (69 Stat. 439; 70 Stat. 735).

"REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"(8) The annual report of the National Center for Deaf Blind Youths and Adults, through the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the Congress with comments and recommendations as the Secretary deems appropriate (81 Stat. 251; 29 U.S.C. 42a(c)(2)).

"REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

"(9) The annual report by the Secretary to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, of the Senate identifying specific areas of program administration and man-

agement which require improvement, describing actions taken and proposed for the purpose of making such improvements, and recommending such legislation as may be necessary to accomplish such improvements (82 Stat. 477; 84 Stat. 1816; 12 U.S.C. 1701c note).

"REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"(10) The annual report by the Secretary to the President, and transmitted by the President to the Congress, relating to a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River as required by section 3 of Public Law 89-605, as amended (80 Stat. 848; 84 Stat. 203).

"(11) The annual report to the Congress by the Secretary on acquisitions of land and interests in land, or agreements entered into with respect to land, necessary to preserve, protect, and improve Antietam Battlefield, Maryland (74 Stat. 80; 10 U.S.C. 43000).

"(12) The annual report to the Congress by the Secretary on actions taken under the program for sealing of abandoned coal mines or the filling of voids in abandoned coal mines (69 Stat. 353; 76 Stat. 935; 30 U.S.C. 575).

"(13) The annual report to the Congress by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Mines, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the research laboratory in the lignite consuming region of North Dakota (62 Stat. 85; 30 U.S.C. 403).

"(14) The annual report to the Congress by the Secretary on the operations of programs to stimulate exploration for minerals within the United States, its territories and possessions together with his recommendations regarding the need for such programs (72 Stat. 701; 79 Stat. 1312; 30 U.S.C. 645).

"(15) The reports to the Congress by the Secretary of all laws passed by the Legislature of Guam as reported to the Secretary by the Governor of Guam (64 Stat. 389; 48 U.S.C. 1423i).

"(16) The annual progress report, through the Secretary, by the tribal business committee representing the full-blood group of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, of its activities and the expenditures authorized under Public Law 83-671 (68 Stat. 877; 25 U.S.C. 677w).

"(17) The report to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, on every loan made under the Act of November 4, 1963, Public Law 88-168 (77 Stat. 301; 25 U.S.C. 70n-3).

"(18) The semiannual report to the Congress of negotiated contracts for the disposition of materials or products on public lands (76 Stat. 588; 30 U.S.C. 602(b)).

"(19) The annual report to the Congress by the Secretary on all agreements whereby the United States or its lessees shall be compensated for drainage of oil or gas from United States owned land resulting from wells drilled on adjacent lands (74 Stat. 783; 30 U.S.C. 226(g)).

"(20) The submission to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of copies of grants, contracts, and other matching arrangements, sixty days prior to award of same, under section 200(a) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (80 Stat. 130; 42 U.S.C. 1961b(b)).

"(21) The report to Congress by the Secretary, from time to time, on classifications and reclassifications of reclamation project lands (53 Stat. 1193; 43 U.S.C. 458g(f)).

"(22) The report to the Congress by the Secretary, at the end of each five-year period after incorporation of Boulder City concerning the need for assistance to the municipality for its water supply (72 Stat. 1374).

"REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

"(23) The semiannual report to appropriate committees of the Congress by the Secretary on agreements providing for the detail of members of the armed services to the Federal Aviation Administration (72 Stat. 745; 49 U.S.C. 1343(a)(3)).

"(24) The biennial authorization requests to the Congress by the Secretary together with his recommendations regarding adjustments in the schedule for liquidation of obligations pursuant to section 4(d) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (84 Stat. 965; 49 U.S.C. 1603(d)).

"REPORTS UNDER THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

"(25) The triennial report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by the Commission on a full review of its activities under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 483; 42 U.S.C. 2314).

"REPORTS UNDER THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

"(26) The annual report to the Congress submitted by the Director through the President concerning officers or employees whose compensation is subject to the limitation set forth in section 610-1(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and who were receiving at the end of the fiscal year a salary of $10,000 or more per year (80 Stat. 1470; 42 U.S.C. 2951(b))."

SEC. 2. The frequencies of submission of the following reports to the Congress or other Government authority are hereby modified as follows:

"(1) From quarterly to semiannual submission to the President and to the Congress by the Secretary of Commerce of a report on his operations under the Export Administration Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 846; 50 U.S.C. App. 2409).

"(2) From semiannual to annual submission to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by the Secretary of Defense of a progress report on the cataloging program and a report on the progress of the standardization program (10 U.S.C. 2455).

"(3) From not less often than quarterly to annual submission to the Congress by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of a report on contributions to the States for civil defense purposes (report now required from the Secretary of Defense pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1958, 72 Stat. 1799, as implemented by Executive Order Numbered 10952, 26 F.R. 6577) (64 Stat. 1251; 50 U.S.C. App. 2281(i)).

"(4) From semiannual to annual submission to the Congress, by the Secretary of Defense, of reports concerning lethal and nonlethal chemical and biological agents (83 Stat. 209; 50 U.S.C. 1511).

"(5) From semiannual to annual submission to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, by the Secretary of each military department, on the administration of (10 U.S.C. 1674(f)).

"(6) From as soon as possible after the approval of any project to annual submission to the Congress of a report by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on projects approved under section 1120(a) of the Social Security Act (81 Stat. 920; 42 U.S.C. 1320(b)).

"(7) From semiannual to annual submission to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, by the Secretary of the Interior, of a report on all actions taken pursuant to Public Law 87-626 (76 Stat. 427; 43 U.S.C. 31(c))."

SEC. 3. To modify substantive aspects of certain requirements to report to Congress or other Government authority; the following provisions of law are hereby amended as follows:

(1) Section 410(d) of Public Law 91-121, approved November 19, 1969 (83 Stat. 212; 50 U.S.C. 1436(d)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than December 31 of each year, file with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report on persons who have filed reports with him for the preceding fiscal year pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section. The Secretary shall include in the report such information as he deems appropriate and shall list the defense contractors for whom these persons worked or for whom they performed services."

(2) Section 1308(b) of title 5 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commission shall report annually to the President for transmittal to Congress on the administration of chapter 41 of this title, including the information received by the Commission from the agencies under section 4113(b)(3) of this title."

(3) Section 705(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 258; 42 U.S.C. 2000e 4(d)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the action it has taken and the moneys it has disbursed. It shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable."

(4) Section 4(d) of the Federal Water Power Act, as amended (49 Stat. 840; 16 U.S.C. 797(d)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) To make public from time to time the information secured hereunder and to provide for the publication of its reports and investigations in such form and manner as may be best adapted for public information and use. The Commission shall submit, as part of its annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year preceding, a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued under this part, and in each case the parties thereto, the term prescribed, and the money received if any, or account thereof."

(5) Section 8 of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (80 Stat. 1300; 15 U.S.C. 1457) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Each officer or agency required or authorized by this Act to promulgate regulations for the packaging or labeling of any consumer commodity, or to participate in the development of voluntary product standards with respect to any consumer commodity under procedures referred to in section 5(d) of the Act, shall transmit to the Congress each year a report containing a full and complete description of the activities of that officer or agency for the administration and enforcement of this Act during the preceding fiscal year. All agencies except the Federal Trade Commission shall submit their report in January of each year. The Federal Trade Commission shall include this report in the Commission's annual report to Congress."

(6) Section 2304(c) of title 10 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) A report shall be made to Congress, on May 19 and November 19 of each year, by each agency subject to this chapter, except the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of the purchases and contracts made under clauses (11) and (16) of subsection (a) during the period since the date of the last reports. The report shall—

"(1) name each contractor;

"(2) state the amount of each contract; and

"(3) describe, with consideration of the national security, the property and services covered by each contract."

(7) Section 3(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 451; 29 U.S.C. 153(c)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed."

(8) Section 10(a) of the Small Business Act, as amended (75 Stat. 666; 15 U.S.C. 639 (a)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Administration shall make a report on December 31 of each year of operations under this Act to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall provide summary information on business concerns for whom financing is arranged by the Administration, together with the amounts involved."

With the following committee amendment:

That certain provisions of law, which relate to the submission of reports to Congress or other Government authorities, are repealed as follows:

REPORTS UNDER MORE THAN ONE AGENCY

(1) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes", approved September 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 1793; 42 U.S.C. 1893), is repealed thereby eliminating the annual report under such Act to the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress concerning grants for basic scientific research.

(2) Section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, military, and other uses from the Santa Margarita River, California, and for other purposes", approved July 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 578), is repealed, thereby eliminating the report from time to time to the Congress, by the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Navy, concerning the conditions specified in section 1 of such Act involving facilities to provide water for irrigation and other uses from the Santa Margarita River, California.

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(3) Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes", approved October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 908; 15 U.S.C. 1514 (b)), is amended by striking out ": *Provided*" and all that follows thereafter to the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, thereby eliminating the annual report to Congress showing total expenditures under such Act for food and other subsistence supplies for resale to employees of the Department of Commerce and other Federal agencies, and their dependents, in Alaska and other points outside of the continental United States, and the proceeds from such resales.

(4) Chapter 256 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine claims for damage occasioned by acts for which said survey is responsible in certain cases", approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1054; 33 U.S.C. 853), is amended by striking out ", and report the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due the claimants to Congress at each session thereof through the Treasury Department for payment as legal claims out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor." and inserting in lieu thereof a period, thereby eliminating the annual report to Congress, through the Treasury Department, of claims not to exceed $500 settled under such Act, and the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due the claimants.

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(5) Section 8031(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof, thereby eliminating the annual report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Air Force on the number of officers in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force and the justification therefor.

(6) Section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof, thereby eliminating the quarterly report by the Secretary of the Army to the Congress on the number of officers in the executive part of the Department of the Army, the number of commissioned officers on or with the Army General Staff and the justification therefor.

(7) Section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriations Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 439), is amended by striking out *"Provided,"*, where it first appears, and all that follows thereafter down to and including *"Provided further,"*, where it first appears, and inserting in lieu thereof *"Provided,"*, and section 102 of the Mutual Security Appropriations Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 734), is repealed, thereby eliminating the quarterly reports by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning items ordered, but yet to be delivered, against reserves of unobligated amounts of allocations for military assistance and those reports required not less often than each quarter containing a detailed breakdown, on a delivery or service-rendered basis, on all military assistance funds allocated and available to the Department of Defense as of the end of the preceding quarter.

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

(8) Section 16(c) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (81 Stat. 251; 20 U.S.C. 42a (c)), is amended by striking out paragraph (2) and by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, thereby eliminating the annual report of the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, through the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the Congress with comments and recommendations as the Secretary deems appropriate.

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(9) Section 5 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 477; 12 U.S.C. 1701c note) is repealed, thereby eliminating the annual report by the Secretary to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate, identifying specific areas of program administration and management which require improvement, describing actions taken and proposed for the purpose of making such improvements, and recommending such legislation as may be necessary to accomplish such improvements.

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(10) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program", approved September 26, 1966 (80 Stat. 848), is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of the Interior shall serve as the representative of the United States in such negotiations and shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies concerned.", thereby eliminating the annual report by the Secretary to the President, and transmitted by the President to the Congress, relating to a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River, as required by such section.

(11) The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection and preservation of the Antietam Battlefield in the State of Maryland", approved April 22, 1960 (74 Stat. 80; 16 U.S.C. 430oo), is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof, thereby eliminating the annual report to the Congress by the Secretary on acquisitions of land and interests in land, or agreements entered into with respect to land, necessary to preserve, protect, and improve Antietam Battlefield, Maryland.

(12) Section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 353; 76 Stat. 935; 30 U.S.C. 575), is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof, thereby eliminating the annual report to the Congress by the Secretary on actions taken under the program for sealing of abandoned coal mines or the filling of voids in abandoned coal mines.

(13) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the North Dakota lignite-consuming region for investigation of the mining, preparation, and utilization of lignite, for the development of new uses and markets, for improvement of health and safety in mining; and for a comprehensive study of the possibilities for increased utilization of the lignite resources of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems and to make its natural and human resources of maximum usefulness in the reconversion period and time of peace", approved March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85; 30 U.S.C. 403), is repealed, thereby eliminating the annual report to the Congress by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Mines, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the research laboratory in the lignite-consuming region of North Dakota.

(14) Section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 701; 79 Stat. 1312; 30 U.S.C. 645), is repealed, thereby eliminating the annual report to the Congress by the Secretary on the operations of programs to stimulate exploration for minerals within the United States, its territories and possessions together with his recommendations regarding the need for such programs.

(15) Section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 389; 82 Stat. 847; 48 U.S.C. 1423i) is amended in the last sentence thereof by striking out "Act, and by him to the Congress of the United States, which" and inserting in lieu thereof "Act. The Congress of the United States", thereby eliminating the reports to the Congress by the Secretary of all laws passed by the Legislature of Guam as reported to the Secretary by the Governor of Guam.

(16) Section 24 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the partition and distribution of the assets of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah between the mixed-blood and full-blood members thereof; and for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the mixed-blood members of said tribe; to provide a development program for the full-blood members of said tribe; and for other purposes", approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 877; 25 U.S.C. 677w), is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof, thereby eliminating the annual progress report, through the Secretary, by the tribal business committee representing the full-blood group of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and

Ouray Reservation in Utah, of its activities and the expenditures authorized under such Act.

(17) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission", approved November 4, 1963 (77 Stat. 301; 25 U.S.C. 70n–3), is repealed, thereby eliminating the report to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, on every loan made under such Act.

(18) Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States", approved July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681; 76 Stat. 588, 30 U.S.C. 602) is amended by striking out "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 2." and by striking out subsection (b) thereof, thereby eliminating the semiannual report to the Congress of negotiated contracts for the disposition of materials or products on public lands.

(19) Section 17(g) of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain", approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 443; 74 Stat. 783; 30 U.S.C. 226(g)), is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof, thereby eliminating the annual report to the Congress by the Secretary on all agreements whereby the United States or its lessees, shall be compensated for drainage of oil or gas from United States-owned land resulting from wells drilled on adjacent lands.

(20) Section 200 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (80 Stat. 130; 42 U.S.C. 1961b) is amended by striking out "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 200." and by striking out subsection (b) thereof, thereby eliminating the requirement of the submission to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of a copy of each grant, contract, and matching or other arrangement, sixty days prior to the award of any such grant, contract, or other arrangement under subsection (a) of such section.

(21) Section 8 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1193; 43 U.S.C. 485g) is amended by striking out subsection (f) and redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively, thereby eliminating the report to Congress by the Secretary, from time to time, on classifications and reclassifications of reclamation project lands.

(22) Section 9(e) of the Boulder City Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1734) is amended by striking out "and shall report his findings and recommendations to the Congress as soon thereafter as practicable." and inserting in lieu thereof a period, thereby eliminating the report to the Congress by the Secretary, at the end of each five-year period after incorporation of Boulder City concerning the need for assistance to the municipality for its water supply.

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

(23) Section 302(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 745; 49 U.S.C. 1343 (a)) is amended by striking out paragraph (3) thereof, thereby eliminating the semiannual report to appropriate committees of the Congress by the Secretary on agreements providing for the detail of members of the armed services to the Federal Aviation Administration.

(24) Section 4(d) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (84 Stat. 965; U.S.C. 1603(d)) is amended by striking out the second sentence and all that follows to the end of the subsection, thereby eliminating the biennial authorization requests under such section to the Congress by the Secretary together with his recommendations regarding adjustments in the schedule for liquidation of obligations.

REPORTS UNDER THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

(25) Section 102 of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 483; 42 U.S.C. 2314) is repealed, thereby eliminating the triennial report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by the Commission on a full review of its activities under such Act.

REPORTS UNDER THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(26) Section 610–1 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (80 Stat. 1470; 42 U.S.C. 2951) is amended by striking out subsection (b), and by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b), thereby eliminating the annual report to the Congress submitted by the Director through the President concerning officers or employees whose compensation is subject to the limitation set forth in subsection (a) of such Act and who were receiving at the end of the fiscal year a salary of $10,000 or more per year.

SEC. 2. The frequency of submission of certain reports to the Congress or other Government authorities is modified as follows:

(1) Section 10 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 846; 50 U.S.C. App. 2409) is amended by striking out "quarterly report, within 45 days after each quarter," and inserting in lieu thereof "semiannual report", thereby changing the frequency of submission of the report to the President and Congress by the Secretary of Commerce of his operations under such Act.

(2) Section 2455 of title 10, United States Code, is amended in subsections (a) and (b) thereof by striking out "and July 31" by striking out "six-month period", and inserting in lieu thereof "yearly period", by striking out "June 30 or", and by striking out ", whichever was later." and inserting in lieu thereof a period, thereby changing the requirements under such section of a semiannual to an annual submission to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by the Secretary of Defense of a progress report on the cataloging program and a report on the progress of the standardization program.

(3) The report on contributions to the States for civil defense purposes required of the Secretary of Defense as a result of section 1 of the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799) and section 1 of Executive Order Number 10952 (26 F.R. 6577), pursuant to section 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1251), shall be submitted to Congress annually, in lieu of quarterly as previously required by such section 201(i).

(4) Section 409 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes", approved November 19, 1969 (83 Stat. 209; 50 U.S.C. 1511) is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to Congress on or before January 31 setting forth the amounts spent during the preceding year for research, development, test, and evaluation of all lethal and nonlethal chemical and biological agents.", thereby changing the requirement for submission of the report under such section from semiannual to annual.

(5) Section 1120(b) of the Social Security Act (81 Stat. 920; 42 U.S.C. 1320(b)) is amended by striking out all that follows "(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress setting forth a description of each project approved under subsection (a) during the year preceding such report, including a statement of the purpose, probable cost, and expected duration of each such project.", thereby changing the requirement of submission of such report from as soon as possible after the approval of any project to an annual submission to the Congress by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on each project approved under subsection (a) of such section.

(6) Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to extend certain authority of the Secretary of the Interior exercised through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, to areas outside the national domain", approved September 5, 1962 (76 Stat. 427; 43 U.S.C. 31(c)), is amended by striking out "and July 31", by striking out "six months" and inserting in lieu thereof "year", and by striking out "and June 30", thereby changing the requirement under such section from a semiannual to an annual submission to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, by the Secretary of the Interior, of a report on all actions taken pursuant to such Act.

SEC. 3. To modify substantive aspects of certain requirements to report to Congress or other Government authority, the following provisions of law are hereby amended as follows:

(1) Section 410(d) of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes", approved November 19, 1969 (83 Stat. 212; 50 U.S.C. 1436(d)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than December 31 of each year, file with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report on persons who have filed reports with him for the preceding fiscal year pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section. The Secretary shall include in the report such information as he deems appropriate and shall list the defense contractors for whom these persons worked or for whom they performed services.".

(2) Section 705(e) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 258; 42 U.S.C. 2000e–4(d)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the action it has taken and the moneys it has disbursed. It shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable."

(3) Section 4(d) of the Federal Water Power Act, as amended (49 Stat. 840; 16 U.S.C. 797(d)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) To make public from time to time the information secured hereunder and to provide for the publication of its reports and investigations in such form and manner as may be best adapted for public information and use. The Commission shall submit, as part of its annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year preceding, a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued under this part, and in each case the parties thereto, the terms prescribed, and the moneys received if any, or account thereof.".

(4) Section 8 of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (80 Stat. 1300; 15 U.S.C. 1457) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Each officer or agency required or authorized by this Act to promulgate regulations for the packaging or labeling of any consumer commodity, or to participate in the development of voluntary product standards with respect to any consumer commodity under procedures referred to in section 5(d) of this Act, shall transmit to the Congress each year a report containing a full and complete description of the activities of that officer or agency for the administration and enforcement of this Act during the preceding fiscal year. All agencies except the Federal Trade Commission shall submit their report in January of each year. The Federal Trade Commission shall include this report in the Commission's annual report to Congress.".

(5) Section 3(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 451; 29 U.S.C. 153(c)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed."

(6) Subsection (a) of section 10 of the Small Business Act (75 Stat. 666; 15 U.S.C. 639(a)) is amended by striking out "calendar" in the first and second sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal", and by striking out the comma after "involved" in the fourth sentence and all that follows to the end of the subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(7) Subsection (b) of section 10 of the Small Business Act (75 Stat. 666; 15 U.S.C. 639(b)) is amended by striking out "on December 31 of each year" and inserting in lieu thereof "as soon as practicable each fiscal year".

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 14718, as reported by the Committee on Government Operations. This bill is one of those housekeeping measures necessary every few years to remove from the statute books outdated requirements for reports to the Congress.

My committee has periodically ordered reviews of required reports to the Congress and submitted legislation to the House to implement appropriate changes. This bill reflects the work of a 1½-year GAO study ordered by my committee, which has been published under the title, "Usefulness to the Congress of Reports Submitted by the Executive Branch." The GAO surveyed all reporting requirements and asked each committee receiving a report whether it could be eliminated or modified. The bill reflects the wishes of each committee receiving a report. If there was any disagreement among committees receiving a report, no change was recommended or included in this bill. The GAO submitted draft legislation reflecting these noncontroversial changes. The committee then sent around copies of the legislation to each committee asking them to confirm their willingness to make the changes reflected in the bill. In a couple of instances, changes were recommended and the bill was modified accordingly by the committee amendments.

This bill will remove a great deal of unnecessary paperwork and save an estimated $173,000 a year. Each item in this bill has been confirmed as noncontroversial. I urge acceptance of H.R. 14718.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14718 will modify statutory requirements to eliminate certain reports no longer needed by committees of the Congress and to make other reports more useful. In all, 39 reports are affected: 26 would be eliminated, 6 would be reduced in frequency, and 7 would be modified for greater usefulness. Detail concerning individual reports is set forth in the committee's report on the bill (H. Rept. 93–1214).

The original bill was circulated to the chairmen of all House committees. No objections have been raised by any of these committees. In a few cases, suggestions were received which have been taken into account in the bill as reported.

The bill results from a study by the General Accounting Office pursuant to a request from the House Committee on Government Operations. The GAO conducted careful investigations within the agency making each report and obtained the views of the committees of Congress that received the report.

The Comptroller General testified before the Committee that the GAO had compiled an inventory of 544 reports to Congress required by statute. The GAO then reported on October 26, 1973, its recommendation that 51 statutory reporting requirements be eliminated or altered. The bulk of the GAO's recomendations are incorporated in the bill now before us.

This bill is not, in any way, intended to lessen the obligation of an agency to provide to the Congress specific information covered by any of the affected reports, as the need may arise.

This bill is one of a series of measures which the Congress has enacted over the years. Comparable bills were approved in 1954, 1960, and 1965. So far as we can determine, the House Committee on Government Operations has never received a complaint that curtailment of any report through the earlier acts has resulted in inconvenience to anyone.

This is a measure to promote economy and efficiency in the operations of Government. We conservatively estimate that the changes through this bill will lead to an annual saving of $173,000. It makes good sense not only to save these dollars but to lighten the paperwork burden, as H.R. 14718 would do without adverse effect on the present information needs of the Congress. I urge the bill's adoption.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EMERGENCY INCREASES IN THE SUPPORT LEVEL FOR 1974 CROP OF FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

The Clerk read the bill (H.R. 16056) to provide for emergency increases in the support level for the 1974 crop of Fluecured tobacco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the cost of this bill involves potentially, according to the Department of Agriculture, anywhere from $25 million to $125 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SMOKEY BEAR DISPOSITION AND MEMORIAL

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 564) to declare the sense of Congress that Smokey Bear shall be returned on his death to his place of birth, Capitan, N. Mex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. Con. Res. 564

Whereas a black bear cub was found by forest fire fighters nearly twenty-four years ago in the Capitan Mountains of New Mexico and this cub was placed in the National Zoo in Washington, District of Columbia, and named Smokey Bear and became world famous as the living symbol of forest fire prevention; and

Whereas the people of Capitan, New Mexico, have expressed a strong desire for the return of the body of Smokey to Capitan upon his death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that upon his death the body of Smokey Bear may be returned to Capitan, New Mexico, for proper disposition and a permanent memorial in or near Capitan.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This ends the call of the Consent Calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15155, PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15155) making appropriations for public works for water and power developments, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, WHITTEN, SLACK, PASSMAN, MAHON, DAVIS of Wisconsin, ROBISON of New York, MYERS, and CEDERBERG.

REGULAR INTELLIGENCE BRIEFINGS FOR THE SPEAKER AND THE SENATE MAJORITY LEADER CAN FORESTALL ANY FOREIGN ATTEMPT TO SQUEEZE THE UNITED STATES DURING THE IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the record of the past quarter century shows very clearly that on many occasions when the Soviet Union felt that the United States was weakened by domestic problems and differences they sought to "test" us—as in Korea, Berlin, and the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

Two weeks from today the House is expected to begin its deliberations on the whole impeachment matter. During this period there is bound to be a measure of turmoil in the U.S. Government. In these circumstances we must recognize the possibility that the Soviet Union or one of its satellites may be tempted to take advantage of this turmoil by putting a military or diplomatic "squeeze" on the United States at some world trouble spot like Berlin or the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, however, we in this House may individually feel about impeachment. I feel sure that all Americans would nevertheless unite against any such challenge to our fundamental interests.

Therefore, to enable the U.S. Government to deal swiftly and effectively with any foreign military or diplomatic crisis, I urge strongly that top foreign intelligence briefings be given daily to the Speaker and also to the Senate majority leader, beginning August 19 when the impeachment debate opens in the House.

These briefings would help to insure a united as well as a prompt and informed response to any possible "test" of this kind. Also, with the top Democratic leadership in Congress being kept fully informed of all foreign developments there could be no possible risk of our mistaking genuine threatening moves with "impeachment diversions" something that did become a problem during last fall's October war in the Middle East.

HISTORIC ROLLCALL

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, when the House votes on impeachment, we probably will be casting the most significant votes of our tenure in Congress. Because of the importance and solemnity of the occasion, I suggest that the rollcall on each of the articles of impeachment and any amendments offered be called by individual, voice rollcall, rather than electronically recorded. I have mentioned this to a number of our colleagues and all agreed that the momentous nature of these votes merit the calling of the roll and requiring that each Member stand up and answer individually "yes" or nay."

I urge your consideration of this since it is within your power to decide on the manner of the vote.

SHIPMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES OWNED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16006 comes to the floor today by way of the Consent Calendar.

I was an original author of the portion of this legislation which is now contained in section 1. This section will simply provide authority for the services to utilize some land transportation, which they now cannot, in combination with the sea transportation they now use in shipping servicemen's vehicles. The effect of this authority will benefit military personnel because they will get better service from the increased competition, the Department of Defense can save money for the same reason, and the U.S. merchant marine industry will be strengthened because this use of overland transport can only be used in conjunction with American-flag shipping services.

Moreover, I have heard that because of a strike in Alaska now in progress, the vehicles in this area are not being moved. The authority in this legislation will provide an alternative means of transportation for these vehicles and alleviate the serious inconvenience our military personnel are experiencing as a result of the strike.

This aspect of the bill, as well as the entire bill, is good legislation and deserves favorable consideration by the House.

MAKING A VOTE TO CENSURE IN ORDER

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to urge the Speaker and the leaders of the majority party to exercise their offices so as to permit a vote of censure before the House of Representatives on the impeachment issue. I do not know yet how I am going to vote, but I think the Members deserve the widest latitude in expressing their approval or disapproval of the President's performance in office.

I think when this issue goes before the Committee on Rules it is going to be a test of the partisan motives of the majority because if the majority attempts to gag this issue by not even permitting a censure motion to be brought to the floor, I think the American people will recognize that the majority is acting in a partisan fashion.

Mr. Speaker, the actual impeachment resolution passed by this House on February 6, 1974, says in the last sentence:

> The Committee shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, "or other recommendations" explicitly in the impeachment resolution is language which would permit this House to go beyond voting up or down on impeachment, and I urge the Members to support this proposition.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15405, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15405) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McFALL, YATES, STEED, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. BOLAND, MAHON, CONTE, MINSHALL of Ohio, EDWARDS of Alabama, and CEDERBERG.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 2, 1974.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 3:50 P.M. on Friday, August 2, 1974, and said to contain a message from the President concerning a legislative proposal to establish a Cost of Living Task Force.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By W. RAYMOND COLLEY.

TO ESTABLISH A COST OF LIVING TASK FORCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-329)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Earlier this year, before the expiration of the legislation authorizing the Cost of Living Council, I proposed to the Con-

gress that a residual group within the Executive Office of the President be authorized to monitor wages and prices, as an on-going part of our fight against inflation. The Congress did not act on this proposal.

In my economic address on May 25 of this year, I called for the establishment of a Cost of Living Task Force to monitor wages and prices. Again, no Congressional authorization was forthcoming. While I continue to oppose mandatory wage and price controls, it is essential that wages and prices be carefully watched, that labor and management be constantly aware of public concern in this area, and that Government have the information it needs to persuade labor and management to do their duty in the effort to reduce inflation. We have carried out this monitoring function as best we can with our existing resources, under the leadership of my Counsellor for Economic Policy, Kenneth Rush. The need for a properly authorized group continues, however, and it now appears that many Members of the Congress are prepared to reconsider their earlier opposition to my proposal for such a group. A Senate spokesman for the majority party of the Congress is now advocating such a proposal.

Therefore, I am today transmitting a legislative proposal to establish a Cost of Living Task Force. I invite all those who have come to see the need for this proposal to join as bipartisan co-sponsors in this vital step in our fight against inflation.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 2, 1974.*

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports in two instances.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 438]

Andrews, N.C.	Brown, Mich.	Conte
Badillo	Buchanan	Conyers
Beard	Burke, Calif.	Culver
Biaggi	Burke, Fla.	Davis, Ga.
Biester	Burlison, Mo.	de la Garza
Blatnik	Butler	Diggs
Boggs	Carey, N.Y.	Dorn
Boland	Chisholm	Downing
Bolling	Clancy	Eckhardt
Brasco	Clark	Edwards, Ala.
Breaux	Clay	Eshleman
Evans, Colo.	Lent	Robinson, Va.
Fish	Lott	Roncalio, Wyo.
Flowers	Lujan	Roncallo, N.Y.
Flynt	McDade	Rooney, N.Y.
Ford	McSpadden	Ruppe
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald	Scherle
Frey	Madigan	Sebelius
Gibbons	Maraziti	Stanton, James V.
Grasso	Mathias, Calif.	Stark
Gray	Mills	Steele
Green, Pa.	Mink	Stuckey
Grover	Moakley	Studds
Gubser	Murphy, Ill.	Sullivan
Gunter	Murphy, N.Y.	Symington
Hanrahan	Nedzi	Taylor, Mo.
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara	Teague
Hansen, Wash.	Owens	Tiernan
Harsha	Podell	Treen
Hogan	Powell, Ohio	Udall
Holifield	Pritchard	Vander Jagt
Hosmer	Railsback	Veysey
Howard	Randall	Waldie
Ichord	Rangel	Wampler
Jones, Okla.	Rarick	Ware
Kluczynski	Reid	Wydler
Kuykendall	Reuss	Young, Alaska
Lehman	Rhodes	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 321 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule 27, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule 15.

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

ENDORSING LAKE PLACID, N.Y., AS THE SITE OF THE 1980 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1980 winter Olympic games at Lake Placid, N.Y., in the United States, and pledging the cooperation and support of the Congress of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 72

Whereas the International Olympic Committee will meet in October 1974, at Vienna, Austria, to consider the selection of a site for the 1980 winter Olympic games, and

Whereas Lake Placid in the town of North Elba, County of Essex, and State of New York, has been designated by the United States Olympic Committee as the United States site for the 1980 winter Olympic games, and

Whereas the residents of Lake Placid and the town of North Elba in Essex County, New York, have long been recognized throughout the world for their expertise in organizing, sponsoring, and promoting major national and international winter sports competitions in all of the events which are a part of the winter Olympic games, and

Whereas, it is the consensus of the Members of the Congress of the United States that the designation by the International Olympic Committee of Lake Placid in the town of North Elba, Essex County, New York, as the site of the 1980 winter Olympic games would be a great honor for all of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the International Olympic Committee be advised that the Congress of the United States would welcome the holding of the 1980 winter Olympic games at Lake Placid in the town of North Elba, county of Essex, and State of New York, the site so designated by the United States Olympic Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States expresses the sincere hope that the United States will be selected as the site for the 1980 winter Olympic games, and pledges its cooperation and support in their successful fulfillment in the highest sense of the Olympic tradition: *Provided*, That Olympic activities and plans in all respects fit within the present laws and adopted State plans, rules, and regulations respecting the entirety of the Adirondack Park; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress shall not support, financially or otherwise, any activities or plans which are in conflict with the letter or spirit of those laws, plans, rules and regulations, or which would require any modification of them.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the sense of the Congress in support of the application of Lake Placid, N.Y., as the site of the 1980 winter Olympic games, providing that Olympic plans and activities do not conflict with the environmental laws and regulations concerning the Adirondack Park, in which Lake Placid is situated.

The U.S. Olympic Committee has chosen Lake Placid as the official American candidate for the site of the 1980 winter Olympic games. President Nixon personally endorsed Lake Placid's bid, on February 13, 1974, in a letter to the International Olympic Committee. Support for the Lake Placid application has also been expressed by the Governor and the Legislature of the State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee held a hearing on this matter in which the proponents of the resolution appeared along with representatives of several environmental groups. The environmental organizations indicated that given proper control, this was a suitable site, in their opinion, for the holding of the winter Olympic games. Partly because of their concern, the subcommittee added an amendment which can be found at the end of the resolution, stating that the plans and activities of the Olympics will conform to existing State plans, rules, and regulations regarding the Adirondack Park. With the adoption of that amendment, the matter was considered in the full committee and reported, without objection, to the floor.

I will be glad to respond to any questions.

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the "resolved" clause in this resolution which says:

> That Congress shall not support, financially or otherwise, any activities or plans which are in conflict with the letter or spirit of those laws, plans, rules, and regulations, or which would require any modification of them.

It seems to me that this is unusual language. Could the gentleman state briefly why this is included?

Mr. FRASER. Yes. There was concern at the committee hearing over the possibility that holding the Olympic games might cause environmental damage; there might be damage to the park and to the park setting, which, in the judgment of some of the environmental groups, would be an unfortunate consequence and something they hoped could be avoided. Therefore, the committee adopted this language in order to make clear that our support, in effect, is conditioned upon compliance with the existing laws and regulations, which everyone agreed are adequate to protect against injury to the environment if the rules and regulations are followed.

In effect, therefore, what we are saying is that we approve of the games being held here, provided that there are no transgressions of existing laws, rules, and regulations.

Mr. GROSS. And would financial support be withdrawn in the event that there were transgressions?

Mr. FRASER. Yes. We would not be favorably disposed toward supporting these games if they were going to violate the rules and regulations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Minnesota and the members of his committee for their favorable consideration of this resolution.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman has covered very well in his remarks the thrust of this resolution. The protection of the environment, by the language of the resolution, is insured.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the great advantages of Lake Placid as a site for the world Olympics is the fact that many of the facilities that would be needed for these Olympics are already in place. On White Face Mountain are the ski trails for the Alpine events that meet FIS standards. At Intervale there is the 70-meter jump that still meets Olympic standards. It is the jump that has been used since Lake Placid hosted the 1932 Olympics.

At the same location there would be required a new 90-meter jump. Also in this area is located the only bobsled course in North America. There is an Olympic standard biathlon course and a cross-country course all in place.

From the standpoint of cost for the facilities that would be needed—and there are less needed here than in any other location in this country and possibly in this hemisphere—and from the standpoint of the absence of damage that would be done to the environment, I think all of this commends, from the standpoint of economics and the ecology, the site of Lake Placid

This community has been designated by the U.S. Olympic Committee as the site for these Olympics. It has been endorsed, as the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, by our President in a letter which he addressed to Lord Killanin, the president of the International Olympic Committee

Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I may, to quote from that letter of February 13, 1974, which the President wrote to Lord Michael Killanin. The quotation is as follows:

> As a small, mountainous, winter sports community, and as the site of the 1932 Winter Games and numerous world championships, Lake Placid has both the rich tradition and demonstrated ability to conduct the 1980 Winter Games with quality and distinction. Its invitation is extended with full awareness of the heavy responsiblities involved in an international event of this stature.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Senate concurrent resolution may be concurred in.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 72 which will endorse the bid of Lake Placid, N.Y., to be the official site of the 1980 winter Olympic games.

Earlier this year, I joined with the entire New York congressional delegation in cosponsoring a similar resolution. I am pleased to see that this resolution has one important addition—namely, if this site is selected, the further support of Congress will be contingent on the plans and activities of the International Olympic Committee adhering to the environmental laws which govern the Adirondack Park region which includes Lake Placid.

Lake Placid has the proven distinction of having hosted the famous 1932 winter Olympics. Only two other American communities, Los Angeles in 1932, and Squaw Valley, Calif., in 1960, have hosted Olympic games. Lake Placid is seeking to become the only American community to host two Olympic games, and I feel its credentials to achieve this international milestone are meritorious and worthy of favorable congressional approval.

Lake Placid has the important advantage of already having most of the facilities necessary to successfully conduct winter Olympics. Included among their many existing facilities are alpine and cross country ski trails, excellent bobsled runs, as well as excellent figure skating and ice hockey facilities. As a result of their wealth of winter sport facilities, Lake Placid has in recent years had the distinction of being the host site for more national and international winter championship events than any other place in the world.

Of course there is a vestige of American pride involved here as well. Traditionally the host country of the Olympics fares somewhat better in the overall international competition. Lake Placid has produced many individuals who have already competed in international competition. It stands to reason that by holding the games at Lake Placid these Americans would stand a much better chance of winning the highly coveted gold medals which signify the epitome of international sports excellence.

I am pleased to see that adequate provisions have been included to insure that environmental safety of this region in the event that the 1980 games are indeed held at Lake Placid. The Adirondack Park region of upstate New York is one of the most beautiful areas in all of the United States, and her beauty is partially due to her successful resistance of the commercialism which has destroyed so many other winter resort areas in this Nation. During the consideration of this resolution, assurances were received from a number of environmental groups familiar with this region, that if the environmental laws were followed they would have no adverse effects either on the conduct of the games, or the environmental future of the area.

The support for Lake Placid's bid has been quite impressive. Supporters include the President, the Governor of New York, the U.S. Olympic Committee, the New York congressional delegation, as well as the Senate which has already passed this resolution.

I therefore wish to add my personal support of this bid by Lake Placid. I feel the area has both the high tradition and proven excellence to conduct the 1980 games with true distinction. I hope this resolution meets with the swift approval of my colleagues today, so that all necessary plans can begin to bring the Olympics successfully back to America.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks on Senate Concurrent Resolution 72 presently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 3, rule XXVII, the Chair announces that further proceedings on this vote will be postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Chair indicated the vote will be postponed. Does that mean a rollcall vote will be automatically instituted at the proper time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the vote will be taken by electronic device at the appropriate time.

CONTINUATION PAY FOR PHYSICIANS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES IN INITIAL RESIDENCY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15936) to amend chapter 5, title 37, United States Code, to provide for continuation pay for physicians of the uniformed services in initial residency, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15936

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the portion of the first sentence of section 311 (a), chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, preceding clause (1), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as appropriate, an officer of the Army or Navy in the Medical Corps above the pay grade of O–6 or such an officer who is below that pay grade who is undergoing initial residency training and who was on active duty on June 1, 1974, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a medical officer and is above the pay grade of O–6 or such an officer who is below that pay grade who is undergoing initial residency training and who was on active duty on June 1, 1974, a medical officer of the Public Health Service above the pay grade of O–6 or such an officer who is below that pay grade who is undergoing initial residency training and who was on active duty on June 1, 1974, an officer of the Army or Navy in the Dental Corps, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a dental officer, or a dental officer of the Public Health Service who—".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the Act shall be effective June 1, 1974.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15936 would allow the payment of continuation pay to medical officers who are in initial residency and are otherwise eligible for such pay. It is necessary to approve the bill in order to prevent a loss of pay of as much as $5,000 per year by some career medical officers.

It will be recalled that Congress recently approved Public Law 93–274 which established a new incentive bonus for medical officers. That law terminated continuation pay for those below the grade of O–7 (brigadier general and rear admiral). Continuation pay was authorized for those senior grades because they were ineligible for the bonus and continution pay was necessary to prevent any pay inversions where someone would lose pay by going to a higher rank.

Public Law No. 93–274 excluded officers in initial residency training from receiving bonuses. Officers in initial residency were normally not eligible for continuation pay in the past because the regulations under which the pay was administered required 5 years of service for eligibility.

Subsequent to the passage of Public Law 93–274 it came to the attention of the subcommittee that there were several hundred medical officers who had an abnormal delay in the commencement of their initial residency training. The majority of these are those who have served as general medical officers for several years on active duty, many of them in Vietnam, and were therefore delayed in entering residency training because of the services' urgent need for general medical officers during the Vietnam war.

In 1975 the Armed Forces will have approximately 345 medical officers who would be affected by this bill. One hundred and eighty-four of these are officers who have already had 5 years of service, and who were receiving continuation pay when Public Law 93–274 was enacted. They would lose this pay unless the present bill is passed. The other 161 are officers who are soon to complete their 5 years of service, and thus would have been eligible to receive continuation pay if Public Law 93–274 had not been enacted. They have anticipated getting continuation pay and have made their financial plans accordingly.

If H.R. 15936 is enacted, the medical officers who would benefit from it would receive an average of $5,044 a year of continuation pay. The total cost to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1975 would be $1.7 million. The Department indicates that that cost can be absorbed administratively, and would result in no increase in budgetary requirements. The Department of Defense strongly supports the bill.

The subcommittee amended the bill to limit eligibility to medical officers who were on active duty on June 1, 1974. The amendments are designed to assure that the bill is a saved-pay measure for those officers who were on active duty at the time Public Law 93–274 became effective, so that officers on active duty at that time will not receive less than they were led to expect in additional pay.

I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, let me also comment on the fact that this bill corrects an inequity and an oversight in the original doctors' bonus bill, Public Law 93–274, which was enacted May 6 with an effective date of June 1. That law provides substantial, additional bonus payments to keep in the service the medical officers we need.

Our committee is very disturbed by the fact that, although the Department of Defense told us that it urgently needed the bill back before the first of the year, and needed a $15,000 bonus desperately, and we passed a $13,500 bonus in anticipation of the tremendous shortage of doctors on the first of June, the Department of Defense 2 months after that date has still not implemented the legislation.

I think it is an insult to the House of Representatives, to the Congress, and to the committee to come up here and demand legislation as an urgent requirement, and then not implement it.

I would advise the House that we in our committee are going to find out who is responsible for the failure to implement this legislation. We will pin that responsibility on the proper person or persons and we are going to demand the Defense Department clean house if they do not get this legislation underway.

Just the other day, Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post was an Associated Press article that said that the Pentagon says there is such a critical shortage of trained doctors that they are going to bring back retired medical doctors and pay them $44,000 a year plus their service pension to try to fill the need. And while they are doing this sort of thing they are failing to implement the legislation to meet the same need.

So we are going to make sure that this error is corrected and we may have to reverse our way of writing legislation to make sure this kind of disgraceful situation does not happen again.

But, in the meantime, H.R. 15936 is needed to fill a gap that the Department of Defense did not advise the committee of when the original bill was passed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to pass this bill, as my colleague, the gentleman from New York, has just stated, to prevent an injustice to the young physicians in the service. I was instrumental in bringing this problem to the attention of the committee because of two young physicians at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital who contacted me on behalf of their fellow medical officers. They are outstanding young doctors, desperately needed by the armed services. They have delayed their residency because of their requirements of service. Many of them have served as general medical officers in Vietnam and have likewise given extended time prior to seeking their residency in hospitals where their expertise was required.

Normally a doctor is eligible for continuation pay up to 5 years, and some of those young doctors are already receiving that continuation pay and will lose it if this bill does not pass. Others who have been planning for their future, based upon the continuation of the pay, would lose it likewise. It would mean an unexpected pay loss, Mr. Speaker, of about $5,000 a year for a 3-year period if the bill does not pass this House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members today to promptly pass this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The ques-

tion is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15936, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

AIR FORCE LIEUTENANT COLONELS AND COLONELS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14402) to amend the Act of September 26, 1966 (Public Law 89–606), as amended to extend for 2 years the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of lieutenant colonel and colonel in the Air Force are increased.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of September 26, 1966 (Public Law 89–606), as amended (86 Stat. 1175), is amended by striking out "September 30, 1974" and inserting in place thereof "September 30, 1976".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14402 would provide a 2-year extension of the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of lieutenant colonel and colonel in the Air Force are increased. This is continued relief for the Air Force from the limitations in the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954. Since 1959 Congress has provided, on a nonpermanent basis, for an increase in field-grade authorizations for the Air Force to allow it to have roughly the same numbers of officers in these grades as do the Army and the Navy. The latest extension of this relief was granted in 1972 and expires on September 30 of this year.

If the bill is not passed, the Air Force will be required to demote or eliminate from active duty some 6,000 field-grade officers. There would also have to be a complete moratorium on promotion to the grades of major, lieutenant colonel and colonel for at least a year. In addition, the promotion point for officers in the Air Force would slip as much as 3 years behind those in the Army and Navy. Members can imagine the effect on the morale of the officer corps.

This bill merely continues for the Air Force the percentage of field-grade officers that it now has. The Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1935 provided a substantially lower number of field-grade positions for the Air Force than for the other services simply because it was at that time a relatively new force with a much younger officer corps. By 1959 the Congress determined that the limitations on the Air Force were unrealistic and since that time has provided them with relief from those limitations. This bill simply continues that more realistic approach.

At the time of the last extension of the law in 1972, the Department of Defense was charged with coming up with recommendations for permanent revision of the officer grade structure.

The Department of Defense has submitted, and our committee has commenced hearings on, the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA), H.R. 12405, which would revise the field-grade officer structure for all the Armed Forces on a permanent basis. This is extremely detailed and complex legislation. It is apparent that we cannot expect Congress to complete action on this bill before the present Air Force grade relief expires on September 30. Therefore, your committee recommends extension of the Air Force grade relief for an additional 2 years while we continue to work on H.R. 12405.

I stated at the commencement of the hearings on H.R. 12405 that even if we did not finish that bill this year, if I returned next year, I would consider it as a top-priority item on the agenda of the Military Compensation Subcommittee and that I would agree to any temporary changes affecting officers only in the context of the understanding that we would continue to work on the problem next year. I want the Department of Defense to clearly understand that a permanent revision of the officer grade structure for all services must be pursued. I am by no means persuaded that the Air Force should have, on a permanent basis, the numbers of field-grade officers provided in this bill. But I do not think we should apply restrictions to one service without considering what changes are needed in the others. And I do not believe we should punish the officers of one service. Revisions have to be made with due regard for equity to individuals. Having promoted officers to the grade of lieutenant colonel, for example, we cannot just demote them willy-nilly when they have been performing well.

This bill will not result in any additional budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense. The Air Force stated to our committee that failure to pass the bill would result in increased costs since the savings by having fewer colonels and lieutenant colonels would be more than offset by the cost of separation pay, increased retirement cost, and possible increased cost of training replacements. The additional cost in fiscal year 1975 would range from $9.5 to $42.2 million, depending on assumptions with regard to replacement training. But costs cannot be projected with precision.

Cost is not the most important consideration. What is important is equity to the individual.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out finally that this bill does not prevent us from making reductions in senior officer grades in the interim before action is completed on DOPMA. The Defense Department has asked for authority to noncontinue a number of O–6 (colonel) and O–5 (lieutenant colonel) officers in each service short of the normal tenure expectation of such officers. Our military Compensation Subcommittee has had some testimony on the bill to provide this authority (H.R. 11113) and will complete consideration and make a decision on the measure following the impeachment business.

What we are doing here today is assuring that the Air Force does not have to make wholesale reductions according to some obsolete grade table and does not have to demote capable officers. Equally important, we are attempting to assure officers in the Air Force that their careers will not be one big guessing game, that they will be treated equitably with officers in the other services, and that changes in career opportunity will be made only after thorough study by the Congress.

We do have to consider reducing the number of senior officers in the Armed Forces. But we have to do it in a manner that is not unjust to individuals and that does not damage military morale or weaken our ability to retain highly trained officer personnel.

I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think that the opening statement of the gentleman from New York concedes what I have been arguing for as long as I have been here; that is, there is too much top brass in the military. We all know that there is too much top brass and yet every chance we get to do something about it, we never do anything about it. This is not the first time or the second time or the third time or the fourth time that we have allowed the Air Force to have more brass than it needs. This is the seventh time that we have been requested to do this.

We did pass a law once which limited the number of generals and colonels and lieutenant colonels and majors that all the services could have. All the services have said they could live with this, except the Air Force. The Air Force says, "No, we can't live with it."

What has happened to the Air Force since we have been granting these continual "temporary" extensions of their grade structure? In 1966 when we "temporarily" allowed them to have more colonels and lieutenant colonels for the fifth time, the Air Force had 12,259 planes. Today that 12,259 planes is down to 8,096 planes. They have lost 4,163 planes, but they have made up for this loss by adding 3 four-star generals and 1 three-star general.

To run an Air Force 34 percent smaller in planes than it was 8 years ago, we have an officer force only 13 percent smaller. In the total number of generals, it is only 9 percent smaller.

In 1966 we had 10½ officers for every plane in the Air Force. At the end of 1974 we had 13.7 officers for every plane.

Overall to run the Air Force of 8,069 planes, we have 14 four-star generals, 39 three-star generals, 146 two-star generals, and exactly 200 little old one-star generals. We have 6,095 colonels. We have 13,979 lieutenant colonels, 21,339

majors, 40,404 captains, 14,147 first lieutenants, and 14,740 second lieutenants.

Oh, yes, we also have 534,000 enlisted men; but this bill does nothing for them.

At the height of World War II when there were 2,282,000 people in the Air Force—it was then called the Air Corps—there were 322 generals. Today the Air Force has 1,638,000 fewer people in it, but it has 77 more generals than it had a the height of World War II.

Now, obviously, the generals all have aides, and they all have transportation. They have cars and they have lovely offices or quarters, and almost none of them fly planes.

This particular bill is a bill for the colonels and lieutenant colonels. Under the basic law, the Air Force is, at its current strength, entitled to 4,442 colonels. Today it has 5,558, not counting the physicians or dentists because we let them stop counting the 4,500 Air Force physicians and dentists back in the 89th Congress. The overall bill recommended by the Department of Defense, by the way, would only allow them 5,503. So there are 55 more colonels in this bill than the Department of Defense recommends. Under the basic law, the Air Force is entitled to 8,809 lieutenant colonels. Today it has 13,269, again not counting the physicians and dentists.

The Members have heard all of the terrible things that would happen if this bill were not passed. Well, let us consider, first of all, what might happen. The gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) said the cost, if this bill does not pass, is somewhere between $9.5 million and $42 million. Well, that is a pretty big spread, actually, for just the colonels and lieutenant colonels. I do not think they really know what the cost would be. I do know that the figures they came up with assumed that we have to replace all of these nonflying colonels and lieutenant colonels, that we have to have 733 more pilots and 311 more navigators, and so forth.

The fact of the matter is, if this law were allowed to expire absolutely nothing would happen until the end of this fiscal year, which is next June 30. By that time they would have to have done something. They would either have had to trim some of the fat out of their grade structure or we would have had to pass the basic legislation, and the basic legislation, I might remind the Members, was introduced back in January of this year, and we have not passed it yet. I think as long as we keep "temporarily" extending for the Air Force the right to have more colonels and lieutenant colonels than they need, we never will get it passed.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill to continue the present authorizations for field-grade officers of the Air Force. Although these have been extended on a temporary basis every few years, the truth of the matter is that we are extending the authorizations that have been in effect for 15 years. The original authorizations in the 1954 Officer Grade Limitation Act were only in effect for 5 years.

Failure to enact this legislation would result in 870 fewer colonel spaces and 4,041 lieutenant colonel spaces in the Air Force. The waterfall effect of such reductions would mean reduction in grade or elimination from active duty of approximately 6,000 officers in the grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major. In addition, it would require a halt of promotions for 1 year and a delay in promotion points of as much as 3 years behind what is experienced by the other services.

Reference is sometimes made to the fact that we have more officers proportionately to the size of our forces than we have had in the past. But it should be remembered that field-grade authorizations do not increase as rapidly as commissioned officer strength during periods of force buildup nor do they decrease as rapidly during periods of force reduction. For example, if the Tactical Air Command were to add a fighter wing or two to its structure, there would be a large increase in captains and lieutenants to meet the operation's requirements but minor increases to the numbered Air Force and major command staffs.

Conversely, if a fighter wing or two were to be deactivated, the captain and lieutenant positions in the operations area would be abolished; but the workload at higher command levels would not proportionately diminish. This is referred to as the sliding scale feature of the law.

The bill has been criticized on the basis that the number of airplanes in the Air Force has decreased but the number of senior officers has stayed the same or increased. It will be pointed out that airplanes are flown by lieutenants and captains more than by colonels and lieutenant colonels. This is true. But the research and development, procurement, planning and budgeting—the whole complex management process which brings systems and weapons into being—must be run by experienced, trained officers. The tactical and strategic decisions on deployment of systems and weapons and people must be made by experienced, mature officers. To attract quality officers, we must be able to offer lietutenants and captains a reasonable, reliable career progression.

It must also be remembered that the grade tables provided in 1954 are simply inappropriate for today's Air Force. In 1954 only 18 percent of our Air Force officers had over 12 years of service; today over 38 percent have more than 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, it will be pointed out that the ratio of officers to enlisted personnel is higher in the Air Force than other services. This is true. The Air Force has one officer to every 4.8 enlisted men. The ratio in the other services is as follows: Army, 1 to 6.7, Navy and Marine Corps, 1 to 7.6. In the first place, however, this bill has nothing to do with officer and enlisted ratios. This bill concerns only the number of lieutenant colonels and colonels in the Air Force, which, under our system, is determined as a factor of total officer strength. If Congress wishes to change the officer/enlisted ratio, the time to do it is when it sets the total strength figures each year in authorization and appropriation legislation.

In the second place, however, it should be remembered that the Air Force is an officer-intensive service; the Air Force is unique because the officer rather than the enlisted man performs the primary combat jobs in most cases. Tactical fighter and interceptor aircraft as manned by officers; strategic bombers are crewed by five officers and one enlisted man. Missiles are controlled by officers. Combat casualties in Vietnam reflect this fact. Eighty percent of Air Force casualties were officers, compared to 11 percent of the Army's and 31 percent of the Navy's.

In regard to the charge that we have far more senior officers than we ever intended, it is interesting to note that the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which set the grade distribution percentages and which was drafted following the World War II experience, provided more senior officers than the Air Force now has.

The Officer Personnel Act authorizations are not reflected by number, but as a percentage of the Regular officers in the Air Force. If Officer Personnel Act percentages were applied to today's 110,000 officer force, the Air Force would be authorized 825 generals rather than 399; 8,800 colonels instead of 6,095; and 15,400 lieutenants rather than 14,000.

As part of my remarks, I would like to include a table which compares the Officer Personnel Act percentages at the 110,000 officer force level with the number of officers actually on duty in the Air Force today:

	General	Colonel	Lieutenant colonel	Major	Captain	1st lieutenant	2d lieutenant
OPA percentage	0.75	8	14	19	23	18	18
At 110,000 force	825	8,800	15,400	20,900	25,300	19,800	19,800
USAF, June 1974	399	6,095	13,979	21,339	40,404	14,147	14,740
Percent of officer force	0.35	5.5	12.6	19.2	36.4	12.7	13.3

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which simply continues the promotions and grade distribution system now operating in the Air Force. It treats the Air Force on a par with the Army and Navy, and it is necessary to avoid wholly unjust actions directed at individuals who have been performing in an outstanding manner in our senior officer grades. I hope the Members will support the bill overwhelmingly to let the members of the Armed Forces know that Congress appreciates their services and their sacrifices.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN).

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) said

that the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) had conceded that the Air Force was top-heavy with brass. Let me also concede that point to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) because I believe he is absolutely correct. I believe that the points he is making in his statement are absolutely right. The questions are, Does that apply to just the Air Force, or does it apply to the other services? Is the voting down of the legislation which is before us the best way to deal with it?

The answer to the first question is, of course, that it does not just apply to the Air Force. It applies to the Navy and it applies to the Army, but the legislation that is before us applies just to the Air Force. Because the Air Force was a new service at the time the original OGLA ceilings were drawn up, the number of senior officers given to the Air Force was lower than the number given to the other services. So the Air Force has to come in every 2 years for relief allowing higher levels of senior officers. It is the Air Force which we have over the barrel every 2 years looking for this relief. It is the Air Force, and the Air Force alone, which will be hurt if we vote down this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the fact which the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) points out about topheavy brass is absolutely correct, but the way to deal with it is not to pick on just the Air Force. The way to deal with it is in a comprehensive fashion.

In previous years, when we have been asked for an extension for the Air Force, we have always asked the Department of Defense to propose legislation dealing with the brass problem for all of the services. It ought to deal with the Navy and the Army as well as the Air Force, but we just have the Air Force over a barrel.

We ought to have legislation covering all of them.

The Department of Defense has now come up with that legislation. It was introduced in January. Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on Armed Services has been holding hearings on it. They are looking into the matter. We are going to have legislation. The fact is that we cannot have it very soon. We have impeachment. We have an election. Next year we are going to have the authorization bill before us.

It will be at least this time next year before the DOPMA bill is reported to the full House. However, that is the way to deal with the problem, and that is the way to deal with this legislation.

It seems to me that what we ought to do is to report out this piece of legislation, this temporary relief, with the understanding that it is a short extension and that this time we will get a permanent bill, DOPMA, before the extension runs out.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) says that the cost of this bill is outrageous and that the estimates of the Department of Defense are wrong. He is probably right. He says that the cost estimates are no good. He is probably right. I do not know what the ultimate cost of this legislation is going to be, but it is true that it is going to put a bind on the Air Force if we do not pass it. True, it does not take effect until nearly the end of September.

I want to say any changes that will have to be made in officer promotions or in the officer grade structure by next June would have to start now. Officers to be forced out have to be notified. They are entitled to notification by law. They are entitled to certain procedures.

Officers who would be demoted would have to be identified, and there would have to be training programs to replace officers. The question of career opportunities would have to be cleared up. All of these things would have to be done immediately. Therefore, even if DOPMA were to pass by next year—and it is not going to pass by next year—it is important that this legislation that we have before us be passed. If it is not, the Air Force would have to institute those changes right now.

Mr. Speaker, Congress does have an obligation to overhaul the officer promotion system. It does have an obligation to review the grade structure and to make basic reforms.

However, Mr. Speaker, killing this bill will not accomplish any of the secondary reforms.

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

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I want to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to extend the temporary Air Force grade relief until September 30, 1976. Last October, during the debate on the fiscal year 1974 defense authorization bill, I expressed concern over whether delay in consideration of the proposed Defense Officer Personnel Management Act would necessitate another extension for the Air Force. It now appears that that concern has become this morning's reality.

The primary point I want to make today in supporting this extension is that this is one occasion when we cannot point the finger at the Pentagon and accuse them of causing the delay. In fact I would say that no one is at fault. The Pentagon did what was asked of them and submitted the required report and the proposed legislation. That bill was introduced in January of this year as H.R. 12405 and, despite a very busy schedule of legislative hearings, the Stratton Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee has begun indepth hearings on the DOD-wide proposal. The simple fact is—this is complex legislation that in the best of all worlds is going to take a long time to get through the House, through the Senate and through a conference on the inevitable disagreements.

As others have pointed out, the consequences to the Air Force would be drastic if we fail to pass this bill. In his minority views, the gentleman from New York makes light of the consequences, suggesting that it would be "healthier" if the Air Force lost some lieutenant colonels and colonels. But the fact is that the impact also falls directly on majors and captains and on the career plans of the bright young officers who will surely be influenced in their decision on a career if they see senior officers demoted and RIF's and see a moratorium on all field grade promotions.

I have considerable doubts and questions about the wisdom of the present system, but H.R. 12405 is the place to raise them. That bill deals with the officer structure on a DOD-wide basis. The concern about "grade creep"—as I have pointed out before—should be addressed in the context of all the services. It would be not only unfair, but also unwise and illogical to take an arbitrary, partial stab at the problem by failing to pass this bill and causing absolutely unjustifiable turmoil in the Air Force. I urge that we exercise responsible judgment and pass this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) is recognized.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I find this debate getting more and more interesting because now we have everybody conceding that there is too much brass in the military. We have everybody conceding that we ought to do something about it, and we have had opportunity after opportunity after opportunity over the years to do something about it, but we never do anything about it.

We have had, as I say, seven different opportunities to do it in connection with this legislation.

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, of course I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Is it not true, I ask the gentleman from New York, that there will be permanent legislation coming out after this stopgap measure and that the new legislation will vastly reduce the number of officers in all the services?

Mr. PIKE. I do not know what the legislation is going to say. I know what the Defense Department proposal is. The Defense Department proposal is that there be less colonels and less lieutenant colonels than there are in this legislation right now.

Mr. ASPIN. That is right.

Mr. PIKE. But nobody says, "Let us cut this bill down to the Defense Department proposal."

I do not know what the Committee on Armed Services is going to do on this. I do not know what the subcommittee is going to do. I know this: I know that we have never shown any great intestinal fortitude as far as cutting down the brass in the military is concerned.

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

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think this is the opportunity for us to discuss this matter. I am quite sure no Member is in disagreement with the gentleman's argument that we need to reduce slots in some spots.

It is my finding from discussions with other members of the committee—and I am quite sure the gentleman was pres-

ent when that debate took place—that there was no opposition to taking on the recommendations that they will bring to us a little later. However, in the interim period we cannot drop 6,000 officers, light colonels and colonels, in the Air Force by the wayside and let them sit in limbo until the new bill comes up for consideration.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, let us get around to the business of these officers "sitting there in limbo."

The gentleman from Wisconsin has had some experience over there in the "funny factory," and the gentleman knows very well that it need not be this time next year before this legislation, the permanent legislation, is passed. It may be this time next year, but it need not be this time next year.

When they really want some legislation over there, man, the Committee on Armed Services gets it fast, and the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate gets it fast, and the Congress gets it fast.

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

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. The problem is that if we do what the gentleman is suggesting, I am afraid that the legislation would come out in a form which the gentleman would not like.

The gentleman is both asking us on one hand to review this legislation and go over it carefully and to cut down the number of officers and, on the other hand, telling us we have to pass it right away so we do not have this extension.

Mr. PIKE. No, I am not telling the Members we have to pass it right away. What I am saying is that we have until next July 1.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we do not have until next July 1, because if the Air Force does not get this extension, they are going to have to make some adjustments in their personnel policy starting right away.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said they would have to make some adjustments in their personnel policy starting right away.

Have they notified any officers in the Air Force that their personnel policies are going to be changed right away?

Mr. ASPIN. No, they have not.

Mr. PIKE. Of course, they have not.

Mr. ASPIN. But if this legislation is passed——

Mr. PIKE. Wait. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded to the gentleman.

Of course, they have not notified anybody, because they know that they can lead the Congress around with a ring in its nose. They know the Congress is going to pass this if they ask us to do it.

They have not done one darned thing about reducing the brass because they know they do not have to do anything.

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

Mr. PIKE. Of course, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, let me make a suggestion to the gentleman from New York.

Rather than venting his anger and his wrath on this temporary extension, how about focusing on the permanent legislation which is now before the Committee on Armed Services? The gentleman can come over and testify, come over and appear before our subcommittee. The gentleman can come over and tell us what his views are and introduce some legislation which he thinks is appropriate. And fight for them on the floor.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have yielded long enough.

I have had as much experience, I suspect, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has in trying to get the Committee on Armed Services to do anything whatsoever that the Pentagon does not want, and the fact of life is that it is absolutely impossible to get the Committee on Armed Services to do anything that the Pentagon does not want.

Now, the Congress will do what the Committee on Armed Services does. The Committee on Armed Services will do what the Pentagon wants. And what the gentleman is inviting me to do is to participate in a never-ending tail chase whereby we give the illusion of considering basic problems without ever coming up with any substantive results.

We are always considering, we are always shaking our heads and saying, "Tsk, tsk, isn't it awful that there are so many generals and so many colonels and lieutenant colonels?" But we never do anything about it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining, and the other gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) desires to have additional time I will be glad to yield the gentleman that time.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, but I believe that the remarks I made immediately following those of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) will suffice.

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I have requested the time because I think it is well that we aired this particular piece of legislation. When everybody starts talking about cutting off the "brass" they should know that this bill does not deal with anyone except colonels and light colonels in the Air Force today.

My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN), is entirely right—and I do not use that term loosely, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin. May I also say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) that I am very happy for the gentleman having this chance to be on our side of the fence. I am also delighted that the gentleman had such a nice weekend that he became enlightened with all the good prospects of this bill. It is important to point out also that it is only a temporary situation, as has been described, and when the main bill comes out this matter will be gone over carefully. I know that it will be decided as to the numerical numbers for all of the top slots, not only the Air Force, but in the other branches of service as well. We have reduced the number of our enlisted personnel in different units, and I am certain we will be able to make some good progress with officer personnel—many are entitled to retirement.

But, in the meantime what we will do if we listen to what the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) says today. We will have 6,000 officers sitting out in limbo, and someone will ask what will we do with them after the first of September. Then somebody will say we will get out a piece of legislation, and we will hold them over until we get out the main bill from the Department of Defense, and then put them back in again.

I do not want to do that. I want the Members to support this legislation. These colonels and light colonels in the Air Force should not be penalized. They have come up from the ranks in a number of instances, the hard way, and the majority of them are well-seasoned veterans. They are well versed in their jobs. I think we should for once in our lives do something sensible, and pass this legislation as a stopgap until the permanent grade structure bill is presented.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey has referred to this as just "temporary" legislation. Since 1959—we passed the Officer Grade Limitation Act—not we, but our predecessors in the Congress—back in 1954. Then "temporarily" in 1959 we decided to grant an exception and we granted an exception in 1959, and we have granted exceptions six times since. This "temporary" exception is temporary in the same sense that the national debt is temporary. it is just there forever unless we do something about it.

We have had all of this business about why just pick on the Air Force. And the answer is: I do not want to just pick on the Air Force, but I do want to get something done. The gentleman from Wisconsin admitted that if the Pentagon really wants to get something done, by golly, we get it done.

They wanted the flight pay bill so badly this year that the Committee on Armed Services dropped everything else it was doing, it dropped the procurement bill, and we got that flight pay bill to the floor. We got it to the floor because the Pentagon really wanted it.

Well, here is our opportunity to put some pressure on the Pentagon to get something done on overall legislation.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN).

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) that we did not abandon the procurement bill in considering the flight pay legislation. Flight pay was considered for 7 months by subcommittee No. 4. We worked at it very hard, and we did not abandon the procurement legislation.

The problem with the position taken by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) is he says he wants to pass other legislation so we do not need an extension, but on the other hand he does not want to rubberstamp the recommendations of the Pentagon.

I do not see how we can do that. The gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) is making the right fight on the wrong bill. He is fighting the temporary extension when he should be fighting the total legislation.

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

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

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the minority views put forward in the Armed Services Committee report, Mr. PIKE suggests that for the Air Force to go back to the permanent limits in the 1954 law "very little" would happen. He states this because the Air Force would have until July 1 of next year to adjust its strength and because, in the meantime, Congress could pass the uniform officer legislation contained in H.R. 12405. He summarizes the impact as follows:

> At worst, we would lose some colonels and lieutenant colonels. The nation would survive. The Air Force would be healthier.

That is simply not the case. The impacts on officers in the Air Force would be severe—not just on colonels and lieutenant colonels, but on the majors, captains and lieutenants who make up the main fighting and technical forces of the Air Force. Specifically, the Air Force would have to demote 100 colonels, 3,200 lieutenant colonels, and 1,900 majors, involuntarily separate 800 majors and stop promotions for at least 1 year. The junior officer would see that, at the whim of Congress, his chances for a full career can be snuffed out.

Mr. PIKE further talks of the decrease in the number of Air Force planes being greater than the decrease in the Air Force officers. I would point out to the gentleman from New York that today's aircraft requires two to five aircrew members as opposed to one required in the older aircraft, such as the F-100, F-102, and F-106.

The views of the gentleman from New York suggested that the Air Force "provided some wholly phony figures on the cost of not passing this legislation," and that the figures presuppose passage of legislation to increase retirement benefits. This is not correct. The Air Force simply stated that with those retiring early because of the disruptions caused by the loss of this grade relief, the retirement costs this year, at the current retirement rates, would increase.

The gentleman also suggests the Air Force will continue to insist on replacing every man who leaves. In fact, the Air Force would lose about 1,400 pilots, replacing them with around 700, and it would lose around 600 navigators, replacing them with about 300, again about half.

I support passage of H.R. 14402.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that there are not more Members on the floor so that the wisdom of some of the remarks that we are making might be reflected in the votes that will be cast at a later time.

Let me just make a couple of points in reply.

The point that Mr. PIKE has made is a good one, and that is that there ought to be a very careful overhaul of the grade structure in the armed services. He keeps complaining that we have not been doing anything about it. I cannot speak for other chairmen, but as chairman of the Military Compensation Subcommittee, I can say that as soon as we could our subcommittee got to work on the permanent revision of the grade structure for field grade officers and for other officers, H.R. 12405. I do not think anybody can challenge our subcommittee because we have already turned out more legislation on other important matters—flight pay, doctors' bonus, enlistment, and reenlistment bonuses. We are now working on this. To say that nothing is being done when the basic legislation is now under consideration in the committee is, as the gentleman from Wisconsin, (Mr. ASPIN), has already indicated, to make the wrong argument and to attack the wrong bill.

This legislation did not get to us until January. We have been busy constantly since then. We are working on the grade structure now, and if it were not for the impeachment matter that lies ahead, we very likely would get it out this year, at least in the House. But nobody can predict exactly when it is going to get through the Senate too. I do not think it is fair to 6,000 Air Force officers to take out the failures of the Department of Defense or the failures of the Congress on them and their families. They deserve, certainly, an opportunity to remain in a stable position until the committee has made its decision on the overhaul structure. That is all that is involved here..

The gentleman from New York has said that there are more lieutenant colonels and colonels than the Air Force needs. As a matter of fact, that is not the case. The number of colonels was determined originally in 1954 by the number of officers that was on duty at that time. It was a young service and they did not have many senior officers, but when Congress realized they did not have what they needed, Congress upped the number in 1959, and that increased number has been continued since. Now we are in the process of overhauling the entire structure.

Give the committee time to work on this basic legislation, and let us not take it out on the families of 6,000 officers that are trying to do a good job.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14402.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXVII, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ALLIED WARTIME FORCES

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13377) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide hospital and medical care to certain members of the armed forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in World War I and World War II.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 13377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 109 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c)(1) Any person who served during World War I or World War II as a member of any armed force of the Governments of Czechoslovakia or Poland and participated while so serving in armed conflict with an enemy of the United States and has been a citizen of the United States for at least ten years shall, by virtue of such service, and upon satisfactory evidence thereof, be entitled to hospital and domiciliary care and medical services within the United States under chapter 17 of this title to the same extent as if such service had been performed in the Armed Forces of the United States unless such person is entitled to, or would, upon application thereof, be entitled to, payment for equivalent care and services under a program established by the foreign government concerned for persons who served in its armed forces in World War I or World War II.

"(2) In order to assist the Administrator in making a determination of proper service eligibility under this subsection, each applicant for the benefits thereof shall furnish an authenticated certification from the French Ministry of Defense or the British War Office as to records in either such Office which clearly indicated military service of the applicant in the Czechoslovakian or Polish armed forces and subsequent services in or with the armed force of France or Great Britain during the period of World War I or World War II.".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13377 proposes to extend a limited vet-

erans' benefit—namely, medical and hospital care—to certain members of the Armed Forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in World War I or World War II.

For many years we have been aware of a number of veterans, now U.S. citizens, who served with allied armies in the common cause and yet after the close of the particular war found that in view of the change in government they were deprived of all veterans' benefits. This bill is designed to afford a very modest amount of relief to Polish and Czech veterans who under its provisions must show that they have been U.S. citizens for at least 10 years and as a prerequisite to entitlement to medical care must produce a certification from either the British War Office or the French Ministry of Defense as evidence of subsequent service in the French or British armed forces during the war concerned.

This proposal has the cosponsorship of a number of our colleagues who represent loyal American citizens who fall within the categories described, but I must emphasize that the chief and longstanding proponent of a proposal of this nature is our distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO). Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois to give us a further explanation of the background and need for this legislation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Hon. RAY ROBERTS, who chaired the hearings and who is now managing the bill on the floor of the House, for his cooperation. I rise in support of H.R. 13377. I want to express my appreciation also to Chairman DORN, Congressman TEAGUE, and Congressman DULSKI for their strong support of this legislation. I want also to extend my deep appreciation to Congressman HAMMERSCHMIDT from Arkansas for his support, and to my departed colleague, Congressman John Saylor, for his support in committee prior to his passing. I would like to call to the attention of the Members that I have received invaluable assistance, counsel, and guidance in the preparation of this legislation from the members of the staff of the Veterans' Affairs Committee as well as from officials of the Veterans' Administration, and I thank all of the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for their patient understanding and the courtesy they extended last year to all of the witnesses who testified before the Veterans' Affairs Committee and outlined the need and importance of this bill. Let me also thank all of the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for their unanimous affirmation in committee of this bill's merits.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to point out that in addition to unanimous committee approval of this bill, 46 Members of the House, including many committee members, have joined me in sponsoring this crucial legislation. They include: WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina; MARIO BIAGGI, of New York; JONATHAN BINGHAM, of New York; FRANK BRASCO, of New York; GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., of California: SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, of New York; WILLIAM COHEN, of Maine; DOMINICK DANIELS, of New Jersey; JOHN DENT, of Pennsylvania; ED DERWINSKI, of Illinois; JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan; THADDEUS J. DULSKI, of New York; JOSHUA EILBERG, of Pennsylvania; JOSEPH GAYDOS, of Pennsylvania; BENJAMIN GILMAN, of New York; ELLA GRASSO, of Connecticut; EDITH GREEN, of Oregon; ROBERT HANRAHAN, of Illinois; AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, of California; HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; JOHN KEMP, of New York; JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, of Illinois; RAY MADDEN, of Indiana; JOSEPH MARAZITI, of New Jersey; RALPH METCALFE, of Illinois; JOHN MOAKLEY, of Massachuetts; THOMAS MORGAN, of Illinois; MORGAN MURPHY, of Illinois; JOHN MURTHA, of Pennsylvania; LUCIEN NEDZI, of Michigan; GEORGE O'BRIEN, of Illinois; STANFORD PARRIS, of Virginia; BERTRAM PODELL, of New York; MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois; ROBERT ROE, of New Jersey; ANGELO RONCALLO, of New York; DANIEL ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois; PAUL SARBANES, of Maryland; JAMES V. STANTON, of Ohio; SAMUEL STRATTON, of New York; RICHARD VANDER VEEN, of Michigan; JEROME WALDIE, of California; WILLIAM WALSH, of New York; ANDREW YOUNG, of Georgia; SAMUEL YOUNG, of Illinois; CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin.

This legislation is limited to providing only hospital, domiciliary care, and medical services by the Veterans' Administration to those who served in combat during World War I or World War II, as a member of any armed force of the Governments of Czechoslovakia or Poland, against enemies of the United States. They must have been American citizens for at least 10 years to qualify and they must not be entitled to equivalent care or services provided by a foreign government or ally of the United States.

In our original bill we proposed to include similarly situated soldiers who fought on behalf of the allied causes of the Governments of Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, and Yugoslavia. However, with research and historical inquiry, it developed that at this it would be impossible to document adequately the necessary proof of service from the Communists with respect to men who served in the armed forces of these countries.

As my colleagues are fully aware, we require strict evidentiary proof of service of our own armed services. Accordingly, it appeared that only service of veterans of Poland and Czechoslovakia, who are able to secure appropriate service certifications from either the British War Office or the French Ministry of Defense, could reasonably be equated with the service requirements for our own veterans.

It is for this reason that the bill in its present form is now limited to veterans of Poland and Czechoslovakia who, we have been assured, can secure the appropriate service certification from either Britain or France.

Passage of these limited benefits is supported by the Illinois Division of the American Legion, the National Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the 82d Airborne Division Association, Inc., the 101st Airborne Division Association, and also by the Combined Veterans Associations of Illinois, which embraces the following organizations: AMVETS, the Catholic War Veterans, the Italian-American War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the Marine Corps League, the Navy Club, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Polish Legion of American Veterans, the United Spanish-American War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the Veterans of World War I. It is also supported by the Service Employees International Union, and many other groups and individuals.

There are various estimates as to how many persons would be covered by this bill—and it appears that, at the most, about 35,000 would be entitled to benefits. However, it has also been estimated by our Veterans' Administration that usually less than 11 percent of those entitled to benefits actually apply for them. Keeping these estimates in mind, and also taking into account the fact that each year more and more of these freedom fighters pass away due to the infirmities of advancing age, the cost for providing medical benefits to the 4,000 or 5,000 who may apply would be relatively small.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that these freedom fighters, unlike others who fought with great courage against the enemies of the United States, were not able to return to their homelands after the war was over because their homelands remained under Communist control. For many years, our veterans laws—title 38, United States Code—have permitted certain veterans benefits to those who were not actually in the U.S. Armed Forces on the basis of "reciprocal services" upon request by the government allied with our country during World War I or World War II. However, because the homelands of the freedom fighters are still under Communist control, recourse to the "reciprocal services" authority is unavailable. Thus, the freedom fighters are denied benefits and recognition not only in our country but in their native lands as well.

Several Allied countries, including Canada, Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, have granted full veteran privileges to the Polish veterans who settled in their lands. However, the United States has not, despite the fact that we already provide medical and hospital benefits to World War II veterans of the Philippine Armed Forces, even if they are not U.S. citizens. Yet, the heroic sacrifices that were made by the Poles and Czechs were the same as Philippine nationals—why, then, should not the recognition be the same?

Two years ago, while in Italy, I visited the cemetery in Monte Cassino dedicated to the Polish war dead. Close to 2,000 members of the Polish Army-in-exile were killed in the Italian campaigns of World War II and are buried at Monte Cassino and other cemeteries in Italy. These freedom fighters were committed to the cause of liberty. They fought for democracy. They fought for self-determination. They fought for freedom, and

their devotion to this sacred cause never wavered. They gave willingly of their blood and their lives as they fought shoulder to shoulder with the Americans and the Allied Forces in Europe.

We hear so much about the millions of people who died in World War II, but how many of us are aware of the fact that more than 5 million Poles were killed in World War II. This is a figure that is rarely mentioned, but it must be mentioned today, because these men fought on the Allied side against the common enemy. They sacrificed their lives and gave their all—willingly—with no hope of reward, other than to be free.

Many of the freedom fighters who survived came to America, because their native lands, Poland and Czechoslovakia, remained under Communist control. They became citizens, raised families, and became productive and exemplary members of our communities. Many of these freedom fighters who established themselves in our country have been able to provide well for themselves and their families. They are in no need of the medical benefits that would be provided by H.R. 13377, and undoubtedly will never apply for these benefits.

Yet there is one overwhelming cloud in their lives, and that is the knowledge that official recognition for their great contribution in the cause of freedom during World War II has been denied, despite the fact that the same recognition has been given to others. This is an unconscionable oversight on our part, and gives a hollow ring to our words of gratitude. Those 2,000 Polish graves in Italy are mute evidence of the courage and dedication of the freedom fighters. It is, therefore, our solemn obligation to give tangible recognition to their unforgettable sacrifices.

We have more to consider here than providing medical benefits for a few remaining freedom fighters who have not yet succumbed to the infirmities of old age. We must keep in mind the moral aspect and the spirit of the law—a spirit which for Americans always has meant recognition for sacrifices made in behalf of the American cause. This is part of the American heritage—an integral part of the thinking of every American from the earliest days of the founding of our Republic. Let us for a brief moment recall the magnificent contributions made during our Revolutionary War by Pulaski and Kosciuszko, two noble sons of Poland, without whose help the birth of our great country might not have been possible. Pulaski died in battle before our own country was established, but in the case of Kosciuszko, who returned to Europe once our Revolutionary War was won, our grateful Nation bestowed on him land grants in Ohio as recognition for his indispensable assistance in our War of Independence.

It is this same spirit that is reflected in the provisions of H.R. 13377.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to quote from the testimony given by Dr. Jan Karski, now a professor of government at Georgetown University, who was a spy during World War II for the allies and personally reported to President Roosevelt in 1943. In committee testimony, this courageous man said:

> We are war veterans. We did fight in the Allied ranks. We are American citizens. We do serve these United States which we learned to love and respect with undivided loyalty. We would defend this country, if need be, giving our lives. Could this Nation which extended its generosity to others on a scale unparalleled in all human history deny us, its citizens, a status of war veterans.

Mr. Speaker, in summary let me say that these valiant Americans are not asking for a memorial of granite and marble, they are not asking for special privileges. What they are asking for is the official recognition of the U.S. Government of their status as war veterans. They love this Nation and the principles it stands for and it is a high honor for them to be accorded the title "American War Veteran." Passage of this bill would be a living memorial to them in the name of the American people to commemorate their sacrifices for the ideals of freedom. Their native country was taken away from them and they have never received even this symbolic recognition from their adopted land. I strongly urge my colleagues to grant these fine Americans this justly deserved recognition and honor.

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

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Does this bill enable an allied veteran from Great Britain or one who fought with the De Gaulle Free French forces to also qualify under the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. We have reciprocal agreements under the Veterans' Administration, they are able to get benefits under the reciprocal agreements we have with other allied nations who fought side by side against our common enemy.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. So they are covered on an equal basis?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. They are covered under Public Law, title 38, United States Code.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13377 and associate myself with the explanation and concur with the remarks of our distinguished senior member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Mr. Speaker, this measure will authorize hospital and domiciliary care and medical services to certain members of the Armed Forces of Poland or Czechoslovakia who served during World War I and World War II.

To be eligible for these benefits, such veterans must have participated in armed conflict with an enemy of the United States and have been a citizen of the United States for at least 10 years. Additionally, an authenticated certification from the French Ministry of Defense or the British War Office clearly indicating such service as well as subsequent service in or with the Armed Forces of France or Great Britain during World War I or II is required.

Under existing law, Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to grant such benefits to discharged members of the Armed Forces of nations allied with the United States during World War I or World War II, but only in consideration of reciprocal services extended to U.S. veterans. Because of the change in government in these nations, recourse to the reciprocal services authority is not available. The change in government also makes it impossible for these allied ex-servicemen, in most instances, to prove their military service. Fortunately, through the French and British Governments, the military service of veterans of the Polish and Czechoslovakian can be confirmed. The Veterans' Administration indicated that such confirmation will make the bill more "administratively feasible."

Mr. Speaker, these valiant patriots who fought side by side with our own servicemen in the interests of a free world, though in the uniform of an allied nation, are now citizens of the United States. They have earned these benefits and I urge that the bill be passed.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) who has taken a great interest in this bill and who is one of the cosponsors and yield him such time as he may consume.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, H.R. 13377 and congratulate my colleagues Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. ROBERTS for their leadership.

This important bill assures that courageous veterans from Poland and Czechoslovakia who served as allies with American Armed Forces during World Wars I and II will be eligible for medical and hospital care from the Veterans' Administration.

In order to qualify for the benefits which will be extended by this bill, applicants will have to meet three requirements. First, they must now have been a U.S. citizen for at least 10 years. Second, they may not have received or be entitled to payment for equivalent medical care from their former home countries. And, third, they must submit to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration a verification of their military service in the Polish or Czechoslovakian Armed Forces and subsequent participation in or with the Armed Forces of France or Great Britain.

The people of western New York State have a particular interest in this legislation because of the presence and contributions to our communities and country of former Polish and Czechoslovakian veterans now living there. The Buffalo Post of Polish Veterans of the World War II Association, commanded by Waldemar Czyc, and Karal Tomagwski and the Buffalo Wing of the Polish Air Forces Veterans' Association, commanded by John Libront, have helped to preserve the heritage which is rightly theirs—a heritage borne from valor and courage in defense of freedom. Both organizations are commemorating their 20th anniversaries this year.

These veterans served the cause of freedom against common foes of the

United States and their homelands. They fought with Great Britain's Royal Air Force and other branches of the British armed services. They fought with the Free French in World War II and the French in World War I.

They chose, freely, to come to the United States and to live here after the wars were over, and in the case of the Second World War, they came to our shores to avoid life under communism after the Soviet Union enclosed those lands behind the Iron Curtain of the mid-forties.

They are deserving of our Nation's gratitude, and the bill before us is a means of expressing that sentiment to them.

I cosponsored the legislation to provide these benefits. I am pleased to see the House approving them.

I call upon the Senate to act as soon as possible with their consideration, and I call upon the administration to approve this legislation when it comes to the President's desk for his action.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I asked, as the gentleman from Arkansas knows, the question of the gentleman from Illinois as to whether or not the French and the British were also covered. What concerns me with this legislation as I have read it is, No. 1, why is it necessary for the Veterans' Administration to go to the French and British War Offices to ascertain whether or not a Polish or Czech individual served and fought in the Allied Forces against the enemies of the United States?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. This is a procedural safeguard to ascertain whether they did, in fact, serve. Until this particular language was in the bill, I opposed the bill. This certification will establish the fact that they actually fought in the Free Polish and Czech Forces over there under the overall command of the British and French.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, they were under the administrative command and control of the British and French Armies. They were regiments and groups assigned and fighting directly under the French and British. All they are getting is part of the same reciprocity we give to the French and British. This is mostly an honor and is not going to be a big, expensive thing.

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

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, is the report of the committee in terms of the letter which is quoted in the committee report from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration accurate, that the Veterans' Administration is opposed to the bill; and also that the Veterans' Administration says this "would be an unwise departure from well-established policy that veterans' benefits should be granted only to those who serve in our Armed Forces."

Why is it a departure if, in fact, we are doing this in response to the question I asked of the gentleman from Illinois, for British and French allied soldiers?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Of course, the report stands on its own and the language is as the gentleman has before him. As it states, the certification provision makes the bill more administratively feasible but then they continue to oppose it, as is stated in the report.

Since we have existing authority to provide benefits on a reciprocal basis to veterans of the armed forces of certain nations allied with the United States, I do not believe it is a departure. British and French and other nations which served together with the United States in the Armed Forces have entered into such reciprocal agreements with us.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one more point. What we are talking about, as I understand it—and Good Lord, I am as sympathetic as anybody could be to both Poles and Czechs who have fought—what we are talking about in this bill is a situation in which we are seeking to have those who did not fight in the forces of the United States be eligible for service, given the limitations that they had to be a citizen and so forth, while at the same time we have some very serious problems within the Veterans' Administration hospitals. Why are we taking a step at this very point to seek to bring more people into VA hospitals when, in fact, they are already overcrowded and I get complaints, as I am sure other Members do, that service in the VA hospitals is not as good as it should be?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I would respond to the gentleman this way: These people, of course, are taxpaying U.S. citizens and have been for at least 10 years paying their part of the burden. We are creating equity for people who fought in the same cause in the allied forces.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman think this is equity, for us to give these benefits to veterans from Poland and from Czechoslovakia? Is that correct?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. That was my feeling and the feeling was expressed unanimously in the committee, that it did bring equity to a man who did fight side by side with our own forces and is a U.S. citizen. I understand that the number that will be certified is relatively minimal.

Mr. CARTER. Does that make it right and just and fair to our American citizens, that we should do this, because it is a small amount?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. It is my feeling that we would take nothing away from the services that are provided to our own U.S. veterans.

Mr. CARTER. What about those who served during World War I?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. They are covered by this legislation. The same provision applies to the Polish and Czechoslovakian veterans who fought in World War I or in World War II.

Mr. CARTER. My goodness, it seems to me that we are departing from our traditional paths, and we are going to place a great bill upon our taxpayers and the smallness of this just does not justify it. I am as much a veteran as anyone—I fought in World War II—and I have great deal of respect for these people, but I feel we are overburdening the taxpayer of our country, and I do not believe it should be done.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, there are very limited numbers, of these people and we are losing sight of one thing. These men are from countries which were destroyed. These men came to America and have no veterans benefits at home. They are now American citizens and have been American citizens for over 10 years. They fought with our people just like the British and French; fought for the same things we did, and their losses were terrific. Very few of them will ever qualify, but certainly they are entitled to something.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield further, there are millions of Russians who also fought with us in World War II. They came to America and have been naturalized. Do we want to give the benefits to them also?

Mr. ROBERTS. The Russians were not under our command.

Mr. CARTER. There were millions of Italians. These were not in our command, but were under the unified command, that is, the whole group of nations fighting.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no other questions except to state that I think this is an unnecessary burden upon the taxpayers of this country.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) by pointing out to him that when we are talking about Russian soldiers and Italian soldiers, we are not talking about people who fought in the Russian Army or in the Italian Army. We are talking about freedom fighters. Historically and spiritually, America has always recognized those people who have fought for freedom. We are talking about people who are American citizens.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman mentioned my name, I believe, according to the rules of the House, that he has to yield to me. Is that not correct?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I will yield to the gentleman. I am trying to answer your question.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the gentleman that I yield to no one in my love for America. In fact, I fought for America in Southeast Asia, and I want to preserve and protect and defend this country.

However, I do not believe that we owe this to these other people. I do not think the taxpayer should pay it.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of the gentleman's opinion. I am merely trying to clarify the situation so that the gentleman might understand that these are American taxpayers, who do pay taxes.

Mr. CARTER. But they did not fight in the American Army.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. They did fight alongside the Americans.

Mr. CARTER. So did the Russians.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. They fought alongside the French, and they did not return to their country behind the Iron Curtain. The Russians returned to their country.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO).

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago this month, during the final Allied assault against the Third Reich, the Polish Home Army began its uprising against the Nazi oppressors of Warsaw. Today, the House is considering H.R. 13377, a bill which would provide certain benefits to the comrades-in-arms of these brave soldiers.

I became acquainted with the forerunner of this bill shortly after entering the Congress in 1971. Since that time, I have supported efforts to bring this legislation to the floor of the House. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and cosponsor of this revised bill, I am pleased to play a role in its presentation today.

Specifically, H.R. 13377 would provide certain hospital and domiciliary care and medical services to persons who served as members of the Polish or Czech Armed Forces during either World War and who have been citizens of the United States for at least 10 years.

I would like to address my remarks today to the importance of H.R. 13377 to many of the 35,000 Polish Army veterans in the United States, 3,000 of whom live in Connecticut. These men have willingly fought for the ideals of liberty so deeply cherished by all free men and women. Now, we have an opportunity to express our thanks to them through the passage of this legislation.

During World War I, Poles who had been deprived of their nation joined the fighting forces of other lands. Americans of Polish ancestry along with recent Polish emigres formed a Polish Army in France under Gen. Joseph Haller and participated in the final Allied victory.

While some of their comrades returned to this country, others pledged themselves to the service of the newly revived Polish state. Their fighting had not ended, however, because they soon found themselves the only force standing between the Bolshviks and a Germany in revolutionary upheaval. Rallied by the leadership of Jozef Pilsudski, the veteran troops halted the Red Army in 1920 and Europe heaved a sigh of relief.

During World War II, the Polish Armed Forces again fought in the struggle against tyranny. Despite the Nazi blitzkrieg victory, a contingent of Poles reached France where they regrouped and fought at Narvik and Champagne and in Lorraine. Also, the Polish Air Force supplied desperately needed pilots who fought bravely with the RAF during the crucial Battle of Britain.

Throughout the remainder of the war, the Polish Armed Forces were a credit to their homeland and the cause of freedom. They helped defend Tobruk, braved the bloody storming of Monte Cassino, and joined in the final Allied assault against Hitler. For their efforts and sacrifice, they received the praise and gratitude of President Roosevelt, General Eisenhower, and other Allied leaders.

But, what occurred off the battlefield and after the war necessitates the passage of this bill. Rather than return to a Communist Poland, thousands of these gallant veterans emigrated to various countries in the West. Unlike their comrades who settled in Canada, Britain, New Zealand, or Australia, however, these veterans have not received veterans benefits in their adopted land.

The United States partially opened the doors to benefits for Allied veterans, but stipulated that these rights would be granted following an agreement between the United States and the respective Allied Governments. While arrangements were made with Canada, Britain and other countries, this agreement was never concluded with the Communist Government of Poland. For this reason, former members of the Polish Army who are citizens of the United States have never had the opportunity to receive these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, for the past generation, these veterans have enriched our Nation with their talents and their devotion to the ideals of liberty which we all cherish. Passage of H.R. 13377 would in a small way make amends for the oversight of the past and show our appreciation to these Poles, and also to their Czech counterparts, who have become citizens of their adopted home.

Years ago, in speaking of the Polish Army, General Eisenhower said:

> The Free World will always remember their sacrifice.

For the sake of history and the benefit of these men, it is time we act upon these words and pass H.R. 13377.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation as one of the cosponsors, and I want to commend the committee for their action in bringing this bill out to the House floor. I believe it is a measure which is much needed and one whose time has come.

As the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO) has just indicated, the people who will be affected by this bill have fought bravely on our side in two different wars. They have been staunch allies. They are today American citizens, but they have unfortunately not received the same kind of veterans benefits extended to them as others who fought alongside them have received.

Certainly we would be paying proper honor to their service and extending to them our appreciation for their contribution to the common cause through providing these normal veteran benefits to them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13377 legislation which will provide medical care for those citizens of Czechoslovakia and Poland, who fought for the Allies in World Wars I and II, and who have since become American citizens. I consider passage of this legislation to be imperative if we are to begin to repay the huge debt of gratitude which these men are owed for their efforts at preserving democracy and the ideals of freedom for millions of people in the world.

During World Wars I and II many citizens of countries in Central Europe fought side by side with American troops against our common enemies. These men who fought so gallantly and courageously for the cause of freedom returned to their homelands only to find abrupt changes in their government, and their hopes for a life of freedom reduced to mere dreams.

As a result, many of these individuals immigrated from Czechoslovakia and Poland to the United States to pursue those freedoms which had been denied them in their homelands. While in America, these men have contributed much to both the economic and moral well-being of our Nation. Yet, due to serious gaps in our laws they have been denied the right to important medical benefits which are otherwise available to other veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces, and are even available to those persons who served in the Armed Forces of the Philippines even though they may not be American citizens.

What this legislation will do is correct years of injustice to these brave men by providing them with hospital, domiciliary, and medical programs provided by the Veterans' Administration.

This legislation includes the administrative provisions which were missing from similar legislation introduced in recent years. In order to be eligible all a person has to do is obtain proof of military service to the Governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia from either the French Ministry of Defense of the British War Office, as well as show proof of American citizenship for a period of at least 10 years.

The important provision here that by obtaining these military records from friendly governments, this will preclude these veterans from the arduous task of having to obtain these records from their home governments. It is expected that

many of the records of these men can be obtained from the French and British Governments, and thus the program then becomes more administratively feasible for the VA to handle.

I was pleased to be one of 46 cosponsors to this bill which was introduced by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO. He is to be commended for the introduction of this legislation, and I am sure that these men who will finally become eligible for medical benefits will be grateful for Mr. ANNUNZIO's efforts on their behalf.

In this century the cause of freedom has been subjected to numerous threats which resulted in the fighting of two global wars. We owe much of our successes in these encounters to the Allied forces of Poland and Czechoslovakia. We must now seek to provide assistance to these men in their hours of need just as they responded to us in ours. I urge swift approval of this legislation.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Let me say at the outset, that it is not the intent of this legislation to reward anyone. Instead, its purpose is to provide benefits to those individuals who fought for Czechoslovakia and Poland in World Wars I and II, but who are not eligible to receive normal veterans benefits because they chose to become citizens of the United States. Accordingly, this bill would provide certain benefits; namely, hospital, domiciliary care, and medical services, which are provided to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, as well as members of the Philippine Army.

To many of these Czechoslovakian and Polish veterans, the reward for their valiant efforts in the defense of freedom was their admission to the United States. Since their entrance into this country, they have become an integral part of our society and contributed fully.

The purpose of this bill is to provide the necessary benefits that all veterans of allied forces in both wars receive from their respective governments. With respect to the group which is referred to in this bill, however, such benefits are not forthcoming as the freedom for which they fought has ceased to exist in their native homelands, despite their valiant efforts.

The cause for which they fought, however, has prevailed primarily because of the participation of the United States in both of these conflicts. When the battle for freedom was lost in Poland and Czechoslovakia, many of the veterans of those countries refused to compromise their principles and return to exist under a totalitarian regime. Instead, they chose to emmigrate to the United States and contribute to the preservation of freedom. Yet, the principles for which they fought were the same as the principles for which American veterans fought. In many instances, these Polish and Czechoslovakian veterans fought alongside the American veterans.

In one sense, the current status whereby these veterans are ineligible for the benefits provided in the legislation before us, acts as a penalty for their desire to refuse to return to the totalitarian regimes of their homelands.

Interestingly, our allies in both wars, specifically, Canada, England, Australia, and New Zealand, have granted full veterans privileges to Polish veterans who settled in their lands.

This bill will have more restricted benefits in that it will only provide hospitalization, domiciliary care, and medical services to those veterans, members of the armed forces of Czechoslovakia and Poland, who participated in armed conflicts with an enemy of the United States and, most importantly, who have been citizens of the United States for at least 10 years.

I strongly urge my colleagues to give full support to this legislation.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 13377, I am pleased to join other Members of the House this afternoon in expressing my views as to why this legislation should be approved by the Congress.

I am sure the Members have not forgotten that during World War I and II many citizens of countries in central Europe fought with great courage in alliance with and against the foes of the United States and its allies. After the war there was a change of government in these countries, particularly Poland and Czechoslovakia, which deprived many of these Eastern Europeans the freedom for which they so valiantly had struggled.

Rather than accept the restrictions imposed on them by their governments, many emigrated to the United States where they could live with full and rightful dignity.

These Americans have given much to our Nation—they have contributed to our economic life, and they are a spirited example of individuals determined that freedom is the most precious possession of any people.

Because of a gap in our laws these individuals are ineligible to receive any of the benefits available to veterans of the Armed Forces. It is time for us to right this injustice. H.R. 13377 provides that former servicemen of Poland and Czechoslovakia, who have been citizens of the United States for 10 years, shall be entitled to hospital and domiciliary care and medical services from the Veterans' Administration to the same extent as if their service had been performed in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this bill, H.R. 13377, certainly deserves our support.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13377, a bill to provide medical care to certain members of allied wartime forces. This legislation would extend to veterans of the Polish and Czecholsovakian Armed Forces who fought with American and Allied forces during World War I and II the same hospital and medical services now available to veterans of our armed services. To be eligible, each foreign veteran must have been a citizen of this country for at least 10 years and be able to furnish authenticated certification of service from either the French or British Governments.

The men and women who would be assisted by H.R. 13377 are all Americans. They are Americans who have a very deep appreciation of their citizenship because they one and all have survived great wars in defense of their former homelands only to return and find them in the hands of another set of oppressors. They have come to this country, as have millions before and after, for the promise of freedom and peace. They deserved their new citizenship as much as any of us who fought during World War I or II, because they risked their lives and shed their blood for the same cause. They and their fellow countrymen who did not leave the battlefields deserve the thought and the gratitude that we have given to our own soldiers. Providing medical care for those survivors who have immigrated to our shores in search of the ideals for which they fought in two world wars is therefore an act of gratitude for this Congress and for the country.

I ask my colleagues to consider these men whom we propose to reward in the same light as our own World War I and II veterans. Both groups served and did not count the cost. We too must not count the additional cost that this bill will bring.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one other point.

The hospital beds and treatment are available to these people only on a space-available basis. They have no priority and no other rights.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will vote for this bill and we pass it unanimously.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13377, the bill before us providing medical and hospital care for members of the armed forces of Poland and Czechoslovakia who served with the allies in World War I and II and who have been citizens of the United States for at least 10 years.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I feel strongly that the passage of this measure will correct a loophole in our veterans' benefits laws which prevent some of our most patriotic citizens from receiving the medical assistance they need and deserve.

During World War I and II, many citizens of allied countries joined with our Armed Forces in defending and preserving the world from tyranny and oppression. But the peoples of Poland and Czechoslovakia were denied the freedom for which they fought so bravely. Accordingly, many of these men and their families emigrated to the United States where they have made significant contributions to the development of our great Nation.

However, since these men were not technically members of our Armed Forces, they were not eligible for any veterans' benefits. Moreover, because their former fatherlands are under Communist control, many of them have nowhere to turn for medical attention they need and deserve.

Accordingly, I am pleased to join in urging the passage of this worthy legislation to assist these deserving patriots and urge my colleagues to vote in support of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) that the House suspended the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13377.

The question was taken.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 3(b) rule XXVII, the Chair will state that, pursuant to the prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

THE VETERANS' HOUSING ACT OF 1974

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15912) to amend chapter 37 of title 3, United States Code, to improve the basic provisions of the veterans home loan programs and to eliminate those provisions pertaining to the dormant farm and business loans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15912

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 "Veterans Housing Act of 1974".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection 1802(b) is amended by deleting the subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) In computing the aggregate amount of guaranty or insurance entitlement available to a veteran under this chapter the Administrator may exclude the amount of guaranty or insurance entitlement used for any guaranteed, insured, or direct loan, provided—

"(1) the property which served as security for the loan has been disposed of by the veteran, or has been destroyed by fire or other natural hazard, and

"(2) the loan has been repaid in full, or the Administrator has been released from liability as to the loan, or if the Administrator has suffered a loss on said loan, such loss has been paid in full.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Administrator may, in any case involving circumstances he deems appropriate, waive either or both of the above-named requirements.".

(b) Subsection 1802(d) of such title is amended by deleting in the first sentence the clause "(3) by a mortgagee approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and designated by him as a certified agent and which is acceptable to the Administrator." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(3) by any lender approved by the Administrator pursuant to standards established by him."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection 1810(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "$12,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000".

(b) Subsection 1810(d) of such title is amended by deleting the clause "as to which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has issued, under section 234 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715y), evidence of insurance on at least one loan for the purchase of a one-family unit." and inserting a period after the word "project".

SEC. 4. Subsection 1811(d)(2)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "$12,500" each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000".

SEC. 5. Section 1819 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting "or the mobile home lot guaranty benefit, or both," immediately after "loan guaranty benefit" each time it appears in such subsection, and by striking out "mobile home" immediately before "loan guaranteed" in the second sentence of such subsection.

(2) Subsection (b) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(b)";

(B) by redesignating clauses "(1)" and "(2)" as clauses "(A)" and "(B)"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) Subject to the limitations in subsection (d) of this section, a loan may be made to purchase a lot on which to place a mobile home if the veteran already has such a home. Such a loan may include an amount sufficient to pay expenses reasonably necessary for the appropriate preparation of such a lot, including, but not limited to, the installation of utility connections, sanitary facilities, and paving, and the construction of a suitable pad.".

(3) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or the loan is for the purpose of purchasing a lot on which to place a mobile home previously purchased by the veteran, whether or not such mobile home was purchased with a loan guaranteed or made under this section or purchased with a loan guaranteed, insured, or made by another Federal agency, and".

(4) Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) is amended by striking out "30 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 per centum".

(5) The last sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (d) is amended to read as follows: "In the case of any lot on which to place a mobile home, whether or not the mobile home was financed with assistance under this section, and in the case of necessary site preparation, the loan amount for such purposes may not exceed the reasonable value of such lot or an amount appropriate to cover the cost of necessary site preparation or both, as determined by the Administrator.".

(6) Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) is amended by deleting all of the paragraph after "exceed—" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) $12,500 for twelve years and thirty-two days in the case of a loan covering the purchase of a single wide mobile home only and such additional amount as is determined by the Administrator to be appropriate to cover the cost of necessary site preparation where the veteran owns the lot, or

"(B) $15,000 for fifteen years and thirty-two days in the case of a loan covering the purchase of a double wide mobile home only and such additional amount as is determined by the Administrator to be appropriate to cover the cost of necessary site preparation where the veteran owns the lot, or

"(C) $20,000 (but not to exceed $12,500 for the mobile home) for fifteen years and thirty-two days in the case of a loan covering the purchase of a single wide mobile home and an undeveloped lot on which to place such home, which includes such amount as is determined by the Administrator to be appropriate to cover the cost of necessary site preparation, or

"(D) $22,500 (but not to exceed $15,000 for the mobile home) for fifteen years and thirty-two days in the case of a loan covering the purchase of a double wide mobile home and an undeveloped lot on which to place such home, which includes such amount as is determined by the Administrator to be appropriate to cover the cost of necessary site preparation, or

"(E) $20,000 (but not to exceed $12,500 for the mobile home) for fifteen years and thirty-two days in the case of a loan covering the purchase of a single wide mobile home and a suitably developed lot on which to place such home, or

"(F) $22,500 (but not to exceed $15,000 for the mobile home) for fifteen years and thirty-two days in the case of a loan covering the purchase of a double wide mobile home and a suitably developed lot on which to place such home, or

"(G) $7,500 for twelve years and thirty-two days in the case of a loan covering the purchase of an undeveloped lot on which to place a mobile home owned by the veteran, which includes such amount as is determined by the Administrator to be appropriate to cover the cost of necessary site preparation; or

"(H) $7,500 for twelve years and thirty-two days in the case of a loan covering the purchase of a suitably developed lot on which to place a mobile home owned by the veteran.".

(7) Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the loan is secured by a first lien on the mobile home purchased with the proceeds of the loan and on any lot acquired or improved with the proceeds of the loan;".

(8) Subsection (f) is amended by inserting "and mobile home lot loans" immediately after "loans".

(9) The first sentence of subsection (i) is amended by striking out the period at the end of such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and no loan for the purchase of a lot on which to place a mobile home owned by a veteran shall be guaranteed under this section unless the lot meets such standards."

(10) Subsection (n) is amended by inserting "and mobile home lot loans" immediately after "mobile home loans".

(11) Subsection (o) is deleted in its entirety.

(12) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) is amended by deleting in the first sentence the clause "or for the purchase of a used mobile home which is the security for a prior loan guaranteed or made under this section or for a loan guaranteed, insured or made by another Federal agency," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or for the purchase of a used mobile home which meets or exceeds minimum requirements for construction, design, and general acceptability prescribed by the Administrator,".

SEC. 6. Chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting sections 1812, 1813, 1814, and 1822.

SEC. 7. Chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) by deleting from subsection 1803(a)(1) "and not more than 50 per centum of the loan if the loan is for any of the purposes specified in sections 1812, 1813, or 1814 of this title." and inserting a period after the phrase "section 1810 of this title".

(b) by deleting the first sentence in subsection 1803(b).

(c) by deleting paragraph (1) of subsection 1803(d) and inserting in lieu thereof "The maturity of any loan shall not be more than thirty years.".

(d) by deleting the last sentence in paragraph (3) of subsection 1803(d).

(e) by deleting the last sentence in subsection 1815(b).

(f) by deleting in subsection 1818(a) "(except sections 1813 and 1815, and business loans under section 1814, of this title)".

(g) by deleting subsection 1818(c) and renumbering subsection (d) as subsection (c).

SEC. 8. Section 802 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000".

SEC. 9. The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the following:

"1812. Purchase of farms and farm equipment.
"1813. Purchase of business property.
"1814. Loans to refinance delinquent indebtedness."

and

"1822. Recovery of damages.".

SEC. 10. The provisions of this Act shall become effective the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment, except that sections 2(b) and 3(b) shall become effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, known as the Veterans' Housing Act of 1974, is the result of hearings on the GI housing program held by our Housing Subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY). His able associates on the subcommittee are the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HELSTOSKI), the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILSON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS), the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUBER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MOORHEAD).

H.R. 15912 contains a number of provisions which are designed to improve the veterans' home and mobile home loan programs and to liberalize the grant for the so-called paraplegic housing program.

I now yield such time as he may consume to our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, who will explain in greater detail the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as indicated by our acting chairman, the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, held hearings on a predecessor bill at which time testimony was received from representatives of the Veterans' Administration, all of the major veterans' organizations, and a number of representatives from associations representing the housing and the mobile home industries. Subsequently, the subcommittee recommended a clean bill to the full committee which was introduced as H.R. 15912. I am pleased to note that our bill now carries the sponsorship of 21 members of the committee and was favorably reported by unanimous vote on July 29.

H.R. 15912 is designed to accomplish the following major objectives:

First. It would permit the Administrator to restore a veteran's entitlement to a guaranteed, insured, or direct loan provided a prior GI loan has been paid in full and the property has been disposed of by the veteran. The law presently provides that the VA may restore entitlement previously used if the property is taken, through condemnation or otherwise, by a governmental body, or is lost or destroyed through a natural hazard, or is disposed of for some compelling reason devoid of fault on the part of the veteran. That portion of the amendment regarding restoration only upon payment in full in effect codifies the regulatory practice. The removal of "compelling reasons devoid of fault" would eliminate a statutory requirement that is susceptibile to varying interpretations and hence, uneven application throughout the system of VA field stations. Furthermore, determinations of the validity of the reasons for the disposal of properties by veterans entail a substantial expenditure of resources on the part of VA staff.

This provision would tend to increase the availability of loan benefits to veterans rather than servicemen. The impact would be largely confined to those who have used substantially all of their $12,500 entitlement for the purchase of a home and who did not have a "compelling reason" for disposing of their homes.

The amendment will continue the discretionary authority in the Administrator to waive either or both of the mandatory conditions prerequisite to such restoration in certain deserving situations.

Second. It would authorize the Administrator to permit any lender to process GI conventional home or mobile home loans on an automatic guaranty basis pursuant to standards established by the Administrator. At the present time, only supervised lenders; for example, banks, savings and loan associations and insurance companies are authorized to automatically guarantee VA loans. Because of this limitation, consumer credit and finance companies which are nonsupervised, have been precluded from such automatic guarantee status. The bill would permit the Administrator to establish standards which, if met by any lender, would enable that lender to process loans to be automatically guaranteed by the VA without the necessity of obtaining prior approval. This will greatly speed the loan obtaining process for veterans. The committee also believes this provision will serve to stimulate greater participation in the mobile home loan program.

Third. It increases the maximum loan guarantee from $12,500 to $15,000. From June 22, 1944, to September 1, 1951, the maximum loan guarantee was $4,000. From September 1, 1951, to May 7, 1968, it was $7,500. On May 7, 1968, the maximum guarantee was raised to $12,500. With rapid increases that have occurred in the prices of homes since 1968, the present guarantee does not afford a reasonable opportunity for the veteran and his family to purchase a home unless he is able to make a substantial downpayment. If the veteran is to continue to obtain loans with no downpayment or very low downpayment in today's housing market, the maximum guarantee must be increased.

According to the Veterans' Administration an increase in the maximum guarantee will not significantly increase the expenses and losses in the home loan program.

Fourth. It would authorize the making of loans to acquire individual condominium units without the present prerequisite that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has issued insurance on at least one loan in the project. Due to the limited number of condominiums processed under section 234 of the National Housing Act, veteran purchasers have been limited to a relatively narrow selection of units and have been precluded from using their loan benefits to finance condominium units from the total available market. This has severely limited the availability of VA financing for veterans badly in need of shelter. The committee recognizes that living styles have changed considerably during the past few years and one of the outgrowths of these changes has been the use of condominiums as well as mobile homes. Housing experts have cited a number of reasons for the rapid growth of condominiums and it would appear that the trend is not a temporary one.

Fifth. The bill would increase the maximum loan guarantee for mobile homes from 30 to 50 percent, bringing it more in line with the guarantee for conventional home loans. Separate provisions are made in the bill for maximum loan limitation for double-wide mobile homes, as contrasted with single-wide mobile homes. The maximum loan for single-wide mobile home loans would be increased from $10,000 to $12,500 and establish a new loan maximum of $15,000 for double-wide mobile home units. The present statutory maximum of $10,000 for mobile homes largely relegates the VA program to a level serving only the most modestly priced segment of the market. At present, any veteran who desires to buy a large single-wide or a double-wide mobile home would find it necessary to put up so much downpayment under the GI loan program that he is, in effect, deprived of the benefits of a VA guaranteed loan.

Sixth. The bill would also provide authority, for the first time, to guarantee a loan for the purpose of acquiring a lot and making necessary site preparations upon which to place a mobile home unit already owned by a veteran.

Seventh. Under present law, no loans may be made for the purchase of mobile homes after July 1, 1975. The bill would delete section 1819(o) of chapter 37, title 38, that prohibits the Administrator from making loans to purchase mobile homes and mobile home lots on and after July 1, 1975. When the Veterans' Housing Act of 1970 was under consideration, the Congress recognized that many young veterans do not have the resources with which to pay rapidly escalating prices for conventionally built homes. The act, therefore, authorized VA to guarantee loans on mobile homes in order "to make available lower cost housing to low and lower income vet-

erans, especially those who have been recently discharged." According to the Veterans' Administration, the total number of mobile homes guaranteed to date number 14,624. This represents only a small proportion of the total loans guaranteed; however, it appears that veterans obtaining VA mobile home loans are, for the most part, those for whom the program was intended. The VA reports that the average veteran obtaining a mobile home loan in calendar year 1973 had a monthly income of $523 and assets of $580, compared to $739 average monthly income and $2,375 average assets for veterans receiving VA loans for conventionally built homes. In addition, mobile home buyers were younger, as demonstrated by the fact that 40 percent were 26 years old or less, compared to 20 percent of conventional home purchasers in the same age group. More than three-fourths of the veterans obtaining mobile home loans were Vietnam-era veterans.

With a view toward developing a larger volume of mobile home loans and encouraging more widespread participation of dealers and lenders, the Veterans' Administration has instituted several programs that are discussed later on in this report. Experience by VA in the mobile home loan program shows that the program is meeting the needs of those for whom it was intended and the committee is now recommending that the program be extended on a permanent basis.

Eighth. The bill would increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans from $17,500 to $20,000. The grant was set at $10,000 by Public Law 702 (80th Congress) in 1948. It was increased to $12,500 in 1969 (Public Law 91–22), and again increased to the present maximum of $17,500 in 1972 (Public Law 92–341). According to the Veterans' Administration, in fiscal year 1971 the average total cost to a veteran for a new, specially adapted house was $35,990. This cost rose to $38,744 for fiscal year 1972 and to $45,155 for fiscal year 1973. It is anticipated that the average cost for fiscal year 1974 will be even higher—$48,107 is a tentative estimate.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in my remarks a section-by-section analysis of the bill together with a detailed estimate of the costs involved:

Section 1. This captions the Act as the Veterans' Housing Act of 1974."

Section 2. Amends section 1802(b) to permit the Administrator to restore a veteran's entitlement to a guaranteed, insured or direct loan provided a prior GI loan has been paid in full and the property has been disposed of by the veteran. The Administrator will continue to have authority to restore a veteran's entitlement when circumstances warrant even though these conditions can not be met. Also amended is section 1802(d) to authorize automatic guaranty of loans made by a lender other than a supervised lender provided such lender has prior approval by the Administrator. The provision for automatic guaranty of loans by mortgagees designated by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development as certified agents is deleted as that program is no longer in effect.

Section 3. Amends section 1810(c) to increase the maximum dollar amount of guaranty from $12,500 to $15,000. It also amends section 1810(d) to delete the requirement that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development must have issued evidence of insurance on at least one loan for the purchase of a one-family unit in a condominium project before the Administrator may make a loan to a veteran to purchase a unit in the project.

Section 4. Is a technical amendment to further implement the increase in the guaranty from $12,500 to $15,000. This is accomplished by amending section 1811(d)(2)(A) to delete $12,500 each place where it appears and insert $15,000 to correspond to the amendment to section 1810(c).

Section 5. Amends section 1819 to provide for loans to purchase lots on which to place mobile home units already owned by veterans. It also amends the section to increase the maximum permissible loan amount for a single wide mobile home to $12,500 and to provide a separate maximum of $15,000 for double wide units. The present 12 year loan maturity is retained but the loan maturity for double wide units is established at 15 years. Further, the guaranty on mobile homes is increased from 30 percent to 50 percent. It also deletes section 1819(o) that prohibits the Administrator from making loans to purchase mobile homes and mobile home lots on and after July 1, 1975. Finally, the provision for guaranteeing a loan on the purchase of a used mobile home is liberalized in that it will no longer be required that such a used mobile home must have been the security for a prior guaranteed loan. In administering this provision it is the intention of the Committee that the Administrator provide adequate safeguards and criteria with respect to the value, quality and condition of used mobile homes on which loan applications are made.

Section 6. Amends chapter 37 by deleting sections 1812, "Purchase of farms and farm equipment", 1813, "Purchase of business property", 1814, "Loans to refinance delinquent indebtedness", and 1822, "Recovery of damages".

Section 7. Contains technical amendments to sections 1803(a)(1), 1803(b), 1803(d), 1815(b), 1818(a), and 1818(c) required by the deletion of sections 1812, 1813, 1814, and 1822. The deletion of the reference to section 1815 in section 1818(a) and 1818(c) will give veterans who served after January 31, 1955, benefit rights under the "insured loan program" comparable to those enjoyed by veterans of prior conflicts so that all veterans would enjoy like benefits under the "guaranteed loan program", the "direct loan program", and the "insured loan program".

Section 8. Amends chapter 21, section 802, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for certain severely disabled veterans from $17,500 to $20,000.

Section 9. Amends the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 to reflect the decision of sections 1812, 1813, 1814, and 1822.

Section 10. This section represents a Committee amendment dealing with effective dates for the various provisions of the bill. The bill generally would be effective the first day of the first month following the date of enactment, it was recently brought to the attention of the Committee that two of the provisions should have a reasonable deferred effective date in order to afford the VA adequate time to appropriately implement the provisions. These provisions deal with the extension of the automatic loan provision to non-supervised lenders and, secondly, the provision that would shift the burden of initial review of condominium projects upon the VA. Implementation of this provision will entail the preparation of detailed plans, procedures and forms for reviews of not only the physical plan or structure, but also the legal documents relating to the condominium project, cost of maintaining the common property, and assuring that any management agreements to be entered into are fair to all concerned. Accordingly, with regard to these two provisions the Committee concluded that a 90 day deferred effective date would not be unreasonable.

ESTIMATES OF COST

The Committee has determined that the estimated total first year cost of the bill, if enacted would be $2,467,800 and the total first five year cost would be $20,235,000. A detailed breakdown of these costs follows:

ESTIMATED COSTS OF H.R. 15912 FOR FISCAL YEARS 1975 THROUGH 1979

	General operating expenses	Expenses and losses	Total
A. Reinstatement:			
Fiscal year—			
1975	−$280,000	$47,000	−$233,000
1976	−301,000	179,000	−122,000
1977	−308,000	348,000	+40,000
1978	−315,000	515,000	+200,000
1979	−322,000	702,000	+380,000
Total	−1,526,000	1,791,000	+265,00
B. Automatic processing:			
Fiscal year—			
1975	−305,000	270,000	−35,400
1976	−326,000	270,000	−56,700
1977	−332,800	270,000	−62,800
1978	−339,800	270,000	−69,800
1979	−345,700	270,000	−75,700
Total	−1,650,400	1,350,000	−300,400
C. $15,000 guaranty:			
Fiscal year—			
1975	0		0
1976	0	5,000	5,000
1977	0	25,000	25,000
1978	0	62,500	62,500
1979	0	90,000	90,000
Total	0	182,500	182,500
D. Condominiums:			
Fiscal year—			
1975	544,200	0	544,200
1976	549,600	0	549,600
1977	555,100	0	555,100
1978	560,700	0	560,700
1979	566,300	0	566,300
Total	2,775,900	0	2,775,900
E. Mobile home loans (increases in loan amounts, increase in percent of guaranty and elimination of 1975 termination date):			
Fiscal year—			
1975	100,000	467,000	567,000
1976	535,000	696,000	1,231,000
1977	581,000	1,001,000	1,582,000
1978	642,000	1,994,000	2,636,000
1979	698,000	2,817,000	3,515,000
Total	2,556,000	6,975,000	9,531,000
F. Increase SAH grants to $20,000:			
Fiscal year—			
1975	0	1,625,000	1,625,000
1976	0	1,625,000	1,625,000
1977	0	1,563,000	1,563,000
1978	0	1,530,000	1,530,000
1979	0	1,438,000	1,438,000
Total	0	7,781,000	7,781,000
Total estimated cost:			
1st year			2,467,800
2d year			3,321,900
3d year			3,702,300
4th year			4,919,400
5th year			5,913,600
5-year total			20,235,000

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an excellent bill which will materially improve the GI housing program and effectively aid veterans in securing homes.

With a very minor exception, the Veterans' Administration has indicated that it favors the enactment of this legislation and I strongly recommend its approval by the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15912. This measure will liberalize the provisions of the Veterans' Administration loan guaranty program, thereby making it possible for eligible veterans to more readily obtain housing.

This bill is the end product of hearings by our Subcommittee on Housing under the able leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY). During the course of these hearings, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee received testimony from the Veterans' Administration, the major veterans' organizations, housing industry spokesmen, and mortgage bankers. Witnesses were unanimous in their opinion that current conditions were making it virtually impossible for young veterans and their families to purchase adequate housing. One witness summarized the problem thusly, "A serious drought in available mortgage money, soaring interest rates, and skyrocketing costs of material, labor, and land have combined to push housing out of the reach of many American families, and have resulted in a dramatic fall off in housing starts."

Now, I recognize, of course, that many of these problems cannot be corrected by this bill or any other legislation. We can, however, alleviate the problem for veterans by making the so-called GI home loan program more attractive to investors with mortgage capital and by making it easier for the veterans to obtain economical housing. This, we have attempted to do in H.R. 15912.

The bill, Mr. Speaker will increase the maximum amount of the loan guaranty from $12,500 to $15,000. It is common practice in mortgage banking, we are told, for lenders to limit the maximum amount of the loan they are willing to purchase to a multiple of the amount of the guaranty. Thus, the modest increase in the guaranty authorized by this measure would have a shotgun effect with respect to the amount of the loan.

The bill also contains a provision that will permit the Administrator to grant authority to process loans on a so-called automatic basis to certain lenders other than banks, savings and loan associations and insurance companies. Under existing law, mortgage companies, or in the case of mobile homes, consumer credit and finance companies are termed "nonsupervised lenders" and must obtain prior approval from the Veterans' Administration before making a GI loan. This provision will expedite the flow of paper and loan closing. We are hopeful that the simplified procedures authorized will encourage greater participation by lenders in the veterans housing program.

Another significant provision of the bill, Mr. Speaker, will permit the Veterans' Administration to approve loans on one-family residential condominium properties without the current requirement that at least one loan in the project be insured by FHA under section 234 of the National Housing Act. The increased popularity of condominum housing makes it necessary that such housing be made more readily available to veterans.

One of the most economical types of housing is, of course, the mobile home. Since this type of home became available for GI bill financing, there has been a slow but steady increase in the number of such homes on which a VA guaranty has been issued. A number of provisions contained in this bill should stimulate much greater activity in this type of low-cost housing.

For example, the bill will increase the maximum guaranty on mobile homes from 30 to 50 percent, thus increasing the value of the security on the loan and encouraging more lender participation.

It would increase the inadequate $10,000 maximum guarantee on single-wide mobile home units to $12,500. It would also authorize a new maximum of $15,000 for double-wide units with a 15-year loan maturity.

Additionally, the bill will provide authority to guarantee a loan to acquire a lot and make necessary site preparations upon which to place a mobile home unit already owned by a veteran.

These improvements in the Veterans' Administration mobile home loan program will, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, stimulate greater interest by lenders and veterans in this activity.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill contains two very important provisions that will be welcome news to the relatively small numbers they will affect.

One of the provisions will increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing to certain veterans with serious service-connected disabilities. The existing grant of $17,500 for the construction of homes with special features such as ramps for wheelchairs and handrails in strategic locations will be increased to $20,000.

Another provision will authorize the restoration of a veteran's entitlement to a GI home loan provided the previous GI loan had been paid in full and the property disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported unanimously from the committee. Its major provisions have been endorsed by the Veterans' Administration, veterans organizations, lenders, and housing industry leaders. It is a good bill and I urge that it be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15912, a bill designed to improve the veterans home loan programs.

Of overall interest and value to all veterans is the increase in the maximum loan guaranty from $12,500 to $15,000 for conventional type housing. This should tend to enhance the lender's interest in making GI loans. More lenders also should become available, because this bill will permit the VA to automatically guaranty loans made by unsupervised lenders such as finance and mortgage companies. Under present law automatic guarantees are permitted only to supervised lenders, such as banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies.

For the veteran who can afford only low-cost housing, this bill provides for an increase in the maximum loan guaranty from 30 to 50 percent on mobile homes; increases the maximum loan for single-wide mobile homes from $10,000 to $12,500; creates a new loan maximum in the amount of $15,000 for the purchase of a double-wide mobile home, and grants authority to guaranty a loan for the purchase of a lot to include site preparation for the placement of a mobile home already owned by the veteran.

Another source of housing for our veterans will be expanded, by eliminating a restriction in the present law which stipulates that the Department of Housing and Urban Development must insure at least one unit in a condominium project before a veteran may obtain financing through the Veterans' Administration.

Veterans who may have used their GI loan entitlement will be eligible for a restoration of full entitlement if the previous loan has been paid in full and the home disposed of.

The maximum grant for specially adapted housing for which certain veterans with serious service-connected disabilities are eligible will be increased from $17,500 to $20,000.

This is a very meritorious bill and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH), a member of the committee.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15912, the Veterans' Housing Act of 1974.

As a cosponsor of this bill, I wish to note the key features; namely the extension and expansion of home loan programs. I am especially pleased with the mobile home provision on which the guarantee will be increased from 30 to 50 percent. Also the maximum loan for a single-wide mobile home is increased from $10,000 to $12,500. In addition, double-wide units will also be covered at a $15,000 maximum.

Due to the fact that mobile homes constitute 80 percent of all new home sales under $20,000 and more than 75 percent of all mobile home loans were obtained by Vietnam-era veterans these changes in the 1970 act are indeed worthy.

High housing mortgage and interest costs have hit and hurt us all, but no one is hit and hurt harder than the Vietnam veteran. If the veteran is to continue to obtain loans with little or no downpayment, the maximum guarantee must be increased.

This bill recognizes the changes in living styles by including condominiums in its coverage. Attention is given to special adaptive housing grants for service-connected disabled veterans.

H.R. 15912 is a major improvement of the 1970 Veterans' Housing Act. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that will help not only the veterans, but the housing situation.

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 15912, a bill that would provide better opportunities for veterans to purchase homes under the VA loan guaranty program. The bill is supported by almost everyone engaged in the homebuilding business and will provide a much-needed boost to that industry. The bill would increase the number of VA mobile home guaranteed loans for veterans.

At a time of tight money and high interest rates, this legislation is absolutely essential for our veterans and their dependents.

This legislation would allow a veteran to have continuous entitlement for VA home loan purposes. This means that even though a veteran has already used his full entitlement, he will now be eligible for additional home loans so long as his previous loans are paid in full and the property has been disposed of by the veteran.

I commend the action of my good friend from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY) chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, and other members of his subcommittee, and the unanimous vote of the full committee in reporting this bill to the House. It is a bill that deserves immediate attention. As the Members know, the maximum loan guaranty limit was $4,000 from June 22, 1944, to September 1, 1951. The limit was increased to $7,500 in 1951 and remained at that figure until May 8, 1968, when it was again raised to the present $12,500 limit. I need not remind this body of what has happened to the housing market during the past 6 years. In many areas of the country it is impossible for a veteran to purchase a home even with a substantial downpayment. This situation will be corrected to some degree by raising the limit to $15,000 as proposed by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. CARNEY has already discussed the major provisions of this legislation and I shall not dwell on them. There is no doubt that this bill will bring about increased activity for VA-guaranteed home loans for the purchase of both conventional and mobile homes. There are approximately 309,000 veterans residing in South Carolina, and for many of them this bill will provide much-needed benefits.

I hope the Senate will give early consideration to this bill and send it to the President without delay.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the American veteran who has served his country valiantly during times of war cherishes the dream of owning a home of his own where he and his family can settle down and grow together. Today, thousands of Vietnam-era and their brother veterans are finding it difficult to purchase homes for their families. In these times of spiraling inflation and tight money, veterans need more help in obtaining financing for houses and mobile homes.

The bill before us—H.R. 15912, the Veterans' Housing Act of 1974—represents a significant step toward extending to American veterans the aid which they so richly deserve. It is a comprehensive piece of legislation which would amend various provisions in the current veterans home loan program.

The bill deals with three major sections of the program.

With regard to the general loan program, H.R. 15912 would increase the maximum home loan available for a veteran from $12,500 to $15,000. Also, it would make it easier for a veteran to obtain a second guaranteed loan if he has disposed of a home bought with an earlier veterans home loan. In light of the increasing popularity of condominium living, the bill would also authorize loans for the purchase of individual condominium units.

In recent years, more and more people have purchased mobile homes, and veterans have also turned to these units as an alternative to owning or renting a home. To improve existing provisions for mobile home purchases, the bill would increase the maximum guarantee for mobile homes from 30 to 50 percent. In addition, the maximum permissible loan would increase to $12,500 for single-wide homes and to $15,000 for double-wide homes. Authority is also granted to guarantee loans to purchase a lot for mobile homes and to continue existing authority to making loans for mobile homes and lots.

Disabled veterans have specific housing needs which often require special facilities and architecture. Therefore, H.R. 15912 would increase the maximum grant for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans from $17,500 to $20,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vital piece of legislation for the many thousands of veterans who helped defend our Nation and must now readjust to a job-scarce, inflation-ridden economy. We must show our continued commitment to the well-being of our veterans and H.R. 15912 offers us such an opportunity.

I strongly urge passage of this important bill.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the veterans' housing bill. It is essential that we act promptly on this measure to update the veterans' home loan program. Dramatic changes in our economy and the housing market have resulted in this program becoming seriously inadequate.

The bill permits the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to restore a veteran's entitlement to a guaranteed, insured or direct loan provided a prior GI loan has been paid in full and the property has been disposed of by the veteran.

Under the present law, restoration of entitlement is only possible if the property is taken, through condemnation or otherwise, by a governmental body or is lost or destroyed through a natural hazard or is disposed of for some compelling reason devoid of fault. By removing the need for a compelling reason, a condition which has proved to be subject to varying interpretations and applications, veterans will be able to replace their present home for personal reasons. For example, a veteran may desire to purchase a different or larger home. If his prior loan has been paid off he will be granted new entitlement in full for the purchase of the new home.

The maximum guarantee was last raised in 1968 to $12,500. With the rapid increases that have occurred in the prices of homes since that time, this amount has become too low and does not afford the veteran and his family the opportunity to purchase a home unless he is able to make a substantial downpayment. The bill raises the maximum guarantee to $15,000.

This legislation also updates the loan program for mobile homes and condominiums. Living styles have changed considerably during the past few years and one of the results has been the increased attraction and use of mobile homes and condominiums. The bill increases the guaranteed loan on mobile homes from 30 to 50 percent and provides that a guaranteed loan may be made for the acquisition of an individual condominium unit without the prerequisite that HUD must have issued insurance on at least one loan in the project.

Lastly, the bill increases the maximum grant payable to certain service-connected disabled veterans from $17,500 to $20,000. Again, this is in recognition of rising costs and will assure our disabled veterans the ability to purchase ramps, lifts and other equipment for their homes.

Each of these provisions has my full support and, therefore, I urge prompt favorable action.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15912, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the two veterans' bills just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS TO GUAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13267) to authorize Federal agricultural assistance to Guam for certain purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13267

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide financial and technical assistance to Guam for improving fire control, watershed protection and reforestation, consistent with existing laws, administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, which are applicable to the continental United States. The program authorized by this section shall be developed in cooperation with the territorial government of Guam and shall be covered by a memorandum of understanding agreed to by the territorial government and the Department. The Secretary may also utilize the agencies, facilities, and employees of the Department, and may cooperate with other public agencies and with private organizations and individuals in Guam and elsewhere.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this Act may be allocated to such agencies of the Department as are concerned with the administration of the program in Guam.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 13267, the bill I am sponsoring with the distinguished Delegate from Guam (Mr. WON PAT).

For as long as I have been in Congress, the provision of adequate agricultural services to Guam has been an important matter to me. When I first came to the House in 1963, I served on the Agriculture Committee, and I sponsored a bill which eventually became Public Law 88-548. That law authorized a USDA program on Guam for a period of 5 years—a period which, unfortunately, expired in 1969. In each Congress since then I have sponsored legislation to reinstate that program.

In this Congress, I am pleased to say, I was able to turn over prime responsibility for this bill to the distinguished Delegate from Guam, my good friend TONY WON PAT, who now has the right to introduce legislation himself, commencing with the 93d Congress. But I remain intensely interested in seeing this program reinstated. Because of its insularity Guam needs to move in the direction of greater self-sufficiency in agriculture. These USDA services could contribute substantially toward that goal, and that is why I am pleased to be sponsoring H.R. 13267 with the distinguished Delegate from Guam.

The bill is a modest one, and would give the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to extend three specific agricultural programs to Guam. The three—fire control, watershed protection, and reforestation—are all forestry-related, and all will help Guam control the substantial danger to crops and people now posed by fires each year.

There is nothing controversial in the bill, Mr. Speaker. It was reported in the Agricultural Committee by unanimous voice vote. It has the support of the administration. The cost is minimal. I urge the House to extend these limited agricultural services which are now available to all States, to the only group of Americans who do not now enjoy them, the American citizens of Guam, by approving the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 13267.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The bill is open-ended, as stated in the language on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. We are given cost estimate figures on page 4 of the report.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Those total, I believe, somewhere around 400-and-some-odd thousand dollars over a period of 5 years?

Mr. MATASUNAGA. Yes; for a 5-year period.

Mr. GROSS. To establish some kind of a record here with respect to expenditure—and I do not like open-end authorizations—may we assume that the figures to be found on page 4 and in the amounts that are listed for the 5-year period will be the governing authorization for this bill?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the estimates would be the maximum amount which would be spent. I would be happy to make a statement here and now for the record that these will be the maximum amounts spent for the years designated.

Mr. GROSS. Not to exceed these amounts each year for the 5-year period?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. WON PAT).

Mr. WON PAT. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of American citizens of Guam, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote in support of H.R. 13267, a bill to authorize certain Federal agriculture programs for Guam.

This measure has the unanimous support of the House Agriculture Committee and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and is cosponsored by my esteemed friend and colleague, Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA, and myself.

The main thrust of H.R. 13267 is to provide the territory of Guam with access to several Federal agricultural assistance programs which will provide invaluable aid in controlling our island's ever-present threat of devastating fires in our mountainous areas. Like many areas in the Pacific, Guam is covered with wild growth which is extremely vulnerable to fire due to the lack of ground moisture.

If enacted into law, H.R. 13267 will provide the government of Guam with access to the expertise of professionals from the U.S. Department of Agriculture in our efforts to reforest the island's mountains with growth less susceptible to fire. Additionally, USDA experts will also assist in helping Guam develop watershed areas.

With the exception of school lunch programs and the Federal food stamp program, Guam is not presently eligible for any of the major programs operated and administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I believe that Guam's need, as stated in the records of committee hearings on H.R. 13267, is adequate justification of our request for the additional assistance which this measure authorizes. For this reason, I again urge my colleagues in the House to support H.R. 13267.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH).

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H.R. 13267 and associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Hawaii and the gentleman from Guam who have spoken in support of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do this in order that I may ask the sponsor of the bill a few questions.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I will be happy to answer the gentleman.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know why this bill was not reenacted when it expired in 1969.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, at that time the Guamanian government was not prepared to carry on the program. And because of the situation with the Guamanian government, there was no request for an extension of the program. But now the Guamanian government is ready and willing to undertake the program by Federal funding and the gentleman from Guam and I have cosponsored this measure.

Mr. GOODLING. Can the gentleman give the Members of this House any specific instances where good has resulted from the original bill?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would like to refer that question to the Delegate from Guam.

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, let me give a little bit of background on this. When the bill was enacted into law in 1965, it provided that agricultural assistance might be provided to the territory of Guam through a memorandum of understanding between the Secretary of Agriculture and the government of Guam. It took a few years before a

memorandum of understanding was reached.

The only program that was extended to Guam was the extension program, in which a representative was sent from the Department of Agriculture to Guam for a couple of years.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. And this program, as I understand it, was very successful.

Mr. WON PAT. Yes, indeed.

Mr. GOODLING. Several years ago we included Guam in our land grant college program.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. GOODLING. Is not the College of Agriculture doing similar work to that provided in this bill?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. This bill deals with an entirely different matter, as the gentleman well knows. It merely extends those programs, other than the land grant program, to Guam, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture whatever he deems appropriate.

We are not asking for anything over and above what the States are now enjoying. These are Americans in Guam we are now speaking of, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. GOODLING. I would like to bring out just one more matter. This was alluded to by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Why did we not specify $427,000 in the authorization bill, rather than making it an open-end appropriation?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. For the reason that in all the programs which pertain to the States, we have an open-end program; but the programs are carried on an annual basis by submission of a budget by the Department of Agriculture and also controlled by appropriations made by the Appropriations Committee of the House in their behalf.

Mr. GOODLING. One further question I would like to have clarified. On page 4 of the report, in a letter written to Chairman POAGE by Philip L. Thornton—for John R. McGuire, Chief of the Forest Service—I read this statement.

This new authorization will not require any additional Federal employees or Appropriations.

Can the gentleman elaborate on that? To me it is confusing.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Well, the statement merely reinforces the earlier statement which I made that we are merely extending to Guam programs which are now applicable to all the States. I suppose the Department of Agriculture believes that this can be done without any additional employees. I am sure that is what Mr. Thornton meant.

Mr. GOODLING. I cannot understand how we will give aid to Guam without additional Federal employees. That is a question I would like to have answered.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I suppose they would send employees now on the payroll from other areas. For example, when the Agricultural extension program was in effect under the 1964 act, which expired in 1969, the Department of Agriculture merely sent someone from Washington for a limited time. I believe this is what is going to happen. We have agents over in the military sector of Guam now. These agents, perhaps, will be sent to the civilian sector to carry on the programs provided in the pending bill.

Mr. GOODLING. If that is the case, it would appear to me we may be overstaffed here. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. No. I do not believe so. It may mean that perhaps the employees would have to work a little harder, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself may feel that he ought to have two Congressmen for the amount of work he does; it just means that one employee will have to extend himself a little more.

Mr. GOODLING. I wish I could agree. If the gentleman could assure me that we have some employees willing to work longer hours, I would welcome them into the service.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would think there are as many dedicated civil service employees as there are Members of Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the Delegate from Guam (Mr. WON PAT).

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that presently the Military Establishment on Guam controls 34 percent of the total land area, and that area contains some vegetation. However, Guam, from the central portion to the south, is purely volcanic and its vegetation is largely sword grass.

Presently, the military has an agricultural expert on Guam who they are now paying to carry out this very program which this bill intends to do for the civilian area. Although the military has that expert in Guam, his services do not extend to the civilian area. For that reason, this bill, I think, is fully justified in order not only to help the civilian area, but also to help the military area.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13267), as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the bill (H.R. 13267).

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

There was no objection.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT EXTENSION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16045) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1975 and 1976, and to make certain technical and conforming changes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16045

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 216(a)(2) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 3259(a)(2) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "June 30, 1973,"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of such paragraph ", not to exceed $76,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and not to exceed $76,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976".

(b) Section 216(a)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3259(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "June 30, 1973,"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of such paragraph ", not to exceed $140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and not to exceed $140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976".

(c) Section 216(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3259(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "June 30, 1973,"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of such paragraph ", not to exceed $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and not to exceed $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 203(1) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 3252(1)) is amended by striking out " 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof " 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency".

(b) The Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 3251–3259) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" whenever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrator"; and

(2) by striking out "Secretary" whenever it appears, except—

(A) in section 213 of such Act where "Secretary" is followed by "of Labor"; and

(B) in sections 203(1), 214, and 216(b) where "Secretary" is followed by "of the Interior";

and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrator".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16045 is a bill to extend the authorizations under the Solid Waste Disposal Act for fiscal years 1975 and 1976. These authorizations will remain at the levels provided for fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

This bill is necessary because the authorizations under the existing act expired June 30, 1974. Although the program may continue to operate through

September 30, 1974, under the terms of the joint resolution, passage of this bill is essential to permit it to continue thereafter.

The Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment has unanimously sponsored this legislation. The full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered it reported by unanimous voice vote.

This is not just another measure to keep an unnecessary bureaucracy in operation. On the contrary, a recent survey by the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors showed refuse and solid waste disposal to be the most commonly mentioned problem facing local municipal leaders. The Nation's cities and towns now spend $6.4 billion for refuse disposal. This amount will rise to $10 billion by 1980.

While solid waste management consumes 47 percent of the municipalities' environmental budget, the Federal Government spends only 1 percent of its environmental dollars to help with planning, research, demonstration, and technical assistance in the solid waste area. The towns and States have sought more aid from Congress and EPA to help meet these needs.

The committee believes that more money must be spent to assist in reducing municipal expenses, to increase resource recovery, and to improve solid waste practices. The Congress has agreed by appropriating $26.5 million on this program in fiscal year 1975. In addition, new provisions of law will be necessary. The committee intends to use these 2 years to develop and adopt comprehensive revisions of this act.

In the meantime, we are hopeful that the current levels of appropriations and manpower can be increased to deal with this important problem.

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

Mr. Speaker, I join with the chairman in support of this bill. I would like to mention something for the record relative to the questions I asked the experts in this field dealing with solid waste. They indicated that sometimes the solid waste disposal sites would bring some infiltration into the water supply, the underground water supply.

At the same time we have the Environmental Protection Agency demanding of our powerplants that they put scrubbers in their stacks throughout the country, and this solid waste or slurry is deposited on land sites all over the country.

In my judgment, the time will come when they themselves will be demanding that this practice cease. It is very expensive, and I think it is also a danger to the underground water supply. However, this point was brought out in our hearings.

I want to say that this bill, I believe, must be extended, and I hope the House will pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) wanted to ask the chairman some questions. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am puzzled by the cost of this bill.

On page 3 of the report the cost estimates are listed as totaling $176 million over a 5-year period.

Then I turn to the bill and find a variety of figures used.

Can the gentleman state what the total cost of this bill may be?

Mr. STAGGERS. This is just simply an authorization, and the authorization in it is $225 million. This money is for demonstration projects. There is $140 million provided and $76 million for the disposal of waste and then there is another provision for $22.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. On page 3 of the bill there is a $276 million authorization over a period of 2 years, and on page 4 there is $140 million for each of 2 years. I just do not understand what the cost of this bill is supposed to be.

Mr. STAGGERS. I can explain to the gentleman the reason that this was put in. As I understand it, clause 7, rule 13, of the House rules requires a 5-year cost estimate, but the bill is only for a 2-year extension, as we say in the bill itself.

Mr. GROSS. Then are we supposed to disregard the figures on page 3 of the report?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes. I would do that, right.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. If I could have the attention of the chairman, I would like to ask a question. In my State, which is a public-land State, if I understand correctly, under the authorization of this act, dumping of garbage on public land has been barred.

We have places, such as in Valley Country, where the small communities, the very rural, forest-type community, has people who now have to haul the garbage down to the city, to an approved dump site.

I am wondering if this is the result of this authorization. In other words, we are hauling garbage from the rural areas to the city so they can legally dump it.

Is this coming under this act or is it a result of it?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, it is not.

Mr. SYMMS. Is this an Executive order or where does it come from? Will the chairman be able to enlighten me on that?

We are hauling garbage in Idaho in some places as far as 100 miles to a city dump, to dump the garbage.

It seems to me that the cities have too much garbage. We are hauling it in from out in the country to the city to dump it.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is an Executive order. I would say that many communities throughout America have the same problem. Most of the areas are doing it in their own way, but this is the most convenient thing for them to do. However, many of them have the solid waste disposal facilities, and use bulldozers to cover the waste up.

Mr. SYMMS. Of course, the problem is that the small communities do not have the means to buy bulldozers.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true. One small community may have a problem in disposing of it.

So we are trying to make this program operate in an equal way.

Mr. Speaker, I can give the gentleman an example of this. In my own county, there is a community that has a disposal system, and they have no public water supply. The disposal is contaminating the water supply, so they are going to have to put in a better disposal system for their solid wastes. I think that this ought to be done all across the land.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for his answer. I just hope that we are not getting the cart ahead of the horse. That is what is bothering me.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other question to ask the gentleman.

To what extent does this interfere with some private entrepreneur who might want to go into the garbage disposal business for a profit? Are there any instances here where the Government is interfering with that?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, not in the world. Not a bit.

If these private people show they can do the job, they will be allowed to do the job.

Mr. SYMMS. If they cannot do the job, what happens then?

Mr. STAGGERS. If they cannot do the job, they should not be allowed to try to do it. They must be able to do it or they should not be allowed to try it.

That condition has arisen in my own community. Some of them were able to do it; some wanted to do the job, but they could not do the job. Others showed they could do the job, so they have been allowed the opportunity. This is the way we have handled it. We must utilize the proper people to do the job.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, when we prescribe that this is to be done on public land, perhaps we have outlawed it for private participation. If the land is owned by the Federal Government in these instances, we also say that we cannot sell the land to private enterprise. So we are getting this back to the point where the garbage disposal business is becoming more and more a problem, from my viewpoint, where the Government interferes with the private enterprise sector, and the Government interference is a hindrance, not a help.

Mr. STAGGERS. No, I would not say that.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we do not have any public lands in our part of the country, but it seems to me that if one takes solid wastes and dumps that on his neighbor's place, we must say, "You take care of it or somebody has to take care of it."

I do not care what happens, they cannot do that on public land. Somebody has to be accountable for it. We have to

take it to a place where it is taken care of.

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

Mr. SYMMS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is really for demonstration grants and for technical assistance. It does not go as far as the gentleman might think it does, and I want to allay his fears if that is possible.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration (H.R. 16045) will extend for a period of 2 years the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1967. This simple extension does not necessarily mean that certain changes and improvements are not needed in this program, but I want to point out that the existing program is an important one in our efforts to provide for effective solid waste management. Our committee does expect to review this program further for appropriate revision.

It is clear that increasing attention must be paid to the need for resource recovery and more rational solid waste management practices in our Nation. Our committee held hearings in March on this important matter, and we agreed, after several executive sessions, to extend the existing authorities at this time rather than to substantially change them.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to recognize the need for an effective solid waste management program.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HUDNUT).

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, I rise in support of H.R. 16045, to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, as amended.

Since the authorization under the Solid Waste Disposal Act expired June 30, the Office of Solid Waste Management is currently operating under a continuing resolution passed July 30 which will also expire on September 30 or whenever the President signs the appropriation for EPA. In view of this time constraint and the fact that the committee has other pressing legislative business, the committee has proposed a straight 2-year extension of the Solid Waste Disposal Act at the current funding level of $140 million annually for demonstration grants and $76 million annually for technical assistance, research, planning, and other Office of Solid Waste Management programs. While I support H.R. 16045 and urge the House to approve it, I would have preferred to see an expanded Office of Solid Waste Management program especially in research, technical assistance, and demonstrations projects. As we find ourselves in the mid 1970's in a situation where we are falling behind in our capacity to dispose of our solid waste thus posing a significant threat to our environment, we need to provide greater incentives to urge the construction and use of resource recovery systems—also we need to do more research in the concept of turning trash into energy resources, which has been suggested. It is my hope that our subcommittee will consider this matter again in the very near future.

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

Mr. HUDNUT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation, because this brings up the reason why it was extended for just 2 years. The reason is that there is considerable work that needs to be done, as the gentleman says.

This is what is going to happen in the future. We are trying to help in different ways in different communities, and we realize it is going to be by 1981 a big burden. We are aware that there are certain ways waste materials can be used gainfully to make energy.

Therefore, in the next 2 years the committee wants to take a real deep look at this and make several new changes in the bill.

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response.

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16045. This is a simple, 2-year extension of authorizations of appropriations of the Solid Waste Disposal Act. As the full committee chairman has stated, the authorization expired at the end of fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment conducted hearings on a number of bills that would revise Federal law relating to solid waste disposal on March 27 and 28, 1974. We conducted several executive sessions on proposed revisions and concluded that the provisions of existing law are sufficient to provide Federal guidance and support to this Nation's need for effective resource and energy recovery and rational solid waste practices. Although I certainly am not satisfied with the level of funding and the number of personnel positions the Environmental Protection Agency has received to implement the act, I believe that 4 years' experience with the act has produced positive results.

Mr. Speaker, during our hearings the wisdom of the provisions of section 204, which authorizes research and experiments in the development of new methods of processing and recovering materials and energy from solid waste, was demonstrated. Under this provision, EPA has funded a project called the CPU-400 in Menlo Park, Calif. Representatives of this project testified during the March hearings, and I had occasion to visit the project 2 years ago. This project is used to demonstrate the effectiveness of a gas turbine system for material recycling and utilization of municipal wastes as nonpolluting fuel for the generation of electricity. The demonstration plant will be the end product of 7 years' research and development effort in new combustion technology financed by the government at cost of nearly $8 million. It will be an environmentally safeguarded unit serving a population of 250,000. The electric power return will meet the total requirements of up to 10 percent of the population served. I would hope that if the project demonstrates success, it will receive Federal support under section 208, which authorizes sufficient funds to place it into operation in a municipality, so that its potential can be fully realized. I understand that a full-scale demonstration would involve costs of approximately $12 million.

Mr. Speaker, another bright spot in this Nation's solid waste disposal effort came to our attention during the hearings. Representatives of the National Center for Resource Recovery testified as to the success of their nonprofit center, funded almost entirely by industry and labor over the past 4 years.

The National Center, during this relatively short period of time, has established that the so-called front-end systems approach to municipal solid waste management is a fruitful approach to pursue. While most of the research and development funding by the Federal Government over the past few years has been expended on what "back-end" systems uses to use the organic fraction of solid waste in such efforts as composting, pyrolysis and other methods to extract energy or byproducts from the organic or light fraction of solid waste, the National Center has concentrated its efforts on "front-end" systems extracting from the total solid waste system those products which ordinarily would be lost. These are glass, ferrous and non-ferrous metals.

Serving as a research and development group, the National Center has become a catalyst in bringing together communities with problems using engineering feasibility studies and marketing arrangements, along with private capital both in its own funding and in the infusion of private capital to finance a pilot project in New Orleans.

It is apparent that additional funding is now needed to keep this kind of effort ongoing, to provide for a meaningful and quite interesting industry-labor-government partnership to solve a national problem. The New Orleans project may likely serve as a symbol of what can be done by other cities since it is a cooperative effort involving local government, the private sector, and the Federal Government.

Therefore, I would hope that, in addition to the funding industry and labor have pledged to the work of the National Center for Resource Recovery, the Environmental Protection Agency would consider very carefully the need for funding of the National Center to encourage the replication of approaches pursued by the Center in communities, and allow the Center to provide technical assistance to states and cities, conduct engineering and economic feasibility studies and carry out other research or information programs which push the state-of-the-practice of solid waste management forward in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would say

to the gentleman from West Virginia that as I figure this, it involves $478 million, almost half a billion authorized to be spent over a 2-year period.

Mr. STAGGERS. It is $225 million.

Mr. GROSS. But I am talking about 2 years. The price tag for 2 years is a total of $478 million.

Mr. STAGGERS. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that we authorize that, but the Committee on Appropriations only appropriated $13 million last year. We are hoping they will do better this time, and come up with sufficient money to meet the problem.

Mr. GROSS. Surely the gentleman from West Virginia would not be asking us to authorize $478 million and then suggest he would not expect that the Committee on Appropriations will provide only $13 million?

Mr. STAGGERS. We recognize the problem as it is, and as we had it last year. I think we will have to meet our obligations because this is one of the greatest problems in America, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt it is one of the serious problems, but why do not the cities take care of their own waste disposal problems? Why come to the Federal Government?

Mr. STAGGERS. We are not taking care of their disposal problems for them, we are only helping them in demonstration projects, experimentation and other things; also planning. We are trying to be helpful.

For instance, we need safe drinking water, and so that we can go to any nation in the world, and we ought to be able to expect we will have uniform treatment wherever we go, of drinking water. But if we do not take care of the solid waste disposals we will have contaminated water, and we will have different kinds of health problems.

Mr. GROSS. What is the matter with the States and municipalities, the counties and the townships doing this for themselves?

Mr. STAGGERS. They do not have the money or the time, the talent or the skill or the manpower necessary to do the actual experimenting and to do the other things.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from West Virginia, that we do not have any money left in the Federal Treasury, either.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. If the Committee on Appropriations takes you up on this authorization, and appropriates the $478 million as this bill provides, Congress will be adding nearly a half billion to the debt and deficit of the Federal Government.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would agree with the gentleman from Iowa—

Mr. GROSS. The Federal Government has no money to spend in amounts of this kind, and for this purpose, except what it borrows.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would agree with the gentleman from Iowa, but I would like to say just this, that if we spend any money in any way it ought to be helping America first. That is the first problem we should be looking into.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide demonstration projects for solid waste disposal, and also for recovery of solid wastes, to recycle them.

For instance, one of the plants that I looked at in St. Louis in company with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is a very complex plant, and was contributed to by this agency of the Federal Government, and it does great work. It separates the solid wastes to their different component parts, so that they can be recovered and recycled. It is very helpful.

Then there is one down in Miami, Fla., which is a very necessary plant, and which was contributed to by the Federal Government, and it is helping. If we do not take care of the solid wastes within a few years they will be up to our hips.

So the Federal Government is actually providing leadership in this area.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is faced with the problem of disposing of 500 billion pounds of solid waste annually at a cost of $15 billion, a domestic expenditure second only to education and welfare. Every day we generate six pounds of garbage for every man, woman, and child in the country. There are indications that the amount of solid waste, and the cost in money, manpower, materials, and energy will double by 1980. The constant increase in per capita generation of solid waste, stimulated by production growth and coupled with a rapidly increasing population concentrated in urban areas has created a serious disposal problem.

What happens to all this waste? Unfortunately, about 75 percent of the Nation's solid waste is still being disposed of by primitive open dumping. To compound the problem, a national survey has shown that of our 14,000 land disposal sites, less than 6 percent were being operated within recognized sanitary landfill standards. And the National League of Cities and the U.S. Council of Mayors, in a joint report, ominously warns that for 47 percent of our cities, only 5 years remain on the capacity of their disposal facilities.

From an environmental standpoint, therefore, solid waste disposal presents itself as an obvious problem. Improper disposal and treatment results in the pollution of our land, air, and water, and contributes to the endangerment of public health and safety. The situation has already passed the critical stage. What many people do not realize is that we can turn solid waste, which has been in the past at least a nuisance and at worst a hazard, into a continuing resource for the future. Through proper management and planning the problem may in fact become an asset. This would do much to alleviate our environmental problems while simultaneously providing our Nation with a wealth of secondary materials and substantially decreasing our energy expenditures.

Proper management is an ambiguous term. In this context it means a combination recycling-energy generation program as an alternative to our present wholesale disposal system. The case for such a program is strong, even when the environmental implications are not discussed. Annually discarded in municipal dumps are 12 million tons of ferrous metals and over 1 million tons of nonferrous metals including copper, aluminum, tin, lead, and zinc. An estimated 12 million junk cars still remain to be reclaimed from auto graveyards across the Nation. Every year cities dispose of an estimated $5 billion worth of metals. It is time the United States realize the enormity of these resources, long ignored, and the need for exploiting them.

Recycling, the first step in our program promises a significant virgin resource savings in the areas of mineral ores, forest sources, and fossil fuels. According to production estimates, over 50 percent of the lead, 40 percent of the copper, 45 percent of the iron and steel, and 25 percent of the aluminum and zinc made available for new products last year were derived from secondary sources; and the percentage could and should be greatly increased. The United States continues to import enormous quantities of bauxite, iron ore, and newsprint, while discarding like amounts of aluminum, steel, and old newspapers. This policy cannot continue for long. Besides materials savings, recycling has other advantages. It also saves energy indirectly. When all stages of material acquisition, transportation, and processing are considered, material recycling requires less energy than virgin material production. Recycled aluminum takes 95 percent less energy to prepare for production than bauxite, steel requires 25 percent less energy than iron ore. Full recycling of our material wastes could result in a 2-percent reduction in our energy demand.

Energy can also be derived directly from the postrecycled solid waste materials. By any one of at least three processes—hydrogenation, pyrolisis, and bioconversion, potentially 10 to the 15th power Btu's could be generated annually. This is enough energy to meet the entire energy consumption needs for residential and commercial lighting, or up to one-third to one-half of the energy that is projected to be delivered by the Alaskan pipeline. In light of today's serious energy crisis, can we afford to ignore this resource? What we need is a system with high material recovery which will generate electric energy to be used in centers where the solid waste and waste stream is generated. A recycling-energy generation program is simply the most intelligent and beneficial program in all areas.

The measure before us today, H.R. 16045, provides a 2-year extension of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1967, as amended, by extending for 2 years at constant dollar amounts the authorizations of appropriations in the act, which expired June 30, 1974. I feel that the Solid Waste Disposal Act was a significant first step—7 years ago. Today, we must recognize all that still needs to be done.

I testified before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Public Health and the Environments several months ago and outlined a plan for further efforts in this area. Unfortunately the subcommittee was unable to agree on the precise nature of the comprehensive revision of the act, and they have simply asked for an extension of the original legislation. Although I do not think this is sufficient, and I intend to reintroduce my recommendations for amendments during the next Congress, I support this bill, H.R. 16045, because it is the only legislation we have that intelligently deals with this Nation's solid waste resource problem.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 16045, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were refused.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clauce 3(b) of rule XXVII, and the prior announcement made by the Chair, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16077) 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.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16077

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 225 (i) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting before the period ", and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 742(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "and" after "1973," and by inserting after "1974" the following: ", and $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

(b) Section 740(b)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 824 of the Public Health Service Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "1973,"; and

(2) by inserting after "1974," the first time it appears the following: "and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975,".

(b) Section 822(b)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16077, a bill to extend through fiscal year 1975 the scholarship program for the National Health Service Corps and the loan programs for health professional students. These programs, along with other health manpower authorities, expired June 30, 1974, and are presently being continued under the continuing resolution pending completion of the revisions in progress of all the expired authorities. However, the continuing resolution does not authorize new scholarships and loans for freshmen students entering school in September and for this purpose the 1-year authorization is necessary.

H.R. 16077 authorizes a total of $135 million for fiscal year 1975: $40 million for National Health Service Corps scholarships, $60 million for health professional student loans, and $35 million for nursing student loans.

This is a bill similar to one which we enacted in 1970 for similar purposes. It is necessary because under the continuing resolution new scholarships and loans for freshmen students entering professional schools in September cannot be made, and without such new scholarships and loans both the schools and the students would be severely penalized. The bill is cosponsored by all of our members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment and was reported from both the subcommittee and full committee by unanimous voice vote.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What is the cost of this bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. $135 million.

Mr. GROSS. $135 million?

Mr. STAGGERS. This is the authorization, but this is for doctors and nurses across America who might be helping you some time, or my family, or somebody else's family. We need doctors so badly. It is a little program. Most of this will be paid because the recipients serve in different communities where they are needed. It is one of the best programs we have for America.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, What is the administration position on this bill? One would not know from looking at the report whether it is for or against it.

Mr. STAGGERS. They certainly have been for the full program, but I cannot speak for the administration. I will say to the gentleman that they are officially against the bill. We disagree with their position, which you will find on page 4 of the committee report. It came out of the subcommittee unanimously. It came out of the full committee unanimously. We felt it was one that is necessary to America, and it was passed, as I said. The Senate has already passed a similar bill unanimously on July 24 of this year, knowing that something had to be done in order to get these loans to these boys and girls in school by September of this year.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am not impressed by the unanimity with which many bills come to the House floor. There is much howling and yowling by some Members of Congress with respect to inflation, how it is tearing this country apart, and the sad state of the economy of the country. But there are apparently all too few committees that want to cut down or even make an effort to ascertain where the money is to come from to pay bills of this nature. Surely, there is some good in almost every bill.

The point is we cannot afford all of these expenditures. A day of reckoning is at hand and make no mistake about it.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would expand the National Health Services Corps. Had our manpower bill been passed, which is still in committee, this clause cited here would be in the manpower bill. Under an appropriation as provided in the past year, the amount was $98 million, and this is $135 million.

This bill would authorize funds for the National Health Service Corps scholarship program and other programs for health professional students.

The amounts authorized are identical to the amounts in current law with one exception. We are asking for additional funding for the NHSC scholarship program so that this effort can be expanded and more slots made available to qualifying students.

While I strongly support this bill, we must understand that it is only an emergency, stopgap measure. The funding provided for in H.R. 16077 would enable entering students to receive assistance for the school year beginning in September. All other aspects of the health manpower program have been taken care of by the recent continuing resolution or by HEW forward funding.

This combination of legislative and administrative patchwork cannot displace the need for a new and comprehensive manpower bill this year.

I urge support for H.R. 16077 and trust we will have a complete manpower program before this body in a few weeks.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to say that $95 millicn of this is for loans and the other portion of it goes to students who will repay the loan by going to difrent localities where they are needed, so I think all of it will be accounted for in a way which will contribute to our land.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in understanding that the fiscal year 1974 amount appropriated for the National Health Service Corps was $3 million and the fiscal year 1975 budget is $22.5 million, but this bill is for $40 million?

Mr. NELSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the need for this bill immediately is the fact that with the school year starting and the manpower bill not yet acted upon and not yet out of conference, it seems obvious that this part of it would have to be enacted so this part of the program could go forward.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

This is an excellent bill. It does provide increased funds to provide physicians for the ghetto and rural areas. The original authorization was $225 million. It was increased through my amendment to $40 million so we could have more people in deprived areas. I think it is a good bill and I strongly support it.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the bill, H.R. 16077, to extend the scholarship program for the National Health Service Corps and the loan program for health professions students through fiscal year 1975.

I wish to emphasize that the significantly increased authorization level under section 1 will provide an important step toward increasing the health care resources of the many deprived areas in our Nation, especially those where the physician-population ratio is inadequate.

Although this measure does not deal directly with the matter of revising the existing health manpower programs, our committee is presently working on a new health manpower proposal which I hope will be an effective measure.

I want to point out that the loans and scholarships provided for in this extension are not gifts to students. They must be repaid in cash or by serving in a shortage area. Hopefully, this will help to alleviate the problem of physician maldistribution.

This measure is important in our long-range effort to provide substantially improved health care resources for our citizens, and I urge the Members of this House to support it.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16077 which would extend the National Health Service Corps scholarship program and loans for health professions students. As the chairman of the full committee has stated, this is emergency legislation which received the support of all of the members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment and was reported unanimously by the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1974, the Congress enacted a continuing resolution which provided appropriations for those programs which had been funded in fiscal year 1974 through September 30, 1974. While many of the programs received support at the fiscal year 1974 funding levels, because the authorities for the Health Manpower and Nurse Training Acts expired on June 30, 1974, these programs were funded at the levels requested by the administration. The budget request under these acts would provide no moneys for new loans or scholarships to health professions students.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment is currently considering several lengthy and complicated measures which would revise and extend the Health Manpower and Nurse Training Acts. The other body is presently engaged in the same activities, and it appears to be quite likely that a conference committee will be confronted with two very different bills, thus, delaying enactment of authorizations for these programs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16077 would simply extend the authorizations for loans under both the Health Manpower Act and the Nurse Training Act. It would enable students entering health professions schools for the first time to apply for and obtain loans before the school year begins, rather than looking to other sources for financial support which, as I am sure my colleagues would agree, during this inflationary period would be difficult to say the least.

H.R. 16077 would also raise the level of support for the National Health Service Corps scholarship program from the current level of $3 million to $40 million through adoption of an amendment in subcommittee offered by Mr. CARTER of Kentucky. The members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment feel very strongly that the Corps represents the best way at the present time to meet the geographic maldistribution problem currently facing health care in the United States today. Under this program, students in health professions schools receive scholarships in exchange for an agreement to serve as members of the National Health Service Corps in areas designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as medically underserved. HEW has requested $22.5 million for NHSC scholarships, but the effect of the continuing resolution is to appropriate only $3 million.

Mr. Speaker, the present legislation, when enacted, will not mean that the task of revising all of our health manpower authorities can be put off or dropped. The subcommittee intends to move as rapidly as possible to report out responsible legislation. In the meantime, it is essential that this measure be favorably considered by the House. I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 16077.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXTENSION OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14213) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to extend for 3 fiscal years the authorizations of appropriations for the administration and enforcement of that act, as amended.

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 effective July 1, 1974, section 709 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 904) is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 709. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $105,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, for the expenses of the Department of Justice (other than its expenses incurred in connection with carrying out section 103(a)) in carrying out its functions under this title.

"(b) No funds appropriated under any other provision of this Act may be used for the expenses of the Department of Justice for which funds are authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) of this section.".

SEC. 2. Section 509 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 879) is amended by striking out "(a)" and subsection (b).

SEC. 3. Section 702 of the Controlled Substances Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section or section 1103, section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to any individual convicted under any of the laws repealed by this title or title III without regard to the terms of any sentence imposed on such individual under such law."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14213, the Controlled Substances Act of 1974. This bill would extend the authorizations of appropriations for the administration and enforcement of title II of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 for 3 years through 1977. The total authorization is $480 million, a figure based on estimated needs provided to us by the Department of Justice. These authorizations generally pay for the activities of the Drug Enforcement Administration. The Drug Enforcement Administration, previously known as the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, is responsible for the prevention and control of drug abuse in our country, and in the judgment of our committee has generally done a laudatory job.

The bill also makes two substantive amendments to the Controlled Substances Act. First it extends normal Federal parole provisions to prisoners convicted and sentenced prior to May 1971 under drug abuse control laws repealed by the 1970 act. Some of these prisoners are not presently eligible for parole despite the fact that people sentenced for the same offenses since 1971 are. This is a situation which the committee feels represents unequal treatment under the law, and the amendments in question are designed to correct it.

Second, the bill would repeal existing, so-called no-knock provisions of the act.

This provision authorizes search warrants which allow narcotics agents to break into premises which are to be searched without advance warning if the judge issuing the search warrant is satisfied that the property sought might be quickly destroyed or that the agents would otherwise be in danger. The committee feels that experience with this and other no-knock provisions mandates its repeal. Evidence which has come to the committee's attention suggests that the provision has been used with a lack of discretion, is of questionable constitutional validity, has not proved necessary to the enforcement of drug abuse laws, and has by its improper use resulted in serious injury and death to law enforcement officers and civilians. The best known of the abuses of this provision occurred in April 1974 in Collinsville, Ill., when Federal narcotics agents mistakenly broke into the homes of two families, destroyed family property, and terrorized the members of the families. I should note that our bill repeals the no-knock provisions in the Controlled Substances Act but does not affect the similar provision in the District of Columbia Code, since it is not in our jurisdiction.

This legislation was reported from both the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment and our own full committee by unanimous voice votes. It is a good and necessary bill, extending authorizations for drug abuse control activities which have already expired, and I urge your support for its passage.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of observations relative to this bill. As the chairman of our committee pointed out when we passed this control substances bill, the most recent measure in the field, we forgot to take a look at the penalty provisions that had been in the previous law. So we found we had certain persons in the penitentiaries or in prisons under the old law and were held there under mandatory sentence. When we amended it, some of them became eligible for parole, but those convicted under prior law were not made so eligible—the provisions of this bill correct that situation.

I would like to make some comments about the no-knock provisions repealed under the passage of this bill; we can recall we had no-knock provisions on the floor when we dealt with District of Columbia laws. This bill repeals the no-knock provisions of the Federal law.

I am not so sure it is a wise move, for the reason that under the common law they can break and enter if a police officer so desires, if he feels sure some violation of Federal law is going on within a certain residence. Under the no-knock legislation it was our intent to protect the public by requiring that law enforcement people get a warrant to enter and, therefore, would have to prove their case before entry was made. However, it must be said that many States have passed laws that have thrown out the common law entry and it has not been extensively used in the District of Columbia.

So I have reconsidered the more rigid position I took earlier. I am advised that this does not affect the recodification of any of the laws and penalties provided in the laws of the District of Columbia.

I am sure the chairman would agree with me, that was not our intent.

So I support the bill. I hope it is passed. I believe it is good legislation.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding. I want to say I support this legislation. I recall I was one of two members of the subcommittee who opposed the no-knock law. We also opposed it in the full committee and on the floor of the House. I thought it was not good then. I think it is not good now. I think it is good that the House has seen fit to bring it before us for repeal.

In the area which I come from, if a man knocks the door down and goes in, he usually comes out feet first and the undertaker takes care of him. A man's house is his castle.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What is the total authorization of this bill, some $480 million?

Mr. NELSEN. Four hundred and eighty million dollars. The administration recommended an open-ended bill, as I understand it, without the identifiable figures, but this is the figure that we agreed upon in our committee.

Mr. GROSS. This does not deal with alcoholism, does it?

Mr. NELSEN. No, it does not.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a report on this bill? Apparently there is. I did not get one when the bill was made available.

Mr. NELSEN. I will speak to the majority side and see that they get one to the gentleman. They should have had one to the gentleman before.

Mr. SYMMS. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Could it possibly be that with all of the inflation that is going on being caused right here by the Congress printing press, that we are driving these people to drugs to escape the politicians?

Mr. NELSEN. That may be, sir.

Mr. SYMMS. I have always said the liberals pass so many laws it drives a man to drink, and the conservatives try to pass laws against drinking.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. H.R. 14213, as reported, would extend the authorization of appropriations for the administration and enforcement of title II of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (the Controlled Substances Act) for fiscal years 1975, 1976, and 1977, with a total authorization of $480 million. The legislation would also make the following substantive modifications to the act: First, repeal existing section 509(b) of the act, the so-called no-knock provision; and second, make 18 U.S.C. 4202—which authorizes Federal prisoners serving terms of over 180 days to be eligible for release on parole after serving one-third of their terms—applicable to those prisoners sentenced prior to May 1, 1971, under drug abuse control laws repealed by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. Prisoners sentenced under the act after its effective date presently are eligible for parole consideration under such section.

Mr. Speaker, the Controlled Substances Act, enacted in 1970, was designed primarily to improve Federal efforts to eliminate diversion of drugs from legitimate channels through adoption of new control and enforcement provisions. The act is now administered by the Drug Enforcement Administration, following a series of executive branch reorganizations designed to provide a single focus on Federal drug enforcement activities. I believe the DEA and its predecessors have performed a credible job in limiting the availability of legitimate dangerous drugs within this country under the regulatory provisions of the act. Funding to pursue these activities for an additional 3 years is clearly justified.

Mr. Speaker, as the report points out, the committee adopted by voice vote, two amendments to existing law. The first would repeal the controversial no-knock provision that applied to Federal drug enforcement agents. This provision has been rarely used since the formation of DEA and does not appear to be necessary to the effective enforcement of drug abuse laws. Because of its potential for abuse as well as potential for unnecessary injury to police officers and civilians, the committee has concluded it to be best to remove the no-knock as it applies to Federal drug abuse enforcement from the books.

A second amendment would correct an anomalous situation that has arisen with regard to eligibility for parole of persons convicted under past and existing criminal statutes. One of the statutes repealed by the 1970 act provided that certain narcotics offenders sentence to mandatory minimum prison terms would be ineligible for parole under the general parole statute which authorizes Federal prisoners serving terms of over 180 days to be eligible for parole after serving one-third of their terms or after serving 15 years of a life sentence or of a sentence of over 45 years. The 1970 act removed this prohibition, but the Supreme Court has ruled that the prohibition did not render offenders sentenced prior to the effective date of the 1970 act eligible for parole consideration under the general parole statute. The second amendment simply makes the general parole statute available to persons sentenced under applicable provisions of law repealed by the 1970 act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is vital to the continued effectiveness of drug abuse law enforcement. I urge its adoption.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER).

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, the House is today voting on the extension of the Controlled Substances Act and I would like to speak on behalf of a provision in the bill to repeal the no-knock section of this act whereby Federal narcotics agents were authorized to obtain a warrant to enter a dwelling without knocking and identifying themselves.

I introduced this amendment to repeal the no-knock law in Committee and am firmly convinced that it should be supported. The no-knock provision was enacted 4 years ago and during that time it has seldom been used by either the Federal agents or the D.C. police.

Such action on the part of law enforcement drug agents is extremely dangerous to the agents as well as to the occupants of the dwelling which they are entering. Everyone in the country is aware of the raid which took place in Collinsville, Ill., in April of 1973 when agents raided two homes and absolutely terrorized the occupants and then finally discovered that they were in the wrong house.

Under the no-knock provision, law enforcement officers are effectively entering a dwelling like any burglar and the occupants of the home have the right to use force to prevent such entry. Citizens have a right to protect themselves and can use a gun to shoot the agents and are perfectly within the law in doing so.

I believe it is significant that Chief Jerry Wilson has stated that he has no objection to the repeal of this provision. His department has not used it since October of 1971. Also, in 1972 there were 100 no-knock warrants issued nationwide and in 1973, there was only one such warrant.

In short, the no-knock law simply does not work, and its elimination will in no way bring the drug program to a standstill. This country has always upheld the traditional right of personal privacy and the idea that a man's home is his castle. The provision should never have been enacted and the Congress in its wisdom should repeal it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill H.R. 14213, to authorize a 3-year extension of the Controlled Substances Act. This measure authorizes $105 million for fiscal year 1975, $175 million for fiscal year 1976, and $200 million for fiscal year 1977, to carry out the provisions of the act.

It is very important that we extend the control and enforcement provisions contained in this legislation in order to check the diversion of drugs from legitimate channels. We have made much progress in the area of drug abuse control in recent years, and I submit that we must continue our efforts.

I want to point out that this measure repeals the no-knock authority, which has enabled the Justice Department to enter premises for the purposes of a search without prior indication of this intention. A number of incidents involving this provision and its doubtful constitutionality have led us to repeal this authority.

All of us clearly realize the importance of our drug abuse programs, and I urge my colleagues to consider the measure pending before us today.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14213, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were refused.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3355) to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to provide appropriations to the Drug Enforcement Administration on a continuing basis, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3355

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 709 of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-513; 84 Stat. 1284; 21 U.S.C. 904) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978, and $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1979".

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

SEC. 2. Section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c)(1) Any Government, which permits the production of opium poppies, shall not be the recipient of economic and military assistance furnished under this or any other Act, and all sales, credit sales and guarantees made with respect to such country under the Foreign Military Sales Act and under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall be suspended, beginning January 1, 1975, unless the President determines that a ban on the growing of opium poppies is in effect or certifies to the Congress that safeguards adopted by the Government concerned effectively prevent the diversion of opium and its derivatives into illicit markets. Such certification shall be accompanied by a detailed description of such safeguards. In the latter event, economic and military assistance and sales, credit sales and guarantees shall continue only so long as the President continues to be satisfied as to the effectiveness of such safeguards.

"(2) The Director of the Drug Enforcement Administration shall report immediately to the President and the Congress any evidence that opium and its derivatives are being diverted from permitted production into illicit markets and shall also make a detailed report on or before June 30 of each year to the President and the Congress, reporting on the worldwide production of opium and its derivatives, the effectiveness of controls in each producing country, and the extent to which opium and its derivatives are being diverted into illicit markets.

"(3) If, within sixty days of continuous session of the Congress after a report is submitted under paragraph (2), the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution finding that any country has not effectively banned the growing of opium poppies or that such country is not effectively preventing opium, or its derivatives, produced in such country from being diverted into illicit markets, then the President shall immediately suspend economic and military assistance to such country under this or any other Act and shall suspend all sales, credit sales and guarantees to such country under the Foreign Military Sales Act and title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954."

"(d) Subsections (e)-(g) of this section are enacted by the Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described by this paragraph; and they shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"(e) For purposes of the section, the term 'concurrent resolution' means only a concurrent resolution of the Senate or the House of Representatives the matter after the resolving clause of which is substantially as follows: 'The Congress finds that ——— has not effectively banned the production of opium and has not effectively prevented the diversion of opium, or its derivatives, produced therein from being diverted into illicit markets.' (the blank space being filled with the name of the country involved.)

"(f)(1) A concurrent resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate or the House as the case may be. When the committee of the House has reported a concurrent resolution, it is in order at any time after the third day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) following the day on which the report upon such resolution has been available to Members of the House (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(2) General debate on any concurrent resolution in the House of Representatives shall be limited to not more than ten hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority parties. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit the concurrent resolution is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution is agreed to or disagreed to. No amendment to the concurrent resolution is in order.

"(3) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the consideration of any concurrent resolution, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to any concurrent resolution shall be decided without debate.

"(g) (1) Debate in the Senate on any concurrent resolution and debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than ten hours. The time shall be equally divided between and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

"(2) No amendment to the concurrent resolution is in order. A motion to further limit debate is not debatable. Debate on any such motion to recommit shall be limited to one hour, to be equally divided between and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the concurrent resolution."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 509 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 879) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 23-522(c)(2) of the District of Columbia Code is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 23-521(f)(6) of the District of Columbia Code is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 23-524(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) An officer executing a warrant directing a search of a dwelling house or other building or a vehicle shall execute such warrant in accordance with section 3109, title 18, United States Code.".

(d) The last sentence of section 23-561(b)(1) of the District of Columbia Code is hereby repealed.

(e) Section 23-591 of the District of Columbia Code is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. Section 1114, title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting "Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs" and inserting "Drug Enforcement Administration" in lieu thereof.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS move to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3355 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 14213, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read, "To amend the Controlled Substances Act to extend for three fiscal years the authorizations of appropriations for the administration and enforcement of that Act."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 14213) was laid on the table.

PASSPORT APPLICATION FEES

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15172) 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.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15172

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (22 U.S.C. 214), is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. There shall be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States quarterly a fee of $10 for each passport issued and a fee in an amount prescribed by the Secretary of State by regulation for executing each application for a passport. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to limit the right of the Secretary of State by regulation (1) to authorize State officials to collect and retain the execution fee, or (2) to transfer to the United States Postal Service the execution fee for each application accepted by that Service. No passport fee shall be collected from an officer or employee of the United States proceeding abroad in the discharge of official duties, or from members of his immediate family; from an American seaman who requires a passport in connection with his duties aboard an American flag-vessel; or from a widow, child, parent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member. No execution fee shall be collected for an application made before a Federal official by a person excused from payment of the passport fee under this section.".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, under existing law an individual who wishes to apply for a passport may do so at one of the 10 passport agencies of the Government or at Federal courts and some State courts. The applicant pays $2 for the application and $10 for the passport.

This arrangement was generally satisfactory until the latter part of the 1960's when international travel really boomed and the demand for passports mounted. At the same time a number of State courts found their workload so heavy that they ceased to handle passport applications.

In 1970 a number of Members of this body introduced bills intended to provide better service to their constituents who applied for a passport. My subcommittee held hearings on these measures. Some of the areas suffering the most congestion were Texas, Michigan, and Connecticut. I remember the impressive testimony of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) and of our former colleague (Mr. MONAGAN) from Connecticut.

It was clear to the subcommittee that the creation of more passport agencies funded by the Federal Government was not the answer. This proposed remedy would be very costly and in the judgment of the subcommittee inefficient. Passport applications are seasonal—heaviest in the spring and summer. There would be many months when additional passport agencies would be underutilized.

The executive meanwhile had started a test program using the postal facilities in a few cities such as Houston, Tex.; Detroit, Mich.; and several in Connecticut. It proved to be popular, efficient, and far less costly than any other proposal. The Congress for 2 years gave this plan its approval on an interim basis and allowed the Postal Service to retain the $2 application fee as the State courts do. Today almost one-third of all passport applications are handled through 878 post offices in 626 cities in all 50 States.

Let me say a word about the application fee of $2. This is a statutory fee set in 1958. Studies have shown that that sum is inadequate not only for the Postal Service but for the passport agencies and for the State courts. In fact, that is one of the reasons some of the State courts have refused to handle applications. Unless Congress is prepared to make an annual study of costs, the most sensible approach is to allow the Secretary of State to determine what the fee should be. No one expects this to be a profit-making operation. Neither should it be run at a loss. The Secretary's ability to adjust the fee in line with the actual cost will remove a major argument made against the use of postal facilities, namely, that they are performing a public service at a loss.

The interim authority to use the postal facilities expired on July 1 this year. This bill, H.R. 15172, has two simple purposes: First, it gives permanent authority to the Secretary of State to transfer to the Postal Service the execution fee for each passport application accepted by the Service; and second, it authorizes the Secretary of State to prescribe the fee to be collected for the execution of the application, whether made to the Postal Service, a clerk of court, or a passport agency.

This is a bill that authorizes a much-needed service to the public without cost to those taxpayers who may not have occasion to use it. I urge the passage of H.R. 15172.

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

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a question concerning the bill.

Is there any indication of the extent to which the State Department will increase the $2 application fee, which I note in the report is said to be inadequate?

Mr. MORGAN. To answer the gentleman, during the hearings it was brought out, and the State Department assured the subcommittee that it is going to make a study of the cost. It is possible that the increase in the application fee will go from $2 to about $2.50.

Mr. GROSS. From $2 to $2.50?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That would be in addition to the $10?

Mr. MORGAN. That would be in addition to the $10; the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Has the passport application fee been increased recently, other than the $10 charged for the passport for some time past?

Mr. MORGAN. The last increase in the application fee was in 1958. It was increased to $2.

Mr. GROSS. And it is not proposed to increase the passport fee?

Mr. MORGAN. It is not proposed to increase the passport fee.

Mr. GROSS. The usual exception is made for Members of Congress, is that not correct, with respect to passport fees?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, with relation to the fees, they do not pay for the passport but they pay the fee.

Mr. GROSS. They pay a fee, but they do not pay for the passport?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That is saving the big end of the cost of the papers required if one wants to go gallivanting abroad, is it not?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that is correct.

I know the gentleman does not have a passport, and I assure the gentleman that the committee is aware that the gentleman does little traveling.

Mr. GROSS. A passport is issued for what period of time?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it covers a period of 5 years. It is good for 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. They must pay $10 to renew it every quarter?

Mr. MORGAN. They pay $10 to renew a passport once every 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. Once every 5 years?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That is cheap at half the price. Will the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MORGAN. It certainly is.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15172.

The question was taken.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 3, Rule XXVII, and the prior announcement by the Chair, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AMENDING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 229) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 229

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out "July 30" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15977, a bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 was ordered reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency last Wednesday, July 31. It is designed to facilitate the continuance of the programs of the Export-Import Bank at current levels of growth for a period of 2 years, with appropriate new policy directives.

The objectives and purposes of the legislation are to enable the bank to aid in financing exports between the United States and foreign countries, and to continue the policy of fostering expansion of exports which contribute to the promotion and maintenance of employment, income, and development of our productive resources. Such authority is essential if American exporters are to be able to meet foreign competition which is assisted by the government support offered to exporters in the other principal trading nations.

The Export-Import Bank Act expired on July 30. In the absence of such authority, countless transactions calling for guarantees and insurance against foreign and commercial political risks and in other instances requiring direct loan support from our Export-Import Bank must be held in abeyance. Thousands of American jobs which are reliant on exports which require financing are threatened.

Many colleagues are aware of the substantive reasons which prevented the Committee on Banking and Currency from bringing legislation forward prior to July 2, when the act was extended through July 30. The Subcommittee on International Trade met in executive session on three occasions following the July 4 recess and made final recommendations on July 17. H.R. 15977 was introduced on July 18. The Committee on Banking and Currency scheduled four sessions for consideration of the subcommittee bill. The full committee ordered H.R. 15977 reported on July 31 with amendments.

The report of the committee is about to be filed, awaiting the inclusion of dissenting views of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Other legislation pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency which has precluded bringing forward an Export-Import Bank bill at an earlier date includes the following: The Small Business Act amendments, the real estate settlement cost procedures, the conference report on urban mass transportation, and Bank Holding Company Act amendments designed to help assure a continuing supply of funds for the home mortgage market. Several members of the Subcommittee on International Trade also serve on the committee of conference of which has been meeting almost daily on the housing legislation which has cleared the House and Senate.

Although action is expected soon on H.R. 15977, the Senate has yet to consider a bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act. Therefore, it is imperative that legislation to enable the Bank to continue its functions for a temporary period to September 30 be adopted.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said they were awaiting the inclusion of dissenting views.

I wish to say that they are supplemental views, not dissenting views. I favor the continuation of the Export-Import Bank. We just want to make sure that the amendments are offered.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the record will show that. I offer my apologies to the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) has already indicated, the legislation which would deal with the extension of the Export-Import Bank has been voted out of committee. There is absolutely no reason why we could not have that bill before us this week, even prior to any potential legislation, because it moved very swiftly through our Committee on Banking and Currency, the Members realizing that there was a 30-day extension already granted.

My reason for believing that we should vote down this suspension is because the Export-Import Bank bill will be before the Committee on Rules very soon, and there are some substantial amendments that we made to this legislation in committee that many of us think are very important to the continuation of the Export-Import Bank. I do favor a continuation of the bank under some more reasonable restrictions than those we have had in the past. Many of us have felt that it is improper to be granting interest rates at 6 or 7 percent to manufacturers trading overseas, and yet in the domestic market our own people are not able to obtain these kinds of favorable interest rate conditions.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will yield to the gentleman in just a moment, as soon as I conclude my brief remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we felt that there should be some kind of consideration in that the Export-Import Bank would have to take another look at the regular banking transactions in this country and what our local commercial manufacturers have to pay in this country. It is important to be competitive overseas, and I am very friendly with that position—we should not make interest charges so unusually low that there is no risk at all to the financial institutions to which we are guaranteeing these loans.

This was an appropriate amendment that was made in the committee bill now before Rules.

There are additional amendments.

Further than that, the bill that was passed out of the Committee on Banking and Currency included a Reuss amendment which will require that the Export-Import Bank be included in the budgetary process. I think that this is an important consideration.

I realize that Mr. Casey has said that he will again guarantee that he will not engage in any unusual transactions as long as Congress is working its will on this subject. At least that is what his office has transmitted to me. And I would ask the gentleman from Ohio if that is not what Mr. Casey has transmitted to the gentleman; is that correct?

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes, the gentleman is absolutely right.

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

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield

to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY).

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

I just want to make clear that there has been no effort to obviate consideration of the substantive issues that relate to the Eximbank amendments. We have addressed ourselves to the rising interest costs in our domestic economy and internationally. We have shown concern, as the gentleman knows, for the various aspects of East-West trade. We have certainly directed attention to the matter of including the transactions of the Eximbank in the unified budget. There is no effort—and this is my point—whatever to cause there to be any less consideration of these issues. On the contrary, what we are trying to do is to make certain that the full House will have appropriate opportunity, as the gentleman has, to address itself to these issues.

The gentleman from California, I am sure, understands my concern as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Trade with regard to the fact that the Senate has not yet acted on this legislation, and for this reason, while we have addressed ourselves to it, while we have acted, while we expect the rule and perhaps consideration on this matter on the floor of the House within a matter of days, the Senate is not in this posture. For that reason, the authority of the Bank having expired, it does seem to me that, from any realistic appraisal of the time factors involved, the prudent and wise course is to adopt the joint resolution.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am sure the gentleman will acknowledge with me that there is really going to be quicker action if we do not just keep adding these 30-day extensions. I am sure the gentleman does not want to go more than 30 days; does he?

Mr. ASHLEY. I would, frankly, be in favor of the amendment to extend it to 60 days.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So that if the rules are suspended, the gentleman is going to ask for an amendment to extend it 60 days; is that correct?

Mr. ASHLEY. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Then, I think my other colleagues should understand this is not just a 30-day extension; we are now talking about a 60-day extension. My concern is that there is far more reason to believe that this House will act and will act promptly with the regular legislation (H.R. 15977) if we do not just keep extending it indefinitely. If we do not extend the Bank for another 30 days, we will do what we should have done 90 days ago. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio agrees with that.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am fully aware of the logic of the gentleman's position. My concern is that we are further advanced than is the other body with respect to this.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am aware of that.

Mr. ASHLEY. My second concern, of course, is that the attention of this body is going to be focused on another matter of substantial interest and concern to the country within a relatively short time. I am simply trying to provide an extension interval that will be realistic in terms of all of these considerations.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I know the gentleman and I both wish to have some kind of action on this legislation. My belief is, as is the belief of a number of members of the Committee on Banking and Currency whom I know, that we would be better served as a House if we turn down the extension for 30 or 60 days and to get at the regular legislation (H.R. 15977). I think this is the more responsible way to legislate.

I know my good colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) has several amendments he wishes to offer. I know there are a great number of Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle who are very concerned about jobs in this country and who are very concerned that we take this legislation up in some substance before we just keep extending it for 30 or 60 days. Therefore, I am going to try to urge my colleagues to vote down the motion to suspend the rules that is before us because it does not give us adequate time to add amendments and provide the kind of credit conditions that we think are needed.

By the way, the committee report on this legislation will be out in another couple of days so that we can really study more carefully what the details of this legislation are. It is not available for us today. I know the gentleman from Ohio made some additional amendments to the legislation, and we need to review those considerable amendments, which we cannot do under this procedure.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield briefly to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

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

I intend to support this extension for 60 days.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield at that point, it is now 30 days. The gentleman from Ohio has said if the suspension passes he will be able to amend it. That shows we have had a change of mind since we originally came to the floor.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, in his initial comment the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) indicated he was going to offer an amendment to extend the time for 60 days. I am speaking to that.

I say I will support this resolution which is before us and the amendment which would extend its effect for 60 days. I do not believe we can just pull the rug out from under the Export-Import Bank at this time and permit its authority to expire longer.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. The act has already expired, it expired last week.

Mr. WYLIE. I know Ex-Im's authority expired on the first day of August. But, the Export-Import Bank has been in existence by act of Congress since 1935. It has a good track record. It is true there is a bill just reported from the Banking and Currency Committee to which amendments have been added which I think improves existing legislation, but I would say to the gentleman the main source of difficulty as far as the Export-Import Bank is concerned at the present time stems from a purported loan to the Soviet Union for $180 million for 6-percent interest. I will say it is my understanding that when the loan is finalized, if it is, the Soviet Union as a part of the arrangement has agreed to purchase over $400 million worth of technology and equipment from American businessmen. I think over the years the Export-Import Bank has had a good record as far as aiding and supporting American businessmen is concerned. Since the Soviet fertilizer loan the Export-Import Bank has been negotiating at interest rates between 7 and 8.5 percent.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. If the gentleman will yield at that point, and since this is my time, and the gentleman is speaking basically in support of the gentleman from Ohio's position, I would like to ask my colleague about the fertilizer deal that was arranged for $180 million at 6 percent.

Mr. WYLIE. I mentioned the fertilizer loan and said it was negotiated at 6-percent interest.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I do not yield any further to my good colleague, the gentleman from Ohio who I know was in the committee the other day when we passed the bill. He also offered some amendments.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Very briefly.

Mr. WYLIE. The fertilizer loan has not been finalized I believe but the Export-Import Bank is now negotiating loans at 7 percent and 8.5 percent. Exim is in the process of moving with other nations to renegotiate interest rates. I would say to the gentleman from California that during the course of the discussion on the fertilizer loan it was agreed the Soviet Union would purchase some $400 million in machinery and technology from U.S. companies. I am not necessarily defending the 6-percent interest rate, I cannot.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I hope not.

Mr. WYLIE. But there are two sides to the question. In any event I would suggest it makes sense to extend Exim's life for 60 days.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Though I strongly question the logic of a temporary increase in authority without basic legislation coming to the floor for full and complete debate. This is not the right way.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

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

Mr. Speaker, the principle behind the thing is one we have been overlooking. One of the reasons this Congress is always in bad trouble is because we always operate on the most important issues in this Congress with a gun at our head. We have already reached a deadline and we are going to pull the rug out from under somebody. We are always getting into the position where we cannot stop and think and we have to legislate on the basis of what is already happening.

So this is just another extension. So what? What did the last 30-day extension do? It did exactly what I said it would do. I said it would give us 30 days in which to work out another 30-day extension. And if we get into the impeachment process it will give them time to work out another 30-day extension. And without the amendment to the interest rate, do the Members think we would have had an increase in the interest rates from 4 percent to what might be 8 percent unless we had this amendment?

But we won that fight. We put this House on the alert.

Let me tell the Members something. I do not know this person too well. I have met him on a few occasions and sat on the committee with him in conference; but I was very happy and very proud to hear a Member of the Senate stand up and say that the time had come to eliminate the Eximbank on a very important principle.

We talk about 7½ or 8 percent. Do we know what the cost of borrowing money is right now? Eleven and a half and 12¼ percent, in order to expand their facilities to produce in the United States the very things we are giving money away to produce in foreign countries.

We have just blown $17 million to Dow Chemical. Their last quarter profits went up 120 percent. Why did we give them Exim money? We gave it to them to expand their fertilizer plant in Brazil. Why did not they do it in the United States? Because they would not go into their capital. They have to borrow money. That is the method of doing business in this country, so borrowing money at 11½ or 12 percent is a lot more than borrowing at 4 percent in Brazil. The only way they are going to get paid is if that Brazilian plant will export its products from Brazil to Dow Chemical and reverse the flow and send the chemicals back to the United States to pay off the loan. This has gone on all over the world.

When we come to the bill itself, I promise to show the House that if there is anybody in the world that was left out of the Eximbank loan, that was left out that asked for it, any production facility competing with the United States all over the world has received low interest money from all the lending agencies of this country.

My time has expired, Mr. Speaker, and I extend my remarks at this point to include certain important statements by the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question or two. It is my understanding that the gentleman's committee has a bill before it, not this particular piece of legislation, but a bill relative to the Eximbank.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes, we voted that Eximbank bill last week. It will go to the Committee on Rules sometime this week.

Mr. KETCHUM. That bill, as I understand it, has been amended by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RINALDO) to preclude any Export-Import loans to Turkey until the opium growth there has ceased; is that correct?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes, and even further than that, until Turkey abides by its agreement to discontinue the heavy exports of heroin. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RINALDO) did an excellent job in making his case before the committee. The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey carried in the committee. It is in the bill before rules. It is an additional aspect of the guarantee that I think is important; and it is in compliance with the agreement that Turkey signed 3 years ago.

I think that the gentleman makes an excellent point. I supported Mr. RINALDO's amendment in committee. That is one more aspect.

Now if this motion to recommit passes today, that particular amendment will not be included in this resolution.

Mr. KETCHUM. That, of course, is the question I was going to next ask. Under this extension, the approximately $146 million plus that Turkey would like to borrow from the Export-Import Bank could perhaps be extended under the provisions of this extension; thereby negating what we are trying to do in the bill; is that essentially correct?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is correct, and our efforts to try to stop the importation into this country of substantial amounts of heroin will be thwarted. I appreciate the gentleman bringing out that point.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 229), as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3 of rule XXVII, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

Does the gentleman from California withdraw his point of order at this time?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California withdraws his point of order.

EXTENDING EXPIRATION DATE OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1104) to extend by 62 days the expiration date of the Export Administration Act of 1969.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 1104

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by striking out "July 30" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Export Administration Act of 1969 provides the authority to prohibit or curtail exports for three purposes—national security, foreign policy, and short supply. This authority, as my colleagues are aware, I am sure, expired on July 30 and the purposes for which it had been designed are now being met on a tenuous basis by Executive order under the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917.

The Trading With the Enemy Act simply does not provide the array of sanctions afforded under the Export Administration Act. That array has proven its effectiveness over a period of some 25 years, following the passage of the Export Control Act of 1949, the violations provisions of which are incorporated in the 1969 act. Furthermore, there remains the question of whether the act of 1917 may be of doubtful validity for the purposes of carrying out the foreign policy and short supply provisions for which the Export Administration Act was designed. This leaves the Department of Commerce possibly open to suit in the course of administering its controls over such items in short supply as ferrous scrap and crime detection equipment and petroleum products.

The Committee on Banking and Currency requested a rule on H.R. 15264, a bill to amend and extend the authority for regulation of exports, some 6 weeks ago. A rule was granted on July 16. Floor action has been subsequently scheduled for four different dates since that time, and is now again on the calendar and expected to be brought to the floor later this week.

The Senate passed legislation to amend and extend the Export Administration Act on July 31. The Senate bill contains a number of provisions which are substantially at variance with the committee reported bill to be considered by the House in the coming days.

It is, therefore, essential that the adequate authority contained in the Export Administration Act be continued on a temporary basis to September 30, in order that the executive branch may administer programs in accord with the policy directives of the Congress while the House works its will with respect to amendments and time as afforded for coming to an agreement on the differences which may arise between House and Senate versions of this vital legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, my good colleague from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) had intended to be here to discuss this. I know he is in a housing conference so he is unable to be here at this immediate moment. His main concern was that this legisla-

tion also is scheduled for this week, subject to a rule. Some changes were made in the committee again, and before we extend this even for a temporary time I know it is my colleague's feeling we should consider this in the regular legislative process. I also believe that that is a more correct procedure rather than living from 30-day extension to 30-day extension. I think that is a more appropriate way to legislate.

Mr. ASHLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Of course, I agree with the gentleman. I am persuaded, after discussion with the Secretary of Commerce, that there is questionable legal authority, that there are legal questions that are raised with respect to reversion to the Trading With the Enemy Act as authority for their present responsibilities. It is really on that basis, in particular, that I would urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the gentleman from California is being inconsistent. On the one hand the gentleman protests the loan of $180 million to the Soviet Union under the Export-Import Bank Act.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. At the 6-percent rate.

Mr. WYLIE. I understand, but the real purpose of this bill, I would say to the gentleman, is that without extension of the Export Administration Act, unrestricted exports to the Communist bloc nations of computers and sophisticated technology could take place. With this act, in effect, there is a control over the Nation's outflow of critical materials in short supply, such as ferrous scrap and petroleum.

Therefore, I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman that it seems to me as though it is very important that we pass this temporary extension until we can bring the export administration bill to the floor which the gentleman mentioned, has been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is the gentleman willing to guarantee that we will not have any more 30-day extensions once we vote for this legislation and get it done?

Mr. WYLIE. I appreciate the compliment of the gentleman but I have no such authority.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is my point. I think we should have encouraged the Congress to move legislatively and do what it should have done 90 to 100 days ago, and that was to get to this legislation. In fact, we knew it was going to expire. We were busy with some other legislation, but I believe by not passing this extension, we put a mandate on the House to move.

The bill is scheduled for a rule this week. It has been out of committee for some time.

I think that if the House will move the regular legislation, there will be more persuasion on the part of the Senate to move this bill than there is now with respect to the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN), who has been waiting breathlessly to comment on this legislation.

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

I have no objection to this 60-day extension. I will have amendments when the final bill is presented to the House.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the comment of the gentleman from Ohio that the Senate bill leaves a lot to be desired. In fact, it leaves about as much to be desired as the House bill.

What I am wondering is this: It seems to me that in both there is an attempt to control prices in this country with an export control act, I do not think it will work. In fact, it will be harmful.

If this bill passes and we have a 60-day extension, it will provide the time needed so that we could take this bill back to the committee and come back with a better bill.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. If the gentleman will yield to me, the point is that the regular bill has already come out of the committee. It is subject to a rule this week. We have an excellent chance to get it here on the floor. The leadership is basically committed to getting it to the floor, by an announcement included in the weekly whip agenda.

My point is that by giving it another extension, we take the pressure off this Congress to act. I think that is a mistake.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, agrees that we need to keep that pressure on, though we disagreed a minute ago on the final method.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1104).

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE EXPIRATION DATE OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 228) to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 228

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "July 30" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13044, a bill to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, passed the House last Thursday, August 1. It is designed to improve and continue programs which are needed to assure that our industrial capacity and resource inventory remain at levels necessary to adequately safeguard national security.

H.R. 13044 would extend the authority of the Defense Production Act another year, until June 30, 1975. In addition, the bill amends the act to change the method by which Defense Production Act stockpile materials are purchased for use in order to guarantee uninterrupted defense production when necessary. It also calls for a 9-month administration study of the management of all our stockpiles in light of new worldwide economic developments.

Under the act as it is presently written, such stockpiles are maintained through the purchase of materials with loans from the Treasury. The cost of loan funds, especially in view of the soaring interest rates in today's economy, has constituted a serious financial drain on the stockpile program. H.R. 13044 would eliminate this problem by providing funds needed for stockpile purposes through congressional appropriations. In addition to improving the financial condition of the program, such a change would also improve congressional surveillance and control over stockpiling efforts.

The United States is greatly reliant on foreign sources for many of its vital resource needs. We face intensified competition among the countries of the world for those resources. Also, countries dominating resource markets have the potential to organize market control mechanisms and arbitrarily increase prices. The effect of those price increases on the economy may be quite severe. Hence, the wisdom of the administration's plan to severely reduce the national stockpiles and inventories is particularly suspect. H.R. 13044, therefore, includes provisions calling for a study to reappraise the current plans for reduction of the stockpiles and inventories, and coordinate more effectively our overall resources management.

The Senate has passed one version of the Defense Production Act extension with the new financing arrangements for the stockpile. The House, on last Thursday, August 1, passed similar legislation, with the addition of the stockpile study. The Senate version calls for a 2-year extension of the act. The House version calls for a 1-year extension. Therefore, there are certain minor differences in the two bills. This should not delay final action for more than a few days.

However, because of these differences, it is necessary to pass the resolution before us for a 60-day extension of the original act, which expired on June 30, and received by way of an earlier resolution,

a previous 30-day extension. I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

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

I will just make the observation that the House did pass by voice vote, just last Thursday, a bill which would extend the Defense Production Act for an additional year, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) has already said, and the resolution before us would simply give the House and the Senate the time to work out their differences so that an extension, for an additional year or two years, as the case may be, may be agreed upon.

Of course, all this resolution would do is to extend the Defense Production Act until September 30, 1974.

So I would urge passage of Senate Joint Resolution 228 which is before us now.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY), that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate Joint Resolution 228.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING CASCADE HEAD SCENIC RESEARCH AREA IN OREGON

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8352) to establish the Cascade Head Scenic-Research Area in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8352

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide present and future generations with the use and enjoyment of certain ocean headlands, rivers, streams, estuaries, and forested areas, and to promote the protection and study of significant areas for research and scientific purposes, and to promote a more sensitive relationship between man and his adjacent environment, there is hereby established, subject to valid existing rights, the Cascade Head Scenic-Research Area (hereinafter referred to as "the area").

SEC. 2. The administration, protection, development, and regulation of use of the area shall be by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to national forests, in such manner as in his judgment will best contribute to attainment of the purposes set forth in this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) The boundaries of the area, and the boundaries of the subareas included therein, shall be those shown on the map entitled "Proposed Cascade Head Scenic-Research Area" dated June 1974, which is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided,* That, from time to time, the Secretary may, after public hearing or other appropriate means for public participation, make adjustments in the boundaries of subareas to reflect changing natural conditions or to provide for more effective management for the purposes of this Act.

(b) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, with provisions for appropriate public participation in the planning process, develop a comprehensive management plan for the area. Said plan shall prescribe specific management objectives and management controls necessary for the protection, management, and development of the area and each of the subareas: *Provided,* That within the area, the following subareas shall be established and shall be managed in accord with the following primary management objectives which shall be supplemental to the general management objectives applicable to the entire area:

(1) Estuary and Associated Wetlands Subarea: An area managed to protect and perpetuate the fish and wildlife, scenic, and research-education values, while allowing dispersed recreation use, such as sport fishing, nonmotorized pleasure boating, waterfowl hunting, and other uses which the Secretary determines are compatible with the protection and perpetuation of the unique natural values of the subarea. After appropriate study, breaching of existing dikes may be permitted within the area.

(2) Lower Slope-Dispersed Residential Subarea: An area managed to maintain the scenic, soil and watershed, and fish and wildlife values, while allowing dispersed residential occupancy, intensive recreation use, and agricultural use.

(3) and (4) Upper Timbered Slope, and Headlands Subareas: Areas managed to protect the scenic, soil and watershed, and fish and wildlife values while allowing extensive recreation and research-educational activities and timber harvesting activity and associated road development which does not significantly interfere with the purposes of the area.

(5) and (6) Coastline, and Sand Dune-Spit Subareas: Areas managed to protect and maintain the scenic and wildlife values while allowing extensive recreation and research-educational activities.

SEC. 4. The boundaries of the Siuslaw National Forest are hereby extended to include all of the lands not presently within the national forest boundaries lying within the area as described in accordance with section 3 of this Act.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the area added to the Siuslaw National Forest by this Act may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. Any lands so transferred shall become part of the Siuslaw National Forest.

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands, water, or interests therein within the area by donation, purchase, exchange, or otherwise.

(b) Within all subareas of the area except the estuary and associated wetlands subarea, the Secretary may acquire lands and interests only with the consent of the owner so long as the owner uses the land for substantially the same purposes and in the same manner as the lands were used and maintained on June 1, 1974: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may acquire lands or interests in lands without the consent of the owner when such lands are in imminent danger of being used for different purposes or in a different manner from the uses existing on June 1, 1974. The Secretary shall publish within one hundred and eighty days of the enactment of this Act, guidelines which shall be used by him to determine what constitutes a substantial change in land use or maintenance for the nonfederally owned lands within the area. Within the estuary and associated wetlands subarea the Secretary may acquire lands and interests without the consent of the owner at any time, after public hearing.

(c) At least thirty days prior to any substantial change in the use of nonfederally owned lands within the area, the owner or owners of such lands shall provide notice of such proposed change in use to the Secretary or his designee, in accordance with such guidelines as the Secretary may establish.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 7(a)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 903, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 4601-9(a)(1)) moneys appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund shall be available for the acquisition of any lands, waters, or interests therein within the area added to the Siuslaw National Forest by this Act.

SEC. 7. The lands within the area, subject to valid existing rights, are hereby withdrawn from location, entry, and patent under the United States mining laws and from disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral leasing and all amendments thereto.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary shall establish an advisory council for the area, and shall consult on a periodic and regular basis with such council with respect to matters relating to management of the area. The members of the advisory council, who shall not exceed eleven in number, shall serve for the individual staggered terms of three years each and shall be appointed by the Secretary as follows—

(i) a member to represent each county in which a portion of the area is located, each such appointee to be designated by the respective governing body of the county involved;

(ii) a member appointed to represent the State of Oregon, who shall be designated by the Governor of Oregon;

(iii) not to exceed eight members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who, individually or through association with national or local organizations, have an interest in the administration of the area; and

(iv) the Secretary shall designate one member to be chairman and shall fill vacancies in the same manner as the original appointment.

(b) The members shall not receive any compensation for their services as members of the council, but they shall be reimbursed for travel expenses and shall be allowed, as appropriate, per diem or actual subsistence expenses.

(c) The Secretary shall, in addition to his consultation with the advisory council, seek the views of other private groups, individuals, and the public, and shall seek the views and assistance of, and cooperate with all other Federal, State, and local agencies, with responsibilities for zoning, planning, migratory fish, waterfowl, and marine animals, water and natural resources, and all nonprofit agencies and organizations which may contribute information or expertise about the resources or management of the area or its resources, in order that the knowledge, expertise and views of all agencies and groups may contribute affirmatively to the most sensitive utilization of the area and its various subareas, for the benefit of the public, now and in the future.

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall cooperate with the State of Oregon and political subdivisions thereof in the administration of the area and in the administration and protection of lands within or adjacent to the recreation area owned or controlled by the State or political subdivisions thereof. Nothing in this Act shall deprive the State of Oregon or any political subdivision thereof of its right to exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction within the area consistent with the provisions of this Act, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises or other non-Federal prop-

erty, in or on the lands or waters within the area.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) will be recognized for 20 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8352, as amended by the Interior Committee, establishes the Cascade Head Scenic-Research Area in Oregon surrounding the Cascade estuary. It will provide enjoyment and study of the ocean headlands, rivers, streams, estuaries, and forested lands contained within the area. The boundaries of the Siuslaw National Forest are extended to include all of the lands in the Cascade Head Scenic-Research Area not presently within the national forest boundaries. The area which would be affected by H.R. 8352, as amended, involves approximately 8,910 acres consisting of a mixture of public and private lands.

The Cascade Head-Salmon River area is known for the spectacular beauty of its estuary, coastal beaches, headlands, and the surrounding forested lands. Portions of the national forest lands included are presently administered under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture as a research natural area, a scenic area, and an experimental forest. Major public concern has been concentrated on the future management of the estuary, associated wetlands, and immediately adjacent forest lands.

H.R. 8352, as amended, specifies management direction for six separate subareas within the area. The Interior Committee accepted this provision because of the special and unique nature of each subarea and a specific desire to have each subarea managed individually so that its distinctiveness could be retained and maintained. These subareas evolved from the Forest Service study of the area.

The entire area is withdrawn from mineral entry and leasing.

To help achieve the broad and specific objectives of H.R. 8352 the Secretary would be authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands, though this authority is specifically acquisition. Acquisition, except in the estuary and associated wetlands subarea, could only be done with the consent of the owner so long as the owner uses the land for substantially the same purposes, and in the same manner, as the lands were used on June 1, 1974. On the other hand, when such lands are in imminent danger of being used for different purposes or in a different manner from the uses existing on June 1, 1974, the Secretary may acquire lands or interests in the lands without the consent of the owner. This authorization is to protect the area from substantial changes in use that would irreparably damage the natural qualities of the area. A further protection for both the area and the landowners within the area is that at least 30 days prior to any substantial change in the use of nonfederally owned lands, the owner or owners of such lands would have to provide notice of such proposed change in use to the Secretary. This would be done in accordance with such with such guidelines as the Secretary may establish. This provision allows the Secretary to determine whether a proposed change in use is incompatible with proper management of the area in advance of the change and to take the appropriate steps which could include acquisition of the lands when necessary. Clearly, the private landowners would benefit from such a provision by their knowing whether any land use change was compatible with the area. With the extension of the boundaries of the Siuslaw National Forest to encompass the entire scenic-research area, moneys from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, can be used as needed for the acquisition of any lands, waters, or interests therein.

An 11 member advisory council is established for the area to consult on a regular basis with the Secretary on matters relating to management of the area.

The Department of Agriculture agreed that additional lands in the Cascade Head-Salmon River area should be included within the boundaries of the Siuslaw National Forest and that the area should be managed to provide for the protection and use of its unique values. However, the Department wanted to designate the Cascade Head-Salmon River area as a scenic research area rather than have it done legislatively. The committee believes the legislative designation of the area will afford a much firmer protection for this unique area on the Oregon coast from encroaching urbanization in the adjacent areas.

COST

A land acquisition plan has not been developed for the area; however, the Department of Agriculture estimates a possible 5 year land acquisition program of $1.5 million which would be funded through the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The estimated increased annual cost for administration of the area as part of the national forest is $80,000.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 8352, a bill introduced by our colleague, Mr. WYATT, which would establish the Cascade Head Scenic-Research Area in the State of Oregon. The Cascade Head-Salmon River area is not in my district, but I am quite familiar with this unique and very beautiful area on Oregon's coast. It is in this Nation's interest to hold areas such as this aside from the encroaching urbanization that will otherwise surely engulf this last remaining untouched estuary on our west coast. We have seen too many of our wetlands drained and filled, adjoining hillsides scarred and leveled, nature's remaining wonders destroyed forever.

The mouth of the Salmon River and its associated wetlands have so far remained unchanged by commercial and industrial development. The thrust of this legislation is to preserve this biologically unique and scientifically valuable area. Together with the Cascade Head headlands and the upper slopes timbered by rain forest, the entire region is truly a "scenic-research" area. This bill proposes to establish six subarea management units with specific management objectives which would insure that each subpart is managed for its own unique contribution to the natural harmony and balance of the entire proposed 8,900 acre area.

An alternative proposal by the Forest Service, Mr. Speaker, was to merely enlarge the area of the Siuslaw National Forest and then allow the rest of the objectives to be accomplished by regulations under existing authorities of the Forest Service. The view of the committee, and my personal view, is that this administrative designation route is much less satisfactory than establishing the objectives and guidelines through legislative action.

Who can tell what changes might be made in a set of administrative regulations to accommodate whatever pressures there might be in the future from some group or interest to provide a commercial recreation site or summer homesites? Of course, the Congress can change whatever legislation it might write here today; but we all know that such a course is much, much less likely to be taken by a future Congress than would be the case with mere administrative designation of the area.

Another objective that administrative designation does not accomplish is meaningful local input and participation in overseeing and managing the area. This is specifically spelled out in the bill because it is a very important need.

There is another important matter covered in the language of the legislation. This is the problem of dealing with nonconforming development or use of the lands within the proposed scenic-research area. The committee has included language to make mandatory a 30-day notice to the Secretary of any proposed change in land use by a landowner. This gives the leadtime to the Secretary so he can head off any proposed land use that would cause irreparable damage to the area which the legislation is trying to preserve.

It is my feeling that such an "advance notice" provision works to the advantage of both the public interest and of the private property owner. The private property owner can now know what is or is not acceptable and can avoid having his property condemned if a proposed change in land use is cleared before it is started. The condemnation procedures of the Forest Service are not materially broadened in this bill. What has been done is to permit the Forest Service to condemn both in cases where a land use is materially changed and in the case where lands are in imminent danger of having their use changed. In other words, the language is intended to stop threatened damage which, once it is done, may be irreparable to the area.

This is an area which could never be reclaimed if once it were lost. We have time to move now and we should move now. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I want particularly to thank the members of the subcommittee and the committee for promptly handling this legislation and bringing it to the floor of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8352, as amended by the Interior Committee, would preserve and protect the Cascade Head-Salmon River Estuary area in the State of Oregon for the enjoyment and scientific benefit of present and future generations.

This unique coastal area is distinctive in a variety of ways.

Of particular scenic value is Cascade Head itself, a sweeping mountainous ridge covered by rain forest that ends abruptly in a series of waterfalls—dropping hundreds of feet off a sheer precipice to the ocean's floor. These cliffs, in turn, form an impressive backdrop for the entry of the Salmon River into the Pacific.

The river, aside from its natural beauty, is a rare microcosm of what the Oregon coast was like prior to the settlement of man. It is virtually the last estuary on the west coast which has remained unchanged by industrial or commercial use, and because of this it is of immense scientific value. The overriding purpose of the Cascade Head bill is to insure that the area around the Salmon River remains sparsely populated and unspoiled, thus guaranteeing and preserving its biological uniqueness.

The bill would extend the boundaries of the Siuslaw National Forest to include all of the lands now presently within the national forest boundaries. The area which would be affected involves approximately 8,910 acres consisting of a mixture of public and private lands. Approximately one-half of the area is outside the existing national forest boundary; and approximately 50 percent of the land covered by this legislation is in private ownership. Portions of the national forest lands included are presently administered under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture as a research natural area, a scenic area, and an experimental forest.

Major public concern has been concentrated on the future management of the estuary, associated wetlands, and immediately adjacent forest lands. These lands are predominantly outside the national forest boundary and are presently used for recreational and agricultural purposes.

Mindful of public concern, the Forest Service and others after extensive studies of the area, indicated the desirability of including the entire region within the Siuslaw National Forest. Management plans for the public and private lands, therefore, were jointly developed by the Forest Service and local authorities and are contained in the basic proposal of H.R. 8352, as amended.

These management plans developed would designate the lands added to the national forest as a scenic-research area. It was specifically included in order to halt future development, thus maintaining the delicate biological balance of the area. This particular designation is important because it will enable management to be specifically tailored to the various biological units or natural subareas within the Cascade Head—Salmon River estuary region. Moreover, it will set up legislative guidelines which will help insure that the natural balance, scenic beauty, and scientific value of this magnificent portion of the Oregon coast will never be threatened.

Under this legislation, the Secretary would be authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands, though this authority is specifically limited. Acquisition, except in the estuary and associated wetlands subarea, could only be done with the consent of the owner so long as the owner uses the land for substantially the same purposes, and in the same manner, as the lands were used on June 1, 1974.

Because of these limits on acquisition, although a land acquisition plan has not been developed, the Department of Agriculture estimates a possible 5-year land acquisition program of only $1.5 million which would be funded through the land and water conservation fund. The estimated increased annual cost for administration of the area as part of the national forest is $80,000. Same amount as under Forest Service substitute proposal.

The Cascade Head bill can be a beginning. Through this bill we hope to preserve the unique qualities of the Cascade Head area without the wholesale condemnation of land, but rather through Government cooperation with private landowners.

If passed, it will guarantee that the land will be left as it is now, thereby allowing man and nature a valid chance to coexist in harmony. I hope it will further provide us with the impetus and direction to guide the future of conservation away from absolute protectionism and toward a reconciliation of man and his environment.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8352, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7486) to authorize the establishment of the Boston National Historical Park in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7486

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 "Boston National Historical Park Act of 1974".

SEC. 2. (a) In order to preserve for the benefit and inspiration of the people of the United States as a national historical park certain historic structures and properties of outstanding national significance located in Boston, Massachusetts, and associated with the American Revolution and the founding and growth of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secetary") may, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, acquire by donation or by purchase with donated funds, all lands and improvements thereon or interests therein comprising the following described areas:

(1) Faneuil Hall, located at Dock Square, Boston;

(2) Paul Revere House, 19 North Square, Boston;

(3) The area identified as the Old North Church area, 193 Salem Street, Boston;

(4) The Old State House, Washington and State Streets, Boston;

(5) Bunker Hill, Breeds Hill, Boston;

(6) Old South Meeting House, Milk and Washington Streets, Boston; and

(7) Charleston Navy Yard.

(b) In the event that the properties described in this section are not donated to the United States or purchased with donated funds, they may be acquired by the Secretary with appropriated funds: *Provided,* That, except for privately held lands within the Charlestown Navy Yard as described in subsection (d) of this section, the Secretary shall not acquire any such properties by eminent domain so long as he determines that a binding, written cooperative agreement, assuring the preservation and historical integrity of such properties remains in force and effect. Lands owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or any of its political subdivisions, may be acquired only by donation.

(c) At such time as the Secretary determines that sufficient lands, improvements, and interests therein have been acquired or that cooperative agreements satisfying the preservation and historical objective of this Act have been executed, he may establish the Boston National Historical Park by publication of notice to that effect in the Federal Register, together with a detailed description or map setting forth the properties included therein.

(d) As used in this section, the Charlestown Navy Yard shall include the United States Ship Constitution and the lands generally depicted on the map entitled "Boundary Map: Charlestown Naval Shipyard—U.S.S. Constitution, Boston National Historical Park", numbered BONA 20,000 and dated March 1974 which shall be on file and available in the offices of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. All right, title, and interest in the Federal properties and improvements included therein shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That he may, by written agreement with the Secretary of the Navy, permit the continued use of any such buildings and facilities as the Secretary of the Interior determines to be necessary for the preservation and maintenance of the Constitution, which agreement shall provide that the Department of the Navy shall transfer to the Department of the Interior funds sufficient to cover the costs attributable to the functions and services which are provided by the Department of the Interior. The Secretary shall consult with representatives of the city of Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts concerning the development of suitable transportation plans consistent with the purposes for which the Navy Yard was included in the historical park.

SEC. 3. (a) In addition to the properties described in section 2 of this Act, the Secretary shall study the properties described in this Act, the Secretary shall study the properties described in this section to determine the feasibility and suitability of including them within the Boston National Historical Park. In making such studies, he may enter

into tentative agreements with any owners thereof for their inclusion in said park and he may enter into options, for a nominal consideration, for the purchase of such properties, but no additional properties may be added to the park except by an act of the Congress. Studies shall be made of the following properties:

(1) Boston Common;

(2) Dillaway-Thomas House;

(3) Thomas Crease House (old Corner Book Store);

(4) Dorchester Heights; and

(5) the following burying grounds: King's Chapel, Granary, and Copp's Hill.

(b) In furtherance of the general purposes of this Act as prescribed in section 2, the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the city of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or any private organization to mark, interpret, restore, and/or provide technical assistance for the preservation and interpretation of any properties listed in section 2, or portions thereof, which, in his opinion, would best be preserved in private, municipal, or State ownership, in connection with the Boston National Historical Park. Such agreements shall contain, but shall not be limited to, provisions that the Secretary, through the National Park Service, shall have right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property covered by such agreement for the purpose of conducting visitors through such properties and interpreting them to the public, that no changes or alterations shall be made in such properties except by mutual agreement between the Secretary and the other parties to such agreements, except that no limitation or control of any kind over the use of any such properties customarily used for church purposes shall be imposed by any agreement. The agreements may contain specific provisions which outline in detail the extent of the participation by the Secretary in the restoration, preservation, and maintenance of such historic properties.

(c) The Secretary may identify other significant sites of the colonial and Revolutionary periods of American history in the city of Boston, Massachusetts, and its environs, which are related to the historical park created by this Act, and, with the consent of the owner or owners thereof, may mark them appropriately and make reference to them in any interpretive literature.

SEC. 4. (a) There is established a Boston National Historical Park Advisory Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(1) Three members appointed from recommendations submitted by the Governor of Massachusetts;

(2) Three members appointed from recommendations submitted by the mayor of the city of Boston; and

(3) One member to represent each owner with which the Secretary has concluded a cooperative agreement pursuant to section 3 of this Act, to be appointed from recommendations submitted by each such owner.

(b) The Commission shall terminate ten years from the date of establishment of the Boston National Historical Park.

(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment (and for the balance of the unexpired term). The Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the Secretary.

(d) The Commission shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of its members.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall from time to time, but at least semiannually, consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Boston National Historical Park.

(f) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act upon presentation of vouchers signed by the Chairman.

SEC. 5. The Secretary may acquire property or any interest therein by donation, purchase, or exchange for the visitor center, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the development and operation of the visitor center may be expended on property in which the Secretary has acquired less than the fee simple interest therein, including a leasehold interest.

SEC. 6. When established as provided in section 2 of this Act, the Boston National Historical Park shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461–467).

SEC. 7. For the acquisition of lands or interests in lands designated by section 2 of this Act as components of the Boston National Historical Park, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,740,000. For development of the components designated as paragraphs 1 through 6 in section 2, there is authorized to be appropirated not more than $12,818,000. For the development of the component designated as paragraph 7 in section 2, there is authorized to be appropriated not more than $11,500,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7486, as amended, provides for the establishment of the Boston National Historical Park. The park would consist of seven areas of national historic significance plus a separate visitor center to be located in downtown Boston. These several units are now owned by different units of government or by nonprofit corporations and are now open to the public. The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements for the protection, preservation, and operation of the properties and would provide the right of acquisition of the properties by eminent domain if such agreements should fail.

Perhaps no other part of our country can match the claim of Boston as "the Cradle of the American Revolution." Any schoolchild knows of the Boston Tea Party or Paul Revere's ride, the Old North Church, and the Battle of Bunker Hill.

Let me describe the remarkable areas to be included in this unit of the National Park System.

Faneuil Hall, known as the "Cradle of Liberty," typifies the vital, active spirit of this area. There are still active markets in and near the structure, much as there were when patriots such as Samuel Adams used the meeting hall, making the radical assertion that free men might govern themselves better than a king 3,000 miles away.

The Old State House, just a short walk away, served to house both the Colonial Government before the Revolution, and the fledgling government of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, once our independence had been declared.

The Old South Meeting House, also located in downtown Boston, has been restored and is owned and operated by a nonprofit association. Aroused citizens left a meeting in this building and went to the waterfront to stage the Boston Tea Party.

To dramatize the birth of that revolution itself, what more fitting symbol than the Old North Church, where the lanterns signaled the maneuvering of British troops that would lead to the "shots heard round the world."

The Paul Revere House pays tribute to the man who rode into American history and legend as he gave warning of the approach of enemy troops. Remarkably, the house itself was a hundred years old and more while Revere lived there.

The flow of events swept in a few short months from the opening skirmishes to the Battle of Bunker Hill. The monument and its surroundings on the site of the actual battle on the crest of Breed's Hill pay homage to the rebel militia that fought the first pitched battle of the Revolution.

Finally, to carry the history of the area beyond the immediate events of the Revolution, we have the Charlestown Navy Yard and the U.S.S. *Constitution*. Founded in 1800, the Charlestown Yard began to contribute to the naval presence that the *Constitution* best exemplified. The ship not only won her battles on the high seas. She also won the lasting affection of the American people, as evidenced by the heavy visitation she now receives each year.

Mr. Speaker, this describes the properties to be protected should we pass H.R. 7486. I should now like to describe several features of the bill as our committee reported it.

H.R. 7486 suspends the usual powers of eminent domain for the historic properties listed in the bill. Instead, the National Park Service will enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of several of the structures. Only if an agreement breaks down at some time date, thus threatening the integrity of one of the sites, would the Federal Government be able to initiate condemnation proceedings.

One reason for adopting this procedure was to keep the continued involvement of the citizens of Boston who have assured the preservation of these buildings over the past 200 years. By retaining the specified condemnation authority, we insure not only protection of the Federal investment, but also that of the buildings themselves. In addition, the bill would establish an Advisory Commission which would further insure the continued participation of Bostonians in this National Historical Park.

The cost of this proposal received the detailed attention of the committee. Development costs were included for long-term restoration of the historic buildings. As most of the structures are in a good state of preservation, these funds will be expended over a number of years, rather than having to be committed almost immediately. In the case of the Charlestown Navy Yard, the committee cut near-

ly $8,000,000 from the initial proposed costs. The preliminary figures for this area included highly developed exhibits proposed for future development, as well as extensive restoration of many elements of the navy yard. The reduced figure adopted by the committee will still allow for the U.S.S. *Constitution* to be properly displayed, and for the essential restoration in the navy yard unit to be accomplished.

I might say that I do not anticipate that the National Park Service will immediately be spending large sums of money in this area. However, enactment of this legislation will permit the Park Service to establish a presence in this area before the Bicentennial celebrations. The ability of the Service to assist in establishing coordinated interpretation and display of the properties will be of great immediate benefit to those Americans who will visit the Boston area during our Bicentennial celebrations.

Finally Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7486 directs the Secretary of the Interior to study certain additional areas which he may recommend to Congress for inclusion in the park at a later date. The Park Service may also engage in marking and interpreting other sites in the greater Boston area to further the visitor's appreciation of the people and events that helped make of us a new nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to protect and make available to all Americans the national treasures included in this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the national park system was designed by the Congress to be the Federal repository for the superlative natural and nationally historic heritage of our Nation.

If there is any place where nationally significant historical events occurred, it is in Boston in association with the American Revolution. Some of the most important events that shaped the beginning of our Nation happened here. A number of the buildings and structures where many of these events took place are still here, and are unquestionably worthy of saving for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.

The only reason these structures still exist, and principally in much of their original historic condition, is due to the great attachment given them by the people of Boston. They have been reasonably well preserved to date through the strong devotion and dedication of local people and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, with the Bicentennial year and associated events approaching us, the impact of increased visitation will be very noticeable. These structures will need increased restoration, strengthening for increased traffic, and added interpretation and protection. The people of Boston, recognizing this need, coupled with the unquestioned national significance of these historic places, have sought the technical and financial assistance of the National Park Service.

These areas will be operated under cooperative agreements between the National Park Service and the various owners as components of the Boston National Historical Park. This arrangement will greatly assist a coordinated approach to management, and will result in a much improved program of interpretation. The total story for all these sites can be better woven together into a meaningful whole.

I would hope that the cooperative agreements will be formulated in such a way as to assure that the local people will be able to continue to exhibit their local pride and involvement in the operation of these areas. The ideal situation would be for the National Park Service to provide initial assistance, and then permit the local people to operate and maintain these areas from that point onward.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 4 minutes?

Mr. SKUBITZ. I yield 4 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, do I understand there is a price tag on this bill to the Federal Government of some $27 million?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman is approximately correct. As I pointed out in my initial statement, the developments called for are long-range expenditures. These historic buildings are in a good state of preservation. They can be shown to the public in their present condition; but in the long-range future a good deal of renovation and restoration of the buildings will be necessary.

Mr. GROSS. But then I read in the report that apparently after the Federal Government puts that much money into the various projects that the Federal Government is not going to have much, if anything, to say about the property it has purchased or renovated, or whatever the purpose; am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I am saying the Federal Government would not have anything much to say in regard to the operation of the properties. The bill does authorize entering into long-range agreements with the owners of the property. By "long range" we contemplate 40 or 50 years, probably with the right of the Park Service to extend for another period of time. Such an arrangement would give the Park Service possession of the properties, would give the Park Service the right to maintain, preserve and restore the properties, would give the Park Service the right to show the properties, to advertise them and display them to the public.

Mr. GROSS. I am now quoting from the report, and alluding to $5,037,000 of this money. The Department of Interior says: (it) "would not in our judgment be warranted without assurances that the properties to be interpreted would be available and maintained at National Park Service standards at such time as the visitor center was completed. These assurances are not provided in the bill. . ."

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield further, I state the legislation gives the Department full authority to make certain that in the cooperative agreement they do have that power.

Mr. GROSS. If the Federal Government is taken in as a partner, has some control over the properties, how the money is spent, has something to say about its operation in the interests of the public—if the gentleman can give us the assurance we are not putting $27 million into this situation in Massachusetts, without having something to say about what transpires, I will have no objection to the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield further, the entire purpose of the legislation is to see that the Federal Government has the power to enter into long-range agreements, which give the Secretary possession of the property, the right to maintain it, to operate it, to interpret it, to show it to the public, and almost all of the authority which he would have if he had ownership.

Mr. GROSS. Then we have that assurance from the gentleman?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The additional purpose of this arrangement is to maintain that interest on the part of the people of Boston who have preserved these buildings so effectively during the last 200 years. We have a program of volunteers in the parks. I know of no better opportunity for us to use volunteer labor in interpreting the background and meaning of historical buildings than here in Boston.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I speak on behalf of my bill, H.R. 7486, to authorize the establishment of the Boston National Historic Park, which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, from the earliest days of the Republic, Americans have exhibited a desire to protect and maintain the buildings, battlefields, and sites which comprise the most physical and ostensible evidence of our Nation's rich and varied history. The bill authorizes for inclusion within a national park the following described areas:

First, Faneuil Hall;
Second, Paul Revere House;
Third, Old North Church;
Fourth, Old State House;
Fifth, Bunker Hill, Breeds Hill;
Sixth, Old South Meeting House; and
Seventh, Charlestown Navy Yard.

The bill also authorizes the Department of the Interior to study the follow-

ing areas for future inclusion into the park, such inclusion coming only by a specific act of Congress:

First, Boston Common;

Second, Dillaway-Thomas House;

Third, Thomas Crease House;

Fourth, Dorchester Heights; and

Fifth, King's Chapel Granary and Copp's Hill.

Finally, the bill provides for the construction of historical markers and maintenance of a visitors' center which will aid in the understanding and interpretation of the sites for the thousands of Americans who will journey to the park each year.

As we all know from our American history the above-mentioned sites figured heavily in the first days of our Nation's existence. It was in Boston that the first shots of the Revolutionary War were fired, and it is where the fervor of freedom and liberty generated by men like Samuel Adams and James Otis first took firm hold. Throughout the Revolution Boston continued to serve as a stronghold of American resistence. I am, therefore, in complete agreement with the committee report (Rept. No. 93-1246) when it states—

> Perhaps no other part of the country can match the claim of Boston, Mass., as the Cradle of the American Revolution.

Thus located within Boston, in close proximity, are a series of sites which are almost unequaled in historic and symbolic significance. H.R. 7486 represents a unique opportunity to bring within one park, under the supervision and auspices of the Federal Government many historic sites integrally related to the founding of this Nation as well as the early years of our growth.

One important aspect of this legislation is that acquisition of any of these proposed sites is only with the consent of the owners. As noted in the report—

> Donation, or purchase with donated funds, is specified as the preferred means of acquisition.

The only money authorized for land acquisition is for property for a downtown visitor's center and for several plots of land surrounding the entrance to the Charlestown Navy Yard. The Park Service is presently engaged in finalizing cooperative agreements between themselves and the present owners of the sites. The cooperative agreements concept is presently being utilized by the National Park Service in Philadelphia in maintaining Independence Hall.

There are compelling reasons for enactment of H.R. 7486. While these sites are located within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts they belong to the entire Nation. And the revolutionary spirit which these sites embody belongs not only to the State of Massachusetts, but to the Nation as well. The story of struggle and independence represented in these sites does not belong only to the Commonwealth, but should be a vital and continuing landmark to which any American may look for inspiration. This bill then, will provide more Americans than ever an opportunity to visit and appreciate these monuments to our glorious beginnings as a nation, which are not only testaments to the vitality of America's past, but are a source of purpose and resolve for the future. In time of domestic turmoil and foreign strife, our historical monuments can provide a kind of stability and security offered by no other medium. If Americans can look to their past with dignity and pride, they are more likely to endure the travails of the future. This can best be accomplished under the auspices of the Federal Government.

Second, there is an overwhelming practical consideration which dictates that these sites be placed under Federal supervision. Only the Federal Government can provide the degree of care necessary to retain these buildings and prevent their deterioration. And only the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service have the resources to transform the proposed park into a genuinely national shrine. Recently, I was shocked to learn that several of these sites did not even have American flags for display. While this situation was easily remedied, it points to the clear need for Federal assistance and supervision. Only several months ago, the famous "grasshopper" which flys atop Fanueil Hall as a weathervane, and which served as signal to the Colonials, was stolen, although finally retrieved by the Boston Police Department. It is imperative that deterioration and disrepair, which has tragically afflicted many other significant historic sites, be prevented from ravaging the historic sites of Boston which played such an important role in the birth of the United States.

Lastly, a similar bill, S. 210, passed the Senate December 7, 1973.

I urge the House to act favorably on this measure for the reasons I have presented.

Thank you again Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CRONIN).

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving on this committee and also of having lived in the Greater Boston Area most of my life.

I think that it is significant that the buildings we are talking about today are structures that belong to all America.

When people think of Faneuil Hall, they do not think of a building that belongs to the city of Boston. Yet the city of Boston has maintained it for 200 years.

When they think of the Old North Church and the Paul Revere House, they think of national treasures. Still, for over 200 years it has been the people of the Boston area, the people of Massachusetts, who one way or another have found ways to keep these buildings together and still keep them as viable entities for historic preservation.

There has been some concern expressed about the question of the cooperative arrangements. I think that this arrangement is a positive, new departure by our Committee of the Interior that will allow the Park Service to create this national park without the tremendous additional acquisition costs by just assuring the people who presently have control of these properties that they will be cared for at least as well as they have been over the last 200 years and that they will be preserved for the next 200 years and ad infinitum for future generations of Americans.

I think it is significant, on the question of additional staffing, that in a neighboring national park in Lexington and Concord, Minuteman National Park where the shots heard around the world were first fired, we have the largest number of volunteers in the park—VIP—of any park in the United States of America. Yet, Minuteman National Park is one of the smallest national parks in the country.

I think that Boston being so close and Massachusetts people being so concerned about their history and being so concerned about the Bicentennial, it is inevitable that once this park opens, the volunteers in the park for the Boston area will not only be some of the best but also one of the largest groups in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that especially the majority leader and all of the members of the Massachusettes delegation have fought long and hard for this park, long before I was ever a Member of this House. As a member of the National Parks Subcommittee I owe each and every one of them my thanks for their help, advice and information they provided through hearings, on site inspections and with the full committee. Today is the end result of the entire Massachusetts delegation working together for the citizens of Massachusetts and the Nation.

I think it is significant that as we approach the Bicentennial, we will see the area of the country that gave birth to our revolution finally receive the assistance that it deserves, so that all Americans and people throughout the world who see these sites during 1975 and 1976 will leave with a new inspiration and dedication to the principles that caused our country to be born.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7486, to establish a national historic park in Boston, Mass.

Perhaps no city in America is so intimately linked with the Revolutionary War than is Boston. And certainly no city faces a more monumental task in preparing for the Bicentennial celebrations. Prompt action on this bill will greatly help us with this work.

This bill will enable the National Park Service to acquire many of the most historic sites in the Nation, all with the consent of the owners. A visitors center would be built, so that tourists can fully appreciate Fanueil Hall, the cradle of liberty, where the Boston Tea Party was partially planned; Bunker Hill, where Revolutionary soldiers fired on the British only when seeing "the whites of their eyes"; the Old North Church, which was the signal for Paul Revere's famous ride; and the Old South Meeting

House, where Boston patriots did their planning.

Further, this visitors center will put the Park Service in a position to develop programs for the maintenance and exhibition of these sites.

The bill also provides that the Park Service can undertake a study of other sites in Boston, for their possible inclusion in the park at a later date. Of particular importance in this study, and I would urge the Park Service to act soon and favorable on this proposal, is the inclusion of Dorchester Heights and the Dilloway Thomas House.

Dorchester Heights was fortified in March of 1776, and was the site of the first real Revolutionary War victory. Under the threat of the guns on these heights, the British evacuated Boston, never to set foot in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts again. So it is important to note that the war not only began in Boston, but actually ended as far as Massachusetts was concerned 3 months before the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

I would like at this time also, to thank and commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TAYLOR, and other members of the committee who visited Boston to study the sites scheduled for inclusion. Congressman CRONIN of Massachusetts deserves some particular thanks also for his diligence on behalf of the people of the Commonwealth so interested in the Bicentennial.

Thus, appropriately, it is in Boston that the Bicentennial will begin. This bill will allow the people of Boston, and indeed the Nation, to be faithful to their past.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, only foolish men pay no heed to history. Time and again the wisest of our leaders have warned that we can never be sure of where we are going unless we truly know from where we have come. The Nation now stands on the threshold of its third century and more than ever needs the leadership and direction that in earlier days made it great. I have chosen to preface my remarks with these thoughts because today the House takes up legislation that would create a national historic park in Boston. The historic structures that this bill proposes to preserve and protect are lasting symbols of where our country has been. The roots of our greatest American tradition, freedom and individual liberty, are embedded in the soil on which these structures stand.

I stand in support of this legislation Mr. Speaker, because I believe it is essential that we as a nation act to preserve those invaluable sites where our American heritage was born. Places such as Fanueil Hall, The Old North Church, the home of Paul Revere, and the Charleston Navy Yard, where the U.S.S. *Constitution* is berthed, are continuing sources of inspiration for American citizens. No one who visits these historic places can escape the sense of greatness and the magnitude of the moment that imbued our patriotic forefathers with such a passion for liberty.

Up until this very day, however, these hallowed places have had to rely for the most part on the charity and good will of the private citizens of Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for their upkeep. These historic structures and grounds are more than sites of incidental local history. Rather they are beyond a doubt the surviving symbols of our struggle for independence. They are of national concern because they are a source of national pride. Development and long range restoration plans for these historic properties are urgently needed and can best be administered through the management of the National Park Service. At Independence Hall in Philadelphia such a plan has been a success for a number of years. The influx of tourists expected in 1976 in Boston for the Bicentennial celebration will surely be more than the nonprofit associations that operate several of these sites could handle.

This legislation, however, does not amount to a total Federal takeover. The Boston National Historical Park Act of 1974 makes a point of setting up a cooperative arrangement with the local associations and citizens of the area who in the past have been the benefactors of the national treasures.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a moment to commend the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for their hard work on this legislation. This plan is the result of many hours of study and research, including field visits to these historic landmarks by the Subcommittee on National Parks. By sounding out the views of the local populace and providing an important participative role for them in the administration of the properties, the committee has combined the best of both worlds—the insurance of adequate Federal funding for future preservation costs and the retention of local community involvement. As cosponsor of this bill I believe that it puts our national landmarks in the proper perspective for yet unborn generations of Americans by showing that a central government that sits many miles away is not unrepresentative of the public which it serves. After all, this is what the colonial protestations that led to the American Revolution were all about, and why today we seek to preserve and protect these historic sites.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7486, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 210) to authorize the establishment of the Boston National Historic Park in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 210

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 "Boston National Historic Sites Act of 1972".

BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

SEC. 2. (a) In order to preserve for the benefit and inspiration of the people of the United States as a national historical park certain historical structures and properties of outstanding national significance located in Boston, Massachusetts, and associated with the American Revolution and the founding and growth of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, to acquire only with the consent of the current owner by donation or by purchase with donated or appropriated funds and all lands and improvements thereon or interests therein comprising the following described areas:

(1) Fanueil Hall, located at Dock Square, Boston;

(2) Paul Revere House, 19 North Square, Boston;

(3) The Old State House, Washington and State Street, Boston;

(4) Bunker Hill, Breeds Hill, Boston; and

(5) Old South Meeting House, Milk and Washington Streets, Boston.

(b) At any such time as the Secretary determines that he has acquired sufficient lands, improvements, and interests therein or entered into cooperative agreements with sufficient numbers of private, municipal, or State owners as provided in section 3 of this Act, to provide an efficient administrative unit, he is authorized to establish such lands, improvements, and interests as the Boston National Historical Park by the publication of that fact in the Federal Register, together with a detailed map setting forth the boundaries thereof.

(c) In addition to the above described areas, the Secretary is authorized to study the following locations, and any others he deems appropriate for inclusion in the park, either by donation or by purchase with the consent of the owner with donated or appropriated funds, or by entering into cooperative agreements:

(1) Boston Common;

(2) Charlestown Navy Yard;

(3) Thomas Crease House (old Corner Book Store);

(4) Dorchester Heights;

(5) following burying grounds: King's Chapel, Granary, and Copp's Hill;

(6) Thomas Dillaway House;

(7) The area identified as the Old North Church area, 193 Salem Street, Boston.

(d) No site will be included in the park which has not been either acquired with the consent of the owner or the subject of a cooperative agreement as outlined in section 3.

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. In furtherance of the general purposes of this Act as prescribed in section 2 thereof, the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the city

of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and private organizations to assist in the preservation and interpretation of such of the properties listed in section 2, or portions thereof, which, in his opinion, would best be preserved in private, municipal, or State ownership, in connection with the Boston National Historical Park. Such agreements shall contain, but shall not be limited to, provisions that the Secretary, through the National Park Service, shall have right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property covered by such agreement for the purpose of conducting visitors through such properties and interpreting them to the public, that no changes or alterations shall be made in such properties except by mutual agreement between the Secretary and the other parties to such agreements, except that no limitation or control of any kind over the use of any such properties customarily used for church purposes shall be imposed by any agreement. The agreements may contain specific provisions which outline in detail the extent of the participation by the Secretary in the restoration, preservation, and maintenance of the historic site. Any historical properties not acquired by negotiated purchase, donation, or not the subject of a cooperative agreement may be excluded from the Boston National Historical Park.

ADDITIONAL AREAS

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to accept donations of property of national historical interest and significance located in the city of Boston which he may deem proper for administration as part of the Boston National Historical Park. Upon such acceptance, such property shall be deemed part of such park. The Secretary may purchase with the consent of the owner or enter into a cooperative agreement with the owner of any additional historic sites which he deems appropriate for inclusion in the Boston National Historical Park.

ADVISORY COMMISSION

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to establish a suitable advisory commission. The members of the advisory commission shall be appointed by the Secretary, with three members to be recommended by the Governor of Massachusetts, three by the mayor of the city of Boston, Massachusetts, and one each by the organizations with which the Secretary has concluded cooperative agreements pursuant to section 3 of this Act. The advisory commission shall render advice to the Secretary, from time to time, upon matters which he may refer to them for consideration.

HISTORICAL MARKERS

SEC. 6. The Secretary is hereby authorized to carry out a program of historical marking in the city of Boston, Massachusetts, and other municipalities within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to cover nationally significant sites of the colonial and Revolutionary periods of American history, and such sites as are related to any unit of the national park system within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, through agreements with the owners of such sites.

VISITOR CENTER

SEC. 7. The Secretary with the consent of the advisory commission is authorized to construct on lands acquired by him in accordance with this Act or upon other lands that may be donated to him for such purpose, or make use of existing facilities with proper restoration, a suitable visitor center for the interpretation of the historical features of the Boston National Historical Park.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 8. The Boston National Historical Park shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461–467).

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $360,000 for land acquisition and $8,067,000 for development of the historic site; except that no such sums shall be used for the purchase of property owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or the city of Boston, Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 210 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 7486, as amended, as passed, with the correction of a printing error on page 9, lines 14 and 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 7486) was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT OF OCTOBER 27, 1972 (PUBLIC LAW 92–578)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14167) to amend the act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92–578), as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of October 27, 1972 (86 Stat. 1266), is hereby amended as follows:

1. By designating subsection 4(b) to be subsection 4(c), and by adding a new subsection 4(b) to read as follows:

"(b) The Board of Directors is authorized to procure the temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of city planners, architects, engineers, appraisers, and other experts or consultants or organizations thereof in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not in excess of the rate in effect for grade GS–18 of the General Schedule.".

2. In subsection 7(b),

(i) delete "this Act," and insert "the Act to amend the Act of October 27, 1972 (86 Stat. 1266),";

(ii) delete "within twelve months of the date of enactment of this Act," and insert "by June 30, 1975,".

3. In section 17, delete "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,750,000 for the operating and administrative expenses of the Corporation and".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14167 would amend Public Law 92–578 which established the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.

This Corporation, established by Congress in 1972, was charged with development of a plan to restore and appropriately develop the great ceremonial Avenue of our Nation, Pennsylvania Avenue, as it runs from the Capitol to the White House.

The Corporation now has a completed plan in the final stages of revision before its submission for congressional review. Should Congress not raise objection to this plan, the Corporation will proceed with the implementation of the needed work to restore this great Avenue to the position it merits as part of our Nation's Capital.

H.R. 14167 will further the purposes of the original Act by accomplishing three objectives:

First, it will permit the Corporation to hire temporary technical and professional assistance directly, rather than on a contract basis only. This will provide more flexibility and permit additional support studies without resorting to full-scale contracting procedures for every needed service;

Second, a moratorium on nonconforming construction in the area covered by the plan is reinstituted until June 30, 1975, unless the approved plan is in effect by that date. The moratorium included in the original act to prevent inappropriate construction within the area until the plan could begin functioning has expired. The cutoff date is included so that if there is no final agreement on the plan by June 30 of next year, private enterprise will no longer be restrained from operating in the area; and

Finally, the authorization ceiling for the Corporation is increased by $750,000. Of the original $1 million authorization, $850,000 has been obligated. The additional $750,000 authorization is needed so that the Corporation can make final preparation of the plan, participate in the congressional review process, and take the needed preliminary steps for the implementation of this means to revitalize Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation is needed if we are to continue and finish the work begun in the last Congress to restore and revitalize this Main Street of America.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is not much that I can add to the statement which has just been made by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR). H.R. 14167 is a bill to authorize the continuation and funding of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act. This bill would increase the present authorization from $1 million to $1,750,000.

The Corporation has now obligated $850,000 and needs the additional money to carry out its work.

Mr. Speaker, I lend my support to the bill before us, H.R. 14167, which embodies several simple amendments to the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act enacted by the last Congress. The Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation is charged with the preparation of a plan to revitalize the generally blighted but historic and ceremonially important stretch of the avenue between the Capitol and the White House.

This plan is now under review and will soon be submitted to the Congress for its final scrutiny and decision as to the disposition of the plan. The bill before us is merely an interim measure to authorize continued funding of this effort, extend an expired construction moratorium, and amend certain methods of procuring services for the Corporation.

I know of no controversy regarding this bill, which is designed to assist the final production of the plan and the continued functioning of the Corporation during the plan's congressional review period.

I urge my colleagues to vote favorably for this legislation.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What has been accomplished with the $1 million already spent on Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I would reply to the gentleman from Iowa that this has been used to produce the plan and to fabricate a formula so as to carry out the program, and these have not as yet been completed and submitted. There is in addition a great deal of work to be done, and these funds are needed to complete that work.

Mr. GROSS. This means that the plans are going to cost at least $2,750,000?

Mr. SKUBITZ. No, $1,750,000.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. SKUBITZ. One million seven hundred fifty thousand.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman said $1 million had already been expended.

Mr. SKUBITZ. One million has already been authorized, and we are authorizing an additional $750,000.

Mr. GROSS. An additional $750,000?

Mr. SKUBITZ. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. And not another $1,750,000?

Mr. SKUBITZ. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Well, what has transpired with regard to the deal that was concocted some time ago to trade some Wyoming or Montana land for the old Willard Hotel?

Mr. SKUBITZ. That, Mr. Speaker, I do not know, and I will have to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) for an answer to that.

Mr. GROSS. Has anything developed in that respect?

Mr. SKUBITZ. I do not know. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. I am trying to find out about some horse trading that has been going on between the owners of the Willard Hotel and the Interior Department for some public lands in the State of Wyoming or Montana.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I do not know of any horse trading or any other proposal to exchange the Willard Hotel for land in Montana or Wyoming. I did read in the paper several months ago that a proposal was made that some land in or near New York City be exchanged for the Willard Hotel, but I think public opposition was so strong that no action was taken.

Mr. GROSS. I suspect that public opposition to both projects was strong enough to stop both deals.

I cannot help but wonder how much we are going to spend to develop a plan. Is this going to be another one of those interminable expenditures on behalf of Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. SKUBITZ. I am hoping not. I am just as much interested in saving every dollar that we can save. I do think it is necessary to complete the present work that has been set into motion.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose we will spend $2 million or $3 million on it and wind up giving that block occupied by the Willard and Washington hotels across from the Treasury, to the District of Columbia.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14167, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3301) to amend the act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92–578), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of October 27, 1972 (86 Stat. 1266), is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By designating subsection 4(b) to be subsection 4(c), and by adding a new subsection 4(b) to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (b) The Board of Directors is authorized to procure the temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of city planners, architects, engineers, appraisers, and other experts or consultants or organizations thereof in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not in excess of the rate in effect for grade GS–18 of the General Schedule.".

(2) By deleting subsection 7(b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 7. (b) After the date of the enactment of the Act to amend the Act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92–578), no new construction (including substantial remodeling, conversion, rebuilding, enlargement, extension, or major structural improvement of existing building, but not including ordinary maintenance or remodeling or changes necessary to continue occupancy) shall be authorized or conducted within the development area except upon prior certification by the Corporation that the construction is, or may reasonably be expected to be, consistent with the carrying out of the development plan for the area: *Provided,* That if the development plan for the area does not become effective under the provisions of section 5 by December 31, 1974, this subsection shall be of not further force and effect until such time as the development plan does become effective under that section.".

(3) By deleting section 17 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 17. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,750,000 for the preparation and presentation of the development plan pursuant to section 5 of this Act and for operating and administrative expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; and for operating and administrative expenses of the Corporation for succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3301 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 14167, as amended, as passed by the House.

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. 14167) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 69

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 583) authorizing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 69.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 583

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 69) to extend and amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to make the correction described in the following sentence. Immediately after subsection (b) of section 121 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which is added by section 101(a)(2)(E) of the bill, insert the following:

"(c) A State agency shall use the payments made under this section only for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and, where necessary, the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of such children, and the State agency

shall provide assurances to the Commissioner that each such child in average daily attendance counted under subsection (b) will be provided with such a program, commensurate with his special needs, during any fiscal year for which such payments are made.

"(d) In the case where such a child leaves an educational program for handicapped children operated or supported by the State agency in order to participate in such a program operated or supported by a local educational agency, such child shall be counted under subsection (b) if (1) he continues to receive an appropriately designed educational program and (2) the State agency transfers to the local educational agency in whose program such child participates an amount equal to the sums received by such State agency under this section which are attributable to such child, to be used for the purposes set forth in subsection (c)."

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of such bill is further authorized and directed to make the correction described in the following sentence. In section 252 of the bill, strike "Title IV" and insert in lieu thereof "Title V".

SEC. 3. The Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of such bill is further authorized and directed to make the correction described in the following sentence In the title of section 612 of the bill, strike out "Office" and insert in lieu thereof "Bureau".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution which is at the desk corrects certain clerical errors made in the conference report on H.R. 69. I would now like to take a minute to describe those corrections.

The first correction will be to add two subsections to the State program for the handicapped under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Those subsections were adopted in an identical form by both the House and the Senate but through error were deleted from the conference report as it was filed.

The second correction will be to insert the correct references to a title of the bill which is being amended by section 252 of the bill. This correction has no substantive effect.

The third correction will be to strike "Office" from a section dealing with the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education. This correction also has no substantive effect.

Mr. Speaker, I have deleted from the concurrent resolution which is at the desk two sections which appear in the House Concurrent Resolution 570, which I tried to bring up last Wednesday after the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 69. One of those corrections dealt with the impact aid program, and the other correction dealt with the Equal Educational Opportunities Act. After checking the enrolled bill, we discovered that those two errors did not appear in the enrolled bill although they did appear as printing errors in the conference report as it was printed and distributed. Since they did not appear in the enrolled bill as errors, they are not necessary to correct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the concurrent resolution offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

As he has stated, this resolution does nothing more than order the Clerk of the House to make certain corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 69 before it sent to the President.

The most major correction involves the insertion of two paragraphs which I prepared and which were identical in both the House and Senate bills. The language appears in the House-passed bill on page 15 as section 121(c) and 121(d). The identical language appears on page 160 of H.R. 69 in the Senate and bears the same section designation. This language, even though identical in both bills and hence not an item in conference, simply dropped into the oblivion of some wastebasket along the way in the preparation of the conference report.

The missing two paragraphs do two things: First, they say that a State agency receiving funds for handicapped children under title I of ESEA must use these funds only for special education programs and that each child counted will be provided with a program to meet his or her needs. Secondly, the language says that in the event a child is moved by a State agency into a local school district the State may continue to count that child only if the funds are passed through the State and go to the LEA which is actually providing the services to that handicapped child. Here is the missing language:

(c) A State agency shall use the payments made under this section only for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and, where necessary, the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special needs of such children, and the State agency shall provide assurances to the Commissioner that each such child in average daily attendance counted under subsection (b) will be provided with such a program, commensurate with his special needs, during any fiscal year for which such payments are made.

(d) In the case where such a child leaves an educational program for handicapped children operated or supported by the State agency in order to participate in such a program operated or supported by a local educational agency, such child shall be counted under subsection (b) if (1) he continues to receive an appropriately designed educational program and (2) the State agency transfers to the local educational agency in whose program such child participates an amount equal to the sums received by such State agency under this section which are attributable to such child, to be used for the purposes set forth in subsection (e).

The second change is a simple error in the cross-reference language which precedes the Ashbrook amendment. Although the legislative intent is crystal clear without the change, we thought it best to make the change. Specifically, the language appears on page 39 of the conference report. In section 252 the sentence should read, "Part B of the General Education Provisions Act as amended by title V of this act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:".

The final change is another very minor correction, and it deals with the handicapped section. On page 104 of the conference report, the heading to section 612 should read Bureau for the Education and Training of the Handicapped. That title currently reads Office for the Education and Training of the Handicapped. Since the substance of section 612 makes clear that this unit is a Bureau, we are merely conforming the heading with the substance.

As I have tried to explain, these are all minor corrections but ones which should be made before the bill goes forward. I urge the support of my colleagues.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding because I was one of those who was concerned about the omission of these sections and the procedure of not informing the House ahead of time that these were absent from the conference bill that was presented to us last week.

I would like to ask my good colleague, the chairman of the committee, if in the future we can be assured, when this kind of thing has occurred, that we will be notified in advance of the time of the vote, assuring that the gentleman knows.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will assure my colleague, the gentleman from California, that when we discover an error of this type in the future the gentleman will be immediately notified.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And the whole House will be assured ahead of time prior to the vote if something as substantive as these two sections relating to the handicapped are missing and the committee knows it, so the House is not presented with a total concept, portions of which, and important portions of which, are not present in the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. The truth about the whole matter is I did not know about it myself until we were in the process of debating the conference report.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate that.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

I wish to make the point again that I hope when we have conference reports of this significance and importance, when there are these kind of mistakes in the printing, that the House is made aware of that problem and that it is presented with the facts relating to the conference report so that we do not have this kind of slippage in the future.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I think it also behooves conferees to be extremely careful when a large piece of legislation such as this comes from conference, to be sure the conference report includes all parts that were agreed to, and in the language they were agreed to. There is the dilemma we are faced with on the floor after a

conference report is already adopted in the other body, that it is impossible to offer an amendment to put those sections back in where a clerical error had been made.

As the gentleman knows, the enrolling does come from a different piece of paper than the conference report which we see.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I know the gentleman is speaking directly to the impact aid section and I know the gentleman from Minnesota was very quick to point out these shortcomings to me. I appreciate it and I appreciate very much the chairman suggesting very strongly that this kind of thing will not occur again.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 583).

The question was taken.

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

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

Does the gentleman from Michigan withdraw his point of order that there is no quorum, since the vote has to be put over?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I do withdraw my point of order with that understanding.

RATIFICATION OF THE GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1258) concerning ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and a comprehensive review of this Nation's national security and international policies regarding chemical warfare.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1258

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Geneva Protocol of 1925, banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare, should be ratified; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that both the President and the Congress should resolve the position of the United States on the future status of herbicides and tear gas so that the Senate may move forward toward ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that reconsideration of the protocol would provide an opportunity for a comprehensive review of United States policies in the field of chemical warfare.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1258, a sense of the House resolution concerning ratification of the 1925 Geneva protocol and a comprehensive review of this Nation's national security and international policies regarding chemical warfare.

As you know, the 1925 Geneva protocol has failed to receive Senate ratification since it was first submitted in 1927. A variety of complex historical reasons account for this failure to ratify. Nevertheless, it has been a source of deep concern to many, particularly in recent years.

Thus, several resolutions were introduced in the 93d Congress aimed at solving the problem of the Geneva protocol and other related matters. The first of these, House Resolution 679, was introduced by Representative WAYNE OWENS of Utah on November 1, 1973. It and four subsequent resolutions—sponsored or cosponsored by 46 Members of Congress—were referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and subsequently to the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments.

These resolutions became the subject of 5 days of hearings held during May by the subcommittee. Testimony was heard from four Members of Congress, spokesmen for the Departments of Defense and State and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and five private witnesses. The hearings were published under the title, "U.S. Chemical Warfare Policy."

By unanimous vote, the subcommittee favorably reported House Resolution 679 with amendments on July 18, 1974. A resolution embodying the subcommittee's amendments, House Resolution 1258, was introduced on July 24 by Representative OWENS with six members of the subcommittee and Mr. DELLENBACK as cosponsors. The Committee on Foreign Affairs considered House Resolution 1258 in open session on July 31 and unanimously ordered it favorably reported without amendments.

The primary objective of House Resolution 1258 is to urge a solution to delayed ratification of the 1925 Geneva protocol. Briefly, that impasse centers on differences between the executive branch and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over the question of whether herbicides and tear gas should be included within the meaning of the protocol.

President Nixon resubmitted the protocol to the Senate in August 1970. Accompanying the resubmission at that time was an executive branch understanding, in the form of a letter from then Secretary of State William Rogers, to exclude herbicides and tear gas from the provisions of the protocol. Because of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's disagreement with that understanding, the issue has been stalemated.

This failure to ratify the protocol is unfortunate for a number of reasons.

First, formal ratification of the protocol would help to reaffirm this Nation's moral leadership in banning this most dread form of chemical warfare.

By eliminating this source of embarrassment to the United States embodied in the failure to ratify, this Nation would close the gap between its often repeated policy objectives and the reality of its practices on chemical warfare.

Further, ratification of the protocol would help to create a more conducive atmosphere for reaching even more comprehensive chemical warfare agreements at the Conference Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. At the moment, those negotiations are in a sad state of limbo. As a result, the chance to seek a treaty banning or limiting chemical warfare may be irretrievably lost.

Lastly, ratification of the protocol would clear the way for ratification of a second treaty also before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pending resolution of the protocol question. This second treaty is the 1972 Convention on Biological Weapons, an agreement which will not go into effect until ratified by the major powers, including the United States.

One reason for the executive branch's desire to exclude herbicides and tear gas apparently related to the fact that we were using those agents in Vietnam at the time the protocol was resubmitted. Now that our military role in that conflict has passed and related emotional overtones have lessened, the time for reconsideration of the exclusions is optimum.

In addition to the question of the 1925 Geneva protocol, however, the subcommittee also reviewed two related issues:

First. The status of the current negotiations at the Conference Committee on Disarmament in Geneva on achieving a comprehensive chemical warfare agreement, particularly as those talks relate to the verification problem; and

Second. A comprehensive review of current U.S. chemical warfare policy, including the need to retain a retaliatory chemical warfare capability and the issue of the new binary nerve gas weapons.

These latter two issues corresponded to the provisions of the various resolutions considered by the subcommittee.

Thus, the Foreign Affairs Committee report accompanying House Resolution 1258 includes a number of findings and recommendations on these two matters which I recommend to the full and careful reading of my colleagues.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin just said that the Foreign Affairs Committee had unanimously approved this resolution. That is true. I was present when the resolution was adopted. However, I have strong reservations as to whether or not we should approve this resolution, primarily because I have not seen, up until this afternoon, the committee report on the resolution itself. Certainly the language of the resolution appears innocuous, but the same cannot be said of the committee report.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has indicated that all we are trying to do is to secure ratification of the Geneva protocol of 1925. I doubt if many would argue with that goal. I wish to say that I personally would like to see this country

ratify that protocol. However, if we look at the legislative history as written in the committee report, we will find we are urging the other body to take action with respect to ratification under certain conditions.

Let me quote some language on page 4 of the report as an example, I refer to the third paragraph from the bottom entitled "Recommendations." I might say that this whole report is written in terms of the subcommittee's recommendations. There was no thorough discussion in the full committee of the nature of the report that was to be filed or what the recommendations of the full committee would be. In fact there was no discussion on mose topics in the full committee at all.

The sentence I would like to quote begins:

> Thus, in exercising its right and responsibility to advise, the Senate would appear to have the prerogative of ratifying the 1925 Geneva Protocol without the exceptions on herbicides and tear gas as interpreted by the administration.

At the top of page 4 the subcommittee seems to be putting itself in the position of suggesting that a careful examination of the drafting of the protocol and the ordinary meaning of the instrument and subsequent practice suggests that both herbicides and tear gas should be included in any prohibition that might result from ratification.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that I do not know enough, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to say whether tear gas and herbicides should be prohibited. However, we are urging the other body to take a position and act as if there were not reservations that the administration had with respect to this topic.

Let me say that a representative of the administration appeared before the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The representative was Leon Sloss, Deputy Director, Politico-Military Affairs, Department of State. He said that there were three points of view which underlined the administration's view. This is on page 174 of the hearing:

> First, the protocol is in our view ambiguous as to the coverage of riot control agents and herbicides.

Unquestionably, Mr. Speaker, that is true; but the position of the committee seems to be that we would try to make it unambiguous by putting herbicides and riot control agents in the prohibition.

Mr. Sloss continues:

> Secondly, I would note that these agents are not lethal weapons, although their use certainly can have some undesirable effects. They have demonstrated some military utility. Their use has saved the lives of our troops and of noncombatants; thus giving up the right to use them in war has both pros and cons. In our view the best way that Congress can reinforce past U.S. policy initiatives in this area is by prompt ratification of the protocol.

Mr. Speaker, this brings up what has caused the delaying action by the other body. I refer to the reservations that the administration has with respect to the significance of ratification. The House is jumping in with both feet into a matter which is not its primary concern—in fact, is of no concern to us at all—and saying to the other body, "We think you should ratify, and we think that if you did, it would have certain consequences."

In my opinion, this would be a mischievous move. I do not think that it should be considered a very simple, noncontroversial matter.

I hope that there are others who would agree that we do not need to have this resolution brought up on a consent basis, so that we can have a real, ongoing debate on the merits of the proposition.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for his position and say that I support the arguments he has made against adoption of the amendment.

I see no reason for supporting the outlawing of tear gas, and I am afraid that is what we would be doing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would like also to mention, Mr. Speaker, language on page 9 of the committee report. The gentleman from Wisconsin discussed very briefly the so-called binary proposal.

Let me say that in full committee the word "binary" was never even mentioned. I would have thought, on reading the language of the resolution, that we would not be involving ourselves with the question of whether or not we should be engaged in the financing of a so-called binary weapons program. It may well be that it will cost a lot of money. It may well be that there are two sides to the argument about whether we should engage in this kind of program or not.

All I am saying or suggesting is that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in its entirety, never discussed this question. Yet here we are, on paper at least, seeming to pass judgment and to cast aspersions about the wisdom of going ahead with this program.

Let me read the final paragraph on page 10 of the committee report to indicate the need for debate on what we are doing.

This, I might say, is listed as a subcommittee recommendation. Since the full committee is taking responsibility for this resolution and supposedly for the report, I assume the full committee is now endorsing the subcommittee's recommendations, too.

Point 4: "Because of the obvious dangers to America's strategic position in the proliferation of chemical weapons, it may be in the national security of the United States to postpone the $5.8 billion binary procurement request. This postponement should be accompanied by an intensive effort to negotiations within the CCD to seek a comprehensive international agreement to ban the production and stockpiling of chemical warfare weapons."

Of course, it may be that there are dangers to our strategic position if there is a proliferation, but we do not really know on the basis of information that I have seen submitted to me, and surely the full committee has not had the benefit of a meaningful discussion of the significance of the so-called binary program.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would be very unwise to follow the leadership of a committee that has not taken a look at a subject which is really on the periphery of its interests simply because a subcommittee has come up with a certain recommendation.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I fully understand the gentleman from New Jersey would not have had time to be present at all these hearings, but certainly the gentleman had time enough to read them. Unquestionably he will agree that we should have a careful consideration of this question.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the ratification of the Protocol of 1925, as well as the Biological Weapons Treaties, I would refer the gentleman to the testimony of Dr. Ikle, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, on page 172 of the hearings. He says that U.S. ratification is critical, that ratification should be accomplished in the near future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I might say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, that I understand his point about ratification. I am not arguing against ratification of both the biological weapons treaty and the protocol. I am not arguing that at all.

What I am arguing is the point as to the wisdom of passing judgment as to whether we should engage in the production of materials for the binary program, whether it is expensive or not. This recommendation would seem to be irrelevant to the language of the resolution. I believe we are treading on very awkward ground if we pass, on the committee's recommendation, on something that is not included in the language of the resolution. I think that is unwise policy.

If the gentleman in the full committee had mentioned that the committee report would discuss a lot of subjects not included in the language of the resolution, I might have thought differently about it, and I certainly regret the fact that I did not vote against this resolution.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the binary proposal the gentleman refers to is not in the resolution. But the resolution contains a provision calling for a comprehensive review of U.S. chemical warfare policy. In that context the binary is an integral part of the entire question as to whether we are going to have peace in this world.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that he should have made such a request in the full committee. He should have asked that the committee report include topics that were not included in the resolution which we are considering, and we could have at least discussed the wisdom of including his recommendations.

My point is that on the face of it we are accepting the legislative history regarding what seems to be an innocuous resolution in its language and judgment, language in the committee report concerning matters which were not even discussed in the committee.

I think that is unwise. I hope this resolution is defeated until we have another discussion in the committee.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) who is presenting this resolution, but I have serious reservations about the resolution.

It is a very innocent-sounding measure. It is one that would appear on its face to be acceptable. I hope it does not become a mischief-making resolution, but it may, and that is the reason for my reservations about it.

I know the committee wants it to be something that is useful. But I question the need for it.

The first paragraph involves ratification. The matter of ratification of the Geneva protocol has been around for nearly half a century and, hopefully, all nations will ratify a ban on gas and bacteriological warfare. The question is whether those ratifying it will live up to it. There could be one notable exception, Russia. I do not know any way a ban could be enforced against Russia. Russia has the most advanced and most effective chemical warfare capability in the world.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that we are getting into the business of the U.S. Senate, for they are the treaty ratifiers of the Congress, and not the House. This could be interpreted as an attempt to bypass the Senate, or to instruct the Senate.

The third paragraph is one which I do not find objectionable, although it may not have much value. It has to do with a comprehensive review of U.S. policies in the field of chemical warfare. I presume it is safe to say that have been many comprehensive reviews of U.S. policy in the field of chemical warfare. They are all neatly stacked on the shelves gathering dust, and serving no useful purpose.

The opportunity for another review would delight the bureaucrats who must justify their expensive existence. I hope it will accomplish something worth while, but I doubt that it will.

It is the second section of the measure which disturbs me most. It calls on the President and the Congress to resolve the position of our country on the future status of herbicides and tear gas. Herbicides and tear gas have a place in war, and a place in domestic application entirely apart from their use in war.

Are we proposing that the House of Representatives so express itself today that some future court or conference can decide that we have also said herbicides can no longer be used for removing obnoxious weeds or brush for peaceful purposes, or use tear gas for the control of criminals or mobs, or using either to save American lives in warfare? The executive branch has generally objected to the inclusion of herbicides and tear gas in the ratification of the Geneva protocol.

It is what the resolution does not say which may be most dangerous.

I question that we should get ourselves involved this deeply in a subject that has not been more widely discussed and debated. The printed hearings that I have seen generally appear to exclude the concern of those who want to face up to the actuality of a tremendous Russian capability in the field of chemical warfare and the Communist goal to control the world by whatever means may be utilized.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that this measure has come before the House I do not propose to ask for a rollcall, but if it is ordered I intend as a safeguard to vote against the resolution.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey yielding me time.

I want to say the very sensible and sound remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey underscore my regret, and I am sure the regret of many Members in this Chamber, that the good sense, good wisdom and penetrating judgment of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) will be missing from this Chamber next year.

I want to express my very severe reservations about this resolution. In fact, I want to express my opposition to it.

I share the view of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that this is a very plausible sounding resolution, very innocuous appearing but what we are really doing, in my judgment, is beginning, in this resolution, and I think it is clear, from the wording of the committee report which the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) referred to, we are beginning an effort which will be continued tomorrow in this Chamber, to undercut a major part of our defensive arsenal.

And we are doing it without any real understanding of what it involves, and without any participation of the Committees on the Armed Services, which are supposedly the experts in this field, and without any recognition of the military realities in the world with which we are actually confronted.

This calls on the Senate to "resolve" some particular question, and yet it does not even debate that question. Obviously, if we are going to resolve this argument, it ought to come from people who are best qualified in this field.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of misinformation; there is a lot of misrepresentation; there is a lot of confusion when it comes to the subject of chemical warfare. We are told that this is a terible form of warfare, a very inhumane form of warfare; something that no civilized country ought even to consider. Yet it seems to me that these terms really lost their meaning once we got into the present nuclear age.

Once we got into the business of dropping the atom bomb, I do not see how we can possibly compare various kinds of inhumanity or "Schrecklichkeit" when it comes to warfare. One of them is as bad as another. The really important consideration is not whether chemical warfare is bad, but whether we are equipped to protect ourselves against a chemical capability in the hands of a potential enemy, indeed to deter an enemy from employing such a capability against us.

I had the unique opportunity last fall to head a committee that went to the Middle East immediately following the October war. We had an opportunity to look at vast quantities of captured Soviet equipment in the hands of the Israelis. The thing that amazed me was the fact that every piece of Soviet equipment was fully outfitted with defensive measures against chemical, radiological, and biological warfare. That means at the very least that they are well aware that this is an important instrument of warfare. But more than that: no country would embark on a chemical warfare offensive without first equipping itself defensively to protect its own troops.

I think the demonstration that we got there in Israel surprised the U.S. Army forces. It also surprised the representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who went to Israel, too. So what we saw is a very good indication that the Soviets have an offensive chemical capability.

So are we now going to eliminate our own capability in this field? I can remember 4 years ago, when we had the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Max McCarthy, on the floor. At that time, we were being told about all the frightening aspects of chemical warfare. It turned out that we had supplies of all of these gases stored around the country, but we were told they could explode at any minute, and so it developed that we were, as a practical matter, prevented from moving these supplies from one part of the country to another.

The gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) does not want the chemical warfare stocks now located at Stapleton Airport in Denver, and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) does not want them moved up into Utah. So if, God forbid, we ever had another war, under these arrangements we could never get our chemical warfare supplies moved to the front. In other words, they are now useless.

In response to that hysteria, the Army has now developed a new kind of chemical weapon that is safe and can be moved around safely if we need it, because it will only be effective when one fires it and the two different parts come together.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Certainly the gentleman is aware that the report does not say that there should not be any defensive programs in chemicals.

But certainly the gentleman has to agree that the binary program is not against this program.

Mr. STRATTON. The point is, that without an offensive program of our own we cannot really hope to deter an offensive program developed by a potential enemy. This is also the case with our basic nuclear strategy. We have developed nuclear weapons primarily to deter the enemy from using his nuclear weapons against us. We have virtually abandoned the defensive ABM program. And so far, for the past 30 years, this strategy has worked and prevented nuclear warfare. I believe we can do the same with chemical warfare. But we must act logically and not on the basis of emotion and factual inaccuracy.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Moss was allowed to proceed out of order.)

THE LATE MRS. WILLA MAE DOUGLAS, DAUGHTER OF CHET HOLIFIELD

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Willa Mae Douglas, wife of Donald Douglas, and daughter of Congressman and Mrs. CHET HOLIFIELD, passed away on August 3 in Montebello, Calif.

Willa Mae was born in Montebello on February 15, 1931, attended local schools, and except for her high school years, lived most of her life in the Montebello area.

Also surviving Mrs. Douglas are four sons, Michael, 20; Scott, 17; Jon, 15; and Lang, 12; and three sisters, Lois Mulholland of Whittier; Betty Feldmann, now living in Costa Rica; and Jo Ann Ward of Balboa; and their respective families.

Memorial services will be held at the Montebello First Baptist Church at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 6.

The family would like to share with Willa's friends one of the poems which she authored:

THE CLIMBER

As you wander through the valleys and over mountains climb—
Will you see the sun at twilight and hear the church bells chime?
Will you stop to smell the flowers and watch the birds on high?
Or will you be so busy that you let things pass you by?
The journey through a lifetime is to climb and sometimes fall.
It's how you get back up that is the measure after all.
The climb is often steep between the shadows and the light.
So enjoy the sounds of morning and the quiet of the night.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER).

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on Report No. 93–1257 dated August 2, 1974, which accompanies House Resolution 1258. House Resolution 1258 ratifies the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

The Geneva Protocol of 1925 was, indeed, one of the most promising attempts to outlaw chemical warfare. It prohibits the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases and all analogous liquids, materials and devices, and bacteriological methods of warfare.

While I have no great quarrel with the objectives of the resolution, I must take exception to portions of the report that contain data which, on the basis of the committee staff review, I believe to be misleading.

The major obstacle, for example, in achieving an effective agreement regarding chemical warfare policy is that of verification. On page 6 of the report, various means of verification are suggested. Photographic reconnaissance, including the use of satellites, is mentioned. I contend that it would be nearly impossible to ascertain whether a country in question was producing fertilizer or nerve gas since the raw materials—such as trisodium phosphate—that are used in nerve gas are used in fertilizer as well. I do concur, however, with the later statement in the report that suggests that it is unlikely that any of the known methods of verification short of onsight inspection will provide the currently required high degree of confidence of compliance with any proposed chemical warfare treaty.

Turning to page 8, the report states that research and development of chemical weapons must be based on how such weapons fit into a broad national security framework, not merely within the context of an isolated tatctical problem.

The Mideast conflict was certainly not an isolated tactical problem and the chemical warfare equipment that was in the possession of the Arab State indicated their capacity to affectively engage in such warfare.

The report further contends—on page 9—that an adequate and defensive posture against chemical warfare attack is a primary factor in deterrence. Again, this is not true.

Experts relate that there is a minimum reduction of 20 percent in the performance of personnel dressed in chemical warfare defensive gear. Further, personnel can operate in such equipment for only a few hours.

Department of Defense representatives state that it would require a minimum of 12 years to establish an effective defensive capability against a chemical warfare attack.

Similarly, on page 9, the report states that there is ample evidence that the United States is carrying out an adequate program of research in chemical warfare defense.

The total tri-Service chemical warfare research and development defense program is $25 million. This is an insignificant percentage of the $9.3 billion R.D.T. & E. request for authorization—two-thousandths of 1 percent.

The report states that the estimated $5.8 million is for procurement of the binary weapons in fiscal year 1975. This is not true.

There is a $5.8 million item in the 1975 budget included in activity 2, procurement of ammunition, Army. This amount will provide for the procurement and installation of equipment in a facility at Pine Bluff, Ark., to produce, load, assemble and pack the 155-millimeter binary projectile XM687. It will not provide authority for production of the 155-millimeter binary munition; his will be requested of the Congress only when a production decision is made, now anticipated in fiscal year 1976. The facility is being requested at this time since long-leadtime items of equipment must be placed on order to prevent undue delays once a production decision is made.

The report further contends that the program in reality will total $2.0 billion. Again, this is not true.

The procurement estimate provided by the Department of Defense is closer to $100 million rather than the $1.0 billion specified in the report. I have not been able to verify through the Department of Defense the estimate of the additional $1.0 billion required for disposal of the existing stockpile. I would not attribute this cost, however, to the binary weapons program insofar as our present stockpile is deteriorating and would require replenishment with or without the binary weapon program.

Page 9 further contends that there is no firm position within the executive branch regarding the desirability or need for the binary system.

The report fails to mention that this very consideration is under intensive review by the National Security Council with input being provided by the State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the Arms Control Disarmament Agency and others.

The report questions the effectiveness of the binary system and contends that the binary weapon will not be as effective a chemical weapon as the current system. It is anticipated that the binary weapon will be at least as effective and in fact, depending on meteorological data, more effective than the current chemical weapons. It is facetious to think that the new binary weapon will be fielded if it were less effective than present chemical weapons.

Page 10 of the report contends that implementation of the binary weapon will probably prove highly destabilizing to negotiations at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva.

Following is the statement of Mr. Leon Sloss, Deputy Director, Politico-Military Affairs, Department of State, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on May 14, 1974:

Mr. FRASER. All right. Now finally, if we go ahead with this new system and with a statement that on the face of it looks like we are going to enlarge our munitions stockpile—at least this is testimony from the Department of Defense—in your view is

this conducive to either promotion of renegotiation at Geneva or what effect would it have?

Mr. SLOSS. Well, let me say first of all that as far as we are concerned in the State Department no decision has been made to expand the chemical stockpile, and we are not considering expansion of the chemical stockpile as a bargaining chip, if that is the import of your question.

I think that were we to make this decision to replace some existing stocks—and incidentally all that the Pentagon is talking about now is a portion of the existing inventory, the binaries—it would be my judgment that this would have relatively little impact.

The report states that the binary would ultimately make verification more difficult for a variety of reasons.

All known procedures for verification to date are geared to the utilization of raw materials. No changes in the complexity of the verification procedures are anticipated.

The report states that there is doubt regarding the willingness of our NATO allies to accept the binary as a replacement for current U.S. talks in Europe.

This is speculation and it is anticipated that our NATO allies would not balk at a replacement on a 1-to-1 basis.

The first three recommendations listed in the report—on page 10—are in my view acceptable provided that the words "if verifiable" follow recommendation No. 1.

I believe that the fourth recommendation would seriously jeopardize our military posture and should not be accepted.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

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

I find it a little difficult to understand the basis for the opposition to the resolution before us. There may be statements in the committee report that not everyone could agree with, but I find it difficult to see how anyone can quarrel with this simple resolution.

The first paragraph says:

That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Geneva Protocol of 1925, banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare, should be ratified.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anyone here who is going to argue against that principle. Certainly we are not in favor of the first use of these weapons.

The second paragraph says that the position of the United States on the status of herbicides and tear gas should be resolved. How can anyone quarrel with that?

Finally, and this coincides precisely with what my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), was saying, we say the whole matter should receive the most intense study. That is what the third paragraph calls for, a comprehensive review of United States policies in the field of chemical warfare.

We are not here to debate the pros and cons of the binary system. Obviously there are differing views on that, but here is a very simple resolution and it is difficult for me to see how anyone can quarrel with it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER).

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in favor of the resolution and to point out and particularly stress on the issue of herbicides and tear gas and other such devices, that the language of the protocol, specifies the conduct between and among the signing parties and refers solely to the matters between those parties themselves. There is nothing expressed in this protocol which would in any way jeopardize the use of tear gas and other kinds of devices in terms of riot control within anyone of the countries which have signed and adhered to this protocol. In fact, those countries which have signed include a great number of countries which currently have some domestic unrest and who approach that domestic unrest in part with tear gas. There is no question involving that here.

The only question is are we disposed here to urge the other body to adhere to something which is so profoundly consistent with what a civilized society is all about and which represents the prudent will of the American people.

I therefore urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. FRELINGUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of this legislation, I rise in support of House Resolution 1258. The resolution does three basic things: First, it expresses the sense of the House that the Geneva protocol of 1925, banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare, should be ratified; second, it states the sense of the House that the position of the United States on the future status of herbicides and tear gas should be resolved; and third, it calls for a comprehensive review of U.S. policies in the field of chemical warfare. These are simple, direct, and overdue.

I first became involved with this whole question of CB weaponry in 1969 when I joined 15 other Republican colleagues in sponsoring a study entitled "CBW and National Security," a paper dealing with the tactical and strategic implications of chemical and biological weapons. As many of you will recall, shortly after our study, on November 25, 1969, President Nixon announced a series of decisions based on a National Security Council review of our policies. All biological weapons were renounced and the United States indicated that it would never be the first to use lethal or incapacitating chemical weapons. Irritant gases and herbicides, which the United States was using in Vietnam, were not included in the ban on first use. The President also indicated he would submit the 1925 Geneva protocol prohibiting the first use of chemical and biological weapons to the Senate for ratification and he did so in August 1970.

Some further progress was also made in disarmament talks on this type of weaponry at the conference on the Committee on Disarmament talks at Geneva. The session in 1972 came forth with a convention proposing to bar the development, production, and stockpiling of biological and toxic weapons—something the 1925 Protocol failed to do—and the convention was submitted to the Senate for ratification in August 1972. Unfortunately, however, the Senate has not acted on the convention—apparently because it has locked horns with the administration over the 1925 Geneva protocol.

The issue of contention between the administration and the Senate committee is whether or not tear gas and herbicides are included in the provisions of the 1925 protocol. I have my own opinions on this matter, but the important thing is that the Senate and administration resolve the question—then we can move forward with ratification of the protocol. And this is just what is asked by the resolution before us today.

I am personally convinced that American ratification of this treaty is very important for three reasons. First, the United States was one of the major proponents of the protocol in 1925 and our failure to ratify it has been a constant source of embarrassment to our diplomats. Second, ratification, representing action by the Congress, would be binding on future Presidents, while our present stance could change with a new administration. Third, the overall strength of the protocol would be reinforced and our efforts at Geneva now to eliminate stockpiling of chemical weapons would be enhanced by our ratification. It should be noted that with Japan's ratification in 1970, the United States became the sole major power to fail to bind itself to the protocol's provisions.

In comment on the last paragraph of the resolution before us, I believe the time has come for a thorough review of American policies regarding chemical weapons. A clearcut decision on the necessity of chemical weapons as part of our defense arsenal would strengthen our negotiating hand at Geneva and possibly break the present stalemate in the chemical warfare control talks there. Furthermore, we are now at a point of decision on whether to proceed with a proposed Army program to switch to binary chemical munitions as we destroy our current stockpile of mustard gas and nerve gas. The House will be voting tomorrow on the Department of Defense appropriations for 1975 and that bill includes $5.8 million to begin production of these binary munitions this year at Pine Bluff, Ark. I will support an amendment to be offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HICKS), tomorrow to strike these funds from the appropriations—largely because I believe it is very important that this program be delayed until the kind of comprehensive review of our policies which we are talking about in this resolution is undertaken.

The whole issue of chemical weaponry and its place in our defense program must be faced squarely and postponed no longer. I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to vote in favor of House Resolution 1258 today.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Of course.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In view of the language in the committee report, does the gentleman feel that approval of this resolution would mean that insofar as the House is concerned that we feel that both herbicides and tear gas should be included within the terms of the Geneva Protocol or should not?

Mr. DELLENBACK. In response to the gentleman, I was not a part of drawing up the report, so that I think so far as what it is that the report is meant to say in this particular regard is a question better directed to the chairman of the subcommittee. I would call upon the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) to respond to the gentleman.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Of course.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The text of the entire Protocol appears on page 364 of the hearings. What we say in the report is this, that a careful reading of the Protocol would suggest that for military purposes it includes herbicides and tear gas.

I might say that 80 nations of the United Nations have agreed with this interpretation in a resolution of that body.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I close by urging support of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution [H. Res. 1258.]

The question was taken.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that understanding, I withdraw the point of order.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

FOR NEGOTIATIONS ON THE TURKISH OPIUM BAN

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 507) for negotiations on the Turkish opium ban, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES 507

Whereas the President of the United States in 1971 declared that the drug problem in our Nation had "assumed the dimensions of a national emergency," and that "heroin addiction was the most difficult to control and the most socially destructive form of addiction"; and

Whereas the Foreign Assistance Act authorizes the President of the United States to suspend aid to any nation that he determines had not taken adequate measures to prevent illegal drugs from entering the United States; and

Whereas the revocation of the opium ban in Turkey is counterproductive to measures precluding illegal heroin from entering the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) immediately initiate negotiations at the highest level of the Turkish Government to (a) prevent the resumption of opium production; or (b) assure that adequate control measures have been developed and implemented which would effectively safeguard the United States from a renewed flow of illicit opium and its derivatives originating in Turkey; and

(2) if such negotiations prove unfruitful, exercise the authority provided by the Congress under the Foreign Assistance Act to suspend all assistance to the Government of Turkey.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are considering today is significant in several respects. First, it is an entirely appropriate response to a policy by a foreign government that has acted in a way hostile to the interests of the United States and the world community. Second, it will require the President of the United States to act within his statutory powers enumerated in the Foreign Assistance Act to protect the United States from the return of a massive influx of heroin. Finally, it will set the important precedent that foreign assistance given by this country is not a "dole" to be handed out without any regard to the consequences of our actions. We must establish once and for all that the United States will not stand for other nations profiting from our generosity, and then turning around and inflicting immeasurable human misery on our people, the dollar cost of which alone runs into the billions annually.

Perhaps an appropriate starting point for consideration of congressional action is the firm and sensible policy enunciated by President Nixon in September 1972. Before a conference of senior American narcotics officials, the President said:

Winning the battle against drug abuse is one of the most important, the most urgent national priorities confronting the United States today . . .

In working on narcotics control around the world, I want you to convey this personal message from me to the foreign officials . . . Any government whose leaders participate in or protect the activities of those who contribute to our drug problem would know that the President of the United States is required by statute to suspend all American economic and military assistance to such a regime and I shall not hesitate to comply with that law where there are any violations.

I consider keeping dangerous drugs out of the United States just as important as keeping armed enemy forces from landing in the United States . . .

These remarks were not made lightly, and they should not be taken lightly, either by foreign nations who encourage narcotics trafficking, or, indeed, by the U.S. Congress, which initially gave the President the authority to cut off assistance. Nor do I believe that the action by the Turkish Government can be interpreted in any way other than as an action falling within the prohibitions of the statute, for reasons which will be enumerated in my discussion.

An examination of the situation within the Turkish economy will give some indication of the motivations of the Turkish Government in lifting the ban, and will strengthen the argument of those of us who argue for a firm U.S. response. The 1972 "World Opium Survey" put out by the Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control, indicated that:

Poppy growing is an insignificant part of total Turkish agricultural production (which reached about $3 billion in 1970). It also constitutes a minor factor in Turkish export earnings as exports of opium gum, seeds, and pods have constituted less than 1 percent of total export earnings in recent years . . . In 1971, 89,283 farmers cultivated poppies. For the economy as a whole, income from opium growing amounted to an estimated $5 million to $6 million.

The 1971 agreement between the United States and Turkey in which Turkey banned the cultivation of opium poppies, was achieved by an American promise to pay Turkey $35.7 million, significantly higher than any reasonable offset of losses from legitimate income from poppy production for several years. Of course there is no question that the illicit underground market for Turkish opium to be refined into heroin for peddling by organized crime elements added income to the Turkish farmers' pocket, and the loss of this blood money was felt by them. But the critical question remains, of course, should the United States acknowledge the legitimacy of this extra income, by its docile acquiescence in the resumption of poppy cultivation? I think that question answers itself.

Turkish Government has stated in its communique of July 1 that it chose to permit recultivation of opium of the Turkish farmers and the needs of the legitimate opium market for medicinal uses. I would even question that apparently forthright statement. We know that some farmers have been hurt—but why—and that our Government has been more than lethargic in instituting effective development and crop substitution projects. We also know that there is a great deal of confusion as to how much of the compensation has actually reached the farmers, very little I am told.

Nonetheless, the Turkish Government never made any efforts to remove these stumbling blocks and clarify any ambiguities in the bilateral understandings. Nor did it even seek to renegotiate the agreement with the United States. The only conclusion that can be drawn from these actions is that the Government was not interested in actually helping the Turkish farmers, for it cannot be denied that the potential benefits available under the agreement might well have left the Turkish farmers in a vastly improved position. Rather, some demagogic Turkish politicians chose to use this issue as a symbol of Turkish nationalism, as a means of using a convenient target to forward their own aims, trying to show this new coalition government was better than the one that negotiated the U.S. agreement.

I do not wish to belittle the propriety of developing nationalistic appeals, in underdeveloped areas, but at the same time I must point out that this particular issue was built upon deception and in fact undermined pressing humanitarian concerns of the Turks, the Americans and in fact the entire world community. The success of the appeal cannot be doubted—all Turkish political parties adopted the cry, which was framed as a reaction to the former government. But once again I ask, is this sufficient reason for the United States to forgo its obligation to protect its own young people, and continue to subsidize the illicit activity which wreaks devastation wherever its effects are felt?

The other reason put forth by the Turkish Government is the legitimate medicinal needs of the pharmaceutical concerns. Here again, the Turkish Government position is less than selfless. We have been bombarded with propaganda over the last several years from the pharmaceuticals companies informing us of a licit opium shortage throughout the world. Yet the facts belie this contention, at least insofar as we are talking about the availability of opium to the pharmaceutical companies. Indeed, the interests of the large multinationals have been contrary to this agreement or in fact any agreement that would reduce the legitimate market—note that I say market, not supply—for many years.

In May of 1973, Walter Minnick, who at that time was the Chief of the Division of Federal Drug Management for the Office of Management and Budget, testified before the Government Operations Committee that:

The drug companies were opposed to our getting the Turks out of the business, because that eliminated their osurce of supply.

In the same testimony, Minnick further said, however, that according to the World Opium Survey, only 5 percent of the licit world supply came from Turkey, with about half coming from India.

Nonetheless, a bad growing season and extraordinary purchases by the Soviet Union were said to have caused a shortage for the current fiscal year, and based on that assumption, we acted in Congress. According to a letter I received recently from Linwood Holton in the State Department:

The President and the Congress have acted to avert a temporary shortage of medicinal opiates in the United States by providing for the release of up to 45% of the strategic opium stockpile. Periodic releases will be made to the extent needed to enable U.S. manufacturers to maintain minimum, yet safe inventory levels. We assume we shall continue to receive our proportionate share of opium imports from India. The U.S. stockpile released should not, therefore, affect the marketing of world production of opium for medical and scientific requirements.

In addition, to the availability of the American stockpile, it is expected that improved climatic conditions, and the absence of abnormal purchases by the Soviet Union which were witnessed last year, coupled with improved procedures which will lead to a higher yield to morphine base, from existing acreage will combine to significantly raise the amount of licit medicinal product available from India in the coming year.

In light of these considerations, it becomes increasingly clear that Turkish politicians have been using the rallying mechanism of the opium ban and its anti-American slogans to make the more fundamental and serious problems faced by that government, such as the tremendous increase in the numbers of Turkish laborers returning after working in other European nations.

In viewing the Turkish announcement, we must consider the situation that will evolve concerning the enforcement efforts that will be made to prohibit the massive new quantities of opium from being diverted into illicit channels.

That a massive new enforcement mechanism would be essential is beyond doubt; we are all familiar with many of the facts and figures concerning the heroin epidemic which swept our Nation in the late 1960's, due largely to the illegal entry of Turkish derived heroin. To briefly highlight some of the critical problems that will surely arise, however, I would like to offer a few quotations:

"As commissioner of (New York City's) Addiction Services Agency, which cares for over 40,000 addicts in 400 treatment facilities of every modality at a cost of about $90 million annually, I can state with some degree of authority that the lifting of the opium ban by Turkey will have serious consequences for all New Yorkers.

"If the United States Government, bowing to pressure from Turkish poppy growers, agrees to a lifting of the ban, it will be a backward step that is almost guaranteed to lead to an upsurge in heroin addiction nationally, with a consequent rise in addict-related crime. . . . I therefore urge all Americans to support resolutions that give the President authority to withhold military and economic aid to Turkey unless that nation agrees to cooperation with us in the war against heroin."—Jerome Hornblass, Commissioner, New York City Addiction Service Agency.

"Lifting the ban on growing the opium poppy by the Turkish government would definitely have a severe impact on the already overburdened law enforcement efforts to the New York City Police Department. Any addition to the necessary and legitimate supply of opium for medical use on the world market will correspondingly increase the supply in the illicit market. Police Commissioner Michael Codd has stated that any overproduction in excess of world market needs can only exacerbate the conditions and situations with the result that the excess would find its way to the underworld.

"Since the Turkish ban went into effect, a definite downtrend was noticed in the heroin availability in New York.

"The crimes of robbery and burglary are often associated with the heroin addiction problem of a city. These crimes become the source of money for the purchase of narcotics to maintain the addict. The crime analysis section of the New York City Police Department reported an 18% decrease in burglaries and a 12% decrease in robberies in the year 1972 against the same period in 1971. The 1973 figures for the same crimes were practically the same as the year 1972. This is but one indication of what can be accomplished when drugs are in short supply. The increased supply of heroin as a result of the Turkish government's lifting the ban on poppy growing will reverse the downward trends still prevelant in 1974 in these two key drug related crimes.

"It is my belief and the belief of my staff of investigators that should the Turkish government resume production of opium, the results will be measured in New York City in the number of human casualties; first, in the form of an increased number of heroin addicts and second, in the form of the victims of violent street crime. There is no worthwhile benefits to be gained from the removal of the ban in Turkey."—Daniel Courtenay, Community Officer, Narcotic Division, N.Y. City Police Department.

Every empirical study indicates that the Turkish poppy growing ban has dramatically diminished heroin supply on the east coast of the United States. Dr. Robert DuPont, Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, cites statistics concerning the decrease of drug availability since the ban went into effect.

From the peak of over ½ million heroin addicts, 1973 saw for the first time rates of overdose deaths, drug related hepatitis, and drug related property crimes (all indicators of heroin dependency) decline throughout the United States. The quality and quantity of heroin have decreased, while the price has increased. One milligram of heroin in New York City cost 44 cents in 1972; by mid 1973 it had risen to $1.52. Street level purity of heroin sold to addicts decreased 52% during the same period, from 7.7% to 3.7%. A heroin shortage has existed for almost 24 months.

It is common knowledge that Turkey was unable or unwilling to control the diversion of opium in the past, and actions taken to date offer no hope of any change in that situation when the farmers again enter cultivation in seven provinces instead of the four where they hitherto cultivated opium control, who is kidding whom? The profits from illegal sales are simply too great, the incentives too high, to assure a sufficient control situation. As John Cusack, Chief of the International Operations Division of the Drug Enforcement Administration testified to an ad hoc hearing I sponsored in New York last week:

While we are inclined to accept the good intentions of the Turkish government in its promise to adopt a fool proof system of control, should it reestablish opium production, we must be guided by past experience where the most conservative observers estimate that at least half of the opium produced in Turkey entered the illicit traffic. The conditions responsible for this situation have not changed. To a great extent, they are beyond Turkish control and involve narcotic traffickers in the United States, Western Europe, as well as those in Turkey. There are numerous unscrupulous individuals who,

through their interaction, have been in the past and would be again responsible for penetrating the Turkish system of opium control and diverting vast quantities to the illict traffic for heroin manufacture and to again infect western Europe and North America.

It is simply impossible to control the production of opium by 100,000 farmers on half-acre plots in Turkey. This production is simply too vulnerable to criminal elements in Turkey and abroad, and there is no system that can prevent substantial diversion. The cost of attempting to develop and implement such a system would be economically prohibitive.

Following his statement, I further questioned Mr. Cusack on control possibilities I would like now to play a tape of that portion of the questioning.

This attitude was reflected at the Third Special Session of the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs at Geneva last February, and has been echoed virtually every time a narcotics enforcement official discusses the Turkish opium ban. I would further cite a General Accounting Office Report, which discussed the possibility of customs agents and border patrols reducing the smuggling of heroin. The GAO said:

Although these efforts may deter amateurs and small scale smugglers, they have not had and probably cannot have any real impact on the organized groups engaged in large-scale heroin smuggling.

And it must be noted that the Turkish Government, despite its promises for tough controls, has already taken the first step to flood the illicit market by permitting cultivation in seven provinces, which is an increase from the four provinces that were permitted to grow opium immediately prior to the ban.

So once again the choice for the Members of Congress becomes stark and clear. If we do not act to cut off assistance, it cannot be on the premise that this time opium production will be controlled—no one seriously believes that. Heroin will flow into this country once again virtually unchecked, for once it is in the traffic channels, large-scale control is impossible. The French connection now broken stands ready to resume traffic. The problem is either eliminated at the source, or it is permitted to turn to crisis levels.

Another aspect of the proposition we consider today must be dealt with—we must review the likely consequences of U.S. action to cut off assistance to Turkey in light of our own military defense requirements. There has been a fear expressed that if we cut off assistance—if we deny the President's request for over $200 million in military and economic assistance for fiscal year 1975—Turkey will retaliate against our NATO commitment. We have, since World War II, given the Turks almost $6 billion. To first dispose of this apparent threat. I cite the statement by Turkish Foreign Minister Turan Gunes in the New York Times last Thursday, July 11. Gunes said that even if Washington cut off aid to Turkey, as some Congressmen had threatened, Ankara would not "change the status" of about 2 dozen vital military bases maintained there under the joint command of the two North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies. I think this position is understandable, in light of the real defense requirement of Turkey. The likelihood of such a response from Turkey—particularly if all other assistance is cut off—is from a strategic standpoint very small. Even if we take the military possibilties on a "worst case basis," General Goodpaster assured this committee only 3 weeks ago that we would still maintain the capability of knocking out the Dardanelles and bases available in the Mediterranean, should that unlikely necessity occur, denying to the Soviets their use and bottling up the entire Soviet Mediterranean Fleet.

Let us turn, however, to the scenario which would unfold when the heroin market is back in action. It is appropriate to recall America's experience in Indochina, when, according to Marine Gen. Lew Walt testifying in Senate testimony:

Our forces were caught up in a massive heroin epidemic when, overnight, high grade heroin became available everywhere at $1 a vial.

Only recently, Adm. Noel Gayler told this committee that during the Vietnam conflict difficulties faced by our Pacific forces from drug abuse resulted in the impairment of the effectiveness of our fighting forces.

As late as February 1974, UPI carried a story quoting Gen. Michael S. Davison, the American Army commander in Germany, as saying that:

Drug abuse was the "single greatest threat to the discipline and professionalism of the Army in Europe."

Since our NATO troops will soon be availed of large quantities of low priced heroin, the meaningfulness and security of NATO forces may hinge on the Turkish action, and this situation ultimately puts in jeopardy the security of the United States itself for what we face is a repeat of the Indochina drug epidemic that has produced 350,000 Indochina addicted veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are considering today will put our Nation firmly on record, not only in words, but in definitive action, against the tolerance by foreign nations of the trafficking in death which the opium trade represents. This approach will send more than a message—it will send an unmistakable warning—that U.S. generosity will no longer be extended to nations which spit in the face of mankind. If the Turks say that the drug problem is ours, not theirs, let us say to them that economic development and military supply is their problem, not ours. What is actually involved here is that the Turks do not believe we will take meaningful action—that we are in reality a paper tiger. Let them know that we place a nonnegotiable price on the lives of the kids of this Nation.

We cannot afford $27 billion in drug-related crime in this country. Our constituents want to walk our streets in safety without fear of some junkie beating them over the head for money to buy the next fix.

This approach, which was taken before by the House and Senate in relation to Thailand at the height of the Indochina conflict, was dramatically successful in winning the cooperation of the Thai Government without any serious long-term rupture in Thai-American relationships. It will be successful in this case.

When efforts to halt heroin traffic are characterized as a "war," that characterization is carefully chosen. Indeed, the Washington Post, in a recent editorial, pinpointed the accuracy of the analogy. The editorial reads:

Indeed, if the Turkish Government had announced that it intended to land secret agents at night on American shores to poison and kill thousands of Americans and to subvert the foundations of American society—which, of course, is exactly what heroin does—then that would be regarded as an act of war and handled accordingly.

The condemnation which the outrageous act by the Turkish Government merits in the civilized world cannot be mistaken. Perhaps the most eloquent statement of the interests of mankind in stopping drug traffic was made by President Nixon, who said in 1972:

The men and women who operate the global heroin trade are a menace not to Americans alone, but to all mankind. These people are literally the slave traders of our time. They are traffickers in living death. They must be hunted to the end of the earth. They must be left no base in any nation for their operation. They must be permitted not a single hiding place or refuge from justice anywhere in the world and that is why we have established an aggressive international narcotics control program in cooperation with the governments in more than 50 countries around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation should be reported out promptly, so that the Government of Turkey, and our own foreign policy officials, understand that the American people cannot and will not tolerate a reestablishment of the heroin trail. The Senate acted last week on a similar measure, by an 81 to 8 margin. If it is to be argued that this move will strain relations with Turkey, it is even more important that our closest relations are our children.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I want to commend the gentlemen from New York (Mr. WOLFF) and Mr. RANGEL, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for offering this resolution, which provides a rational response to the problem of Turkish opium again flowing into this country, and into the veins of thousands of Americans. These gentlemen have done much to bring this matter to the attention of the American people, and to this Congress. We owe them our deep gratitude.

This legislation is entirely reasonable. It does not legislate a direct cutoff of aid to Turkey. It does not say that the United States will immediately abandon any commitments. What it does say is that this Congress, and this Nation, will do everything within its power to halt the flow of Turkish heroin into this country.

Last month, the Government of Turkey announced its decision to lift the ban on production of opium. That ban

had been in effect since 1972. Previous to the imposition of that ban, 80 percent of the heroin that was consumed in this country had come from Turkey. Since the ban was imposed, the addict population in the United States has decreased from a staggering 600,000 to about 200,000. Clearly, the ban was effective in reducing the addict population. An equally important fact is that, as a congressional study group has reported, drug-related property crimes have declined throughout most areas in the United States for the first time in 6 years.

That noteworthy statistic should make clear that heroin addiction is not just a problem for the addict. It is a serious problem for all of society as well. Statistics show that the average cost of maintaining an addict's habit is over $50 a day. Obviously, that kind of money does not come easily to heroin addicts, for $50 is a lot of money for anybody to spend each day. Where does that money come from? It comes from crime. And crime is not just the individual's problem. It is society's problem. We all must do the best we can to reduce crime in this country. This resolution is another step in the direction of reducing crime in the United States.

Now, that might not seem apparent, but it is obvious if we stop to consider the success we have had in reducing drug-related crime in the past 2 years. This resolution calls upon the President to initiate high-level negotiations with Turkish officials to reinstitute the ban. If that can be achieved, the results will be most beneficial to all sides, and perhaps drug-related crime will continue to decrease. If, however, these negotiations fail, then this resolution urges the President to exercise his legal authority under section 109 of Public Law 92–226 to suspend economic and military assistance to any country which has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs from entering the United States unlawfully. This authority already exists, and the President should use it if it becomes apparent that Turkey refuses to cooperate.

It is incumbent upon this Congress to insure the American people that we will not tolerate the abuse of our citizens by some other country for economic profit. Likewise, we will surely not help to finance such a country.

This resolution is a proper response to recent actions. If we cannot agree with the Turks to a resumption of the ban, then we urge the President to exercise his prerogative to suspend aid. If it comes to that, then we will all have to make the best of the situation. Any other response to this callous act of the Turkish Government would not demonstrate the magnitude of our concern. We cannot continue to aid a country which pays no respect to our citizens. I urge support of the resolution.

Section 109 of Public Law 92–226 follows:

SECTION 109, PUBLIC LAW 92–226

The President shall suspend economic and military assistance furnished under this or any other Act, and shall suspend sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act and under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to any country when the President determines that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances (as defined by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 507.

The threat to the well-being of the United States posed by a renewed influx of heroin originating in the poppy fields of Turkey is grave. Every effort must be taken by the United States to prevent this from happening.

If poppy cultivation is resumed in Turkey, and if Turkish opium again finds its way into the illegal narcotics market, heroin abuse in the United States could become more acute than it already is.

In the decree announcing the lifting of the ban on opium cultivation, the Turkish Government indicated that it would take strong measures to control opium production to insure that there would be no diversion to the illegal market.

Several experts in the United States are of the opinion that the control of opium production is difficult, if not impossible, prudence would dictate an alternative to an immediate termination of assistance for U.S. policymakers.

In its consideration of the resolution the committee was faced with a choice of calling for an immediate termination of assistance to Turkey or to report out a resolution which would give the President time to work out an agreement with Turkey which would stop, if possible, the flow of heroin to the United States in the vent that the decision to resume poppy cultivation was not revoked.

As the committee report states on page 4:

The Committee is of the opinion that action to immediately terminate all assistance to Turkey, our NATO ally, could be counterproductive in terms of the objectives being sought by the sponsors of the resolution, the Congress and the Government of the United States.

For this reason, the resolution, as reported, gives the President an opportunity to try to work out suitable arrangements with the Government of Turkey, including effective control procedures, to preclude a new supply of opium reaching illegal narcotics markets.

The resolution being considered is a wise one. It gives the President time to negotiate with the Turks. It gives him the flexibility he needs in those negotiations by not requiring an immediate cutoff of aid. At the same time, it demonstrates to the Turks the concern of the Congress. Finally, it provides that if effective action is not taken to control opium production, the President must suspend all assistance to Turkey.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 507, a measure I have been pleased to cosponsor with my colleagues from New York, Mr. WOLFF and Mr. RANGEL.

The resolution calls for our Government to initiate high level negotiations with the Turkish Government to prevent the resumption of opium production or assure that adequate control measures will be developed and implemented to effectively safeguard the United States from a renewed flow of illicit opium. In the event that these negotiations are unsuccessful, the resolution further provides that our Nation terminate all assistance to the Government of Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, Turkey's tragic decision to lift its ban on poppy production shocked and outraged many of our American citizens, particularly those who work diligently in drug enforcement and rehabilitation. Turkey's blatant disregard for the welfare of America's youth cannot be tolerated.

In February 1974, at a meeting of the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the U.S. Representative, Robert Dupont, reported that the heroin epidemic of the mid-sixties, which had fostered a 6-year pattern of increased drug addiction, had been reversed, noting that both the quantity and quality of heroin available in the United States had substantially decreased. Mr. Dupont indicated that a major factor in this decrease was the Turkish ban on opium growing which had been agreed to in 1971.

Substantiating this report are statistics from the New York City Department of Health Narcotics Register indicating a 46-percent decrease in heroin addiction between January and June 1972, during the period of time in which Turkey refrained from poppy production.

Now that Turkey has rescinded that agreement, the progress we have made in controlling this dread drug will be quickly reversed and we will once again be plagued by devasting drug addiction.

Immediately following Turkey's announcement lifting the poppy ban, a majority of the Members of this House joined in sponsoring this resolution. The Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, duly recognizing the urgency of a pending debacle, promptly commenced hearings and markup on the bill now before us.

It is my firm opinion that passage of the measure now before us is the only appropriate response we can make to Turkey's unfortunate decision. If our negotiations with the Turkish Government fail to insure the necessary safeguards against furthering drug addiction, we must suspend all current and pending economic and military aid to Turkey until such time as the Turkish Government revokes its unilateral decision to allow opium cultivation.

Mr. Speaker, there are two salient points which should be underscored in regard to the reasons for supporting this resolution:

First. Turkey, which agreed to article 22 of the UN Convention, outlining that nation's responsibility in complying with a worldwide effort at discouraging drug trafficking, fully recognizes their commitment.

Second. Our Nation has compensated the Turkish Government to the extent of $35.7 million in return for Turkey's agreement to refrain from poppy growing.

These two significant factors clearly point out the path we must follow.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 507. Let us caution Turkey lest those humanitarian concerns so important to world protection are tossed away by the self-serving interests of a handful of men. Punching a hole in the dam of drug containment will only serve to reopen the floodgates of an epidemic.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who just spoke for his active participation in the passage of this legislation, as well I would like to compliment the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) on the other side who has led the effort to stem the flow of narcotics to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), who pioneered in the efforts he has made toward stamping out drug addiction in this country. It was this gentleman who was responsible for the very first amendment that directed the President to cut off aid to any country that did not cooperate with our Nation in controlling this menace.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 507 and I particularly want to commend the Foreign Affairs Committee for bringing this resolution to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

In this regard I would also like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) for his leadership and diligence in this matter as well as the other gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his untiring efforts to combat the drug problem.

I am very gratified that this resolution calls upon the President to effectuate my international narcotics control provision which was incorporated into the foreign assistance a few years ago.

While I fully believe that Turkey's decision to resume the growing of opium poppies warrants an immediate suspension of foreign assistance, this resolution will encourage additional negotiations with the Government of Turkey. We are hopeful that such negotiations will convince Turkey as to the need for reevaluating its decision; or in the alternative will enable that Government to convince us as to their capacity to control opium production.

The Government of Turkey has indicated it will take strong measures to prevent opinum from being diverted into illegal channels, but I remain unconvinced as to the capacity of the Turkish Government to accomplish that objective. My conclusion is supported by a variety of international drug experts and I would remind my colleagues that former Prime Minister Erim stated in 1971 that—

> Smuggling cannot be prevented in Turkey . . . in spite of all the efforts which were made.

When this statement was made, opium was being grown in only four provinces whereas the recent Turkish decree rescinding the opium ban, will permit the growing of opium poppies in seven provinces.

However, since my 1971 provision allows the President wide discretion in determining whether a particular country is not cooperating with our efforts to stem international trafficking in hard drugs, I believe that the President and Secretary Kissinger should be provided with additional negotiating time in order to ascertain whether Turkey's decision will result in a resumption of the flow of heroin to this country.

It is questionable whether these negotiations—even at the highest level—will produce positive results. However, it will provide an opportunity for our officials to convey to the Turkish Government the deep concern of the American people over Turkey's indifference to this very serious problem.

In adopting the international narcotics control provision, Congress did not intend it to be used solely as a diplomatic weapon. When diplomatic negotiations proved unsuccessful Congress intended that the ultimate sanction of a foreign aid cutoff would be utilized. This two-fold purpose is now restated in House Concurrence Resolution 507 and consequently I wholeheartedly support the resolution.

Subsequent to its adoption, the President indicated he would "not hestitate to comply with the law where there are any violations"; and he added:

> I consider keeping dangerous drugs out of the United States just as important as keeping armed enemy forces from landing in the U.S.

It is therefore appropriate for the Congress to call upon the President to live up to his words by immediately initiating high-level negotiations with Turkey and to stand ready to suspend foreign aid to that country if these international discussions are unsuccessful.

I am somewhat disturbed that intensive, high-level negotiations have not already commenced especially when we consider the tremendous concern of the American people regarding the problem of drug abuse.

We are all very aware, particularly those who represent major urban areas, of the destructive impact of heroin on our communities and on the lives of our people who have become addicted to heroin. Turkey's decision in 1972 to ban opium production has substantially alleviated the drug epidemic in this country and we do not wish to return to the tragic situation that existed prior to the ban.

As representatives of people who have been directly and indirectly affected by the drug menace we cannot be satisfied with mere promises by Turkey that opium will not find its way into illicit channels. Likewise we must recall the opinions of drug experts everywhere that Turkey will confront serious difficulties in controlling opium production. Finally we must also remember that Turkey has already breached its agreement with the United States, in which we provided $35 million in return for Turkey's prohibition on opium poppy cultivation.

Approval of this resolution today will not only call upon the President to take a hard line with Turkey, but will also convince other opium producing countries and those countries which have failed to cooperate with our efforts to combat the drug problem, that we will no longer tolerate their inaction.

It is evident that international cooperation is needed if we are to attack this problem in an effective manner; and in the absence of such cooperation the United States must be willing to take the bold action of suspending foreign assistance to any country which fails to meet its international responsibilities.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY).

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to compliment the committee on the resolution they have presented. I think they have done a very fine job on a most difficult subject.

Just before the Turks announced the ban following the trip by the gentlemen from New York (Mr. RANGEL and Mr. WOLFF), my colleague, Mr. HASTINGS and I went over to Turkey to try to negotiate the problem with the Turks regarding the growing of poppy.

Congressman HASTINGS and I came back with the feeling that the Turks did not think this country cared enough about its young people or cared enough about the drugs coming into this country to really do anything. And the attitude of the Turks about us withholding aid was that we would never do it when the chips were down. We tried to convince them otherwise, that this was not so, and that this Nation did care and would indeed act. But apparently, along with others, we were unsuccessful in this.

I personally hoped the committee would have suspended aid until the Turks took certain steps. However, I do not think this a significant step in the right direction. I hope that we will keep a close watch upon it.

Of course, my personal feeling is they are not going to be able to provide the security that must be performed in watching the drugs. We know that up to 80 percent of the heroin in the past has originated in Turkey. I think within a year or so, the young people in this country may be paying for this situation in Turkey.

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

Mr. FREY. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank the gentleman in the well for his efforts, and the work the gentleman has done on this problem.

I might say to the gentleman from Florida that the resolution is so worded that after negotiations have been com-

pleted, in other words, before the seed goes into the ground, that we are assured that adequate control measures have been developed. In other words, this is not after the fact, after we have seen the drug coming into this country, but we have to have assurances before it comes into this country and before aid is given.

Mr. FREY. I certainly agree with those remarks. I will say that I have been in India and there they grow some 900 tons of poppy, and they claim that they have adequate control, but this I do not agree with. I have been out into the farm areas, and it appears to me that up to about 10 percent of the crop in diverted. The difference between India and Turkey is simply that in Turkey there is no user problem.

I question whether they will be able to put in adequate controls. It is just like the situation here during prohibition, there is too much money involved. As an example, when we were traveling in Northern Ireland, we found that for an expenditure of about $400 we could have purchased enough poppy to sell on the streets of New York City for about $500,000. There are too many people making money in this cruel business.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of this resolution.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GUYER), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, as a new member of the Special Subcommittee on International Narcotic Control, it was my good pleasure to be with Messrs. ADDABBO, GILMAN, and WOLFF at the special hearing held in New York City. We had seven very outstanding witnesses which I thought added a great deal to the storehouse of information on this subject. We did discover there is a "preventive medicine" approach to this problem and that it can be contained. Demonstrably, it was pointed out.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) indicated that the number of narcotic addicts was reduced from 500,000 to 200,000 just since the ban by Turkey in 1971.

We also found there was a better way to help Turkey and to deal with this devastation. Several of the programs suggested were agricultural diversity technology. Canning factories for food and other produce was far better than the continued granting of a subsidy which was getting nowhere.

I just want to say that narcotics in any illicit form is a down payment on misery and the promulgation of human devastation.

I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) for an almost one-man crusade. I think we are on the right track. We have a better way to deal with this. The heroin trail ended when the spigot was turned off and it lead to an empty bin. There was a definite drought of heroin on the streets of New York City. There was a turning of thousands of people to methadone and other substitutes, and there was a new brightness on the faces of people who found that there was a better way, and another day.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues, and I think this is a great day for us to do something bold and effective, that has for far too long been neglected, millions of people will voice their gratitude for our passage of this sensible resolution for humanity.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) and the many other coauthors of this legislation. I think it is nigh time that the House take this proposed action.

When I was first elected to the California State Senate some 13 years ago, my first legislative act was to introduce a resolution asking Congress to take all necessary steps, including the withdrawal of foreign aid, to prevent the exportation from foreign countries of illegal narcotics.

I would urge my colleagues to make this a unanimous vote. I think it will have a great effect on the Government of Turkey and perhaps persuade the government to continue its previous ban on opium growing.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

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

The resumption of opium poppy production in Turkey is a serious threat to the quality of life in America today. In the last decades, we have become a country burdened with increasing drug abuse.

Until 1972, the major source of illicit heroin in the United States was Turkey. That same year, in exchange for financial assistance which Turkish farmers then desperately needed, the Government of Turkey agreed to place a ban on the production and trade of opium. In the period since that agreement we have seen a radical decrease in the amounts of heroin available in American cities as well as a drastic reduction in the number of heroin addicts.

On July 1 of this year, however, the Government of Turkey lifted that ban on opium poppy production, an action which seriously endangers our efforts to control drug addiction by again providing a dependable heroin source.

Thus, I cosponsored the resolution now being considered, which urges the President to initiate negotiations with Turkey to prevent this resumption of opium poppy production.

I would suggest that, if our statement of disapproval should prove ineffective, the President use the authority provided to him by law, in the Foreign Assistance Act, to withhold economic and military assistance from the Government of Turkey until a ban on opium production is restored.

This resolution would serve as a powerful tool in negotiations with Turkey and would clearly answer the decree by which Turkish authorities lifted the ban in July.

If the United States expects to continue the remarkable progress which we have begun to make toward the problem of drug addiction, then we must take this necessary action to prevent the flow of heroin into our country and into the streets of our cities.

I, therefore, give House Concurrent Resolution 507 my full support, and for the sake of our fellowmen, urge my distinguished colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CRONIN).

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a positive step by the U.S. Congress to stop the flow of heroin into the streets of the United States. Friends help each other in time of need and we have always stood ready to aid Turkey. The friendship, however, is not being returned. The United States has offered substantial foreign aid to Turkey to halt the production of opium and now Turkey has turned its back and announced renewed production of what will only add to the problems of America. This stand is in direct contrast to that of traditional friends like Greece.

I think the time has come to completely eliminate any foreign assistance to Turkey—not only because of its actions in growing poppies but also due to its aggressive actions in Cyprus. Turkey is now using past American aid against one of our oldest allies—Greece. The United States should stop subsidizing efforts that work to our detriment and start maximizing the expenditures of Government funds to help all of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak on Concurrent Resolution 507 which urges the President to immediately initiate negotiations at the highest level of the Turkish Government to prevent the resumption of opium production. The resolution further states that if the negotiations prove unsuccessful, then the President should exercise his authority provided by the Foreign Assistance Act, to terminate all economic assistance to the Government of Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, July 1, 1974, represented a sad day in our efforts to eradicate the insidious heroin menace which plagues our Nation. For on that day, the Government of Turkey announced its decision to resume cultivation of the opium poppy, the same opium poppy that once fed the infamous and now dormant French connection, which in turn supplied 80 percent of the heroin which reached this country prior to the imposition of the Turkish ban on opium production; the same opium poppy that feeds the captured veins of thousands of our citizens and has led to human misery and suffering, destruction of families, and slavery to the criminal elements of our society.

In my home city of New York, we have over half of the Nation's heroin addicts. My own community is estimated to contain more than half the addicts in the city; we have been called the drug capital of the Nation. It has been estimated that over 60 percent of all crime in my city is drug related. In my home community of Harlem, the junkies line the street, occupy abandoned buildings, lurk in doorways, and literally hold the community in fear. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I know firsthand the destructive impact of heroin on a community, and the detrimental effects it has on the quality of life for our citizens.

I have devoted a significant portion of my energies as a legislator toward the elimination of this cancerous sore from my community as well from the other infected communities throughout the country, urging the establishment and implementation of more effective law enforcement measures. No law enforcement measure has proven as successful as the agreement reached between the United States and Turkish Governments to eradicate the source by placing a ban on the cultivation of the opium poppy in Turkey. Turkey, which was the primary source before the ban, is now gearing up to reclaim its place of prominence in this insidious market.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is little doubt that the ban has made a positive and substantial contribution toward eliminating the heroin menace. There has been a dramatic decrease in both the quantity and quality of heroin on the streets of America, and a corresponding decrease in the number of heroin addicts. The Drug Enforcement Administration reports a reduction in the estimated number of heroin addicts by more than 60 percent over the past 2 years. Correspondingly, the number of heroin overdose deaths and drug-related criminal activity has shown a marked decrease. In New York City, the purity of a "bag" of heroin has declined from 7.7 percent to 3.7 percent. The number of addicts admitted to New York correctional institutions has decreased by 36 percent. The New York City Police Department reports that drug-related robberies have decreased by 19 percent and the number of drug-related burglaries has decreased by 17 percent.

All of this progress Mr. Speaker, can be directly related to the cessation of opium production in Turkey. Therefore, the announced resumption of opium poppy production in seven Turkish provinces poses a serious threat to the health and safety of our communities. The Congress of the United States, which is charged with the responsibility of the public welfare, must now determine a proper response to this action by the Government of Turkey.

Last spring, rumors from Ankara of Turkey's plans to lift the ban prompted me to join my distinguished colleague, the Honorable LESTER WOLFF, in a fact-finding visit to that country. During that visit we became convinced that the rumors were, indeed, fact. Seed for fall planting were being germinated. Turkish Parliamentarians, Government officials, and the Turkish press were taking a very hard line equating Turkish nationalism with the growing of the poppy. We left convinced that the decision to resume cultivation was inevitable unless the U.S. Government took direct and immediate action to assure the Turkish Government that such a decision would be looked upon as an extremely unfriendly act that could result in a worsening of United States-Turkey relations. Upon our return, we expressed our concern to the White House and the State Department, but received no indication of a sense of priority or urgency on the matter. I have since written to the President; conferred with the Vice Chairman of the National Security Council; conferred with our Ambassador to Turkey; and discussed the matter with officials of the State Department and other cognizant Federal agencies. Apparently my warning fell on deaf ears. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the administration's Watergate preoccupation, our celebration for success in the negotiations for a settlement in the Mideast, and grandstand summitry has blinded the administration to this crucial matter.

On May 9, when I introduced the resolution that is now being considered, I believed this to be the proper congressional response to this issue and I maintain that position for the following reasons:

First, it recognizes section 109 of Public Law 92-226, which authorizes the President to suspend economic and military assistance to those countries which have failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs from entering the United States unlawfully;

Second, it does not mandate a cut off of funds but urges the President to exercise the authority already provided by law;

Third, it provides him leverage in his negotiations with Turkey and time to develop and recommend alternatives measures as he sees fit; and finally

Fourth. It will send a message to Turkey and to the American people, that the Congress is deeply concerned over this matter and is willing to act to stop the resumption of the flow of Turkish heroin into our community.

Mr. Speaker, some may challenge this resolution on the grounds that urging the President to exercise this authority assumes that Turkey cannot prevent opium from being smuggled out of the country. In response to this, we need only look at the history of the last year of cultivation before the ban. At that time poppies were grown in only four provinces yet it was estimated that over half the opium produced was diverted to the illicit market. The institution of the ban was an admission by Turkey that they were unable to control diversion. Turkey has time and time again stated that the decision to ban the cultivation was based on article 22 of the United Nations Single Convention on Narcotics Drugs of 1961. That article provides that when a country considers the prohibition of the cultivation of the opium poppy the most suitable measure for preventing the diversion of opium into the illicit international narcotics market, it shall do so.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the Turkish Government proposes to increase the cultivation to seven Provinces under the same controls that were exercised before the ban. In addition, the government recently released from jail all charged narcotic traffickers. This can only exacerbate the control problem. The U.S. law enforcement officials have no faith in the ability of the Turkish Government to control illicit diversion, and I question their desire to control it. Just as the cultivation of poppies has been a long tradition in Turkey, so has the illicit opium market, a market which has not only provided under the table cash to the farmers, but has traditionally bribed high government officials. I can only believe that Turkey's promise of strict control is diplomatic subterfuge in an attempt to pacify the U.S. outrage.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that the reasons given publicly for lifting the ban, that is internal poverty and shortages of legitimate opium, were subterfuges. It was an attempt to legitimize a decision made solely for political purposes. It was a decision desperately made in an attempt to shore up the crumbling government of the prime minister by appealing to the nationalistic mood of the conservative factions of the government.

Let me briefly review some of the facts concerning the so called plight of the Turkish farmer as a result of the ban. The farmer in Turkey who grew opium poppies is a general farmer, growing wheat, barley, other grains, sugar beet, vegetables, and seed oil crops. Poppy was an extra cash crop which, because of its high risk of failure due to weather conditions, no farmer ever grew exclusively. The average grower earned from $10 to $60 annually on his poppy crop in an economic environment where he earned from $700 to $1,000 total income annually. The cultivation of opium poppy was one-tenth of 1 percent of the overall agricultural production of the regions in which it was grown. Opium poppy and its products amounted to three-fourths of 1 percent of Turkey's total exports. Annually, Turkey cultivates about 30 million acres. Yet, at the height of production, only 112,000 acres of poppy were cultivated; and in 1972, the last year of production, only 18,000 acres of poppy were cultivated by farmers, amounting to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of Turkey's cultivation area.

Because poppy was such a soil-depleting crop, farmers always rotated it with wheat, barley, other grains, and melon. The transition to substitute crops was, therefore, quite easy and normal, and most of the substitutes earn as much for the grower as poppy, provided he did not sell to the illicit market. Given the profits that are available to the farmer if he decides to supply the illicit market, however, there is no crop that can compete with the poppy. Many farmers have indicated that they were glad to have ended poppy production, that the crop was no longer worthwhile because of the choice land, hand labor, fertilizer, and water resources it required. Those who

complain the most and advocate a return to production may well have supplied the huge illicit traffic.

There were no real economic or social hardships caused by ending poppy cultivation. Crop substitution is a viable alternative and the $36 million we offered was more than enough to carry the farmers through the transition. If such hardships really exist, then why has not Turkey requested the remaining $20 million of the $35 million U.S. commitment, and why has not most of the $16 million they have received reached the farmer? Turkey would do well to keep this primitive crop in its past and concentrate on developing its splendid agricultural resources to help supply the world with food crops, particularly grain, which is badly needed.

With respect to the question of whether there presently exists a critical shortage of opium for legitimate medical purposes, I have initiated a GAO investigation that will provide some answers. I became deeply concerned when I discovered that the supply and demand situation is determined by our Government based solely upon information provided by the pharmaceutical industry. We have a few major companies in the industry who could conceivably manipulate data in such a way as to force self-serving public policy decisions. John Bartels, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, has recently been quoted as saying that he fears that the extent of the claimed opium shortage has been greatly exaggerated by the pharmaceutical companies. While the GAO report has not been completed, preliminary indications suggest that present demand for opium-based medicines is increasing faster than the supply. However, the degree to which there is a pending crisis is questionable. The shortfall of 1973 was directly attributed to a drought in India.

As you know, India produces essentially all of the opium exported to nonproducing countries for legitimate medical purposes. This shortfall of about 200 tons was primarily responsible for the claimed present shortage. In this regard, the International Narcotics Control Board, in its report for 1973, which was issued on February 25, 1974, stated that:

> It appears that whereas the 1973 production schedule will not in itself suffice to meet demand, the 1974 schedule can be expected to lead to a possible equilibrium.

So there are indications, Mr. Speaker, that if the demand continues to grow at the present rate, and if the supply continues to lag, then eventually there will be a shortage. However, the extent of any present shortage is negligible, and surely does not justify resumption of cultivation in Turkey. In fact, the recent third special session of the United Nations Narcotic Commission cautioned against hasty decisions by governments to begin or to reestablish any opium production based on the shortfall of 1973.

Research is being performed toward synthetic substitutes for codeine. A small amount of this research is being performed by NIH, but most is being conducted by private industry. Technology may be able to provide alternatives to the increasing of opium poppy cultivation before we are faced with a long-term shortage. Increasing the world production now by initiating opium cultivation in Turkey for the purpose of averting a shortfall will only lead to a windfall for the illicit market. So it appears, Mr. Speaker, that based on the evidence presently available, opium shortages cannot be accepted as justification for removing the ban.

I cannot complete this testimony without addressing what will surely be a major concern of many of my colleagues; that is, the argument that the national security considerations impel a continuation of our economic and military assistance agreements with Turkey despite the decision to resume poppy cultivation. There are those of us who will contend that we should not do anything to jeopardize our strategic position in Turkey, our military bases locate there. I, for one, believe it is time to reassess the strategic value of these installations, and more importantly to reassess them in the context of the price we may be paying for them not only in foreign aid, but more importantly, in human misery in the streets of our communities.

It should be recognized that under the existing treaty with Turkey we cannot use our bases except when Turkey is at war with the Soviet Union. During the recent Arab-Israel war we were not able to use our bases to refuel our reconnaissance aircraft. Obviously Mr. Speaker, these bases contribute nothing to our strategic nuclear deterrence. Their real value is to deter local aggression against Turkey. We are doing them a favor by being there. The strategic value of Turkey to the United States is a myth. We should not continue to use this as a justification for pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into a country who reciprocates with human suffering and misery upon the American people.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there has been a close relationship between America and Turkey over the past quarter century. We have a friendship founded in the Truman doctrine and formalized in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; a friendship nurtured by a steady supply of over $3 billions in military and economic aid. This year we are asked to provide $232 million. This represents one-half of the total amount budgeted for all our drug abuse prevention programs; it equals the amount budgeted for rehabilitation and treatment of the drug addicted and equals our budgeted drug enforcement effort. It is 5 times the amount budgeted for drug abuse research.

During these troubled economic times, when inflation and unemployment has reached critical proportions, affecting the pocketbook of literally every American, we are asked to hand a quarter of a billion dollars of taxpayers dollars to a government that hands in return the shackles of heroin. Shackles that capture the minds and bodies of hundreds of thousands of Americans. Shackles that lead to black, white, and brown slavery in the Harlems of America as well as the affluent suburbs of our cities. We are being asked to subsidize a government which apparently disregards the welfare of the American people, disregards the agreement negotiated in 1971, and disregards the wisdom of the international community. A government that is willing to risk the health and safety of a friendly country solely for internal political expediency.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must not let this action go unanswered. We cannot continue to financially buttress such a government. We must not let our responsibility for the welfare of our society be overshadowed by the current issues of Presidential survival. We must closely scrutinize the national security argument. Threats to our security may manifest themselves in many forms. Let us not be so concerned over a base in Turkey that we lose a community, a city here at home. In 1973, there were 3,586 drug-related deaths in this country. That was over 10 times the number of hostile deaths in Southeast Asia during the last year of the war. In New York City alone, there were 942 drug-related deaths in 1972, while 300 U.S. soldiers died in hostile action in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this country's war with drugs can be just as deadly as wars fought with bullets. Resuming cultivation of opium in Turkey represents a real threat to the security of this Nation. This Congress must act now to pass this resolution voicing its sense of outrage over this clear violation of humanitarian principles—this unilateral decision to resume the growing of opium poppies that become the heroin which eventually enters the veins of our children.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 507, of which I am a cosponsor, and which urges the President to immediately initiate negotiations at the highest level of the Turkish Government to prevent the resumption of opium production. The resolution further states that if such negotiations are not successful, then the President should exercise his authority and terminate all U.S. assistance to that Nation.

In my view the decision by the Turkish Government to allow the resumption of poppy cultivation presents our country with the most serious single problem in narcotics control we have had to confront since 1971. And I believe that the seriousness of this situation necessitates an immediate and strong response by Congress. I personally feel that there is only one practical step remaining to the United States which stands a chance of heading off a new deluge of Turkey-originated heroin in the United States, and that step is to suspend all U.S. assistance to the Turkish Government unless there is a reinstitution of the ban on the growing of opium poppies.

As my colleagues are aware, in April 1971, I was selected by the House Foreign Affairs Committee along with my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. MORGAN MURPHY, to probe firsthand the international trafficking in narcotics. And I am very proud of the role that that mission played in helping to obtain Turkey's agreement to halt the production of opium. This ban has been a key to our success in decreasing the availability of heroin, and in turn, stemming the tide of heroin addiction in the United

States. Prior to the Turkish ban, well over 50 percent, and some estimate up to 80 percent, of all the heroin that reached our shores was produced in Turkey.

As a result of the cessation of poppy cultivation in that country—together with the sharply increased law enforcement efforts both at home and abroad and vastly improved treatment and rehabilitation programs, we have cut the number of heroin addicts in the United States by an estimated 50 percent since 1971, from more than 500,000 to 250,000.

This progress is now severely threatened, for the Turkish Government has not only announced that it will drop the ban and will resume poppy cultivation, but that it intends to allow poppy production in seven Provinces—a dramatic increase from the four Provinces in which cultivation was to be allowed in 1972 before the ban went into effect. Thus, this is not a minor return to opium production on a small scale; this is a return with a vengeance for full-scale production of opium. And its results will be seen, as one drug director told me, not only in the streets of our cities but in our morgues as well.

There are those who believe that the Turkish Government was forced to make this decision because of the severe economic situation in that country. I do not believe that this is the case.

Despite the recent assertions by the Turkish Government, poppy cultivation simply no longer was a significant factor in the Turkish economy at the time that the ban went into effect. According to the official Turkish Government statistics furnished to the study mission the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY), and I undertook for the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1971, Turkey's total export earnings in 1969 were approximately 534 million U.S. dollars.

Legal exports of opium products in that year were valued at only $2.6 million. Moreover, while illegal sales do not show up in these figures, it appears clear that even these financial gains for Turkish farmers selling into the illicit market are very small when compared to the nation's total export earnings. It is estimated that illegal sales net approximately three times the legal price in Turkey. That means that illicit opium trading nets less than $8 million annually in U.S. dollars.

In order to offset any economic impact on the Turkish farmer, our Government agreed to provide some $35 million in compensation and to assist in the development of alternative crops and industries. I think it is clear that the economic gain of renewing poppy cultivation, particularly in light of the amount of money this Nation was willing to furnish to the Government of Turkey, was extremely small, if at all existant. There is only one place where it is financially beneficial and that is on the illegal market. And there is only one significant group that will benefit and that is organized crime in Turkey. The resumption of opium production will provide a crooks' bonanza in Turkey. I think it is time we look at this problem in this light and not as a situation where we are depriving Turkey of a major part of her legitimate economy.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I say this: It seems to me that over the years Turkey has not had a greater friend than the United States. Ever since President Truman sent the *Missouri* to the straits we have asked Turkey's help in essentially three things. One was to support us in Korea which Turkey did with enormous heroism and effectiveness. We have asked that they cooperate with us in a mutual defense effort which they have done to the benefit of the United States and the benefit of Turkey. Finally, we have asked that instead of taking the very, very small economic benefit that opium production might provide them that they recognize our friendship, that they acknowledge that friendship, as well as a moral obligation to the world to keep opium production under control.

It is my firm belief that the Congress must now take an active role in attempting to get the Turkish Government to ban the cultivation of the opium poppy. It is essential that our Government show that it is deadly serious about the necessity to control the international traffic in narcotics. After consultation with a wide variety of experts in this field and after great personal deliberation I conclude that there is only one practical step for the Congress to now take: to urge that the President immediately initiate negotiations at the highest level of the Turkish Government to prevent the resumption of opium production and if these negotiations fail, then the President should exercise his authority provided by the Foreign Assistance Act to suspend all U.S. economic and military assistance to the Government of Turkey.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 507 which urges the President to immediately initiate negotiations at the highest level with the Turkish Government to prevent the resumption of opium production.

As I say, I support and shall vote for the resolution. However, I wish to make clear my feeling that this resolution does not go nearly far enough and that the House should be considering much more stringent sanctions against the Turks.

For example, H.R. 15048, which I introduced on July 16, would stop all forms of U.S. aid to Turkey. Passage of the legislation or a unilateral invocation by the President of his power under Public Law 92–226 to cut off such assistance would be a much more fitting response to the irresponsible action by the Turkish Government.

Nevertheless, House Resolution 507 does urge the President to halt aid to Turkey if the negotiations fail and it does provide a vehicle whereby the House may express its displeasure at the Turkish decision which, if allowed to stand, will have untold tragic consequences for many Americans.

Turkish poppies, before production was halted in 1971, constituted the source of a proportion of the heroin which reached the United States. In fact, many experts estimate that 80 percent of the illegal heroin in our country prior to 1971 came from Turkey.

The Turkish decision to again grow poppies is a clear breach of a 1971 agreement between the United States and Turkey which provided for a phaseout of poppy growing in exchange for compensation from the United States. Our Government pledged $35.7 million in compensation to Turkey to stop opium production. An estimated $15 million of that has already been spent.

Mr. Speaker, the Turkish Government's decision is an outrageous act, one that is totally unjustifiable, and one which the United States cannot, and must not, tolerate.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, Turkey's decision to lift its ban on opium production represents a direct blow to our young people and to the overall fabric of life in our Nation. No strategic considerations with Turkey can be worth the pain and human sufferings, the crime and social disruption that will result fro and social disruption that will result from the increased flow of heroin into American veins.

Mr. Speaker, we must lend our strongest support to House Concurrent Resolution 507 if we value the quality of American life. The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the President immediately initiate negotiations at the highest level of the Turkish Government to prevent the resumption of opium production. If these negotiations fail, the resolution continues, then the President should terminate all further military and economic assistance to the Turkish Government under the authority provided by the Foreign Assistance Act.

Since 1971, when the flow of cheap Turkish opiates into our Nation subsided, the number of heroin addicts in the United States had decreased by a remarkable 60 percent. But the enormous progress we have made in the war against drug addiction will erode drastically if we do not take action to negate the Turkish decision, a decision which will surely have an insidious, corruptive influence on large segments of our population, particularly our young people.

The passage of House Concurrent Resolution 507 would transmit an urgent message to the Turkish Government from the American people. It is a message filled with alarm and concern for our young people. We must not hesitate to withhold aid to Turkey if such action is necessary to convince Turkey that it must lift its ban on opium production.

Mr. Speaker, we must make a stand against the dangerous corruption of our young, the inevitable increase in the crime rate, and most important, against the intense tragedy of human suffering brought on by heroin addiction. We must express to Turkey and to the American people our determination to continue the battle against drug abuse by passing this resolution.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 507 expressing the concern of Congress over the recent decision of the Turkish Government to resume the production of the deadly opium poppy. I view this legislation as a vehicle which hopefully will lead to a reversal of this ill conceived and dangerous action by the Government of Turkey.

Turkey's decision represents a major blow to our Nation's efforts at combating the evil scourge of heroin abuse. In

1971, I introduced legislation to cut off all economic and military aid to nations who were not cooperating with the United States in curbing the flow of illegal drugs. As a result of this and other efforts, the U.S. Government was able to secure an agreement with Turkey which placed a ban on their poppy production in return for some $35.7 million in American compensatory aid.

This agreement was hailed by many in this Nation, for with it we had put a stop to the poppy production of a nation which had been supplying over 80 percent of the illegal heroin of this Nation. The results from this ban were astounding. Since 1971, the numbers of heroin addicts has decreased by over 60 percent, and other important strides were being made in the fight against drug abuse.

Yet all of these accomplishments stand to be wiped our as a result of the decision to resume poppy production. What this legislation seeks to do is to call upon the President to initiate high-level negotiations with the Turkish Government designed to either prevent the resumption of opium production or assure that adequate measures are obtained to safeguard against a renewed flow of illicit heroin onto our shores. This resolution further provides that if negotiations fail, the President should exercise his authority under the Foreign Assistance Act to suspend all assistance to the Government of Turkey.

This to me represents but a small step in what should be a nationwide effort led by concerned Americans speaking through their elected officials, to get the Government of Turkey to reverse this decision. If we fail to act, we will once again be faced with the prospect of poisonous needles filled with heroin entering the veins of thousands of young Americans, thus reducing them in the prime of life to worthless members of society, slaves to the drug habit and those who can maintain it.

We need to do more than merely express our concern in this matter. We should also begin to demonstrate to all nations, not only Turkey, that we will not tolerate the flow of illegal drugs into our country. A better approach in the Turkish question might come from our refusing her request for some $230 million in aid during the consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act. Providing aid to Turkey while she is engaged in renewed opium production is akin to supporting the killing of thousands of Americans who will likely die at the hands of heroin. This reckless and hostile act by Turkey cannot and should not be tolerated.

I applaud the initiative taken today by my colleagues, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WOLFF. Their work in this area is to be commended, but by no means should it be terminated with the passage of this resolution. This is a serious problem which requires strong action by the U.S. Government. We should not fear to act in the wake of Turkey's decision. If we do not we should and can expect to be held accountable by the American public.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude debate on this bill by thanking the chairman for his comments and support in not only this legislation but all legislation relating to the question of stamping out drug addiction in this country.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 507), as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS TO COMMEMORATE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEETING OF FIRST CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1255, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Arrangements To Commemorate the 200th Anniversary of the Meeting and Accomplishment of the First Continental Congress the following Members of the House: Messrs. MCCORMACK, HANLEY, MCDADE, and KEMP.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

Pursuant to clause 3, rule XVII, the Chair will now put the question on each motion, on which further proceedings were postponed, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3 (b) (3), rule XXVII, the Chair announces he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on all the additional motions to suspend the rule on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Chair to announce that on Senate Joint Resolution 229 there will be a vote?

The SPEAKER. There will be a vote but there was no quorum. There is no record vote ordered. We have not reached that yet.

ENDORSING LAKE PLACID, N.Y., AS THE SITE OF THE 1980 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) as amended.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 382, nays 4, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—382

Abdnor	Denholm	Ketchum
Abzug	Dennis	King
Adams	Dent	Kluczynski
Addabbo	Derwinski	Koch
Alexander	Devine	Kuykendall
Anderson, Calif.	Dickinson	Kyros
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Lagomarsino
Andrews, N.C.	Donohue	Landgrebe
Andrews, N. Dak.	Drinan	Landrum
Annunzio	Dulski	Latta
Archer	Duncan	Leggett
Arends	du Pont	Lehman
Armstrong	Edwards, Ala.	Lent
Ashbrook	Edwards, Calif.	Litton
Ashley	Eilberg	Long, La.
Aspin	Erlenborn	Long, Md.
Badillo	Esch	Lujan
Bafalis	Eshleman	Luken
Baker	Evans, Colo.	McClory
Barrett	Evins, Tenn.	McCloskey
Bauman	Fascell	McCollister
Beard	Findley	McCormack
Bell	Fish	McDade
Bennett	Fisher	McEwen
Bergland	Flood	McFall
Bevill	Flynt	McKinney
Biaggi	Foley	Macdonald
Biester	Forsythe	Madden
Bingham	Fountain	Madigan
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Mahon
Blatnik	Frenzel	Mallary
Boggs	Frey	Mann
Boland	Froehlich	Maraziti
Bolling	Fulton	Martin, Nebr.
Bowen	Fuqua	Martin, N.C.
Brademas	Gaydos	Mathis, Ga.
Bray	Gettys	Matsunaga
Breckinridge	Giaimo	Mayne
Brinkley	Gibbons	Mazzoli
Brooks	Gilman	Meeds
Broomfield	Ginn	Melcher
Brotzman	Gonzalez	Metcalfe
Brown, Calif.	Goodling	Mezvinsky
Brown, Mich.	Grasso	Michel
Brown, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	Milford
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Pa.	Minish
Broyhill, Va.	Griffiths	Mink
Buchanan	Gross	Minshall, Ohio
Burgener	Grover	Mitchell, Md.
Burke, Calif.	Gubser	Mitchell, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Gude	Mizell
Burke, Mass.	Guyer	Moakley
Burleson, Tex.	Haley	Mollohan
Burton, John	Hamilton	Montgomery
Burton, Phillip	Hammer-schmidt	Moorhead, Calif.
Butler	Hanley	Moorhead, Pa.
Byron	Hanna	Morgan
Camp	Hanrahan	Mosher
Carney, Ohio	Harrington	Moss
Carter	Harsha	Murphy, Ill.
Casey, Tex.	Hastings	Murtha
Cederberg	Hawkins	Myers
Chamberlain	Hays	Natcher
Chappell	Hébert	Nelsen
Clark	Hechler, W. Va.	Nichols
Clausen, Don H.	Heckler, Mass.	Nix
Clawson, Del	Heinz	Obey
Cleveland	Helstoski	O'Brien
Cochran	Henderson	O'Hara
Cohen	Hicks	O'Neill
Collier	Hillis	Parris
Collins, Ill.	Hinshaw	Passman
Collins, Tex.	Hogan	Patman
Conable	Holt	Patten
Conlan	Holtzman	Pepper
Conte	Horton	Perkins
Corman	Howard	Pettis
Cotter	Huber	Peyser
Coughlin	Hudnut	Pickle
Crane	Hungate	Pike
Cronin	Hunt	Poage
Daniel, Dan	Hutchinson	Powell, Ohio
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Jarman	Preyer
Daniels, Dominick V.	Johnson, Calif.	Price, Ill.
Danielson	Johnson, Colo.	Price, Tex.
Davis, S.C.	Johnson, Pa.	Pritchard
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Quie
de la Garza	Jones, N.C.	Quillen
Delaney	Jones, Okla.	Randall
Dellenback	Jones, Tenn.	Rees
Dellums	Jordan	Regula
	Karth	Reuss
	Kastenmeier	Riegle
	Kazen	Rinaldo
	Kemp	Roberts

Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Schneebeli
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
Studds
Sullivan
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
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, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—4

Conyers
McKay
Miller
Schroeder

NOT VOTING—48

Brasco
Breaux
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Flowers
Ford
Fraser
Goldwater
Gray
Gunter
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Lott
McSpadden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Owens
Podell
Railsback
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Scherle
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Thompson, N.J.
Treen
Veysey
Waldie
Young, Alaska

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution as amended was concurred in.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Teague with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Symington with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Lott.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Treen.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Stuckey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b)(3) of rule XXVII, the chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on all of the additional motions to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CONTINUATION PAY FOR PHYSICIANS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES IN INITIAL RESIDENCY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 15936, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas—375, nays 3, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—375

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bauman
Beard
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Bray
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Daniels, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanrahan
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Hogan
Holt
Holtzman
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, Md.
Lujan
Luken
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Milford
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Schneebeli
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
Studds
Sullivan
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
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, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—3

Carney, Ohio
Conyers
Foley

NOT VOTING—56

Anderson, Ill.
Brademas
Brasco
Breaux
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Flowers
Ford
Froehlich
Gilman
Gray
Gunter
Hammer-schmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Ichord
Long, La.
Lott
McSpadden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Owens
Podell
Pritchard
Railsback
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Ruth
Sandman
Scherle
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Treen
Veysey
Waldie
Wiggins
Young, Alaska

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Gunter.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Treen.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Lott.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Clancy with Mr. Froehlich.
Mr. Gilman with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ruth.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIR FORCE LIEUTENANT COLONELS AND COLONELS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 14402).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14402 on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 271, nays 108, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—271

Abdnor
Adams
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Aspin
Bafalis
Baker
Bauman
Beard
Bell
Bennett
Bevill
Biaggi
Blackburn
Boggs
Boland
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Butler
Byron
Camp
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denholm
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanrahan
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Hogan
Holt
Horton
Huber
Hudnut
Hunt
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Landrum
Leggett
Lehman
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Milford
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Morgan
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quillen
Regula
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Runnels
Ruth
Sarasin
Satterfield
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wylie
Yatron
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—108

Abzug
Addabbo
Anderson, Calif.
Ashley
Badillo
Barrett
Bergland
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Calif.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Daniels, Dominick V.
Davis, Wis.
Dellums
Drinan
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fraser
Gibbons
Grasso
Griffiths
Gude
Hanna
Harrington
Hastings
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Holtzman
Howard
Hungate
Hutchinson
Kastenmeier
Koch
Luken
McKay
Martin, Nebr.
Mayne
Mazzoli
Michel
Miller
Minish
Moakley
Moorhead, Pa.
Moss
Nix
Obey
Patten
Pike
Quie
Randall
Rees
Reuss
Riegle
Robison, N.Y.
Roe
Rosenthal
Roy
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sarbanes
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shuster
Skubitz
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Symms
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Van Deerlin
Vander Veen
Vanik
Whitten
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Yates
Young, Fla.
Zwach

NOT VOTING—55

Brasco
Breaux
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Dennis
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Flowers
Ford
Gray
Gunter
Hammer-schmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Latta
Lent
Lott
McSpadden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Owens
Podell
Railsback
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Scherle
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Treen
Veysey
Waldie
Wiggins
Young, Alaska

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Owens with Mr. Lott.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Treen.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Podell.
Mr. Young of Alaska with Mr. Dennis.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ALLIED WARTIME FORCES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 13377.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13377. on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 341, nays 40, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—341

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Armstrong
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bauman
Beard
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carney, Ohio
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Daniels, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood

Foley
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanrahan
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Long, La.
Lujan
Luken
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKinney
Macdonald
Madigan
Mahon
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, N.C.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shuster
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Studds
Sullivan
Taylor, Mo.
Thompson, N.J.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—40

Archer
Ashbrook
Burleson, Tex.
Carter
Collins, Tex.
Davis, Wis.
Devine
Flynt
Forsythe
Ginn
Goodling
Gross
Haley
Hechler, W. Va.
Hutchinson
Johnson, Colo.
Landrum
Litton
McKay
Mallary
Martin, Nebr.
Mathis, Ga.
Michel
Milford
Pickle
Robison, N.Y.
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Sebelius
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Steiger, Wis.
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Thomson, Wis.
Wyatt
Young, S.C.

NOT VOTING—53

Brasco
Breaux
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Coughlin
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Flowers
Ford
Gray
Gunter
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Long, Md.
Lott
McSpadden
Madden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Owens
Podell
Pritchard
Railsback
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Rousselot
Sandman
Scherle
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Treen
Veysey
Waldie
Young, Alaska

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Gunter.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Treen.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Lott.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Rousselot.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE VETERANS' HOUSING ACT OF 1974

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 15912), as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15912), as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 0, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—384

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bauman
Beard
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Daniels, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hanrahan
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
Luken
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Milford
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Schneebeli
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
Studds
Sullivan
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
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, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—50

Brasco
Breaux
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Findley
Flowers
Ford
Gray
Gunter
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hays
Henderson
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Lott
McSpadden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Owens
Podell
Pritchard
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Robison, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Scherle
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Treen
Veysey
Waldie
Young, Alaska

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Gunter.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Treen.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Lott.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Henderson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS TO GUAM

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13267, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 27, not voting—47 as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

YEAS—360

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Armstrong
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Barrett
Bauman
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carter
Casey, Texas
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Daniel, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Ketchum
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Lujan
Luken
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Milford
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Spence
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Studds
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
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, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—27

Andrews, N.C.
Archer
Ashbrook
Bafalis
Baker
Beard
Carney, Ohio
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conlan
Crane
Gaydos
Gross
Hanrahan
Hungate
Kemp
King
Landgrebe
Miller
O'Brien
Randall
Rousselot
Schneebeli
Shuster
Snyder
Symms
Young, Fla.

NOT VOTING—47

Brasco
Breaux
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Flowers
Ford
Gray
Gunter
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Long, Md.
Lott
McSpadden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Owens
Podell
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Scherle
Smith, N.Y.
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Treen
Veysey
Waldie
Young, Alaska

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Podell with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Holifield.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Lott.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Treen.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. McSpadden.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT EXTENSION

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 16045) as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16045) as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS SCHOLARSHIPS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 16077.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 16077, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 9, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

YEAS—371

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Armstrong
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bauman
Beard
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Daniels, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hanrahan
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
Luken
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Milford
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Shuster
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Studds
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
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, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—9

Ashbrook
Camp
Casey, Tex.
Collins, Tex.
Crane
Gross
Landgrebe
Rousselot
Symms

NOT VOTING—54

Brasco
Breaux
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Dennis
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Flowers
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gray
Gunter
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Lott
McSpadden
Maraziti
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Owens
Podell
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Scherle
Smith, N.Y.
Spence
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Treen
Ullman
Veysey
Waldie
Young, Alaska

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Spence.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Rangel with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Owens with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Dennis.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Lott.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Maraziti.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Mills.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Young of Alaska with Mr. Treen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3782) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 1 year the authorization of appropriations for Federal capital contributions into the student loan funds of health professions education schools, a similar bill to the bill just passed by the House, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3782

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 "Emergency Health Professions Educational Assistance Act".

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 2. (a) Section 742(a)(3) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by deleting the period after "1974" the first time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.".

(b) Section 824 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1974," the following: "and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975,".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3782 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 16077, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To 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."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 16077) was laid on the table.

PASSPORT APPLICATION FEES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 15172.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill

H.R. 15172, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 7, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

YEAS—381

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bauman
Beard
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Boling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Daniels, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hanrahan
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
Luken
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Milford
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Schneebeli
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
Studds
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
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, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—7

Burton, John
Carney, Ohio
Gross
Landgrebe
Moakley
Schroeder
Symms

NOT VOTING—46

Brasco
Breaux
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Flowers
Ford
Gray
Gunter
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Lott
McSpadden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Owens
Podell
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Scherle
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Treen
Veysey
Waldie
Young, Alaska

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. Podell with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Rangel with Mr. Holifield.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Waldie.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Owens.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Symington with Mr. Lott.

Mr. Clay with Mr. Brasco.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Gunter with Mr. Scherle.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Treen.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Young of Alaska.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. McSpadden.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 229), as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 229), as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. 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 271, nays 113, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

YEAS—271

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Armstrong
Ashley
Badillo
Barrett
Bell
Bergland
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Cronin
Daniels, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Dulski
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Forsythe
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Harrington
Hastings
Hawkins
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Horton
Howard
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Milford
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Quie
Railsback
Rees
Reuss
Riegle
Roberts
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal

Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schneebeli
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Spence
Staggers
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Tiernan
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Ware
Whalen
White
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—113

Alexander
Archer
Ashbrook
Aspin
Bafalis
Baker
Bauman
Beard
Bennett
Bevill
Biaggi
Bray
Burgener
Burke, Fla.
Byron
Camp
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Chappell
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Crane
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Davis, S.C.
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Dickinson
Duncan
Fish
Flynt
Fountain
Froehlich
Gaydos
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gross
Haley
Hammer-schmidt
Hanrahan
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Holt
Holtzman
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jones, Okla.
Kemp
Ketchum
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Long, Md.
Luken
Maraziti
Mathis, Ga.
Miller
Minish
Mizell
Montgomery
Moss
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
Perkins
Powell, Ohio
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Randall
Regula
Rinaldo
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Rosenthal
Rousselot
Runnels
Ruth
Satterfield
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shipley
Shuster
Snyder
Stanton, J. William
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stubblefield
Symms
Taylor, Mo.
Thornton
Towell, Nev.
Vanik
Wampler
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Zion

NOT VOTING—50

Brasco
Breaux
Burlison, Mo.
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Eckhardt
Flowers
Ford
Gray
Gunter
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Kuykendall
Lott
McKay
McSpadden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Owens
Podell
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Scherle
Shoup
Stuckey
Symington
Teague
Thompson, N.J.
Treen
Veysey
Waldie
Young, Alaska

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey and Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Burlison of Missouri against.

Mr. Breaux and Mrs. Chisholm for, with Mr. Ichord against.

Mr. Diggs and Mr. Sandman for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Murphy of New York and Mr. Rhodes for, with Mr. Stuckey against.

Mr. Podell and Mr. Nedzi for, with Mr. Teague against.

Mr. Carey of New York and Mr. Treen for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.

Mr. Rangel and Mr. Symington for, with Mr. Scherle against.

Mr. Reid and Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Young of Alaska against.

Mr. Owens and Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Clay with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Dorn with Holifield.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Culver with Mr. McKay.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Downing.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Lott with Mr. Mills.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Shoup.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 69

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 583).

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 583).

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RATIFICATION OF THE GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1258).

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 1258.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 315, nays 70, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

YEAS—315

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Armstrong
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carney, Ohio
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohen
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Cronin
Daniels, Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dent
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Forsythe
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Gonzalez
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hanrahan
Harrington
Hastings
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hinshaw
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
Luken
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mallary
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Milford
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Stephens
Stokes
Stubblefield
Studds
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—70

Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Bauman
Beard
Bevill
Blackburn
Breckinridge
Brown, Ohio
Burleson, Tex.
Carter
Chappell
Cochran
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conlan
Crane
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.

Davis, Wis.	Huber	Roberts
Dennis	Hudnut	Robinson, Va.
Derwinski	Jones, N.C.	Rousselot
Devine	Ketchum	Ruth
Dulski	King	Satterfield
Duncan	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Flynt	Landgrebe	Sikes
Fountain	McEwen	Snyder
Frelinghuysen	Madigan	Spence
Goldwater	Mathis, Ga.	Steiger, Ariz.
Goodling	Michel	Steiger, Wis.
Gross	Montgomery	Stratton
Haley	O'Brien	Symms
Hammer-schmidt	Passman	Taylor, Mo.
	Poage	Waggonner
Harsha	Powell, Ohio	Whitten
Hillis	Quillen	Wilson, Bob

NOT VOTING—49

Brasco	Hansen, Idaho	Rangel
Breaux	Hansen, Wash.	Rarick
Burlison, Mo.	Hogan	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Holifield	Rhodes
Chisholm	Hosmer	Rooney, N.Y.
Clancy	Ichord	Sandman
Clay	Johnson, Pa.	Scherle
Culver	Lott	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	McSpadden	Symington
Diggs	Mathias, Calif.	Teague
Dorn	Mills	Treen
Downing	Mosher	Veysey
Eckhardt	Murphy, N.Y.	Waldie
Flowers	Nedzi	Wiggins
Ford	Owens	Young, Alaska
Gray	Podell	
Gunter	Pritchard	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Owens with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Mosher.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Lott.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Treen.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pritchard.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Breaux.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESOLUTION OF CENSURE OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I introduced a resolution of censure of the President. Since then I have made no effort to get cosponsors or support, but I am glad to report that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), is today introducing the identical resolution of censure.

This resolution was conceived as a bipartisan effort, one that will make it possible for Members to have a choice between censure and impeachment when the time comes to vote. The choice must be established before debate of impeachment begins.

It is my position that the Committee on Rules ought to make a resolution of censure in order in the rule that brings articles of impeachment to the floor.

There are two precedents for Presidential censure, and I include with my remarks a summary of each, together with the text of the resolution.

My purpose today is to appeal to the leadership of the House and especially to Speaker ALBERT, as Speaker of all the Members of this Chamber, to use the influence of his office with the Committee on Rules to make this resolution of censure in order.

The material I referred to is as follows:

BUCHANAN CENSURE

In 1859, President Buchanan and his Secretary of the Navy were accused of misusing public funds by awarding government jobs and contracts to favored contractors who were not the lowest bidders as the law required, but who had contributed money to the election of President Buchanan in 1856. Extensive hearings were held by the House over a period of months.

In one case, three friends of President Buchanan applied for the position of government coal agent. Since only one could be appointed, he agreed to split the $15,000 salary with the other two, all with Buchanan's approval. He then gave an open contract for coal to a relative of the Secretary of the Navy at a price considerably higher than the market price.

In another instance, a friend of the President promised to help a businessman obtain a $239,000 government contract to supply live oak logs in exchange for a 10 per cent kickback and a $16,000 contribution to Buchanan's campaign.

In a third instance, the Secretary of the Navy awarded a government contract for the construction of a marine engine to a firm which had supported Buchanan's presidential bid at a price substantially higher than the lowest bid. President Buchanan personally interceded on behalf of the firm awarded the contract.

Many of these acts are similar to those violations of "his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of the President, . . . to take care that the laws be faithfully executed," and in contravention of "the laws governing agencies of the executive branch," which have been made against President Nixon in the Articles of Impeachment.

However, for his violations of the law, President Buchanan was censured by the House. On June 13, 1860, the House passed the following resolution of censure by a vote of 106 to 61:

"*Resolved*, That the President and the Secretary of the Navy, by receiving and considering the party relations of bidders for contracts and the effect of awarding contracts upon pending elecitons, have set an example dangerous to the public and deserving the reproof of this House."

JACKSON CENSURE

In the fall of 1833, President Jackson fired Secretary of the Treasury Duane who refused his request that he remove all government funds from the Bank of the United States. In his place he appointed Roger B. Taney, who, unconfirmed by the Senate, carried out the President's order.

On December 11, 1833, the Senate by resolution requested the President to communicate to the Senate a copy of the paper "which purports to have been read by him to the heads of the Executive Departments" listing his reasons for removing the deposits from the U.S. Bank. The next day, on December 12, President Jackson asserted his executive privilege and refused to surrender the document, stating:

"The Executive is a co-ordinate and independent branch of the government equally with the Senate, and I have yet to learn under what constitutional authority that branch of the Legislature has the right to require of me an account of any communication, either verbally or in writing, made to the heads of departments acting as a Cabinet council."

Whereupon, on December 26, Senator Henry Clay introduced a resolution censuring the President for his conduct, stating:

"*Resolved*, That the President, in the late executive proceedings in relation to the public revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both."

This resolution was passed by the Senate on a vote of 26 to 20.

Thus, President Jackson, who had acted in an unconstitutional manner and in violation of the laws, as the Senate thought, and in addition had refused to supply the Senate with records of Presidential conversations, was censured for his conduct by the Senate.

H. RES 1288

Whereas the people have the right to expect from the President of the United States high moral standards and personal example, as well as great diligence in the exercise of official responsibilities and obligations;

And whereas, Richard M. Nixon, in his conduct of the office of President—despite great achievements in foreign policy which are highly beneficial to every citizen and indeed to all people in the world—(1) has shown insensitivity to the moral demands, lofty purpose and ideals of the high office he holds in trust, and (2) has, through negligence and maladministration, failed to prevent his close subordinates and agents from committing acts of grave misconduct obstruction and impairment of justice, abuse and undue concentration of power, and contravention of the laws governing agencies of the Executive Branch;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives that Richard M. Nixon should be and he is hereby censured for said moral insensitivity, negligence and maladministration.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I support what the gentleman from Illinois is doing. It seems to me Members should have an option to vote for or against some type of censorship. I felt the Judiciary Committee should have considered a censure resolution first before impeachment.

I have a letter requesting the Rules Committee permit the offering and consideration of a motion to recommit with instructions to censure.

I hope my colleagues on this side of the aisle consider signing this letter of request.

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

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WITHDRAWING FOREIGN TROOPS FROM CYPRUS

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that on Friday last, I introduced on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BAFALIS), and for 78 other Members of the House of Representatives House Concurrent Resolutions No. 577, 578, 579, and 580, which resolutions express the sense of Congress regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus.

On behalf of Messrs. KYROS, YATRON, SARBANES, BEFALIS, and myself, I wish to invite other Members of the House of Representatives who may wish to join in cosponsoring this resolution to advise the offices of any of the five original cosponsors of their desire to do so before 12 p.m., Thursday, August 8, when another identical resolution will be introduced.

Mr. Speaker, the text of House Concurrent Resolutions 577, 578, 579, and 580 follows:

H. CON. RES. 577

Whereas a settlement of the present conflict in the Republic of Cyprus is vital to the peace and security of the Eastern Mediterranean and is in the best interests of world peace and stability; and

Whereas a settlement depends upon the right of the Cypriot people to determine their own destiny and the efforts of the United Nations to act as a negotiating body; and

Whereas Resolution 2077 (xx) adopted by the General Assembly on December 18, 1965, "calls upon all states . . . to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from any intervention directed against it"; and

Whereas the continued presence of foreign troops in Cyprus undermines the ability of the Cypriot people to resolve their own crisis and the efforts of the United Nations to restore peace; and

Whereas Resolution 353 adopted by the Security Council on July 20, 1974, "demands an immediate end to foreign military intervention in the Republic of Cyprus" and "requests the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements. . . ."; and

Whereas the declaration of Cyprus signed by the foreign ministers of Britain, Turkey and Greece in Geneva on July 30, 1974, calls for a "timely and phased reduction of the number of armed forces" from Cypriot soil; and

Whereas the continued presence of foreign troops in Cyprus violates international agreements and U.N. resolutions, threatens the independence and territorial integrity of the island, jeopardizes peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean, and imperils the very existence of NATO: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That all foreign troops currently involved in Cyprus be withdrawn immediately so that the United Nations may be permitted to restore peace to the island and the Cypriot people guaranteed the right to determine their own destiny.

Lester Wolff, Frank Annunzio, Lionel Van Deerlin, John J. McFall, James A. Burke, Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., Edward I. Koch, John Breaux, Trent Lott, Bo Ginn, Frank M. Clark, Lindy Boggs, Don Edwards, Harold T. Johnson, Neal Smith, Thomas S. Foley, Barbara Jordan, Chas. H. Wilson, Melvin Price, Thaddeus J. Dulski, Robert O. Tiernan, Charles Wilson.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ABORTED WATERGATE INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee articles of impeachment included reference to the House Banking and Currency Committee's aborted Watergate investigation of the fall of 1972. Reference to that investigation is contained in Judiciary Committee book VIII, particularly in the transcript of September 15, 1972.

In October of 1972 the House Banking and Currency Committee voted not to give its chairman blanket subpena power to call before the committee any persons associated with the Watergate matter. The bipartisan vote in the committee basically reflected the Membership's reluctance to let our Banking and Currency Committee investigate a problem which obviously extended beyond our jurisdictional powers.

There were other reasons for voting against the chairman.

First, the committee's jurisdiction is broad, but the only Watergate items included are those of the foreign bank transfers—Mexican money—and the unproved allegation that bank charters had something to do with contributions to the Committee to Re-Elect the President. Most of the Members who voted against the issuance of subpena powers indicated that they wanted to investigate the matters under the committee's jurisdiction and indeed urged the chairman to do so.

A substitute motion favored by most of the committee was ruled out of order by the chairman. It would have provided for a full investigation of matters within our jurisdiction.

I supported that motion and repeatedly asked for an investigation. One of my pleas was made in committee and shown on national television. Unfortunately, the chairman did not seem very interested in actually working on the banking matters. In the past 2 years I have written and spoken to him several times urging his attention to this matter without success. The material which follows documents some of my efforts.

The charter allegation, again made by Chairman PATMAN, referred to the Ridgedale National Bank in the city of Minnetonka. The Comptroller of the Currency testified in writing to the chairman that there was nothing unusual about the granting of that charter and offered to come before the committee and answer any questions. The chairman did not ask him to appear. In the absence of other proof or other investigation, the Comptroller's statement must stand.

Second, the criminal process was already in operation with respect to Watergate burglars. Members of the committee felt that the civil rights of the defendants, and the rights of the prosecution, might have been jeopardized by a congressional investigation at that time. This was the principal point made by Senator KENNEDY when he declined to investigate these matters at exactly the same time Chairman PATMAN wanted to begin his investigation. Senator KENNEDY's subcommittee had broader jurisdiction and would have been a more appropriate investigation vehicle.

As a matter of fact, the trial that ensued, with which we did not want to interfere was the very trial through which Judge Sirica was able to get the defendants to make the statements that eventually led to the breaking of the Watergate case. It is impossible to tell what would have happened had Chairman PATMAN's Banking Committee gone through its investigation, but there is widespread speculation that the committee could well have messed up the trial.

Third, the House adjourned several days after the Banking and Currency Committee voted not to issue blanket subpena power. Quite obviously, if there were an investigation, it would have been conducted by staff members rather than Members of Congress.

For the reasons stated, I supported the majority of the committee which voted against giving blanket subpena powers to its chairman. I do not believe that any of the Watergate matters would have been completed any sooner had the committee gone ahead.

During the time this matter was under consideration, I did not hear from the White House or any of its employees. I did receive one telephone call from Clark MacGregor, the chairman of the Committee to Re-Elect the President, who called as a matter of courtesy—he was my predecessor—to notify me that he would not be appearing at the invitation of Chairman PATMAN at one of our meetings.

As one who has supported the Watergate investigation, voted for funding of that investigation, for committee powers, for printing requests, and as one who supported a reasonable investigation, I do not believe that a quick and sweeping investigation by the committee would have been helpful.

I am including in the RECORD the following material relative to this matter:

Frenzel statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 3, 1972, page 33529 asking the Banking and Currency Committee to carry out oversight on transfers of election funds through foreign banks.

Frenzel statement and letter urging investigation of foreign bank transfers

and bank charters—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 6, 1972, pages 34175 and 34176.

Frenzel statement on committee rejection of blanket subpena; Chairman PATMAN's unwillingness to conduct investigations as requested by subcommittee chairman; statement in committee on October 12, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 13, 1972, 36127 to 36128.

Frenzel letter of May 10, 1973, asking investigation of foreign bank transactions.

Gonzalez response of May 14, 1973, to Mr. FRENZEL.

Frenzel response of May 16, 1973, to Mr. GONZALEZ.

Patman response of May 29, 1973, to Mr. GONZALEZ.

Gonzalez response of June 1, 1973, to Mr. FRENZEL.

Frenzel response of June 5, 1973, to Mr. PATMAN.

Patman response of June 28, 1973, to Mr. FRENZEL.

Patman letter of December 15. 1972, to Mr. Kleindienst.

Petersen response of January 11, 1973, to Mr. PATMAN.

Frenzel letter of October 19, 1973, asking inquiry on bank charters.

Patman memo of October 16, 1973.

Frenzel letter of December 20, 1973, to Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Frenzel letter of December 20, 1973, to Mr. FRASER.

All of these statements and correspondence provide a pretty clear picture of the committee chairman's unwillingness to study those matters under the committee's jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, the question of contributions made to political campaigns through instruments drawn on foreign banks is still a matter of importance which has not been resolved. It is my hope that students of this matter will find the following information helpful.

The materials mentioned above follow:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 3, 1972]

REPORT ON BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today the press and public witnessed a performance by the Banking and Currency Committee that was unusual even in a committee famed for unusual procedures. Rules of the House and rules of the committee were not only ignored or broken, they were stomped on.

This committee has, during he past congressional session, been chaired under personal, frequently good-humored, rules of whimsey and caprice, but in today's meeting the personal rules could only be described as autocratic.

Committee members were not recognized; motions were not recognized; points of order were ignored; parliamentary inquiries were unanswered; and preferential motions were not put to vote.

Since an extension of the chairman's onering circus was not granted by the committee, many committee members will be content simply to wait for next year and a new deal. However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot do that.

One of the items under consideration related to a bank charter issued within my district. The chairman's original staff study—released to columnist Jack Anderson more than 12 hours before it was released to me and other committee members—had raised questions of irregularity about the issuance of that charter.

I have mentioned my interest in the matter to the chairman twice. On one occasion during the consideration of the housing bill I asked for recognition on a point of personal privilege, and explained my interest to the chairman and the committee. Nevertheless, I was not recognized by the chairman today.

In addition, I had questioned the staff about its report incidentally, I was amazed to find that the staff, which accused others of being evasive in answering questions, was itself remarkably uncommunicative.

Mr. Speaker, since the issuance of that charter has been called into question, there certainly ought to be an investigation by our committee. If there are irregularities, changes in the law, or perhaps indictments, should follow. If the issuance of the charter was within the rules, each one of the people who have been tried in the press because of the staff report should be cleared.

Mr. Speaker, it is also reasonable for our committee to assume oversight obligations concerning the Bank Secrecy Act and transfers of foreign funds, or other funds through foreign banks, into the election processes of this country. Apparently the chairman did not want to conduct this kind of investigation. He apparently wanted to witch hunt against a single candidate. Therefore, a resolution was proposed to subpena everybody in sight, including all of the telephone companies in the country and a half-dozen buildings.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is a matter of concern to the whole House when any Members are ignored when they wish to speak in committee on matters that pertain to their own districts. This kind of absolute authoritarianism exercised by the chairman is exactly the reason that the seniority system has come into such disrepute in the minds of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to get the time or consideration that is provided to senior, experienced, and wiser Members of this body. However, I believe I should be allowed, as a matter of common courtesy, to make comments on events and conditions that are being referred to within my own district.

Mr. Speaker, these are strong words, but my feelings are strong. The conduct of the committee today is sowing seeds that will be reaped by future Congresses. If we do not change, we will be changed. The primary change required here is a rule to allow a majority of the committee to control the committee's actions, rather than continuing the current practice—autocratic and arbitrary one-man rule.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 6, 1972]

CONGRESS SHOULD INVESTIGATE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on the day before yesterday the House Banking and Currency Committee defeated an investigation resolution containing subpena powers considered by most members of the committee as being far too broad in extent, too political in nature, and too prejudicial to the personal rights of accused persons.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 3 the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) indicated that he would like to begin an investigation with his subcommittee just as soon as possible. As a member of that subcommittee, I would second the gentleman from Texas' request and have written to him with a copy of my letter to the chairman, suggesting that at least two subcommittees be activated to continue the investigations which the chairman thought were so important the day before yesterday.

Today the chairman has written to Judge Sirica in an apparent effort to legitimize his enthusiasm for unrestricted investigation. Meanwhile time which could be used for investigation of the alleged irregularities is wasting. We do not need subpena powers or statements from judges to investigate bank charters. We should be investigating now.

Without the ability to concentrate the investigation on a single candidate, the chairman seems unwilling to exercise the oversight obligations of the committee with respect to questions raised in his staff report. The attitude now seems to be if it cannot be done in an unfair and unreasonable way, it would not be done at all.

My letter to Mr. GONZALEZ and the chairman's letter to Judge Sirica follow:

OCTOBER 4, 1972.

Hon. HENRY GONZALEZ,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Finance.

DEAR HENRY: I noticed your remarks in the Congressional Record of October 3 relative to the vote in the Banking and Currency Committee regarding investigation of possible violations of various banking laws and irregularities in the granting of bank charters.

While I do not subscribe to all of your statements, I do very strongly endorse your desire to have our Subcommittee proceed with an investigation which would include all possible violations rather than center on one particular campaign. I will be pleased to work with you in any way on whatever investigation you are able to initiate, and I feel that we could have a couple of meetings to provide at least a basis for further work without a need to issue subpoenas, etc. I call your attention to my remarks on page 33529 in the Record of October 3, and feel strongly that we should proceed with the investigation just as soon as possible.

By copy of this letter I am requesting the Chairman to activate not only your Committee to look into the possible use of foreign banks and contributions but also that he activate the appropriate subcommittee to look into the questions which he and his staff have raised about possible irregularities in the granting of a charter to the Ridgedale National Bank in the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, in my district.

My statement in the Record was subjected to much editing from its original version. I haven't been quite so upset about a procedure in a long time. This Committee and its Chairman can very well conduct an investigation on the issuance of that bank charter without subpoena power. I expect to continue to bring this matter to the attention of the public at every possible opportunity.

Thanks for your interest in these important matters.

Best regards,

BILL FRENZEL,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 5, 1972.

Hon. JOHN J. SIRICA,
Chief Judge, U.S. District Court, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDGE SIRICA: As a Member of Congress and as Chairman of a standing Committee of the House of Representatives, I am deeply concerned about press reports which indicate that you have issued an order prohibiting anyone connected in any way with the Watergate case from making statements to anyone outside of your court. I am further disturbed by a quotation which is attributed to you in this morning's *Washington Post:*

"I tried to make it (the order) as broad as I could."

It is my understanding that the seven defendants before you are charged with conspiracy; interception of oral and written communications; second degree burglary; and unlawful possession of intercepting devices.

As I am sure you are aware, there are many aspects of the incidents which relate to what has become popularly known as the "Watergate Caper" which do not involve the relatively narrow set of charges brought against these seven defendants. A great number of these aspects touch on matters which are * * * Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

I trust that it was not the intent of your order to in any way, hinder the Congress, its duly designated Committees, or any of its Members from pursuing proper legislative functions. If your order is broadly interpreted, it appears likely that persons who have information essential to these legislative functions will be inhibited from discussing issues wth Members of Congress, their staffs, and investigating arms of the Legislative Branch.

While there is no desire to interfere with your Court or to impair the rights of any defendants before your Court, the Constitution requires the Congress to carry out its responsibilities. I do not feel it would be proper, under the Constitution, for the Congress to abandon these responsibilities simply because indictments have been brought in one narrow area of the complex and far-ranging incidents that have been lumped under the phrase, "Watergate Caper."

Unless I am misreading the indictment, the extensive banking issues are not mentioned and comments emanating from the Justice Department indicate that there is no immediate prospect that any of these issues will be raised before a grand jury.

Again let me emphasize that I have no question about the rights and responsibilities of the Congress to proceed on its separate course. But what I am concerned about is the interpretation which prospective Congressional witnesses might place on your order and for this reason, I feel that it is very important—important to the proper carrying out of the Congressional function—for you to make it clear that your order extends only to the charges which are raised in the indictments and not to other issues.

Unless this is done, I am convinced that irreparable damage may well occur to the integrity of the banking system, the integrity of the political process, and the very integrity of our Federal Government.

For example, Judge Sirica, one of the issues about which I am deeply concerned relates to the granting of a bank charter at Minnetonka, Minnesota. There have been public inferences that a $25,000 political contribution may have contributed to a decision to grant this charter. It is fact that this $25,000 was later found in the bank account of one of the suspects in the Watergate case.

This charter must still obtain approval from another Governmental agency—the Federal Reserve Board—and the facts surrounding this political contribution and other elements in the granting of this bank charter should be known before any final steps are taken and the bank is allowed to open under the auspices of the current applicants. If these facts cannot be determined and final approval to the application is granted, it is conceivable that irreparable harm will occur to competing banking interests in Minnesota and to the integrity of the banking system and the bank regulatory agencies.

If your order is broadly interpreted, it may well be that the witnesses who hopefully will come forward with the details of this bank charter will be inhibited and will decline to provide the Congress and the appropriate regulatory agencies with essential information. I feel confident that you do not want your order to be interpreted by anyone as interfering with the investigation of this bank charter or any of the witness who might come forward and present information to the Congress on this issue.

Also, this Committee, and the Congress, are deeply concerned with questions involving the transfer of money across international borders, particularly as these transactions affect the domestic banking system and contribute to the furtherance of criminal activities. This is an ongoing concern and, once again, I trust that your order was not intended to interfere with the right of the Congress to investigate such matters and to determine whether laws and regulations are being properly followed by commercial banks and the appropriate Federal agencies.

The movement of campaign contributions in this country and in foreign countries affects many areas of the Banking and Currency Committee's jurisdiction and specifically its oversight functions, as assigned it by the House of Representatives, and once again I trust that your order is not intended to interfere with these responsibiilties of this Legislative Branch.

It is common knowledge that newspapers have carried extensive reports of the destruction of certain records which might bear on these jurisdictions of this Committee and the Congress and it is reasonable to assume that there are dangers that other documents will be destroyed, damaging the ability of the Congress to carry out its legislative function in these areas. It is also common knowledge that political committees dissolve immediately after an election and that the personnel who would have pertinent information will scatter after the campaign making it difficult, if not impossible, for the necessary information to be gathered for the Congress to perform its proper functions. Thus, it is important that the Congress and its various investigating arms, be able to move forward immediately and not await the outcome of other developments at some unspecified time in the future, particularly when these developments are essentially unrelated to the issues before the Congress.

In discussing this case, we might as well face the practical situation as it actually exists. It is a fact that the Justice Department is an arm of the Administration about which most of this investigation centers. It is a fact that the futures of the high officials of the Justice Department are dependent upon political events and there is nothing to be gained by pretending that this situation does not exist. The Justice Department has, in recent days, attempted to intervene in matters before the Banking and Currency Committee and has attempted to use issues which are before your Court as an excuse to block and to encourage others to block proper legislative investigations. This heightens the probable damage from a broad interpretation of your order and it heightens the need for you to limit your order to those very specific charges in the indictments and not allow your order to be used for broader political purposes.

I have looked at this entire situation very carefully and I am firmly convinced that there is no reason why the Congress and the Judicial Branch cannot carry out their functions and responsibilities concurrently without damage to anyone in this case.

It is anticipated that voluntary witnesses will be appearing in public sessions of the Committee in the immediate future and, therefore, it is of the utmost importance that we have your reply to the questions I raise in this letter at the earliest possible moment. I hope you will find it convenient to supply this answer.

With best regards, I am.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 13, 1972]

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, during the last 8 weeks, the Banking and Currency Committee has been conducting an interesting series of investigations, meetings, and press conferences occasionally concerning its own oversight jurisdiction in the field of banking, but always directed at the political impact of the Watergate incident.

These adventures may, or may not, have culminated yesterday in two sessions, both lacking a quorum of Congressmen, but with nearly perfect attendance by the press. Since the afternoon session took place during debate on the revenue sharing bill, I did not attend.

On October 3 the committee defeated 20 to 15 a motion by Congressman REUSS to grant to the committee extensive subpena powers, which, in the judgment of most committee members, could have prejudiced the rights of those persons under criminal indictment in connection with the Watergate affair.

No one condones the incident. It is a scandalous affair, and another symptom of the sickness of our society, which now seems to place high monetary value, or other high values, on information gained by illegal means. Those responsible, at any and all levels, should be indicted, and if guilty, convicted. The criminal investigation should be thorough and wide ranging—but the criminal aspects of the case should be left to the Justice system until the guilt or innocence of the accused parties has been proved.

There are two edges to the sword. Undue publicity can free those already convicted and proved guilty, as demonstrated by the Delaney case; or, worse, it can imply guilt for those who may be innocent.

The worst aspect of the Banking Committee caper—a 2-month caper by now—is that during this extensive period the committee could have carried out its jurisdictional responsibilities by conducting hearings on the bank charter in question and on the transfers from foreign banks.

In a short phrase, the committee blew it. It allowed itself to be seduced from its responsibilities by the sweet smell of political gain. The chairman's political circus had to take priority over solid committee work. And so the Congress failed in its responsibilities.

There is an especially interesting contrast in the other body. There, Senator KENNEDY, who according to the New York Times article on page 18, October 13, is "under pressure" from GEORGE MCGOVERN and Larry O'Brien "to conduct an inquiry into the Watergate affair," said, as reported on an AP wire of September 30, that he does not plan to hold hearings on the Watergate affair. The same wire quotes him as saying:

"This is a criminal indictment, and we must be sensitive to the fact that any adverse publicity might impinge on a fair trial."

I am particular concerned because a bank charter, issued for the Ridgedale National Bank in Minnetonka, Minn., within my district, was questioned by the chairman of the committee. His statements and reports said the charter was issued "in an unusually rapid time" and that there was a deviation from normal practices. Yesterday he referred to it as a "quickie bank charter."

I take no position on the issuance of that charter, except that for 2 months the per-

son to whom it was granted has been tried in the press by the chairman's allegations, which, up until now, have been unbacked by evidence. I have begged the chairman to hold a hearing to determine whether he can prove his allegations.

The Comptroller of the Currency, a Johnson appointee, takes the opposite point of view. He says the charter was normal and not unusual, and he offered to present additional information to the committee. Apparently the chairman thought the facts might interfere with the politics of the situation, because the Comptroller was never asked for more information, nor was he asked to appear before the committee.

The Comptroller's letter to Chairman PATMAN follows:

THE ADMINISTRATOR OF NATIONAL BANKS,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1972.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: This is in further reference to your letter of September 5, 1972, wherein you requested information concerning applications for new national banks within the past five years.

There is enclosed a tabulation showing all bank applications since January 1, 1967, which contains the date each application was accepted, the decision rendered with respect to such application, whether or not a hearing was conducted, the date the charter was issued, the location of the proposed new bank and the names of the applicants appearing on the application.

The attached tabulation does not include applications for new national banks which were organized in connection with corporate reorganizations as they relate to holding company banks. There have been 244 corporate reorganization applications during the past five years.

The attached list of all applications processed by this office during the past five years reflects 424 cases. The tabulation shows that the processing period on new bank applications varies substantially from case to case. This is due to many factors. For instance, applicants are normally given 30 days after the application is accepted for filing to prepare supportive material to present to the investigating examiner. The examiner must work out a mutually agreeable time to meet with the applicants and proposed directors for the purpose of reviewing all banking, economic, personal and other data in connection with the application. On occasion the applicants file additional data to the application which must be evaluated. In many instances additional individuals are added as organizers and proposed directors. Evaluating new information, of course, lengthens the processing period. The investigating examiner is then required to interview a good cross-section of people representing the business, civic and consumer life of the community in order to determine their views as to the need for a bank. It should be noted that the examiners who conduct the regular examinations of banks also conduct the field investigations. The scheduling of these field investigations are therefore sometimes delayed in view of the work loads in the respective regions. As a matter of procedure we do not disrupt the examiner's schedule to conduct field investigations for new bank applications. All of these features present many variables as to the time taken in processing new bank applications.

In addition, the processing time is sometimes substantially affected if a request is received for a public hearing. If a request is received from any party in interest, this office grants a public hearing on new bank applications.

You will note that there were 50 applications on which decisions were rendered in a period of less than 100 days. The processing time on these applications ranged from 49 days to 99 days. There follows a list of days required to date of decision:

	Days
Heflin, Alabama	90
Chatom, Alabama	71
Selma, Alabama	99
Ventura, California	99
Arcadia, California	65
Santa Rosa, California	84
Gilroy, California	94
Longmont, Colorado	84
Winter Park, Florida	86
Dade County, Florida	71
Deerfield Beach, Florida	82
Sarasota, Florida	87
Palm Spring, Florida	74
Dade County, Florida	89
North Miami Beach, Florida	89
Plantation, Florida	69
Orlando, Florida	95
Fort Myers, Florida	98
Brandon, Florida	98
Miami, Florida	84
Pinellas Park, Florida	72
Hillsboro Co., Florida	97
Loves Park, Illinois	78
Oak Brook, Illinois	98
Mandeville Parish, Louisiana	61
Kentwood, Louisiana	77
Wellesley, Massachusetts	98
Portage, Michigan	49
Oak Park, Minnesota	92
Olivia, Minnesota	90
Minneapolis, Minnesota	93
Minnetonka, Minnesota	86
Corinth, Mississippi	84
Mt. Laurel, New Jersey	85
Pennsville, New Jersey	91
Melville, New York	49
York, Pennsylvania	60
Pasadena, Texas	78
Tomball, Texas	78
Pharr, Texas	84
Austin, Texas	57
Ft. Worth, Texas	71
Richfield, Utah	99
Kennewick, Washington	97
Chester, West Virginia	67
Huntington, West Virginia	94
New Berlin, Wisconsin	69
Hales Corner, Wisconsin	74
Monona, Wisconsin	97
Sheridan, Wyoming	89

There were 79 applications processed in 100 days to 130 days. In summary, 30.3% of all applications handled by this office were processed within a period of 130 days.

All of this means that the processing time on new bank applications will vary widely from case to case and from region to region throughout the country.

Formal hearings were held on 152 cases representing 35.9% of all cases processed. These formal hearings are conducted whenever requested and a transcript is made by a court reporter.

The above data shows clearly that there was absolutely nothing unusual about the processing of the Minnetonka application. Far from being hasty or unusual, as apparently characterized by your well-publicized staff report, of which we have not been furnished a copy, the record shows the usual routine of filing, investigation and office processing. We cannot understand how any fair-minded person could conclude that the subject applicant got a federal bank charter faster than most people do. The fact that the location of the proposed bank was in a large shopping center complex to occupy approximately 1,100,000 square feet of retail space, was not a reason to delay processing. Quite the contrary, normal business and lease requirements demand that final commitments must be made well in advance of construction and completion of such a large project.

As you will know, there is nothing secret about the filing or processing of new bank applications. This office publishes a complete summary of actions each month. In addition, all applications for national bank charters are required to be published in a paper of general circulation in the area where the bank would be located. This publication includes the names of applicants, the proposed location and the proposed capital structure. Specific notice is also sent to the State Banking Supervisor and to competitor banks.

Over the years all of us have heard criticism of Government agencies, for failure to respond timely to requests from citizens generally. It seems strange to me that the Comptroller's office now would be criticized for endeavoring to process an application before this office on a timely basis.

If there is any further information you require on this matter, we shall be glad to cooperate.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. CAMP,
Comptroller of the Currency.

The other banking aspect of the case, foreign bank transactions, could also have been investigated by the Committee. The chairman of our International Finance Subcommittee said yesterday that he has tried to get the committee to investigate this aspect since 1966. On October 3 he reported in the RECORD that he had asked the chairman that his subcommittee be allowed to investigate this aspect of the Watergate incident or of other campaigns. I joined in his request. Yesterday, I challenged the chairman on this authority, got no response, and I believe that the authority has not yet, nor will be, granted.

Many Members will be queried on this subject during the campaign. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting now my remarks made yesterday during the quorumless morning meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee.

STATEMENT BY MR. FRENZEL ON OCTOBER 12, 1972, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Chairman, because you refused to recognize me during the Committee hearing of October 3, I have prepared a lengthy statement, for which I request time now. I request unanimous consent that this statement be put in the record.

During the last week in August I received several phone calls from local bankers that the staff of this Committee was making phone calls and asking for information relating to the charter recently granted to the Ridgedale National Bank in Minnetonka. As the questions were explained to me, they were couched in such a way as to encourage the local bankers, most of whom had protested the issuance of that charter within their trade area, to indicate that the charter had been issued hastily.

Bankers also asked me what kind of investigation our Committee was carrying on. Since there had been no information from you or the staff that an investigation was in process, I could only advise them that I was unaware of such activities. When I returned after Labor Day to the Congress, I saw in the newspapers that you were investigating the Watergate incident. During the hearings on the Housing Bill, one of our Committee's notable failures, I talked to the staff member who had been identified to me as one of the callers into my district. He admitted to making the telephone calls and indicated that he was not looking for anything special except some comment from the local bankers.

During that week, following a point of personal privileges requested by Congressman Brown on the same subject, I asked for the same privilege. I asked you during

one of our housing meetings what the scope of the investigation was, why the Committee could not be involved and why I could not be involved as to the nature of the investigation. You benignly smiled my request into oblivion and made no reply.

After that meeting I talked to you briefly and explained the local nature of the problem. The location of the charter is within my district, but I did not know of the application, nor of the granting of the charter until I read it in the newspapers. The individuals who were granted the charter, or at least some of them, are constituents; and some have been contributors to various of my political campaigns. At that time you gave me no further explanation of the investigation but told me that you would release a confidential report to committee members when it was completed.

Your next action was to release a confidential memo dated September 12 which I heard read on television by Jack Anderson the evening before it was delivered to my office. I note that across the face of the report was written the word "confidential".

In that "confidential" report, on Page 5, you, or your staff, wrote:

"In the midst of the investigations of the Watergate incident, at least two major newspapers reported that the contributor of one of the sums in question—the $25,000—had received a bank charter on August 22—just 88 days after the application was filed with the Comptroller of the Currency. The $25,000 is now an integral part of the campaign law violations reported by the GAO to the Justice Department and this is a portion of the money which went into the bank account of Bernard Barker, a suspect in the Watergate case.

"A preliminary investigation indicates that the bank charter was granted in an unusually rapid time—88 days—particularly considering the fact that the shopping center in which the bank is to be located has not been constructed and apparently the bank could not be ready for banking operations until 1974 or 1975. In addition, a preliminary investigation has indicated that the Comptroller of the Currency may have deviated from the normal practices in the procedures leading up to the granting of the charter. There seems no question of the Committee's jurisdiction over the activities of the Comptroller and the granting of national bank charters."

After the release of the confidential memo, both to the press and to the Committee, I again spoke to you indicating that an investigation was in order since the bank charter issued in my district had been questioned in your report. Your report indicated that the charter was received "in an unusually rapid time" and that there was a deviation from normal practices.

In your later press release of October 3, which is headed "Opening Statement of Chairman Wright Patman", you also refer to the phrase "unusual practices" in connection with this bank charter and of the men in the group to whom the charter was issued, Dwayne Andreas and Kenneth Dahlberg.

On September 5 you had written to the Comptroller of the Currency requesting information concerning applications for new national banks. On September 28 Mr. Camp, who I understand is an LBJ appointee, responded to you. On Page 3 of his letter to you was the following paragraph;

"The above data shows clearly that there was absolutely nothing unusual about the processing of the Minnetonka application. Far from being hasty or unusual, as apparently characterized by your well-publicized staff report, of which we have not been furnished a copy, the record shows the usual routine of filing, investigation and office processing. We cannot understand how any fair-minded person could conclude that the subject applicant got a federal bank charter faster than most people do. The fact that the location of the proposed bank was in a large shopping center complex to occupy approximately 1,100,000 square feet of retail space, was not a reason to delay processing. Quite the contrary, normal business and lease requirements demand that final commitments must be made well in advance of construction and completion of such a large project."

Perhaps of greater importance than the Comptroller's statement that there were no irregularities in connection with the charter was his offer to volunteer further information. It is of special interest to me that you were not interested in further information on this matter at all. I have asked the question a number of times in the pages of the Congressional Record why this Committee and its Chairman have not been willing to investigate those materials which lie within its jurisdiction. A simple calling of the Comptroller of the Currency before this Committee would, I believe, go a long way toward clearing up questions raised on the bank charter. Somehow since the 28th of September you haven't been able to squeeze enough time in to ask the Comptroller to come here and make his explanation.

I don't know whether there were "unusual procedures" in connection with the Minnetonka charter or not. At this time it seems to be your allegation against a letter from the Comptroller of the Currency. Based on the record to date, that makes it an easy choice. However, I believe that further investigation is warranted. I believe that the persons who were granted the charter have stood accused by you in the press. Whether their charter had any irregularities deserves a hearing. We should get the Comptroller in here to see if your staff or you can prove that his statements are wrong. If you can't, there should be a public apology by you and your staff. If you can, then there ought to be legislation, or indictments.

I only ask that your allegations stand or fall on their own merits. No subpoenas are needed. The Comptroller's letter indicates his willingness to appear here. If you need his secretary or his file cabinets, I am sure that their appearances can be arranged as well. Because of your failure to ask for such testimony, I am led to the conclusion that you are afraid to ask him to come in because it would spoil the political nature of these hearings.

On October 3 you called this Committee into session for a meeting on the Watergate incident. The meeting was open to the public, a procedure I applaud.

Although you had indicated that there was to be a Committee meeting, the procedure was run as a press conference for yourself. You ignored points of order. You refused to answer parliamentary inquires. You refused to accept preferential motions, especially made by the Ranking Minority Member. The "gag-rule" procedures of that meeting again led me to the conclusion that whatever it is you do want to do, there is no intention to hold an investigation of matters within the jurisdiction of our banking duties.

In the Congressional Record of October 10 on page 9385, you are quoted as making the following statement:

"Another reason why I resent the bill is that it comes to the floor under a double gag rule. One gag rule is bad enough, but here in this rule no Member has permission to strike out the last word and speak for 5 minutes. There are only four amendments, and the rule provides 5 minutes to the side on each amendment. With these four amendments then the show is over and the gag rule prevails. I do not believe that is right. I think that is taking advantage of the Members."

In addition to this statement, I have heard you previously on the floor accuse the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of denying Members a chance to amend bills or to speak on bills, indicating that it was an important point of principle to you. If there ever was a case of the pot calling the kettle black, your statement in the Record must be such a case. This Committee's performance on October 3 was the worst case of gag rule that I have witnessed in my short time in Congress.

On October 3, the same day, Mr. Gonzalez wrote in the Record that he had requested authority to investigate certain foreign banking transactions through his subcommittee. On the following day I wrote him indicating my endorsement of your suggestion, with a copy to you, also asking that another subcommittee be authorized to investigate the Minnetonka charter. Mr. Gonzalez responded on the 6th that you had given him no authority for such an investigation as yet. I'll bet that today, 6 days later, he still does not have the authority.

On my return to Washington on October 10, after a weekend of campaigning, I find that you had held another press conference and announced that you were calling another Committee meeting with witnesses from the Committee to Re-elect the President. If such a meeting were to take place today, it would, of course, be out of order under the rules because of insufficient notice. You invited people to testify today who undoubtedly cannot appear. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, some of us, namely a few Members of this Committee, feel an obligation to be here, but I do not want the public to think that by my presence here I am condoning any of your personal political press conferences carried on under the guise of Committee meetings.

This whole series of episodes began on August 17, according to your "confidential" staff report. It is now October 12 and nothing has happened except that you have regularly appeared on TV, and on the front pages of some of the printed media, notably the local ones. Other than information already revealed in the Watergate cases pending in the courts, you and your staff in all of your press releases and interviews and conferences have brought forth little but allegations. On my calendar, that's almost two months. Seldom during that period have you discussed the banking problems. You have always centered your attention on the political figures. While you could settle the bank charter question with calling of voluntary witnesses, and at least begin to build a basis for the investigation of foreign bank transactions, not only in this election but in many elections, as has been suggested by Mr. Gonzalez, there has been no real effort to investigate these banking matters.

The whole attention of your series of press conferences and the direction of this Committee (because you have not allowed other Members to be recognized) has been politically aimed at the criminal aspects of the Watergate affair, which are pending in a court of justice.

With respect to this question, I think that the statements of the Gentleman from New York, Mr. Brasco, at our meeting of October 3 are well taken. They coincide very closely with the remarks of Senator Edward Kennedy, reported in the Associated Press wire of September 30 of this year. On that wire Kennedy is identified as one of the few Senators in a position to hold hearings on the Watergate affair. He is quoted as follows: "This is a criminal indictment, and we must be sensitive to the fact that any adverse publicity might impinge on a fair trial. So far as I am aware, the Senate has not felt a need to get into the criminal aspects of this case with the same enthusiasm as the Chairman of this Committee has.

Although I have restated this proposition many times, I do so again. This Committee

has an obligation to investigate banking matters. It has miserably failed in that obligation. It has no obligation, and, in fact, no authority, to investigate the criminal aspects of the break-in.

We could have made an investigation. We could have identified irregularities or exonerated the people who stand accused in the public press by you. Instead we have had only bright lights and front page stories.

Mr. Chairman, this Committee has had a wonderful record during the last two years. During 1971 we spent more time on your Bank Reform Act than on any other single piece of legislation, but after a couple of months and some nice TV coverage, we never brought it to a vote. This year we hurriedly called up a redundant sewer and water bill which was decisively rejected on the House floor. Recently we put in about three months struggling with a Housing Bill which passed this Committee by a significant majority but which perished in the Rules Committee. I am informed that you exerted no influence to pass it.

With a record like that, it seems highly unlikely that this Committee is going to be able to conduct any significant business between now and Saturday, when the Congress adjourns. Our own record, coupled with your obvious lack of enthusiasm to conduct fair and reasonable investigations, is extremely disappointing.

Mr. Chairman, the way this Committee has been run, as a private vehicle for your own publicity, with little regard for the public interest, with no regard for other Members or for House and Committee rules and with little record of effectiveness (except some bills which were proposed by the Administration), I personally would not vote to give you any kind of powers whatsoever. I hope that the criminal cases pending on the Watergate will bring forth the information that is needed and that this Committee next year will show the courage that is necessary to conduct the real investigations which we should have done this fall.

MAY 10, 1973.

Hon. HENRY GONZALEZ,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Finance, Committee on Banking and Currency, Rayburn Building.

DEAR HENRY: Last year when our Committee was involved in Watergate activities, you and I discussed the subject of your Subcommittee looking into the foreign bank transactions of the suspect political contribution.

My notes indicate that on October 3 of 1972, you put some material in the Record that you had requested authority to investigate foreign banking transactions in your Subcommittee. I believe I wrote you on the following day, with a copy to Chairman Patman, endorsing your suggestion. I believe you responded on October 5 indicating that the Chairman had not given you authority for such an investigation.

I think that now is an excellent time for our Subcommittee to look into the role of foreign banks as "laundries" for political contributions. Perhaps you would want to expand the investigation, and I have no particular objection, although my principal interest is in political contributions made through foreign banks.

I hope you will again ask our Chairman for authority to go ahead with this kind of investigation. In my opinion there is a lot of talk on Watergate but not near enough action. Let's let our Committee be one of the first with positive actions and legislative recommendations that might prevent in the future some of those actions which have shocked us in the past.

Thanks for your consideration of this request.

Best regards,

BILL FRENZEL,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 14, 1973.

Hon. BILL FRENZEL,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I am delighted to know of your interest in having the Subcommittee on International Finance look into foreign bank transactions involved in last year's political campaign.

I believe that for such an investigation to be effective, we would have to have subpoena powers. Last year, when the full Committee sought such powers, the majority opposed the necessary resolution. In light of that, I can only wonder what sort of support the Subcommittee would have if it were to seek authority to carry out the investigation you and I both would like to see.

I feel that we could not be effective without full Committee support, which I would be glad to ask for and will do so after I have an opportunity to discuss this with the Chairman.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ, M.C.

MAY 16, 1973.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Finance, Committee on Banking and Currency, Rayburn Building.

DEAR HENRY: Thank you for your letter of May 14. As you know, I am not thrilled about giving broad subpoena powers to congressional committees. If the Subcommittee is activated for the purpose of making this investigation, and if the Subcommittee establishes some reasonable list of people who might be invited and eventually subpoenaed, I don't mind voting for specific subpoena powers.

I think this is something that we might discuss informally in the Subcommittee to see if we can reach agreement on which parties you might want to subpoena. My position is that I am happy to let Senator Ervin make the headlines as long as our Committee can find out something about money movements during elections through foreign banks.

Best regards,

BILL FRENZEL,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 29, 1973.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: Thank you very much for sending me copies of your recent correspondence with our Colleague, Bill Frenzel of Minnesota, in reference to the Watergate case which this Committee considered last Fall.

As you know from our discussions of last year, it is necessary for the full Committee to vote an investigation and to authorize subpoena powers. Recent court decisions have made it clear that the subpoena power must rest with the full Committee and not with individual Members or Subcommittees. Therefore, to have a full-scale investigation of the use of foreign bank accounts or any other aspects of the Watergate case would require a vote of the full Committee.

You were a strong supporter of this subpoena power last October and as you recall, Mr. Frenzel and the other Republicans voted as a solid block against such an investigation. The subpoena list submitted to the Committee at this time covered persons involved in the transfer of funds in Mexico and it is highly regrettable that we did not pursue this case at that time when witnesses were readily available and when the trails were particularly fresh. Such an investigation at that time would, in my opinion, have saved this nation much grief and would have developed the facts fully and would have undoubtedly prevented many of the sordid events which have occurred since our investigation was blocked.

As you know, both Senator Sam Ervin and Senator Stuart Symington are working on various aspects of this case and have developed information relating to the money transferred in Mexico. In addition, a grand jury has been convened in Houston to look into the transaction and it is presumed that this panel will be reporting soon. Also, Judge Sirica, here in the District of Columbia, is apparently in possession of certain documents relating to these matters and the grand jury in this jurisdiction may also be dealing with some aspects of this transfer of funds.

Despite all of these ongoing investigations and prosecutions, the fact remains that this Committee does have important jurisdiction over various aspects of the Watergate case, particularly where it involves the utilization of foreign and domestic banking institutions to facilitate and conceal the transfer of campaign monies. There remain other parts of the case which also bear on the jurisdiction of the Committee. These various aspects appear to cross a variety of Subcommittee lines and because of the extreme importance of the case and its delicate nature in relation to other investigations, we must proceed carefully.

Despite the fact that the formal investigation and subpoena power were blocked by the unfortunate vote in the Committee last October, the staff did gather a great deal of pertinent information on several areas of the Watergate case. This material has stood up well under the test of time and appears to be corroborated by the various revelations which have come to light since.

With your correspondence in mind and the interest which has been indicated by a number of Members of the Committee, I have instructed the staff to closely monitor the various investigations being carried out in the Congress and the Judicial Branch. At the appropriate time, I have asked the staff to be prepared to submit a memorandum on any areas which may not have been covered by these other investigations and which appear to be likely areas for this Committee to pursue in more detail. At this time, I would hesitate to duplicate the work of other Committees or grand jury investigations, but it is only proper that we remain prepared to pick up whatever areas could be beneficially explored.

If and when it does become apparent that the public interest would be served by a separate inquiry by the Banking and Currency Committee, I would like to sit down and discuss this matter with you and the other Subcommittee Chairmen and other Members of the Committee who have indicated a special interest in the Watergate affair.

I hope you will keep me informed of any information which comes to your attention on these cases and I hope you will forward any suggestions you may have for possible future steps by the Committee. Your assistance and support were extremely important to the limited efforts which we were able to make last Fall and I would certainly want your cooperation, ideas, and help in any future steps we might undertake on Watergate.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 1, 1973.

Hon. BILL FRENZEL,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: This refers to our correspondence on the possibility of a Subcommittee

investigation into the foreign bank operations as related to the election scandals of 1972. I enclose herewith for your information, a copy of a letter from Chairman Patman on the subject.

I have not heard anything further from you with respect to your interest in the Peruvian expropriation of fishmeal industries, some of which are headquartered in your District.

I hope that the Administration is pursuing this matter vigorously and trust you will let me know if I can be of any assistance in this matter.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ, M.C.

JUNE 5, 1973.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Rayburn Building.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PATMAN: Chairman Gonzalez of the International Finance Subcommittee has sent me a copy of your letter to him of May 29 referring, among other things, to the staff work done last fall on the Watergate matter and your instructions to the staff "to closely monitor the various investigations being carried out . . .".

I am glad that the Committee staff has been directed to monitor the case, but I don't see why Chairman Gonzalez' Subcommittee might not go ahead to look into the foreign banking matter. Nor do I see why another subcommittee or the full Committee could not have investigated the bank charter situation.

One of the aspects of our Committee's investigation last year that was a matter of concern to me was the fact that all of the Members of the Committee were not appraised of the staff investigations at the time. You will recall that I was particularly concerned about staff investigations within my district about which I had neither prior nor subsequent information.

Might I respectfully request a peak at staff files on Watergate at this time? As a Member of the Committee I would find it instructive to see what our staff has done on this matter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

BILL FRENZEL,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 28, 1973.*

Hon. BILL FRENZEL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRENZEL: Thank you very much for your letter concerning the foreign banking matters involved in the financing of the President's re-election campaign and I am happy that Mr. Gonzalez furnished you with a copy of my letter on this subject.

In regard to the staff work, I know you have received the two reports which were issued on September 12, 1972 and October 31, 1972 which go into these matters in some detail. Since that time, I have also written the Attorney General and on January 11 of this year, Assistant Attorney General Henry Petersen replied with comments on various aspects of the two reports issued in the Committee. I am enclosing a copy of my original letter to the Attorney General and Mr. Petersen's reply.

As I noted in the letter to Mr. Gonzalez, the staff is watching the hearings and other developments in the case. They are doing this through the public media which is covering the case in great detail as you are aware. In addition, we are requesting copies of transcripts in areas which touch directly on financial matters such as the testimony of Mr. Stans and Mr. Sloan. Also, you are aware that the grand jury is still in session in Houston on the question of the money which traveled to Mexico and was returned to the United States. I assume that the grand jury investigation will give us a good indication of what might remain for the Committee to consider in this area.

While I deeply regret that we did not pursue all of these issues in a more timely fashion last Fall, I do not feel that we should do anything at this moment which might interfere or appear to interfere with the Ervin Committee and/or other ongoing investigations. With all of the difficulties which have been faced in reaching the facts, I would hate for this Committee to be in the position of creating new problems for other investigative efforts. The situation we face today is much different than that of last August, September and October, when we sought to open a full-scale investigation. Now we have a full-scale Congressional investigation underway and an independent prosecutor on the scene and grand juries looking at the issue in the broadest possible terms in contrast to the very narrow approach which was followed by the Justice Department last Fall. However, I am of the very strong belief that all of these facts must be uncovered, and should the Ervin Committee and the grand jury investigation fail to develop the information I would want to present the issue to this Committee again in hopes that many of you would reverse your earlier vote and support the inquiry.

With very best regards, I am

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN, *Chairman.*

WASHINGTON, D.C., *December 15, 1972.*

Hon. RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
The Attorney General, The Justice Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: As you know, a multitude of issues have been raised concerning the Watergate bugging incident and various campaign fundraising activities over the past months. Only part of these issues are included in an indictment returned against seven persons in the District of Columbia on September 15.

You are aware that this Committee has conducted some preliminary inquiries into the financial aspects and related matters involving the Watergate incident and fundraising activities of the Finance Committee to Re-Elect the President. Two staff studies based on these investigations were released on September 12 and October 31 and I am enclosing copies of these documents. Other serious issues, of course, have been raised by respected newsmen, writing for various publications.

As I mentioned on several occasions during the fall, I feel that these allegations touch the very heart of our system of government and I feel strongly that there is a need to clear up the situation fully so that public confidence may be maintained in our political process. It would seem appropriate for you, as the chief law enforcement officer, to see that all of these allegations are fully investigated and prosecutions initiated where required.

At this point, both the Congress and the public are largely in the dark about what your department has and has not done in the case, and this continuing secrecy and the appearance of inaction can only lead to a severe deterioration of confidence in law enforcement.

It is obvious from the indictment that has been returned and the comments of the Assistant United States Attorney, Earl Silbert, that many of these questions will be left unanswered in the coming criminal trial of the Watergate Seven. For example, I note that Mr. Silbert stated in court that he would trace only partially the campaign funds which travelled in Mexico and back into the United States and into the Finance Committee to Re-Elect the President and the account of Bernard Barker, one of the defendants in the watergate case. From press accounts of his statements, Mr. Silbert indicated that he would "not necessarily" trace the money from its source.

While I am in no position to question the manner in which Mr. Silbert is handling the case, it is obvious this would leave unanswered whether or not the contribution was legal under the various statutes affecting campaign financing.

This Committee is vitally concerned with the manner in which both the international and domestic banking systems were utilized to conceal campaign funds or to facilitate the commission of illegal acts. It is my hope that your investigators will be able to furnish a full report on all the questions raised in this area and, once again, I refer you back to the reports issued by the Banking and Currency Committee in September and October.

It is important, Mr. Kleindienst, that we have some early knowledge of what your Department plans to do on these issues. We are now trying to map out an agenda for what appears to be a very busy first session of the 93rd Congress. Faced with this busy schedule, and the need to renew a number of basic legislative authorities during the first half of 1973, it is not my desire to duplicate any inquiries which your Department or other Committees of Congress might be undertaking. So it is important that you give me some kind of idea of the scope of your immediate investigative efforts in order that our Committee will be in a position to judge what, if any, further action it should take in this case.

Recently, some Members of the Committee, including those on the minority side, have indicated that they feel the Committee should make a new effort in the Watergate case in the next Congress. However, I feel that these Members may be willing to forgo such a time-consuming effort if they were assured that the Justice Department was undertaking an aggressive "no holds barred" investigation and that the Department was willing to make its reports public.

At one time, there had been an indication that at least one other Committee of Congress would be conducting public hearings on these matters, but some time has passed and there has been no further announcements from that quarter. So, it is all the more imperative that we know what the Justice Department will be doing on this investigation.

Without rancor, let me state that it is a fact that many persons sincerely questioned the objectivity of the Justice Department's investigative efforts earlier this year because of the impending elections. Now that the election is behind us, I hope that these real, or imagined, constraints are removed. However, we have to face the fact that you are an appointee emanating from the political party under investigation and this is why any statement you make about a full-scale investigation must be unequivocal and must contain assurances that your investigators will be given a free hand in all respects. This, as I am sure you recognize, would be necessary for the public to have confidence in the investigation.

In fact, I would like to urge you to give thought to naming an independent Task Force—clearly outside of the political arena—to carry out the investigation. I am sure that a group of public-spirited lawyers and investigators could be assembled to carry out such a job. In view of the importance of this case, it might be well to consider having the President himself name a high-level investigative task force composed of persons with no particular political bias.

Mr. Attorney General, I hope you will give this your careful consideration and that you will be able to let me know as soon as

possible so that I can make a report to the Full Committee.

With regards, I am

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 11, 1973.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your correspondence dated December 15, 1972, enclosing copies of two reports prepared by the staff of the House Committee on Banking and Currency dealing with the "Watergate Incident" and related matters, and requesting to be advised as to the status of several matters referred to in those reports which might involve violations of Federal law. In our view, the following matters were touched upon in the Committee's reports:

1. The Mexican Checks: The Committee's staff suggests that the involvement of a Mexican national, Manuel Ogarrio, in making a sizable contribution to the re-election campaign of President Nixon shortly before April 7, 1972, could involve violations of 18 U.S.C. 613. We have discussed this matter with the Internal Security Division, which has primary enforcement jurisdiction over Section 613, and they have advised that violations of that Section are unlikely here. In their view Section 613 does not prohibit all contributions involving foreign nationals, but only those in which the actual contributor falls within the narrow and technical definition of "foreign principal" or "agent of a foreign principal" contained in the Foreign Agents Registration Act. From the facts presented in the Committee's reports and those developed through investigation conducted by this Department, it does not appear that Manuel Ogarrio fits within either of these definitions. Moreover, as indicated in the Committee's October 31 report, there is evidence that American national(s), and not Ogarrio, were responsible for the subject contribution. We are, however, presently conducting criminal investigations into several other aspects of this contribution, and its movement to Washington.

2. Texas Fund Raising Activities: The Committee's report of September 12 reported that an aircraft owned by the Pennzoil Corporation had been used to convey political contributions raised in Texas from Houston to Washington. We have conducted an appropriate investigation to determine whether the use of this plane involved a violation of 18 U.S.C. 610, which, as you know, prohibits corporations from contributing their assets to candidates for Federal office. This investigation determined that, although a Pennzoil plane was used to bring political contributions to Washington on April 5, 1972, each of the Pennzoil officials who transported the money, had company business in Washington on April 6. In our view, the presence of legitimate business purposes for the trip makes the fact that political contributions were also carried to Washington at the same time an insufficient basis to support a criminal charge.

3. The $25,000 Andreas Contribution: An extensive investigation was conducted last fall to determine whether the failure of the Finance Committee to Re-Elect the President to report the $25,000 cash contribution which was delivered to Kenneth Dahlberg in Miami could involve violations of the reporting and disclosure provisions of the 1971 Federal Election Campaign Act. The issue to be resolved was when the gift became effective as a matter of law. From the evidence developed, we were forced to conclude that, for criminal purposes at least, we could not prove that this contribution had been made after the April 7 effective date of the Act, and accordingly we have closed this matter.

4. The $114,000 Deposit to Bernard Barker's Account: This matter, too, was extensively investigated to determine whether the deposit of five checks to the checking account of Bernard Barker Associates at the Republic National Bank of Miami on or about April 19, 1972, constituted an "expenditure" that should have been reported pursuant to the Federal Election Campaign Act. The investigation disclosed that the deposit of these checks was insisted upon by the bank as a necessary prerequisite to their conversion into cash, and that the cash proceeds were subsequently returned to the Committee to Re-Elect in Washington. In view of these circumstances, we have concluded that their deposit did not constitute an "expenditure" reportable under the Act.

5. The Ridgedale National Bank Charter: After an examination of the reports submitted by your Committee and by the General Accounting Office concerning the award of a national bank charter to a group of businessmen headed by Dwayne Andreas and Kenneth Dahlberg, we have concluded that there is insufficient evidence of a connection between the award of this charter and the aforementioned political contribution made by Andreas to warrant the initiation of a criminal investigation by this Department either under the bribery statutes or under 18 U.S.C. 600 (promise of benefit for political activity).

6. Inaccurate Reports: Several instances where transactions reported by the Finance Committee to Re-Elect the President on reports filed with the Office of Federal Elections, General Accounting Office, did not conform to bank records are indicated in your Committee's report of October 31. While such errors could constitute technical violations of the reporting provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act, the Office of Federal Elections has taken the position that such errors should not be referred to this Department as "apparent violations" of the Act until the offending committee has been advised of them and given an opportunity to rectify them. None of the matters referred to in your report have been referred for criminal action at this time. Should such a referral be made, we would, of course, make an appropriate review thereof.

7. Bank Account Monitoring: The October 31 report alleges that agents of the Committee for the Re-Election of the President monitored the personal bank accounts of promient Democrats, including some members of Congress, to insure that those accounts were not being used to conduct illegal campaign financing. However, these allegations do not indicate the violation of any Federal law.

8. Pre-April 7 Contributions: The Committee's report of October 31 speculated that $1 million in contributions made prior to April 7 may have been funneled into the cash fund that was alleged to have been kept in a safe at the offices of the Finance Committee to Re-Elect the President in Washington. We are presently conducting appropriate inquiry to determine whether there have been any disbursements from this fund after April 7, 1972, that were not reported by the Finance Committee on reports filed with the Office of Federal Elections.

9. Possible Gift Tax Evasion by Walter T. Duncan: In its report of October 31, the Committee's staff suggests that Texas businessman Walter T. Duncan may have violated Federal gift tax laws by failing to expressly direct that a $305,000 contribution to the Nixon campaign, which he and his wife made in the fall of 1972, be broken up and treated as several $6,000 contributions to various separate political committees. The report also reflects that at the time Duncan surrendered the personal note which represented the subject contribution to an agent of the Nixon campaign, that campaign agent furnished him with a list of several Republican committees to which the contribution was to be treated as having been made. Whatever merit there may be to the position of the Committee's staff in this regard is for the Internal Revenue Service to determine.

10. Possible Violations of 18 U.S.C. 1014: Finally, the report of October 31 sets forth facts indicating possible violations of 18 U.S.C. 1014 in connection with the alleged presentation of fradulent financial statements to several banking institutions. Appropriate investigation is presently being conducted into these matters by this Department.

In conclusion, I would like to assure you and your Committee that this Department has, and will continue, to vigorously pursue all evidentiary leads reflecting possible violations of Federal law. Should you receive any additional information on the matters we have closed which you feel should be considered by us, I would appreciate your bringing it to my attention.

I hope that the information provided herein will be helpful to you, and I will be glad to discuss these matters further with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

HENRY E. PETERSEN,
Assistant Attorney General.

OCTOBER 19, 1973.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Rayburn Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your memo of October 16 which included a copy of your letter to the Comptroller of the Currency inquiring about the charter application for a bank at Key Biscayne, Florida. You may recall that just over a year ago we had a little excitement about a bank charter within my district. You made an allegation to the press that the charter was issued in shorter than normal time, and the Comptroller, in response to written inquiry, indicated that the issuance of that charter was standard in all respects.

I asked you then to have the Comptroller testify before our Committee on this subject so we might query him regarding your allegations. I certainly hope you will call the Comptroller before the Committee to give all Committee Members an opportunity to address their own questions on these bank charters. I have the feeling that my constituents were pretty much found guilty by your statements to the press, and I am hoping that when the Comptroller comes up, those statements can be proved or disproved.

Yours very truly,

BILL FRENZEL,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 16, 1973.

To: All Members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

From: Wright Patman, Chairman.

Numerous questions have been raised in the news media concerning the manner in which an application for a national bank charter at Key Biscayne, Florida, has been handled in the Comptroller of the Currency's Office. As has been our practice when such questions have been raised in the past, I have written the Comptroller asking for a report on this application and the files relating to it.

Attached is a copy of my letter.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 16, 1973.*

Hon. JAMES E. SMITH,
Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: As you are aware, the news media has reported major questions about a charter application for a national bank to

compete with the Key Biscayne Bank and Trust Company headed by C. G. Rebozo.

If the news reports are correct, the application of the rival group has been faced with several conflicting decisions at various levels within the Comptroller's office. The end result has been the rejection of the application leaving the Rebozo bank as the sole commercial bank in the immediate area.

The news reports, which emanate from various media, raise very serious questions which I feel must be answered both in the interests of the public and the integrity of the Comptroller's office. At this point, I do not have any data which would either refute or support the position taken by your office and I am in no way prejudging the case.

In the past, when these questions have been raised about charters, this Committee has taken the position that it should review the pertinent facts and I feel that it is important that we do so in this instance. Therefore, I am requesting that your office furnish me with the entire file on this application and the letters and records of telephone calls which bear on the case in any way and which would indicate what outside contracts, if any, were made with the Comptroller's office, at any level, concerning this application.

You are acquainted with the news stories and the television broadcasts in the past few days and I would hope, in addition to the raw file, you would respond to the questions raised in these news articles in the fullest manner possible. I am enclosing a copy of a story which appears in the *Wall Street Journal* and I also call your attention to the *C.B.S Evening News* program of October 15.

In conclusion, I am requesting that you produce for the Committee the fullest report possible on the reasons why this application for a rival bank was turned down by you and your predecessor and why the earlier decisions at lower levels in the Comptroller's office were reversed and what economic data is available to support the decisions.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 15, 1973]

PLAYING FAVORITES?—A PLAN FOR A BANK TO COMPETE WITH BEBE REBOZO'S IS BARRED BY UNITED STATES; "IT BOILS DOWN TO CLOUT"

(By Stanley Penn)

NEW YORK.—The Nixon administration has done a good turn for one of President Nixon's closest friends, Charles (Bebe) Rebozo.

Mr. Rebozo runs the only commercial bank in the affluent community of Key Biscayne, Fla. A rival group, consisting of lawyers and business people, tried to start a bank in competition with Mr. Rebozo's. But the Treasury Department, through the Comptroller of the Currency in Washington, last month rejected the group's application for a bank charter.

The rejection came despite a recommendation by a hearing examiner last year that the new group be given a charter to compete against Mr. Rebozo.

The rival group is bitter. "It boils down to who's got the clout," charges Mortimer Fried, a Key Biscayne lawyer and a member of the group.

"The Rebozo bank doesn't meet the community's needs, and it enjoys a monopoly position," argues B. Mark Fried, a Springfield, Va., lawyer, who's another member of the investing group. (The Frieds aren't related).

Joseph M. Ream, a spokesman for the comptroller, denies the favoritism charge. He says the application was turned down for strictly economic reasons. The Key Biscayne population is too small to justify another commercial bank, says Mr. Ream, who's the comptroller's Atlanta-based, regional administrator of national banks.

Mr. Rebozo, for his part, made it quite clear to federal banking officials that he didn't want a competing bank in his own backyard. To dramatize his opposition, he showed up at public hearings on the matter in Atlanta last June.

"Bebe was sitting there right in the front row," Mortimer Fried recalls.

Also attending the hearings in full view of banking officials was another of Mr. Nixon's close friends, Robert Abplanalp, the wealthy industrialist. Mr. Abplanalp is a director of Mr. Rebozo's bank, according to the comptroller's office.

Key Biscayne is a six-mile-long island connected to Miami by a causeway. It has an estimated 8,000 to 9,000 population. Among the prominent property owners is Mr. Nixon, who maintains a vacation residence there.

Mr. Rebozo, a companion of the President when Mr. Nixon is in Key Biscayne, formed Key Biscayne Bank & Trust Co. in 1964. It has had a rapid growth, with total assets now of about $20 million.

The rival group that got turned down largely based its argument on the contention that Key Biscayne's growth warrants a second commercial bank. "By the end of the '70s, we're projecting a population of about 20,000," says Mortimer Fried.

Don MacFarland, a Key Largo, Fla., investor in the unsuccessful group, says federal officials were asserting that Key Biscayne wouldn't grow much above 10,000 people. "That's ridiculous," Mr. MacFarland says.

Mortimer Fried, who patronizes Mr. Rebozo's bank, claims the service leaves a lot to be desired. "You go in there on a Friday around lunch time, there could be 40 to 50 people there, and you find just one teller," he says.

The rival group also made the point to federal officials that Mr. Rebozo's bank is allegedly stingy in handing out loans to the needy, including small business loans.

Thomas Wakefield, vice chairman of Mr. Rebozo's bank, denies it. "We make 95% of all loans requested," he says. "We advertise heavily in Key Biscayne. The whole area is statistically proven to be high income, and the end result is you don't have a high loan demand for our area."

If another commercial bank came in, Mr. Wakefield charges, neither bank would make any money.

Mr. Ream, the regional administrator for the comptroller, concedes that a local examiner found in favor of the rival group when it first applied for a charter. "But a charter application goes through five levels"—two in Atlanta, including the local examiner, and three levels in Washington before a decision is made by the comptroller.

Mr. Ream says that William Camp, then the comptroller, rejected the first application. The rival group sought—and was granted—a reconsideration.

During the second go-around, a different local examiner looked into the matter. He recommended against the group. Mr. Ream, who opposed the application the first time, says he was against it when the group reapplied. James Smith, the current comptroller, then rejected the second application.

Mr. Ream is quick to admit that this was a hot potato. "We pored over this. We knew we'd be damned if we do, and damned if we don't," he says. Mr. Ream adds the comptroller's office has been sued "innumerable times" over the granting and nongranting of charters. "We've never lost a case," he says.

DECEMBER 20, 1973.

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON,
Rayburn Building.

DEAR ED: Attached is a copy of my letter to Don Fraser referring to the ADA 1973 allegations of Presidential wrong doing. I am not sure how your Committee intends to proceed, but I certainly hope you will look into the Andreas bank charter question—ADA Item 11. On this matter, I have no idea whether there was any wrong doing. What I do know is that the allegations were allowed to stand and have received great publicity in the press. Despite the fact that the Comptroller of the Currency indicated that nothing unusual was found on the issuance of the charter, the ADA and others are still talking about it and have indicated that it was issued in record time, which is contrary to the statement of the Comptroler.

At the time of the Patman mini investigation, a majority of Committee Members were reluctant to give Chairman Patman subpoena powers. Apparently he was angered by the Committee action and was not willing to carry out the investigations of the two items listed in my letter to Don Fraser which clearly were in the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee.

In any case, I think Congress should complete its investigation of these items even if the Judiciary Committee has to do it. In the case of the bank charter, those who received the charter ought to be cleared or indicted. In the case of the Mexican bank operations, the Congress should know whether we need new laws to prevent this.

Two weeks ago in the House Administration Committee I endeavored to persuade the Committee to write into the campaign reform legislation a prohibition on any contributions made through foreign banks. I still think it is a good suggestion and intend to offer it on the floor. If your Committee in its investigation can provide any good evidence, pro or con, I would be happy to receive it.

Best regards,

BILL FRENZEL,
Member of Congress.

DECEMBER 20, 1973.

HON. DON FRASER,
Longworth Building.

DEAR DON: In your Congressional Record statement of December 18, 1973, Pages E8154–57, you included a list of 73 allegations compiled by the Americans for Democratic Action and indicate that these allegations should be investigated by the Judiciary Committee.

Allegation No. 11 relates to a bank charter granted in my district in August of 1972. During the fall of 1972, Chairman Patman of the Banking and Currency Committee made allegations similar to those made by you. I tried to get him and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. Gonzalez, to follow up the Committee's investigation as to whether a quick charter was issued. Mr. Patman wanted to interview other more important people in the Committee to Re-elect the President and never did summon the Comptroller of the Currency in this matter. However, the Comptroller did write to the Committee indicating that the charter was not granted quickly and was, in his opinion, a routine sort of thing.

I think it is just dreadful that this kind of allegation hangs around and gets repeated over and over again to the detriment of at least two of the incorporators, Mr. Andreas and Mr. Dahlberg.

Since Mr. Patman was never willing to carry this investigation to a conclusion, I surely hope that the Judiciary Committee will do so, so either the allegations can be proved or disproved.

A number of bankers within my district indicated that they had been queried by staff members of the Banking and Currency Committee. I was never furnished the results of such an investigation or survey conducted by that Committee, but again, the Judiciary Committee may want to ask the Banking Committee for its records in this case.

In addition, I had asked the Banking and Currency Committee to investigate the use of funds in campaigns which were channeled to various committees through foreign banks. This was another area of investiga-

tion the Banking Committee did not complete which should have been completed. This is Item 16 on your list, and perhaps the Banking Committee could furnish information on this subject too.

Mr. Gonzalez has indicated to me on several occasions an interest in looking into this matter. I had encouraged him to do so on a couple of occasions, but apparently the Committee Chairman felt it was not worth looking into.

Yours very truly,

BILL FRENZEL,
Member of Congress.

CAMPAIGN REFORM AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker when H.R. 16090, the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments, comes before the House on Wednesday, I intend to offer a series of amendments. Taken as a whole, these amendments constitute the text of my own campaign reform bill, H.R. 11735, which is the toughest bill before the House. A full discussion of my bill and explanation of its provisions may be found on page 38871, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 30, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, my proposed amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 2, strike out line 9 and all that follows down through page 4, line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) (1) No individual or political committee (other than a candidate on his own behalf or a principal campaign committee or the treasurer or any deputy treasurer of such committee) may, directly or indirectly, make contributions or expenditures (or both) for the purpose of influencing the election (including the nomination of such election) of any person for Federal office, in an aggregate amount in excess of—

"(A) $1,000 in the case of an election for the office of President, or

"(B) $500 in the case of an election for any other Federal office.

"(2) No individual or political committee (other than a candidate on his own behalf of a principal campaign committee or the treasurer or any deputy treasurer of such committee) may, directly or indirectly, make cash contributions for the purpose of influencing the election (including the nomination of such election) of any person for Federal office, in an aggregate amount in excess of $100.

"(3) A contribution of money may be only in cash (subject to paragraph (2)) or made by means of a check issued by or drawn on a bank which is organized under the laws of the United States or a State.

"(4) (A) No political committee may make a contribution to a political committee which is not a principal campaign committee.

"(B) No political committee, other than a principal campaign committee, may accept contributions from individual contributors unless such contributors designate in writing the name of the candidate or principal campaign committee to which the contribution should be given.

"(C) No principal campaign committee may make any contribution or expenditure except for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election or election of the candidate designating the committee, or for the purpose of communication between the candidate and his constituency, including but not limited to travel by the candidate between the particular district and the Capital, and the production and distribution of newsletters and radio and television tapes.

Page 4, line 11, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000 multiplied by the total number of congressional districts in the several States".

Page 4, line 14, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000 multiplied by the total number of congressional districts in the several States".

Page 4, line 18, strike out "greater" and insert in lieu thereof "lesser".

Page 4, strike out line 19 and all that follows down through line 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(i) $25,000 multiplied by the number of congressional districts in the State in which the election is held; or".

Page 4, line 22, strike out "$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000".

Page 4, line 22, insert "or" immediately after the semicolon.

Page 4, strike out line 23 and all that follows down through page 5, line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(D) $25,000, in the case of a candidate for the office of Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.".

Page 6, immediately after line 2, insert the following:

"(4) An expenditure may be made (A) by or on behalf of a candidate (other than a candidate to which paragraph (5) applies) only if approved in writing by the candidate, and (B) on behalf of a candidate only by the committee designated by the candidate under section 302(f)(1).

"(5) (A) No expenditure in excess of $100 shall be made by or on behalf of any candidate who has received the nomination of his political party for President or Vice President unless such expenditure has been specifically approved by the chairman or treasurer of that political party's national committee or the designated representative of that national committee in the State where the funds are to be expended.

"(B) Each national committee approving expenditures under subparagraph (A) shall register under section 303 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 as a political committee and report each expenditure it approves as if it had made that expenditure, together with the name and address of the person seeking approval and making the expenditure.

"(C) No political party shall have more than one national committee.

Page 6, line 20, insert "'." immediately after "1973.".

Page 6, strike out line 21 and all that follows down through page 7, line 10.

Page 11, immediately after line 3, insert the following:

"(b) No person shall make a contribution on the condition, or with an express or implied agreement, that the recipient of the contribution will make a contribution to any other candidate or his authorized committee unless the original contributor is identified pursuant to the reporting requirements of section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

Page 11, line 4, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 12, strike out line 20 and all that follows down through page 13, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 102. (a) Section 591(d) of title 18, United States Code, relating to the definition of political committee, is amended by striking out "means any" and all that follows through "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "means any individual, committee, association, or organization (whether or not incorporated) which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing, or attempting to influence, the nomination or election of one or more individuals to Federal office".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 19, line 4, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 201.".

Page 20, immediately after line 17, insert the following new subsection:

(b) Section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to organization of political committees, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) No principal campaign committee may accept contributions from other than individuals or political party organizations.".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 20, line 19, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 202.".

Page 21, immediately after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(b) Section 303 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to registration of political committees and statements, is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (d) thereof, by striking out "in an aggregate amount exceeding $1,000"; and

(2) in subsection (a) thereof, by striking out "in excess of $1,000".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 21, strike out line 5 and all that follows down through page 23, line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 203 (a)(1) The second sentence of section 304(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to reports by political committees and candidates, is amended by striking out "Such reports" and inserting in lieu thereof "With respect to candidates for the office of President or Vice President, such reports".

(2) Section 304(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to reports by political committees and candidates, is amended by inserting immediately after the second sentence the following: "With respect to candidates other than candidates for the office of President or Vice President, such reports shall be filed not later than the first Monday of each month during the period beginning on the date on which such candidate designates a principal campaign committee under section 302(f)(1) and ending on the date of the election involved, and not later than 15 days next preceding the date on which an election is held.".

(3) Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to reports by political committees and candidates, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Each treasurer of a political committee who is required to file any report under subsection (a) shall file a final report with respect to any election not later than 90 days after the date on which such election is held.

"(e) Any contributions received by a candidate which are listed as unexpended or unobligated in the final report filed by such candidate under subsection (d) shall be forfeited to the treasury of the State in which the election is held (or, in the case of an election for the office of President or Vice President, to the Treasury of the United States) not later than 10 days (other than

Saturday, Sunday, or any legal public holiday listed in section 6103 of title 5, United States Code) after the filing of such final report."

Page 23, immediately after line 22, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) Section 304(b)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to reports by political committees and candidates, is amended by striking out "in an aggregate amount or value in excess of $100".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 10690, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 23, immediately after line 22, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) Section 304(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to reports by political committees and candidates, is amended by striking out paragraph (12), by inserting "and" immediately after the semicolon in paragraph (11), and by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (12).

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 10690, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 28, strike out line 18 and all that follows down through page 29, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

(b) Section 301(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to the definition of political committee, is amended by striking out "means any" and all that follows through "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "means any individual, committee, association, or organization (whether or not incorporated) which (A) accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing, or attempting to influence, the nomination or election of one or more individuals to Federal office, or (B) makes evaluations and recommendations with respect to candidates in elections held in more than one State".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 44, immediately after line 23, insert the following new section:

CAMPAIGN INDEBTEDNESS; CAMPAIGN ACCOUNTS

SEC. 209. Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, relating to disclosure of Federal campaign funds, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"CAMPAIGN INDEBTEDNESS

"SEC. 317. No person, other than a candidate for Federal office, may make any expenditure on behalf of such candidate if such expenditure involves the incurring of a debt or other obligation by such person.

"CAMPAIGN ACCOUNTS

"SEC. 318. (a) Every candidate for Federal office shall, within a reasonable time after becoming a candidate, establish a campaign account at not more than one national or State bank.

"(b) The political committee which a candidate designates as his principal campaign committee under section 302(f)(1) shall make expenditures only from the campaign account established by such candidate under subsection (a). No expenditure may be made by any such committee on behalf of such candidate except by check drawn from such account.

"(c) Any contribution received by or on behalf of a candidate shall be deposited in the campaign account established by such candidate under subsection (a) on the first day (other than Saturday, Sunday, or any legal public holiday listed in section 6103 of title 5, United States Code) following the date upon which such contribution is received.".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 44, immediately after line 23, insert the following new section:

PENALTIES

SEC. 209. (a) Section 314(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as so redesignated by section 207(a) of this Act), relating to penalty for violations, is amended by inserting ", and shall be ineligible to hold any Federal office" immediately after "both".

(b) Section 105 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as so redesignated by section 402(a)(1) of this Act), relating to penalties, is amended by inserting ", and shall be ineligible to hold any Federal office" immediately after "both".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 45, strike out line 7 and all that follows down through line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 403. The provisions of this Act, and of regulations promulgated under this Act, supersede any provision of State law with which they conflict with respect to campaigns for nomination for election, or for election, to Federal office, unless any such provision of State law imposes a standard or duty which is more strict than the standard or duty imposed under this Act.".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 47, immediately after line 6, insert the following new section:

CANDIDACIES OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 303. (a) Any Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives who is a candidate for any office other than the office he holds shall, upon becoming such a candidate, resign his office as a Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives. Such resignation shall be effective on the date upon which the oath of office is administered with respect to such office for which such Member is a candidate.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "candidate" means any individual who has qualified to have his name on the election ballot in the geographical area in which the election involved is to be held, or, in the case of an election for the office of President or Vice President, any individual who has qualified to have his name on the election ballot (or to have electors pledged to him on the election ballot) as the candidate of a political party for election to the office of President or Vice President in one or more States.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 53, strike out line 17 and all that follows down through page 61, line 4.

And redesignate the following sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 79, line 15, strike out "406,".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 79, line 15, strike out "408,".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Page 61, strike out line 14 and all that follows down through page 78, line 3.

And redesignate the following sections accordingly.

THE FORTHCOMING CONFERENCE ON FOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to focus on some conflicts that are present this evening in our Government, to point out a distinction between articulated policy and political influence, between promise and performance, between words and deeds.

First, I would point out excerpts from A Declaration on Food and Population, which is addressed to the Government's organizations and men and women everywhere:

No link unites the family of man more than the need for food. For food is an essential condition of life, common to all people; wherever they are, whatever they do, they share alike in this need.

The stark truth is that man's ability to produce food is not keeping pace with his need. Despite efforts by governments and the international community to solve world food problems, more people are hungry today than ever before.

Hundreds of millions of the world's people are undernourished. Population growth is adding 75 to 80 million more people each year, 200,000 each day.

Within the next 25 years or so our present numbers of nearly 4 billion will be nearly 7 billion. They must all be fed.

The world food situation took a sharp turn for the worse in 1972 and 1973:

1. Stocks of grain have hit an all-time low since the end of World War II. Surplus stocks formerly held in reserve have nearly been exhausted and no longer offer security against widespread hunger and starvation.

2. Food prices have reached new highs. Last year, despite a record world harvest, escalating demand nearly doubled grain prices. The increasing cost of food threatens to cause serious hardship for many people already spending most of what they have on food.

3. Less of the cheaper protein foods, which normally supplement grain diets, is available. The world's fish catch and per capita production of protein-rich legumes, the staple diet in many countries, have declined.

4. Food shortages have created serious social unrest in many parts of the world and are particularly severe in countries where hunger and the diseases that thrive on undernourished bodies are prevalent. This scarcity has been aggravated by the consumption of more and more grain to produce meat, eggs and milk.

5. Mounting fertilizer and energy shortages are reducing food production in certain areas and increasing food prices.

In this new and threatening situation, a bad monsoon in Asia (which could occur in any year), or a drought in North America (like those in the 1930's and 1950's), could mean severe malnutrition for hundreds of millions and death for many millions.

This dangerously unstable world food picture, when seen against an unprecedented population increase, has created an immediate sense of urgency. The dangers of food shortages could remain a threat for the rest of this century—even if, hopefully, bumper crops in some years create temporary surpluses and even if the trend toward reduced birth rates becomes general throughout the world.

World food production in the years ahead must rise at least 2 percent a year to keep

pace with the present rate of population growth. But it must rise a good deal more if the world's people are to be provided with an adequate diet. This required annual increase in food production is considerably greater than that which occurred during recent decades—and seems to be increasingly harder to achieve each year. But unless there is this necessary and continuous increase in food production, there will be even more hunger and malnutrition and soaring food prices.

The need to seek solutions is pressing. The nature of the problem, the precarious state of world food production made critical by predicted expectations of continued population growth, calls for concerted action by the world community. There is only one cure for hunger and that is food. No palliatives or panaceas in the form of reports or resolutions can alleviate the pain of empty stomachs that must be filled. International resolutions, however high-minded, are a mockery if they do not have a tangible impact on the human condition.

The United Nations is now providing leadership on both these problems. In August the United Nations will convene the World Population Conference in Bucharest. In November it will convene the World Food Conference in Rome. These are the first occasions when governments have agreed to meet to consider these crucial questions and to consider taking action on them.

With these two conferences only a few months away, we urge governments, acting before, at and after these two global conferences, to consider realistic and purposeful measures such as the following:

Give high priority to programs in each country which will increase the production of grains, legumes and other staple food crops, insure the availability of protein-rich foods, particularly to the more vulnerable population groups; expand the production of fertilizer; and improve the opportunities for small farmers to make a reasonable living. Develop a comprehensive and constructive World Food Plan for adoption at the World Food Conference.

A solution to the present world food crisis must be found within the next few years. The social transformation which can lead to a reduction in the world rate of fertility, along with lowering the rate of mortality, will take decades to accomplish. But a start must be made now because the millions of people being born each year place a heavy burden on the resources available to many nations for education, health, employment and the maintenance of environment quality. A reduction in population growth could help alleviate this burden. Effective measures toward resolving both the world food and population problems must come within a total strategy of development. Not only is social and economic development desirable in itself, but also it contributes to moderating population growth. All these measures are designed to improve the quality of life.

In this declaration, we focus on food because it is the most critical of the pressures on the world today. It is the greatest manifestation of world poverty, which has many aspects. The absolute number of desperately poor are far greater today than ever before in history. The need to eradicate acute poverty is being recognized more than ever as a collective responsibility. It is a task which global partnership and the demands of social justice make imperative.

We repeat, food is crucial because literally tens of millions of lives are suspended in the delicate balance between world population and world food supplies. Growing populations, denied sufficient food needed for survival, resist all efforts to secure a peaceful world. With increased production and more equitable distribution of food, the future could provide a prospect of less misery and more hope for countless people now deprived of the basic necessities that are their right.

The World Food Conference represents a unique opportunity. This opportunity must not be missed. Comprehensive international agreements must be reached to assure at least minimal food supplies, with sufficient annual carry-over stocks. Disastrous breakdowns in the world food supply can thus be avoided. All nations may then rest secure in the knowledge that this, the most critical of their immediate problems, is being attacked with wisdom, vigor and unity of purpose.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, goes on to read:

In the name of humanity we call upon all governments and peoples everywhere, rich and poor, regardless of political and social systems, to act—to act together—and to act in time.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a statement by the United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim on receipt of the Declaration on Food and Population, and before I insert this as a part of my remarks I would like to refer to and quote the second paragraph in Secretary General Waldheim's statement.

He says:

I have recently described the times we are living in as being characterized by mass poverty, food shortages, an energy crisis, a continuing oppressive burden of military expenditure, inflation exacerbated by world monetary instability, and the prospect before us of a doubling of human numbers by the turn of the century.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from you, our leader in the House, which is joined with and by the minority leader, Mr. RHODES, a letter of July 9, 1974, to the colleagues of the House pleading the adoption of this resolution in preparation of the World Food Conference.

I would highlight this letter by referring to three of the paragraphs contained in it. As I quote:

The crises resulting from tremendous population pressures and widespread famine already afflicting a considerable number of countries, and the potentially much more serious situation which would result from possible crop failures, impel us to call your attention to these vital and threatened problems.

Continuing to quote from the body of the letter, Mr. Speaker:

We believe that the extent of death by famine and disease in the developing countries over the next few years will depend primarily on the actions taken by their own governments, but it will also depend to a large extent on the leadership and assistance of the United States and the other industrialized countries in alleviating the crises caused by rapid population increases and tragic food shortages.

It goes on to conclude, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

The long-range effects of food shortages and rapid growth of population on the quality of life are problems which also must be faced. We suggest that as discussions on the various aspects of food and population problems come before the Congress, you give them your careful consideration.

I say to my colleagues that I have given the food and population problems my careful consideration, and I endorse this effort as I have introduced legislation before the House which I believe to be a step in that direction. That legislation is entitled H.R. 15263, the Rice Act of 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I go on to refer to a letter from the U.S. Secretary of State, Dr. Kissinger, who refers to the urgent need to increase domestic food production and to remove domestic restrictions on food production. Before introducing this letter for the record, I quote from the body of the letter wherein, Mr. Speaker, he says:

We strongly support a global cooperative effort to increase food production and have removed all domestic restrictions on our output. We will endeavor to increase the quantity of our food aid to needy countries, give technology and material help to efforts of developing countries to expand their food output, assist in the production of more fertilizer and in more effective use, and join other governments in a world-wide effort to rebuild food reserves.

Mr. Speaker, I do now to refer to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Dent, who states that food shortages in the United States have produced a trade deficit. In June the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Dent, reported a trade deficit for May 1974, at $776.9 million, a swing deeply into the red as import costs remained high and farm exports fell dramatically. Imports outran exports by $776.9 million, the second largest monthly deficit on record surpassed only in October 1971, when the trade was stilled in America by a dock strike.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time this century the United States has had its first full year trade deficit in 1971–72. It is true that devaluations of the dollar helped to win back a surplus in 1973, but this year the increased costs of importing oil has produced a deficit again. One solution to reestablishing a favorable balance of trade is to produce and export more food products from America.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15263, the 1974 Rice Act, is a step in that direction. Increased production as a direct result of this act, would increase U.S. commerce from exports by $350 million to $400 million annually.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury Mr. Simon is reported to have said that America actually paid for its high-priced oil imports in 1973 with agricultural exports that extracted $7 billion from foreign food sales.

If we realistically examine our international fiscal potential as it relates to the balance of payments, the one single resource that is in abundance that we have more of than anyone else is food.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this time table No. 804 from the agricultural statistics of 1973, showing the U.S. positive balance of payments in agricultural trade and its substantial contribution to our total value of international trade.

Mr. Speaker, table 804 follows:

TABLE 804.—FOREIGN TRADE: VALUE OF TOTAL AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, UNITED STATES, 1959–72

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Year ending June 30	Agricultural exports [1]				Agricultural imports (for consumption)					Excess of domestic agricultural exports over supplementary import
								Supplementary		
	Total domestic exports	Domestic	Percentage (domestic) of total exports	Foreign (re-exports)	Total import for consumption	Total	Supplementary [2]	Complementary [2]	Percentage of total agricultural exports	Percentage of total agricultural imports	
1959	$17,357	$3,719	21	$83	$13,857	$4,004	$2,029	$1,975	55	51	$1,690
1960	19,110	4,519	24	73	15,496	4,010	1,979	2,031	44	49	2,540
1961	20,507	4,946	24	67	14,161	3,645	1,814	1,831	37	50	3,132
1962	21,447	5,142	24	63	15,687	3,762	2,049	1,713	40	54	3,093
1963	21,638	5,078	23	62	16,398	3,907	2,208	1,699	43	57	2,870
1964	24,718	6,068	25	84	17,776	4,096	2,225	1,871	37	54	3,843
1965	26,331	6,097	23	----------	19,731	3,986	2,127	1,859	35	53	3,970
1966	28,886	6,676	23	----------	23,295	4,454	2,472	1,982	37	56	4,204
1967	30,819	6,711	22	----------	26,427	4,453	2,667	1,786	39	60	4,104
1968	32,195	6,311	20	----------	29,613	4,656	2,845	1,811	45	61	3,468
1969	35,221	5,741	16	----------	34,175	4,931	3,072	1,859	54	62	2,669
1970	41,059	6,721	16	----------	38,219	5,592	3,451	2,141	51	62	3,270
1971	43,663	7,758	18	----------	42,724	5,828	3,684	2,144	47	63	4,074
1972 [3]	44,864	8,051	18	----------	50,055	6,041	3,949	2,092	49	65	4,102

[1] Includes food exported for relief or charity by individuals and private agencies. These figures include a small amount of certain foodstuffs other than agricultural.

[2] Supplemental agricultural imports consist of all imports similar to agricultural commodities produced commercially in the United States, together with all other agricultural imports interchangeable to any significant extent with such U.S. commodities. Complementary agricultural imports include all others, about 98 percent of which consist of rubber, coffee, raw silk, cacao beans, wool for carpets, bananas, tea, and vegetable fibers.

[3] Preliminary.

Source: Economic Research Service. Compiled from reports of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Data for 1924–58 in "Agricultural Statistics, 1972" table 817.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I also include at this point in the RECORD a photocopy of a letter from Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz dated July 22, 1974, in which he endorses H.R. 15263, the Rice Act of 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1974.

Hon. WILLIAM ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: This is in response to your July 18 query relative to our position on H.R. 15263, the Rice Bill.

This will assure you that the Department strongly supports H.R. 15263 and will continue to push for its prompt enactment in the 93rd Congress.

Sincerely,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the political leaders to which I have referred support increased food production. To this end I have introduced H.R. 15263, the Rice Act of 1974 which frees the American farmer to maximize rice production. The passage of this bill would increase rice output by approximately 500,000 acres in America, which would provide about 1 million more metric tons of rice distribution for commercial trade. But the support of the Secretary General of the United Nations, the support of the Speaker of the House, the support of the minority leader, the support of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Treasury is not enough, Mr. Speaker, because certain powerful special interests having great influence in the U.S. Congress oppose this legislation causing its future to be uncertain.

Why have they turned a deaf ear to the hunger cries of the people of the world? Why have they ignored the request of world leaders? Why have they turned away from the trade advantages to our great Nation?

I will tell the House why, Mr. Speaker. It is because this bill, the Rice Act of 1974, presents a classic example of special interest versus public need, a clash of two forces, of public policy the way it ought to be and of power politics the way it is, the difference between promise and performance.

Mr. Speaker, I as one American am growing weary of political double talk. I am tired of deception. Let us talk straight to the people of the world by passing legislation designed to expand food production and improve the opportunities of small farmers. The existing rice program has served us well in the past but it was designed to prevent overproduction, to build in protectionism and to attack a problem which existed in the past but which does not exist in the present.

What we need is to unshackle the American farmer from the bonds of the past and encourage full production. We must maximize food production in the rice industry, reduce Government interference, and permit the American farmer to respond to the world market forces and the needs of men. I submit, Mr. Speaker, only then can we as Americans rightfully maintain our position as leaders of a free world and take a seat in good faith at the World Food Conference to be held in Rome next December.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the further information of the Members, the article which I have referred to.

STATEMENT BY UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY-GENERAL KURT WALDHEIM ON RECEIVING THE DECLARATION ON FOOD AND POPULATION

(Following is the text of the statement made by Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim on receiving the Declaration on Food and Population presented by a group of eminent intellectuals and scientists at a ceremony at United Nations Headquarters, April 25, 1974.)

I am grateful to be given this Declaration. It is marked by a profound concern for the improvement of the human condition. The Declaration is important of itself by virtue of the authority of the signers whose standing in all walks of life is reflected by the stature of those who have come to the United Nations today to bear witness to it.

I have recently described the times we are living in as being characterized by mass poverty, food shortages, an energy crisis, a continuing oppressive burden of military expenditure, inflation exacerbated by world monetary instability, and the prospect before us of a doubling of human numbers by the turn of the century.

The Declaration addresses itself primarily to the dramatic depletion of available food reserves and the shortfall in world food production. There is no more immediate task than that of rescuing the world from a situation which, for many, has always been precarious and is now even more hazardous. Short-term measures, while essential, must not be allowed to become palliatives, for the coming years will increase our vulnerability.

Virtually in no other area is it more pressing than in the one to which your Declaration addresses itself: the need to assure that the men, women, and children of Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas, whatever their origin, their religion, their political philosophy, their age, their social condition have the basic foods which are the one essential and undebatable pre-condition of a life of dignity and decency. Without an assured supply, all our other aspirations for peace, for social justice, for growth and creativity, both as individuals and as nations, lose their meaning and take on a hollow ring.

I cannot but be sharply and painfully conscious of the dangers posed by the Declaration, having recently returned from the Sahel. There, the suffering provoked by a six-year drought is resulting in premature death, disease and a dreadful sense of helplessness. The tragic spectacle of dying cattle and their owners fleeing the encroaching desert induces a sense of desperation into what should be the objective analysis of the world's food situation and prospects.

It is no accident that this Declaration is presented at the United Nations. This body was established in the final phase of the most devastating war in history not merely to embody the highest aspirations of mankind, but to provide an operational vehicle for global action. The present crisis and those that we can see looming ahead can be overcome. They are indeed a serious challenge to use all our forces, our determination and ingenuity to provide a better life for future generations.

This is a year in which the international community, with some brutally abrupt reminders of what the future may hold, is facing up to the situation. At its present special session, the General Assembly is devoting its attention to finding the basis of a more equitable and workable economic system—a system which takes into account not only the needs of all nations, but also the imperative interrelationships of the several parts of the problem: poverty, the conservation and just apportionment of natural resources, the preservation of the environment, and the problems of trade and monetary system. Food and population, the two urgent issues to which your Declaration addresses itself, form an integral part of this whole.

In August, in Bucharest, for the first time Governments will hold a world population

conference. Shortly afterwards, in Rome, the World Food Conference will offer Governments the opportunity to tackle the world food problem. Your call therefore for international co-operation to ensure supplies of food comes at an opportune moment. The World Food Conference will present the Member States of the United Nations with the unique opportunity to take immediate practical and urgently needed steps to redress a tragic situation which we can no longer afford to ignore.

The unprecedented growth of the world's population is compounding man's difficulties in feeding himself. The time at our disposal is very short. You point out that the world's food production has barely kept pace with population increases. Our goal is not mere survival but a life of dignity and peace with hope for each new generation to improve the condition of life for the billion of men, women and children who will inhabit the earth in the coming decades.

Whether or not we can increase food production depends, as the Declaration states, not on a torrent of words and resolutions, but on adopting new and tangible objectives, hammering out the global strategies needed and revitalizing the machinery to achieve them. In spite of its ideological complexity and the political and other constraints that must exist in any global body, the United Nations can and will respond.

It is in this same spirit of commitment and determination that I receive this Declaration. I am confident that the international community can and will find humane solutions to the serious problems of food and population which confront mankind.

MESSAGES TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL IN SUPPORT OF THE DECLARATION ON FOOD AND POPULATION

MESSAGE FROM HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY, THE SHAHANSHAH ARYAMEHR OF IRAN, TO HIS EXCELLENCY KURT WALDHEIM, THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I have learned with pleasure of the Declaration on Food and Population signed by a group of distinguished people which will be submitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations Organization on the 25th of April, 1974.

It is my sincere hope that this Declaration will create a sense of urgency and contribute to a greater awareness among nations of the grave problems facing mankind in view of the rapid population growth on the one hand and the precarious state of the world food production on the other.

Priority must be given by governments to implementing sound population control and environmental protection policies, to devising methods of increasing food production especially that of grains, to encourage increased cooperation between developing and developed countries in order to provide aid for population control and food production programs and to making provisions for sufficient food reserves to guard against famine.

I earnestly hope that the World Population Conference and the World Food Conference organized by the United Nations and to be held in August and November, respectively, will help to promote a concerted effort on behalf of all the nations of the globe to seek wise solutions to these crucial issues which will have a vital bearing on the future of mankind.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1974.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On April 25, 1974, 40 distinguished signers of the Declaration on Food and Population from 25 countries officially delivered the Declaration on behalf of more than 1,500 signers from over 100 countries to Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim at United Nations Headquarters in New York City.

More than 50 Members of Congress were among those who signed the Declaration. We, who are among those who signed it, are greatly concerned by the increasing shortages of food in many countries and the related problems having to do with too rapidly growing population in the developing countries.

The crises resulting from tremendous population pressures and widespread famine already afflicting a considerable number of countries, and the potentially much more serious situation which would result from possible crop failures, impel us to call your attention to these vital and threatening problems.

If you also are concerned about the threat that these problems present in many parts of the world, we hope that you will sign the Declaration.

We believe that the extent of death by famine and disease in the developing countries over the next few years will depend primarily on the actions taken by their own governments, but it will also depend to a large extent on the leadership and assistance of the United States and the other industrialized countries in alleviating the crises caused by rapid population increases and tragic food shortages.

We are enclosing a pamphlet which includes, in addition to the Declaration itself, an eloquent response by Secretary-General Waldheim in which he expresses his gratitude to the signers from around the world, his concern for the related problems of food shortages and too rapid population growth and his hope that the international community will find humane solutions to these serious problems.

The pamphlet also includes copies of the messages addressed to Secretary-General Waldheim by the Shah of Iran, the Preident of Senegal, the Prime Ministers of India and Sri Lanka, the Foreign Minister of Korea and the United States Secretary of State.

Secretary Kissinger in his message assures the Secretary-General that the United States will do its part and will strongly support a global cooperative effort to increase food production. He expresses the hope that other countries also will help and that all countries will take active measures to bring population growth and food production into better balance.

Undoubtedly, the present Congress will be considering measures to alleviate the famine from the Sahelian countries in Africa and from India and other countries. These are immediate problems which need emergency action.

The long-range effects of food shortages and rapid growth of population on the quality of life are problems which also must be faced. We suggest that as discussions on the various aspects of food and population problems come before the Congress you give them your careful consideration.

We hope that you will join in signing the Declaration; please notify the Population Crisis Commitee, Suite 200, 1835 K Street, N. W., Washington, D.C. 20006, of your intention.

Sincerely,

CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker.
JOHN RHODES,
Minority Leader.

APRIL 25, 1974.

His Excellency Dr. KURT WALDHEIM,
Secretary-General of the United Nations, New York

DEAR MR. SECRETARY-GENERAL: The Declaration on Food and Population presented to you today vividly portrays the connected global problems of food supply and rapid population growth.

It is a timely call by distinguished citizens of many countries for urgent attention to two central problems of human welfare. It recognizes that in this increasingly interdependent world there is no acceptable alternative to nations working together to solve global problems, of which food and population are among the most pressing. It reminds us that the individual nations and the United Nations must approach the World Population Conference and the World Food Conference with the determination to seek and agree on common approaches.

As I stated in my address to the Special Session of the General Assembly, the United States will do its part. We strongly support a global cooperative effort to increase food production and have removed all domestic restrictions on our output. We will endeavor to increase the quantity of our food aid to needy countries, give technological and material help to efforts of developing countries to expand their food output, assist in the production of more fertilizer and in its more effective use, and join other governments in a worldwide effort to rebuild food reserves.

We hope that other countries able to do so will make similar contributions and that all countries will take active measures to bring population growth and food production into better balance.

The food and population crises threaten the welfare and stability of peoples and nations. We must act together with the purpose, the mutual confidence and the determination to overcome them.

Best regards,

HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State,
United States of America.

A MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY, LEOPOLD SENGHOR, TO UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY-GENERAL KURT WALDHEIM ON THE OCCASION OF THE DECLARATION ON FOOD AND POPULATION, DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR MÉDOUNE FALL, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS FROM SENEGAL, ON APRIL 25, 1974

Mr. Secretary-General, Ladies and Gentlemen. On behalf of the President of the Republic of Senegal, His Excellency Leopold Senghor, I come to bring you the support of my country and of my government for this Declaration on Food and Population, and also on my President's behalf to extend congratulations to those who undertook this generous and opportune initiative. I thank you.

AMBASSADOR SAMAR SEN OF INDIA

Ambassador Samar Sen, Permanent Representative to the United Nations from India, at the ceremony on April 25 when the Declaration on Food and Population was officially presented to Secretary-General Waldheim, speaking on behalf of the Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, expressed her support of the Declaration on Food and Population and her hope that this worldwide initiative dealing with the two important and related problems of food shortages and too rapid population growth would be successful. The Ambassador concluded by stating that in India, as the Prime Minister herself has stated publicly that family planning is at the base of our whole endeavor of national development.

PRIME MINISTER SIRIMA BANDARANAIKE OF SRI LANKA CABLED HER SUPPORT OF THE DECLARATION ON FOOD AND POPULATION TO WILLIAM H. DRAPER, JR., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1974

I thank you for inviting me to join a group of leaders to present a Declaration on Food and Population to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I regret my inability to accept the invitation due to other commitments.

I have noted with great satisfaction the initiatives taken by you and other distinguished world citizens to focus attention through this Declaration on one of the most crucial probdems facing mankind today.

We of the developing world are particularly conscious of the gravity of this problem.

I am happy to associate myself with the Declaration.

My government will support all international action to avert a world food and population crisis.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the American economy is in serious trouble, in spite of the administration's attempts to cover up the problems. And the situation will get worse before it gets better. I do not need to elaborate to my colleagues or the American people on the inflation and other obvious ills facing the economy. But I want to urge that we begin to consider fresh new ideas for restructuring our economic policies.

This is a strange economic period: we have rampant inflation and recession at the same time. The administration will not call this a recession, but that does not really matter. What does matter is that nothing is being done about our economic situation. The palace guard in the White House dissipate all of their energy fighting among themselves over economic policy, and the President has to hire an "economic czar" to cover up this bickering. It has reached the point where press reports on the administration's economic policies discuss who is winning this battle, not what is being done for the American people.

The only worthwhile anti-inflation policy being used now is the Federal Reserve's interest rate and monetary policy. Hobar Rowen in the Washington Post calls this a "devastating tool, a blunderbuss of a weapon." While I have the highest respect for Chairman Burns and the purposes of his policies, I am not sure that I like the cure any better than the disease. But the Federal Reserve's policies are concerned with short-term inflation problems; that institution is not chartered to deal with broad-based national economic problems.

In evaluating our economic situation, we naturally look for the villains. Unlike Herbert Stein, I do not think that the American citizens are the villains. A recent nationwide poll found that the American people blame inflation on the Government. We in the Congress are part of the U.S. Government, and if we do not come up with fresh, new ideas for economic policy, we would also deserve the criticism of the people.

It appears that not only is no one directing the American economy today, but that we are at a standstill in terms of developing economic policy. There are many reasons for the paralysis in the Federal Government's economic policy, most of them traceable to the President.

After we have finished naming the villains and bemoaning our situation, what do we do? The Congress must take the lead and seek fresh, new, workable economic policies.

I can assure my colleagues that developing innovative economics is not easy. The expert economists express dismay, and many frankly admit that they do not know what to do about our economic situation. So I am not impressed with the simplistic solutions we hear so much of these days. It is unlikely that we can do anything in the short run; in Congress, we seem to get bogged down in arguing discredited or presently unworkable economic theories. We have yet to begin a constructive debate on new economic policies.

Over the years I have tried to promote a more progressive stance on economic policy and have introduced legislation and promoted policies which would either try a totally new, but workable, idea or set up machinery for more innovative economics. I recall in 1967 when the 10 percent surtax was proposed, I suggested that the surtax be put aside in a trust fund so that the tax could be returned to the taxpayers when the inflation danger had passed. While my efforts were unsuccessful—to the detriment of the taxpayer—I feel that this is the type of innovative thinking we need today.

In fact, I heard that the administration is considering asking for a new surtax to help dampen inflation and curb the Federal deficit. If we are to consider such a surtax it should be in the form I originally suggested in 1967.

Rather than having a straight surcharge we should have a surcharge which takes the form of a deferred credit repayable to the taxpayer over a period of several years. It would be distiguished from a surtax in that the amount involved is borrowed from the taxpayer, not taken away from him forever. The deferred credit could even carry interest to compensate the taxpayer-lender for the involuntary nature of the loan.

The funds received through the surcharge could be held in a trust fund as a Treasury asset to offset the future liability. This would tend to "safeguard" the funds until repaid and discourage increased Government outlays that might otherwise be prompted by the inflow of funds.

I am not pleased to hear talk of tax increases. But if we must talk of tax increases, we must do it the right way. It would be unfair to the taxpayer not to consider this alternative plan. I urge that any proposals for tax increases or surtaxes incorporate my deferred credit plan, which is not only innovative but workable.

A TRUSTEESHIP IN BANKRUPTCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, there follows my remarks to the National Press Club today:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE HENRY S. REUSS

In two weeks, the House starts impeachment proceedings. In four or five months (unless altered by special events) we'll know the results. But whatever the outcome, for the next couple of years, under either Mr. Nixon or Mr. Ford, assuming we continue as we are, this country will live on the brink of economic disaster.

Inflation, 4.7 percent in 1968, is now over 12 percent, the worst peace-time inflation in our history. Unemployment has risen from 3.6 percent in 1968 to 5.3 percent today, with worse predicted to come. The prime lending rate, 6.75 percent in 1968, is now 12 percent. The growth rate in GNP and productivity are now negative. And the distribution of income among American families, steadily improving until 1968, is now shifting some $10 billion a year from low- and moderate-income families to the rich.

More serious than the statistics is the growing loss of confidence among citizens in the capacity of the government to order the economy. Like any other Congressman who has been back with his constituents over the weekend, I can tell you what the polls tell you: for every citizen outraged by Watergate there are two dismayed by the Administration's economic performance.

Their perception is accurate. The Administration, too close to the oil industry, too close to the dairy lobby, too close to ITT, has repeatedly neglected the interests of average Americans. The Nixon-Ford "old-time religion" of nothing but tight money, tight fiscal policy, "trickle-down" incentives to big business is aimed to "wring out inflation", sure enough. But it wrings out inflation from the hides of the poor and the middle income family.

Mr. Nixon's economic advisers are constantly at loggerheads over the seriousness of the economic situation, over what is to be done, over who is to blame. Herbert ("I've never met a statistic I didn't like") Stein looks at the data and sees nothing but milk and honey. Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns looks at the same data and finds the most critical economic crisis in our history. Treasury Secretary William Simon pulls out of his briefcase a $10 billion budget cut (or was it $25 billion?), while OMB head Roy Ash can only find $2 billion slack at most. Mr. Nixon's latest addition, Ayn Rand disciple Alan Greenspan, thinks it is immoral for the government to help the poor; he surveys the Administration's current economic policy—13 percent inflation, 5 million unemployed, and the second recession in 5 years—and is quoted as saying he "likes what he sees".

Without an economic philosophy, his advisers in disarray, wrapped up in his own defense, at hopeless odds with the Democratic Congress now considering his impeachment, seen as a lame duck President by the bureaucracy, Mr. Nixon no longer controls his own agencies and departments. There is, in short, no one running the store.

The worst of it is that even Mr. Nixon's departure from office, should that occur, would not necessarily make things better. His successor will be his appointee and apologist, a Vice President with no mandate from the electors, whose economic thinking, insofar as it has been revealed to us, is much the same as Mr. Nixon's. The Congress will be overwhelmingly Democratic, and overwhelmingly at odds with the Administration.

Are we then condemned for the next 2½ years to the tempests of raging inflation, quickening unemployment, speeding bankruptcies, recurrent financial crises, with the ship of state now drifting helplessly, now jibing wildly while the boom sweeps the hapless crew into the sea, now speeding toward the rocks?

When a business finds itself in economic difficulties that the existing management is unable to solve, the traditional solution is to have the courts appoint a trustee to get the organization back on its feet. A competent trustee, in whom customers, creditors, employees, and shareholders have confidence, attempts to breathe new life into a sick organization.

Our economy is in a similar position. The current economic management is: incompetent. Its ideas are: bankrupt.

Once before within memory, when the United States was exposed to great danger in World War II, FDR summoned to Washing-

ton such leading and responsible Republicans as Henry L. Stimson, Frank Knox, and Robert Patterson. Their business acumen and managerial experience qualified them for the top Cabinet positions. Including them in the Democratic Administration broadened the base of popular support for the government and the war effort. Victory was due in no small part to this bipartisan war directorate.

Today, confronted with the challenge not of war but of equally dangerous economic perils, we need again the statesmanlike behavior of President Roosevelt.

There is a better alternative than for this country to watch our economy go down the drain through the paralysis of partisan polarization. I call upon Mr. Nixon and Mr. Ford to ask Speaker Albert and Majority Leader Mansfield to appoint an Economic Trusteeship for the current crisis, charged with the task of getting prices and unemployment and interest rates down, and getting confidence in our government and in our financial institutions up.

The Economic Trusteeship would consist of a small cadre—perhaps 4 or 5—of the best public leaders available. Since Senate Majority Leader Mansfield and House Speaker Albert would select them, it is highly likely that they would be Democrats. The posts they would fill (at Treasury, at OMB, at CEA, for example) would be equivalent in the War against Inflation to those which FDR gave to Republicans in the War against Hitler.

The Trusteeship would both formulate economic policy and administer it. It would work closely with Congress, now a partner, rather than a competitor, with the Administration.

Both Republicans and Democrats would sacrifice something, from a purely partisan point of view. Republicans would relinquish their undiluted control over economic policy. Democrats in Congress would have to stop sniping at Administration failures and shoulder some of the responsibility for making economic policy and making it work. But both parties would have the satisfaction of knowing that the quality of those appointed to the Trusteeship would be far higher than a Republican Administration could otherwise hope to attract, and their effectiveness far greater than if the Democrats were content to remain the not-so-loyal opposition.

The mere act of appointing an Economic Trusteeship could help restore confidence in the American economy at home and abroad. The stock market, the bond market, the interest rate structure, the international money exchanges—they'd all start feeling better. Above all, we would look like a nation that wanted to live to celebrate its Bicentennial!

What kind of policy could we expect the Economic Trusteeship to carry out? Two weeks ago, House Democrats adopted an economic program based on a time-honored concept strangely lacking in present day public affairs; a social contract between the government and the average citizen, in which the government pledges to concern itself with the economic problems of Americans—the cost of living, jobs, and taxes. If the government can demonstrate its sincerity, workers would have a valid reason for moderating their wage demands.

Such a social contract is essential if we are to forestall a new round of cost-push inflation as wage-earners, left far behind by exploding prices last year, try to catch up and protect their incomes this year.

All the signs point to increased labor militancy in the days ahead.

Strikes and work stoppages by public and private employees are rising dramatically.

Wage settlements have gone up sharply. During 1973 wage increases were held below six percent. But during the first six months of this year new contracts have been providing for first-year wage increases of almost 9 percent.

And we're not out of the woods by any means. In the next six months, a number of major labor contracts, negotiated before the recent spate of inflation, are due to expire. Unless something is done soon, traditionally militant longshoremen, aerospace workers, public employees, and coal miners will be looking for massive wage increases. As steelworker I. W. Abel said, unless labor moderates its demands, "the economy could go to hell".

To give workers an incentive to moderate their wage demands in the coming months, here is a 3-point social contract the Economic Trusteeship could pursue:

(1) Reduced Inflation. To make life more bearable for the average worker whose income is eaten away by rising prices, the Economic Trusteeship could reduce inflation by two main methods:

a. Expand Supplies to Reduce Prices. Even with high rates of inflation, the current Administration has, incredibly enough, often restricted supplies of food and basic commodities.

In 1973, Secretary Butz urged turkey growers to restrict production to force the price up. The program, unfortunately for the consumer, worked. Earlier Mr. Butz refused to let cattlemen graze their livestock on the 60 million acres of land set aside from production under the farm price-support program, until it was too late to ameliorate the beef shortage. Today, just when needed imports of Australian beef are beginning to get the price of hamburger under control, the Administration's agents are in Australia trying to get the Australians to send their beef elsewhere. And another branch of the Department of Agriculture is busy trying to raise the price of American beef by buying it for storage.

Mr. Nixon's refusal to eliminate the oil import quota program until the energy crisis, and his scandalous exchange of gifts with the dairymen, are other ways the Administration has consistently ripped off the American consumer.

To top it off, the Administration is still actively subsidizing exports of basic commodities—often, like scrap, lumber, fertilizer, and oil drilling equipment, in short supply at home—through the Export-Import Bank, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Domestic International Sales Corporation tax loophole.

The Economic Trusteeship would challenge policies of government agencies when they restrict supply and raise prices; recommend anti-trust action against industries when it would reduce prices; monitor excessive price increases; and generally act as the consumer's representative.

b. Restrain Credit, But Allocate It. A major cause of our inflation has been too rapid expansion of the money supply. During the last two years, the Fed jumped the money supply growth to more than 8 percent, and inflation followed suit.

The Trusteeship should willingly accept a Federal Reserve policy of keeping money supply growth within a non-inflationary band—say 4–6 percent for the period immediately ahead.

But keeping the total money supply within bounds makes no sense if in the process too little credit gets directed to interest-sensitive essential needs such as productive capital investment, low-moderate income housing, state-local government, small businesses and farms, and too much credit gets diverted to inflationary uses where the opportunity for high profits makes high interest rates irrelevant—speculative real estate loans, loans for building up supplies in anticipation of future price rises, loans for conglomerate takeovers.

This is precisely what is happening in America today. Home-building is strangled by tight money. Innovative small and medium-size business, the backbone of the economy, is unable to innovate for lack of credit. State and local governments are priced out of the bond market. Meanwhile, business loans, largely by big banks and largely to big borrowers and largely with inflationary results, are up some 23 percent since the beginning of 1974.

The Trusteeship would work with the Congress and with the financial authorities to assure that scarce credit gets nudged in the right direction, not in the wrong direction.

(2) Bring Down Unemployment. The Nixon Administration should have convinced us by now that massive budget deficits by themselves are no longer effective against unemployment. During the last five years, the real deficit has totaled more than $100 billion, and unemployment has risen from 3.8 percent to 5.3 percent.

We must shake off the almost religious attachment to deficit budgets demonstrated by Democratic and Republican administrations alike. During the next fiscal year, we should aim for a balanced budget.

And starting now, we must fight unemployment directly through a substantial program of public service jobs.

Useful work needs to be done—in education, health, public safety, mass transportation, pollution control, day care, building bicycle trails, rebuilding Amtrak's tracks. What on earth are we waiting for?

Public service employment would be the least costly, least inflationary, and least energy-consuming way to assure jobs. Creating 500,000 such jobs would cost approximately $3.5 billion per year, to be recouped through cutting an equivalent amount of fat from the Nixon budget. There is enough adipose tissue in the military budget alone for this purpose.

(3) Taxes. Wage-earners making $13,000 a year or less are the victims of the only recent general tax increase—the rise in social security taxes. Meanwhile, wealthy taxpayers pay less than their fair share. Recent tax cuts for business proposed by the Nixon Administration would only increase the disparity of the tax burden.

To correct this imbalance, without adding to inflation, the Economic Trusteeship would provide coordinated leadership for the Democratic Congress to pass a program of tax relief matched by revenue-raising tax reform.

Tax relief, aimed specifically at low- and middle-income families, would grant a cost-of-living adjustment to those who need it most. Coupled with thorough-going welfare reform for those too poor to be on the tax rolls, such relief could take several forms, such as (a) reducing the payroll tax through a low-income deduction; (b) increasing the income tax low-income allowance; or (c) changing the personal income tax deduction to a credit.

Such tax relief could have beneficial economic effects beyond the increased equity of the tax system. Reduced real family incomes for 1974, almost five percent lower than they were in 1973, have caused retail sales and industrial production to fall in recent months, despite capacity increases. Adequately-maintained consumer purchasing power, through tax relief rather than through the massive wage increases now demanded by workers, would prevent recessionary forces from accelerating without building new cost-push inflation into the structure.

To recoup the lost revenues from this equity-improving tax relief, we must have

thorough-going reform of the tax system at the top. Tax loopholes must be closed, especially those which not only lose revenues but have harmful side effects—for example, DISC, which squanders scarce goods abroad; the foreign oil depletion allowances; the hobby farm provision, which results largely in the bidding up of the price of farmland.

Thus the social contract: let the government deal fairly with working people on prices, jobs, and taxes, and the chances are that they'll deal fairly with their government.

* * * * *

But how, you ask, could a Trusteeship, largely manned by Democrats, though lodged within the Nixon-Ford Administration, ever engraft *its* economic program on the Nixon-Ford "old-time religion"—nothing but tight money, balanced budgets, no tax increase or decrease, and the usual special favors for special friends.

I'll tell you how.

We would leaven the lump of tight money by allocating it—away from inflationary lending, and toward productive lending.

We would buffer the harshness of a balanced budget in the upcoming fiscal year by changing the budget's composition—substituting public service employment, for example, for an equivalent amount of unnecessary military expenditure.

We would accept the gospel of no net tax change, but we would humanize matters by balancing tax cuts for the lower-income wage-earner with plugged loophole for the wealthy.

You ask, but who are these philosopher kings the Democrats would send into an economic coalition, the latter day equivalents of World War II's Stimsons and Knoxes? Here we get ahead of ourselves, and besides that's a question for the Democratic leadership. But if you pressed me, I would—at the risk of being thought parochial—call your attention to some of the talent right in the House of Representatives. Congressman Paul Sarbanes of Maryland, a former staff member of the CEA, who is needed on the CEA now. Congressman John Seiberling of Ohio with a background in law and economics, who could make sense at the OMB. Congressman Pete Stark of California, the only American so far to outwit the Arabs (he sold them his bank at a stunning price) to allocate credit away from inflationary lending. Or to run a massive new public service jobs program, a Congresswoman who knows firsthand about the problems of the three groups hardest hit by unemployment young, blacks and women—Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas.

As the television lens on the Judiciary Committee hearings has recently taught America of the House of Representatives: full many a flower is born to blush unseen and waste its sweetness on the desert air.

Yes, our economy does need a return to the "old-time religion". But the "old-time region" I'm talking about is one of which it can be said:

It was good for Andy Jackson,
It was good for Franklin Roosevelt,
And it's good for you and me!

TURKISH TROOPS MUST WITHDRAW FROM CYPRUS

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, reports continue to come in regarding atrocities on Cyprus and the expanding Turkish military occupation of that nation. Hospitals and civilian centers have been reported bombed by the Turkish Air Force, resulting in the deaths of innocent persons. The Soviet Union has mobilized forces in support of the Turkish position, making the situation worse and endangering world peace.

Turkey has forced the withdrawal of United Nation's peace-keeping forces, has forced its way into Greek Cypriot communities, and has begun to forcibly remove and uproot entire populations—all this after signing a cease-fire accord in Geneva.

Continued hostilities in Cyprus, along with persistent cease-fire violations and further threats by Turkey, increase the chances of open war with Greece. Only the Soviet Union would benefit from such tragedy and bloodshed because both Greece and Turkey are NATO allies of the United States.

The Turkish Government must immediately withdraw its troops from Cyprus and cease its threats of further military incursions or partition of that island nation.

The Greeks have long been loyal and effective allies of the United States and have been strong supporters of NATO from the very beginning. Our Mediterranean fleet is based in Greece and the hospitality shown to us has always been notable.

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government has not yet officially spoken out in support of the lawful government of Cyprus, that of Archbishop Makarios, nor has any stand been taken in opposition to the brutal military occupation of that independent nation by Turkey. I have written Secretary of State Kissinger to urge him to take such action because it is essential that the United States stand firm in defense of Cypriot independence, free from outside interference. My letter is written in the hope that the United States will use its prestige and influence to bring about a just settlement for the people of Cyprus and a strengthening of our NATO alliance in the eastern Mediterranean.

I have also cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 577, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus, and I urge my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee to take the swiftest possible action on this crucial international issue. My letter to Secretary of State Kissinger and my resolution follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *July 30, 1974.*

Dr. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the current military occupation by Cyprus by Turkey and the most recent news of the stringent and unreasonable demands to Greece made by Turkey's Premier for the continued presence of Turkish troops on the island, I urgently request that you make a clear and unequivocal statement in support of the lawful government of Cyprus, that of Archbishop Markarios, and call for complete withdrawal of all Turkish troops from Cyprus.

Reports of atrocities are beginning to come in as well as reports of continuing Turkish cease-fire violations, and as we all know so well, continued hostilities on Cyprus could well lead to general war between Greece and Turkey—a war between two NATO allies from which no one would benefit except the Soviets.

The United States Government, Mr. Secretary, must clearly go on record in strong support of free and democratic government in Cyprus without outside interference. The Greeks have always been staunch allies of the United States and the new Greek government must be encouraged and supported in its efforts to correct the excesses of the former dictatorship. Above all, the United States must firmly oppose any increase in Turkish troop strength on Cyprus and demand the complete and total withdrawal of troops already there.

Sincerely,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 577

Resolved, that Whereas an independent Republic of Cyprus is vital to the peace and security of the Eastern Mediterranean; and

Whereas Resolution 2077 (XX) adopted by the General Assembly on December 18, 1965 "Calls upon all States . . . To respect the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from any intervention directed against it;" and

Whereas Resolution 353, adopted by the Security Council on July 20, 1974, "Demands an immediate end to foreign military intervention in the Republic of Cyprus" and "Requests the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements. . . ."; and

Whereas the declaration on Cyprus signed by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, Turkey and Greece, in Geneva on July 30 calls for "A timely and phased reduction of the number of armed forces" from Cypriot Soil; and

Whereas the continued presence of foreign troops on Cyprus violates international agreements and U.N. resolutions, threatens the independence and territorial integrity of the island, jeopardizes peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean, and imperils the very existence of NATO: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that all foreign troops currently involved in Cyprus be withdrawn and that the United Nations be permitted to restore peace to this troubled area so that the territorial integrity and independence of Cyprus can be maintained.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my congressional district on July 25, 1974, and was unable to vote on rollcalls Nos. 409 and 410. I was granted a general pair and if I had been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 409, motion to recommit H.R. 11500, and "aye" on rollcall No. 410 final passage of H.R. 11500. I support H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act and would have voted accordingly.

QUOTAS, PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT AND REVERSE DISCRIMINATION DENIGRATE THE CAUSE OF RACIAL INTEGRATION

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, I addressed the New York City Human Rights Commission on the subject of reverse discrimination and racial quotas. At that time I expressed my belief that the policy of reverse discrimination contradicts the vision of society set forth by the human rights movement. Today I would like to reiterate to my colleagues some of the remarks I made before the Human Rights Commission. More importantly, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the recent statements of several distinguished civil rights leaders on this sensitive and emotional issue.

The advocates of civil rights seek a society in which each man or woman is judged according to his or her talent and character. In pursuit of this vision, the civil rights movement struggled until the 1960's to overcome legal barriers to racial discrimination. But the culminating victory of the battle against legal discrimination, the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, did not call into being the integrated society envisioned by civil rights advocates. Instead, Americans learned that 200 years of oppression cannot be overcome simply by making discrimination illegal.

The concept of affirmative action arose in response to this realization. The need to go beyond the destruction of barriers to minority participation by reaching out and actively encouraging that participation was recognized. But this well-intentioned effort to accelerate the progress of integration in the United States has on too many occasions been altered to include quotas and reverse discrimination.

Quotas assume a system of preferential treatment based on racial factors. Proportional representation of all minorities in all professions is not one of the necessary requisites of the society to which the advocates of human rights aspire. In a just society competition in all professions would be based only upon considerations relevant to the performance of the job in question, and race does not qualify as such a consideration. The way to achieve an integrated society is not to perform cosmetic operations upon the symptoms of racial inequity—not to rectify inadequate representation by granting preferential treatment to minorities—but to attack the causes that produce unequal representation, by providing adequate opportunities for minorities to become competitive with other groups in our society. In practice this means that we must discard reverse discrimination policies in favor of intensified efforts to enlarge minority opportunities through educational and training programs and the more vigorous enforcement of antidiscrimination laws.

I believe that my views in opposition to quotas, reverse discrimination and preferential treatment are in the true spirit of the human rights movement. I would like now to bring to the attention of the House two recent statements by outstanding civil rights leaders with which I am in accord.

The first statement is a resolution adopted by the Social Democrats, U.S.A. National Committee Meeting on May 11–12, 1974. Social Democrats, U.S.A. is devoted to the achievement of democracy in every sphere of public life—political, social and economic. The organization is chaired by the distinguished civil rights leaders A. Philip Randolph and Bayard Rustin.

The Social Democrats' resolution concerns quotas, racial progress and democracy. The resolution acknowledges that despite the progress of the past decade toward breaking down patterns of discrimination and segregation, racial inequality is a persistent phenomenon of American life. Contrary to the hopes of the proponents of preferential treatment, however, racial inequality will not be eliminated through the acceptance of the quota principle. The resolution predicts that—

> A society which apportions jobs and college admissions on the basis of race and sex will inevitably confront demands for even further compartmentalization.

Thus the Social Democrats' resolution affirms the view presented earlier that the quota principle stands in contradiction to the civil rights movement's values. Moreover, the resolution makes two insightful points regarding the implications of the preferential treatment concept. The first is that quotas have a profoundly destructive psychological impact on those who benefit from them. The existence of a quota system implies that minority groups must be given something in order to have something. Ultimately the institutionalization of the quota doctrine may mean that the majority will never accept the minority as having achieved something through its own worth, while the minority will doubt whether it really made it on its own. Second, quotas are both undemocratic and antidemocratic, for the demand for ratio political representation implies that the natural democratic process is inherently and unalterably biased.

I hope that my colleagues will find the time to read the full text of the Social Democrats' resolution, which I am appending to this statement.

I also wish to call to my colleagues' attention the remarks of the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson before the 64th annual convention of the National Urban League. Reverend Jackson, president of PUSH—People United to Save Humanity—appealed for the reestablishment of the alliance between blacks and Jews. Reverend Jackson's call is significant because the quota controversey is not only a theoretical debate about the ultimate vision of the civil rights movement. Unfortunately, the controversy has created a bitter rift between elements of the black and Jewish communities in this country.

Although quotas are currently employed to benefit some minority groups, for many decades quotas were used to bar blacks and other minority groups, including Jews, from important economic, social, and cultural opportunities. Jews remember the many inequities perpetrated against them through the use of quotas, and reject quota's reinstitution for fear that quotas may once again be employed to unfairly limit opportunities.

Many have interpreted Jewish opposition to quota systems as indicative of a division in the traditional black-Jewish alliance for civil rights. The threat that the reverse discrimination controversy poses to black-Jewish relations gained symbolic significance when the Supreme Court heard DeFunis against Odegaard. In that case, DeFunis, a Jewish law student, challenged the University of Washington Law School's employment of a double standard according to race.

In his speech before the National Urban League, Reverend Jackson noted that the "people who marched with us and demonstrated with us 10 years ago are now meeting us in the Supreme Court as adversaries over the quota issue." In response to this unfortunate situation, Reverend Jackson urged the black leaders present at the convention to meet with the leaders of the American Jewish Committee and B'nai Brith to assess the black-Jewish relationship. Reverend Jackson asserted that "there is much to be gained together, and too much to lose by being apart."

I agree with Reverend Jackson. Those who interpret the quota controversy as indicative of a black-Jewish rift have relinquished the vision of the civil rights movement. They do not realize that human dignity is compromised whenever men are judged by the irrationalities of racial or religious considerations. The Reverend Jackson's pleas and the resolution of the Social Democrats demonstrate the fallacies of preferential treatment and reverse discriminatory policies as they are pursued today. I hope that my colleagues will recognize the validity of the Social Democrats' resolution and Reverend Jackson's remarks. We must achieve the establishment of a just society through means which are in accord with our end. If we do otherwise, we will pervert and destroy our ultimate vision.

The Social Democrats' statement follows:

RESOLUTION ON QUOTAS, RACIAL PROGRESS, AND DEMOCRACY, ADOPTED BY SOCIAL DEMOCRATS, U.S.A. NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEETING, MAY 11–12, 1974

Lying at the heart of the controversy over quotas and preferential treatment for racial minorities are two phenomena. The first is the persistence of racial inequality in American life, despite the significant progress made during the past decade toward breaking down patterns of discrimination and segregation.

The second is the disastrous consequences of the economic policies of the Nixon Administration. There would obviously be no seriously considered demands for affirmative action formulas which extend preference to blacks and Spanish-speaking workers had the Administration committed itself to a policy of full employment. Between 1969 and 1972, black unemployment rose by some 400,000 workers; during the same period

the trend of a decreasing black-white earnings gap was actually reversed, so that today black income is a smaller percentage of white income than it was in 1965. The consequences of the failure of the Administration's fiscal policies, moreover, were exacerbated by the Administration's refusal to implement a manpower strategy, and its resistance to public employment legislation.

The result has been a natural disillusionment for black people for whom the promises of the civil rights revolution have been deferred as prejudice is compounded by policies of economic neglect. The most cynical aspect of this situation is that the concept of affirmative action, originally developed as a means of combatting bias and helping minorities assume a normal role in society, is now propounded as a major strategy for eliminating unemployment. This, it does not do; black joblessness is on the increase.

Prejudice and the shortcomings of Nixonian economics do not fully resolve the question of why the quota principle is rapidly becoming embedded in American society. Another consideration is the attitude of some liberals, much of the news media, and a large segment of the business community towards white working people. The outright snobbery prevalent during the 1960's has been replaced by a more subtle elitism which rejects the validity of the jobs of working people, the aspirations of their children, and the legitimacy of their labor leadership and political representatives. Although 70 per cent of the poor are white, public attitudes and government policy implies that only some groups—minorities and women—merit the help of government.

The dangers of these attitudes and the policies they generate are obvious: an exacerbation of the divisions between blacks and white working people, the perpetuation of an unhealthy, tribalistic form of ethnic consciousness, and a tendency to define social injustices as a function of racial, rather than class differences. A society which apportions jobs and college admissions on the basis of race and sex will inevitably confront demand for even further compartmentalization. We are already told that only black policemen should patrol the ghetto, that only Puerto Rican teachers can relate to Puerto Rican children, that only women can effectively serve as the political representatives of women.

Quotas also have a profoundly destructive psychological impact on those who benefit from them. Quotas infer that minority groups must be given something in order to have something. We reject such a condescendingly racist notion as demonstrably absurd. Society, however, may reach a different conclusion if the quota doctrine becomes institutionalized. The majority will never accept the minority as having achieved something through their own worth; the minority will be plagued by self-doubts as to whether they have really made it on their own.

We also reject quotas as both undemocratic and anti-democratic. The demand for ratio political representation implies that the natural democratic process is inherently and unalterably biased, a suggestion effectively refuted by the substantial political progress blacks have made, including the election of congressional and mayoral candidates in communities with white majorities, and to suggest, as some have, that quotas do not represent reverse discrimination, that quotas are simply "preferential inclusion" is simply semantic evasion. To include members of one group in order to fill a numerical goal is to exclude others. Quotas are quotas, whether they are called goals, preferential inclusion, affirmative action, or whatever.

In pointing out the fallacies and dangers inherent in the quota principle we recognize an obligation to offer workable alternatives. The proposals that follow are laid down not simply as alternatives to quotas, but as an effective strategy for dealing with the persistence of racial bias and the inequitable functioning of the economic order.

1. There must be a commitment by the federal government to a full employment economy. We cannot talk reasonably about abolishing discrimination until government is determined to provide a job for all. We advocate a federal economic and educational program that would provide expansion of opportunities in all areas of American life.

2. Manpower programs and compensatory education efforts which have proven successful must be expanded. The function of these programs is to provide training and education for those who have suffered because of poor educational opportunities. The consequences of downgrading manpower and compensatory education strategies are quotas and the failure of programs—such as open admissions—which initially offered considerable promise. We point to the Recruitment and Training Program, which has already enabled some 12,000 minority youths obtain journeymen's status in the building trades, and the para-professional program of the United Federation of Teachers, which is enabling hundreds of minority men and women to become teachers, as successful models of programs which help minorities achieve meaningful careers.

3. Artificial and meaningless job standards must be abolished. We oppose, however, the broad assault on valid qualifications in which many, including the federal government, are engaged. To weaken the legitimate standards of an institution will ultimately weaken the institution itself; those who will suffer the most severe consequences, moreover, will be the minorities who are beginning to enter society as regular participants. In this regard, we are critical of those liberals who reject the validity of apprenticeship and job standards in the skilled trades, while decrying the erosion of merit in the universities and other professions. Quotas and all they imply are as wrong in the workplace as they are in the college classroom or corporate board room.

4. There must be strong enforcement policies to deal with cases of blatant widespread discrimination. Such solutions, however, do not require the imposition of quotas. Heavy fines should be levied on corporations or government agencies which practice discrimination. Another alternative is the employment of a racially blind lottery system to select job applicants from a pool of qualified candidates.

5. Vigorous affirmative action programs must be continued. However we oppose the use of goals and timetables since as part of these programs, as now interpreted, they are simply a euphemism for quota systems.

Finally, we reject the proposition that quotas are the legacy of the civil rights movement. The leaders of the struggle for racial equality sought to expand opportunity for all who were oppressed by an unjust social and economic order. They were opposed to reverse discrimination for both practical and principled reasons. The quota principle does not reflect the civil rights movement's values, but rather signifies their abandonment.

CORRECTING AN INEQUITY IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter from a constituent brought to my attention a minor defect in the supplemental security income program which I am today introducing legislation to correct.

Let me describe the case very briefly:

A woman in my district applied for SSI benefits in January 1974. She died on May 22, 1974—never having received a penny in SSI benefits. Ironically, the day after her death two checks covering the period prior to her death arrived.

This woman had been living with and substantially supported by her daughter. After her mother's death, the daughter tried to cash the two SSI checks, but was told that under the law only an eligible spouse can receive this money. She felt, quite rightfully, I think, that she had a legitimate claim to the money, given the fact that she was supporting her mother and that these moneys would have been received by her mother a long time before her death if SSI had acted promptly on her application.

The law, however, is quite clear on this point. In the legislative history of the act, there is the following statement:

> If the individual dies before the amount due has been paid to him, or before he negotiates the check representing the correct payment, the amount due would be paid to his eligible spouse, if there is one, and the payment would not be taken into account in determining the spouse's need under this program. Underpayments, however, would not be paid to the estate of a deceased individual since that would not further the objective of meeting the current needs of individuals. (H. Rept. 92-231).

In general, I agree with the committee's thinking in denying underpayments to the estate of the deceased. However, I think that provision overlooks one very important situation which should be exempt from the prohibition: namely, the kind of situation I have described above in which the SSI recipient is being substantially supported by another person.

I think everyone familiar with the problems of the elderly agrees that public policy should be directed toward permitting senior citizens to remain in a home environment as long as they so desire. For many living on SSI benefits, the only way to make ends meet is to share the home of a son or daughter, a relative or friend. For others, there is the strong desire to remain a part of a family environment. Whatever the reason, the option should be theirs.

Obviously, anyone taking on responsibility for support of another individual will incur substantial additional costs. I think it is doubtful, practically speaking, that the SSI prohibition on transferring underpayments to anyone other than an eligible spouse makes any difference in the decision of those who do take on this added responsibility. However, I do think it is important—as a matter of public policy—to make it clear that we support rather than discourage the generosity of these people.

The cost to the Federal Government of lifting this prohibition would, I think, be negligible if and when social security is able to speed up the process of ap-

proving applications and making payments.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to permit payment of an SSI recipient's rightful benefits after his or her death to any person—if there is no eligible spouse—who was contributing over one-half of the person's support at the time of death. I hope the Congress will act quickly on it.

OTHER NATIONS ENFORCE SANCTIONS

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in the many hours of debate spent on the issue of U.N. sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, one of the most frequently heard arguments against U.S. compliance is the allegation that we are the only country taking enforcement seriously. This is simply not true and to lay this argument to rest once and for all I submit for the record the following exerpts from reports issued by the U.N. Sanctions Committee:

1. "By a note dated 16 July 1969, the Permanent Mission of Italy informed the Committee of the seizure by the Italian customs authorities of 250 tons of Southern Rhodesian tobacco."

2. ". . . by a note dated 22 November 1969, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee of a judicial action taken against a group of United Kingdom companies which had been found guilty on five counts of dealing in goods with intent to evade prohibition on exports. Fines totalling £ Stg. 100,020 (were) imposed."

3. "By a note of 23 April 1970, the Acting Permanent Representative of Denmark informed the Committee that a judgment had been pronounced by the Copenhagen City Court against a Danish company and its managing director for business transactions with a Southern Rhodesian firm in violation of Danish legislation pertaining to resolution 253 (1968). The consignment of 10,170 kilos of mica powder was confiscated and fines were imposed which together with the judicial costs reached a total of 165,839 kroner.

By a subsequent note of 20 May 1970, the Permanent Representative of Denmark informed the Committee of another judicial case in which a fine of 5,000 kroner had been imposed on a fraudulent importer."

4. ". . . the Yugoslav government informed the committee that all necessary measures had been taken to insure that the unloading of a suspected shipment of chrome ores did not take place . . ."

5. "On January 13, 1971, the Government of the United Kingdom informed also the committee of action against a firm which was fined £ 22,000 and £ 500 costs for exporting carpeting yarn to Southern Rhodesia. A joint managing director of this firm was fined £ 1000.

6. "A United Kingdom company was fined $46,250 on 10 May 1971 for exporting goods to Rhodesia. Another firm, incorporated in the Republic of Panama with headquarters in Bermuda, had been fined Bermudan $15,000 on 16 September 1971 for contravening Southern Rhodesia United Nations Sanctions Dependent Territories Order No. 2 of 1968, which extended to the dependent territory of Bermuda. The firms former sales manager had been fined Bermudian $10,000. Two other United Kingdom companies together with their managing director and chairman were fined a total of £ 6,100 and assessed £ 2,500 in costs for infringing UK sanctions legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the above facts, it is false to argue that the United States would be alone in the enforcement to UN Sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. I would therefore ask my colleagues to vote in favor of S. 1868—a bill to return the United States to compliance with UN Sanctions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

Mr. RANDALL (at his own request) for Tuesday, August 6, 1974, on account of official business, primary election in Missouri.

Mr. TREEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for this week, on on account of official business.

Mr. RHODES (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. STEELMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, for 15 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. FUQUA, to extend his remarks prior to the passage of H.R. 14718 on Consent Calendar in the House today.

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

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in four instances.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York.

Mr. SYMMS.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. MICHEL in five instances.

Mr. KEMP in three instances.

Mr. HUBER.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. MIZELL in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VANDER VEEN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCFALL.

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. WON PAT in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.

Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.

Mr. HICKS.

Ms. SCHROEDER in two instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER in 10 instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. ROE in three instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. TIERNAN in 10 instances.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, REFERRED

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

S. 857. An act to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to plan museum support facilities; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 2189. An act to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3537. An act to modify section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1085); to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 3578. An act for the relief of Anita Tomasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 230. Joint Resolution to salute Chautauqua Institution on the occasion of its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings entitled "Public Financing of Federal Elections"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 14012. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S. 3669. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Atomic Weapons Rewards Act of 1955, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 2, 1974, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11873. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 6, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2623. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on a comprehensive study of programs carried out under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act, pursuant to section 10 of Public Law 93-150; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2624. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1154(d)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2625. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1254(c)(1)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2626. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1254(c)(1)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2627. A letter from the Assistant Administrator of General Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation transferring to the State of Alaska certain archives and records in the custody of the National Archives of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2628. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on actions recommended to the Secretary of State to alleviate serious financial problems facing the United Nations; 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. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 15928. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to provide for the regulation of the issuance and sale of debt obligations by parents of member banks, nonmember insured banks (including insured mutual savings banks), and savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; with amendment Rept. No. 93-1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1292. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16090. A bill to impose overall limitations on campaign expenditures and political contributions; to provide that each candidate for Federal office shall designate a principal campaign committee; to provide for a single reporting responsibility with respect to receipts and expenditures by certain political committees; to change the times for the filing of reports regarding campaign expenditures and political contributions; to provide for public financing of Presidential nominating conventions and Presidential primary elections; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1260). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 16253. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medicaid programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans' pension and compensation programs or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 16254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended) to permit charitable contributions to the United Nations to be deductible for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16255. A bill to provide for the development of a long-range plan to advance the national attack on arthritis and related musculoskeletal diseases and for arthritis training and demonstration centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 16256. A bill to insure that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced, or entitlement thereto discontinued, because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 16257. A bill to provide for the protection of franchised dealers of petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 16258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat the noncash remuneration paid to certain workers on fishing boats as self-employment income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 16259. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that any payments of supplemental security income benefits which are due an individual at his or her death may, if such individual does not leave a qualified surviving spouse, be made to any person who was contributing over half of such individual's support at the time of such death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER VEEN:

H.R. 16260. A bill to strengthen and expand the Head Start program, with priority to the economically disadvantaged, to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other puropses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16261. A bill to amend title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to extend, improve, and expand programs of bilingual education, teacher training, and child development; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16262. A bill to amend section 428 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to better assure that students will have reasonable access to loans to meet their postsecondary education costs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16263. A bill to provide that local educational agencies shall not receive Federal financial assistance unless they provide educational services to all handicapped children at levels of expenditure at least equal to expenditures for other children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16264. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect the employment rights of the elderly; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16265. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to provide authority to assist training of disadvantaged students for the legal profession; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16266. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation to handicapped persons and persons who are 65 years of age or older, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for persons who are 65 years of age or older, and to provide new and improved transportation programs for the handicapped and the elderly; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16267. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, to revise the programs of student assistance, to revise the National Health Service Corps program, to establish a system for the regulation of postgraduate training programs for physicians, to provide assistance for the development and expansion of training programs for nurse clinicians, pharmacist clinicians, community and public health personnel, and health administrators, to provide assistance for projects to improve the training provided by undergraduate schools of nursing, pharmacy, and allied health to provide assistance for the development and operation of area health education systems, to establish a loan guarantee and interest subsidy program for undergraduate students of nursing, pharmacy, and the allied health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16268. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to revise the various programs of assistance authorized by that act and to extend it to the fiscal year 1976; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16269. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 10-year delimiting period for the pursuit of educational programs by veterans, wives, and widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide income and payroll tax relief to low-income and moderate-income taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. FORD, Mr. STEELMAN, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 16271. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A (the hospital insurance program) for care and treatment furnished at a central radiation therapy treatment facility, and to provide full payment under part B (the supplementary medical insurance program) for radiation therapy services furnished by physicians to inpatients or outpatients of any hospital or any such facility; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 16272. A bill to exclude from gross income the first $500 of interest received on deposits in thrift institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 16273. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for grade retention benefits for certain Federal employees whose positions are reduced in grade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BAFALIS (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BELL, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HALEY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. NIX):

H. Con. Res. 584. 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. BAFALIS (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATRON, and Mrs. HOLT):

H. Con. Res. 585. 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. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. PHILLIP BURTON):

H. Res. 1290. Resolution to establish a John W. McCormack senior citizen intern program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. HICKS, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. VANDER VEEN):

H. Res. 1291. Resolution providing for television and radio coverage of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on any resolution to impeach the President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. DE LA GARZA introduced a bill (H.R. 16274) for the relief of Guadalupe Villegas-Cantu, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MARGARET ZABRISKIE DESERVES HONORS FOR DISTINGUISHED SOCIAL WORK CAREER

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1974

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Margaret Zabriskie deserves recognition and honors for her devotion to humanity during her long career in the field of social work. Mrs. Zabriskie, who retired on July 31, 1974, devoted 39 years of her life to lending assistance to those in need and making life a little more meaningful to them.

Mrs. Zabriskie, a third generation Hawaiian Islander, started her career as a volunteer, and hopes to resume volunteer work during retirement. Her philosophy that every human being must be respected as an individual has been the keystone of her successful career, and has earned her the respect and admiration of her colleagues and the thousands of people she has helped during the past 39 years.

As a means of recognizing the concerned, life-affirming efforts of Margaret Zabriskie and congratulating her upon her retirement, I submit the following article written by Dianne Coughlin in the July 27, 1974, Honolulu Star-Bulletin for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THIRTY-NINE-YEAR CAREER ENDS FOR RETIRING COUNSELOR

People in trouble have been calling Margaret Zabriskie for 39 years and she loves it.

Mrs. Zabriskie retires at the end of this month from Child and Family Service where she has been the first point of contact for thousands of people seeking help from this United Way agency.

Mrs. Zabriskie handles phone calls from persons and either makes appointments for them with one of the agency's 25 workers or refers them to another agency more appropriate to their needs.

On the day of this interview a young Filipino mother, barely able to speak English, called Mrs. Zabriskie and said her husband was beating her and she wanted a divorce.

"I told her that we would help her before she went to an attorney," said Mrs. Zabriskie.

The woman was to have a friend who spoke better English call back later in the day and set up an appointment for her that week.

"In an emergency we can always take someone right away," Mrs. Zabriskie said.

Most of the calls for help are from parents having problems with their children. The second largest number of calls is for marriage counseling.

"More people are interested in marriage counseling than ever before," said Mrs. Zabriskie. "Dear Abby and Ann Landers give marriage counseling a plug every now and then and that helps us."

When people come in for their first appointment with the agency, Mrs. Zabriskie assists them in filling out their application and explains the agency's sliding fee scale which is based on ability to pay.

"Often there's no fee at all because people are paying such high rents. Housing is the severest problem in the State," she said.

Mrs. Zabriskie, whose maiden name was Fleming, is a member of a kamaaina family. She is a third generation Islander and started her social work career with the old Social Service Bureau as a volunteer.

The bureau was eventually split to form the State Department of Social Services plus two private agencies, Children's Service Association and Family Consultation Service.

Mrs. Zabriskie went with Family Consultation Service which merged in 1941 with the Children's Association to form Child and Family Service.

In the beginning of her career, Mrs. Zabriskie went out to see her clients, rather than them coming to her.

"Most didn't have telephones or cars. I'd drop them a note saying 'Thursday I'll be coming to see you.' "

In the early days, she also handled quite a few problems from distraught airplane passengers.

"We'd be asked to take care of children all day while they waited for a flight to Guam. Once I met a plane coming in from the Philippines. A boy was being sent to his natural father in Pittsburgh. He didn't speak a word of English and was so frightened," she said.

Despite all the troubles she has listened to, Mrs. Zabriskie says she never finds her work depressing.

"It's not like treating people who are ill with a terminal disease. Chances are that their situation is going to be made much better with help. I have really, really enjoyed my work."

The biggest lesson her work has taught her, she said is that "every human being, just everyone, is an individual to be respected."

Mrs. Zabriskie plans to do some traveling after she retires, "to visit relatives, nothing exciting."

Then she might take up volunteer work again—which is where it all started for her 39 years ago.

MRS. BUTLER DIES; NEWS PUBLISHER

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death August 3, 1974, of Kate Robinson Butler, president and publisher of the Buffalo Evening News and president of WBEN radio and television.

I was privileged to know her personally through my years in the Buffalo city government and in Congress. She had succeeded her husband, Edward H. Butler as president of the News by the time I was elected to my first term in Congress. Throughout that 1958 campaign, the News demonstrated great professional journalism in its fairness of the political coverage, and it was my pleasure to arrange for my first flag to be flown over the U.S. Capitol, on January 3, 1959, to be presented to the News and accepted by Mrs. Butler.

Mrs. Butler's generosity of time, effort, and financial backing of charitable, civic, and humanitarian causes are well known