

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA,
1973 SESSION
HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1406
JANUARY 23, 1974.

A joint resolution honoring the life and memory of Harold Dunbar Cooley, former member of the United States House of Representatives

Whereas, Harold Dunbar Cooley the son of the late Roger A. P. Cooley and Harriett Davis Cooley, was born in Nashville, Nash County, North Carolina, on July 26, 1897, attended the public schools of Nash County and the Law School of the University of North Carolina and Yale University; and

Whereas, Harold Dunbar Cooley served his nation as a member of the Naval Aviation Flying Corps during World War I; and

Whereas, Harold Dunbar Cooley was a distinguished and effective attorney; and

Whereas, Harold Dunbar Cooley was elected a member of the 73rd Congress on July 7, 1934, and served as a member of Congress for over 32 years; and

Whereas, Harold Dunbar Cooley was chosen as the first member of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives from North Carolina in over one hundred years; and

Whereas, Harold Dunbar Cooley became Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture in 1948 and served as Chairman of that Committee longer than any Chairman in the history of our nation; and

Whereas, during the course of his career, Harold Dunbar Cooley championed the farmers, not only of North Carolina, but of the entire United States, and introduced or actively supported every piece of major farm legislation passed by Congress for a period of 32 years, including the Rural Electrification Act, The Farmer's Home Administration Act, the Tobacco Program, the Wheat Program, the Cotton Program, the Food for Peace Program and many other important acts; and

Whereas, legislation introduced by Harold Dunbar Cooley benefited the people of his district, and people of the entire United States and the world; and

Whereas, Harold Dunbar Cooley served as a delegate to the Interparliamentary Union for many years and served as its President; and

Whereas, Harold Dunbar Cooley was honored by the governments of Italy, Japan,

Korea, France and other countries and many farm organizations for his service to Agriculture and as a statesman of the world; and

Whereas, the North Carolina General Assembly desires to express its appreciation for the long and distinguished career, and the fruitful life of Harold Dunbar Cooley, and desires to express its sympathy to his wife, Madeline Strickland Cooley, and to other members of his family; and

Whereas, this desire can best be expressed in words to his family:

"Thank you for sharing Harold Dunbar Cooley with North Carolina, the United States and the world."

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

SECTION 1. That the North Carolina General Assembly does hereby express its grateful appreciation for the useful and dedicated life of Harold Dunbar Cooley.

Sec. 2. That the General Assembly extends its sympathy to the family of Harold Dunbar Cooley for the loss of its distinguished member.

Sec. 3. That this resolution shall become a part of the public record of the 1974 Session of the General Assembly of North Carolina, and a copy shall be duly certified by the Secretary of State and forthwith transmitted to the family of Harold Dunbar Cooley.

Sec. 4. This resolution shall be effective upon ratification.

THOMAS O. GILMORE

(Member of North Carolina House of Representatives; resident of Greensboro, N.C.)

Harold D. Cooley was a friend of the nation's farmers and a person to whom agriculture is very deeply indebted. He was the first North Carolinian to be chosen as a member of the Agriculture Committee of the United States House of Representatives in over one hundred years, and he served as chairman of that committee longer than any chairman in the history of our nation. In this capacity, he championed the farmers, not only of North Carolina, but of the entire United States. Through his many efforts he served not only the people of his district and his state, but all the people of his nation. Harold Cooley was indeed a great American whose leadership is badly needed in this time of crisis. I hope that we who serve in government will use his life as an example to follow.

JOHN ED DAVENPORT

My association with Harold Dunbar Cooley has been close since my birth. I was born next to his birthplace. For a number of years, we shared adjoining law offices. I participated in his campaigns, so I feel a deep sense of personal loss.

In spite of the feeling of loss, I am thankful for the farm legislation which he authored and promoted. Harold was instrumental in the enactment of the Rural Electrification Act and establishing of the Farmers Home Administration. This legislation has benefited thousands of people of every race, color and creed in rural America. Time and again Harold displayed his interest in tobacco farmers, cotton farmers, wheat farmers and dairymen.

As Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives and President of the Interparliamentary Union, he walked among the important people of the world. During all of this time, to the people at home, he remained "Harold". He kept the common touch.

On one occasion, I heard him say that "thoroughbreds never cry". Therefore his friends should not mourn but celebrate and give thanks for an active and useful life of dedication to the people of his state, his country and the world.

JULIAN B. FENNER

(Member of North Carolina House of Representatives; president of Fenner's Warehouse, Inc; resident of Rocky Mount, N.C.)

Harold Dunbar Cooley, a close friend and neighbor, who represented North Carolina's Fourth Congressional District for 32 years, was the outspoken champion of legislation helping the American farmer, as well as farmers all over the world.

As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee for many years, he sponsored many landmark pieces of legislation which today continue to help the American farmer in the production and marketing of his crops. His interest in people was so far-reaching that he sponsored the legislation launching a World War on Hunger through the Food for Freedom Program.

Much more can be said about this outstanding public servant, but suffice it to say that those of us in the area he served, and especially those as myself who are farmers and are connected with the tobacco industry, are proud of his record and grateful for the services he has given to mankind.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 19, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Ben Zion D. Schaffran, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Honorable Members of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, you represent not only the various people of this country, but also their problems and the hopes and endeavor for solutions thereto. The Founding Fathers of this great Nation set a precedent for you as Representatives and the people of this country, acknowledgement of the great divine providence, and a constant search for divine guidance—so much so that every governmental assembly is opened with a prayer and even the currency of this country bespeaks trust in G-d. A nation which is cognizant of its reliance on the Almighty will surely weather the storms which have befallen it. Let us verbalize the prayer of a people who stand before G-d seeking his guidance. "Great are the needs of Thy people, yet their understanding is incomplete. They are unable to enumerate their

wants and desires. Please grant understanding to them prior to their calling, great powerful and awful Lord."

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.

RABBI BEN ZION D. SCHAFFRAN

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me that Rabbi Ben Zion D. Schaffran has given the benediction to the Congress today. At a time when Congress is confronting such dif-

ficult and complicated problems, I hope that his words will provide a source of guidance for us.

Rabbi Schaffran, who is a constituent of mine, is a distinguished member of the Crown Heights community, and is associated with the Lubavitcher Movement, the worldwide headquarters of which are located within my district.

He does not minister only to the spiritual needs of his neighbors, but has taken an active role in working to alleviate many of the urban problems besetting the Crown Heights community.

Rabbi Schaffran has done important work with young people, both as a lecturer on college campuses and as a teacher at the Hadar Hatorah Institute. He serves as the executive vice president for Concerned Help To Augment Services for Inner City Dwellers. He has worked diligently with Brooklyn groups to seek new and fruitful approaches to uniting and improving their communities.

February 19, 1974

I am pleased as a Representative of the 16th Congressional District that Rabbi Schaffran could be with us today.

APPROVAL OF PROSPECTUS FOR LEASE RENEWAL IN FALLS CHURCH, VA., AND CONSTRUCTION PROSPECTUS FOR FEDERAL BUILDINGS AT ELKINS, W. VA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 7, 1974.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives on January 29, 1974 approved the prospectus for the proposed lease renewal at 5611 Columbia Pike, Falls Church, Virginia; and a construction prospectus proposing the construction of a Post Office, Courthouse and Federal Office Building at Elkins, West Virginia.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman.

THE HONORABLE CHET HOLIFIELD, OF CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a tinge of sadness that we learned today officially that Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, will not run for re-election and will retire at the end of this congressional session.

I have served with Congressman HOLIFIELD since I came to Congress in January 1953, and have had the pleasure of working with him on many important matters, particularly in the Government Operations Committee, on which we have sat side by side for many years.

Congressman HOLIFIELD has served his country with honor, untiring energy, and undeviating dedication. He will be sorely missed by the people of his district and by the House of Representatives.

CHET will long be remembered for his service as chairman of two great committees of Congress, the Government Operations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He has established a record of which any Member of Congress would be proud.

I can understand why, after 30 years of service, he now chooses to take a little time for himself and his family. He has earned it. So has his lovely wife, Cam, who has been so helpful to him throughout his distinguished career. I am sure both of them will enjoy the opportunity to be with their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren more often.

Though the chairman is retiring, I hope that he will continue to maintain an active interest and participation in matters of crucial importance to our country.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS GRAND RAPIDS ELECTION CONTAINS A MESSAGE FOR THE NATION

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Grand Rapids have passed judgment on a lot more than the election of a single Congressman.

RICHARD VANDERVEEN made that election a referendum on the confidence of the people in the Nixon administration and the way it is doing its job. The people's response was a decisive thumbs down.

The seat had been Republican since 1910, and its most recent incumbent—Vice President Ford—had polled 61 percent of the vote in 1972. Yesterday, the people awarded his seat to the Democratic candidate, RICHARD VANDERVEEN, by a solid majority of 51 percent to 44 percent.

Vice President Ford said the outcome was probably affected by the country's unsettled economic situation. I agree that the administration's consistent and continuing mismanagement of the economy had much to do with the Democratic victory.

The outlook for 1974 is bleak: rising prices and rising unemployment. It will cost more to buy less this year, and yet production is declining and more people will be out of work.

Worse yet, the Nixon administration has entangled itself in so many other difficulties that it would have a hard time responding to the energy crisis and the economic crisis, even if it wanted to. By its evasiveness and its attitude toward the Watergate inquiry, the administration has forfeited the trust and confidence of the people. And without these it cannot act.

That was what the election was all about in Grand Rapids, and the message ought to be unmistakable.

ELECTION IN GRAND RAPIDS

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Campaign Committee and Mr. VANDERVEEN made no wild claims before the election and it is not my purpose to come here today and shout about it. I really came in hope that I would have the opportunity to hear my counterpart, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), or better still the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), explain exactly what happened up there. They had a great many explanations about the closeness of the special election in Pennsylvania but I do not see either one of them here today.

It seems to me Mr. VANDERVEEN, who won this election and who knocked the margin—the Republicans got 62 percent a year ago—down to 43 percent today might have had the right campaign slogan because he paraphrased the President's speech and said the following:

The only thing around the corner is a gas station with prices of 50 cents a gallon if they have any gas or a supermarket where half a basket of groceries costs as much as a whole one did a short time ago.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 13, 1974, I was absent and missed two recorded votes. For the record, I now state how I would have voted had I been present:

Rollcall No. 32: Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 11864, to establish a program to demonstrate solar heating and cooling technology. I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 33: Final passage of H.R. 11864, solar heating and cooling technology, I would have voted "yea."

ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am reading from a press release of the Federal Energy Office dated February 9, 1974, which redirected gasoline stocks in 22 States, in which it says in part that the program to redistribute some of the oil supplies around this Nation was done to "achieve a more equitable balance in supply." Supplies in my district and in my State were to be increased some 2 percent. The directive also stated that the FEO would "take further steps to redirect supplies if severe shortages persist." I am informed that that program is being scrapped by the Federal Energy Office as of today. This action is reminiscent of the Cost of Living Council's on-again-off-again administration of the programs that drove prices of beef up to the highest levels in recent history.

The Federal Energy Office administration of the crude oil allocation program under the Mandatory Allocation Act, which was passed by this Congress some few months ago, has brought about an unprecedented fuel crisis. The individual capabilities of refineries around the Nation have been ignored and equal crude oil supplies ordered to each regardless of its design or capacity. As a result, this administration has brought down the average refinery utilization across the country from an average of approximately 93 percent to 76 percent. Under this bureaucratic mishmash, we have reduced our refined supplies of fuel products by almost 20 percent and substantially worsened the current situation. This condition cannot be permitted to persist and I call on the FEO and the Congress to take remedial action in the immediate future.

REMOVAL OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, many Mississippians, like millions of Americans from every State in this great Union, are convinced that wage and price controls must end. They have seen what Government controls can do to a free enterprise system and they overwhelmingly support immediate removal of all such controls.

One of my constituents, a college student, probably summed up Mississippi's view of controls in a recent letter to me. He wrote:

Price controls were supposed to be temporary, but inflation has actually gotten worse since those started. I'm no doctrinaire free-market type, but anybody can run the economy better than the Government. If we have to control gasoline, let's subcontract it out to the Mafia; they'll at least get results, which is a whole lot more than John Dunlop and his boys are doing.

Mr. Speaker, that young man's solution is obviously overstated, but his distrust of Government controls is not. Americans everywhere are convinced—like that student—that anybody can run the economy better than the Government. The Government has tried and failed. Its time to give America's free enterprise system a chance to work out its own problems.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 6186, AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6186) to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, with the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 3 thereto, insist upon the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 3 and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DIGGS, FRASER, DELLUMS, REES, ADAMS, NELSEN, HARSHA, and BROYHILL of Virginia.

OUTCOME OF ELECTION IN FIFTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, without in any way meaning to detract from the victory of Mr. VANDERVEEN in the Fifth District of Michigan, I would be remiss if I did not express my regret and sorrow that Bob VanderLaan, a former very capable associate of mine in the Michigan Senate, was not victorious in that race.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Massachusetts, both of whom preceded me in the well. I only suggest to them that one does not add to the brightness of his own light by pointing at the dimness of others.

Mr. Speaker, I would only hope that this one more Member will give the House Democratic majority the strength

it apparently needs to be able to pass the laws necessary for the Congress to accept the responsibility as well as the authority for resolving the many agonizing difficulties of our present situation.

the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RICHARD BURTON, SFC., U.S. ARMY (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3533) for the relief of the estate of the late RICHARD BURTON, SFC., U.S. Army (retired).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2508) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MURRAY SWARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6411) for the relief of Murray Swartz.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION TO REFER BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF ESTELLE M. FASS TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 362) to refer the bill (H.R. 7209) entitled "A bill for the relief of Estelle M. Fass," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RITA SWANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1342) for the relief of Rita Swann.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, 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.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2535) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COL. JOHN H. SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2633) for the relief of Col. John H. Sherman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

LEONARD ALFRED BROWN RIGG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2629) for the relief of Leonard Alfred Brownrigg.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BOULOS STEPHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4438) for the relief of Boulos Stephan.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FAUSTINO MURGIA-MELENDREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7535) for the relief of Faustino Murgia-Melendrez.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROMEO LANCIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4127) for the relief of Romeo Lancin.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, 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.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

VETERANS' EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12628) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and other persons; to make improvements in the educational assistance programs; and for other purposes.

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 this Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1974".

Sec. 2. Chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) by amending paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of section 1502 to read as follows:

"(1) arose out of service during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era; or "(2) arose out of service (A) after World War II and before the Korean conflict, (B) after the Korean conflict but before August 5, 1964, or (C) after the Vietnam era,

and is rated for compensation purposes as 30 per centum or more, or if less than 30 per centum, is clearly shown to have caused a pronounced employment handicap"; and (2) by amending the table contained in section 1504(b) to read as follows:

"Column I	Col-	Col-	Col-	Column V
	umn II	umn III	umn IV	
Type of training	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	More than two dependents
The amount in column IV, plus the following for each dependent in excess of two:				
Institutional:				
Full-time.....	\$193	\$240	\$282	\$20
Three-quarter time.....	145	180	212	15
Half-time.....	97	120	141	10
Farm cooperative, apprentice, or other on-the-job training:				
Full-time.....	168	203	235	16."

SEC. 3. Chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) by deleting in the last sentence of section 1677(b) "\$220" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250";

(2) by amending the table contained in paragraph (1) of section 1682(a) to read as follows:

"Column I	Col-	Col-	Col-	Column V
	umn II	umn III	umn IV	
Type of program	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	More than two dependents
The amount in column IV, plus the following for each dependent in excess of two:				
Institutional:				
Full-time.....	\$250	\$297	\$339	\$20
Three-quarter time.....	188	223	254	15
Half-time.....	125	149	170	10
Cooperative.....	201	236	268	16";

(3) by deleting in section 1682(b) "\$220" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250";

(4) by amending the table contained in paragraph (2) of section 1682(c) to read as follows:

"Column I	Col-	Col-	Col-	Column V
	umn II	umn III	umn IV	
Basis	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	More than two dependents
The amount in column IV, plus the following for each dependent in excess of two:				
Full-time.....	\$201	\$236	\$268	\$16
Three-quarter time.....	151	177	201	12
Half-time.....	101	118	134	8";

(5) by deleting in section 1696(b) "\$220" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250";

(6) by inserting in clause (3) of section 1652(a), immediately after "1661(a)," the following: "except as provided therein";

(7) by adding at the end of section 1661(a) the following:

"For purposes of this subsection, in determining the period to which any eligible veteran is entitled to educational assistance under this chapter, the initial period of active duty for training performed by him under section 511(d) of title 10 shall be deemed to be active duty if at any time subsequent to the completion of such period of active duty for training such veteran served on active duty for a consecutive period of one year or more.";

(8) by amending section 1662—

(a) by deleting "eight" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "ten";

(b) by deleting "8-year" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "10-year";

(c) by deleting "8-year" and "eight-year"

in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "10-year" and "ten-year", respectively;

and

(d) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In the case of any veteran (1) who served on or after January 31, 1955, (2) who became eligible for educational assistance under the provisions of this chapter or chapter 36 of this title, and (3) who, subsequent to his last discharge or release from active duty, was captured and held as a prisoner of war by a foreign government or power, there shall be excluded, in computing his ten-year period of eligibility for educational assistance, any period during which he was so detained and any period immediately following his release from such detention during which he was hospitalized at a military, civilian, or Veterans' Administration medical facility";

(9) by deleting in section 1673(d) "chapter 31, 34, or 36" and inserting in lieu thereof "chapter 31, 35, or 36";

(10) by adding at the end of section 1682 a new subsection as follows:

"(d) (1) Notwithstanding the bar in section 1671 of this title prohibiting enrollment of an eligible veteran in a program of education in which he is 'already qualified', a veteran shall be allowed up to six months of educational assistance (or the equivalent pursuit of refresher training to permit him to update his knowledge and skills and to be instructed in the technological advances which have occurred in his field of employment during the period of his active military service).

"(2) A program of education pursued under this subsection must be commenced within twelve months from the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active duty and must be pursued continuously (except for interruptions for reasons beyond the veteran's control).

"(3) A veteran pursuing refresher training under this subsection shall be paid an educational assistance allowance based upon the rate payable as set forth in the table in subsection (a)(1) or in subsection (b)(2) of this section, whichever is applicable.

"(4) The educational assistance allowance paid under the authority of this subsection shall be charged against the period of entitlement the veteran has earned pursuant to section 1661(a) of this title"; and

(11) by amending section 1685—

(a) by deleting "\$250" wherever it appears in subsection (a) and substituting "500" in each case;

(b) by deleting "one hundred hours" wherever it appears in subsection (a) and substituting "two hundred hours" in each case; and

(c) by deleting "(not to exceed eight hundred man-years or their equivalent in man-

hours during any fiscal year" in subsection (c).

Sec. 4. Chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) by amending section 1732(a)(1) to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The educational assistance allowance on behalf of an eligible person who is pursuing a program of education consisting of institutional courses shall be computed at the rate of (A) \$250 per month if pursued on a full-time basis, (B) \$188 per month if pursued on a three-quarter-time basis, and (C) \$125 per month if pursued on a half-time basis;"

(2) by deleting in section 1732(a)(2) "\$220" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250";

(3) by deleting in section 1732(b) "\$177" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$201";

(4) by amending section 1742(a) to read as follows:

"(a) While the eligible person is enrolled in and pursuing a full-time course of special restorative training, the parent or guardian shall be entitled to receive on his behalf a special training allowance computed at the basic rate of \$250 per month. If the charges for tuition and fees applicable to any such course are more than \$78 per calendar month, the basic monthly allowance may be increased by the amount that such charges exceed \$78 a month upon election by the parent or guardian of the eligible person to have such person's period of entitlement reduced by one day for each \$8.35 that the special training allowance paid exceeds the basic monthly allowance."

(5) by amending section 1723(c) by deleting "any course of institutional on-farm training"; and

(6) by amending section 1732 by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting immediately after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) An eligible person who is enrolled in an educational institution for a 'farm cooperative' program consisting of institutional agricultural courses prescheduled to fall within forty-four weeks of any period of twelve consecutive months and who pursues such program on—

"(A) a full-time basis (a minimum of ten clock hours per week or four hundred and forty clock hours in such year prescheduled to provide not less than eighty clock hours in any three-month period),

"(B) a three-quarter-time basis (a minimum of seven clock hours per week), or

"(C) a half-time basis (a minimum of five clock hours per week),

shall be eligible to receive an educational assistance allowance at the appropriate rate provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, if such eligible person is concurrently engaged in agricultural employment which is relevant to such institutional agricultural courses as determined under standards prescribed by the Administrator. In computing the foregoing clock hour requirements there shall be included the time involved in field trips and individual and group instruction sponsored and conducted by the educational institution through a duly authorized instructor of such institution in which the person is enrolled.

"(2) The monthly educational assistance allowance to be paid on behalf of an eligible person pursuing a farm cooperative program under this chapter shall be computed at a rate of (A) \$201 per month if pursued on a full-time basis, (B) \$151 per month if pursued on a three-quarter-time basis, and (C) \$101 per month if pursued on a half-time basis."

Sec. 5. Chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) by deleting in section 1786(a)(2) "\$220" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250";

(2) by amending the table contained in paragraph (1) of section 1787(b) to read as follows:

Periods of training	Col-	Col-	Col-	Column V
	umn II	umn III	umn IV	
The amount in column IV, plus the following for each dependent in excess of two:				
First 6 months...	\$182	\$203	\$223	\$9
Second 6 months...	136	158	177	9
Third 6 months...	91	112	132	9
Fourth and any succeeding 6- month periods...	45	67	86	9

(3) by amending section 1787(b)(2) to read as follows:

"(2) The monthly training assistance allowance of an eligible person pursuing a program described under subsection (a) shall be (A) \$182 during the first six-month period, (B) \$136 during the second six-month period, (C) \$91 during the third six-month period, and (D) \$45 during the fourth and any succeeding six-month period."

(4) by amending section 1784(b) to read as follows:

"(b) The Administrator may pay to any educational institution, or to any joint apprenticeship training committee acting as a training establishment, furnishing education or training under either chapter 34, 35, or 36 of this title, a reporting fee which will be in lieu of any other compensation or reimbursement for reports or certifications which such educational institution or joint apprenticeship training committee is required to report to him by law or regulation. Such reporting fee shall be computed for each calendar year by multiplying \$3 by the number of eligible veterans or eligible persons enrolled under chapter 34, 35, or 36 of this title, or \$4 in the case of those eligible veterans and eligible persons whose educational assistance checks are directed in care of each institution for temporary custody and delivery and are delivered at the time of registration as provided under section 1780(d)(5) of this title, on October 31 of that year; except that the Administrator may, where it is established by such educational institution or joint apprenticeship training committee that eligible veteran plus eligible person enrollment on such date varies more than 15 per centum from the peak eligible veteran plus eligible person enrollment in such educational institution or joint apprenticeship training committee during such calendar year, establish such other date as representative of the peak enrollment as may be justified for such educational institution or joint apprenticeship training committee. The reporting fee shall be paid to such educational institution or joint apprenticeship training committee as soon as feasible after the end of the calendar year for which it is applicable."

(5) by adding at the end of section 1788(a) the following:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of clause (1) or (2) of this subsection, an educational institution offering courses on a clock-hour basis below the college level may measure such courses of a quarter- or semester-hour basis (with full-time measured on the same basis as provided by clause (4) of this subsection), provided that (A) the academic portions of such courses require outside preparation and are measured on not less than one quarter or one semester hour for each fifty minutes net of instruction per week per quarter or semester; (B) the laboratory portions of such courses are measured on not less than one quarter or one semester hour for each two hours of attendance per week per quarter or semester; and (C) the shop portions of such courses are measured on not less than one quarter or one semester

hour for each three hours of attendance per week per quarter or semester: *Provided*, That in no event shall such course be considered a full-time course when less than twenty-five hours per week of attendance is required.

Sec. 6. (a) Chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER V—VIETNAM ERA VETERANS COMMUNICATION CENTER

"§ 251. Establishment of the Center

"(a) There is established in the Veterans' Administration a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center (hereinafter referred to in this subchapter as the 'Center') which shall be headed by a core group composed of not less than five employees of the Veterans' Administration, each of whom is a veteran of the Vietnam era. There shall be at least one employee of the Veterans' Administration in each veterans' assistance office established pursuant to section 242 of this title who shall be a Vietnam era veteran and who shall be responsible to the core group.

"(b) The Center shall consist of such other employees as the Administrator deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this subchapter.

"§ 252. Functions of the Center

"The Center shall make an initial evaluation (and report the results of such evaluation to the Administrator and to the Congress within three months after the effective date of this subchapter) and thereafter make a periodic evaluation of—

"(1) the effectiveness of the veterans outreach services program established by subchapter IV of this chapter, particularly as it applies to Vietnam era veterans; and

"(2) make recommendations, based on its evaluations under subparagraph (A), to the Administrator and to the Congress for establishing new, and improving existing, methods and procedures to be implemented by the Veterans' Administration (whether through such subchapter IV or otherwise) to insure that all veterans are made aware of, and are assisted in applying for, all benefits and services under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

"§ 253. Reports to the Congress and the Administrator

"In addition to the initial report required under section 252 the Center shall make a report to the Congress and to the Administrator every six months on its activities under section 252."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER V—VIETNAM ERA VETERANS COMMUNICATION CENTER

"251. Establishment of Center.

"252. Functions of Center.

"253. Reports to the Congress and the Administrator.

Sec. 7. Any veteran who becomes eligible for an additional period of educational assistance under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, by virtue of the enactment of item (7) of section 3 of this Act and who was discharged or released from active duty (qualifying him for such additional period) prior to the date of enactment of this Act shall have a period of twenty-four months from the date of such enactment to use such additional period of educational assistance.

Sec. 8. The rate increases provided by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration, H.R. 12628, Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Members will recall that in the 92d Congress we took positive action on a major veterans' bill increasing the rates of educational allowances and making a number of other significant liberalizations in the program. H.R. 12628 is the culmination of further committee study and action in the 93d Congress. Again, our committee recommends further increases in the allowances payable to veterans and other participants in the education programs as well as several additional and very significant improvements.

The bill is the result of hearings and major executive consideration on the part of the Subcommittee on Education and Training and is substantially in the form recommended by the subcommittee. The Honorable HENRY HELSTOSKI is the chairman of the mentioned subcommittee and the Honorable MARGARET M. HECKLER is the ranking minority member. The other members of the subcommittee are as follows: The gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE); the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS); the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON); the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO); the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF); the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY); the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLES WILSON); the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MARAZITI); the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ABDOR); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUBER); and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

The current GI education program for veterans and certain wives, widows, and children of veterans was instituted in 1966 for veterans of the Vietnam era and others who served after January 31, 1955. The educational allowances provided thereunder are payable directly to the veteran or other beneficiary concerned. At the outset of the program the allowance for a single veteran was \$100 per month. This has been increased three times in succeeding years and is now \$220 per month. The administration has recommended an increase of approximately 8 percent in such allowance bringing it up to \$238 per month but, as pointed out in its report, the committee feels that a further increase to \$250, representing 13.6 percent, can be fully justified in view of the very significant increase in living costs and school expenses. If the Congress approves the bill in its present form it will represent a 150-percent increase in this typical allowance less than 8 years after the program was authorized. Comparable in-

creases are of course provided for veterans with dependents. The bill also makes a number of other improvements in the educational assistance programs, including an extension of the time limitation for completing the training from 8 to 10 years following discharge. Further, it would extend to Vietnam-era veterans the same liberal criteria for vocational rehabilitation as has prevailed for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey, who will discuss in greater detail the major provisions I have mentioned as well as the other liberalizing provisions of this major legislation.

The gentleman is a devoted and dedicated member of our full committee, and he has worked long and hard to bring this bill to the floor today. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HELSTOSKI).

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in line with its objective of periodically reviewing the adequacy of the various education programs, our Subcommittee on Education and Training held a series of hearings in July, September, and October of 1973 following which specific recommendations were made for the consideration of the full committee. I was gratified to note that with very limited exceptions the full committee earlier this month adopted the recommendations which were unanimously agreed upon by our subcommittee.

H.R. 12628 contains three major provisions as well as a number of additional minor liberalizations. In the first place, all education allowances are increased by 13.6 percent. This means that the basic rate for a single veteran is increased from \$220 a month to \$250 a month and proportionate increases are provided for those with dependents. As Chairman DORN pointed out, upon approval of the bill in this form it will represent, as an example, an increase of exactly 150 percent in the rate authorized for a single veteran attending full-time institutional training since the program was inaugurated in 1966.

As will be noted in a comparative chart which I will place in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, during the same period the Consumer Price Index, reflecting the cost of living generally, increased by 43.08 percent. Accordingly, over 100 percent of the increase in the authorized allowance represented a recognition of other costs facing the veteran, such as accelerated school expenses. The additional cost of the increased allowances for the first full fiscal year amounts to \$347.1 million.

The committee was pleased to learn that the administration recognizes a need for increasing the educational allowances and therefore may be said to favor in principle the major provision of our bill. However, the rate changes proposed in the submission of the Veterans' Administrator represented an increase of only 8.2 percent in the current rates. According to the data furnished to the committee, the cost of living reflected by the CPI alone has already exceeded 11 percent to date and it is inevitable that

additional time will elapse during the legislative process before a bill can be enacted and the new allowances actually received by the veterans concerned. We therefore felt that the administration's specific proposal was most unrealistic and completely inadequate.

Another major provision of the bill extends relief in an area as to which I am sure that all Members have received voluminous communications and contacts from constituents. Under the present law all training must be completed before the expiration of 8 years from the date of discharge. With regard to veterans who served between 1955 and 1966, when the new GI bill was enacted, they have a period of 8 years from the date of the bill's enactment. This latter period will expire on May 31 of this year and unless we extend this period thousands of veterans will have to terminate prematurely their period of training. The committee believes that a 2-year extension, that is, to 10 years, is a reasonable additional time to enable all veterans to utilize their entitlement, which is a maximum of 36 months of educational training. The estimated additional cost of extending this delimiting date for the first full fiscal year is approximately \$166 million.

The third major provision of our bill would relax somewhat the present strict eligibility criteria for vocational rehabilitation in the case of Vietnam era veterans. In 1962, during a generally peace-time period, vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disabilities was extended on a permanent basis with the eligibility requirements more restrictive than those that had been in effect for World War II and Korean conflict veterans. As a result, service-disabled veterans of the Vietnam era which commenced in August 1964 have been required to meet these criteria. Consistent with our efforts in other programs to place the Vietnam era veterans on a par with veterans of the two previous wars, we feel it is only equitable to do likewise in this important program of vocational rehabilitation. The additional cost of this equalization for the first full fiscal year is estimated to be \$35.7 million.

Among the other provisions of the bill is one in which I have a particular interest. In our education amendments of 1972 we authorized for the first time a program of veteran-student services under which the administrator was authorized to pay a selected number of veterans whose services could be utilized by the VA an additional educational assistance allowance known as a "work-study allowance." The Vietnam veteran more often than not needs a part-time job to supplement his GI bill benefits if he is to afford a 4-year college education yet many veterans have complained that the college work-study program is largely unavailable to them in view of the rigid requirements to qualify.

Although I feel that the work-study program is a meritorious activity in connection with the overall education program, it is the view of the committee that limitations in the present law are unrealistic and too restrictive. Accordingly, under H.R. 12628 we have extended from \$250 to \$500 the maximum amount that

may be paid to any one veteran during a semester and have extended from 100 hours to 200 hours the maximum period for providing such services to any one veteran. Finally, we have deleted the overall limitation in the program of not to exceed 800 man-years or their equivalent in man-hours during any fiscal year. It is our hope that consistent with the committee's intent, the Veterans' Administration will make every effort to expand the scope and effectiveness of this worthwhile program.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks as a part thereof, I include a detailed explanation of the remaining

significant but relatively minor objectives of the bill, including all pertinent cost data, relevant comparative tables and a complete section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12628.

In addition, I include for the record a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and telegrams from the Disabled American Veterans and Amvets each expressing the strong support of those organizations for the pending legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge approval of H.R. 12628. I believe it is a liberal but reasonable and sound piece of legislation which should serve to relieve in considerable measure the financial problem fac-

ing veterans in their pursuit of education and training and otherwise improve and strengthen the various education programs which the Congress has so generously provided for war veterans and certain wives, widows, and children of such veterans.

The material referred to follows:

PURPOSES OF BILL

The purposes of the bill can be briefly stated as follows:

(1) Increase the educational assistance allowances under all veterans' education programs by 13.6%. The following table sets forth the old and new rates under the various programs according to type of training and beneficiary:

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (CH. 31, SEC. 1504(b))

Type of training	Present law				H.R. 12628				Additional for each dependent in excess of 2
	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents	Additional for each dependent in excess of 2	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents	Additional for each dependent in excess of 2	
Institutional:									
Full-time	\$170	\$211	\$248	\$18	\$193	\$240	\$282	\$20	
1/2-time	128	159	187	14	145	180	212	15	
Half-time	85	106	124	9	97	120	141	10	
Institutional onfarm, apprentice or other on-job training: Full time	148	179	207	14	168	203	235	16	

INSTITUTIONAL AND COOPERATIVE TRAINING (COLLEGE TRAINING) (CH. 34, SEC. 1682(a))

Type of program	Present law				H.R. 12628				Additional for each dependent above 2
	No dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	Additional for each dependent above 2	No dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	Additional for each dependent above 2	
Institutional:									
Full-time	\$220	\$261	\$298	\$18	\$250	\$297	\$339	\$20	
1/2-time	165	196	224	14	188	223	254	15	
Half-time	110	131	149	9	125	149	170	10	
Cooperative	177	208	236	14	201	236	268	16	

FARM COOPERATIVE TRAINING (CH. 34, SEC. 1682(c))

Basis	Present law				H.R. 12628				Additional for each dependent above 2
	No dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	Additional for each dependent above 2	No dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	Additional for each dependent above 2	
Full-time	\$177	\$208	\$236	\$14	\$201	\$236	\$268	\$16	
1/2-time	133	156	177	11	151	177	201	12	
Half-time	89	104	118	7	101	118	134	8	

APPRENTICESHIP OR OTHER ON-JOB TRAINING (CH. 36, SEC. 1787)

Periods of training	Present law				H.R. 12628				Additional for each dependent above 2
	No dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	Additional for each dependent above 2	No dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	Additional for each dependent above 2	
1st 6 mos.	\$160	\$179	\$196	\$8	\$182	\$203	\$223	\$9	
2d 6 mos.	120	139	156	8	136	158	177	9	
3d 6 mos.	80	99	116	8	91	112	132	9	
4th and any succeeding 6-mo. periods	40	59	76	8	45	67	86	9	

OTHER PROVISIONS (CH. 34)

	Present law	H.R. 12628
Flight training	\$220	\$250
Active duty and less than half-time training	220	\$250
Correspondence courses	220	\$250

¹ 90 percent of established charges, with 1-month's charge to entitlement for each \$250 cost.

² Established charge for tuition and fees, but not to exceed full-time rate of \$250 per month.

OTHER PROVISIONS—WAR ORPHANS, WIDOWS, AND WIVES EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE (CH. 35)

	Present law	H.R. 12628
Full-time	\$220	\$250
1/2-time	165	188
Half-time	110	125
Institutional-business courses	177	201
Special restorative training	220	250

(2) Increase the period of time during which veterans must complete training from

the present 8 years following last discharge or release to 10 years. (Veterans who were discharged after January 31, 1955 and before June 1, 1966, whose eligibility for training is scheduled to expire on June 1, 1974, will have until June 1, 1976 to complete training.)

(3) Reduce the disability requirement for eligibility to receive vocational rehabilitation (for service-connected disabled veterans of the Vietnam era) to 10 percent. Presently veterans whose service occurred after January 31, 1955 must show a disability rated at 30 percent or more or, if less

than this degree, the disability must be clearly shown to have caused a pronounced employment handicap."

(4) Remove limitation on number of veteran-students V.A. may assist under the work-study program and increase number of hours during which a veteran may work under this program from 100 to 200 hours per semester or enrollment period and the maximum a veteran may receive for such work from \$250 to \$500.

(5) Allow veterans to count periods of active duty for training (usually 6 months) when computing periods of eligibility for education and training, provided that the veteran serves on full-time active duty for a period of 1 year or more subsequent to performance of active duty for training.

(6) Allow a veteran who was captured and held as prisoner of war following his last discharge or release to exclude the period of time detained as prisoner of war (plus any period immediately following release from detention when he was hospitalized) when computing the period of time during which he is eligible for training.

(7) Permit an exception to the prohibition against enrollment in a program of education for which a veteran is already qualified, by allowing up to 6 months of assistance for pursuit of refresher training, to allow a veteran to update his knowledge and skills and to be instructed in technological advances which occurred in his field of employment during the period of his active military service. Training must begin within 12 months from date of discharge or release and must be pursued continuously except for interruptions beyond the control of the veteran.

(8) Extend eligibility to pursue farm cooperative training (which is now available to veterans) to wives, widows and children eligible to receive training under the war orphans education program. Those eligible include wives and children of 100 percent service-connected permanently disabled veterans and widows and children of deceased veterans whose deaths are service-connected.

(9) Allow educational institutions offering

courses not leading to a standard college degree to measure such courses on a quarter or semester-hour basis in some cases, provided that no course is to be considered a full-time course when less than 25 hours per week of attendance is required.

(10) Allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay a reporting fee to a "joint apprenticeship training committee," acting as a training establishment. This fee, usually \$3 per year per veteran enrolled, is presently payable to authorized educational institutions.

(11) Establish a "Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center" within the VA, to be composed of VA employees who are veterans of the Vietnam era. The proposed Center would be charged with making periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of the Veterans Outreach Services Program (authorized by Public Law 91-219 in 1970) and make reports, with recommendations, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to the Congress.

COST DATA—COST OF VETERANS EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1974

[In millions]

	Fiscal year—					Total, 1975-79
	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	
Rate increase	\$374.1	\$318.2	\$281.0	\$247.6	\$220.7	\$1,414.6
10-year delimiting	165.9	137.8	61.9	73.1	74.5	513.2
Equalize war vet, ch. 31 benefits	35.7	36.3	36.9	37.7	38.1	184.7
Refresher training	2.8	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	12.4
Count active duty for training	.6	.1	.1	.1	.1	1.0
Ch. 35 farm	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	2.0
Joint apprenticeship committees \$3 payment	.5	.5	.4	.4	.3	2.1
Trade and technical course measurement	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Vietnam Veterans Communications Center	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.5
Civilian POW's	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Work study program	28.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	41.5
Grand total	561.4	504.1	391.5	370.1	344.9	2,172.0

* No significant cost.

† While this proposal does not limit the total number of man-years that may be worked, for cost

purposes a maximum usage figure of 2,400 man-years has been used (3 times the present allowable maximum). If experience shows a greater usage then the cost would be increased accordingly.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1

This section provides that the bill may be cited as the "Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1974."

SECTION 2

Clause (1) amends section 1502 of chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans of the Vietnam era shall receive the same wartime vocational rehabilitation benefits as those granted veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. These latter veterans were granted such benefits if they had a 10 percent or greater service-connected disability. Under current law, veterans who served after World War II and before the Korean conflict and after the Korean conflict (including Vietnam era veterans) must be rated for compensation purposes as 30 percent or more disabled, or if less than 30 percent, must have a pronounced employment handicap, before they may receive such benefits. Under the change, veterans serving on or after August 5, 1964 would qualify if they are rated 10 percent or more.

Clause (2) amends the table in section 1504(b) to provide a 13.6 percent across-the-board increase in monthly subsistence allowance rates paid to chapter 31 trainees.

SECTION 3

Clause (1) amends section 1677(b) of chapter 34 to provide a 13.6 percent increase in the monthly entitlement charge for veterans pursuing flight training courses from \$220 to \$250.

Clause (2) amends the table in paragraph (1) of section 1682(a) to provide a 13.6 percent across-the-board increase in the monthly educational assistance allowance rates paid to veterans pursuing institutional and cooperative courses.

Clause (3) amends section 1682(b) to pro-

vide a 13.6 percent increase in the rates for educational pursuits by servicemen on active duty and for veterans pursuing less than half-time courses from \$220 to \$250.

Clause (4) amends the table in section 1682(c) to provide a 13.6 percent across-the-board increase in the monthly educational assistance allowance rates for veterans pursuing farm cooperative training courses.

Clause (5) amends section 1696(b) to provide an increase of 13.6 percent in the monthly educational assistance rate for veterans pursuing PREP courses from \$220 to \$250.

Clause (6) amends section 1652(a) to make a technical change in the law concerning the six months active duty for training provision set forth in clause (7).

Clause (7) amends section 1661(a) to permit the initial six months active duty for training performed by a reservist to be counted for educational benefit entitlement purposes where the reservist subsequently serves on active duty for a consecutive period of one year or more.

Clause (8) amends section 1662 to extend the current 8-year delimiting date for veterans to complete their programs of education to ten years. It also adds a new subsection (d) to section 1662 which would exclude, in computing the delimiting date for those veteran-civilians held as prisoners of war in the Vietnam theater of operations, the period of time during which they were detained, plus any period of time they were hospitalized immediately subsequent to their release.

Clause (9) amends section 1673(d) to make a technical correction in the law premised upon an error occurring at the time Public Law 92-540 was enacted.

Clause (10) amends section 1682 to provide that recent discharges from military service may be allowed up to six months of educa-

tional assistance to pursue refresher training to update their knowledge and skills in the technological advances occurring in their fields of employment during their period of active military service. The refresher training program must be commenced within twelve months from date of discharge or release. Under current law, a veteran may not pursue a program of education in an area in which he is already qualified.

Clause (11) amends section 1685 to remove the limitation on the number of veteran-students the VA may assist under the work-study program and increases the number of hours during which a veteran may work under this program from 100 to 200 hours per semester or enrollment period and the maximum a veteran may receive for such work from \$250 to \$500.

SECTION 4

Clause (1) amends section 1732(a)(1) of chapter 35 to provide an increase of 13.6 percent in the monthly educational assistance allowance rates payable to wives, widows and children pursuing institutional courses under chapter 35.

Clause (2) amends section 1732(a)(2) to provide a 13.6 percent increase in the monthly educational assistance rate payable in the case of wives, widows and children pursuing programs of education on a less than half-time basis from \$220 to \$250.

Clause (3) amends section 1732(b) to provide a 13.6 percent increase in the monthly educational assistance rate payable to wives, widows and children pursuing cooperative training from \$177 to \$201.

Clause (4) amends section 1742(a) to increase the special restorative training assistance allowance payable to those children who are in need of special restorative training.

Clause (5) amends section 1723(c) to delete the bar to pursuit of farm cooperative

training by wives, widows and children which is authorized by clause (6).

Clause (6) amends section 1732 to provide that eligible wives, widows and children may pursue farm cooperative training programs and sets the rates of monthly educational assistance allowance payable to eligible persons pursuing such programs.

SECTION 5

Clause (1) amends section 1786(a) of chapter 36 to provide a 13.6 percent increase in the monthly entitlement charge for veterans, wives and widows pursuing correspondence course training from \$220 to \$250.

Clause (2) amends the table in paragraph (1) of section 1787(b) to provide a 13.6 percent across-the-board increase in the monthly training assistance allowance rates payable to veterans pursuing apprentice and on-job training programs.

Clause (3) amends section 1787(b)(2) to provide a 13.6 percent increase in the monthly training assistance allowance rates payable to wives, widows and children pursuing apprentice and on-job training programs.

Clause (4) amends section 1784(b) to pro-

vide that where joint apprenticeship training committees act as training establishments, they shall be entitled to be paid the same \$8 reporting fee for furnishing the VA with report or certifications as is currently paid to educational institutions furnishing the same type of information.

Clause (5) amends section 1788(a) to provide that vocational schools may measure courses on a quarter or semester hour basis premised on a set formula, but requires a minimum of 25 hours of attendance per week.

SECTION 6

Subsection (a) of this section adds a new Subchapter V to chapter 3 to provide for the establishment of a new Vietnam Era Veterans Communications Center in the VA, headed by a core group of not less than five VA employees, all of whom shall be Vietnam era veterans. At least one employee in each veterans' assistance office shall be responsible to the core group. The Center is required to make an initial evaluation, followed by subsequent periodic evaluations, of the effectiveness of the veterans outreach services

program, particularly as it applies to Vietnam era veterans, and to make reports and recommendations to the Administrator and to Congress concerning new, as well as improvements in existing, programs and procedures in this area.

Subsection (b) makes appropriate changes in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 to reflect the new subchapter.

SECTION 7

This section establishes a savings clause to permit those reservists discharged prior to the date of enactment of this Act to avail themselves of the additional educational benefits authorized under clause (7) of section 3. They would be allowed 24 months from the date of enactment to use such additional period of educational assistance.

SECTION 8

This section sets the first day of the second calendar month beginning after the date of enactment as the effective date for rate increases authorized under this Act. All other provisions are effective the date of enactment.

COMPARATIVE INCREASES IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX¹ AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE RATES UNDER VETERANS' AND WAR ORPHANS' PROGRAMS
(FULL-TIME TRAINEE WITH NO DEPENDENTS)

	June 1, 1966	1st increase		2d increase		3d increase		Proposed in H.R. 12628		Total increase from June 1, 1966			
		Dollar increase	Percent change	Feb. 1, 1970	Dollar increase	Percent change	Sept. 1, 1972	Dollar increase	Percent change	Jan. 1, 1974	Dollar increase	Percent change	
Consumer Price Index (percent)	96.8	100.7	4.03	113.3	12.51	125.7	10.94	138.5	10.18	138.5	10.18	43.08	
Readjustment assistance: (veterans, no service-connected disability ch. 34):													
Institutional	\$100	\$130	\$30	30.00	\$175	\$45	34.62	\$220	\$45	25.71	\$250	\$30	13.64
Cooperative	80	105	25	31.25	141	36	34.29	177	36	25.53	201	24	13.56
Cooperative farm	NA	*105	NA	NA	141	36	34.29	177	36	25.53	201	24	13.56
Onjob training	NA	*80	NA	NA	108	28	35.00	160	52	48.15	182	22	13.75
War orphan assistance: (wives, widows, and children, 100 percent disabled service-connected or deceased service-connected veterans: ch. 35):													
Institutional	130	NC	NA	NA	175	45	34.62	220	45	25.71	250	30	13.64
Onjob training	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*160	NA	NA	182	22	13.75
Cooperative	105	NC	NA	NA	141	36	34.29	177	36	25.53	201	24	13.56
Ofarm training	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*201	NA	NA	NA
Vocational rehabilitation: (service-connected disabled veterans: ch. 31):													
Institutional	110	NC	NA	NA	135	25	22.73	170	35	25.93	193	23	13.53
Farm cooperative or DJT	95	NC	NA	NA	118	23	24.21	148	30	25.42	168	20	13.51

¹ CPI cited for 1st day of stated month is index for the preceding month.

* Benefit provided for the 1st time for this group of beneficiaries.

² Dollar or percentage increase since benefit was first provided.

NA—means Not Applicable.
NC—means No Change in Benefit.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., February 12, 1974.

Hon. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Veterans of Foreign Wars is extremely pleased that your Committee has favorably reported H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation amendments of 1974.

H.R. 12628 carries out a number of mandates approved by the delegates, representing 1.8 million members to the V.F.W. National Convention held in New Orleans last August. In addition, several of the provisions of H.R. 12628 reflect Priority Legislative goals for 1974 approved by our Commander-in-Chief Ray Soden.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has for many years dedicated itself to gaining Congressional approval of comparable readjustment assistance for the millions of returning Vietnam veterans. The Veterans of Foreign Wars was extremely pleased when substantial increases in the GI Bill rates were approved in October, 1972, together with other liberalizations of the program. Unfortunately, inflation has continued to skyrocket, making it more difficult for many veterans to begin or continue an education or training program under the GI Bill.

The 13.6% increase in the allowance for all training programs, including vocational

rehabilitation for the handicapped service-connected disabled, will more than offset the increase in cost of living since the rates were last increased in October of 1972.

Allowing a service connected disability veteran with a 10% or more disability to be entitled to vocational rehabilitation from the VA will place Vietnam veterans on a par with veterans of the Korean war and World War II in this regard.

Of great importance to many Cold War veterans is extending the delimiting date for two years, or from June 1, 1974 to June 1, 1976.

These and other provisions of this bill will be a giant step toward achieving comparable GI Bill and related assistance for Vietnam veterans, as was available to veterans of previous wars.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars commends you for your sponsorship and support of H.R. 12628. Approval of H.R. 12628 by the full House when it is presented for consideration and vote will be deeply appreciated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

FEBRUARY 15, 1974.

Hon. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans com-

mends you and the members of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs for acting so promptly in the current session of Congress to improve the education and training benefits available to America's veterans.

We share your concern over the inadequacies of the present rates which have made it difficult, and in some instances impossible, for thousands of Vietnam veterans to participate in the education programs.

The Disabled American Veterans strongly support House passage of H.R. 12628.

With all good wishes,

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation.

Hon. WM. J. B. DORN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.:

AMVETS urges Congress to take affirmative action on H.R. 12628 to correct current inequities in the GI education and training laws.

The excessive rate of inflation has taken its toll on those veterans and dependents who attend college or technical training under the present program administered by the Veterans Administration.

We believe that America must not forget those men and women who served in this nation's armed forces and it must be re-

membered that the education benefits were earned by those Americans who served their country.

RON HARTLEY,
AMVETS National Legislative Director.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the explanation of this legislation by our most distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN). I concur in his remarks and in his explanation. I want to express my appreciation for his excellent leadership as well as the contribution made by all of those members on the Subcommittee on Education and Training, for the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HELSTOSKI) and for the leadership of our distinguished minority member (Mrs. HECKLER) on our side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974. This bill, Mr. Speaker, will authorize increases in monthly payments to veterans and to dependents and survivors of certain veterans and servicemen who are participating in educational assistance programs. It will also liberalize other provisions of the current educational benefits programs.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, will improve even more the veterans education program—a program that has already trained more college students than were trained during the entire World War II GI bill program.

It will authorize a 13.6-percent increase in monthly educational allowances. Under existing law, an unmarried veteran attending school full time receives \$220 per month. This amount will be increased to \$250 per month under this bill. Proportionate increases, of course, are provided for veterans with dependents and those attending school on a part-time basis.

Educational allowances were last increased September 1, 1972. Since that time, the cost of living as reflected by the Consumer Price Index has increased by 10.8 percent. Projections furnished the committee indicate the increase will be 13.2 percent by May of this year. Thus, the 13.6-percent increase in monthly payments is justified. President Nixon, in his message of January 28, 1974, said:

The cost of living is also a problem for those veterans now taking advantage of the GI bill to further their training or education. They need additional help if their allowances are to keep pace with inflation.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, contains an important provision relating to the time period for utilizing benefits under the GI bill. Under existing law, a veteran is given 8 years after his separation from military service to exhaust his educational benefits entitlement. Those separated between February 1, 1955, and May 31, 1966, were given 8 years from the effective date of the GI Bill, June 1, 1966, in which to utilize their entitlement. Thus, the first date that educational benefits will expire for a substantial group of veterans, May 31, 1974, will soon be upon us.

It is true that the GI bill was intended to be a readjustment benefit, to assist the serviceman in readjusting to civilian life. Ordinarily 8 years is a sufficient period of

time in which to complete the readjustment process. Cogent arguments have been advanced, however, that monthly allowances payable in the early days of the program were insufficient to permit many veterans, particularly those with dependents, to attend school. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes a 2-year extension of the 8-year period during which educational benefits must be utilized.

The vocational rehabilitation program for disabled veterans has also been liberalized, Mr. Speaker. Under the law, a veteran must have a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more or if less than 30 percent, the disability must be clearly shown to have caused a pronounced employment handicap. In the bill before us, the 30 percent requirement is reduced to 10 percent, thus making it identical with the provisions of the World War II law.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the measure will permit veterans to count periods of active duty for training—usually 6 months—when computing periods of eligibility for education and training, if there is subsequent service on active duty for a consecutive period of 1 year or more.

The increases in monthly allowances are also authorized for those dependents of veterans and survivors who are eligible for education or training benefits. Additionally, these dependents and survivors of veterans are made eligible to pursue farm cooperative training. This benefit is now available only to veterans. Those made eligible are the wives and children of service-connected totally disabled veterans and widows and children of deceased veterans whose deaths are service connected.

Mr. Speaker, these are the major provisions of H.R. 12628. The Subcommittee on Education and Training has labored long and hard in perfecting this bill that is responsive to the needs of the young veteran. They are to be commended. It is a good bill and I shall support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Education and Training.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the proponent in committee of three of the provisions of the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974, I rise in strong support of this legislation. This is an important bill, bringing up to date one of the most significant programs that our Government administers. Our action today affects the future of millions of Vietnam-era veterans and their families.

The provisions I fought for as ranking minority member of the Veterans Education and Training Subcommittee are the result of a series of meetings I have had in my district in Massachusetts, and the 1,200 letters I have received from veterans all over the country. The support given my proposals by my colleagues on the subcommittee and the full Veterans' Committee no doubt is the result of similar communication between constituent and representative. This fact, in conjunction with the far-

sighted leadership of the subcommittee chairman (Mr. HELSTOSKI), the committee chairman (Mr. DORN) and the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) produced the bill before us today. My colleagues in this Chamber should take note that this legislation is the Congress timely response to a real need, with the language conceived and drafted with the direct assistance of veterans themselves—from Massachusetts and other States.

My proposals go to what I believe is the heart of the matter—the adequacy of the veterans education program. I offered three amendments in the subcommittee:

Increasing by 13.6 percent the monthly payments made to veterans in school and rehabilitation programs;

Extending to 10 years the time during which a veteran must use his education benefits;

Establishing a Vietnam-era Veterans Communication Center at the top of the VA, to improve communication between the VA and the Vietnam veteran.

The proposals are the end result of a series of meetings I held last summer in Fall River, Mass., and this winter in Taunton, Mass., with veterans from my district. After hearing testimony last year on the need for increases, I thought it wise to investigate for myself, to talk with as many veterans as possible to see what was really needed in terms of legislation to maintain the education assistance statute as an effective program of helping veterans.

What I found was a disturbing situation—the benefit levels we had passed in September of 1972 had already been outstripped by spiraling costs. Also, I learned that the current 8-year period for eligibility is unrealistic, because many veterans need time to readjust after discharge. They are delaying entrance into school, and then finding that 8 years is gone before they finish. In several cases, I found, veterans were within one semester of graduating when their benefits expired.

The third finding was a definitive communication difficulty between VA officials and Vietnam-era veterans. The vital link that is necessary between the VA field officer and the veteran is not as strong as it should be. Consequently, information on benefits and application procedures is not getting through to the one person who needs it—the veteran. I am not implying that the VA is not dedicated or is not working to correct this problem. What I am saying is that the top level of VA could well use direct input from their field offices, from officials who understand the difficulty. Incidentally, I have learned that a similar problem existed after the Second World War.

Starting from the premise that the young veteran will respond best to his peers, I worked out the proposed center. This would essentially amount to a task force within the VA, utilizing a relatively small number of VA employees who are Vietnam vets. Each VA contact office would have a center representative, reporting directly to the center, which would gather information on communication problems and reports its findings and recommendations to both the Ad-

ministrator and Congress. This center will help VA and Congress determine directly what must be done to further improve veteran programs. Based on my inquiries, I believe it is needed and designed to do the job. I hasten to point out that I expect VA to staff the center with on-hand employees. Since the center staff will be directly involved with communicating benefit information to veterans, I do not expect that there will be any deterioration of current VA services.

I must say that this bill comes before the House at an auspicious time, for we have all recently learned that food prices are expected to rise 16 percent this year. Nothing could better underscore the need for quick action to bring benefit levels up to meet the cost of going to school in 1974.

Moreover, nothing could better demonstrate that the 13.6-percent increase we provide is hardly generous—it is merely adequate. When one looks at the 6 million Vietnam veterans as a group, and when one takes into account the actual cost of education today then one cannot avoid the conclusion that this increase is absolutely necessary.

The current monthly allowance is clearly inadequate. Sixty-eight percent of veterans in school now find they must work to make ends meet. Forty percent must work more than 20 hours a week. In my district, fully half of the vets in school are married, thus increasing the burden.

The typical vet today comes from a background that does not provide him with financial assistance, making him even more dependent on his own resources. The American Council on Education reported in December 1972, that the Vietnam veteran's family is of a lower income level than the nonvet student. The ACE study revealed that about 75 percent of the vets in school now depend on their monthly check from VA to pay their bills.

What must this monthly check pay for? First, it must cover tuition, which in this academic year averages \$489 in State colleges, according to the American Association of State Colleges. Private school tuition is about five times that figure, out of reach of most veterans.

What is left after tuition is paid? Figures compiled by the National League of Cities veterans project last year show that in the 1972-73 school year—when tuitions were lower—a veteran had the following sums left to live on after paying his tuition and buying his books:

At the University of California	\$134
At Penn State	111
At Miami of Ohio	116
At the University of Michigan	128

My colleagues should keep in mind that in only two States—Illinois and Massachusetts—does the veteran get free tuition at State schools.

Now, this remaining sum must cover a student's rent, food, clothing, transportation, and so forth. I checked with HUD last winter and was told that the average rent for a one-bedroom apartment is about \$110 a month. The only alternative is a dormitory, but I find that the average room and board charge at these same State colleges is now \$997

a year, which is not much better. Subtract either rent or dormitory charges from the balance after paying tuition, and the veteran has no money at all. No wonder 7 vets in 10 must work to stay in school.

Mr. Speaker, this is the real world as the veteran finds it. Without this increase, many veterans will find the doors to school closed to them. What will be their fate? The younger veteran, fresh out of the service, will have to put himself against the 8-percent unemployment rate among young veterans. Without education or vocational training, he goes to the bottom of everyone's list.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues should not look on this bill's price tag as an expenditure, but as an investment. The higher incomes generated by better educated people results in higher tax revenues, and less money spent on welfare payments. We have here the opportunity to give the veteran the chance to be a successful member of our society. This, I believe, is the least we can do for those who fought the longest and toughest war in our history. If we leave the GI bill benefits at their current inadequate levels, then we are only taunting and mocking the veteran. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH), a member of the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking minority member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974.

This bill contains a number of related and important features. The most publicized feature of H.R. 12628 is the increase of 13.6 percent in the allowances of all participants in the programs of education, training, and rehabilitation administered by the Veterans' Administration. This is necessary if the allowances are to be kept abreast of the increasing costs of living which has risen by 13.2 percent since September 1972.

Under the terms of the bill, reservists will be able to credit for educational purposes the customary 6 months of active duty for training if they subsequently serve on full active duty for at least 12 months.

Under the present law, veterans must complete their education or training within 8 years after their separation from active duty. For those who were discharged between February 1, 1955, and May 31, 1966, the 8 years will expire on June 1, 1974. This bill will extend the 8 to 10 years and thus the earliest delimiting date, June 1, 1974, will be advanced to June 1, 1976. This is probably the most important feature of H.R. 12628.

At present, veterans with service-connected disabilities must be rated at 30 percent or more in order to be eligible for vocational rehabilitation. This requirement will be reduced to 10 percent. A very significant improvement will occur in the prevailing law by granting re-

fresher training, not to exceed 6 months, to the veterans who had a skill or vocation prior to entering on active duty. The training must take place within 12 months from date of separation from service.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am especially interested in the features of this bill relating to the farm cooperative program. I am proud to have played an active part in improving this program to the point that more veterans than ever before are able to take advantage of farm training through a combination of classroom instruction and day-to-day farm experience. Unfortunately, the dependents of service-connected totally disabled veterans and the widows and children of service-connected deceased veterans, although eligible for other types of education, are not eligible for this type of farm training.

This measure will correct this situation by making farm cooperative training available to all dependents and survivors who are presently eligible for war orphans and widows educational assistance.

These are the major provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker. As a member of the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and an American who is proud of those who fought so bravely for this country, I am pleased to commend it to the House for its approval.

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

Mr. ZWACH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that the House of Representatives is today considering H.R. 12628 under suspension of the rules procedure, which does not allow the House to work its will. This is the second time the committee has brought out a veterans' education assistance bill under this procedure, and I certainly hope it is the last.

I believe the Congress should return the GI bill to the form provided the World War II veterans. Under it, direct payments were made to institutions of higher education to cover the cost of tuition, fees, and books, with the veteran also given a monthly cash allowance to cover his living expenses. The World War II veteran was able to pursue his training at whatever institution offered the best curriculum for his career objective. The current GI bill is much more limiting; today's veteran often has to go to an institution which would be his second or third choice if he had the funds to attend his first choice. I regret the bill before us today does not contain a revision in the overall concept of veterans' education assistance to make it like the first GI bill, but I will vote for it since no amendments can be offered.

I heartily commend my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), who will be presenting some recommendations resulting from a "White Paper." I regret we cannot vote on these recommendations.

Further, I introduced a bill which would have eliminated the time period

within which a veteran must complete training. The committee bill, H.R. 12628, does extend from the present 8 to 10 years the time within which a veteran must complete training following his last discharge. Again, while I preferred my own bill, I will be supporting H.R. 12628.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE), a member of the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support and am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 12628, a bill to liberalize the provisions of the educational programs for veterans and certain dependents and survivors of ex-servicemen.

This measure grants a much needed 13.6-percent increase in the monthly allowances of existing law. This means the single veterans enrolled in a full-time program of education will receive \$250 per month instead of \$220. Veterans with one dependent will receive \$297 instead of \$261, while those with two dependents who now receive \$298 will be increased to \$339. Twenty dollars will be provided for each dependent in excess of two.

Information furnished the committee, Mr. Speaker, indicates that by May of this year the cost of living will have increased by 13.2 percent since the last adjustment in monthly educational allowances on September 1, 1972. This information was mentioned by the gentleman from New Jersey, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for reference.

I am hopeful that this increase in monthly allowances will enable thousands more veterans to avail themselves of the educational benefits they have earned.

I am certain that most Members are being deluged with mail from veterans indicating that their educational benefits are about to expire and requesting an extension. Existing law allows 8 years, either from the effective date of the act—June 1, 1966—or from discharge, whichever is later, in which to use the educational benefits earned. The first date after which educational benefits may no longer be used occurs on May 31 for a substantial number of veterans separated between 1955 and 1966.

This bill, I am pleased to report, contains a provision extending the 8-year period for using educational benefits to 10 years. Thus, those late starters who, for a variety of reasons, were unable to timely initiate their programs of education or training will now have 2 additional years. Otherwise, the law will expire for a substantial number of veterans on June 1.

There are other important provisions of this bill. For disabled veterans, the disability requirement for eligibility to receive vocational rehabilitation training is reduced from 30 percent to 10 percent.

Farm cooperative training, heretofore

available only to veterans, is extended to those dependents and survivors entitled to war orphans and widows educational assistance.

Reservists, under the terms of the bill, may count periods of active duty for training in computing their educational entitlement provided there is subsequent active duty of 1 year or more.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the major features of this omnibus-type education bill. The present GI bill, has provided educational benefits to more than 4.5 million veterans since it went into effect June 1966, and it will provide educational opportunities to hundreds of thousands more in the years ahead. Any program of this magnitude is extremely costly. I must hasten to add that it is money that is well spent.

Just a couple of years ago, statistics released revealed that a man with a college degree will earn \$541,000 in his lifetime, over \$201,000 more than a high school graduate. At that time it was estimated that he would pay about \$38,000 in income taxes on that extra \$201,000—more than four times the \$9,000 this bill authorizes the Government to spend for 36 months of college for a veteran.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good investment in the future of our country by any standard and I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS), a member of the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, a particularly meritorious bill which is designed to enhance and make more viable the existing law relating to the education, training, and vocational rehabilitation programs administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Basic to these programs, of course, is the rate of the allowances. This bill will increase them by 13.6 percent.

Vocational rehabilitation will be extended to the veteran who has a service-connected disability ratable at 10 percent. At present a 30-percent disability is required.

The existing education and training law will be amended by crediting active duty for training in computing educational entitlement where the veteran also has at least 1 year of full active duty. Refresher training not to exceed 6 months will be accorded the veteran who wants to update a skill or profession that he had before military service. Those wives, widows, and children eligible for education or training will have their entitlement extended enabling them to pursue farm cooperative training.

The present work study program will be expanded by removing the limitation on the number of veterans who may participate and doubling the number of hours a veteran may work with a commensurate doubling of the amount of money that may be paid.

These are the most significant improvements and I endorse them wholeheartedly.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker,

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER).

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

I recognize that the economic consequences of the energy shortage could mean that workers will be laid off, and the veterans who were the last to be employed would be the first to be laid off. This can be translated into an excellent opportunity for these veterans, if they are properly compensated, to avail themselves of the opportunities for education which will be provided in this bill.

This bill would increase the monthly allowance for single veterans who are full-time students from \$220 to \$250. For veterans with one dependent, the allowance would be raised from \$261 to \$297, and for two dependents, the allowance would go from \$298 to \$339. Each additional dependent's allowance would be raised from \$18 to \$20.

The bill also extends the deadline for veterans to make use of their GI benefits from the present 8 years after discharge to 10 years. It removes the limit on the number of student veterans who may take part in a Veterans' Administration work-study program and increases the maximum amount a veteran may be paid under this program from \$250 to \$500 per semester.

In these days of spiraling living costs, I can certainly understand the difficulties a veteran, and his family if he is married, must have trying to secure an education and still keep food on the table. I have received many letters from veterans in my district, and I am glad to see this measure which will provide continued opportunities for education for them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) who is not on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs but who has always had a great interest in veterans and veterans' legislation. He has been holding hearings on the subject in several cities around the Nation. I know of his deep feelings and gratitude for the contribution the GI education bill made to his own life and his distinguished career. It is my pleasure to yield to Mr. CONTE at this time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, inadequacies in the present GI bill deny the Vietnam veteran the assistance and opportunities intended by Congress. This conclusion is clear, from an intense probe I have conducted over the past 11 months, including three public hearings in Newark, N.J., Cleveland, Ohio, and Seattle, Wash.

Certainly, this generation of veterans has paid its dues to this Nation—now, I am inserting into the public record today a 43-page "white paper," prepared by the Special Veterans Opportunity Committee of the National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors, documenting most graphically that today's veteran is not getting the break his father got in educational benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the World War II GI bill gave me the only chance I would have had for a college and law school educa-

tion. As a member of Congress Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor-HEW, I wanted to see programs responsive to the needs of today's veterans. I, therefore, became deeply involved in the situations of returning Vietnam veterans, particularly efforts to obtain the education and training many had to forego to fight for their country.

The public hearings I cochaired with the mayors of Newark, Cleveland, and Seattle on veterans readjustment problems convinced me that changes must be made now so that our new veterans get the benefits they most richly deserve.

That observation recently was reaffirmed by a report commissioned by the VA released last month by the Educational Testing Service, which manifests the actual degree to which the Vietnam veteran lacks parity with World War II veterans under the GI bill.

Mr. Speaker, when I undertook to cochair the Special Veterans Opportunity Committee, I thought veterans were as well off as we were, and that any gaps could be filled from Labor-HEW and by State and local action. This, regrettably, is not the case. And on top of that, today's veteran faces peculiar problems of readjustment due to the unpopularity of the Vietnam war, a conflict most Americans would just as soon forget.

If we are to convince these men that their country and their Government does care, we have to have some good answers.

I remember one young Vietnam vet, who had recently dropped out of his GI bill college course because he could not afford to support his wife and child, and go to school at the same time. He testified about this, then looked up—and in that crowded city hall chamber in Cleveland, said to us: "All we want is what our fathers got." The applause from the other vets in the room was thunderous.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert into the RECORD letters from veterans around the country who have written to express their plight to me. And our 43-page white paper report on Vietnam veterans.

When we began our hearings—we found a situation where many young veterans are not using their educational benefits because they cannot afford to—they do not have the reservoir of cash to meet both living costs and high tuition payments, even at public colleges: They may not live in an area where a college has an upward bound for veterans program which will seek them out, counsel them and help them put the pieces together; they may not have been stationed at a military base where a project transition or college discovery or other remedial effort was fully subscribed to by a unit or base commander; they may not live in a State where cheap public higher education is readily available; they may not be where public employment opportunities exist; they may live where unemployment rates are high and no jobs exist for them to supplement their benefits; they may not be able to patch together food stamps, welfare, social security student benefits, unemployment compensation, or other social programs to make it under the GI bill.

Mr. Speaker, our "white paper" report concludes with seven recommendations:

First. The restructuring of the GI bill so that it pays 80 percent of all tuition and fees and makes a separate subsistence payment of at least \$220 per month;

Second. A guarantee of a job by work-study and public employment programs to every enrolled veteran who needs or wants one;

Third. The elimination of delays and obstacles to discharge review and more leniency by the Veterans' Administration in the granting of educational benefits in those cases where it had administrative jurisdiction;

Fourth. The development of a program of effective marketing and communication to increase the use of the GI bill;

Fifth. The expansion of programs in the areas of readjustment and pre-release remedial education and the universal availability of the programs on a continuing basis for all GI's;

Sixth. The convening of a special commission to review the relevancy of VA benefits and procedures and recommend needed reforms; and

Seventh. The full funding of the veterans cost of instruction provision in the 1972 Higher Education Act and the continuation and expansion of other programs which support or supplement local veterans assistance efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the veterans educational benefits package which the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs recently reported even though it falls somewhat short of the mark. On March 29, the Nation will honor our Vietnam-era veterans. That honor is well deserved. However, with the enactment of today's comprehensive veterans measures, we shall be presenting our veterans with the proper honor and dignity; the Nation's gratitude for the services they have rendered us all.

The material follows:

HAVERHILL, MASS.
October 2, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONTE: I want to thank you very much for what you are trying to do for the veterans. Myself I am totally disabled and have five children. Being a World War II veteran, I agree with you 100%. \$220.00 a month is nothing today with everything going up sky-high, such as food, education, rents, medical care, public utilities, etc. But let us concentrate on education. How can any veteran afford to go to a good college on \$220.00 a month. For instance, my son graduated last June at 22 yrs. old with a B.S. degree in mechanical engineering. He done five years of college in 4 years, taking an overload. He went to Northeastern University in Boston, Mass. Many times he starved, as that college only had dormitory for the engineers for the first year. He had to share an apartment with 3 other students, plus he had to buy food. I couldn't give him too much help as my daughter also attends college and is in her second year. In 1975 my son Dominick, who is very brilliant, will attend college at Tufts to become a medical doctor. I am strapped now. I only pray you and your committee will pass a law for the veterans and the children of totally disabled will be able to attend college with the government paying the whole bill, plus give them \$220.00 a month for eating and sleeping.

They give all kinds of money and help to many foreign countries, but our veterans are getting short changed when they should become first. Colleges are going to go up and something must and should be done right now, not 10 years from now. I cannot afford

to send my son to Tufts at \$220.00 per month to study for a medical degree. I feel as a disabled combat World War II veteran the government should pay all costs. Why should these intelligent children be denied a good education simply because the parents do not have the money to send them. This is the richest country in the world, but at times our money is not being spent right. More money on education and less money in other countries. Let the other countries take care of themselves. Nobody cares for the U.S. problems. But our veterans should be entitled to a good education without suffering trying to scrape up enough money and starving their stomach like my son did and many others, with no money in their pockets. I come from *Italian born parents* and my wife comes from Calobecca, Italy. She came here in 1947. I was born in Portsmouth, N.H. My father was a U.S. bandmaster and composer. They erected a plaque in his honor at the Portsmouth, N.H., Navy Yard in 1951. Hoping to hear from you, I remain,

Sincerely,
DOMINICK ZANGAN, Sr.,
Life Member, Commander, Haverhill
DAV No. 20; Life Member, VFW No.
29, Haverhill; Life Member, Amvets
Post No. 147, Haverhill.

MARIONVILLE, Mo.,
September 19, 1973.

Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: A recent associated Press News item in the Springfield News and Leader stated that you are the chairman for the Special Veteran's Opportunity Committee. The news item stated that your committee is concerned that present-day veterans are not receiving educational aid on a par with earlier veterans. As a veteran with a wife and three children who is attempting to attend Southwest Missouri State University, I would like to state I fully agree with the committee's concern. We are buying only the necessities (food, transportation, shelter), but those three items alone have inflated tremendously in the past three months. I sincerely hope you and your committee are able to raise the veterans' benefits in keeping with the current costs of attending college.

I also feel very strongly that the expiration of GI education benefits, eight years after separation, should be changed. In our present society, retraining is sometimes required to allow a man to remain employed. In my own case, I have held three different jobs with two aerospace companies in the past few years, and I am now attempting to retrain again. My GI educational benefits will expire next May even though I have thirty months of eligibility left. I am asking for no additional eligibility—just the chance to use what I acquired during my tour in the service. I doubt seriously that an extension for GI education benefits would greatly escalate the cost of the program. I am sure there are many veterans in situations similar to mine who would love to have the chance to use their full eligibility.

Thank you sir for your concern for the veterans. In this day and age, such concern is refreshing.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM W. TORRETT.

ACTION, MASS.,
November 1, 1973.

Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONTE: I am a Vietnam veteran pursuing my college education under the present Veteran's Administration education allowance. I encourage your support of increased allowances, especially those proposed by the special Veteran's Opportunity Committee.

Present benefits are not in line with those

February 19, 1974

received by my father (World War II) and my uncles (Korean War). I am unable to attend classes and support my family simultaneously. The present level of educational assistance is a help but I must work full time and attend classes at night in order to take advantage of the existing benefit. Increased tuition allowance plus a subsistence payment would make it possible to pursue full time studies as previous veterans have. The Vietnam veteran should not be a victim of the unwanted memory of an "unpopular" war.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH E. ESPOSITO.

— FEBRUARY 6, 1974.

DEAR SIR: I would also at this time like to express my feelings and opinion in how I feel about the veterans GI Bill for education, and compensation for disabled veterans.

I do feel that the GI Bill for veterans education should be increased to ease the financial burden, and that the time allowed to complete school be extended to ten years after discharge. I also feel that the 36 months given to the veteran to go to school should be extended to 48 months, as past veterans had received.

I was happy and proud to have served in the U.S. Marine Corps for thirteen years, four months, and nineteen days, and I still feel the same, because I feel I did very little for such a great country. I also would like to continue to contribute in some small way to help this country, or help the people of this country, and that is why I'm going to college, and majoring in mental health, so that I can help.

I am now married and have six children and going to college isn't easy financially, but I didn't expect it to be easy, and I also didn't, and don't expect any more benefits than past veterans, but I do feel that the veterans of today do not receive as good a benefit that World War II and Korean veterans received. Also, that getting an education today is a lot harder for today's veterans and this is why most veterans don't continue their education. *Because financially they can't!*

With the cost of living so high I just can't understand how the House of Representatives and the Senate can forget today's veterans, especially the disabled veterans who's compensation does not increase with the high rise in the cost of living, and has it so difficult. I just feel that it's about time that somebody takes the bull by the horns and gets things straightened out now before it's too late. Not only for veterans, but for all the people of this great country.

Thank You For Your Time,

ROBERT LUCIA.

— SOUTH HADLEY, MASS.,

February 12, 1974.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONTE: I am writing regarding the *Veterans Education Bill* which I hope will be acted upon this year. I am a Dartmouth College graduate ('64) and Vietnam veteran (1st Lt. Army Intelligence) discharged 24 June '66 who, after discharge, worked as a stockbroker for seven years. I now wish to further my education and enter another field which, I hope, will be more rewarding to both myself and my country. I feel the current *eight year limitation on benefits*, especially to those who have never taken advantage of them like myself and now find themselves all but ineligible is highly unfair and discriminatory.

This country's people are its greatest resource—the oil 'shortage' notwithstanding—and education of our citizens is its best investment. If we can afford to blow up errant 18 million dollar rockets we can surely spend money on our veterans' education. The dollar amount of help is also inadequate in these inflationary times, but that point is obvious.

I have never written a representative in Washington before, and I therefore hope this letter will be useful.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. STEWART.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.,

February 6, 1974.

Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE,
Pittsfield, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing in response to information that I have received concerning Veterans Legislation under consideration by the House Committee on Veterans Affairs. One of the prime components of this legislation is an increase in the educational allowances from the present \$220.

I am no longer directly concerned with this aspect of the bill since I have just completed my undergraduate work and am currently employed by the General Electric company as an electrical engineer, but I still feel a pay increase is desperately needed. I started my education when the allowance was \$130/month thus gaining considerable experience in scrounging for an education. I might never have gotten my degree without the GI Bill and I am grateful for it. But let's make it a little easier on the guys that will follow in my footsteps and vote for an increase in the Veteran's education allowance.

In summary, how do you feel about the Senate's 23% increase versus the House's 13.6%?

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH T. POOR.

[Special Veterans' Opportunity Committee, U.S. Representative SILVIO O. CONTE (Republican, Mass.), Chairman]

FINAL REPORT: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

VETERANS' EDUCATION AND TRAINING SERVICE (VETS), SEPTEMBER 13, 1973

Based on Public Hearings held in Newark, N.J.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Seattle, Wash.

SEPTEMBER 4, 1973.

Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONTE: This report is the culmination of an extremely important, timely and productive undertaking—the series of public hearings which we, as Mayors, co-chaired with you under the sponsorship of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. As local chief executives, we are very much aware that many Vietnam-era veterans have problems. These problems—jobs, the search for understanding, educational opportunities and the attitude of the public—are not the things these young men should have to face on a daily basis.

Opportunities in both employment and education should be readily available; and the gratitude of a nation well-served should be automatically apparent. The fact that neither of these is the case is the real lesson of the hearings.

With the issuing of this final report, we all must dedicate ourselves to making these recommendations a reality, and these findings obsolete. Just as the hearings brought together in common cause public officials, academic leaders, business and labor executives, the military, a concerned citizenry, the media, and the veterans themselves—that same coalition must follow through, with this report as the first step.

We look forward to working with you as this is done.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH A. GIBSON,
Mayor, Newark.

RALPH J. PERK,
Mayor, Cleveland.

WES UHLMAN,
Mayor, Seattle.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. Public reaction to the Vietnam War has been a severe obstacle to civilian readjustment of returning GI's.

B. The present GI Bill has not been able to adequately help those who need it the most.

C. The World War II veteran got a substantially better deal in terms of benefits and acceptance.

D. Jobs for GI Bill-enrolled veterans is a major problem.

E. Veterans generally see the bureaucracy only as something to be overcome—not as a positive force.

F. There are wide geographic disparities in GI Bill use and in available assistance programs.

G. The federal government has primary responsibility for veterans' programs, but should make its resources available for support of state and local assistance efforts.

H. Lack of uniform in-service assistance by the military has made civilian readjustment more difficult.

I. There is a lack of leniency and understanding in the administrative dealings with those who may have gotten less than honorable discharges by proceedings other than courts martial.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The GI Bill should be restructured so that it pays 80% of all tuition and fees and makes a separate subsistence payment of at least \$220 a month.

B. Work-study and public employment programs should guarantee a job to every enrolled veteran who needs or wants one.

C. Delays and obstacles to discharge review should be eliminated; and the VA should be more lenient in the granting of educational benefits in those cases where it has administrative jurisdiction.

D. A program of effective marketing and communication should be undertaken to increase use of the GI Bill.

E. Readjustment programs and pre-release remedial education efforts should be expanded and made universally available to GI's, on a continuing basis.

F. A special commission should review the relevancy of VA benefits and procedures and recommend needed reforms.

G. The Veterans Cost of Instruction Provision in the 1972 Higher Education Act should be fully funded. Other programs which should be fully funded. Other programs which support or supplement local veterans assistance efforts should be expanded and continued.

INTRODUCTION

When I came home from World War II, my home town turned out for a welcome. There were parties, ceremonies, honors and a feeling that, whether we served in combat or were on permanent KP in the states, we were all heroes.

More importantly, the nation we fought for showed its gratitude through the GI Bill; and each and every one of us had the opportunity to get—at little or no cost to us—all the education we wanted. I'm sure the 7,000,000 World War II vets who used the GI Bill feel as I do, that it was the most valuable thing that ever happened to us. Without it, I certainly would not be in Congress today.

This report is the result of an eight-month effort to find out what the problems of today's veterans are, and what can be done about them. I was asked by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors to chair a Special Veterans Opportunity Committee and hold a series of public hearings across the country, so that we could hear, first-hand, from the veterans themselves, as well as from those who are in a position to help them.

The all-day hearings were designed to strengthen city-sponsored veterans assist-

ance projects by involving local leaders and by hearing the views of veterans and other concerned citizens.

The hearing panels included Vietnam veterans, public officials and leaders of the business, labor, academic and service organization communities. The first hearing was held in Newark, New Jersey, on October 25, 1972; the second in Cleveland, Ohio, on March 9, 1973; and the third in Seattle, Washington, on May 18, 1973.

In the three hearings, a total of 111 witnesses were heard, 62 of whom were Vietnam-era veterans. The hearing panel members and complete witness lists are attached.

As can be seen from the hearing summary reports, these findings and recommendations represent a broad consensus, although several witnesses wanted to go much farther in remedial action. The evidence indicates that what is contained here is fair, reasonable and necessary.

The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors operate the Veterans Education and Training Service (VETS) through a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. VETS has helped to establish Vietnam-era veterans assistance projects in 10 cities across the country and has provided technical assistance to veterans efforts in many other cities.

In the course of running these projects, thousands of Vietnam-era veterans have been contacted, counseled, enrolled under the GI Bill, and helped with employment and benefits problems.

A major recurring complaint of veterans is that they feel few people are either listening to or really caring about their problems. They believe their problems are unique due to the nature of the Vietnam conflict and the public reaction to it.

These public hearings were, therefore, conducted to provide the veterans themselves—as many as wanted to testify—a chance to tell a panel (which included Vietnam veterans) what they think the problems are, and what the solutions to those problems should be.

This testimony was supplemented by testimony from college officials, employment services, businessmen, psychiatrists, psychologists, veterans organizations, state legislators, U.S. Congressmen, military personnel, federal, state and local agency officials, labor leaders and interested citizens.

We greatly appreciate the full cooperation we received from all these groups and individuals—especially benefits personnel at the Veterans Administration—and believe that their valuable contributions will lead to positive and immediate action.

As a World War II veteran who benefited so substantially from the GI Bill, I am most concerned with the problems of today's veteran. It is disquieting that these highly motivated young men would—as one did at the Cleveland hearing—equate their plight with the soldier's lament from "All Quiet on the Western Front":

"Now, if we go back, we will be weary, broken, burnt-out, rootless and without hope. We will not be able to find our way any more, and men will not understand us. For the generation that grew up before us, though it has passed these years with us here, already had a home and a calling; now it will return to its old occupations and all will be forgotten. And the generations that have grown up after us will be strange to us and push us aside. We will be superfluous even to ourselves and will grow older. A few will adapt themselves—some others will merely submit—and most will be bewildered. The years will pass by, and in the end we shall have fallen into ruin."

There is much that we can do to see that today's veterans have a more hopeful future.

It is apparent to me that we must work to see that today's veterans have more than just the present GI Bill available to them. There will be many who will need a package of assistance that will include a guaranteed part-time job, special counseling, help in obtaining other applicable programs, as well as the financial assistance available through both the GI Bill and the individual educational institutions. We cannot expect that the majority of Vietnam-era veterans will be able to put all this together themselves—even if it were universally available. We must have both adequate programs—available to all—and an efficient and usable delivery system.

That is what this report is all about.

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Special
Veterans Opportunity Committee.

PART I—FINDINGS

A. The Vietnam veteran

"Today's veteran must not be a political pawn. The hawks and the doves have had their day in court, and now society must understand the need to assist the man. His problems are society's problems."—Mayor Kenneth Gibson, Newark hearing.

The Vietnam-era veteran is no different from the veteran of earlier conflicts. But the war was different—and the public reaction to the war is different. Any assistance program must recognize this.

This is not to say that the Vietnam-era veteran is any less highly motivated or less valuable as a student, employee or citizen. Having survived a complex and difficult assignment in a difficult time, he may be more valuable.

A production manager for a steel plant said at the Cleveland hearing, "Our experience with today's vets shows them to require less training, less supervision and to be more work-disciplined than non-veteran employees." A college president at the Newark hearing commented that his experience with Vietnam vets showed that they were highly motivated and mature students and less likely to drop out [for non-financial reasons] than the student fresh from high school.

Former Army Chief of Staff General William Westmoreland has said of today's veterans, "... They are, as a group, more eager for betterment and more responsible than GI's of the same age in past wars. Their service has been difficult, demanding and devoid of the public acclaim that was given to past GI's. They understand and accept this and have proven to be unusually anxious to build a meaningful future for themselves."

However, during the course of the hearings, it became obvious that the world is a long way from beating a path to their doors. Far from being welcome heroes, many veterans at the hearings told of feeling, in effect, discriminated against just because they were Vietnam veterans. At Cleveland, one young veteran said, "Most people treated me like I was a psycho, a probable drug addict or just a dummy for fighting in a dumb war. It got so that I hid the fact that I was a veteran."

Psychiatrists and psychologists who testified at the Newark hearing confirmed this. Dr. Gordon Livingstone, an Army psychiatrist, said, "Today's vets are survivors of what happened in Vietnam and . . . have become a crucible for all of society's doubts and misgivings about our involvement in Vietnam." The VA's Harris Survey showed that "A plurality of the people feel 'Veterans of this war were suckers, having to risk their lives in the wrong war at the wrong time.'"

Several expert witnesses traced the problem back to the decision to fight the war basi-

cally with draftees, taken under a less than universal draft—recognized on all sides to be highly unfair in its operation. The college deferment exempted people from higher income brackets, and lower income men served in their place. Later, these men came home to an economic situation that was rapidly deteriorating. From 1970 through 1972, while close to a million men a year were discharged, veteran unemployment rose from 100,000 men to a high of 400,000 (in January of 1972), with the rate exceeding 15% "and among non-white veterans and those with less than a high school education reaching 21% and 31% respectively," according to the VA's Harris Survey.

As a result, these men became frustrated. They expected that their service to their country would be fully recognized, as earlier service had been recognized. Yet the controversy surrounding the war made this impossible. They felt that the bureaucracies of the Veterans Administration, the employment services and the colleges where they sought help disregarded their sacrifices and treated them as children. A persistent theme was that the federal government educated, trained and transported the soldier-citizen for combat with great efficiency. But the manner in which the veteran returning to civilian life is treated contains none of that efficiency and concern.

Their own words best reveal their feelings: "Why do we have to beg for assistance or even attention?"

"All we want is the chance that the guys got who didn't have to go."

"Either I can take care of my wife and child or I can go to school—not both. Why should I have to make such a choice?"

"Liberals hate us for killing and conservatives hate us for not killing enough."

"The real prisoner of this war is the ordinary veteran—the conscripted grunt who didn't have the money to buy his way out of the war by going to college or didn't have the political connections to get into the National Guard to sit it out."

"All we want is what our fathers got."
"We feel that no one is really listening."

B. GI bill use

Many returning Vietnam-era veterans lack the financial resources to use today's GI Bill, which they see as their best opportunity. A high proportion of the draftees in the Vietnam era were high school dropouts, members of minority groups and persons from lower income backgrounds. Consequently, a GI Bill which requires supplementary financial aid, special outreach and remedial efforts by educational institutions and a sophisticated understanding of government and bureaucracy will reach primarily those veterans who had pre-service higher education. This is generally what has happened. The use of the GI Bill is, therefore, inverse to need.

The proof of the "use is inverse to need" claim lies in the following discussion (based on VA statistics): About 20% of returning Vietnam-era veterans have less than a high school education. And yet, of those actually enrolled in college or junior college under the GI Bill, this educational group represents only about 3% of the total. You have to dig this figure out because the largest number in this category are in the "other schools" groups, which is about 70% correspondence schools. This group is discounted here because, according to a recent GAO report, those vets in correspondence schools have a 75% dropout rate. The combined college and junior college use rate is higher today than after earlier wars, because of the higher level of education offered by junior colleges that previously would have been counted under other categories. The availability of cheap, good technical

education at junior colleges, as well as the higher education qualifications demanded for jobs, are the reasons this report stresses the college and junior college participation route. But many veterans have much to gain from on-the-job and technical training in other settings. We recognize that fact.

Todays GI Bill has educated hundreds of thousands of veterans, and will cost \$2.5 billion this year. It is in many respects the best available federal scholarship program, yet it operates with an uneven impact. Its successes in helping many veterans must be weighed alongside the difficulties other veterans have in using this—the prime readjustment tool. While nationally 46.1% of the nation's 6,220,000 Vietnam-era veterans have used the GI Bill (for one purpose or another), 53.9% have not. Within the ranks of those that have used it, there are many that have failed to complete their courses, for reasons that were brought out during these hearings and in Congressional hearings.

The low level of GI Bill benefits has for all intents and purposes precluded most veterans from using the bill to go to private colleges. In effect, these veterans have been forced to compete for limited spaces in public community and junior colleges with low tuition. Even the tuition at four-year public colleges is higher than some veterans can afford. This was demonstrated at the Cleveland hearing, when one young vet said he was enrolled at Cuyahoga Community College (instead of Cleveland State College, where he wanted to go) merely because of the difference in tuition: At Cuyahoga, he said, the tuition was \$390, while at Cleveland State it was over \$700. "Why should I be restricted in the choice of a public college just because of \$320? Doesn't that mean there is something wrong with a GI Bill that does that?"

The monthly subsistence funds a student veteran at Rutgers Newark would have for living expenses, after payment of tuition, rose on account of the October 1972 benefits increase from \$101.11 to \$133.33. Veterans at the Newark hearing considered both sums inadequate because of the consistently high unemployment rate in the Newark metropolitan area, resulting in difficulties in locating part-time jobs, and a high cost of living in the city.

Far more veterans appear to be married than non-veteran students, and their financial obligations are commensurately greater. According to an American Council on Education research report—"The Vietnam-Era Veteran Enters College"—38.3% of the veteran students are married, while only 1.2% of non-veteran, first-time college students are.

C. Comparison with situation of World War II GI's

Compared with the World War II veteran, his counterpart today is receiving unequal treatment, both in terms of benefits and opportunities and in terms of public acceptance. "We only want what our fathers got," was a frequent veteran comment. After World War II, veterans had most tuition and fees paid directly by the federal government, a book allowance, some subsidized housing and a \$75 month subsistence allowance; and they were eagerly sought after by educational institutions, both public and private. Today's GI Bill, increased in three stages, now gives the single veteran a base allowance of \$220 a month, out of which must come his tuition, as well as money for rent, food, books, transportation and other basic necessities. Schools and colleges do little to adapt their procedures to the needs of veterans.

Under the World War II GI Bill, veterans could attend any approved institutions of higher education. Today they are effectively excluded from private colleges by high tuition costs, which are five times higher than those of the late 1940's. The average tuition

charge at private colleges has risen from \$396 to \$1,902. After World War II, public colleges were encouraged to take veterans as a result of direct reimbursement from the federal government of what amounted to out-of-state tuition rates for instate veterans. Out-of-state tuition rates more truly recognize the actual or true costs of education to the states.

Those rates today are \$2,000 or more in California, Ohio, Michigan and Pennsylvania—four of the states with large concentrations of veterans. In effect, the federal government has shifted a large bulk of the costs of education from itself to state and local government, and to the veteran. Until \$25,000,000 for the Veterans Cost of Instruction Provision was released in June 1973, no federal funds went directly to colleges to support veterans education efforts other than a \$4.00 per student processing fee, and the small Upward Bound for Veterans Program. Thus, the federal government no longer funds—through the GI Bill—the expansion of post-secondary education necessary to enroll additional veterans.

As a result, the veteran of the Vietnam era feels that his lot is directly related to the unpopularity of the war and the divisions and debates engendered by it.

As pointed out at the Seattle hearing by Dr. Charles Odegaard, President of the University of Washington:

"Soldiers from Vietnam were not universally conscripted as they were during World War II; more were chosen from among men who could not go to college and who were not granted deferments. Not surprisingly, then, veterans from Vietnam include more financially disadvantaged men and more minorities than previous veteran groups, at least in recent history. Predictably, these men are going to have unusual, indeed unique problems. They are not going to be as well prepared for college, so that they will require more and specialized attention to get through college and to enter graduate or professional study. They are going to be difficult to place in jobs; and more than previous veteran groups they are going to find re-entering civilian life an emotionally difficult and traumatic experience. Unless these men are given special help, the original inequity which encouraged the drafting of poorer and less well educated individuals will be magnified by the fact that those who were less equipped to support themselves when they were drafted come back as veterans to compete in the job market with men who have had two more years of education and training. At the same time they have to face a less receptive and unfriendly environment than their predecessors."

At the Seattle hearing, the Director of the VA regional office took issue with the World War II "discrepancy" argument, submitting a chart showing differences in costs and allowances in constant dollars. The VA chart did not refute the testimony of veterans, who offered their budgets and cost figures and compared them to what was available to the World War II GI Bill-enrolled veterans.

One veteran, William Albinger, Jr., wrote to the Evening Star in Washington, D.C., after reading about these hearings: His feelings were similar to those of many other veterans:

"After receiving the Grateful Nation speech in Cam Ranh Bay, I got on the plane to return to the United States and resume my law studies. I was surprised to return to a place that was practicing cut-rate government. Like in so many other ways, the hidden costs of the war were being foisted off on those who lacked the votes, organization, or money to have political clout—the returning veterans. . . . I wonder how the hell guys who were shot up make it through. What made the situation particularly galling was that at least 50 percent of the people I en-

countered (fellow students, faculty members, friends of my family) all thought I was receiving the same benefits my father and his generation received."

Because of the continuing controversy about the relative benefits given World War II and today's veterans, the Committee staff undertook its own analysis of the available data.

The VA chart used in Seattle, which is similar to other such presentations, lumps together the charges at two- and four-year public colleges. Four-year public college tuition has climbed so that the average charge is now \$609 in the 12 states with 60% of veteran population. The point is that today's veteran in many states, unlike his World War II predecessor, has been hard pressed to command four-year college or graduate education at public colleges, and is priced out of private colleges completely. The latest of three increases since the GI Bill was reenacted in 1966 (at a level lower than the Korean War benefits) has come the closest to giving today's veteran subsistence monies equivalent to those the World War II veteran received.

The veteran, in the cities where we held hearings, trying to attend four-year public colleges received the following benefits after paying for tuition and books:

MONTHLY LIVING FUNDS AFTER PAYMENT OF TUITION

	Academic year		
	1969-70	1971-72	1972-73
Rutgers University.....	\$51.33	\$101.11	\$133.33
Cleveland State.....	68.33	84.44	129.44
University of Washington.....	74.55	106.11	143.44

The GI Bill carried benefits before tuition payments, of:

June 1969, \$130 per month.

June 1971, \$175 per month.

October 1972, \$220 per month.

The value of \$75 in subsistence (received by World War II vets) in current dollars:

1969, \$114.

1970, \$121.

1971, \$126.

1972, \$131.

June 1973, \$138.

As noted above, the October 1972 increase in the GI Bill came the closest to giving the veteran a sum equivalent to the \$75 a month subsistence of a single veteran after World War II. However, the strict dollar conversion of the \$75 in today's dollar seems to overestimate the buying power today's veterans' benefits represent in many states. The World War II veteran had subsidized housing in many instances. The familiar quonset hut was frequently mentioned during the hearings. The colleges and employers adapted their procedures to student veterans. Today's veteran has no such benefits.

But, more importantly, when the GI Bill is compared to the percent of average monthly earnings, as the VA did, in testimony to the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, then the difficulties of the Vietnam-era veteran become readily apparent. The GI Bill was never intended as a full scholarship; however, it was designed to give the veteran a fair chance at working his way through school. The World War II GI Bill did this by giving the veteran with no dependents 35.4% of the average monthly earnings; the veteran with one dependent, 49.5%; and the veteran with two dependents, 56.6%. Today's veteran with no dependents, after paying the average tuition at all two- and four-year public colleges, is left with 26.4% of average monthly earnings; with one dependent, 33.1%; and with two dependents, 38.9%. The veteran who attempts to attend four-year public colleges in major states ends up with 22.4%; 29.0%; and 35.0%, respec-

tively. What this means is that the Vietnam-era veteran has to have alternative sources of income, particularly part-time and summer jobs that bring in substantially more than the World War II veteran needed. Given the high cost of living in cities and the difficulties in finding part-time jobs of the last several years, the demands of the veteran for equal treatment become justifiable.

COMPARISON OF U.S. AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS TO GI BILL BENEFITS

Date	No dependents			1 dependent		2 dependents	
	Average monthly earnings	Monthly payment	Percent of average monthly earnings	Monthly payment	Percent of average monthly earnings	Monthly payment	Percent of average monthly earnings
1948	\$212	\$75	35.4	\$105	49.5	\$120	56.5
May 1973: After payment of average tuition and book costs at all public colleges	614	163	26.4	204	33.1	241	38.9
May 1973: After payment of average tuition and book costs at major 4-year public colleges	617	138	22.4	179	29.0	216	35.0

D. Unemployment

Employment of any kind is the major concern of veterans. To use the GI Bill, most veterans (without outside financial help) must have either a full- or part-time job. Many veterans found they had to get a job and get reoriented to civilian life before they could make the decision to return to school. Yet in many cases, the jobs they thought they were qualified for because of their service were unavailable. In the cities, where most vets are concentrated, jobs are difficult to obtain. Where it has been used for veterans, the EEA Public Employment Program has helped some. But under the President's budget, that program is scheduled for termination; and even those jobs will no longer be available. The college work-study program has not helped the veteran enough, primarily because of funding levels and demands on it by non-veterans. In fact, testimony was presented that veterans were largely excluded from the HEW work-study program because of inclusion of their GI Bill income in determining their economic status.

Unemployment among Vietnam veterans aged 20-24 has remained consistently high, and the figures for the first quarter of 1973 were 11.0% for veterans, versus 7.3% for non-veterans (not seasonally adjusted) in that age bracket. The seasonally adjusted figures were 9.2% for veterans 7.0% for non-veterans. Testimony was heard repeatedly at the hearings that the Vietnam veteran was caught in a vicious cycle because he lacks the education and training to obtain a job. Yet without a job to supplement his inadequate GI Bill benefits, he cannot obtain the education and training.

Both veterans and college officials agreed that the greatest need was for an assistance package that combined an assured part-time job with GI Bill educational benefits. One veteran testified at the Newark hearing that in his search for a job (which he needed to be able to make it under the GI Bill), it was only after he threatened to call his Congressman that he finally secured employment. Part-time employment did not yield enough income, so he carries both a full course of study and a full-time job.

Veteran witnesses told of giving up on using the GI Bill after fruitless searches for part-time jobs. While the state employment services came in for much criticism, the problem is that many employers do not list with the service, and usually only full-time jobs are available. Obviously, the employment service has a difficult time in supplying jobs in a time of high unemployment, like that beginning in 1970.

E. Bureaucracy

Many of today's veterans feel that the whole system of assistance—the VA, the governmental bureaucracy and the traditional veterans organizations—is neither sympathetic to their needs nor representative of their era of service.

While the VA, the employment service, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and others have made important efforts to use Vietnam veterans in their programs, they have had great difficulties in getting veterans to accept those efforts at face value.

One veteran at the Newark hearing summed up the feeling of many about bureaucracy:

"America needs to gamble on the potential of this generation of veterans to at least the same degree as it did on the World War II generation. Instead, with its tradition of diversity, American society can only offer benefits to Vietnam-era veterans through increasingly narrow channels, developed over 25 years ago and administered with decreasing flexibility, under tons of regulations and overregulation, by people who it seems have forgotten the gamble society took on them."

"Efforts on behalf of Vietnam-era veterans should be more in humanistic terms rather than the present national and economic crisis terms. A greater number of Vietnam-era veterans should be involved in the development and running of efforts on behalf of veterans, not just token representation, or a Vietnam-era veteran with a title, for display purposes, with no authority or responsibility. Programs are designed and implemented on a 'Daddy knows what's best for you' philosophy, and when they fall short or fail, the reason is always 'you don't really know what's best for yourself.'

At the Cleveland hearing, an advertising executive (himself a Korean War veteran) noted that the problem seemed to be one of communication, and cited the many forms and brochures with their governmental jargon—and then asked, "How can you expect to relate to today's alienated vet with this sort of stuff?"

At the Seattle hearing, a veteran of World War I, representing the combined charter veterans organization, offered this comment to the Vietnam vets: "I know what it is to be frustrated by bureaucracy." However, he urged vets to "approach it on the basis of negotiation rather than abuse." He suggested that the charter veterans organization's tactic of "constantly watching and constantly checking up" was a good one, and was a lobbying effort worth emulating.

Also in Seattle, a Vietnam veteran—one of the few to be elected to a state legislature—testified that this era of vets needs a lobby of its own. He urged the election of more Vietnam veterans to public office, and suggested that they organize themselves more effectively. He cited the fact that there are no Vietnam veterans in Congress today, and said that in contrast, 1946 saw newly elected vets—such as John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon.

Many vets in the hearings noted the absence of young veterans in outreach roles and in responsible positions in regional offices. They felt the need for Vietnam veterans to

have a major influence in the development of national policies, as well as at the local level, on their behalf.

Another major thrust of the veterans was for local organizations that were veteran-run and veteran-influenced. Satisfaction was expressed with the third-party contracts that bring federal money in to support city-sponsored and controlled agencies. The difficulties of federal regional agencies, such as the VA regional office, that were pointed out included their inability to involve the local public and private non-profit agencies and important men and women who could contribute to programs for veterans. From the testimony given at the hearings, it was evident that there was a great deal of good will that could be channeled to Vietnam veterans; yet the lack of operable mechanisms, such as the citizen committees that were formed in Seattle, prevented assistance from reaching many veterans through existing public and private agencies.

Testimony was given at the Cleveland hearing on the tremendous value of the recent Upward Bound for Veterans projects funded by HEW in 1972. Former astronaut Neil Armstrong, now a professor at the University of Cincinnati, detailed how such a project is working there. Similarly, officials at Cuyahoga Community College told how they have set up successful outreach, counseling, remedial education and assistance efforts with such a grant. These, and projects such as College Discovery, run at Fort Dix by Montclair State College (and detailed at the Newark hearing), show the advantages of federal funds going to locally run "vets helping vets" projects.

Tom Tharpe, a product of College Discovery, testified at the Newark hearing, "When I was in high school, I was told I wasn't college material. Then in the service I discovered College Discovery. They counseled me and got me into college, where I have a 3.2 average." Mr. Tharpe will graduate soon from Brooklyn College with a degree in mathematics.

Ralph Munro, Special Assistant to Governor Daniel Evans, suggested that the principle of special revenue sharing be applied to veterans. He felt that if the state had the financing to tackle veterans problems, it could go a long way toward solving them. Unfortunately, the Emergency Employment Act program, with which the state had launched a major veterans program, assigning veterans to each community college in the state, may run out shortly. Munro suggested that a special revenue sharing program for veterans could solve the problem.

Delays in the receipt of GI Bill benefits have been particularly harmful to Vietnam veterans attempting to stay in college. The fact that checks are late in arriving makes it hard for counselors to persuade veterans to return to school. In fact, many men in school have had to drop out because of late receipt of their checks. The President's

Committee on the Vietnam Veteran pointed out in its 1969 report that low participation in the GI Bill was related to these delayed payments. The report said:

"The effect of this after-the-fact method of payment can be to discourage program participation by the veteran who cannot afford the initial outlay required by most schools for prepayment of fees, tuition, books, and the necessary money for subsistence for himself and his family until the first payment is received. The intent of the program is thus jeopardized."

While the advance payment provision of the 1972 GI Bill is designed to correct this, many veterans at the hearings expressed skepticism, as long as the system depends on computers. However, the new system developed as a result of combined administration and Congressional initiatives, should alleviate the very major problem of payment delays. It appears from discussions with the Veterans Administration officials that taking a veteran's file out of the system to find out why delays are involved may in its own right slow down the processing of his claim. Obviously, the computer is only as good as the paper that is fed into it; and the current system, with its potential delays—by the veteran, by the college and by the Veterans Administration—works a serious hardship on individuals.

F. Geographical differences in GI bill effectiveness

The programs of assistance which are designed to supplement the GI Bill are not uniformly available to veterans. The GI Bill itself is used to widely varying degrees in different states. Some states have bonuses and free public tuition. Some schools have

federally funded veterans assistance efforts. Some local areas have outreach programs. Some areas have available jobs. But nothing, not even the GI Bill itself, is uniform in its effectiveness.

The effectiveness of the GI Bill depends on which state a veteran returns to. California has the nation's most extensive public college system. Community colleges and a state college system with a 200,000-student enrollment are available at low tuition rates.

A California student veteran pays \$140 of his GI Bill benefits for tuition at a state college, while a New Jersey veteran pays \$630 and an Ohio veteran \$700. (Because the present program no longer takes into account variations in tuition costs, equal military service no longer means equal readjustment opportunities, as it did under the World War II GI Bill.)

The National Association of Collegiate Veterans submitted a report that it had prepared, entitled *The Vietnam-Era GI Bill—Equal Military Service—Unequal Readjustment Opportunities*. Unfortunately, NACVI President James Mayer was unable to come to Cleveland and testify. However, the substance of the report shows that per capita payments to individual veterans vary greatly from state to state. California leads the major states, with its veterans able to use over \$1230 in GI Bill benefits on a per capita basis during the five years from fiscal 1968 to fiscal 1972. New Jersey and Ohio veterans used slightly more than half as many dollars in GI Bill benefits.

The NACVI report cites the difference in how California veterans were able to make use of the benefits in contrast with New York veterans. In fiscal 1972, Californians used \$302,000,000 in benefits, while New

Yorkers used \$99,000,000. These two states ordinarily get nearly equal shares under most federal programs; however, between fiscal 1968 and fiscal 1972, California veterans used more than \$565,000,000 more than New York veterans in GI Bill benefits. This is largely a reflection of the mix of the state's post-secondary education system and the lower levels of tuition in California. With few private colleges, a heavily subsidized state system, and a community college system three times as large as New York's, the California veteran had much easier access to the GI Bill than did the New York veteran. It should be noted that California veterans take no money away from New York veterans when they use the GI Bill to the extent they do, for the GI Bill contains a unique commitment by Congress to make more money available as more veterans decide to use the benefits.

The attached chart shows the great disparities among states in the usage of the GI Bill. In a per capita basis (to show the relation of GI Bill payments to the number of veterans on a state-by-state basis), annual educational benefits go from a high of \$469 for veterans in North Dakota to a low of \$174 for veterans in Virginia. As for the utility of the GI Bill for college or junior college education, 35% of California's veterans use it, while less than 14% of Indiana's veterans do so.

This points up the inherent inequality in the practical limits on the way the GI Bill can be used by veterans in various states. Further variances among veterans with different economic and social backgrounds were testified to at the hearings. However, no definitive national statistics exist on this point.

IMPACT OF VIETNAM-ERA GI BILL

	Payments per 10,000 Vietnam-era vets	Vietnam-era vet population (November 1972)	Total GI bill payments fiscal year 1972	Percent ever in college under GI bill		Payments per 10,000 Vietnam-era vets	Vietnam-era vet population (November 1972)	Total GI bill payments fiscal year 1972	Percent ever in college under GI bill
1 North Dakota	\$4,690,000	15,000	\$7,040,000	34.4	28 Mississippi	\$2,870,000	45,000	\$12,910,000	19.8
2 New Mexico	4,550,000	31,000	14,120,000	29.7	29 Iowa	2,820,000	79,000	22,300,000	19.1
3 Arizona	4,500,000	61,000	27,440,000	32.2	30 Missouri	2,790,000	141,000	39,360,000	20.8
4 South Dakota	4,210,000	15,000	6,320,000	27.2	31 Nebraska	2,780,000	43,000	11,970,000	24.1
5 California	4,170,000	725,000	302,180,000	35.3	32 Rhode Island	2,730,000	33,000	9,020,000	19.2
6 Out of Country	3,900,000	71,000	27,690,000	16.4	33 Michigan	2,650,000	255,000	67,600,000	22.1
7 Utah	3,880,000	38,000	14,750,000	28.2	34 Illinois	2,550,000	309,000	78,940,000	20.5
8 Colorado	3,810,000	81,000	30,860,000	26.6	35 Nevada	2,430,000	19,000	4,610,000	16.9
9 Alabama	3,690,000	90,000	33,240,000	20.8	36 Kentucky	2,330,000	83,000	19,340,000	15.8
10 Hawaii	3,670,000	28,000	10,280,000	26.7	37 New Hampshire	2,310,000	26,000	6,010,000	17.0
11 Oklahoma	3,670,000	87,000	31,950,000	25.5	38 Connecticut	2,300,000	91,000	20,890,000	19.1
12 Washington	3,450,000	136,000	46,890,000	27.8	39 Maine	2,280,000	29,000	6,620,000	17.0
13 Florida	3,410,000	213,000	72,590,000	25.4	40 Massachusetts	2,270,000	181,000	41,070,000	19.1
14 Oregon	3,390,000	77,000	26,140,000	29.2	41 West Virginia	2,250,000	45,000	10,120,000	17.6
15 Louisiana	3,370,000	94,000	31,700,000	20.0	42 New York	2,160,000	461,000	99,730,000	20.3
16 Idaho	3,350,000	21,000	7,040,000	28.8	43 Pennsylvania	2,160,000	344,000	74,160,000	16.1
17 Texas	3,320,000	342,000	113,680,000	24.3	44 Vermont	2,080,000	14,000	2,670,000	13.3
18 Kansas	3,300,000	67,000	22,130,000	25.3	45 New Jersey	2,040,000	198,000	40,440,000	16.4
19 Tennessee	3,230,000	114,000	36,870,000	19.9	46 Delaware	2,020,000	19,000	3,840,000	18.2
20 Montana	3,180,000	22,000	7,000,000	26.8	47 Indiana	1,970,000	161,000	31,750,000	13.8
21 Arkansas	3,160,000	51,000	16,140,000	19.4	48 Maryland	1,940,000	133,000	25,860,000	20.2
22 Georgia	3,040,000	147,000	44,730,000	16.6	49 Ohio	1,910,000	322,000	61,590,000	16.2
23 South Carolina	2,990,000	77,000	23,000,000	17.2	50 Alaska	1,800,000	12,000	2,160,000	15.4
24 North Carolina	2,970,000	136,000	40,360,000	20.1	51 Virginia	1,740,000	152,000	26,510,000	18.5
25 Wyoming	2,960,000	11,000	3,260,000	27.3	Total	12,960,000	6,220,000	1,806,540,000	23.4
26 Wisconsin	2,930,000	125,000	36,610,000	21.5					
27 Minnesota	2,900,000	128,000	37,070,000	20.6					

* Average per 10,000 vets.

** Average.

G. Federal responsibility

The President's Budget Message for FY 1974 says, "The primary responsibility for most [education and manpower training] activities, other than those for veterans, rests with state and local government. (emphasis added)" Yet for the shortcomings in federal funds—not only for the GI Bill, but for the Veterans Cost of Instruction Program, work-study, EEA, OEO and other programs needed by veterans—it is the states that are trying to deal with the gap. State

and local governments have had to make up for the differences in today's GI Bill and that of World War II. Where they have not, veterans have been unable to use their opportunities. California, with its extensive public higher education system, has, in effect, created a universal scholarship program for all its citizens. Most states have not. As a result, the veteran who returns to California has a far better chance to effectively utilize GI Bill benefits.

The federal government's programs which

Source: Vietnam-Era Veterans Population and College Participation Rate, Department of Veterans Benefits, Veterans Administration; payments by State, VA work sheet for Office of Management and Budget Report, Federal Outlays Bulletin of November 1973.

have benefited veterans—such as the EEA and the Jobs for Veterans Program—and the National Alliance of Businessmen's veterans program have gone part way in reducing veterans unemployment and in creating opportunities. But with 250,000 veterans still unemployed, the federal government will have to assume a greater share of the burden. Where local veterans projects exist, each must persuade the city to allocate money for those veterans. The veterans themselves are large-

ly unorganized and competing with established interest groups for available funds.

At all three of the hearings, testimony was given by members of the state legislature about proposed or existing cash bonuses for veterans or so-called State GI Bills granting educational benefits as add-ons to the federal GI Bill. A survey of all 50 states revealed an incredible amount of activity in this regard. The total amount of one-shot cash bonuses either passed or pending is more than a billion dollars, while the annual amount of total state education benefits is nearly half a billion dollars. These figures say a great deal about the inadequacy of the present GI Bill; and, while much of this state legislation will probably not become law, it is significant that so many public officials feel it is necessary.

Ohio State Senator Anthony Calabrese put the case of state legislators for federal responsibility when he said, "The State doesn't have adequate resources to solve the (veterans) problem. The federal government

alone has the power to declare and wage war; therefore, because the federal government is responsible for this war, it has responsibility for the veterans of this war."

At both the Newark and the Cleveland hearings, the American Servicemen's Union testified in favor of a flat \$2500 bonus for Vietnam-era veterans—a figure representing the minimum average difference between civilian and military pay over the usual two-year military tour of service. The Committee tends to agree more with the testimony of the state legislators at the Cleveland and Seattle hearings, who argued that cash bonuses are an inappropriate way of structuring veterans benefits. Such benefits under the GI Bill are more appropriately related to the pursuit of education and training, and any cash payments should be made only for subsistence while enrolled in school.

Pending State Veterans Benefits. This is a chart showing present and pending Vietnam-era veterans benefit legislation by state. It is limited to either cash bonuses or edu-

cational benefits, such as tuition credits. It does not include the multitude of bills affecting POWs, MIA's or survivors and dependents of veterans. It also does not include the low or non-interest loan bills being considered by the states.

The estimated costs of the benefit levels are figured in the following way: Bonus payments are multiplied by the latest VA figures showing numbers of Vietnam-era veterans by state (figures do not include payments some states make to earlier veterans); tuition credit costs are figured by multiplying 75% of the number of veterans using the GI Bill to go to college (75% being the average number of students in state schools) by the average out-of-state tuition rate (as being close to the true cost of education to the state).

States not listed either do not have legislatures in session or do not have identifiable veterans legislation.

Sources: American Legion, VFW and Council of State Governments, May 1973.

State and legislation	Status	Provides	Estimated cost (millions)		State and legislation	Status	Provides	Estimated cost (millions)	
			Annual payment	Total payment				Annual payment	Total payment
Arizona:									
(1) Vet bonus	Committee	\$500 maximum		\$30.5	Montana:				
(2) Educ. benefit	Introduced	\$50 cut/semester in tuition	\$1.5		(1) Vets bonus	Introduced	\$300 maximum		\$6.6
Arkansas: Educ. benefit	Committee	Free textbooks, full tuition, State schools	6		(2) Educ. benefit	do	Tuition, State schools	\$5.8	
Colorado: Educ. benefit	Senate passed	\$300 tuition, credit at State schools	4.8		New Hampshire: Vet bonus	Committee	\$100 maximum		2.6
Connecticut: Vet bonus	Passed	\$300 maximum		27.3	New Jersey: Educ. benefit	Passed House	\$500 tuition credit	15	
Delaware:					New Mexico: Educ. benefit	Introduced	Tuition, State schools	3.2	
(1) Vet bonus	Passed	do		5	New York: Educ. benefit	do	do	84.6	
(2) Educ. benefit	Committee	Tuition, all schools	3.5		North Dakota: Vet bonus	Passed	\$600 maximum		9
Florida: Educ. benefit	do	Tuition credit	64.8		Ohio: Vet bonus	Conference	\$500		225
Illinois:					Pennsylvania:				
(1) Vet bonus	Passed	\$100			(1) Educ. benefit	Introduced	\$50/mo supplemental to GI bill	25	
(2) Educ. benefit	Committee	Tuition, State schools	61.7		(2) Vet bonus	Passed	\$750 maximum		256
Indiana: Vet bonus	Passed	\$200 Vietnam vets	5		Rhode Island: Vet bonus	Introduced	\$350 maximum		9.9
Louisiana: Vet bonus	Committee	\$500 maximum			South Dakota: Vet bonus	Passed	\$500 maximum		7.5
Louisiana: Vet bonus	Passed	\$250			Tennessee: Vet bonus	Not yet signed	\$300 maximum		34.2
Massachusetts:					Texas: Educ. benefit	Committee	Tuition, State schools	85.7	
(1) Vet bonus	Passed	\$300 maximum			Vermont: Vet bonus	Passed	\$120 maximum		1.7
(2) Educ. benefit	Pending	Tuition, State schools	18.2		Washington: Vet bonus	do	\$250		34
Michigan:					West Virginia: Vet bonus	Conference	\$400 maximum		40
(1) Vet bonus	Committee	\$500 maximum			Wisconsin: Educ. benefit	Committee	Tuition credit, all schools	5.5	
(2) Educ. benefit	do	Tuition, State schools	50		Total bonuses amount (of which 454.3 passed)				1,049.8
Minnesota: (1) Vet bonus	do	\$300 maximum		63	Total annual education benefits				448.2
Missouri:									
(1) Vet bonus	do	\$200 maximum		28.2					
(2) Educ. benefit	do	66 percent reduced tuition, State schools							

H. The military

The military itself has done far too little in the area of GI readjustment. Many psychiatrists and psychologists contend that no attempt at real readjustment counseling has been made. Given the nature of the war and the public reaction to it, these experts feel that lack of readjustment—and lack of any significant elapsed time between field service and homecoming—are the heart of the veteran problem.

Present veterans outreach efforts, conducted by nearly 30 different national public and private groups and agencies, would have been greatly simplified if the military had conducted a uniform and thorough program of information about, the encouragement to use, the GI Bill.

As it is, some GI's have benefited from demonstration projects, such as Fort Dix's College Discovery. But the vast majority returning from Vietnam have merely been told to be proud of their service and to convert their GI life insurance. They have then been released to confront an often hostile public and to deal with a complex system of sporadic and uneven assistance.

Testimony from Fort Dix officials at the Newark hearing and from the Commanding General of Fort Lewis at the Seattle hearing told of commendable pre-release programs at these installations. However, such efforts are not national in scope, and often depend

on local unit commanders as to whether GI's can have proper counseling and remedial education available to them—especially on a "release time" basis.

Project Transition received roughly \$17,000,000 a year in Labor Department funding for several years, and additional Department of Defense support, but each base commander had the option as to how deeply to get involved in Project Transition. However, the veteran coming back directly from Vietnam was in many cases discharged directly, without ever getting the chance to take advantage of a transition program. He was briefed at his point of discharge, which was often in California. This briefing was limited and usually given to a man whose attention was focused on his return to his family and loved ones. If the Army would begin to treat the veteran, from his first day, as someone whose future it was concerned with, the morale problem might be greatly improved, and the ability of the veteran to find post-service opportunities might also be substantially enhanced.

I. Discharges

The present system of awarding less-than-honorable discharges by administrative proceedings can be unfair in its application and can result and has resulted in unwarranted hardships. Testimony at the Cleveland hearing both by the co-author of the Nader Re-

port on the Vietnam Veteran, a former Marine Corps lawyer, and by recipients of such discharges, gave ample indication of the problem. Congressman Louis Stokes also testified about many constituents who have been unduly penalized.

However, it appears that agreement of the type and means of reform will require much more investigation and research. Meanwhile, the results of the present system must be dealt with. The VA, as well as present military boards of review, have authority to deal with such cases, but have a record of delay, complexity and a demonstrated lack of leniency and understanding.

The VA, while it has a limited right to grant educational benefits to certain recipients of less-than-honorable discharges, has a 93% rejection rate of such applications. Given the hardship this imposes on the veterans involved—most of whom share common economic and social backgrounds—this seems shortsighted and harsh. Since a less-than-honorable discharge already imposes employment restrictions on the recipient, to deny him a chance for needed education shuts him completely off from society and from any means of readjustment and rehabilitation.

The process for discharge review is complex, costly and to a large extent unrewarding. The American Legion and American Red Cross (as well as other groups)—provide val-

uable assistance for some veterans in this regard. However, the successes are limited, and many veterans are precluded from pursuing the matter if only because of the cost of travel involved.

If the problem of alienation, peer involvement and readjustment are to be met, it seems logical that veterans who are precluded from using the GI Bill must be given assistance and understanding. Otherwise, charges of discrimination, undue hardship and harassment will continue. The most outspoken and emotional parts of the public hearings concerned this one issue, indicating the need for more sensitivity on the part of the benefits system.

PART II—RECOMMENDATIONS

A. GI Bill

If today's GI Bill is going to be truly adequate for Vietnam-era veterans, the experience of these hearings is that major changes must be made in the present GI Bill. As the President of the University of Washington put it, "Though the benefits are intended to be equally available, they are not equally accessible to all veterans."

Therefore, today's GI Bill must do two things:

1) It must make a reasonable tuition payment, so that more veterans can further their education without regard to state differences in education costs; and

2) It must provide a subsistence allowance equivalent (in terms of buying power) to that which was available to World War II veterans.

As presently constituted, the GI Bill is not equally available to veterans of differing economic means. This has implications that disturb many Vietnam-era veterans, college administrators and public officials. Further, the structure of the GI Bill limits its use by veterans in many states. Merely raising the present benefits will not attack the major problem—the GI Bill must be made more usable by more veterans, especially those who most need its education and training benefits. Only in this way will the GI Bill give those who were called to military service the same chance for advancement enjoyed by those who stayed home. If the GI Bill really represents this country's gratitude towards those who sacrificed their best time and efforts in behalf of their country in a

difficult war and in a difficult time, then it must be uniformly available to all who want or need it.

Therefore, the educational benefits under the GI Bill must be made part of an assistance package to the veteran—a package which includes: a reasonable tuition payment which does not limit the veteran in applying to the school of his choice; a subsistence payment equivalent to that given the World War II veteran; loans; a part-time job for those who need it; counseling; and whatever remedial measures are necessary to enable the veteran to get full usage out of the GI Bill.

How can this be done? First, each veteran eligible for educational benefits should be given a voucher which constitutes at least 80% of tuition costs at institutions of higher learning of his choice. Both the VA and the educational institutions should work together on this system, so that the veteran is least impaired by paperwork, financial complexities, computer delays and timetables for payment.

This Committee initially recommended a tuition payment which would represent the average non-resident tuition at public colleges (\$1200). However, as was pointed out at the Seattle hearing, college charges are such that such a strict payment formula would not allow veterans to enroll in many nearby private colleges that might exactly suit their needs. Also, it would disadvantage those veterans presently enrolled in low-tuition community colleges. An initial recommendation would have limited them to a subsistence allowance of \$150 a month, which is less than they are presently getting.

To be a fair equivalent of the World War II GI Bill, close to full tuition at private colleges must be paid. College tuitions at private colleges have increased, on the average, five times from what they were in 1948—far exceeding the cost of living increase since that time.

Testimony by two college presidents at the Seattle hearing dwelt on the fact that the present GI Bill represents "a tilt towards public colleges," and this is neither wise nor fair. Dr. Odegard, President of the University of Washington, pointed out that some 30 states assist private colleges, while others do not, and that if a GI Bill is going to be "equally accessible," it will have to pay

tuition and fees at both public and private colleges. The 80% maximum is consistent with the principle that the veteran make a significant contribution to his own education.

Besides the World War II system, a precedent of direct tuition payment is within the present GI Bill. Full tuition for disabled veterans is paid through the GI Bill. Adequate safeguards have been devised to protect the government against abuse when tuition is paid for the disabled veteran. These safeguards could easily be carried over to the regular veteran students.

The second element in restructuring the GI Bill is to contain a direct subsistence payment to the enrolled veteran. This figure should be the present \$220-a-month base payment. This amount is the equivalent of the World War II GI Bill subsistence payment, in that the \$75 a month paid then was 35.4% of the average monthly earnings reported by the Department of Labor. The latest average monthly earnings figure is \$617, and an equivalent 35.4% of that is \$220. Married veterans' payments are out of line with the corresponding World War II percentages, however, and payments for married veterans with two or more dependents especially should be brought into line.

Several witnesses at the hearings recommended a straight cost-of-living increase be applied to the World War II \$75-a-month subsistence payment—yielding a base payment of about \$150 a month. However, the percentage applied to the average monthly earnings figure more closely approximates the buying power available to veterans of World War II—especially when consideration is taken of the fact that the earlier bill covered cost of books and that colleges then made available low-cost veteran housing, frequently government surplus.

These two changes—the 80% tuition voucher and the base \$220-a-month subsistence payment—would wipe out the disparities that exist in the usage of the present GI Bill. They would also enable veterans to consider enrolling in private colleges—something they are economically precluded from doing now. The following chart reflects this situation in comparison to that of the World War II era:

SAMPLE PRIVATE COLLEGE VETERAN ENROLLMENT

	1947-48			1971-72		
	Enrollment	Veterans	Percent veterans	Enrollment	Veterans	Percent veterans
Harvard University	5,600	3,326	59	6,073	89	1.5
Holy Cross University	1,079	989	87	2,379	13	.5
New York University	26,438	14,359	54	10,932	463	4.2
Northwestern University	21,128	9,941	47	9,372	90	1.0
Notre Dame University	4,200	3,587	85	6,439	108	1.7
Pepperdine University	4,431	2,299	52	4,641	639	13.8
St. Olaf	1,660	564	34	2,650	5	.2
Stanford University	15,800	7,011	44	18,000	291	1.6
Whittier College	1,249	507	41	1,815	66	3.6
Xavier University	3,163	1,715	54	2,918	175	6.0
Yale University	5,676	3,365	59	4,739	37	.8

SAMPLE PUBLIC COLLEGE VETERAN ENROLLMENT

	1948-49			1972-73		
	Enrollment	Veterans	Percent veterans	Enrollment	Veterans	Percent veterans
University of California	43,469	18,948	44	148,813	9,635	6.5
Ohio State University	23,929	12,146	51	49,943	3,516	7.0
Penn. State University	12,410	5,496	44	52,360	4,364	8.3
Purdue University	13,674	7,623	56	27,492	1,256	4.6
Rutgers University	9,088	4,290	47	38,060	3,729	9.8
University of Illinois System	25,920	11,880	46	57,536	4,427	7.7
University of Wisconsin	22,353	10,808	48	135,921	12,342	9.1

A further recommendation is to relax the present eight-year time limit for GI Bill eligibility. It was felt that this unnecessarily puts the veteran under the gun to take courses that will enable him to get through college as quickly as possible—without proper regard to field of study and relevant courses. If a veteran is going to college half-time, he literally must begin the day he is separated to complete his studies before his benefits run out. This seems an unwarranted restriction. It also prevents veterans from using, today, a program that, when enacted in 1966 at \$100 a month, offered benefits \$10 less a month than the Korean War GI Bill offered. The 1972 amendments gave veterans in many states, for the first time, a level of GI Bill benefits that was feasible for them to begin to use, even though these benefits remained far below those of World War II in terms of buying power. Indeed, the 1972 amendments passed by the Congress and signed by President Nixon enabled the veteran to come closer to parity with World War II benefits than he had ever been before.

A similar easing of the 36-month entitlement period—extending it to 48 months—is also recommended. This gives the veteran needed flexibility in changing courses, upgrading job skills and other aspects of education and training.

It is estimated that there would be a major increase in public dollar expenditures for veterans' education by such changes in the GI Bill. However, the GI Bill is a unique investment in individuals. It is proven; indeed, many think our post-war prosperity rests on the trained manpower that resulted from the \$19 billion expenditure on the World War II and Korean War GI Bills. Some savings might be realized in the many federal, state and local programs which are now tapped by veterans because of present low GI Bill benefits. These range from welfare to food stamps, to social security benefits, to unemployment compensation, to education grants and loans, to other programs which have been funded to help veterans take advantage of the GI Bill. If benefits were adequate, veterans would not so often have to seek and use funds from these other social programs.

Secondly, a survey of activity in the 50 state legislatures reveals that more than a billion dollars is currently either pending or available in Vietnam-era veterans' cash bonuses, and nearly \$500 million in annual educational benefits costs is pending for veterans. This substantial fiscal activity is only planned because of the inadequacies of the federal GI Bill. Much of it will probably not become law, because of the unpopularity of the war, although earlier veterans received significant benefits in this fashion. The President's FY 1974 Budget Message stated that the federal government has primary responsibility for veterans' benefits and programs. Therefore, veterans should not be subject to the kind of disparities such non-uniform state efforts engender. Educational opportunity should be equally available for equally rendered national service.

More important than any fiscal impact of such GI Bill benefits changes is the effect of producing a fairer and more usable system of educational assistance.

Veterans who testified at the hearings resented the fact that they are compelled to act as charity cases in order to take advantage of the GI Bill. As veteran Walter Copeland said at the Newark hearing, "The legend is the Army builds men . . . what kind of man has to walk around begging people to help him?" Another veteran complained that the state of New Jersey houses its veterans affairs agency in the department that deals primarily with prisoners, mental patients, orphans and the handicapped—thereby confirming how the veteran is categorically viewed by the government. Vets at

the Cleveland and Seattle hearings also complained of the complexities and the demeaning task of seeking aid from welfare, unemployment compensation, food stamps and other programs which were not primarily designed for use by veterans attempting to use their GI Bill benefits.

At the Cleveland hearings, Mr. Bernard B. Direnfeld, past National Commander of the Jewish War Veterans, testified, "The GI Bill for Vietnam veterans . . . as pertains to education . . . is grossly inadequate, and substantially less than the World War II veteran received. . . . It is my hope that Congress will be realistic in according today's returnees an allowance for living expenses and tuition that is in line with today's prices and requirements."

In a statement submitted to the hearing by student veterans from campus clubs associated with the National Association of Collegiate Veterans, the indictment of today's GI Bill was precise and characteristic of the bulk of veteran testimony:

"It is a tragic fact that the Vietnam-era GI, unlike his World War II counterpart, is almost totally at the mercy of factors out of his control—income; geography; higher education's finances—in utilizing today's very different GI Bill. The individual's motivation, initiative and need regrettably play a minor role. While many veterans are able to use it, others with equal service and equal qualifications cannot."

"The degree of educational opportunity available to today's veteran unfortunately depends on such things as what state he lives in; what city he lives in; the local unemployment rate; the extent of commitment of local and state leaders; the quality and structure of the educational system available to him; his economic and social background; the public attitude towards the war; and whether his area has been selected as the site for a limited number of federal demonstration assistance efforts."

B. Employment

Employment opportunities for veterans are a total necessity. In areas of high unemployment, the federal government should be the funding source, through public employment programs.

Given both the educational and economic background of the veterans who do not use their GI Bill benefits, a part-time job (at the very least) is their main concern, if they are to use the GI Bill. It has been demonstrated by many veterans at the hearings that the lack of such jobs, combined with the complexities of securing benefits and their unfamiliarity with higher education admissions procedures, has produced college enrollment rates among veterans that are way below reasonable expectations.

It is obvious to this Committee that a substantial work ingredient is an essential part of making the GI Bill more available and more usable to more Vietnam-era veterans.

Jobs for GI Bill-enrolled veterans should be a national priority. Even with the GI Bill changes recommended above, enrolled veterans will need and should have the necessary jobs to enable them to meet the high costs of furthering their education. *The veterans' needs must be viewed as a package.*

Under its present structure, the GI Bill largely precludes the poorer veterans from its benefits. The Bill must be changed so that all veterans have an equal opportunity to further their education by using its benefits. With the disproportionately high unemployment rates among veterans in the key 20-24 year age group, and the general paucity of adequate part-time jobs in most cities, this means that the government will have to take the lead.

At the Newark hearing, Mr. Benito Guzman, a Vietnam veteran who has worked with Spanish-speaking veterans, testified that he

knew of several vets who became so frustrated in trying to find work to enable them to go to school that they gave up and re-enlisted in the Army. Veteran John Moss, at the Cleveland hearing, told how he was forced to drop out of college because he couldn't earn enough to meet costs, even with the GI Bill and a part-time job. Similarly, veteran Larry Parker, at the Cleveland hearing, said, "Either I can take care of my wife and son, or I can go to school—not both. Why should I have to make such a choice?"

After World War II, veterans studying under the GI Bill worked, depending on their economic circumstances, in a wide variety of part-time jobs. The jobs were there. Today the jobs are too often not there, and with more veterans in the low income category, the jobs are needed now more than ever.

There are five specific steps that can be taken to assure that GI Bill-enrolled veterans can have jobs available to them:

1. A public employment program should be continued and fully funded. Percentages of these public employment jobs suggested for Vietnam-era veterans should reflect the employment needs of veterans in each locality.

The Emergency Employment Act, in those cities, counties and states where it has been used to give jobs to veterans, has had two extremely valuable applications. First, because these jobs have been on a one-year basis, they have had natural application to veterans enrolled in school and college. This has been especially true where the job has been "split," so that two veterans share it—freeing each for full-time study.

Second, the EEA jobs have been used to hire veterans to recruit and counsel other veterans to use their GI Bill benefits. This type of peer outreach has been of key importance in dealing with the Vietnam-era veteran who generally feels that the system doesn't relate to him.

This precise point was made strongly by educator Dr. Murray Polner and Army psychiatrist Dr. Gordon Livingstone at the Newark hearing. Also, the VETS projects themselves in 10 cities (as well as similar outreach efforts) have had great success with this approach. Where the VA, employment service and American Legion have participated in the training of these peer recruiters and counselors, results have been even more substantial.

2. Not only EEA jobs, but also federal employment opportunities, should be made available to GI Bill-enrolled vets on a split-job basis.

At the Newark hearing, Co-Chairman Conte mentioned the President's Memorandum to Executive Agencies and Departments, urging the hiring of veterans and the use of this split-jobs-for-veterans approach. In subsequent follow-up with the Civil Service Commission and other government agencies, requested by veterans at the Newark hearing, it appeared that the split-job initiative had not produced substantial results.

Available federal jobs must be set aside and designated as available on a split-job basis for veterans enrolled under the GI Bill, in order to ensure results.

3. The college work-study program and the VA work-study provision of the GI Bill Amendments of 1972 should be adequately funded and expanded to meet the employment needs of GI Bill-enrolled veterans. In addition, the new Work-Study for Community Service Learning Program, contained in the Higher Education Act of 1972, should be funded. These programs should be fully coordinated with the GI Bill so that the question of whether a veteran can afford to use his educational benefits becomes moot. A job for those who need it should be part of his GI Bill benefits package. Federal work-study funds should be made available in sufficient quantities to areas with high unemployment

rates for the key veteran age group, perhaps through a separate GI Bill program.

The college work-study program, many veterans testified, is largely unavailable to them, since qualification for it is based on income, and colleges consider GI Bill benefits as income. One veteran complained that if the GI Bill benefits weren't considered as income for tax purposes, why should they be considered as income in the awarding of work-study jobs? He concluded that such a determination was just a bureaucratic way of limiting funds for the purpose. Veterans Cost of Instruction funds provide a significant source of jobs for student veterans, and it is urged that colleges use all these funds, rather than just the 50% required by statute, to aid veterans.

4. All efforts should be made to provide for the transferability of military training and skills to civilian use for full credit and qualification. There is no reason, for instance, why military driving licenses, and especially heavy equipment operators' permits, should not be acceptable and certifiable by the States. The Department of Labor should work with labor unions to see that military skills with civilian utility receive full recognition.

5. The President's Jobs for Veterans program, an interagency task force, has done a commendable job with a small staff and limited funds. Its advertising campaigns have brought an awareness to the public and to employers, and have probably contributed to the success that the National Alliance of Businessmen has had in placing several hundred thousand veterans in job opportunities. JFV should be allowed to continue its efforts among employers and communities as to the need to hire the vet. Job fairs should be expanded to include counseling and information on benefits and educational opportunities, so that the GI Bill-enrolled vet can have easy access to available jobs.

C. Discharges

As long as the present system of awarding less-than-honorable discharges through administrative (non-court martial) proceedings affect veterans, review, upgrading and benefits awards methods should be reformed. Discharge review should be available in each of the 10 federal regions, and should be by boards made up of not just military and VA personnel, but also Vietnam veterans' representatives, local leaders and service organizations. In addition, the VA must be more lenient in administratively granting educational benefits to recipients of less-than-fully-honorable discharges.

The practice of coding DD-214 separation papers so that employers know whether a veteran is reenlistable (due to drug use or other reasons) should be stopped. Such a red flag, representing a judgment that may be arbitrary or questionable (or related to a situation since corrected), is merely a further stigma to a veteran seeking employment. The reenlistment code was not intended for use by employers as a means of judging an applicant's qualifications, but that is what is happening.

Congressman Louis Stokes and Raymond Bonner, a former Marine captain and a lawyer with considerable experience with veterans who have less-than-honorable discharges, both testified in Cleveland as to the ills of the present system. They added considerable weight to the testimony of several veterans who have suffered under the stigma of such discharges.

Veterans' testimony in Cleveland confirmed that even with the notable help of the American Legion and the American Red Cross, upgrading of discharges is virtually impossible—the more so because review takes place only in Washington, D.C., before a board representing only the military.

The cries of anguish from veterans with less-than-honorable discharges who try to

get a job or education were shrill. One veteran at the Cleveland hearing said the system was driving these veterans to violence and crime. "He doesn't want to do this," he said. "It's what you are forcing him to do."

The appropriate Congressional committees would make a large contribution by undertaking an intensive review of the processes used for granting less-than-fully-honorable discharges during the Vietnam War. Recommendations for the reform of those discharges deserving of it and for a system to aid veterans who might otherwise fall into a vicious circle of problems would also be evaluated.

D. Communication

To ensure that no veteran neglects his benefits and rights merely because of poor communication, the federal government should fully fund an effort to reach and convince veterans to use the GI Bill—using the best marketing, advertising and communications techniques, like those employed in the campaign to recruit volunteers for the Armed Services. These tools of communications should be available not only for VA and employment service use, but for the coordinated use of all the nearly 30 private groups and agencies involved with veteran outreach and counseling across the country.

Where necessary, explanatory materials should be printed in Spanish or otherwise adapted, so that benefits are clear and easily utilized.

Mr. George Sapin, a vice president of the advertising firm of Meldrum & Fewsmit, testified at the Cleveland hearing (as a professional communicator) that the government's effort to reach and inform returning GI's of their rights and benefits had the appearance of "non-communication." He suggested that if the same kind of expertise went into an effort for veterans as presently goes into the drive to recruit volunteers for the Armed Forces, many more veterans would at least try to use the GI Bill.

The complexities and bureaucrat-ese embedded in the whole system of veterans assistance (from the VA to employment service to other government efforts) were cited repeatedly by veterans at the hearings. Veteran Larry Parker, at the Cleveland hearing, as well as veteran Bob Penn, who sat as a panelist, cited the callous, bureaucratic treatment veterans receive. They suggested that the speedy, personalized, no-expense-spared treatment accorded men entering the service is typical of how the government feels about them—"Get us in, do the job and then forget us."

Mr. Raul Vega, testifying at the Cleveland hearing, said the problem of non-communication is much more severe for Spanish-speaking veterans. The Senate Veterans Affairs Committee Report reported testimony that only one Puerto Rican veteran was working as a VA counselor in New York City.

It is apparent that much of the effort to inform veterans of benefits and procedures is through direct mail—a project largely ignored and discounted by today's veteran. One veteran at the Newark hearing told of receiving 45 separate pieces of such mail—benefits information, form welcome home letters from organizations, sales pitches and the like.

Shortly after the Cleveland hearing, the United Press carried a story on the reaction of Ohio veterans to direct mail:

"DISCHARGED VETERANS LEAVE CHECKS UNCASHED"

"COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 11—An Air National Guardsman mailed \$1 checks to 50 recently discharged servicemen last month. So far only one check has been cashed."

"M. Sgt. Charles Dowdy said he sent the checks out of personal curiosity to find out if men fresh out of the service read their mail. The envelopes also contained recruiting information and personal letters. Dowdy said

yesterday one check has been cashed, two were sent back because of changed addresses and one was returned with a 'No thanks.'

"He believes the other 46 were thrown away as junk mail."

The complex legal jargon used in pamphlets and brochures is further proof to many veterans that the system cannot and will not relate to them. Changing that jargon and widely distributing information through television and radio would be a distinct signal to the veteran.

E. In-service programs

The military should make a special effort for those 350,000 to 400,000 men who will continue to be released annually. Readjustment programs and pre-release remedial education efforts should be expanded and made uniformly available. Unit commanders should be required to allow participating GI's to utilize such programs during duty hours. Every effort should be made to provide for and encourage GI Bill enrollment before separation.

Testimony was given at the Newark hearing by officials and GI's involved in Fort Dix's College Discovery program. This project, a PREP program funded through the 1970 GI Bill Amendments, is an excellent and effective attempt to offer and deliver college preparatory instruction to GI's.

The main ingredient in such programs is release time from military duties to attend remedial courses. Several veterans testified that their unit commanders would not grant this, while others received it. This is a local commander option. It illustrates the necessity that in-service education be stressed by the Department of Defense, so that local commanders will encourage their men to use the opportunities.

It makes good sense to have released GI's be "satisfied products," especially if the Armed Services are going to depend exclusively on enlistments. Efforts to help the educationally disadvantaged should be made while the GI is still in the service. Similarly, programs to help him readjust and use his benefits should be directed at the pre-released GI, and coordinated with local institutions of higher education. The varied program in effect at Fort Lewis, described by Major General Fulton at the Seattle hearing, could serve as a model for many bases.

F. Veterans' Administration

A review commission, similar to that appointed after World War II, should be established to study and recommend reform of veterans benefits and benefits procedures. Congressman Peter Rodino, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, stated at the Newark hearing:

"It is time to call for a new national Commission on Veterans Affairs to conduct a careful examination of the kind of treatment our veterans can reasonably expect from this society and how we are delivering on that expectation. My colleague, Congressman Joseph Minish, and I recommend that such a commission be established by the Congress, with carefully balanced representation from major segments of the society, and not simply the education community and business who were the only groups represented in President's Eisenhower's Commission. We recommend that such a Commission have substantial representation from traditional veterans service organizations, representatives of all major groups of veterans, including Vietnam-era veterans, as well as the education, business and the religious communities. The Commission would consider all aspects of benefits, reemployment rights, pensions and compensations. It would examine the \$12 billion budget of the Veterans Administration, as well as the substantial funds expended by other Federal and state agencies for serv-

ices and evaluate the quality of support and service that those Federal dollars bring to today's veterans."

Many other witnesses—veterans, academic leaders and others—endorsed this proposal and urged that it be enacted immediately, so that any results could be of timely help to today's veterans.

G. Support programs

In addition to the work-study programs previously mentioned, there are a number of other programs which, if fully funded, could measurably improve educational opportunities for Vietnam-era veterans. Chief among these is the Veterans Cost of Instruction Provision of the Higher Education Act of 1972.

This provision authorizes a \$300 payment per enrolled veteran to educational institutions showing a 10% increase in veterans for the purpose of conducting outreach and remedial education. After a prolonged Congressional struggle, and legal action brought by the National Association of Collegiate Veterans, \$25 million in appropriated funds was finally obligated. However, due to the low funding level, a payment of only \$55 per veteran was actually made. If this program is really going to give incentives to higher education institutions to seek out the veteran and help him further his education, the full authorized funding will be needed.

The rationale behind the Veterans Cost of Instruction program, as originally enacted, was to provide colleges and junior colleges with federal funds to undertake efforts on behalf of the Vietnam-era veteran. Unlike under the World War II GI Bill, whereby money passed through the hands of the colleges, no more than a \$4.00 payment is made directly to the colleges through the GI Bill. With the funds, which, in the case of public colleges, covered the equivalent of out-of-state tuition rates for in-state veterans, colleges and junior colleges were able to develop administrative structures to deal with the problems of the World War II veteran. Although there was a change-over to a direct tuition payment to the veteran under the Korean War GI Bill, those administrative structures remained in place throughout the Korean era—but went out of existence in the period subsequent thereto. The Veterans Cost of Instruction funds would give colleges which increase their enrollment of veterans the direct funding needed to undertake veterans outreach and counseling programs and offer special courses.

The point was made at the Seattle hearing that schools with large enrollments of veterans may be unable to meet the 10% increase requirement, because of past activities which have been successful, and because of the dropoff in the numbers of veterans. The Committee would suggest that a longer base period be considered in determining eligibility under the increase requirement, and that the dropoff in the numbers of veterans be recognized.

As noted in the findings, the Committee recognizes the value of the Upward Bound for Veterans projects now operating at 67 colleges. This most worthwhile program, which is being continued, should be expanded, for while many veterans benefit from its counseling and remedial education, many more do not—just because a college in their area may not have received such funds. Between this program and the Veterans Cost of Instruction Provision, such efforts should reach all veterans.

As one young veteran, who is in college because of such a program, testified at Seattle, "Every veteran should have the same opportunity."

Another key support program can be Veterans Administration funding of non-federal agencies to aid veterans through contracts. The Senate Veterans Affairs Committee Report of July 1972 recognized the need for such

outreach activities, but there has been no significant support of such agencies by the Veterans Administration. There are nearly 30 national groups and agencies (both public and private) conducting veterans outreach, counseling and assistance programs. Given the fact that the workload of the VA is increasing concurrent with administrative funds and personnel cuts, such outside activity is essential.

In Seattle, for instance, the regional office of the VA reported a 10% increase in benefits workload and an 8% reduction in personnel. Agencies such as SeaVac perform a function that would be impossible for the VA itself within existing funding. Such groups now funded by OEO, the Department of Labor, HEW and many private foundations should be supported and coordinated by the VA. Third-party contracts are the best way to do this.

All these support-type programs are part of the total package that must be available and fully funded at the federal level if today's veterans are to really receive the intended benefits of the GI Bill.

CONCLUSION

This public hearing process, which produced this report, brought forward much new information on the problems of the Vietnam veteran. Obviously, much has been done on his behalf, and those efforts should not be underestimated. But there remains much more to do. The personal testimony taken at the hearings clearly pointed up the gap between present education and job opportunities and those available to veterans of World War II. This gap merely serves to reinforce the belief of today's veteran that he fought an unpopular war and must deal with public apathy about his future.

The trend to merely increase the GI Bill benefits in stages has not dealt with the basic problem that many veterans simply cannot afford to use the GI Bill.

The federal government and the Congress must show decisive leadership in rectifying the situation and in supporting and encouraging state and local efforts to make benefits and opportunities equally available to all veterans. The fact that the United States' involvement in the Vietnam conflict has ended should not make this effort any less necessary or pressing.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROBLEMS OF VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS, NEWARK, N.J., OCTOBER 25, 1972

PANEL

Mayor Kenneth A. Gibson.

U.S. Representative Silvio O. Conte (R.-Mass.).

U.S. Representative Henry Helstoski (D.-N.J.).

Msgr. Thomas Fahy, President, Seton Hall University.

Mr. Mark Hanson, National Council of Churches.

Mr. Joel Jacobson, United Auto Workers, Region 9.

Mr. Austin Kerby, National Headquarters, American Legion.

Mr. Robert Penn, Vietnam veteran; Commissioner of Parks, Buffalo, New York.

Mr. Robert Kleinert, President, N.J. Bell Telephone Co.

Dr. Nathan Weiss, President, Newark State College.

Mr. Angel Rodriguez, Newark VETS Project Director.

WITNESSES (IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE)

U.S. Senator Clifford P. Case (R.-N.J.).**

U.S. Representative Joseph G. Minish (D.-N.J.).**

Rev. Philip E. Kunz, N.J. Council of Churches.**

Dr. Murray Polner, author of "No Victory Parades."

Mr. Walter Myer, Vietnam-era veteran.*

Mr. Benito Guzman, Vietnam-era veteran. Mr. Walter Copeland, Vietnam-era veteran. Mr. Jack McMahon, Vietnam-era veteran. N.J. Assemblyman William H. Hamilton, Jr., Middlesex County.*

Dr. James Smith, clinical psychologist, N.Y.C.

Dr. Gordon Livingston, psychiatrist, Columbia, Md.

Mr. Otilio Mighty, N.Y.C. Urban League. U.S. Representative Peter Rodino (D.-N.J.).*

Mr. Alan Leder, Vietnam-era veteran.

Mr. Emilio Mola, Vietnam-era veteran.

Mr. James Pizzaro, Vietnam-era veteran.

Mr. Neil Clarke, Vietnam-era veteran.

Mr. Thomas Giddings, Project College Discovery, Ft. Dix.

Ms. Barbara Barnes, Project College Discovery, Ft. Dix.

Sp3 Dan Keyes, Ft. Dix, N.J.

PFC Jose Nieves, Ft. Dix, N.J.

Sp3 Thomas Tharpe, Ft. Dix, N.J.

Mr. George G. King, Montclair State College.

Mr. Cody Barrett, N.J. State Employment Service.

Mr. Ralph Geller, N.J. State Employment Service.

Mr. Frank Donovan, Vietnam-era veteran. Mr. Ken O'Brien, Vietnam-era veteran. Mr. Kenneth C. McCarthy, disabled veteran. Mr. John Hagan, Director, VA Regional Office, Newark.

Mr. Hakim Abdullah, American Servicemen's Union.

Mr. Raul Morales, American Servicemen's Union.

Mr. William Vincenti, Rutgers Newark.* Mr. John Rowan, Vietnam Veterans Against the War.

Mr. Skip Delano, Vietnam Veterans Against the War.

Mr. Robert Sniffen, National Association of Collegiate Veterans.

Mr. Fabio Frank, Vietnam Veterans Against the War.

FOOTNOTES

* Also submitted written statement.

** Submitted written statement only.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROBLEMS OF VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MARCH 9, 1973

PANEL

Mayor Ralph J. Perk.

U.S. Representative Silvio O. Conte (R.-Mass.).

Mr. Austin Kerby, National Headquarters, American Legion.

Mr. Robert Penn, Vietnam veteran; Commissioner of Parks, Buffalo, New York.

Mr. Lester W. Dettman, Regional Vice President, General Electric.

Mr. John Rosel, Cleveland Federation of Labor.

Mr. James Gillam, Cleveland VETS Project Director.

WITNESSES

U.S. Senator Robert A. Taft (R.-Ohio).**

U.S. Senator William Saxbe (R.-Ohio).**

U.S. Representative Charles Vanik (D.-Ohio).**

Professor Neil Armstrong, former astronaut.

U.S. Representative William Minshall (R.-Ohio).*

U.S. Representative William Keating (R.-Ohio).*

U.S. Representative Louis Stokes (D.-Ohio).*

Mr. Greg Penn, Vietnam veteran.

Mr. James Vocaire, Vietnam veteran.

Mr. Robert Swift, Vietnam veteran.

Mr. William Cade, World War II veteran.

U.S. Representative James Stanton (D.-Ohio).*

Mr. Larry Holmes, American Servicemen's Union.

Mr. Welton Chappell, Vietnam veteran.

Mr. Thrice Polk, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Donald Clayton, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. John Moss, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Paul Schumacher, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Ron Johnson, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Bill Schumacher, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Billy Jones, Vietnam veteran.
 Ms. Nicolette McClure, veteran.
 Ms. Hunter, mother of Vietnam veteran.
 Capt. Ray Bonner, Vietnam veteran.*
 State Senator Anthony Calabrese.
 Mr. Chester Koch, Ohio VFW.
 Mr. Roger Munson, Ohio American Legion.
 Mr. Bernard Durenfeld, former National Commander, Jewish War Veterans.*
 Mr. Freddie Williams, Greater Cleveland Veterans Council.
 Mr. Harry Lee, AmVets.
 Mr. George Traicoff, Dean of Community Services, Cuyahoga Community College.*
 Mr. Samuel Carrington, Director, Project Search.
 Mr. Paul Taylor, veterans counselor.
 Mr. Larry Parker, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Raul Vega, veteran.
 Mr. George Sapin, Vice President, Meldrum & Fewsmith.
 Mr. Arthur Haffner, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Jim Carlton, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Michael Carmody, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Raynard Hammond, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. John Belliveau, President, Ohio Private Employment Services Association.*
 Mr. Ray Barnett, Manager, Manpower, Inc.
 Mr. Robert Jones, Ohio Bureau of Employment Security.
 Mr. Jack Faught, Production Manager, Standard Pressed Steel Corporation.
 Mr. Robert Johnson, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Clint Nelson, Vietnam veteran.
 Dr. John Corfas, President, Dyke College.*
 Mr. Kenneth Sislak, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. Ronald Chandler, Vietnam veteran.
 Mr. John J. Pokorny, American Red Cross.
 Mr. Julius P. Scipione, President, Cleve-Tech Machine & Tool Company.**

Mr. John Rosel, Cleveland Federation of Labor.**
 Mrs. Dorothea Brown, Director, Extended Learning Program.*
 Mr. John Grady, Vietnam-era veteran and faculty member, Pennsylvania State University.**

FOOTNOTES

*Also submitted written statement.
 **Submitted written statement only.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROBLEMS OF VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS, SEATTLE, WASH., MAY 18, 1973

PANEL

Mayor Wes Uhlman.
 U.S. Representative Silvio C. Conte (R-Mass.).
 Mr. Austin Kerby, National Headquarters, American Legion.
 Mr. Robert Penn, Vietnam veteran; Commissioner of Parks, Buffalo, New York.
 Rev. William B. Cate, President, Church Council of Greater Seattle.
 State Senator Booth Gardner.
 Mr. Robert Hill, Project Director, VETS.
 Mr. Stuart Feldman, Program Coordinator, VETS.
 Ms. Jeanette Williams, Seattle City Council.

WITNESSES (IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE)

U.S. Senator Warren G. Magnuson.*
 U.S. Senator Henry M. Jackson.*
 U.S. Representative Brock Adams.*
 Dr. Charles Odegaard, President, University of Washington.
 Dr. Nolen Ellison, President, Seattle Central Community College.
 Mr. Joe Garcia, Director, Sea-Vac.
 Mr. William Phillips, Director, VA Regional office.

*Submitted statements.

Mr. John Rabel, State Representative.
 Mr. Les Blevins, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Santiago Juarez, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Edgar Bentley, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Phillip Meyerson, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Ralph Munro, Special Assistant to the Governor.

Mr. Ernest LaPalm, Assistant Commissioner, Employment Service.
 Mr. Peter Jamero, Assistant Secretary, Department of Social and Health Services.

Mr. Gregory Barlow, Director, Special Projects, Community College Education.
 Mr. J. B. McKremmin, State Office of Economic Opportunity.

Maj. Gen. Howard McGee, Adjutant General, Washington National Guard.
 Maj. Gen. William Fulton, C.G. 9th Division & Ft. Lewis.

Ms. Mary Garvey, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. James Sanders, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Richard Moore, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Dale Bott, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Tom Davis, Vietnam Veterans Against the War.

Mr. Wellington Rupp, United Veterans Organizations.
 Mr. Dwight Long, Chairman, Executive Committee, Washington State Veterans Coalition.

Mr. Tom Levanto, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Jon Lantz, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Michael Rooney, Vietnam-era veteran.
 Mr. Paul Richards, Vietnam-era veteran.

APPENDIX A

A summary comparison of World War II and today's GI Bills follows, with an evaluation of the impact those differences make:

WORLD WAR II

GI Bill paid for all tuition, books and fees (effectively) at any public or private college or technical school.

TODAY

No direct tuition payment to schools—a flat \$220 a month to the vet. Education costs at many colleges are five times greater than in 1948.

WORLD WAR II

A separate monthly subsistence allowance of \$75—35% of average monthly earnings. Available cheap quonset hut housing.

TODAY

Cost of living doubled. Vet must cover it, plus tuition, from \$220. In many areas, this barely covers rent and food. There is no subsidized housing.

WORLD WAR II

Part-time jobs readily available.

TODAY

Tight job market has made part-time jobs hard to find.

WORLD WAR II

Public colleges paid out-of-state tuition by the federal government for vets. Colleges and technical schools eagerly recruited vets. Led to expansion of higher education.

TODAY

Vets pay in-today tuition rates at public colleges from their \$220. Out-of-state charge at U of Cal is \$2100; total GI Bill is \$1980; vet pays \$660. Colleges have few significant vets programs.

In large part because of the funding differences between the World War II and today's GI Bills, the effectiveness of the GI Bill is uneven, particularly for college and junior college education and for institutional non-college training.

1) *Great regional disparities in GI Bill use.* California has a 36% GI Bill use rate; New York, 20%; Massachusetts, 19%; Pennsylvania and Ohio, 16%. In fiscal 1972, California vets used \$302,000,000 in GI Bill benefits; New York vets used \$99,000,000.

2) *Equal military service means unequal*

opportunity. Since today's veteran pays tuition out of his GI Bill, veterans in states with cheap public colleges end up with considerably more subsistence money than those from states whose public colleges charge higher tuition; for example, California State at Los Angeles charges \$117, while Jersey City State charges \$635, a difference of \$518, leaving the New Jersey veteran with \$1,365 to live on for nine months, while the California veteran has \$1,862—almost \$500 more.

3) *Veterans are a smaller percentage of college students.* After World War II, veterans were 50% of all enrollees in college. Today they are 9%. Although there was a large universe of eligible World War II veterans—15,000,000 versus 6,220,000 Vietnam-era veterans—today's veterans are still a large potential audience. Higher levels of education in the population and the greater availability of junior colleges result in a higher percentage of veterans using their opportunities for college—23.4% versus 20.8% after Korea, and 14.5% after World War II.

4) *Use is inverse to need.* Roughly 20% of the 6,220,000 Vietnam-era veterans have pre-service college; 20% are high school dropouts; and 60% are high school graduates. High school dropouts have about a 20% use rate, while those with pre-service college have a 50% use rate, and high school graduates have close to a 50% rate. But the dropouts and high school graduates make the greatest use of the GI Bill for correspondence courses, with 800,000 persons having done so; 75% of those, according to a GAO study, dropped out prior to completion.

5) *Percent of federal budget devoted.* After World War II, the GI Bill took 7.5% of the federal budget; today it takes 1%.

6) *Ruled out of private colleges, with fewer at state universities.* Today veterans comprise only 1% of total enrollment at Holy Cross, Northwestern, and Yale; veterans can no longer afford most private colleges, and represent less than 10% of the student body at major state universities.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill before us which will increase the education and training allowances to veterans in line with the changes in the Consumer Price Index.

It is a fair bill and one which I feel can become law. I hope there is no delay in the other body in acting on this bill, and I know that the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee is making plans for hearings in the near future.

I am distressed, however, that the public is being subjected to the steady barrage of propaganda calculated to support a bill which has been introduced in the Senate which has a price tag of \$1,400,000,000 for the first year. Statements being made in support of this bill are devised to create the impression that Vietnam veterans are not being treated fairly when compared with veterans of the previous wars.

In testimony before our committee spokesmen for the Veterans' Administration stated unequivocally that when adjusted to constant dollars, the U.S. Government is paying out more money per veteran in training for Vietnam veterans than was paid on behalf of either World War II or Korea veterans. Of course, we all know we no longer employ the practice of making higher payments to those veterans enrolled in high-cost schools, but on the average expenditures for Vietnam veterans are greater when adjusted than expenditures for veterans of the two previous wars.

For several years it was the favorite

propaganda tactic to contend the present education and training program was inadequate and that Vietnam veterans were not taking advantage of the program. The detractors have now fallen strangely silent when the record shows conclusively that Vietnam veterans are actually going to school in greater numbers than veterans of World War II or Korea.

In the propaganda being used, there is an attempt to infer that the program for Vietnam veterans is more rigid than the programs for veterans of previous wars. The fact of the matter is that Vietnam veterans enjoy several major benefits, such as work-study programs, tutorial assistance, military PREP and high school education without charge against entitlement, that were not available to veterans of previous wars. The time limitations for Vietnam veterans is more generous than those for the two previous groups, and with the passage of H.R. 12628, the time limits will be substantially more liberal.

Even though World War II veterans did receive separate tuition payments, rarely is it mentioned that these individuals had an accelerated use of their entitlement for tuition paid in excess of \$500 a year, and almost no one ever mentions the fact that World War II veterans were subjected to an income limit on their outside earnings or income.

The education program for Vietnam veterans is working. There are 1,400,000 veterans in training. More Vietnam veterans are going to school than the two previous groups. After the passage of this bill, the position of the Vietnam veterans will be distinctly preferential. Certainly, any Member is entitled to support any legislation he chooses, but I do hope that we can see less of the misleading statements that are emanating in connection with the Senate bill mentioned above, and let me make it clear that I am not referring to the bill supported or introduced by the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. O'BRIEN).

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, with the Nation at peace, it is all too easy to turn our backs on the courageous young men who fought in Vietnam.

These men returned home not to a hero's welcome but more often to hostility or indifference. In many cases, they were greeted not with parades but with unemployment lines.

Though these men fought as bravely and suffered as deeply as my own comrades in World War II, the educational benefits offered them fall short of those available to veterans of that conflict. I believe it is only a matter of fairplay that these men should be granted benefits equal to those accorded veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Therefore, while I applaud today's enactment of H.R. 12628, I feel that it does not go far enough. This bill will raise benefits available under the GI bill 13.6

percent, from \$220 to \$250 per month, for single veterans attending school full time. In this respect, the committee bill is identical to my own, H.R. 12664.

Nevertheless, I believe more must be done to give younger veterans a well-deserved boost in educational benefits.

The bill passed today will extend the time limit on eligibility for GI bill benefits from 8 to 10 years. This is an improvement, yet I see no valid reason for imposing any time restrictions on eligibility. Therefore, I am sponsoring legislation that would eliminate all such restrictions.

It was with the help of the GI bill that I was able to get through law school after World War II and I am well aware of how valuable such benefits are to the young veteran. It would be a great injustice to deny Vietnam veterans comparable benefits simply because they fought in an unpopular war.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628 and I praise the action of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for its work on this most important legislation.

As a member of the committee, and of the Subcommittee on Education and Training which held hearings and drafted the bill much as it is today, I can say that a great deal of effort went into this bill and that a great many points of view were taken into consideration. I can state without reservation that this bill is vitally needed and I recommend speedy passage.

This legislation will help the veteran of today to defray his college expenses. It is, however, not enough, particularly when compared to the benefits offered the World War II veteran.

Some statistics will point out the wide disparities between the Vietnam and World War II veterans. The World War II GI bill paid for all tuition, books, and fees—effectively—at any public or private college or technical school. Today, no direct tuition payment is made to the school—a flat \$220 a month goes to the single vet. Education costs at many colleges are five times what they were in 1948. In addition, the World War II vet got a monthly subsistence allowance of \$75—equal to one-third of the average U.S. worker's monthly earnings then. Today, average monthly earnings are nearly triple and vets must cover living costs plus tuition from that \$220 per month. In many areas, this barely covers rent and food.

The disparity, Mr. Speaker, is obvious. I have long advocated that equal time in the military service deserves equal benefits. I benefited from the World War II GI bill and I feel that the Vietnam veteran earned his benefits the same as I—so he should get the same chance to attend college. The bill before us today is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step.

Last October 25, I introduced H.R. 11134, and since then many of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring it, introduced similar measures on their own, or expressed their support of the concept contained in it.

The idea has gained support over the

past weeks and now my distinguished colleague, Mr. HELSTOSKI, chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and Training, has promised to set a date for hearings in the very near future. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to all of our efforts to hasten early passage of this most important concept.

What my bill does is to provide a tuition payment to each veteran who must pay more than the national average in tuition payments. This average for public colleges and universities is \$419 per school year, so everything over this amount would be paid to the school by the Veterans' Administration. In no case, however, would the payment exceed \$600 per school year. In other words, tuition between \$419 and \$1,019 would be defrayed. Over \$1,019, the payment would remain at \$600.

Mr. Speaker, this is an idea whose time has truly come. My colleague from New York (Mr. WOLFF) has been of great assistance in garnering support for this proposal, and we have been joined by Members of both parties and all ideologies. This is truly a nonpartisan issue—politics has been set aside in the effort to provide all veterans with equal benefits for equal service.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically rise to urge the immediate adoption of H.R. 12628, the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974.

There are, currently, 29 million living veterans in the United States, 7 million of whom are Vietnam era veterans. In our efforts to hold down Government spending this year, we must avoid the tendency to neglect these men and women who have served their country so valiantly.

Last year, through the Veterans Health Care Expansion Act, the National Cemeteries Act, and the pensions legislation, we made meaningful progress toward meeting our obligation to these individuals, but there is still much work to be done.

The bill before us today will provide needed relief to veterans who have been subjected to the rapidly rising cost of living and skyrocketing tuition costs. It will give an across-the-board increase of 13.6 percent in allowances, and it will extend from 8 to 10 years, the time in which veterans may utilize their benefits. In addition, it makes many improvements in programs such as the work-study program, and vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill is of paramount importance to our Nation's veterans. I urge its swift adoption.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the future of America, as we all know, lies in the untapped potential of the present generation of Americans who are currently students and trainees in our school systems and job training programs across the Nation. Included among these are the veterans of the Vietnam war era.

All of these veterans during their span of service in the Armed Forces incurred what is commonly referred to in economics as "opportunity costs." A simple definition of this concept can be stated as: Those losses which have been ac-

erued, knowingly or unknowingly, while pursuing any other course of action. For example, the loss of educational benefits and employment opportunities while serving in the Armed Forces of our country.

Mr. Speaker, America has always been known as the land of opportunities and it is our responsibility, and in this case our privilege, to provide these opportunities, not deny them. These veterans have served their time in defense of their Nation now let us provide them with the means to restore to them seemingly lost opportunities, for we cannot provide them with what they long for most, lost time.

In a time where the cost of living has increased to a brandnew high, where the percentage of unemployment has just reached 5.2 percent nationally, I feel that it would be the height of negligence on our part if we do not pass the proposed legislation before us today. The provisions that the Veterans' Affairs Committee have recommended are essential to the continuing success of the GI bill, and any major deletions from the proposed bill would be in effect denying the veteran an opportunity which he has justly earned and deserves.

I feel that special recognition should be accorded to certain provisions of the proposed bill. Included among them are the following:

The increase in educational allowances by 13.6 percent is a major step forward which provides a much more realistic opportunity for an education. I feel that this will enable many more veterans to partake in the program, especially in the New England area. In New England the vast majority of the colleges are privately owned, and this provision will go a lot further than the present allowance in alleviating tuition and book payments.

Many of the veterans are married and are in the tight position of trying to support a family and to obtain an education. As we all know, the dollar of the World War II does not stretch very far today. It is about time that we updated the figure and put the Vietnam veteran on a par with the World War II veterans.

The reducing of the disability requirement from the previous 30 percent standard to the World War II standard of 10 percent will be of great help to veterans who should be receiving vocational rehabilitation but are now technically ineligible.

The allowance of a 6-month refresher course under the bill is also a key consideration. In the few years that the Vietnam veteran was on active duty there were many great technological advances and without proper new training to correspond with the basics, a technician of the 1960's is lost in the technology of the 1970's.

Another point which I feel merits our support for this legislation is the expansion of the work-study program. This bill removes the limitation on veteran-students which the Veterans' Administration may assist under the work-study program and increases the number of hours during which a veteran may work under the program from 100 to 200 per

semester, and increases the maximum a veteran may receive under the program from \$250 to \$500. This along with the 13.6 percent increase will enable veterans to enlist in the ranks of academia and to support a family to a much greater degree than before.

Although this bill will begin to place the Vietnam veteran on a more equal par with the World War II veteran, much more can be done. In the future, I would hope that the time period during which these benefits could be taken advantage of would be extended indefinitely so that the veteran could pursue his education to the fullest. Mr. Speaker, these people served their country well and they are fully deserving of our complete support in this area. I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in voting for the passage of the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there has been a greater success story in modern education than the GI bill of World War II.

Veterans by the hundreds of thousands trooped to the classrooms as they had in answer to the rallying cry for freedom. Their brains and their hands, as they emerged from college classrooms and vocational training schools, built modern America and kept her flourishing today.

The new generation of Vietnam and Korean veterans are as eager for learning as their earlier comrades. More, in fact, are seeking college level educations than ever before, Mr. Speaker.

A grateful Nation did not shortchange the veterans of World War II. It must not shortchange the veterans of today.

H.R. 12628 contains veterans' education and rehabilitation amendments to lock the door on any doubts that this Congress or the American people have any desire to do so.

As a veteran, a Congressman and a citizen taxpayer, I support H.R. 12628. I support it as a debt of decency. I support it as an obligation of good government. I support it as a measure of justice.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will bring up to parity the equivalency in dollars, in an age of inflation, what this Nation invested in its future in the 1940's. It will loosen up and relax some of the stringencies of previous congressional efforts by providing for the realities of today's higher costs and urgencies for expanded learning by our newest veterans.

If we can afford to spend, Mr. Speaker, billions to clean up our air, clean up our water and rebuild our cities, we can afford to add a 13.6-percent increase in GI educational benefits and to open up the arms of opportunity to more of those who served, or their widows who now silently endure the loss of a husband and father, as they try to educate themselves and their children. We can use the better brains this legislation will build for the better tomorrow we seek.

Higher education, in the arts or the trades, is the handhold on success for today's veterans, Mr. Speaker, just as it was for those who came before them in search of knowledge and training.

It will extend by 2 years—to 10 years, the time a veteran has to complete his education—a recognition and renewed opportunity for those who have been unable to do so because of financial or other reasons.

It will increase the opportunity for Veteran-students in work-study programs, and double the allowance.

It will reduce the disability requirement for veterans who seek vocational rehabilitation by dropping the eligibility requirement of 30 percent disability to 10 percent.

It will provide eligibility for 6 months of educational benefits for refresher courses in colleges and vocational training schools for veterans who may have fallen behind in technical expertise while defending their country—electronic, computer, physic, mathematical, and other practitioners and theorists of the exotic sciences. It will extend eligibility to pursue farm cooperative training.

And, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will, in ultimate tribute to reality, say to the veterans who suffered the ultimate indignities as prisoners of war, that the time you spent in bamboo cages or in the dank of caves of communism, nor the time spent recovering in a hospital, will be counted against you in computing the time period available for educational benefits.

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 12628, Mr. Speaker, in gratitude and devotion to those who served.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, to increase educational benefits for veterans.

Unlike their counterparts of previous conflicts, Vietnam era veterans seeking to broaden their educational and employment opportunities have had to contend with unprecedented inflation and rising costs of education. Congress has repeatedly recognized this burden on the veteran and his dependents as it passed legislation in 1967, 1970, and 1972 to boost educational allowances. Since the last time the benefits were adjusted in 1972, the Consumer Price Index has jumped 10.2 percent as of last December and is expected to rise another 3 percent by May. It seems to me that the 13.6 percent, across-the-board increase contained in this bill is reasonable. I regret, however, that the committee choose to drop from the bill automatic cost-of-living increases for the future. The need for such adjustments to prevent income erosion while the Congress acts has already been applied to civil service and social security pensions. I believe it is time to also apply this mechanism to not only the GI bill but all VA monthly benefits as provided in a bill I introduced last year.

On the other hand, I am pleased to see that the committee has included in H.R. 12628 language to lengthen the period of time in which a veteran can complete his or her training. H.R. 12628 provides that a veteran now has 10 years after service discharge to complete his training or education using GI bill benefits instead of 8 years. As a sponsor of legislation to extend this time period to 12 years, I feel the committee has taken positive action to hold open educational

opportunities so that more veterans may be able to take advantage of their entitlements.

The bill also reduces from 30 to 10 percent the disability rate requirement for Vietnam era veterans wishing to utilize vocational rehabilitation programs.

H.R. 12628 now makes it possible for a veteran to receive up to 6 months of refresher training provided the veteran begins training within 12 months after service and the training is continuous except for interruptions beyond control.

Also, a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center within the Veterans' Administration would be established by H.R. 12628. The center would be staffed by VA employees who are veterans of the Vietnam era, and will be responsible for making periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of the veterans outreach service program which distributes information about training program activities to veterans.

While the bill could have been improved in several ways I have indicated, I feel H.R. 12628 should be approved and enacted promptly.

I view the GI bill as an investment in the future of America and its costs are repaid many times over through the taxes derived from the increased earning power of GI bill trained and educated veterans. We cannot and must not forget those who answered their country's call and bore the battle. They deserve our respect and that extra measure of gratitude we can provide by offering them the opportunity and means to improve their lives through education and training.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of an identical bill, I am very pleased to rise in support of H.R. 12628, the proposed Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1974.

From an objective viewpoint, this bill deserves to be approved overwhelmingly today by the House. But I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to be completely objective about this legislation. When I returned to Hawaii after World War II, along with thousands of my comrades who served in the Asiatic-Pacific and European theaters of war, I found that the GI bill could provide me with an opportunity I had yearned for all of my adult life—the chance to attend law school. So many returning GI's used the educational benefits to obtain professional or college-level training; it can truly be said that the GI bill changed the lives of thousands of Hawaii residents, and with that had a profound impact on the social and political atmosphere in the islands.

Nationally, the same sort of thing was happening. The post-World War II GI bill produced 450,000 engineers, 360,000 teachers, and hundreds of thousands of professionals in the fields of medicine, science, and law.

But the obstacles faced by a veteran seeking to better his education through this program have grown substantially since World War II. No longer can the veteran count on his tuition, books and fees being paid. The \$220 basic monthly allotment scarcely covers tuition in hundreds of institutions. That is why Congress recently directed the Veterans' Ad-

ministration to study the program today as compared with the program existing after World War II. The key finding of the study was that—

The actual value of the educational allowance available to veterans of World War II was greater than the current allowance being paid to veterans of Vietnam, when adjustments are made for the payment of tuition, fees, books, and supplies.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the central provision of H.R. 12628, an increase in all allowances of some 13.6 percent. That will raise the basic, full-time educational allowance from \$220 to \$250—hardly enough to overbalance the greater costs of today, but certainly a move in the right direction.

There are two other major provisions in this bill about which I must comment, Mr. Speaker.

First is the extension of the period of time in which veterans may take advantage of their benefits, from 8 years to 10 following discharge. For a variety of reasons, Vietnam war veterans have not been able to use their educational benefits immediately. This extension will give many of them a chance to finish their education in a rational way.

The other major improvement contained in H.R. 12628, Mr. Speaker, is a provision which would grant credit for Reservists serving 6 months active duty for training, who are later called to active duty for a year or more. This would merely put Reservists and others serving 18 months active duty on an equal footing, and is the substance of a separate bill which I have sponsored in the past several Congresses. I congratulate the Veterans' Affairs Committee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Dorn), on incorporating this equitable change into the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have long supported amendments to the veterans educational benefits program which would more nearly approximate those America provided for her World War II vets. I believe that the earlier program not only benefited hundreds of thousands of individual Americans, but it allowed our country to tap a resource which otherwise would have been wasted. I shall continue to press for improvements in the veterans education program. Certainly, H.R. 12628 is such a major improvement, and I urge the House to pass it by substantially more than the two-thirds margin needed.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe there are two major reasons why we should pass this GI education bill of 1974. It is, I suggest, an equal rights bill, because it proposes to bring educational and vocational assistance for veterans into line with our times. None of us likes the fact that the cost of living has been rising, and we wish that trend would end, but we should not lock assistance levels for veterans into levels that do not recognize that trend.

So the first major reason for passing this bill is that we owe it to these men and women, and a grateful nation can do no less than maintain our care for those who served our Nation so well in time of need.

The second reason, I believe, is that we need the skills and talents of these young people who left their homes, their education or their jobs when the country called them into service. Thousands and thousands of them answered that call, accepting the training and performing the duties that were required in military life. Some may have gained skills of peacetime benefit to themselves and to their communities, but most were not so fortunate. They came home to resume their educations or their vocational training, and we should not consider that they should carry that load alone.

For years, our Nation has recognized that it should help them regain some of the time they lost. Many of them, in colleges and universities, carry expedited study schedules. We should not ask them to be held back by limited help, or by restrictions on their outside employment while they are students. We should do all we can to help them be good civilians, just as we wanted them to be good soldiers, sailors, and airmen. I, therefore, urge passage of H.R. 12628, as unanimously recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, the veterans education and rehabilitation amendments, as a much-needed improvement in our GI educational program.

In doing so, I wish to commend the Veterans' Affairs Committee and Chairman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN and his colleague Representative JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT for their responsiveness to the needs of the veterans as reflected in this most worthwhile measure. Thanks are due as well to my fellow members of the New England House delegation who have expressed unified support for these improvements in a formal statement of the New England Congressional Caucus.

Action to increase benefits by 13.6 percent is certainly justified in light of cost-of-living increases of 10 percent since the benefit level last was raised. Expansion of the work-study program by doubling the hours worked from 100 to 200 hours and the maximum payment received from \$250 to \$500 also are worthwhile improvements.

Another desirable feature is the stretch out of the period for eligibility from 8 to 10 years following expiration of term of service. Personally, however, I would prefer to see this limitation done away with altogether, and have cosponsored a bill to do so.

In all, Mr. Speaker, this is a most deserving measure and one which should pass overwhelmingly in the interests of keeping faith with those who have served our Nation and in recognition of the critical importance of education in equipping them from the place they have earned in society.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, increasing tuition costs, inflation, and the recent rise in the unemployment rate make our approval today of H.R. 12628 absolutely necessary. At the present time it is not only difficult, but often impossible for veterans to avail themselves of the GI educational benefits provided by law.

In this bill we are only trying to put recent veterans on a par with their fathers and mothers who went to school on GI benefits after World War II. This is certainly not too much to ask in behalf of the young men and women who interrupted their education and careers to serve their country.

Vietnam era veterans came home with serious handicaps: While they were gone their peers have advanced professionally and educationally; many came back without any notably marketable skills; for many inflation has wiped out their ambitions and expectations for advancement; and now they find they cannot afford to take advantage of the education and rehabilitation benefits the Government promised them.

We owe these young men and women no less than the opportunity to obtain the education or vocational training they require, and I urge my colleagues to give this legislation their support.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, we must insure that Vietnam era veterans are provided with educational benefits that compare favorably with those made available to their fathers after World War II and the Korean war.

If the veterans education assistance program is to remain responsive to those it is designed to serve, then the level of assistance must be expanded to cover escalating costs facing the veteran. The continued rise in the cost of higher education and the cost of living has placed too many of our Vietnam era veterans in financial difficulties. Without relief in the form of an increase in GI education benefits to cover inflationary increases, the effectiveness and participation level of the current program will be impaired.

As a member of the Education and Training Subcommittee which helped draft this legislation, I am giving my strong support to H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974. The bill improves many existing assistance programs, two of which are of particular interest to the Vietnam veteran. First, it provides a 13.6-percent increase in the monthly education assistance allowance to help meet the added cost-of-living expenses incurred over the past 18 months. Under the provisions of H.R. 12628, a single full-time student will receive an increase from \$220 to \$250 a month. A married, full-time student with two dependents will have his monthly assistance increased from \$298 to \$339 a month. Naturally, comparable increases will be given to other categories of veterans. Second, the bill increases from 8 to 10 years the time period after discharge during which veterans must utilize their GI benefits.

Mr. Speaker, studies conducted by the Educational Testing Service—ETS—and the National League of Cities—United States Conference of Mayors indicate that the current level of benefits is insufficient to meet today's education expenses. Only by providing an adequate increase in benefits to compensate for inflation and rising tuition will our present veterans receive the assistance needed to meet their career objectives.

As for the increase in the time period

for using GI benefits, I have received numerous comments from veterans who are faced with a loss of eligibility this coming May. Many of these veterans began working after their discharge and have only recently begun utilizing their education benefits. By expanding the period of eligibility, the veteran will be allowed more freedom to design a program better suited to his individual goals and circumstances. In this way the program's flexibility and responsiveness will remain while the veteran's education desires are fulfilled.

For the 95,000 Vietnam era veterans in Connecticut, H.R. 12628 offers an opportunity for greater access to institutions of higher education. Nothing less than the provisions of this legislation will enable our veterans to meet their present and future education needs.

This important bill must be approved by the House today.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support of H.R. 12628, the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974.

The GI education bill is without a doubt one of the most important and most effective pieces of social legislation ever enacted by the Congress, and it has profoundly affected the lives and fortunes of thousands of veterans and their families.

Since this educational program was initiated in 1944, hundreds of thousands of veterans who would not have been able to further their education or training without their financial assistance have been able to do so. In addition to benefiting personally, veterans educated under this program have contributed immeasurably to our country and our economy, and the investment our Nation has made in educating them is clearly evident and eminently worthwhile.

When discharged from the service, a veteran is generally faced with the choice of going to work or continuing his education or training. If he cannot afford the schooling, he is forced to seek employment and is unlikely to pursue his education at a later date.

Since the GI bill was originated, the cost of living has increased tremendously and the cost of higher education has soared astronomically. As a result, veterans of the Vietnam era are not receiving assistance comparable to that provided veterans of World War II. While benefits have been increased a number of times, they still fall far short of the benefits older veterans received, and if our efforts today to provide a reasonable increase in benefits are not successful, many veterans may have to leave school and abandon their hopes for a better education and a more meaningful and more rewarding future.

The Vietnam war was a most controversial and unpopular war, but the young men who were called upon to serve their country in this conflict made the same sacrifices and suffered the same inconveniences and interruptions in their normal lives as did the veterans of previous wars. As a nation, we owe them the same gratitude, the same respect, and the same benefits enjoyed by previous veterans.

The bill before us today seeks to correct the inadequacies of the present GI bill and bring benefits up to a level comparable to what they were following World War II. While it will not increase benefits as much as many of us would like, it will ease the financial strain many veterans are feeling and enable them to continue their schooling and better prepare themselves to serve their Nation in what will hopefully be an era of lasting peace and prosperity. By investing in our veterans and their future, we are investing in our future as a nation.

I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in support of this important and most worthwhile proposal.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628. In the past few weeks I have been contacted by many of my constituents concerned about veterans educational benefits.

One of these letters is typical in the sentiments it expresses and I would like to share it with you. Mr. Pete Calgaro of Rockford, Ill., is a veteran of 6 years in the U.S. Navy, a policeman, and a father of five children who attends Rock Valley College in my district. In order to defray costs of education, Mr. Calgaro currently works 48 hours a week and his wife babysits to make ends meet. He tells me that because of the almost daily increase in the cost of living, he may not be able to finish his education, without the support envisioned in this measure.

An increase of 13.6 percent in educational assistance allowances will, as Mr. Calgaro points out, just barely compensate for the rise in the cost of living since the last rate increase. This does not tell the whole story, as the costs of tuition have risen steadily and at a great rate.

A major study, commissioned by the Veterans' Administration concluded that today's educational benefits, on an adjusted basis, compare unfavorably with those of post-World War II. At that time, a \$500 payment that could be made for tuition covered tuition not only at public colleges, but also at 89 percent of the private institutions of higher education.

In addition, the World War II era veteran received a \$75 per month subsistence allowance which represented at that time 35 percent of the average U.S. monthly wage. Today's veteran receives a lump-sum payment to purchase an education and pay living expenses. This \$220 a month also represents 35 percent of the average U.S. monthly wage, but it does not cover living expenses.

The increase in educational assistance is therefore needed at this time, but it is by no means the only worthy provision in this bill. Many veterans who served before 1966, because of the pressures of family life or financial necessity, were able to recommit their educations only recently. If this bill is not enacted, they will be left high and dry, willing, but lacking the money to continue their efforts at self-improvement.

Almost all of the constituents who wrote me mentioned the sacrifices they and their families are making in order to continue their studies. We owe to these young men and women the chance to achieve the goals they have set for

themselves, and are earning through their diligence. This measure will also correct a situation in which a veteran who was captured and held as a prisoner of war subsequent to his last discharge, would be penalized for the time he was confined. The time spent in captivity, will not, under this bill, be subtracted from his 10-year period of eligibility for educational assistance.

Finally I wish to call attention to the provision this bill makes for the establishment of a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center. While we in this country honor all our veterans, we must recognize the fact that some have had a more difficult time after their return than others. The young men who went to Vietnam fought in an unpopular, but particularly long and nightmarish war.

I do not intend to explore the full sociological ramifications of this, but I do wish to remind you of the difficulties these young men faced upon their return home. Unable to take a great deal of satisfaction in the uncertain progress or the uneasy atmosphere of the war in which they had fought, they returned to a country much changed since the first veterans' benefits were enacted. An increasingly complex economy has more than necessitated the training provided for by the educational assistance and other veterans programs.

The Communications Center will be one further step in making certain that all the veterans of the Vietnam era receive the information and assistance they need to avail themselves of the opportunities offered. In contrast to the many benefits offered by this bill, the cost estimated for it seems to fall safely within the bounds of prudence. We must increase our vigilance in the attempt to keep Government spending from growing out of all proportion.

However to deny our recent veterans the same benefits as their predecessors would certainly be a move of specious economy. We do not provide for the future by neglecting those who have served our country in the past. We can guarantee a decent way of life for our veterans only by providing them with the opportunities they have proven they deserve.

MR. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974. The cost of living is a growing burden on those veterans who are attempting to further their education under the present GI bill. No built-in cost-of-living increase is included under the present law. This makes it the duty of Congress to keep a constant check on such increases. The time has come when the \$220 monthly payment is simply not enough compensation to offset the cost of 1 month's schooling. Although we must be ever mindful of our budgetary responsibilities, our newest generation of veterans certainly deserve adequate educational opportunities. I fully support the full 13.6-percent increase as proposed by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in their legislation before us today. The 13.6-percent-a-month increase would raise payment to \$250 a month, a level much more in line with today's costs.

This adjustment alone is not enough. There is another proposal before us today which is extremely important to thousands of veterans. Veterans who were discharged after January 31, 1955, and before June 1, 1966, will lose their eligibility for educational benefits on June 1, 1974, under present law. New emphasis has been added to veterans' outreach activities in recent years. Schools are being encouraged to enroll more veterans by adopting their programs to meet the special needs of veterans.

However, many of the veterans who have been reached by these programs are veterans who are in the group due to lose their benefits this June 1. They will be left in the predicament of losing benefits before completing degrees for which they have already sacrificed much hard work and time. I was fortunate enough to be able to visit with several groups of veterans during the month long Christmas recess. I found a large number caught in this unfortunate dilemma of losing their benefits before completion of their schooling. They expressed sincere hopes of finishing a degree program, and asked that I support an extension of their eligibility from 8 to 10 years. H.R. 12628 includes this 2-year extension which I consider a must.

The American veteran deserves our most conscientious efforts. It is my opinion that the needs of the over 2.1 million veterans now under the GI bill will be better met with the passage of H.R. 12628.

MR. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, legislation is desperately needed to upgrade and extend educational and rehabilitation benefits for veterans, especially those of the Vietnam era.

While President Nixon's comprehensive veterans' proposal is a step in the right direction, I feel that it does not go far enough in fulfilling our obligations to this newest group of veterans.

A recent study by the Education Testing Service—ETS—has confirmed the contention that Vietnam veterans get considerably less benefits than the benefits provided for World War II veterans.

I believe that we can and must do more to help our veterans reestablish themselves in our society by use of educational or rehabilitational programs.

Congress is vitally concerned with the welfare of our veterans. This is evidenced by the wide variety of educational benefit proposals introduced recently. Proposals have been made ranging from an increase of over 25 percent in monthly allowances to the 8-percent increase advocated by the administration. Legislation has been introduced which would extend the delimiting period to 10 years, to 15 years, 20 years, or to remove it completely.

I introduced a bill—H.R. 9147—and testified on July 24, 1973, in favor of eliminating the time limitation.

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 12628, would provide a 13.6-percent increase in both educational assistance and vocational rehabilitation allowances. This would allow a single veteran taking advantage of the GI bill to receive \$250 a month, rather than the present \$220.

In addition, the House bill would equalize the criteria for receiving vocational rehabilitation for Vietnam era veterans, establishing the same basis used for World War II and Korean conflict veterans.

Another problem which this House bill addresses is the impending expiration on May 31 of this year of the GI bill education training benefits for many veterans of the post-Korean conflict period. As the law now stands, those veterans discharged prior to the effective date of the current GI bill—June 1, 1966—will have reached the statutory delimiting date of May 31, 1974, 8 years after the date of enactment of the bill. In addition, no educational assistance is presently available to any other veterans 8 years after discharge. The House bill extends the delimiting period to 10 years, thus enabling veterans to pursue training.

Many post-Korean veterans did not take immediate advantage of their GI bill benefits upon discharge because they already had a trade or skill. However, with advancing technology, their professions may become outmoded or obsolete and additional training becomes necessary. The extension of the delimiting period would alleviate some of the frustrations encountered by this group of veterans by giving them a "second chance" to obtain much needed education.

Another necessary provision of this bill would correct an oversight in amendments made last year to the GI bill and authorize farm cooperative training programs for eligible wives, widows, and children under chapter 35 of title 38, the war orphans' and widows' educational assistance program. There are, in addition, several technical amendments made to the present GI bill.

There are provisions in S. 2784, Senator HARTKE's bill, not present in H.R. 12628, that I have long advocated such as extending the aggregate period for which any person may receive assistance under two or more programs. Perhaps these will be included in a conference on H.R. 12628 is required. I hope so.

Under the provisions of H.R. 12628, a veteran could receive up to 72 months of training, 36 months based upon his status as a war orphan, and 36 months based upon his own active duty entitlement.

It seems evident that both the administration and Congress have recognized the need for an increase in educational assistance under the GI bill. The question now remaining is how much assistance and how long our veterans will be forced to wait.

We must not stand by and watch inflation and the constantly spiralling cost of living erode the education benefits of those veterans who so selflessly served their country.

I stress the urgency of this legislation. The veteran, particularly the veteran of the Vietnam era, has had a hard enough time readjusting to civilian life. He has received less than a hero's welcome home. We now owe it to these veterans to make their transition as easy as possible. Inadequate education

benefits must not be another burden on those men who have served their country.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time in strong support of this legislation, H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974.

I count it a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to be able to vote in favor of legislation to improve and expand this Government's assistance to the armed service veterans of America.

As I have said many times, our debt to these courageous men and women is one that we can never fully repay.

This bill would increase the educational assistance allowances under all veterans' education programs by 13.6 percent. These rates were last increased in September of 1972, when an increase of 25.7 percent was approved.

In addition to increasing educational allowances, these amendments will:

First, increase the period of time during which veterans must complete training from the present 8 years following last discharge or release to 10 years. Veterans who were discharged after January 31, 1955, and before June 1, 1966, whose eligibility for training is scheduled to expire on June 1, 1974, will have until June 1, 1976, to complete their training.

Second, remove the limitation on the number of veteran-students the Veterans' Administration may assist under the work-study program and increase the number of hours during which a veteran may work under this program from 100 to 200 per semester or enrollment period and the maximum a veteran may receive from such work from \$250 to \$500.

Third, reduce the disability requirement for eligibility to receive vocational rehabilitation—for service-connected disabled veterans of the Vietnam era—to 10 percent. Presently, veterans whose service occurred after January 31, 1955, must show a disability rated at 30 percent or more, or if less than this degree, the disability must be "clearly shown to have caused a pronounced employment handicap."

Fourth, allow veterans to count periods of active duty for training—usually 6 months—when computing periods of eligibility for education and training, provided that the veteran serves on full-time active duty for a period of 1 year or more subsequent to performance of active duty for training.

Fifth, allow a veteran who was captured and held as prisoner of war following his last discharge or release to exclude the period of time detained as prisoner of war—plus any period immediately following release from detention when he was hospitalized—when computing the period of time during which he is eligible for training.

Sixth, permit an exception to the prohibition against enrollment in a program of education for which a veteran is already qualified, by allowing up to 6 months of assistance for pursuit of refresher training, to allow a veteran to update his knowledge and skills and to be instructed in technological advances

which occurred in his field of employment during the period of his active military service. Training must begin within 12 months from date of discharge or release and must be pursued continuously except for interruptions beyond the control of the veteran.

Seventh, extend eligibility to pursue farm cooperative training—which is now available to veterans—to wives, widows and children eligible to receive training under the war orphans education program. Those eligible include wives and children of 100 percent service-connected permanently disabled veterans and widows and children of deceased veterans whose deaths are service-connected.

Eighth, allow educational institutions offering courses not leading to a standard college degree to measure such courses on a quarter or semester-hour basis in some cases, provided that no course is to be considered a full-time course when less than 25 hours per week of net instruction is required.

Ninth, allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay a reporting fee to a "joint apprenticeship training committee," acting as a training establishment. This fee, usually \$3 per year per veteran enrolled, is presently payable to authorized educational institutions.

Tenth, establish a Vietnam Era Veterans' Communication Center within the VA, to be composed of VA employees who are veterans of the Vietnam era. The proposed Center would be charged with making periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of the veterans outreach services program—authorized by Public Law 91-219 in 1970—and make reports, with recommendations, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to the Congress.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by passing the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments we can assure every American veteran the benefits of an assistance program tailored for the economic and social needs of 1974.

Experience has demonstrated that some of the current program limitations are preventing veterans from receiving the kind of educational assistance they need and deserve. This bill resolves many of these problems and should insure every veteran the maximum opportunity in education and employment.

The most important aspect of the bill is its attention to increases in the cost of living. It increases the educational assistance allowances under all veterans' education programs by 13.6 percent. This will compensate for a projected cost-of-living increase of over 13 percent by May of this year.

The bill would raise rates for single veterans and servicemen from \$220 to \$250 monthly, for those with one dependent from \$261 to \$297, and for those with two dependents from \$298 to \$339. At a time when the cost of living continues its alarming rise, increases such as these are more than justified.

It is interesting to note that the President recommended an eight-point increase in the allowances when an 8-percent increase in the cost of living had been reached between August and Sep-

tember of last year. I think our veterans deserve more consideration than a program based on last year's standards.

One amendment increases the period of time during which veterans must complete training from the present 8 years to 10 years. This provision is very important to the great number of Vietnam veterans who served on active duty before June 1, 1966, and whose eligibility would otherwise expire on June 1 of this year.

I am also pleased to see that the bill would establish a Vietnam Era Veterans' Communication Center. On several occasions in the past I have spoken of the special needs of the Vietnam veteran. He was denied the kind of honor bestowed upon veterans of past wars, and for that reason we owe him special consideration. The Communication Center is one method for doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this bill be passed. Providing for the education and rehabilitation of our veterans is a way of demonstrating our gratitude for their service. If we allow our gratitude to become half-hearted, it becomes an insult. These amendments demonstrate our firm belief that veterans deserve something of continuing value in return for their contributions to their country.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1974, and would like to commend the committee on their unanimous approval of this legislation. The committee has taken a realistic approach to the problems facing American veterans today and their efforts to correct these problems should be given our favorable consideration.

During the past 3 months I have received hundreds of letters from veterans attending school who are enrollees in several veteran educational benefit programs. It is obvious that without this help many veterans would be unable to finance their education, and consequently could not continue their studies.

Many of these veterans have been faced with that very prospect come June 1 of this year. Fortunately this bill would allow them an additional 2 years to complete their education and would allow all veterans 10 years in which to complete their course of study.

Everyone here knows the provisions of this bill and the arguments for it. I would just like to say that there are few tasks which this country asks of its youth that are more demanding and potentially dangerous than military service. It is a period of time in a young person's life that can never be recovered.

By passage of this legislation today, we pay a debt to our veterans and help build a better America.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my strong support for the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974.

Our Nation has, as a part of its heritage, a tradition of gratitude to those who have served in our armed services.

Our returning soldiers need our help in affording them adequate financial assistance to obtain the educational status

they would normally have aspired to and achieved had they not served their country. The bill before us provides this incentive by increasing the level of benefits as well as expanding the overall scope of the programs.

Veterans in my congressional district have pointed out to me the inflexibility of the time limitation in the current law. By extending the eligibility period from 8 to 10 years many more of our veterans will be able to take full advantage of their educational benefits.

Veterans in my district have also emphasized the fact that the cost of obtaining an education is rising even faster than the spiraling cost of living, making it exceedingly difficult for them to make ends meet. The increase provided in this bill is, in my opinion, greatly needed and justly deserved.

Therefore, I strongly urge the immediate enactment of this measure.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will overwhelmingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1974.

In summary, the main features of this measure are those providing for a 13.6-percent increase in the educational assistance allowances under all veterans education programs; extending to 10 years instead of 8 the eligibility period during which veterans must complete training following their last military discharge; allowing veterans to count the normal 6-month period of active duty for training when computing periods of eligibility for educational enrollment, on the condition that the veteran serves on full-time active duty for a period of 1 year or more following his performance of active duty for training; permitting an exception, to the prohibition against enrollment in an educational program for which a veteran is already qualified, for the granting of 6 months of refresher training in order for the veteran to update his knowledge and skills and receive instruction in the technological advances which occurred in his employment field during the period of his active military service.

To take advantage of this exception, the training must begin within 12 months from the veterans' discharge date and must be normally pursued continuously without interruption; establishing a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center within the Veterans' Administration, to be composed of VA employees who are veterans of the Vietnam era. This proposed center would be responsible for making periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of the veterans outreach services program and make appropriate reports to the Veterans' Administration Director and to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this country and Government has the highest moral and legal obligation to render every reasonable assistance to our military veterans and very few, if any, will question the rightness or the wisdom of that obligation and national investment. There is no doubt whatever that the spiraling econ-

omy now afflicting us has skyrocketed the basic costs of living as well as all charges related to educational instruction and training.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis has further accelerated the inflation spiral and already has begun to generate tragic unemployment in almost every occupational field.

Under all of these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that this bill, on behalf of all our veterans and their families, and in particular the Vietnam veteran, represents but simple justice to those who have given priceless service to this country.

It is also very obvious that the bill is timely and prudent and, finally, we can truthfully say, in this instance, that what is good for the veteran and his family is good for all Americans and in the best interest of all the people in this Nation. Therefore, I again urge my colleagues to resoundingly adopt this measure.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12628, the omnibus veterans bill, would raise the level of Vietnam era veterans' benefits by 13.6 percent in an effort to insure that these benefits keep pace with the ever rising cost of living.

Affected by the rate increase would be programs providing monthly subsistence payments, educational assistance and special restorative allowances. The effect upon the monthly subsistence check of the average veteran would be to increase the amount from \$220 to \$250.

Such an increase has become all too necessary in light of the mercurial rise in the Consumer Price Index during fiscal year 1974. By December, it had risen a phenomenal 10.2 percent. If it continues to rise at that rate, it will have approached 13 percent by July 1.

The administration offer of 8 percent is, thus, totally inadequate if veterans benefits are to keep in stride with the wild fluctuations of our cost of living.

Vietnam veterans should not be asked to bear the brunt of the worst economic planning this country has seen in many years.

Besides an across-the-board rate increase, current GI programs now in existence simply must be brought up to a level that realistically compares with that on which benefits were extended to veterans of World War II.

Foremost among areas needing reform are educational and vocational rehabilitation programs. I have sponsored legislation that would extend the current 8-year delimiting period for educational benefits from 8 to 10 years.

I welcome the presence of such a provision in H.R. 12628 as well as that allowing the computation of 6 months active duty training for assessing eligibility for veterans programs.

The bill before us today also allows Vietnam prisoners of war to disregard the period of their imprisonment in figuring the delimiting date of their educational eligibility. These provisions become all the more important when it is noted that 50 percent of all Vietnam era veterans have availed themselves of educational and vocational opportunities created by the 1966 version of the GI

bill. Considering the fact that 26 percent of Vietnam veterans had some college training previous to their service—as compared with a 14.3-percent figure for World War II veterans—this indicates that an increased proportion of veterans have gained from educational benefits since World War II.

Vocational rehabilitation programs will be available to a larger number of veterans as a result of H.R. 12628.

A lowering of the disability percentage from 30 to 10 percent will allow vocational rehabilitation benefits to veterans on the same basis as they were after World War II. The bill also would permit veterans to take refresher courses in fields where they have an established expertise within 12 months of their release.

Cooperative farm training assistance will be lent to families of veterans who have 100 percent service-connected disabilities.

The list of benefits that will be added or expanded by H.R. 12628 does not read like that of an expensive grab bag that some voices have called it. I consider it more a restoration of benefits and rewards promised our Nation's soldiers and then taken away by inflation. If we really intended that Vietnam era veterans receive benefits similar to those given to veterans of World War II or the Korean war, H.R. 12628 is hardly an expansion. It will merely maintain what has already been granted at rates commensurate with the cost of living. It will also append additional and incidental benefits new to the Vietnam era veteran, but familiar to the veterans of World War II. Thus, H.R. 12628 offers no grab bag of favors and treatment. It does, however, renew the obligation this Congress and this Nation have to our veterans—and on a scale that is consistent with our national philosophy—equality of treatment for all.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12628, which extends veteran's benefits under the GI bill, will provide increased educational opportunities and benefit levels for hundreds of thousands of veterans. This bill is especially important to America's Vietnam era veterans, many of whom are now pursuing further education under the GI bill.

The cost of living has gone up 13.2 percent since the last increase in veteran's educational benefits was approved by Congress in September 1972, and this bill will increase those benefits accordingly by 13.6 percent across the board. It also increases the time during which a veteran must complete his training, from the present 8 years to 10.

Other provisions will insure that information concerning available benefits is conveyed to eligible veterans, and provide an opportunity for "refresher" training not now available.

This legislation is particularly important to the many hundreds of veterans attending community colleges within my congressional district. These young people have served their country during the Vietnam era and they certainly deserve the support this legislation offers.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee reported this bill by a unanimous vote, and I am confident that the full House will

lend its overwhelming support to it. I fully support the measure and urge its adoption.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974. This bill will be of great benefit to many thousands of Americans and their families, who have served our country in the Armed Forces. In particular, the Vietnam-era veteran will be helped by this bill.

Clearly, there is a need to improve existing programs to assist returning veterans in their effort to reestablish themselves in civilian society. The fact of the matter is that the GI bill simply has not kept pace with today's need, as education costs and the cost of living have escalated.

H.R. 12628 makes desirable changes in veterans' educational programs.

The two outstanding features of the bill are the 13.6 percent across-the-board increase in veterans' education allowances, and a 2-year increase in the period of time during which veterans must complete training, from the present 8 to 10 years, after last discharge or release. The basic rate of assistance to a single veteran is thus increased from \$220 per month to \$250 per month.

While this increase is substantial and desirable in its own right, it nonetheless is an imperfect answer. Many veterans will still be effectively denied the opportunity to attend the higher education institution of their choice, because of the wide disparity between the costs of one institution and another.

While this increase is substantial and doubtless make it easier for a veteran to attend a public, State-supported university, the increases are of little assistance in meeting the much larger financial demands of a private university, where costs for a year might approach \$6,000 for a single individual. It seems to me that sooner or later, our Federal student assistance programs, both for veterans and for the general populace, will have to be restructured and expanded to more adequately come to grips with the realities of higher education today.

The 2-year increase in the amount of time a veteran has, after release or discharge, to use his education benefits is also of great importance. I have received many letters from constituents, Vietnam veterans, who indicated that they would be ineligible for further assistance in the middle of their education unless such an extension were enacted.

I urge that my colleagues join me in voting for this vital legislation. While not an ultimate answer to the many problems facing our veterans today, it seems to me that this bill will significantly improve training and education opportunities for our veterans, and make the benefits of these programs more adequate in this time of high inflation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we vote today on a bill to improve the educational assistance provided for veterans under the GI bill. I am confident that despite the opposition of the Veterans' Administration and the Office of Management

and Budget, which have 8 pages of comments and objections in the committee report on the bill, the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974 will be approved by the House. I think every Member of this body is aware of the crucial importance of this bill to Vietnam-era veterans and post-Korean war veterans, whose benefits have been eroded by galloping inflation.

H.R. 12628 provides an increase in education allowance of 13.6 percent, which will increase the basic rate for a single veteran from \$220 a month to \$250 a month, with proportionate increases for veterans with dependents. This bill also increases the period of time during which veterans must complete training from the present 8 years following discharge or release from active duty to 10 years. This is especially important for those veterans whose eligibility for the GI bill commenced in June 1966, since their eligibility is scheduled to expire on May 30 of this year. Limitations on the number of veteran students the VA may employ through its work study program have also been eased, and a new evaluation of VA services to be conducted by Vietnam veterans is authorized in this bill.

Together with other technical amendments, these provisions make this bill a necessary equalizer for those veterans who are now enrolled in school and have been unable to meet the 12.8 percent increase in the cost of living since the last benefit increase was enacted by Congress in 1972. I have supported similar provisions in bills such as H.R. 11008 and H.R. 11009 which I have introduced.

However, cost of living tuneups will not make the GI bill the kind of education and training vehicle we need in these times. Serious problems in the present structure of VA educational assistance programs remain and can only be overcome by additional legislation.

The fact is that the GI bill today is not as useful as a readjustment tool as it was after World War II. As an investment in the future of this Nation through the education of veterans, and as partial compensation for the disruption of the lives of young men and women who have served their Nation in times of war, the present GI bill still falls short. Millions of veterans who need further education and training fail to use the GI bill. Although the Veterans' Committee points proudly to the fact that the same proportion—about 50 percent—of Vietnam-era vets have used the GI bill for some form of training as did the veterans of World War II, this simple equation is misleading.

A far higher proportion of young people pursue some higher education in the 1970's than did in the 1940's, as the general educational level of the population and job qualification requirements have accelerated over the decades. Clearly, then, a higher proportion of veterans should be expected to use the GI bill today than after World War II.

The fact that the participation rates are the same for both periods is therefore not cause for rejoicing. It is instead

reason to wonder what is wrong with the GI bill.

In fact, dollar for dollar we give today's ex-GI less than we gave his father after World War II. In those years, the GI bill paid for practically all tuition, books, and educational fees, with the payment going directly to the college chosen by the veterans. In addition, the VA paid each veteran \$75 per month for living expenses, putting a 4-year education at a public college or university within the reach of every veteran. Today there is no direct tuition payment, and increases in the cost of living plus the dramatic increase in educational costs at both public and private colleges, have made today's GI bill relatively less helpful for the GI who wants to return to school. For example, in 1948, the \$75 per month living allowance received by veterans represented 35.4 percent of average U.S. monthly earnings as determined by the U.S. Department of Labor. Using that measure today, 35.4 percent of average monthly earnings represents \$220 per month—ironically, the exact payment Vietnam veterans receive to cover all educational expenses as well as living cost.

The level of assistance provided by the GI bill may help explain why those who need the GI bill the most use it the least. Substantial additional resources are needed by the ex-GI if he wants to use the GI bill to return to school, but the chronic, above-average unemployment facing the veteran and the difficulty in securing educational loans certainly contributes to discouraging veterans. Those with the least preservice education are likely to be the most negative about their prospects for further education anyway, and the economic obstacles thrown into their path seem insurmountable in many cases. As a result veterans who had some preservice college experience are two to three times as likely to return to college or junior college as high school graduates, and up to four times as likely as those veterans who dropped out of high school before entering the service. Stated another way, about 20 percent of Vietnam-era veterans have less than a high school education, yet these men account for only about 3 percent of those veterans enrolled in college or junior college under the GI bill.

Perhaps the most startling conclusion of all, however, is the fact that there is a clear geographic use pattern of GI bill education benefits, with a wide variation in the number of veterans who use the GI bill in each State. For example, 37 percent of California's Vietnam-era veterans have used the GI bill to go to college or junior college, but only 17 percent of New Jersey's veterans have. This is a remarkable disparity.

A comparison of utilization rates by States reveals the fact that Western and Midwestern States seem to enroll far more of their veterans in schools than other parts of the country. No Eastern State has more than 25 percent of its eligible Vietnam-era veterans enrolled in college under the GI bill, but 19 other, primarily Western States do. Perhaps

this pattern is explained by the relative availability of inexpensive, accessible, public education opportunities supplied by State colleges and junior and community colleges. The growth of these types of institutions has been uneven nationally concentrating primarily in the South and West. A veteran returning to a State with an underdeveloped community college system has a set of opportunities far less attractive than the veteran in a State with a fully developed system. The costs at private colleges are out of reach for most veterans, and if public college opportunities are not readily available, the use rate drops.

For example, 59 percent of Harvard's students in the 1947-48 school year were veterans, but only 1.5 percent are today. Holy Cross enrolled enough veterans to comprise 85 percent of its student body in 1947-48, but only 0.5 percent today. Today's GI bill will not allow any but a few veterans to enter private colleges and universities.

Let me describe this pattern as it relates to my own region of the Nation and as it compares to California. The percentage of veterans who have ever used the GI bill to go to college in New York is 21.3 percent; in New Jersey, 17 percent; and in Connecticut, 19.4 percent. California's 37-percent use rate far outstrips all of these figures. Interestingly enough, California also has 763,000 junior college slots, compared with only 216,000 in New York and 55,000 in New Jersey. Tuition charges for public colleges in these three States are also higher than in California, with the notable exception of the City University of New York, whose low charges have attracted thousands of veterans as students.

When these use rates of the GI bill are translated into Federal dollars the consequences are truly staggering. In the fiscal years 1968 through 1973, California veterans have received \$1,270 million in GI bill payments. New York veterans have received \$457,360,000 or a little more than one-third what California's veterans have received even though New York has almost two-thirds the number of California's veterans. In fiscal year 1973 alone, California's veterans received \$380,085,982 in GI bill education benefits and New York only \$141,885,629. Because New York State has not been able to attract as many veterans into its educational institutions, New York's veterans and the educational institutions of the State have been losing hundreds of millions of dollars. California has not been getting more than its share or depriving the veterans in other States, however, since the GI bill is an open-ended program for which Congress appropriates whatever funds are needed. While I can estimate the dollar losses to the State of New York, it is impossible to estimate the damage of the lost training opportunities, the potentially higher skills, higher incomes, and higher taxes paid by a better educated work force. The World War II and Korean war GI bills had a great broadening effect on our society by giving men

and women veterans the skills they needed to become competitive. Today's GI bill operates in such a way that some States may be losing their ability to compete with others, as huge disparities in the Federal Government's largest educational assistance program continue.

The bill we will act on today does not address these problems. I understand that the Veterans' Committee will, however, begin hearings next month on legislation which I have sponsored along with my colleague from New York, WILLIAM WALSH, to provide direct tuition payments of up to \$1,000 for each school year as a means of equalizing the opportunities of veterans in the several States. Only such a measure can open the doors of higher education which have been slammed in the faces of hundreds of thousands of discouraged veterans.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act, H.R. 12628. It is impossible to overemphasize the need for improving the GI education bill for Vietnam era veterans. As one who worked on the drafting of this bill in the Education and Training Subcommittee, I have heard a wealth of testimony which pinpointed the inadequacies of the current GI bill, particularly in comparison to its World War II predecessor. Nor was it possible for the Veterans' Administration to convincingly counteract this testimony. Most of us are aware of the recent study made by the Educational Testing Service for the VA, which confirmed that the present GI bill not only falls far short of the World War II program, but that the present bill actually discourages hundreds of thousands of vets from trying to improve their education.

The present formula for distributing the GI bill, as you know, gives veterans a lump sum of \$220 a month. Out of this alone, the vet must pay all education fees, books, supplies, plus his living expenses. In effect, it is a misnomer to call the \$220 per month a subsistence allowance for it must be stretched to cover a good deal more. The World War II bill, in comparison, paid for essentially all tuition, books, and educational fees—payments going directly to the college the vet chose; in addition, the World War II vet received a monthly subsistence allowance which was the equivalent, considering the cost of living index, of what today's vet receives to cover everything.

The bill we are considering today provides for a 13.6-percent increase in the monthly subsistence allowance, or rather in educational benefits since we are talking about the same thing. This will unquestionably help a good number of vets presently enrolled in school who are trying to make ends meet. It is a greatly needed step in the right direction, but we still have a way to go if we are going to bring the present GI bill anywhere close to a par with its World War II counterpart.

One of the single most important findings made by the Educational Testing Service study was that the ability of a

Vietnam vet to take advantage of his GI bill benefits depends more on the State in which he resides than on any other factor. This was not the case for World War II vets, who in fact were virtually free to pick and choose not only among public schools but among private as well. In a good number of our States, public in-State tuition—never mind private—is so high that the vet is discouraged from even beginning his education; the inadequacy of current benefits simply obscures whatever educational opportunities he might wish to pursue.

While it is important for use to make benefits more realistic, as the bill before us tries to do, I think we should also take a good, hard look at the basic, disparate structure of the current GI bill. In plain truth, it does not afford equal educational opportunities, and yet, is not our debt and gratitude to each and every vet the same? If we are going to give more than lip-service to what is recognized as a national commitment, we must not only pass the bill before us today, but begin action on the proposal to authorize a variable tuition payment where tuition costs exceed the national average.

One final point I would like to make about the bill before us today concerns the provision to extend the eligibility time period from 8 to 10 years. Last session, I introduced legislation to eliminate the time limitation completely; I felt it was simply unfair to force vets to use their benefits within the confines of an arbitrary time period. Over the course of the past few months, I have heard from literally hundreds of vets from around the country urging, if not a complete elimination of the time period, at least an extension. The 2-year extension contained in the bill will help countless numbers of cold war vets whose benefits are due to expire in May of this year.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that there are many in this Chamber who, because of the World War II GI bill, are now in a position of responsibility where they can provide needed assistance to the young vet of today. I know that we will not shirk that responsibility, that we will pass this bill in sufficiently overwhelming numbers so that, when it goes to the President for his signature, he cannot possibly veto it. I mention this concern, not only because of the President's rather limp proposal for an 8-percent increase in benefits, but also because the administration has tried to block virtually every meaningful veterans' measure that Congress has enacted. The time has come for honesty in dealing with the Vietnam vet.

For my colleagues' consideration, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record a table showing resident and non-resident undergraduate tuition rates at State colleges and universities for the 1973-74 academic year. I think this chart will serve to highlight some of the points I have been making as to why improvements are needed in the GI bill. The table follows:

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR. (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESIS)

	Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees		Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees		Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees				
	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident			
ALABAMA									
Ala. A&M U.	\$280(270)	\$630(520)	Armstrong State College	\$405(390)	\$945(930)	Fitchburg St. College	\$300(250)	\$600	
Auburn U.	525(450)	1,050(900)	Augusta College	400(390)	940(930)	Framingham St. College	300(250)	600	
U. of Alabama	510	1,020	Columbus College	396	936	Massachusetts Coll. of Art	405(353)	705(703)	
Alabama State U.	405(345)	630(570)	Georgia College	423	963	North Adams St. College	357(302)	652	
Florence State U.	470(450)	470(450)	Georgia Southern Coll.	367(361)	787(781)	Salem St. College	400(350)	800(700)	
Livingston University	435(430)	612(603)	Valdosta State College	429(387)	969(792)	Southeastern Mass. U.	420(370)	700(650)	
U. of Ala.—Huntsville	525	1,050	West Georgia College	417	957	Westfield St. College	300(250)	600	
U. of Montevallo	360	570				Worcester St. College	395(345)	695(645)	
U. of South Alabama	579	867	HAWAII						
ALASKA							MICHIGAN		
U. of Alaska	472(402)	1,072(1,002)	U. of Hawaii	223(233)	733(743)	Mich. St. U.	720(675)	1,620(1,530)	
ARIZONA							IDAHO		
Ariz. State U.	320	1,210					U. of Michigan:		
U. of Arizona	411	1,301	U. of Idaho	380(356)	1,280(1,156)	Freshman-Soph.	800(696)	2,600(2,260)	
Northern Arizona U.	330(304)	995(969)	Boise State College	356	1,296	Junior-Senior	904(698)	2,800(2,260)	
ARKANSAS			Idaho State U.	276(373)	1,126(1,123)	Wayne St. U.	704(668)	893(1,857)	
U. of Arkansas, Fayetteville	400	930	Lewis-Clark St. College	240	840	Central Michigan U.	550(510)	1,240(1,110)	
U. of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	400	1,000				Eastern Michigan U.	565	1,353	
Arkansas Polytechnic College	410	940				Grand Valley St. College	517(480)	1,305(1,224)	
Arkansas State U.	400	700				Northern Michigan U.	495	1,260	
Henderson State College	400	800				Oakland U.	602(557)	1,562(1,502)	
Southern State College	410	680				Saginaw Valley College	510(450)	1,290(1,200)	
State College of Arkansas	410	920				Western Michigan U.	540	1,140	
CALIFORNIA							ILLINOIS		
U. of California, System	644	2,144	Southern Illinois U.	579	1,437				
Cal. Maritime Academy	1,380(1,080)	1,680(1,380)	U. of Ill., Chicago Circle	636	1,626				
Cal. St. Polytechnic U.:			U. of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	686	1,676				
Pomona	163	1,156	Eastern Illinois U.	599(691)	1,445(1,437)				
San Luis Obispo	165	1,300(1,100)	Governors State U.	585	1,650				
California St. Colleges:			Illinois State U.	611(585)	1,272(1,246)				
Bakersfield	39	1,100	Northeastern Illinois U.	476(520)	1,322(1,366)				
Dominguez Hills	146(143)	1,256(1,253)	Northern Illinois U.	603(574)	647(617)				
San Bernardino	157	1,270	Sangamon State U.	472(447)	1,133(1,110)				
Sonoma	140	1,345(1,250)	Southern Illinois U. at Edwardsville	589(584)	1,447(1,442)				
Cal. St. Universities:			Western Illinois U.	561(558)	1,407(1,404)				
Chico	166(160)	1,276(1,270)	INDIANA						
Fresno	168	1,278	Indiana U.	682(650)	1,560(1,490)				
Fullerton	160	1,270	Purdue U.	700	1,600				
Humboldt	163	1,399(1,273)	Ball State U.	630	1,260				
Long Beach	164	1,369(1,274)	Indiana State U.	660(600)	1,260(1,110)				
Los Angeles	165	1,236(1,110)	IOWA						
Northridge	164	1,145	Iowa State U.	600	1,332(1,230)				
Sacramento	160	1,110	U. of Iowa	620	1,350(1,250)				
San Diego	161	716	U. of Northern Iowa	600	1,00(1,000)				
San Francisco	164	1,110	KANSAS						
COLORADO									
Colorado State U.	778(570)	2,069(1,759)	Kansas State U.	526(746)	1,316(1,066)				
U. of Colorado, Boulder	593(576)	1,959(1,895)	U. of Kansas	544(486)	1,334(1,076)				
Adams State College	471(456)	1,446(1,431)	Fort Hays Kansas St. Coll.	475(407)	970(802)				
Fort Lewis College	433(418)	1,337(1,283)	Kan. St. Coll. of Pittsburg	390	885(785)				
Metropolitan St. College	330(333)	1,080(1,062)	Kansas St. Teachers Coll.	394(386)	889(781)				
Southern Colo. St. Coll.	474(450)	1,489(1,389)	Wichita State U.	536(459)	1,327(1,060)				
U. of Northern Colo.	427(402)	1,303(1,200)	KENTUCKY						
Western St. Coll. of Colo.	358(349)	1,003(1,315)	Kentucky State U.	455(395)	985(911)				
CONNECTICUT			U. of Kentucky	480(405)	1,210(1,120)				
U. of Connecticut	715(655)	1,715(1,555)	Eastern Kentucky U.	420(360)	950(875)				
Central Conn. St. Coll.	570	1,410	Morehead State U.	420(380)	950(895)				
Southern Conn. St. Coll.	524	1,424	Murray State U.	425(365)	955(881)				
Western Conn. St. Coll.	450	1,350	North' Kentucky St. Coll.	420(360)	950(876)				
DELAWARE			Western Kentucky U.	420(360)	950(876)				
Delaware St. C.	355(345)	930(920)	LOUISIANA						
U. of Delaware	585(475)	1,560(1,350)	La. St. U.	320	950				
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			Southern U.	284	914				
District of Columbia Teachers Coll.	70	1,082	Grambling College	332	782				
Federal City College	132	852	Louisiana Tech U.	334(318)	964(948)				
FLORIDA			McNeese State U.	290(285)	530(525)				
Fla. A&M U.	570	1,620	Nicholls State U.	302	932				
Florida State U.	570	1,620	Northeast Louisiana U.	292(270)	922(900)				
U. of Florida	570	1,620	Northwestern State U.	302(294)	932(324)				
Florida Atlantic U.	570	1,620	Southeastern Louisiana U.	165	480				
Florida Technological U.	570	1,620	MAINE						
U. of North Florida	570	1,620	Maine Maritime Academy	600	1,350(1,200)				
U. of South Florida	570	1,620	U. of Maine:	400	1,400				
U. of West Florida	570	1,620	Augusta	400	1,400				
GEORGIA			Farmington	400	1,400				
Fort Valley St. C.	387(382)	927(922)	Fort Kent	430	1,430				
Georgia Inst. of Tech.	534	1,419	Machias	400	1,300				
U. of Georgia	539(519)	1,259(1,239)	Presque Isle	400	1,400				
Albany State College	435	975	MARYLAND						
MASSACHUSETTS			U. of Md., Eastern Shore	698(639)	1,692(1,439)				
U. of Md., Eastern Shore			Bowie State College	345(320)	695(620)				
Coppin State College			Frostburg State College	570(450)	1,020(655)				
Morgan State College			St. Mary's Coll. of Md.	520(335)	970(685)				
Salisbury State College			Towson State College	636(420)	1,086(770)				
Towson State College			U. of Md., Baltimore City	651(460)	1,051(835)				
MASSACHUSETTS			U. of Md., Baltimore City	470(460)	720(710)				
U. of Mass			721	1,179(954)					
Boston St. College			Towson State College	546(436)	896(886)				
			560(500)	1,560(1,300)					
MAINE			U. of Md., Baltimore City	560(500)	1,560(1,300)				
MASSACHUSETTS			MISSISSIPPI						
U. of Hawaii	223(233)	733(743)	Alcorn A&M C.	400	1,000				
			Mississippi State U.	506	1,106				
			U. of Miss.	516	1,116				
			Alcorn A & M College	400	1,000				
			Delta St. College	434(428)	1,034(1,028)				
			Miss. St. Coll. for Women	474(465)	1,074(1,065)				
			Miss. Valley St. College	400	1,000				
			U. of Southern Mississippi	320	920				
MINNESOTA			MISSOURI						
			Lincoln U.	370(350)	640(620)				
			U. of Missouri	540	1,540				
			Central Missouri St. U.	315(300)	915(900)				
			Harris Teachers College	205	NA				
			Missouri Southern St. Coll.	300	710				
			Missouri Western St. Coll.	340	720				
			Northeast Missouri St. U.	280	760				
			Northwest Missouri St. U.	310(300)	600(800)				
			Southwest Missouri St. U.	300	900				
MISSOURI			MISSISSIPPI						
			Mont. St. U.	476(471)	1,376(1,318)				
			U. of Montana	487(471)	1,387(1,318)				
			Montana Coll.	450(445)	1,350(1,292)				
			Montana Coll. of Mineral Sciences and Technology	378(375)	1,278(1,223)				
			Northern Montana Coll.	430(413)	1,330(1,260)				
			Western Montana Coll.	434(432)	1,334(1,280)				
NEBRASKA			NEVADA						
			U. of Nebraska	519	1,719				
NEW HAMPSHIRE			NEVADA						
			U. of New Hampshire	983(1,033)	2,233				
			Keene State College	617	1,450				
			Plymouth St. Coll. or the U. of New Hampshire	714	1,547				
NEW JERSEY			NEVADA						
			Rutgers U.	725	1,310				
			College of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey:						
			New Jersey Dental Sch.	1,188	1,838				
			New Jersey Med. Sch.	1,135(1,125)	1,775				
			Rutgers Medical Sch.	1,200(1,250)	1,850(1900)				
NEW MEXICO			NEW MEXICO						
			New Mexico State U.	466	1,296				
			U. of New Mexico	458	1,284				

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR, (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESIS)—Continued

	Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees		Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees		Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident
NEW YORK						
City U. of New York	\$70	\$620				
Cornell U. (statutory)	1,350(1,200)	1,950(1,800)				
State U. of New York:						
Fresh-Soph.	750(740)	1,175(1,165)				
Junior-Senior	900(890)	1,400(1,390)				
Queens College of City U. of New York	138	1,338(1,038)				
State U. of New York:						
Empire State College	900(786)	1,468(1,234)				
Maritime College	800(600)	1,300(900)				
St. U. of N.Y. Colleges:						
Brockport	890(740)	1,390(1,165)				
Buffalo	887(737)	1,387(1,162)				
Fredonia	800(650)	1,300(1,075)				
Genesee	800(650)	1,300(1,075)				
New Paltz	875(725)	1,375(1,150)				
Old Westbury	800(650)	1,300(1,075)				
Oneonta	800(650)	1,300(1,075)				
Oswego	800(650)	1,300(1,075)				
Plattsburgh	800(650)	1,300(1,075)				
Potsdam	895(885)	1,395(1,385)				
Purchase	650	1,075				
Utica/Rome	800	1,300				
NORTH CAROLINA						
N.C. A&T U.	542(525)	2,075(2,074)				
N.C. State U.	474(427)	2,034(2,002)				
U. of North Carolina	439(422)	1,997				
Appalachian St. U.	485(467)	2,070(2,067)				
East Carolina U.	438(423)	2,004				
North Carolina Central U.	443(421)	2,043(2,021)				
Pembroke St. U.	389(390)	1,730				
U. of N.C. at Wilmington	368(396)	1,923(1,936)				
Western Carolina U.	169(166)	691(699)				
Winston-Salem St. U.	490(472)	1,875(1,872)				
NORTH DAKOTA						
N. Dak. St. U.	435	1,164				
U. of N. Dak.	456	1,184				
Dickinson S. College	415(405)	952(943)				
Mayville St. College	305	852				
Minot St. College	400	937				
Valley City St. College	405(396)	942(933)				
OHIO						
Kent St. U.	804	2,004				
Miami U.	780	1,980				
Ohio State U.	750	1,800				
Bowling Green St. U.	780	1,179(1,143)				
Central St. U.	663(648)	1,188(1,173)				
U. of Akron	705	1,606				
U. of Toledo	780	1,935				
Wright St. U.	780(750)	1,680(1,650)				
Youngstown St. U.	630(570)	1,200(1,050)				
OKLAHOMA						
Langston U.	337	832				
Oklahoma State U.	456	1,236				
U. of Okla.	448	1,200				
Central St. U.	340	835				
East Central St. College	348	843				
Northeastern St. College	352(345)	847(840)				
Northwestern St. College	332(327)	827(822)				
Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts	335	830				
Southeastern St. College	355	835				
Southwestern St. College	330	825				
OREGON						
Oreg. St. U.	451(425)	1,633(1,484)				
U. of Oregon	566(534)	1,748(1,593)				
Eastern Oregon St. College	549(519)	1,392(1,239)				
Southern Oregon College	549(513)	1,392(1,233)				
PENNSYLVANIA						
Pennsylvania St. U.	900(885)	2,100(1,986)				
Temple U.	1,050(970)	1,950(1,870)				
U. of Pgh.	1,012(982)	2,002(1,972)				
Bloomsburg St. Coll.	750(700)	1,500(1,400)				
California State College	820(770)	1,570(1,470)				
Cheyney State College	415(780)	1,576(1,470)				
Clarion State College	750(700)	1,380				
East Stroudsburg St. Coll.	840(790)	1,470				
Edinboro State College	750(700)	1,380				
Indiana U. of Pennsylvania	750(700)	1,500(1,400)				
Kutztown State College	1,018(1,418)	1,718(1,418)				
Lincoln U.	750(700)	1,380				
Lockhaven State College	750(700)	1,380				
Mansfield State College	NA(760)	NA(1,450)				
Millersville State College	750(700)	1,500(1,380)				
Slippery Rock State Coll.	750(700)	1,500(1,380)				
WEST VIRGINIA						
W. Virginia U.	310	1,140				
Bluefield State College	242(240)	992(990)				
Concord College	240	990				
Fairmont State College	242(232)	992(982)				
Marshall U.	282	1,082				
Shepherd College	280	1,030				
West Liberty State College	270(250)	1,020(1,000)				
W. Va. Institute of Tech.	277(260)	1,027(1,010)				
West Virginia State Coll.	250	1,000				
WISCONSIN						
U. of Wisconsin—Madison:						
Freshman-Soph.	573(558)	1,906				
Junior-Senior	628(558)	2,006(1,906)				

Sources: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

MR. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill, H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974. Passage of this legislation is critical to the future well-being of millions of veterans, for it will allow them the same educational and employment opportunities as their fellow countrymen enjoy.

This past year was a difficult one for veterans, especially those who were seeking either to start or continue their education. For the returning Vietnam serviceman, this problem was particularly acute. Thousands of these brave Americans had discovered that in the course of their years of duty, the cost of a decent education had become prohibitive to them. The costs of tuition and books had skyrocketed while their educational benefits were not registering similar increases.

This bill we are considering today will take great strides in eliminating this tragic inequity. The basic educational benefit for veterans under the GI bill will be increased by 13.6 percent, the kind of realistic figure necessary if veterans are to be provided with the basic opportunity to pursue an education.

Equally as important to the veteran of today is vocational rehabilitation and training. Through the years there have been a number of requirements which have prevented many veterans from taking part in these important programs. H.R. 12628 removes some of the more stringent requirements and opens the door for thousands more veterans to participate in vocational rehabilitation and training programs. These include:

Increasing the period of eligibility for veterans to receive training, from the present 8 years after discharge, to 10 years.

Reducing from 30 to 10 percent the disability level required for a service-connected veteran to qualify for vocational rehabilitation.

Finally, I am pleased to see included in this legislation the creation of a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center within the VA to assist Vietnam veterans with problems related to education or employment. The time is long overdue for this Nation to respond to the special needs of the Vietnam era veteran. This is one important step, and another might be the establishment of a new Deputy

Administrator for Vietnam Veterans' Affairs.

Many people have proclaimed 1974 as the "Year of the Veteran" in America. There is no doubt about the need for a national commitment to improve the quality of life for the veterans, but more than rhetoric is needed to succeed. This legislation represents the kind of positive response needed to help solve the problems of veterans. For far too many of them, their return from the rigors of warfare has been anything but triumphant. They have been forced to do battle here in America with such enemies as inflation and discrimination. The American veteran is weary, tired of fighting, tired of idle promises of help from the Government, but above all tired of a nation who seems to turn their backs to them in their times of need. Let us show the veteran that we do care, and let us not wait until it is too late.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974 which would increase veterans' education allowances from \$220 to \$250 a month. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, for reporting out an excellent bill. Over the last 25 years, the cost of higher education has risen three times as much as GI educational assistance. The bill before us today is a significant step forward to making educational opportunities more readily available to veterans who wish to take advantage of them.

Unfortunately, even with the passage of this bill, the cost of higher education will still be beyond the reach of many veterans. Tuition fees in some States are vastly higher than in other States. In the 14th District of Ohio which I represent, for example, the tuition fee at Kent State University is \$804 and at Akron University, \$705. In contrast, 1 year's tuition at California State Universities is \$164.

The present GI bill fails to take note of these variances. The result is that some veterans are penalized simply because they reside in one State rather than another.

I know the distinguished chairman is aware of this discrepancy, and has indicated that his committee plans to investigate this issue. I simply want to take this opportunity to express my support to the chairman for immediate hearings and legislative action to insure that no matter where a veteran lives, he will have the same educational opportunities as other veterans.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12628, the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974.

This legislation combines general provisions from two bills which I have previously sponsored, calling for an increase in educational allowances for our veterans and extending the time period in which our retired servicemen may avail themselves of educational benefits.

In addressing ourselves to the measure before us today, let us be mindful of the initial reasons for providing educational benefits for veterans. Under the Selective

Service System, operating until very recently, our Nation called upon its young men to respond to our defense needs by entering the armed services. In the many times we were involved in hostilities in other parts of the world, large numbers of our men were summoned to active duty. By responding to the call, these men were interrupting their lives at an age when they were only beginning to plan for their futures. Upon completion of their tours of duty, these same men returned to their homes to pick up the pieces of their lives and to begin to pursue their goals.

The congressional decision offering assistance to veterans pursuing their educations was one way by which we expressed our gratitude for service rendered to our country. To my mind, I find this expression one of the best responses we can make.

I need not remind my colleagues of the affects of the inflationary economy which is causing hardship for many individuals throughout our Nation. It would be unfortunate, indeed, if those men who served their country faithfully and well were not afforded the opportunity to pursue their educational needs, because the benefits provided were inadequate to meet increased costs. For this reason, I strongly support that portion of the bill providing a 13.6-percent increase in veterans education benefits.

A measure I sponsored earlier called for an indefinite time extension for utilizing educational benefits. While the "open-ended" assistance is more realistic, particularly for the veteran who is the head of a household and must remain employed, forcing him to receive his education on a part-time basis, I feel that we have made some headway in this measure by extending the time period for use of educational assistance from 8 to 10 years.

I applaud the work of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in reporting out this measure and urge its speedy adoption.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 12628, the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments.

Before discussing the provisions of this legislation, I want to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague from New Jersey, HENRY HELSTOSKI. It was Congressman HELSTOSKI's Subcommittee on Education and Training which developed this important and much-needed measure.

The bill before us today increases educational allowances by 13.6 percent under the GI bill. This amount is much more realistic than the proposal by the administration for a meager 8-percent increase, which would fail to meet even the cost-of-living rise since the last boost in benefits.

H.R. 12628 also increases the period of eligibility to receive training from the present 8 years following discharge to 10 years, or until June 1, 1976, in the case of those discharged between January 31, 1955 and June 1, 1966.

Additionally, the bill would receive disability requirements for eligibility to receive vocational rehabilitation to 10 percent, thus placing Vietnam era veterans on a par with veterans of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I urge overwhelming approval of H.R. 12628 and its prompt consideration by the Senate.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my strong support for this important veterans benefits bill before the House today.

H.R. 12628 recognizes the debt this country owes to those noble young men who have served their country in the Armed Forces. I have been proud to support two previous legislative efforts increasing veterans benefits. Since I have represented Missouri's 10th Congressional District, educational allowance benefits have risen 69.2 percent. The legislation before this body today will raise this figure to 92.3 percent. In practical terms, the single veteran attending college today will receive \$250 per month if this bill is enacted into law. This compares to \$130 per month for the same veteran in 1969.

In addition, this legislation allows veterans 10 years to utilize their GI bill entitlements rather than the 8 years from time of discharge under current law.

This bill also contains a number of other important provisions designed to liberalize assistance programs for Vietnam era veterans. For example, this legislation reduces the disability requirement for vocational rehabilitation eligibility from 30 to 10 percent, making present vets on an equal level with World War II vets. Veteran students will also be allowed to increase part-time employment and work-study programs without jeopardizing their benefit eligibility. Of special significance to many veterans from my rural communities is the provision extending eligibility to wives, widows, and children to participate and pursue farm cooperative training.

Finally, H.R. 12628 establishes a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center within the Veterans' Administration that would be responsible for making periodic evaluations concerning the effectiveness of several VA Outreach programs. Hopefully, such a center will provide a workable clearinghouse for much-needed information on VA benefit programs.

Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically endorse this measure and urge my colleagues to vote prompt passage of this measure.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments, H.R. 12628, because the legislation recognizes an obligation to the Vietnam veteran on the part of this Government and the people of the United States who benefited from their service to the country during a difficult period. I believe there is no better way to show our gratitude and appreciation than by giving the veteran a greater opportunity to improve his education or to learn a trade with which to support his family and to further enhance his contribution to society.

The legislation recognizes some of the inequities and inadequacies of the present law by liberalizing the eligibility requirements for wives, widows, and chil-

dren, as well as the veteran. It gives him more time after discharge to complete his training, and broadens the choices of career training for which he may receive assistance.

The bill encourages veteran participation in work-study programs by removing the current limitation on the number of veterans who may receive assistance, and by doubling allowable work hours and payments under the program. I believe the work-study program is of special value to those who already have heavy family responsibilities, but still wish to pursue their educational or job training opportunities.

In addition, the 13.6-percent increase in benefits is a realistic and reasonable amount consistent with the increased cost of living.

The Vietnam-era veteran has received the short end of the stick from the American people and the Government in many respects. With the signing of the peace treaty more than a year ago, and the return of our troops and our prisoners of war, the people and the Congress have been anxious to put the Vietnam war and everything connected with it far from their minds. Especially since the onslaught of Watergate and the energy crisis, we have tended to be preoccupied. These things are important and demand our attention, but we must not renege on our obligations to our veterans and their dependents.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12628.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 0, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—382

Abdnor	Bingham	Carter
Abzug	Blackburn	Casey, Tex.
Adams	Boggs	Cederberg
Addabbo	Bolling	Chamberlain
Alexander	Bowen	Chappell
Anderson,	Brademas	Clancy
Calif.	Bray	Clark
Anderson, Ill.	Breaux	Clausen,
Andrews, N.C.	Breckinridge	Don H.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brinkley	Clawson, Del
Annunzio	Brotzman	Cleveland
Archer	Brown, Calif.	Cohen
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Collier
Armstrong	Brown, Ohio	Collins, Ill.
Ashbrook	Broyhill, N.C.	Collins, Tex.
Ashley	Broyhill, Va.	Conable
Aspin	Buchanan	Conte
Bafalis	Burgener	Corman
Baker	Burke, Calif.	Coughlin
Barrett	Burke, Fla.	Cronin
Bauman	Burke, Mass.	Culver
Beard	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Dan
Bell	Burlison, Mo.	Daniel, Robert
Bennett	Burton	W. Jr.
Bergland	Butler	Daniels,
Bevill	Byron	Dominick V.
Biaggi	Camp	Danielson
Blester	Carney, Ohio	Davis, Ga.

Davis, S.C.	Jones, N.C.	Riegle	Chisholm	Kluczynski	Stanton,
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Okla.	Rinaldo	Cochran	McCloskey	J. William
de la Garza	Karth	Roberts	Conlan	Mills	Stokes
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Robinson, Va.	Conyers	Minshall, Ohio	Stubblefield
Dellums	Kazen	Robison, N.Y.	Cotter	Moss	Talcott
Denholm	Kemp	Roe	Crane	Nix	Teague
Dent	Ketchum	Rogers	Delaney	Patman	Vander Jagt
Derwinski	King	Roncalio, Wyo.	Dennis	Patten	Vanik
Dickinson	Koch	Roncalio, N.Y.	Frelinghuysen	Railsback	Wilson,
Diggs	Kuykendall	Rooney, Pa.	Gray	Reid	Charles, Tex.
Dingell	Kyros	Rose	Hosmer	Rodino	Wyatt
Donohue	Landgrebe	Rosenthal	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.	Wydler
Dorn	Landrum	Roush	Johnson, Pa.	Royal	Zablocki
Downing	Latta	Rousselot	Jones, Tenn.	Scherle	
Drinan	Leggett	Roy	Jordan	Shoup	
Dulski	Lehman	Runnels			
Duncan	Lent	Ruppe			
du Pont	Litton	Ruth			
Eckhardt	Long, La.	Ryan			
Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.	St Germain			
Edwards, Calif.	Lott	Sandman			
Ellberg	Lujan	Sarasin			
Erlenborn	McClory	Sarbanes			
Esch	McCullister	Satterfield			
Eshleman	McCormack	Schniebeli			
Evans, Colo.	McDade	Schroeder			
Evins, Tenn.	McEwen	Sebelius			
Fascell	McFall	Selberling			
Findley	McKay	Shipley			
Fish	McKinney	Shriver			
Fisher	McSpadden	Shuster			
Flood	Macdonald	Sikes			
Flowers	Madden	Sisk			
Flynt	Madigan	Skubitz			
Foley	Mahon	Slack			
Ford	Mailiard	Smith, Iowa			
Forsythe	Mallary	Smith, N.Y.			
Fountain	Mann	Smith, N.Y.			
Fraser	Maraziti	Smith			
Frenzel	Martin, Nebr.	Smith, N.Y.			
Frey	Martin, N.C.	Staggers			
Froehlich	Mathias, Calif.	Stanton,			
Fulton	Matsunaga	James V.			
Fuqua	Mayne	Stark			
Gaydos	Mazzoli	Steed			
Gettys	Meeds	Steele			
Giamo	Melcher	Steelman			
Gibbons	Metcalfe	Steiger, Ariz.			
Gilman	Mezvinsky	Steiger, Wis.			
Ginn	Michel	Stephens			
Goldwater	Milford	Stratton			
Gonzalez	Miller	Stuckey			
Goodling	Minish	Studds			
Grasso	Mink	Sullivan			
Green, Oreg.	Mitchell, Md.	Symington			
Green, Pa.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Symms			
Griffiths	Mizell	Taylor, Mo.			
Gross	Moakley	Taylor, N.C.			
Grover	Mollohan	Thompson, N.J.			
Gubser	Montgomery	Thompson, Wis.			
Gude	Moorhead,	Thone			
Gunter	Calif.	Thornton			
Guyer	Moorhead, Pa.	Tiernan			
Haley	Morgan	Towell, Nev.			
Hamilton	Mosher	Treen			
Hammer-	Murphy, Ill.	Udall			
schmidt	Murphy, N.Y.	Ullman			
Hanley	Myers	Van Derlin			
Hanna	Natcher	Veysey			
Hanrahan	Nedzi	Vigorito			
Hansen, Idaho	Nelsen	Waggoner			
Hansen, Wash.	Nichols	Walde			
Harrington	Obey	Walsh			
Harsha	O'Brien	Wampler			
Hastings	O'Hara	Whalen			
Hawkins	O'Neill	White			
Hays	Owens	Whitehurst			
Hebert	Parris	Whitten			
Hicks	Hechler, W. Va.	Widnall			
Hillis	Passman	Wiggins			
Hinshaw	Heckler, Mass.	Perkins			
Hogan	Heinz	Pettis			
Holifield	Helstoski	Peyser			
Holt	Henderson	Pickle			
Holtzman	Hicks	Charles H., Calif.			
Horton	Hillis	Fiske			
Howard	Hinshaw	Poage			
Huber	Hogan	Podell			
Hudnut	Holifield	Powell, Ohio			
Hungate	Holtzman	Preyer			
Hunt	Horton	Price, Ill.			
Hutchinson	Hudson	Price, Tex.			
Ichord	Hudson	Pritchard			
Johnson, Calif.	Huber	Quile			
Johnson, Colo.	Hudnut	Quillen			
Johnson, Ala.	Hungate	Randall			
Rees	Hunt	Rangel			
Regula	Hutchinson	Rarick			
Reuss	Ichord	Rees			
Rhodes	Johnson, Calif.	Young, Alaska			
	Johnson, Colo.	Young, Fla.			
	Jones, Ala.	Young, Ga.			
		Young, Ill.			
		Young, S.C.			
		Young, Tex.			
		Zion			
		Zwach			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—47

Badillo	Boal	Broomfield
Bratnik	Brasco	Carey, N.Y.

Chisholm	Kluczynski	Stanton,
Cochran	McCloskey	J. William
Conlan	Mills	Stokes
Conyers	Minshall, Ohio	Stubblefield
Cotter	Moss	Talcott
Crane	Nix	Teague
Delaney	Patman	Vander Jagt
Dennis	Patten	Vanik
Frelinghuysen	Railsback	Wilson,
Gray	Reid	Charles, Tex.
Hosmer	Rodino	Wyatt
Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.	Wydler
Johnson, Pa.	Royal	Zablocki
Jones, Tenn.	Scherle	
Jordan	Shoup	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Patten with Mr. Cotter.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cochran.
Mr. Brasco with Miss Jordan.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Dennis.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Chisholm with Mr. Royal.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Moss.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Vanik.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. J. William Stanton with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Wydler with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10834) to amend the act of October 27, 1972, establishing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco and Marin Counties, Calif., and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10834

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(a) of the Act of October 27, 1972 (86 Stat. 1299), is hereby amended by deleting "Boundary Map, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, numbered NRA-GG-80,003, sheets 1 through 3, and dated July, 1972," and inserting in lieu thereof "Revised Boundary Map, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, numbered NRA-GG-80,003-D, and dated September 1973.", which shall include, in addition to the existing properties within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the following:

"Marin County:

"(1) Allan Associates, Incorporated property, 38.89 acres,

"(2) County of Marin and Tamalpais Community Services District lands, 22.94 acres,

"(3) Ghilotti Brothers property, 10.40 acres,

"(4) Oakwood Valley area, various properties, 208.89 acres,

"(5) Olds property, 207.56 acres,

"(6) Wolfback Ridge area, various properties, 287.47 acres: Provided, That the Sec-

retary is authorized to acquire such interest as he deems reasonably necessary to preserve the scenic quality of the 9.47 acres designated for scenic protection.

"(7) Keller property, Stinson Beach, 10 acres,

"(8) Leonard property, Stinson Beach, 8.25 acres,

"(9) Muir Beach properties, 4 acres, and

"(10) State of California, Department of Transportation, 120 acres.

"San Francisco County:

"Haslett Warehouse; and shall exclude the following:

"(1) Leonard (homesite), 10 acres,

"(2) Panoramic Highway area, Stinson Beach, 40 acres."

Sec. 2. Section 5(b) of the Act of October 27, 1972 (86 Stat. 1299), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of sixteen members appointed by the Secretary for terms of three years each. At least one of the members appointed to the Commission shall be a member of the Marin County Planning Commission, Marin County, California, who is familiar with the purposes and facilities of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and the Point Reyes National Seashore and is a resident of the area known as West Marin located in Marin County, California."

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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the enactment of H.R. 10834—a bill to amend the act establishing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco and Marin Counties in California. This legislation was introduced by Representative PHILIP BURTON and cosponsored by his California colleagues—Representatives MAILLARD, JOHNSON, DON H. CLAUSEN, HOSMER, BURKE and KETCHUM—as well as by 23 other Members.

This is not a complicated measure. It simply makes some changes in the existing boundaries of the recreation area which was created by the 92d Congress. Some of the changes were necessitated by relatively minor errors made in the original boundary map—particularly the Haslett Warehouse in San Francisco which was inadvertently omitted. In other cases, the Department of the Interior found that certain parcels were not necessary for the recreation area, that some were already developed with expensive residential dwellings, and that some were needed for the orderly expansion of the community of Stinson Beach. For these reasons, some properties formerly within the recreation area would be excluded if H.R. 10834 is enacted. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill would add to the recreation area certain additional tracts of land which are important to the scenic values of the area or which are needed for public access or facilities.

Altogether, H.R. 10834 adds approximately 925 acres of land to the boundaries of the recreation area and excludes about 50 acres. Included in the additions are 120 acres of State-owned lands which would be acquired under the terms of the original act by donation only. While it would not be correct to assume that this legislation will be free of the need for funds in order to implement it, the committee believes that the acquisition program can be accomplished within the existing authorization ceiling for the recreation area.

Mr. Speaker, the committee amendments also include a provision expanding the existing Advisory Commission by one member in order to assure proper representation of the Marin County Planning Commission. As everyone knows, most of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Point Reyes National Seashore are located in Marin County. Because of this fact, the principal sponsor of the bill suggested and the committee agreed that the agency most directly involved in county planning should be represented on the Advisory Commission.

In short, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10834 does two things:

First, it makes certain relatively non-controversial boundary revisions which will have the net effect of enlarging the recreation area by 875 acres; and

Second, it expands the Golden Gate Advisory Commission from 15 to 16 members.

I urge the adoption of the bill, as amended, by the Members of the House.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress made an important decision in 1972 when it enacted the law creating the Golden Gate National Recreation Area near San Francisco. Some outstanding natural and scenic landscapes are now preserved on the very edges of this city. They afford outdoor recreational opportunities for large numbers of people living in and near this urban area. Visitors from elsewhere also are attracted to the area.

The bill before us is designed to effect various boundary adjustments in this recreation area. While a few small parcels are deleted from the original area, more of the adjustment is in the nature of additions, for a net increase of about 875 acres. It is anticipated that the costs entailed by this bill can be absorbed within the authorization ceiling of the original act which established the area in 1972.

An amendment to the bill was adopted in committee which is controversial. Its nature and background will be explained by our colleague from California (Mr. GUBSER), whose objections to the bill as amended are entitled to respect. I hope that this difficulty as well as the possible exclusion of some acreage which is questionable may be handled by the other body if and when it acts on the bill.

On balance, I reluctantly support the legislation by my colleagues. The bill will help perfect the administration of an already successful venture.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this bill, H.R. 10834, amending the act passed by the Congress in 1972 which created

the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in California.

The bill before us essentially deals with boundary adjustments so as to extend protection to adjacent valuable scenic and recreational landscapes. The bill also deletes some minor acreages from the recreation area so as to improve the effectiveness of administration of the area.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that while this bill provides a net gain to the existing recreation area of about 875 acres, there is no dollar cost attached to this bill. The cost of this additional acreage is expected to be able to be absorbed within the initial authorization ceiling for the area set by the Congress when the parent act was enacted in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill, a needed bill, and one without cost. I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for its passage.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my gratitude to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) for his assistance in attaining passage of this legislation, to note the effective assistance of the coauthor, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLARD), as well as the great assistance to us by the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BURKE). I wish to express my appreciation to one and all for this corrective and improving legislation on the Golden Gate National Recreational Area.

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco and Marin Counties was established in the closing days of the 92d Congress and preserved for future generations an important part of the most beautiful and easily accessible open space in all of America.

Study and analysis in the intervening months have brought an even greater appreciation of the magnificence of this park that will stand as a monument to the foresight of the Congress that created it.

The same study and analysis have brought into focus some necessary boundary adjustments, both exclusions and additions, which I have incorporated into my bill, H.R. 10834.

The proposed additions are necessary refinements that round out boundaries for more efficient management, avoid potential adverse development, protect the scenic quality of the landscape, and provide necessary access to planned recreational facilities. The excluded parcels, on the other hand, contain developed homesites or land which the local community needs for growth and which are not essential to the recreation area. The current authorization ceiling is adequate to take care of the boundary adjustments recommended to you in H.R. 10834.

I urge speedy approval of these modest changes in the lines defining the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, destined

to be the finest urban recreation area in the Nation. Approval of this measure will be another opportunity to express commitment to the preservation of our treasured open space for the enjoyment of all the people and all future generations of America.

In brief the boundary changes would add to the present 34,000-acre park approximately 925 acres and exclude about 50 acres. The additions would include Allan Associates, Inc. property, 38.89 acres; County of Marin and Tamalpais Community Services District lands, 22.94 acres; Ghilotti Brothers property, 10.40 acres; Oakwood Valley area, various properties, 208.89 acres; Olds property, 207.56 acres; Wolfback Ridge area, various properties, 237.47 acres: Provided, That the Secretary is authorized to acquire such interest as he deems reasonably necessary to preserve the scenic quality of the 9.47 acres designated for scenic protection; Keller property, Stinson Beach, 10 acres; Leonard property, Stinson Beach, 8.25 acres; Muir Beach properties, 4 acres; and State of California, Department of Transportation, 120 acres.

The exclusions would be: Leonard—Homesite—10 acres and Panoramic Highway area, Stinson Beach, 40 acres.

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

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

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON), and to extend my congratulations to the Chairman of the committee, the committee, and our colleagues from California who have joined together to make this great national monument a step forward in the fight for conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to commend my colleagues, the gentlemen from California, DON CLAUSEN, BIZ JOHNSON, BILL MAILLARD, and PHIL BURTON, for the outstanding contribution they have made by their joint work to report this bill.

This legislation has enjoyed strong bipartisan support by Members from across the country, and under the leadership of these four northern California Representatives, was promptly considered by the House Interior Committee.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is one of the best examples we have of the concept of urban parks. Its purpose is to preserve the undeveloped land surrounding our cities for the use and enjoyment of those urban residents. This particular area, extending north and south from San Francisco, encompasses beach and forest land on the peninsula south of San Francisco and extends far north into Marin County along the rugged, magnificent coast. These lands have long been landmarks of the northern California coastline, and have been enjoyed not just by city residents, but by people from across the country coming to visit the area.

Passage of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in 1972 was a major step in the preservation of these lands. These amendments, though, are just as critical.

They will improve the boundaries for the area and increase the amount of land that can be acquired, and thereby saved from development.

The northern California members of the Interior Committee have done an admirable service in the cause of conservation in their work on this bill. As a Representative from the East Bay, I would like to express my sincere appreciation, on behalf of my constituents, to these men for helping to preserve our rapidly dwindling undeveloped lands.

Finally, I am most heartened by the work they have done on this bill, as it suggests that the conservation movement is gaining impetus in the House. That is a boost to every inner-city resident, particularly in the bay area, who has worked to see the coastlands and ridge-lands, unique to the bay area, preserved for their enjoyment.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of this bill, and to extend their appreciation to the chairman and committee members who are legislating conservation.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina how much, if any, these land deals cost the taxpayers of the country?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. It is estimated that the additional cost of these additions to the Golden Gate National Area will be \$5.6 million.

Mr. GROSS. How many millions?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. \$5.6 million.

Mr. GROSS. Was any of this land previously purchased by the Government from those to whom it will revert? Was there any land previously purchased by the Government, for which compensation is being paid, that is now being returned to private use?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield further, I might state that the legislation does provide for the deletion of 50 acres of land which is included in the present boundaries. That land has not been purchased, so it will not be a matter of deeding back property that has been purchased. The land is just being taken out of the park and will not be acquired. It would be very expensive to purchase it, and the Park Service recommended that it be removed.

Mr. GROSS. There is no land that was previously purchased by the Federal Government that is being returned without compensation to private ownership; is that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand from reading the report that a new member is being added to some kind of a board or commission in connection with this deal?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield further, the parent legislation establishes the Golden Gate Advisory Commission, and this bill does add one additional member to that Commission. The Commission presently has

15 members. This will increase it to 16 members.

The reason for the increase is that there is a request that the Marin County Planning Commission be represented on the board.

Mr. GROSS. Has that individual been selected; does the gentleman know?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Not to my knowledge. I should think the selection would be made after the legislation is passed.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has no information as to whom that individual will be?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I do not.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. There was a member added in addition to that one member. There has been some mention about this. In fact, the next speaker has asked for 5 minutes to discuss that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Gubser).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to request a "no" vote on the motion to suspend the rules. Let me emphasize at the outset that a "no" vote will not be an anticonservation vote, and do not let anyone tell you it is. All we want to do is bring this bill up in the regular order with a rule so that some of the gimmicks in it can be amended out. That is all we are asking. I am for the Golden Gate National Recreational Area.

In fact, last year I played a very significant part in bringing about the compromise between the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs which made a bill possible.

There are two features in this bill which are wrong and the House should have the opportunity to at least offer amendments to delete those features.

The gentleman from Iowa alluded to one, and that is language in this bill which calls for the appointment of a 16th Commissioner. That language is so tight that it can apply to only one person. His name is Jerry Friedman. He will be the new Commissioner, and no one else will be eligible. If the supervisoral representative from the West Marin District happens to appoint someone else to the Planning Commission then today we are acting to appoint a new Commissioner whom we do not know and have never heard of.

I do not labor under any delusion as to why Mr. Friedman is being appointed. I know why and you know why. I say we should let a man dispense his political patronage after he is elected and not before.

The second feature that should be amended in this bill is to delete what is referred to as Assessors Parcel No. 195-232-01. This is 8.25 acres of expensive land which sells for about \$12,000 an acre and is too expensive for park use.

February 19, 1974

It is right next to the city of Stinson Beach. The Planning Commission of Marin County and the board of supervisors of Marin County have both asked that this land be deleted because they feel it is needed for some commercial development in the city of Stinson Beach and it is the only place that development can take place. The chairman of the board of supervisors, Mr. Arrigoni testified before the committee and was assured the views of the Marin County Board of Supervisors would be given due consideration. But their views were completely ignored, and we do not have the right even to offer an amendment to give their wishes fair consideration in this House.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) in whose district this park is going to be built.

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

I may say I am really in agreement with the point the gentleman is making. On the other hand, as a coauthor of the bill I have been around here long enough, and the gentleman has been, to know that we do not always get a bill written precisely as we want, but I want certainly to underline two things the gentleman says.

I have a telegram from the Marin County Board of Supervisors which reiterates their testimony about this 8.25 acres.

I also did not realize the committee had slipped in this provision creating an extra position on the Supervisory Commission in terms that only one man can qualify, and if that man should leave the job on that County Board, then his successor on the County Board would be the only man who could qualify. I think this is a terrible way to legislate.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me reiterate the Marin County Board and the Planning Committee of Stinson Beach say they believe this 8.25 acres are necessary for logical growth and orderly expansion of the city of Stinson Beach, and if they say that I believe we in Congress ought not to impose our contrary will on them.

Remember this. If we defeat this motion to suspend the rules, then we can have a rule and we can offer an amendment to strike these two objectionable portions, and then we will have a park which we all favor of at least about 30,000 acres. I do not believe this 8.25 acres is going to ruin the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I respectfully ask the Members to vote "No" on suspending the rules and let the bill be brought up under regular procedure, under a rule, and then we can all vote on this fine recreational area.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am not in agreement with what my colleague from California says. It reminds me of something that was said by Danny Thomas years and years ago. Danny was portraying the part of an immigrant Lebanese boy and he was bragging about this country and what we could do in it.

I always remember that Danny made this statement:

America is a great country. You can do anything here you want to do, but don't do it in my front yard.

I have been on the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee for 12 years. I have never seen a time yet that I did not have somebody coming in and saying, "Well, we would like to have the park, but we want you to take this in or take that out."

I think the committee has done a pretty good job here and I hope this bill is not sent back for that reason.

I was not present in full committee at the time the amendment was made regarding the adding of an additional Commission member.

I think it would be fair to pass this bill and let us try to work this point out in conference. If there is something about this that is bad, I am sure that the conference can work it out.

I hope that this bill will be given very unanimous support.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 10834.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of legislation establishing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco and Marin Counties, and as a cosponsor of H.R. 10834, I am pleased to rise in support of this measure to include additional lands in the recreation area in order to assure its scenic quality and to provide needed access points to its planned recreational facilities.

Mr. Speaker, approval of H.R. 10834, notwithstanding the controversy involved, should properly be credited to our distinguished colleague and member of the Interior Committee, PHIL BURTON, who steadfastly and tenaciously guided the original legislation creating the Golden Gate National Recreation Area through the Congress in 1972. Throughout his service in the House, PHIL BURTON has been dedicated to the preservation of those areas now comprising the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and it is a tribute to his legislative skill, his tireless efforts and his leadership in the conservation movement, that we add these critical lands needed to perfect the boundaries of this outstanding scenic recreation area.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time.

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. 10834, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 284, nays 88, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—284

Abzug	Giaimo	O'Hara
Adams	Gibbons	O'Neill
Addabbo	Gilman	Owens
Alexander	Goldwater	Passman
Anderson,	Gonzalez	Pepper
	Calif.	Perkins
Anderson, Ill.	Grasso	Pettis
Andrews, N.C.	Green, Pa.	Peyser
Andrews,	Griffiths	Pickle
N. Dak.	Grover	Pike
Annunzio	Gude	Poage
Ashley	Haley	Poddell
Aspin	Hamilton	Preyer
Badillo	Hammer-	Price, Ill.
Barrett	schmidt	Quie
Bell	Hanley	Quillen
Bennett	Hanna	Randall
Bergland	Hansen, Idaho	Rangel
Biaggi	Harrington	Rees
Biesler	Harsha	Regula
Bingham	Hastings	Reuss
Boogs	Hawkins	Riegle
Bolling	Hays	Rinaldo
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Roberts
Breaux	Heckler, Mass.	Roe
Breckinridge	Heilstoski	Roncalio, Wyo.
Brooks	Henderson	Roncalio, N.Y.
Brotzman	Hicks	Rose
Brown, Calif.	Hillis	Rosenthal
Brown, Ohio	Hogan	Rostenkowski
Buchanan	Holifield	Roush
Burgener	Holtzman	Roy
Burke, Calif.	Hosmer	Runnels
Burke, Fla.	Howard	Ruppe
Burke, Mass.	Hungate	Ryan
Burleson, Tex.	Hunt	St. Germain
Burlison, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Sandman
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Sarasin
Byron	Jones, Ala.	Sarbanes
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Schneebeli
Carney, Ohio	Jones, Okla.	Sebelius
Carter	Karth	Seiberling
Casey, Tex.	Kastenmeier	Shipley
Cederberg	Kazem	Shriver
Chappell	Ketchum	Sikes
Clark	Koch	Slack
Clausen,	Kyros	Smith, Iowa
Don H.	Leggett	Smith, N.Y.
Cohen	Lehman	Snyder
Collins, Ill.	Long, La.	Staggers
Conte	Long, Md.	Stanton, James V.
Conyers	Lujan	Stark
Corman	McClory	Steele
Coughlin	McCormack	Steelman
Cronin	McDade	Steiger, Wis.
Culver	McFall	Stephens
Daniels,	McKay	Stratton
Dominick V.	McKinney	Studds
Danielson	McSpadden	Sullivan
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald	Symington
Davis, S.C.	Madden	Taylor, Mo.
de la Garza	Mahon	Taylor, N.C.
Dellenback	Mailiard	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Mallary	Thompson, Wis.
Denholm	Mann	Thone
Dent	Maraziti	Thornton
Derwinski	Mathias, Calif.	Tiernan
Dingell	Matsunaga	Udall
Donohue	Mayne	Ullman
Dorn	Mazzoli	Van Deerlin
Downing	Meeds	Vesey
Drinan	Meicher	Vigorito
Duiski	Metcalf	Waggoner
Duncan	Mezvinsky	Walde
Eckhardt	Milford	Wampler
Edwards, Calif.	Miller	Ware
Elberg	Minish	Whalen
Evans, Colo.	Mink	White
Evins, Tenn.	Mitchell, Md.	Whitehurst
Fascell	Mitchell, N.Y.	Whitten
Findley	Mizell	Widnall
Fisher	Moakley	Wolff
Flood	Mollohan	Wright
Flowers	Montgomery	Yates
Foley	Moorhead,	
Ford	Calif.	
Fountain	Moorhead, Pa.	
Fraser	Morgan	
Frenzel	Mosher	
Frey	Murphy, Ill.	
Froehlich	Murphy, N.Y.	
Fulton	Myers	
Fuqua	Natcher	
Gaydos	Nedzi	
Gettys	Nelsen	
	Obey	

Yatron	Young, S.C.	Zwach
Young, Ga.	Young, Tex.	
NAYS—88		
Abdnor	Edwards, Ala.	McEwen
Archer	Erlenborn	Madigan
Arends	Esch	Martin, Nebr.
Armstrong	Eshleman	Martin, N.C.
Ashbrook	Flynt	Mathis, Ga.
Eafalis	Forsythe	Michel
Baker	Ginn	Nichols
Bauman	Gooding	Parris
Beard	Green, Oreg.	Powell, Ohio
Bevill	Gross	Price, Tex.
Blackburn	Gubser	Rhodes
Bray	Gunter	Robinson, Va.
Brinkley	Guyer	Robinson, N.Y.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanrahan	Rousselot
Broyhill, Va.	Heinz	Ruth
Butler	Hinshaw	Satterfield
Chamberlain	Holt	Slusher
Clancy	Horton	Spence
Clawson, Del	Huber	Steiger, Ariz.
Cleveland	Hudnut	Symms
Collier	Hutchinson	Towell, Nev.
Collins, Tex.	Ichord	Treen
Conahie	Kemp	Wydler
Daniel, Dan	King	Wylie
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Landgrebe	Wyman
Davis, Wis.	Landrum	Young, Alaska
Dennis	Latta	Young, Fla.
Devine	Lent	Young, Ill.
Dickinson	Lott	Zion

NOT VOTING—57

Blatnik	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Boland	Johnson, Pa.	Royal
Bowen	Jones, Tenn.	Scherle
Brasco	Jordan	Shoup
Broomfield	Kluczynski	Stanton, J. William
Brown, Mich.	Kuykendall	Steed
Carey, N.Y.	McCloskey	Stokes
Chisholm	Mills	Stubblefield
Cochran	Minshall, Ohio	Stuckey
Conlan	Moss	Talcott
Cotter	Nix	Teague
Crane	O'Brien	Vander Jagt
Delaney	Patman	Vanik
Diggs	Patten	Wiggins
du Pont	Pritchard	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Fish	Railsback	Wyatt
Frelinghuysen	Rarick	Zablocki
Gray	Reid	
Hansen, Wash.	Rodino	
Hébert	Rogers	

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. Zablocki.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. Rodino with Mr. Talcott.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. J. William Stanton.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Scherle.
 Mr. Bracco with Mr. O'Brien.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Moss.
 Mr. Cotter with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. du Pont.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Vanik with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Royal with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Crane.
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. Kuykendall.
 Miss Jordan with Mr. Patman.
 Mr. Patten with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Conlan.
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Rogers with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Railsback.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Pritchard.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Cochran.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Shoup.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Wyatt with Mr. Bowen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I was detained on official business and missed the rollcall on H.R. 12628, the Vietnam Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments. I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON (H.R. 10203) WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10203) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

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

Mr. ROBERTS during the reading. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the managers on the part of the House, I am proud to bring to the floor the conference report on H.R. 10203, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, as amended.

The bill, as agreed to by the conferees, is the House bill with some of the additions and modifications contained in the Senate amendment and accepted by the House conferees. The major provisions in the bill reflect the position of the House. I would particularly like to mention four items in the bill which are of particular importance.

A new procedure for authorization of major water resources development projects is established. These projects are authorized only through what is called the phase I design memorandum stage of advanced engineering and design. This is the first stage of post-authorization planning, prior to commencement of construction, when the original project plan is reviewed and brought up to date, the final environmental impact statement is prepared, and the final decisions are made as to the precise nature of the project to be built.

The committee adopted this change in procedure because of its growing concern over the major changes that often take place in projects between the time a project is first authorized and the time detailed plans are prepared for construc-

tion. This new authorization procedure will give the Congress the opportunity just prior to construction to examine and affirm or modify any changes which may have taken place in a project.

The bill establishes a uniform procedure for deauthorization of projects. Under this procedure, the Secretary of the Army will annually submit to Congress a list of projects he has determined, after study and coordination with local interests, should no longer be authorized. After 180 days the projects become deauthorized unless the House or Senate Public Works Committee passes a resolution to the contrary. This will provide an orderly and efficient means of reducing the large backlog of old projects which do not meet present day criteria.

Federal agencies are directed to consider nonstructural alternatives when planning flood control projects. This provision will encourage the wise use of flood prone lands, the preservation of open spaces, and the preservation and enhancement of the environment. In fact, three projects are included in the bill which incorporate nonstructural alternatives—acquisition of natural storage areas in the Charles River Basin in Massachusetts, relocation of the inhabitants at Prairie du Chien, Wis., and flood plain acquisition for park purposes at the Chatfield Dam project in Colorado.

There is one last provision of the bill which I would like to discuss. This is the provision concerning the principles and standards used in the formulation and evaluation of water and related land resources projects.

In 1965 the Congress enacted into law the Water Resources Planning Act. The purpose of that act was to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprise with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

The act established the Water Resources Council to achieve the goal of comprehensive and coordinated planning. One of the specific duties assigned to the Council by the Congress was the establishment, after consultation with other interested entities, and with the approval of the President, of principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources. One part of these principles and standards is the discount rate formula to be used.

On December 24, 1968, the Water Resources Council adopted a new formula for computing the interest rate to be used in plan formulation and evaluation for discounting future benefits and computing costs. This formula is based on the yield rate of marketable securities which at the time of computation have 15 or more years remaining to maturity. The current rate—July 1973—under this formula is 5% percent.

In October of last year a new interest rate formula, prescribed by the Council, became effective. The rate, which is to be established initially at 6 1/8 percent and which may vary by one-half of 1 percent

per year, is to be based upon the estimated average cost of Federal borrowings as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average yield during the 12 months preceding his determination on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to a 50-year period of investment. This formula differs markedly from the previous formula adopted by the Water Resources Council in 1968.

We are greatly concerned with the effect this new discount formula would have on the justification of water resources projects that are essential to meet the needs of future generations. The higher the discount rate, the less future benefits are worth when discounted to present-day values. Thus, the formula encourages capital-intensive projects which provide for immediate or early near-future benefit returns, and lessens the opportunity to build projects which are designed to satisfy the needs of future generations.

We feel strongly that Congress must play a role in the establishment of principles and standards for water resources development. The bill accordingly provides that any changes in the interest rate formula must be approved by Congress, and enacts into law the 1968 formula.

The interest rate formula is but one aspect of water resource project formulation and evaluation, and cannot be considered in a vacuum. There is a real need for a complete examination of all the issues involved in project formulation and evaluation—not just the interest rate, but the principles and standards to be used and the Federal and non-Federal cost sharing to be employed. We cannot consider the discount rate to be used in evaluating benefits without also considering what benefits should be evaluated and how the evaluation should be made. Likewise, the appropriate Federal and non-Federal responsibilities must be considered in the formulation and evaluation of projects. For these reasons, the legislation provides for the President to study, and report to the Congress with his recommendations on, all of these matters—principles and standards, including the interest rate formula, and appropriate Federal-non-Federal cost sharing. When this report is received it will provide the Congress with the information it needs to examine the whole spectrum of issues involved in the water resources program and to come up with those changes it determines should be made. We look forward to receiving the report and intend to give it our thorough consideration.

There are some who claim that if the Congress takes the action intended by section 80 of the conference report, the executive branch is somehow limited in making recommendations as to specific projects. Some would argue further that the Congress has no right to reverse the action taken last October by the President and the Water Resources Council. I would point out the absurdity of these contentions by noting first, that the executive branch is free to make whatever recommendations it desires for whatever reasons it chooses as long as it furnishes

the Congress with the information that the Congress specifically requests; and second, the authority for the October action was as a result of an act of Congress, the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, and clearly what the Congress gives, the Congress can take back.

However, what is far more important than these arguments is that it is time for the executive branch and the Congress to jointly examine the future direction of the water resources development program and to determine where we want to go with it and how we get there.

It may turn out that after the President completes and submits to the Congress his study and recommendations—and after we review them in detail—we may be in agreement. And, then again, we may not be. Nevertheless, it is only through this procedure will we be able to give some direction and momentum to this program. Accordingly, I call upon all who may have some influence in the determination as to whether this legislation will or will not become law to carefully consider their actions and recommendations.

I firmly believe that section 80 is in the best interests of our Nation in providing a means for a reexamination of the entire scope—benefits, costs, interest rates, cost sharing, cost allocation, and objectives—of water resources development projects, and I urge the most serious consideration of this provision both by the executive branch and the Congress.

One section of the conference report that I believe requires further clarification is section 80 concerning the projects in the Potomac River Basin. The House provision was modified in the conference report so as to accept substantially the language of the Senate amendment—which essentially was a rewrite of the plan which had been included in the House version. The advocates of the amendment desired specific language in the section which would preclude the construction of Sixes Bridge Dam in Maryland until all elements of the plan were completed, including the Corps of Engineers' comprehensive study of the Potomac River Basin and the Washington metropolitan area, the study of the use of the Potomac estuary area as a source of water supply, and the report of the National Academy of Sciences-National Academy of Engineering on the scientific basis for the conclusions reached with respect to the use of the estuary for water supply and the estuarine pilot project.

At page 126 of House Report No. 93-541, which accompanied H.R. 10203, the Committee on Public Works stated unequivocably:

The Committee feels strongly that the three-element plan authorized and directed by this section is the best means of securing the necessary information needed to arrive at a decision as to what must be done to meet the water and related resources needs of the Potomac River Basin and the Washington Metropolitan Area. The Committee wishes to emphasize that in no event will the Sixes Bridge and Verona projects be authorized for construction until the Committee is satisfied, based on the results of the pilot program and on the comprehensive review study, that they are necessary.

This is still our position—despite the language of section 80 which would provide a limitation on construction only on Sixes Bridge Dam until the completion of all studies, it is our intent not to consider either project—Sixes Bridge Dam or Verona Dam in Virginia—for construction until the completion of all studies authorized by this section.

At this point, I would point out one technical error in the conference report which I believe to be of minor significance, but nevertheless has to be noted, and we would expect the Secretary of the Army to administer the provision in accordance with the congressional intent. In section 51 in the area described by that section, the words "shoreward of a line with" should read "shoreward of a line within".

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have computed the estimated costs to the United States in accordance with rule XIII(7) of the Rules of the House of Representatives—even though it is our understanding that rule XIII(7) does not apply to conference reports—which would be incurred in carrying out H.R. 10203, in fiscal year 1974 and each of the following 5 years. It is not possible at this time to predict the stages and the rate of construction of the various projects authorized in this legislation. Accordingly, the estimate which has been prepared by the Managers on the part of the House after consultation with the Corps of Engineers, is based on the total amount of authorization contained in H.R. 10203 for the 6-fiscal-year period. Such amount is \$551,393,900 for title I, the Water Resources Development Act of 1974, and \$780,000,000 for title II, the River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1974.

I would further point out that the \$551,393,900 authorized in title I includes modifications of and additions to existing emergency and disaster-type continuing programs. These consist of \$2,000,000 per year for planning assistance to States—section 22; \$3,000,000 per year for clearing and snagging for flood control—section 26; \$9,000,000 per year for emergency bank and shoreline erosion protection—section 27; \$25,000,000 per year for disaster relief services, plus a one-time reimbursement payment of \$30,000,000—section 45; \$5,000,000 per year for small flood control projects—section 61; and \$4,000,000 per year for additional flood plain information studies—section 64; or a total for these provisions of \$270,000,000.

I am, as always, deeply appreciative of the splendid leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), and the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES), and the cooperation given by the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN). I sincerely appreciate the counsel and the support of my other colleagues on the conference—the two gentlemen from California (Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. ANDERSON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROE), and the gentleman from Kentucky

(Mr. SNYDER). I would also commend the conferees on the part of the Senate, especially led by the Senator from Alaska, Mr. GRAVEL, for their helpful attitude, their patience, and their understanding of the position of the House when we explained it to them. My thanks to the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH; my colleague from Texas, Mr. BENTSEN; the Senators from North Dakota, Mr. BURDICK; Virginia, Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT; Tennessee, Mr. BAKER, and Vermont, Mr. STAFFORD.

Mr. Speaker, this was an unusually good conference and a highly successful one. All the conferees and the staffs on both sides worked together in a spirit of cooperation and understanding and I am delighted to present this conference report—the results of our joint efforts—to you, my good friends in the House, for your support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report in H.R. 10203.

As you remember, the President vetoed the last rivers and harbors bill passed by Congress. The President stated that the legislation was too costly. It has now been stated that objectionable features leading to a veto of the 1972 omnibus bill have been retained in this bill. This deserves comment.

As the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee of Water Resources has stated we have made a significant change in the method for authorizing new projects. We have provided in section 1 that large new construction projects are now authorized for the design stage only. Thus, even though a number of projects not recommended for construction by the administration have been authorized through phase I design, I must emphasize that this is not an authorization for construction. Such projects, after the design phase is completed, after the design is determined, and after a more detailed assessment of costs and benefits is made, will again have to face scrutiny by the Committee on Public Works, Congress, and the administration. This new approach to major projects reflects the need for thorough review. Let me emphasize, design authorization is not an automatic indication that construction authorization will follow.

I understand the administration opposes new Federal programs for streambank erosion. This deserves comment. I am sure most of us have witnessed the ravages of unabated erosion along many of our rivers and streams. Fertile farmland as well as urban areas are destroyed or threatened in hundreds of areas. Homes have been lost or threatened.

Mr. Speaker, the potential loss of productive lands and property damage from erosion may ultimately exceed the level of damage from any other natural force. Certainly, our hearings on H.R. 10203 demonstrated the severity of the problem.

Section 32 of the conference report, the "Streambank Erosion Control Demonstration Act of 1974," provides for an evaluation of the extent of erosion; research and development; a report to Congress on results and recommenda-

tions; and demonstration projects, including bank protection works.

The need for study of the problems of streambank erosion and demonstration projects is critical. This is a national problem; most if not all States are experiencing erosion problems. The provisions of the Streambank Erosion Control Demonstration Act of 1974 are most important. Possible administration opposition is not justified.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a report by the Comptroller General of the United States on dredging activities conducted and licensed by the Corps of Engineers. He recommended that the Congress establish a national dredging policy for the guidance of the corps. The committee commented on the report on page 5 of House Report 93-541 which accompanied H.R. 10203.

Both the House and the Senate have provided such guidance by appropriate language in the committee reports. The reports make it clear that Congress intends that the Corps of Engineers put out for competitive bid all dredging work which industry has the capability to perform and that such work shall be done by contract whenever reasonable prices can be obtained. By "reasonable prices" the committee means prices based upon a fair and reasonable cost to a well-equipped contractor.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has worked hard on H.R. 10203. We have today a conference report which reflects our national needs. I commend RAY ROBERTS of Texas, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, and DON H. CLAUSEN of California, the ranking minority member, who managed this bill. They have done their work well. I urge your support.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 10203. The conference report is a result of many days and months of effort by the Committee on Public Works, the committee of conference, and the Members of this body.

I believe that the conference report, which in all of its major national-scale provisions is essentially identical to the original House bill, meets the needs of our national water resources program. The fact that this conference report meets our needs reflects the hard work of the committee and the leadership, dedication, and hard work of the chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee, my good friend from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS). It has been a pleasure to work on this bill with his leadership and I commend the product of our efforts to the membership of the House.

In this vein, I would like to relate to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, an experience I shared with Chairman Roberts prior to the consideration of this legislation by the committee.

He and I met with Mr. Roy Ash and Mr. John Sawhill at the Office of Management and Budget. The basic thrust of the meeting centered around the Ad-

ministration's desire to keep the total authorization level at a reasonable and responsible level. Because of the backlog in funding water resource projects, it was a desire of all of us to keep authorization levels in line with our ability to appropriate funds.

As a result of the meeting, we set out to develop a dual phased authorization system to allow the Congress to review projects again after the advanced engineering and design stage is completed. Thus, decisions on the costly construction stage will be made in the future after the design is fixed, the cost estimates have been refined, and the benefits have been stated in more detail.

It is this kind of innovative thinking that has characterized the leadership of the gentleman from Texas in his handling of this legislation and in his responses to a variety of suggestions that have been made regarding the bill. It was a privilege for me to have worked with him.

Another new and important provision in this legislation is the deauthorization section which will permit inactive projects to be completely deauthorized. There are from time to time requests that certain projects be deauthorized. It was wise and appropriate for the Committee to set up an automatic procedure for deauthorization so that a special bill need not be introduced and considered by the Congress for each project which is to be terminated.

As I pointed out when we originally had this bill before this body, section 80 of this legislation could be the basis for a recommendation to the President by OMB that H.R. 10203 be vetoed. I say to you today that I hope this will not be the case. Section 80 of H.R. 10203 would enact into law the interest rate formula used in the formulation and evaluation of water resource projects as established by the Water Resources Council in 1968. This amendment to section 80 of the conference report make it clear that all of the provisions of the Water Resources Council's 1968 discount regulation including subsection 3 apply.

As we noted on page 120 of the original committee report on H.R. 10203:

Section 80 does not in any way preclude the President or the Water Resources Council from submitting to the Congress alternative legislative proposals for an interest rate formula.

In addition, we recognized in the conference report that the administration may desire to send to the Congress its recommendations on cost sharing. We have specifically invited the administration to submit such recommendations for congressional review.

Our provisions in section 80 are intended to provide time for further study and review of the methods for evaluating long-range water resource projects. We believe the proposal recently approved by the President could place long-range water resources needs in jeopardy. We feel strongly about this and feel as though the Congress should be in the position to be able to further study and evaluate the methodology for the evaluation of water resource projects.

Also, the bill as approved by the Conference Committee totals \$551 million in

February 19, 1974

authorizations. This represents a \$700 million decrease from the original bill which was vetoed by the President. This substantial decrease has been accomplished even though the scope of this legislation is not much different from the initial measure.

Another key provision in this bill is the section permitting the use of non-structural alternatives for flood control purposes. These alternatives include such things as channel stabilization, flood proofing, and relocation.

While there are specific nonstructural flood control projects listed in the bill, it is certainly the intent of the committee that this provision apply to all water resource projects so as to permit the modification of existing authorized projects, thereby permitting more flexibility in co-ordinating channel stabilization with flood-proofing and relocation.

The committee believes very strongly in the value of this section and expects that its full potential will be explored by those Federal agencies involved in the formulation of flood control projects and plans under this new authority.

This provision has nationwide relevancy and I can give as an example the Eel River Basin and Delta in my own congressional district. There is a wide variety of nonstructural action plans that can be developed to help reduce the damages caused by flooding on an interim basis, that can be coordinated with and integrated into the comprehensive basin plan for flood protection and prevention.

These include improving the channel of the river, removing structures from the flood plain, designing buildings so as not to be devastated by floods. None of these, of course, can come close to preventing all, or even most, flood damage in this particular basin and the Eel River Valley and Delta areas, but they can serve to lessen financial loss and personal hardship to a great degree and possibly be completely successful at times of minor flooding.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on a statement made by the senior Senator from Tennessee at the time the other body considered this legislation. Senator BAKER's remarks appear on page S229 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 22.

The Senator appeared to be taking exception to language in the Senate committee report on the bill relating to the use to that which appeared on page 5 of House Report 93-541.

I wish to emphasize that the views of the Senator from Tennessee do not reflect the intent of the House Committee on Public Works. The language on page 5 of our report on the bill does in fact reflect the thinking of our committee. There should be no misunderstanding on this.

Let me again thank RAY ROBERTS for his leadership on this bill. I urge that our colleagues give their full support to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, during this past week, I flew over the flood-stricken areas of Humboldt, Mendocino, and Sonoma Counties. In addition, I had a number of meetings with flood victims and local officials concerned with and/or affected by the flood problems.

I make this point to once again remind my colleagues of the continuing threat of floods and the need for the Congress to maintain its support for flood control and disaster relief legislation.

Further, I want to make a personal observation and comment regarding a lovely young lady, Miss Laurabelle Rocha, a senior student from Ferndale Union High School. Miss Rocha and her family reside near the Eel River and they are intimately familiar with annual flood threats and devastation that has taken place in the Eel Delta.

Laurabelle is in Washington this week attending the Presidential classroom and has been observing from the executive gallery of the House Chambers here today.

I have been explaining to her in my office, the various alternative plans for flood control, we have for dealing with the Eel Basin and the Eel Delta areas. She has a deep and abiding interest in this legislation and other legislative proposals of the past and has expressed her concerns to me.

It is my hope that some of the provisions of this legislation will provide us with more flexibility to move forward, on interim flood protection measures, and at the same time integrate the effort into the longer range Eel River watershed conservancy program review recently approved by our water resources subcommittee.

I further hope this will prove to be an historic and productive day for Miss Rocha and our neighbors who live in the Eel River Valley.

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

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation for the hard work done by the conferees, particularly the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 10203, Water Resources Development Act. The report before us today contains important specific project authorizations to benefit many communities throughout the country, as well as river basin monetary authorizations.

In view of the Presidential veto, at the close of the 92d Congress, of similar water resources legislation it is, in my judgment, imperative that the House take affirmative action on this conference report in order for long-delayed projects to be undertaken. The authorizations involved include municipal water control efforts, flood control projects and bridges.

Of particular concern to the Third Congressional District of Arkansas is the section 16 authorization for construction of a highway bridge over Norfork Reservoir in the area where U.S. Highway 62 and Arkansas State Highway 101 were inundated as a result of the construction of Norfork Dam and Reservoir. This provision would correct a long-standing inequity and bring about overdue relief to a constant transportation problem which

has hampered economic growth and greatly inconvenienced citizens in north central Arkansas.

Since 1943, transportation along two major routes has been interrupted and is presently dependent upon a totally inadequate and outdated ferry service.

When the Norfork Dam was constructed, the settlement amount with the State of Arkansas was inadequate to construct a bridge or relocate U.S. Highway 62 or State Highway 101 after the critical material ban of the war years was lifted. Under the terms of section 16 of the 1973 Water Resources Development Act, the State of Arkansas would, upon completion of the bridge by the Corps of Engineers, reimburse the United States the sum of \$1,342,000 plus interest for the period from May 29, 1973. It would then be owned and maintained as a free highway bridge by the Arkansas State Highway Department.

This bridge will bring about great economic advancement for the surrounding area in increased tourism and greater flow of interstate commerce, since U.S. Highway 62 is a major route roughly east-west across northern Arkansas and State Highway 101 goes north into Missouri from Henderson, Ark., along the eastern edge of Lake Norfork.

With the State of Arkansas willing to make full restitution of the funds it received three decades ago from the Federal Government, in my judgment, it is certainly time for the Federal Government to provide just and equitable compensation to the loss suffered by the people and State of Arkansas by replacing the bridges.

In addition to the important bridge provision, this 1973 Act also authorizes alteration of the municipal water supply facilities of the city of Conway, Ark., to restore capacity which existed prior to construction of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system.

Another section of the act provides for the acquisition of lands for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses caused by the Cache River project, up to 30,000 acres of land, subject to approval by the district court for the eastern district of Arkansas.

Of nationwide importance in water resources development, this conference report has a provision designed to nullify the new regulations promulgated in 1971 by the Water Resources Council on a new discount rate formula for evaluating projects. This act would require the Corps of Engineers to continue to use the 1968 procedures that have one benefit category—national economic development—and a 5% percent discount rate. Water resources development continue to be critical in the well-being of our Nation. If the higher discount rate figure recommended in 1971 were used to re-evaluate the 377 active authorized projects, only 176 of these would remain viable at the higher rate of 6% percent.

I urge my colleagues to support the 1973 Water Resources Development Act.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 10203.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to commend the distinguished minority leader of the subcommittee and the members of the committee, for an outstanding job.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Water Resources Subcommittee of our Public Works Committee I am especially pleased to support passage of our Water Resources Development Act conference report. In many ways this \$1.3 billion bill is a landmark in developing the Nation's water resources.

Of special interest to our people in South Carolina is the section authorizing and directing the Corps of Engineers to conduct a national demonstration project at Broadway Lake in Anderson County. Broadway Lake is presently "dying" due to continued silting and growth of aquatic life. Our bill directs the Corps of Engineers to restore the lake, at an estimated cost of \$400,000, and to report on its results so that the techniques developed in cleaning up Broadway Lake might be applied in a national program to restore silted lakes.

Mr. Speaker, our Broadway Lake provision was included in our original House bill but was omitted from the Senate bill. Therefore, we especially want to thank and commend the Senate and House conferees for agreeing to accept the House version with respect to Broadway Lake.

Broadway Lake is a major public recreation area for one of our State's most populous and growing regions. We are delighted that the heavily used lake will be restored and that we will be able in this way to make a major contribution to the national program to restore other lakes in similar condition. This will be a tremendous advance for environmental improvement on a national scale.

Mr. Speaker, we are glad that over the years we have had the opportunity to participate in developing our Nation's water resources. One can only speculate how desperate our overall energy situation would be, especially with respect to electric power generation, had we not pressed forward with development of our water resources. Our Nation's environment has been immeasurably enriched. Our committee has authorized flood control programs and rivers and harbors programs that have paid for themselves many times over in benefits to all Americans. The bill before us today continues in that great tradition, and I am proud to be a member of the Public Works Committee, which is responsible for this investment in the future of America.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) who may be our new Chairman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, that introduction is somewhat premature.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and the members of the subcommittee for bring-

ing about a great innovation for capital improvements in water resources development.

If the Members will recall when we brought the bill to the floor some time ago, the preamble of the report put in place the requirements for the necessity of water conservation, and we related it to the energy situation that presently exists. In anticipation of the problems that may arise, here was a dislocation of the amount of water and how it is to be restricted.

In this conference report and in the bill itself and the hearings we put full recognition on that problem with an emphasis which I think will draw great attention from the Members of the House as to how we are going to make future distribution of water in the areas of this country where it is lacking.

This bill is a good piece of legislation and will go far to improving this Nation's water resources program. It contains many major provisions needed to meet the water resources needs of the country more effectively and efficiently. One of the important innovations in the bill is that large water resources projects are no longer authorized through construction, but only through what is known as the phase I stage of advanced engineering and design. The committee adopted this change in procedure in recognition of its growing concern over the major changes that often take place between the time a project is authorized and the time detailed plans are prepared for construction. This new authorization procedure will give the Congress the opportunity to reaffirm or modify its original authorization in keeping with the new information that becomes available.

Another provision of the bill would direct Federal agencies to consider non-structured alternatives in the planning of flood control projects. This will encourage the wise use of flood prone lands and protection of the environment.

The bill establishes a uniform procedure for deauthorization of projects. Under this procedure, the Secretary of the Army will annually submit to Congress a list of projects he has determined, after study and coordination with local interests, should no longer be authorized. After 180 days the projects become deauthorized unless the House or Senate Public Works Committee passes a resolution to the contrary. This will provide an orderly and efficient means of reducing the large backlog of old projects which do not meet present day criteria.

The bill also contains an important provision with regard to the formulation and evaluation of water resources projects. The interest rate formula to be used in evaluation of projects, promulgated by the Water Resources Council in 1968, is enacted into law, and cannot be changed except by act of Congress. We recognize the need, however, to take a new look at the whole process of project formulation and evaluation. Accordingly, we have included a provision directing the President to study, and report to Congress with his recommendations on, the principals and standards, including the interest rate formula, to be used in the formulation and evaluation of water resource projects, and appropriate Fed-

eral-non-Federal cost-sharing. This will give us the information we need to consider any changes in these matters.

One other matter which must be addressed soon is the impending water crisis facing this Nation.

On a gross quantity basis, the total amount of water available in our country is ample for foreseeable needs for domestic use, industry, agriculture, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other beneficial purposes. The problem is that the Nation's water supply is not uniformly distributed in time or place. We are continually faced with damaging excess supply in time of flood and equally damaging shortage in time of drought. The coming crisis will not be one of total quantity, but one of gathering, storing, and delivering water where and when it is needed.

We must act today to avert the coming crisis, since the leadtime between decision to act and online operation of facilities is long—often 10 to 15 years.

We must be prepared to make the financial investments necessary to avert future water shortages and we need to take a broader view of regional water resource development. A new and fundamental emphasis must be placed on planning and implementing programs to assure the continued availability of water to our Nation.

We must plan for a vigorous economy and healthy growth for our Nation, and not allow complacency, shortsightedness, or neglect to bring the impending crisis upon us.

I commend the chairman, as I said, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the others who have worked so diligently and so long in their efforts to improve the legislative process as well as their earnestness to try to build these capital improvements that are going to mean so much for the future welfare of our Nation.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) such time as he may consume.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) for the fine job he did as chairman of the committee of conference on H.R. 10203, the Water Resources Development Act of 1974. I also wish to commend the entire membership of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and of the full committee for their efforts which resulted in this bill coming to the floor.

This legislation contains many significant and innovative provisions which will insure the continued viability of the Nation's water resources program. This program has already resulted in vast benefits to the country through the prevention of floods, the generation of hydroelectric power, the provision of municipal water supply, recreation opportunities, fish and wildlife enhancement, and navigation improvements. The navigation improvements have been of particular benefit in providing low cost transportation of raw and finished products necessary to our economy and way of life. With regard to maintenance of these projects, we pointed out in the committee report on H.R. 10203 that the Comptroller General, in a report to Con-

February 19, 1974

gress on dredging activities, recommended that Congress provide guidance to the corps as to what the role of the Federal Government should be in meeting the future national dredging requirements. The Comptroller General's report indicated that the dredging industry has an "idle" dredge plant rate of 53 percent based on the latest statistics. The report also pointed out a conflict between the corps' policy for maximum utilization of its own dredging plant with the corps' general policy of contracting for dredging.

Much of the dredging work done by Government equipment is not put out to industry for competitive bids. The purpose of the report language is to give industry an opportunity to competitively bid on such work which industry has the capability to perform. In addition, full utilization of the dredging industry capability will help to avoid spending Federal funds for the costly rehabilitation and replacement of existing Government equipment. Government dredges will continue to be utilized to perform work which industry may not have the capability to perform or when reasonable prices cannot be obtained or where emergency or other circumstances make contracting with private contractors impracticable. Along the same line, Government cost estimates for competitively bid dredging jobs should be based on a reasonable cost to a well equipped and efficient dredging contractor and not on the basis of the cost of performing dredging in-house with corps-owned dredges. This is what we on the House Public Works Committee meant when we refer to "reasonable prices" in the "omnibus bill."

I am also pleased to note the following provisions which are of particular interest to my State of California.

Authorization of the use of the San Francisco Bay Delta model for research on proposals affecting the environmental quality of the region.

Studies of the local cooperation and appropriate cost sharing for the Santa Cruz Harbor and the Anaheim Bay projects.

An amendment to the Disaster Relief Act to provide that the costs of replacing certain community facilities shall include the cost of obtaining substitute services insofar as they exceed the normal costs of providing the services.

Authorization of construction of a two lane, all weather road from Weimar, Calif., to Spanish Dry Diggings, Calif., as a replacement for roads which will be inundated by construction of the Auburn Reservoir.

Authorization of a fish hatchery on the Russian River to mitigate the fish losses occasioned by operation of the Cayote Dam.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to another distinguished member of the committee on conference, the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 10203, the Water Resources Development Act, which would authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain projects on rivers

and harbors designed to aid in navigation and prevent flooding.

And I would like to emphasize the importance to California of two specific sections which will benefit our State by, first, reimbursing local governments for added expenses incurred by the February 9, 1971, earthquake, and, second, establishing a shoreline erosion control program.

REIMBURSEMENT

The purpose of the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 was to aid those communities which were devastated by floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and other natural phenomena. The law, however, has been interpreted in such a way as to deny Federal funds for the added costs to those areas that were forced to find alternative services—at higher prices—to replace services which were interrupted by the disaster.

When the Sylmar earthquake knocked out power sources and water supplies for areas within Los Angeles County and, as a result, the local governments were forced to purchase more expensive water and power from alternative sources, the local taxpayers were asked to foot the bill for the nearly \$20 million in added costs.

The conference report before us today would correct this inequity by amending the Disaster Relief Act to permit the Federal Government to incur these additional costs if the Federal Administrator decides that the services—such as water and power—are necessary for the health and well-being of the people of the community.

And since these services were obviously necessary, the Federal Government will be permitted to reimburse the local agencies for these added costs totaling nearly \$20 million.

While this section will aid the people of the Los Angeles area, it will also aid other communities by encouraging them to provide essential services—even at higher costs—when tragedy strikes. Obviously, when disaster hits a community, the public welfare must be the highest priority without overburdening the local citizens with expensive water and power.

SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL

Mr. Speaker, of our many assets, our beaches certainly deserve a high rating. Yet, as each year passes, we witness a deterioration of our shores, caused by high tides, winds, and the pounding surf. And the costs of preserving these national assets are high and sometimes prohibitive for the local taxpayer alone.

The conference report attempts to take a first step toward preserving our coastal beaches by establishing a program to develop and demonstrate low-cost means to prevent and control shoreline erosion.

Under this provision, the Corps of Engineers is directed to establish and conduct a national shoreline erosion control development and demonstration program with demonstration projects at no less than two sites each on the shorelines of the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, as well as on the Great Lakes and Alaska.

At the conclusion of this study and from the information gathered at the project sites, we should be in a position

to effectively preserve our beaches and coasts through low-cost conservation methods.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is designed to meet our pressing needs in navigation, in flood prevention, in disaster situations, and in preserving our invaluable coasts. I was pleased to serve as a conferee on this measure, and I urge my colleagues to adopt this important legislation.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

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

How does this conference report compare with the bill that was vetoed by the President in 1972?

Mr. ROBERTS. It is a substantially different bill and a much improved one. One significant change is that in this bill large projects of the Corps of Engineers are no longer authorized through construction, but only through what is known as the phase I design memorandum stage of advanced engineering and design. This new authorization procedure will give the Congress the opportunity just prior to construction to examine and affirm or modify any changes which may have taken place in a project.

Another important change was made in the provision of the bill concerning the discount rate formula to be used in the formulation and evaluation of water resources projects. The vetoed bill simply established the interest rate formula to be used. H.R. 10203 specifies the interest rate formula, but in addition provides for the President to make a study of all of the principles and standards to be used in formulating and evaluating water resources projects and of appropriate Federal and non-Federal cost sharing for such projects and to submit a report to the Congress with his recommendations. This will enable the executive branch and the Congress to jointly examine the future direction of the water resources development program and to determine where we want to go with it and how we get there.

Mr. WYLIE. What is the difference in the amount of money in each bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. The estimated total amount of authorizations in the vetoed bill was \$458,000,000. The comparable authorizations in H.R. 10203, title I, total \$551,000,000. I might point out that the \$458,000,000 figure for the vetoed bill is not a realistic figure because that bill contained many partial project authorizations, a procedure which both we and the administration have found to be unsatisfactory because partial authorizations of that type are commitments to build entire projects.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would also remind the gentleman that we have included in this bill the river basin authorizations. They would normally have been taken up this year separately but for the fact that the 1972 bill was vetoed. Thus, we have included it as a separate item, and as a result the total cost of the bill is around \$1.3 billion including the authorization of \$551 million for the phase I authorizations.

Mr. WYLIE. That is about the same as it was before, then.

Mr. ROBERTS. The gentleman is quite correct. Title II of the bill, the River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1974, is usually considered as a separate bill. It is only included in H.R. 10203 because this is the year in which it normally would have been considered. As the gentleman knows, it is the title I authorizations which are, in effect, being considered out of normal sequence because of the veto of the last authorization bill.

H.R. 10203 is really two bills instead of one.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would yield for one more question.

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

Mr. WYLIE. I notice in the report accompanying the conference, it says in the bill which previously passed in 1971, the so-called cost-benefit ratio was such that it would yield a rate of about 6% percent on water projects approved, and in this conference report the cost-benefit yield has been reduced to 5½ percent.

Mr. ROBERTS. The 6½ percent to which the gentleman refers is the interest rate used in evaluating water resources projects under the new formula established by the Water Resources Council last October. In H.R. 10203, we continued in existence the 1968 formula of the Water Resources Council and provided for a complete study of the whole question of project formulation and evaluation as I pointed out earlier.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman. The reason for that is to include additional water projects and the gentleman does not think the figure is unrealistically low then?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, I do not.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS. I have one other request for time, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON).

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the conference committee. I was interested to see section 23, because it is important to the Great Lakes area because it enables the Environmental Protection Agency to assist in clearing disposal facilities that could not be constructed in the past because of local contributions.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) and the other members of the conference committee for their cooperation and assistance.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the distinguished chairman of our Water Resources Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) for the outstanding job he has done in chairing the committee of conference on H.R. 10203. I wish also to extend my appreciation to the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), and to the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, the gentleman from California (Mr. Don CLAUSEN), for their very able assistance and cooperation on this bill.

This bill contains many important

items. One of the items which I find particularly important, coming as I do from the Great Lakes area, is section 54, the Shoreline Erosion Control Demonstration Act of 1974. This section directs the Corps of Engineers to conduct a national shoreline erosion control development and demonstration program to consist of planning, constructing, operating, evaluating, and demonstrating prototype shoreline erosion control devices, both engineered and vegetative, on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, and on the shores of the Great Lakes. These projects will emphasize the development of low-cost shoreline erosion control devices, and will provide the Congress with the information it needs to solve the erosion problem.

There is also another provision in the bill of importance to shoreline erosion damages. Section 27 authorizes emergency protective works to protect public facilities from damages caused by streambank and shore erosion.

I am also pleased to note the following provisions which are of particular interest to my State of Minnesota:

Authorization of a flood protection project for Rochester, Minn.—Zumbro River Basin:

Authorization of a survey study of the East Two Rivers between Tower, Minn., and Vermillion Lake;

An extension of the demonstration program for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes until December 1976 and an increase in funding to \$9,500,000;

Authorization of a study of the feasibility and practicality of constructing a hydraulic model of the Great Lakes and an associated technical center in the vicinity of Duluth, Minn.;

Amendment of the Corps of Engineers' emergency authorities to permit the corps to provide emergency supplies of clean drinking water on a temporary basis to any community which is confronted with a source of contaminated drinking water likely to cause a substantial threat to the public health; and

Authorization of the necessary measures to correct the design deficiency in the Knife River Harbor on Lake Superior, Minn.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to express to my colleagues in the House of Representatives my strong support of the conference report of H.R. 10203, the Water Resources Development Act of 1974. The construction, repair, and preservation of public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control which will be supported by this legislation are urgently needed.

I wish to specifically make reference to section 61 of the conference report, which will increase the allotments for small flood control projects from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 in areas where a major disaster has occurred within the past 5 years. In the 11th District of Massachusetts as well as many other areas throughout the country, this provision is of vital importance in providing for the small flood control projects which are desperately needed to protect residences and businesses from the threat of floods.

A regional conservation planning

board in the South Shore area of Boston has notified me to emphasize the fact that many small flood control projects which are well along in the planning stages will not be executed unless the dollar limitation is increased, as provided in section 61 of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the conference report to H.R. 10203, as many flood-prone areas of Massachusetts will greatly benefit by passage of this legislation.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 10203 strongly merits support as a measure reflecting heightened concern for the environment, and accordingly I urge its adoption by an overwhelming vote.

I also wish to express my appreciation to Chairman RAY ROBERTS, ranking minority member DON CLAUSEN and other members of the Water Resource Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee for their receptivity to at least three of my proposals incorporated in the bill at my request. A direct outgrowth of problems in the Second District of New Hampshire, these provisions should also be of considerable benefit elsewhere.

NONSTRUCTURAL ALTERNATIVES

They include encouragement of nonstructural alternatives to traditional approaches to flood protection, establishment of a procedure for deauthorization of dams no longer deemed in the public interest, and expansion of the size of eligible emergency projects where riverbank deterioration threatens adjoining public facilities and other structures.

I also welcome inclusion of another provision, which I strongly supported, which makes possible an innovative approach to flood prevention in the Charles River Basin in Massachusetts. Employing the natural impoundment capacities of upstream wetlands to absorb potential floodwaters, this approach evolved in the committee as a logical application of one nonstructural alternative.

The nonstructural alternatives in the bill include regulation of construction in flood plain, floodproofing of existing structures, acquisition of flood plain lands for recreational, fish and wildlife, and other purposes, and relocation of threatened facilities.

The bill would require that such alternatives be given due consideration in the planning of federally assisted projects, along with conventional measures such as dams, dikes, and levees, with the disruption which such facilities construction can entail. Structural and nonstructural measures can be taken in combination, with a resulting reduction in the scope of construction involved.

It simply makes no sense to go in flood-prone areas, leaving no alternatives but costly construction or postflood relief. Similarly, it makes no sense to protect uncontrolled development—which can intensify the flooding potential of heavy rainfall—in urban areas while creating demand for flood-control impoundments upstream in what may be rural areas of an adjoining State.

Some of these approaches have been evolving administratively, on paper, but this measure will put teeth in the requirement by building into law the pos-

sibility of challenges to construction projects for which nonstructural alternatives have not been fully considered.

DEAUGHRIZATION

The dam deauthorization provision, and outgrowth of my experience in the tortuous process in having a dam long authorized for Claremont, N.H., scrubbed from the books, should lift from many areas the blighting effects of the threat that a dam may someday be constructed. This problem is common to many areas of the country.

The provision increasing the size of riverbank protection projects is a direct outgrowth of problems experienced in Charlestown, N.H., which the town selectmen and I have been wrestling with for literally a matter of years.

For these and other reasons, I urge my colleagues to adopt the report and the President to sign this legislation into law.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 10203, the Water Resources Act. This bill contains authorization necessary for the completion of the urban river project in Salisbury, Md., an imaginative and very important plan to revitalize the business district in that city.

Section 97 of this bill declares the southern prong of the Wicomico River, which flows through Salisbury, to be nonnavigable. This is necessary to permit construction of bulkheads and other alterations required for completion of the project drawn up by the Greater Salisbury Committee. The urban river project will be a catalyst for the redevelopment and revitalization of the downtown area of the city, which has been undergoing a rebirth in recent years. The plan, which was drawn up by a renowned architectural and engineering firm, has been adopted as part of the comprehensive plan for the city of Salisbury. Several million dollars will be invested in the project by the city, as well as some \$12 million by private interests.

I wish to thank members of the Senate and House Public Works Committees and the conferees on this bill for including the provisions allowing the Salisbury project. I particularly want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), all of whom cooperated to include this provision in the bill.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report now pending before this Chamber—the conference report on H.R. 10203, the Water Resources Act. I do so because I believe most of its provisions to be worthy of the support of the Members and the public interest we represent.

A conference report is, by definition, a compromise between the House and Senate over particular matters in which those two bodies were in disagreement. As a compromise, there is, understandably, a lot of give and take, as both sides strive toward the important final re-

sult—getting a bill to the respective floors for final action, thence to the President for signature or veto.

There are several projects within this conference-reported bill which pertain to western New York, and I am grateful that the deliberations of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works, as well as the struggles of the conference committee, produced their inclusion in the bill.

I think particular words of thanks are in order for the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. BLATNIK; the ranking minority member of the full committee, Mr. HARSHA; and to Mr. ROBERTS of Texas and Mr. DONALD CLAUSEN of California, the chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

There is one particular provision, section 54, the proposed Shoreline Erosion Control Demonstration Act of 1974, which I think warrants particular attention. It embodies one of the most significant, new approaches in the long-standing Federal commitment to works of improvement—to protect life, limb, and property—in recent years. I strongly support its enactment.

I personally know, from the many conversations I have had throughout my congressional district, of the tragic damage which has been caused to both personal property and to the environment by shoreline erosion. I have visited the affected areas along the shores of Lake Erie and have seen instances where property in which entire life savings have been invested is being washed away. A single storm that battered the southern shore from March 16 through March 26 of 1973 caused an estimated \$1 million in property damage and shoreline erosion in just one site in Erie County, N.Y.

The problems occasioned by the erosion of our Nation's shorelines are myriad. And, the complexity of the problem pales into virtual insignificance when compared to proposed solutions. We cannot ignore the fact that, in addressing ourselves to the beach erosion issue, we are interjecting ourselves into the ceaseless struggle between land and water, each of which gives a little and takes a little. Remedial engineering techniques and devices can, at best, usually only slow the rate of erosion, an erosion which customarily comes as a gradual decrement of the beach area but occasionally comes as an extraordinarily severe cutting away of massive areas of the shoreline. Slow water currents occasion the former; storms and excessive tides, the latter.

In summary, though, the end results are the same:

Homes are jeopardized and sometimes totally lost, and these are not always the "second" or "weekend" homes of the well-to-do, for they are often the sole residences of families which have placed the bulk of all their personal earnings into their equity and furnishings;

Commercial and industrial facilities, ranging from manufacturing plants to marinas, are damaged and, in some instances, must be abandoned or relocated;

Public service facilities and structures—such as, roads, storm and sanitary

sewers, utilities—are damaged or destroyed;

Economically vital sections of real estate are wholly or partially abandoned to the elements, causing distresses and turmoil in local economies;

Important recreational and park areas are lost or severely damaged;

Pollution occasioned by silt is worsened; and

Because of inadequate Federal assistance and disaster relief coverage, local government is called upon to bear costs far exceeding its normal taxing capacities.

Recognition of the old adage that "man's eternal proclivity is to build upon flood plains" does not, however, remove from government an affirmative obligation to protect life and property against the ravages of nature, when man has built on such flood plains because they are the most practical and viable places on which to build, to live, to work, and to play.

It has been an American tradition, going back to the earliest days of the Republic, for Government to participate in meeting the costs of works of improvement—public works of genuine need—essential to the preservation of life and property and to the facilitation of commerce among the States. Government has built flood control works, erosion control structures, channelization levees, dikes—all in an effort to retard flooding or ferocious water, to lessen damage to life and property, and to alleviate the sufferings which arise from such natural disasters as floods, storms, and so forth. Federal participation in beach erosion control is consistent with that tradition.

The Great Lakes have been the site of severe shoreline erosion, both by storms and by the gradual wearing away of the shore. The severe storm of March 1973 to which I have referred left shoreline areas throughout the Great Lakes in disaster conditions.

One of the most severely damaged sites was at Hoover Beach in Erie County, N.Y. As a result of this storm and the persistent erosion already having been suffered there, nearly a full mile of the Hoover Beach shore was severely effected, with 65 residences damaged. State and local authorities determined the damage to be of disaster proportions. Losses to real estate, including a loss of the land, are continuing. There has been severe damage to retaining walls and structures by the undercutting action of the water. Temporary excavations to retard the erosion have, themselves, been washed away. And, damage is continuing to accumulate.

The provisions of the bill before us constitute a great stride toward alleviating these severe conditions.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, to establish and conduct for a period of 5 fiscal years a national shoreline erosion control development and demonstration program. The program shall consist of planning, construction, operating, evaluating, and demonstrating prototype shoreline erosion control devices, both engineered and

vegetative. Such projects "shall be undertaken at no less than two sites each on the shorelines of the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts; the Great Lakes; and the State of Alaska," and at several other specifically named coastal locations. The demonstration projects may be carried out on private or public lands, except that no funds appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for the acquisition of privately owned lands.

I have compared the factual circumstances appertaining to the Hoover Beach site location with the testimony offered before the committees, with the language of the bill, and the various reports which accompanied the bill as it wound its way through the legislative maze, and I am convinced that the Hoover Beach site lends itself demonstrably to the type of project envisaged by this bill.

I have communicated this opinion to both the Secretary of the Army, Howard H. Callaway, and to the Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. F. J. Clarke.

I have also begun to solicit the support of the private sector, including corporations internationally known for the construction of shoreline erosion control devices.

The Hoover Beach Association, a group of dedicated and conscientious residents of the area, have worked diligently to harness State and local public funds and private capital to alleviate the erosion conditions. Now, let us hope that this new Federal commitment can come to their long overdue aid.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my appreciation to those in committee most responsible for this legislation for having reflected the voices of those of us who have long sought the inclusion of this authority in law. I know I speak for thousands of families on the Great Lakes who have seen their lives detrimentally affected over the years by uncontrolled or inadequately controlled erosion. Now, we are to have a new beginning. I trust it is only the first step in a long, national commitment to help resolve this problem.

EROSION CONTROL ESSENTIAL TO SOUTHEASTERN OHIO COMMUNITIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to act on the Water Resources Development Act conference report, I would again like to underscore the significance of section 32 of the bill.

Section 32 deals specifically with the increasingly serious problem of streambank erosion by giving the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers a much broader role in preventing and controlling erosion on navigable rivers and assisting in the repair of damaged shoreline.

Demonstration projects will be initiated at four "multiple sites" including along the Ohio River. Because of the severe damage incurred to public and private property along the stretch of the Ohio I represent, I can say that empowering the corps to develop methods and means of bank protection is not only necessary but long overdue. The steady erosion by river forces has washed valuable farmland away, ruptured highway foundations, and endangered home and public facilities. Believe me, there is nothing more discouraging

to a property owner than to see a river eat away his land and threaten his physical safety. It must be stopped.

For many years now, I have been working with the Army Corps of Engineers trying to find a remedy to curb the erosion process to Ohio and protect the river homes and communities. In one case, the very foundation of the municipal parking lot is about to crumble because of unchecked erosion and in another situation the retaining walls of a village's sewage lagoons are being washed into the river.

Section 32 is absolutely necessary to efforts to stabilize riverbanks and to help construct bank protection works at critical points on the Ohio River.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) and all of the conferees for the excellent and speedy work of the conference committee on the Water Resources Development Act of 1973. The report represents a most reasonable compromise between the House passed measure and the bill approved by the other body.

This legislation is significant in that it adopts a new national policy for the approval of major water resources projects. As I have previously stated, we will no longer walk blindly into authorizing projects which may later become environmental red herrings. Individual projects will be considered through phase I design and advanced engineering studies. After completion of such studies, projects will be considered for authorization based upon phase I findings. If environmental or other major controversies should appear during phase I design and studies, the project could then be reviewed in its new light and halted, if necessary, before construction begins.

This measure also provides that non-structural alternatives to be considered for flood control projects. This provision is another key environmental gain. Rather than building dams, such an approach includes floodproofing of structures and flood plain acquisition for recreation, fish, and wildlife.

The Water Resources Development Act is also significant to the people of the New York City metropolitan area.

First, it provides for the relief of the Rockaway beaches in Queens, which are threatened by serious erosion. This provision was introduced by me, and co-sponsored by 30 other members of New York State's House delegation and by both New York Senators. Section 72 of the bill will permit the Corps of Engineers to proceed immediately to commence work on beach erosion control at the Rockaways. I have received assurances that the corps will begin work on beach erosion control by May or June of this fiscal year.

This will be welcome news to the residents of the area and to the millions in the metropolitan area—particularly those of low and moderate income—who use the beaches for their recreational activity.

A second project of vital importance to the metropolitan area is the provision of the legislation which provides for the collection and removal of drift and

sunken and abandoned vessels from New York Harbor; \$14 million are authorized for the harbor cleanup.

The inclusion of the New York Harbor provision in this bill is the culmination of a 10-year effort which involved many members of the New York congressional delegation. The section was introduced by myself and cosponsored by 16 other members of New York City's House delegation and by Senator JAVITS. In a harbor which is a national, if not an international resource, this measure is important for both commercial and health reasons.

Damage to public and private shipping amounts to over \$5 million annually. Furthermore, health problems are created when drift and debris jam the tide gates permitting the intrusion of salt water into the sewerage system at high tide and causing raw sewage to wash out into the harbor when the tide goes out. Over the past 8 years, the city of New York has spent over \$14 million in removing deteriorated piers which are a source of drift and debris. However, due to fiscal constraints, it is not possible for the city to complete the job alone. This provision will provide much needed Federal assistance to alleviate health and environmental problems from the harbor, as well as to protect shipping from damage.

Because of its environmental provisions and because of its benefit to the New York City metropolitan area, among other reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the Water Resources Act. I do so because of the importance to the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey.

No single problem within the 12th Congressional District has consumed as much of my time as the flooding that has afflicted communities in the Rahway River Basin.

The bill under consideration today will increase the funds available for the flood control project on the Rahway River by \$300,000. These funds will allow the Federal Government to pay for the relocation of utilities within the channel wall.

The Rahway River in Union County has caused severe hardships to people whenever it overflowed its banks. The completion of this flood control project is of the utmost importance to the people of my district. I am hopeful that passage of this bill will move us a step closer to the day when rainfall will no longer cause terror in the hearts of people living near the Rahway River.

Previously, I was instrumental, along with Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, in obtaining additional funds to advance flood control studies at Cranford, so as not to delay similar work at Springfield and Clark, which are ahead of the Cranford schedule.

In addition to the benefits for the 12th Congressional District, this bill will provide other needed projects throughout the Nation, including an innovative program to halt the serious beach erosion that is occurring along the entire coastline.

Since it does so much to improve and

February 19, 1974

preserve our Nation's waterways and seashores, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to the Members of the House who participated in producing the conference report for the Water Resources Development Act of 1974.

I was especially pleased to see that the conference report includes as one of its sections the text of a certain bill I introduced last session.

Essentially, the section eliminates the existing authorization for construction of a huge diversion channel intended to relieve flooding conditions in St. Landry and Evangeline Parishes and authorized in its place the enlargement of the natural water escape route. Also, the section authorizes the addition of more culverts to speed the water toward the Gulf of Mexico.

I would point out that in accepting this section the House can help solve a severe flooding problem, satisfy ecological considerations, and promote the economy of St. Landry and Evangeline Parishes, all at the same time.

The flooding problem the section would correct is one that has been caused by Federal flood control projects in Louisiana and other States. St. Landry Parish and to some extent, Evangeline lie in an area that was never flooded until the elaborate system of levees was built along the Mississippi and Atchafalaya Rivers. These levees block drainage from the natural basins of the rivers and cause flooding in formerly upland areas. The enlargement of Bayou Courtaleau and the installation of additional culverts will allow more of this blocked drainage to pass into the rivers.

Environmentally, the section will spare the parish from the destruction of the 500 foot right-of-way previously authorized. By enlarging the existing bayou, we will preserve a beautiful hardwood forest, a Scout camp and a game management area.

Another beneficial effect of the section will be to relieve the citizens of the area of the burden of paying all the costs of disposing of the spoil and waste from the project. Normally, local interests are required to pay substantial amounts for disposal, but this section recognizes that these flooding problems are the direct result of other Federal projects. As a result, the costs of correcting the problems should be borne by the Federal Government, as is called for by this section.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to take part in the creation, consideration and passage of this legislation. I believe the bill is sound and well-balanced. I urge the House to adopt the conference report.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum

is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 4, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]
YEAS—374

Abdnor	Davis, Wis.	Hosmer	Pepper	St Germain	Tiernan
Abzug	de la Garza	Howard	Perkins	Sandman	Towell, Nev.
Adams	Dellenback	Huber	Pettis	Sarasin	Treen
Addabbo	Dellums	Hudnut	Peyser	Sarbanes	Udall
Alexander	Denholm	Hungate	Pickle	Satterfield	Ullman
Anderson,	Dent	Hunt	Pike	Schneebeli	Van Deerlin
Calif.	Derwinski	Hutchinson	Poage	Schroeder	Vander Jagt
Anderson, Ill.	Devine	Ichord	Powell, Ohio	Seiberling	Veysey
Andrews, N.C.	Dickinson	Johnson, Calif.	Freyer	Shipley	Vigorito
Andrews,	Diggs	Johnson, Colo.	Price, Ill.	Shriner	Waggoner
N. Dak.	Dingell	Jones, Ala.	Price, Tex.	Shuster	Walde
Annunzio	Donohue	Jones, N.C.	Pritchard	Sikes	Walsh
Archer	Dorn	Jones, Okla.	Quie	Sisk	Ware
Arends	Downing	Karth	Quillen	Slack	Whalen
Armstrong	Drinan	Kastenmeier	Randall	Smith, Iowa	White
Ashbrook	Dulski	Kazan	Rangel	Smith, N.Y.	Whitehurst
Ashley	Duncan	Kemp	Rees	Snyder	Whitten
Aspin	du Pont	Ketchum	Regula	Spence	Wiggins
Badillo	Eckhardt	King	Reuss	Staggers	Williams
Bafalis	Edwards, Ala.	Koch	Rhodes	Stanton,	Wilson, Bob
Baker	Edwards, Calif.	Kuykendall	Riegle	James V.	Wilson, Charles H.
Barrett	Eilberg	Kyros	Rinaldo	Stark	Calif.
Bauman	Erlenborn	Landgrebe	Roberts	Steed	Winn
Beard	Esch	Landrum	Robinson, Va.	Steele	Wolf
Bell	Eshleman	Latta	Robinson, N.Y.	Steelman	Wright
Bennett	Evans, Colo.	Leggett	Roe	Steiger, Ariz.	Wydler
Bergland	Evins, Tenn.	Lehman	Roncalio, Wyo.	Stephens	Wylie
Bevill	Fascell	Lent	Rooney, Pa.	Stratton	Wyman
Blaggi	Findley	Litton	Rose	Studds	Yates
Biester	Fish	Long, La.	Rostenkowski	Sullivan	Yatron
Bingham	Fisher	Long, Md.	Roush	Symington	Young, Alaska
Blackburn	Flood	Lott	Rousselot	Symms	Young, Fla.
Boggs	Flowers	Lujan	Roy	Taylor, Mo.	Young, Ga.
Boiling	Flynt	McClory	Runnels	Taylor, N.C.	Young, Ill.
Bowen	Foley	McCollister	Ruppe	Thompson, N.J.	Young, S.C.
Brademas	Ford	McCormack	Ruth	Thomson, Wis.	Young, Tex.
Bray	Forsythe	McDade	Ryan	Thone	Zion
Breaux	Fountain	McEwen		Thornton	Zwach
Breckinridge	Fraser	McFall			
Brinkley	Frenzel	McKay			
Brooks	Frey	McKinney			
Brotzman	Froehlich	McSpadden			
Brown, Calif.	Fulton	Macdonald			
Brown, Mich.	Fuqua	Madden			
Brown, Ohio	Gaydos	Madigan			
Broyhill, N.C.	Gettys	Mahon			
Broyhill, Va.	Gialmo	Maillyard			
Buchanan	Gibbons	Mallary			
Burgener	Gilman	Maraziti			
Burke, Calif.	Ginn	Martin, Nebr.			
Burke, Fla.	Goldwater	Martin, N.C.			
Burke, Mass.	Gonzalez	Mathias, Calif.			
Burleson, Tex.	Goodling	Mathis, Ga.			
Burlison, Mo.	Grasso	Matsunaga			
Burton	Green, Oreg.	Mazzoli			
Butler	Green, Pa.	Meeds			
Byron	Griffiths	Meicher			
Camp	Grover	Metcalfe			
Carney, Ohio	Guibser	Mezvinsky			
Carter	Gude	Michel			
Casey, Tex.	Gunter	Milford			
Cederberg	Guyer	Miller			
Chamberlain	Hamilton	Minish			
Chappell	Hammer-	Mink			
Chisholm	schmidt	Mitchell, Md.			
Clancy	Hanley	Mitchell, N.Y.			
Clark	Hanna	Mizell			
Clausen,	Hanrahan	Moakley			
Don H.	Hansen, Idaho	Mollohan			
Clawson, Del.	Hansen, Wash.	Montgomery			
Clay	Harrington	Moorhead, Pa.			
Cleveland	Harsha	Calif.			
Cohen	Hastings	Morgan			
Collier	Hawkins	Mosher			
Collins, Ill.	Hays	Murphy, Ill.			
Collins, Tex.	Hebert	Murphy, N.Y.			
Conable	Hechler, W. Va.	Myers			
Conte	Heckler, Mass.	Natcher			
Corman	Heinz	Nedzi			
Coughlin	Heistoski	Neisen			
Cronin	Henderson	Nichols			
Daniel, Dan	Hicks	Obey			
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hillis	O'Brien			
Daniels,	Hinshaw	O'Hara			
Dominick V.	Hogan	O'Neill			
Danielson	Holt	Owens			
Davis, Ga.	Holtzman	Parris			
Davis, S.C.	Horton	Passman			

Perkins	St Germain	Tiernan
Pettis	Sandman	Towell, Nev.
Peyser	Sarasin	Treen
Pickle	Sarbanes	Udall
Pike	Satterfield	Ullman
Poage	Schneebeli	Van Deerlin
Powell, Ohio	Schroeder	Vander Jagt
Price, Ill.	Seiberling	Veysey
Price, Tex.	Shipley	Vigorito
Pritchard	Shriner	Waggoner
Quie	Slater	Walde
Quillen	Sisk	Walsh
Randall	Slack	Ware
Rangel	Smith, Iowa	Whalen
Rees	Smith, N.Y.	White
Regula	Snyder	Whitehurst
Reuss	Spence	Whitten
Rhodes	Staggers	Wiggins
Riegle	Stanton,	Williams
Rinaldo	James V.	Wilson, Charles H.
Roberts	Stark	Calif.
Robinson, Va.	Steed	Winn
Robinson, N.Y.	Steele	Wolf
Roe	Steelman	Wright
Roncalio, Wyo.	Steiger, Ariz.	Wydler
Rooney, Pa.	Stephens	Wylie
Rose	Stratton	Wyman
Rosenthal	Studds	Yates
Rostenkowski	Sullivan	Yatron
Roush	Symington	Young, Alaska
Rousselot	Symms	Young, Fla.
Roy	Taylor, Mo.	Young, Ga.
Runnels	Taylor, N.C.	Young, Ill.
Ruppe	Thompson, N.J.	Young, S.C.
Ruth	Thomson, Wis.	Young, Tex.
Ryan	Thone	Zion
	Thornton	Zwach

NAYS—4

Steiger, Wis. Wampler

NOT VOTING—51

Blatnik	Jordan	Royal
Boland	Kluczynski	Scherle
Brasco	McCloskey	Shoup
Broomfield	Mann	Skubitz
Carey, N.Y.	Mayne	Stanton,
Cochran	Mills	J. William
Conlan	Minshall, Ohio	Stokes
Conyers	Moss	Stubblefield
Cotter	Nix	Stuckey
Crane	Patman	Talcott
Culver	Patten	Teague
Delaney	Railsback	Vanik
Frelinghuysen	Rarick	Widnall
Gray	Reid	Wilson,
Holfeld	Rodino	Charles, Tex.
Jarman	Rogers	Wyatt
Johnson, Pa.	Roncalio, N.Y.	Zablocki
Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, N.Y.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Patman.	
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Teague.	
Mr. Gray with Mr. Wyatt.	
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.	
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Holfeld.	
Mr. Boland with Mr. McCloskey.	
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.	
Mr. Nix with Mr. Moss.	
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Stokes.	
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Frelinghuysen.	
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Shoup.	
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Conyers.	
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Crane.	
Miss Jordan with Mr. Culver.	
Mr. Patten with Mr. Broomfield.	
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Mayne.	
Mr. Reid with Mr. Scherle.	
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Conlan.	
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Roncalio of New York.	
Mr. Mills with Mr. Cochran.	
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Skubitz.	
Mr. Mann with Mr. J. William Stanton.	
Mr. Rogers with Mr. Talcott.	
Mr. Royal with Mr. Widnall.	
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Railsback.	

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 32 on February 13, 1974, I am recorded as voting "present" on a rollcall vote to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union on the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act bill. I would like the record to reflect my statement following the vote on rollcall No. 32, showing that I would have voted "aye."

THE HOUSE SHOULD EXERCISE LEADERSHIP IN THE ENERGY CRISIS AND ENACT GAS RATIONING LEGISLATION

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rejoice in the victory that took place in Michigan, the election of the Democratic candidate, but I think if we Democrats are going to profit from those victories we have got to establish the leadership that the people are looking for us to establish.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, just before this House recessed for the Lincoln's Day holiday, I took this well to plead with Members not to stall on passing the emergency energy bill. Whatever other flaws that bill might have, I said then, it did contain authority for the rationing of gasoline supplies, and the situation at the gas pumps in this country, I said, had already become so intolerable that the rationing of gasoline was the only fair and reasonable solution to the problem. If the President was not going to order rationing, I said, then we in Congress ought to exercise the leadership the public was desperately looking for, and order rationing ourselves, before we left town or another 5 days of recess.

No one rose in the Chamber that evening to second my remarks. Instead the replies were along strictly political lines, that if the country was in a mess it was the President's fault, and why should we do anything to help relieve a situation that he was responsible for?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gas lines were chaotic and intolerable on February 7 they are far worse today. And still the administration refuses to act.

But one other thing has happened since February 7, Mr. Speaker, that we ought not to forget. The polls have indicated that if the President is in grave disfavor because of his inability to handle the energy crisis among other things, Congress is in even greater disfavor. The President's favorable quotient is 29 percent; ours is only 21 percent.

Does not that tell us something, Mr. Speaker, about the value of the accepted wisdom around here on the best way to handle the energy crisis, that whatever else we do, do not touch rationing with a 10-foot pole because it will get us all defeated at the polls in November, if we have to go to rationing to arrange it so it is the President who takes the rap?

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the purveyors of this accepted wisdom have been paying much attention to the American people these last few weeks. The American people are completely fed up with long lines at gas stations. The American people are fed up with spending an inordinate amount of their time and their limited gas supplies searching for and standing in line to get gas on the present catch-as-catch-can system we are operating on. In the present vacuum of Federal leadership State after State has moved forward to set up its own partial rationing system. But even this will not do the job, I am afraid.

What the people want is some system that will let them know in advance how much gas they can count on, and let them buy it without interminable waits and endless searches.

How many times have we heard that Congress must recover its proper powers, that we, not the Executive, must begin to exercise our share of the national leadership. Well here is a perfect chance to do just that, and yet our major concern seems to be to do nothing that might run the risk of incurring disfavor with the people.

But can anything be in less disfavor, Mr. Speaker, than an institution with only a 21 favorable rating? If we do not want to run the risk of doing something unpopular we might as well give up legislation altogether.

I say the time for this House to act is now, by taking over the leadership in this energy chaos and enact a fair and responsible gasoline rationing plan promptly, to end turmoil, chaos, and confusion at our gas stations that could shortly blow this country apart.

PROVIDING RELIEF FROM INFLATION FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing four measures designed to assist our senior citizens who have caught the brunt of our inflationary economy. Recent increases in social security have helped, but the comments I have received from thousands of senior citizens indicates that they are still losing ground. The Federal Government has not moved fast enough to keep pace with the elderly's needs, and I offer this package of legislation to at least ease some of their financial burdens.

First, I am introducing a bill to provide property tax relief to those citizens over 65. This legislation would give a tax credit on Federal returns for up to \$800 for real estate taxes paid—or an equivalent percentage of rent paid to give relief to those who do not own their homes. Under this proposal an individual over 65 would get 100 percent credit for the taxes paid at \$6,000 per year family income, and declining percentages of the amounts paid up to \$11,000 per year family income. In no event would the credit exceed \$800 per family.

The second bill would provide out-of-hospital prescription drug coverage un-

der medicare for those who suffer from the most common of life-threatening chronic diseases that plague the elderly. This proposal was passed by the Senate in the last session, but has never been cleared by the House Ways and Means Committee. The bill would create a "Formulary Committee" to select the specific drugs to be covered under the program and would require a nominal \$1 copayment by the medicare patient for each prescription. The drugs to be selected would cover patients for such diseases as diabetes, high blood pressure, all types of heart diseases, respiratory diseases, arthritis, rheumatism, gout, tuberculosis, cancer, and epilepsy.

The third measure would eliminate capital gains treatment on the sale of an individual's primary residence. This proposal is not limited to the elderly, but recognizes the hardship that many people, especially the elderly, endure when they are forced to move and cannot comply with the present requirement of purchasing another house within 1 year in order to avoid capital gains tax. The Congress has already taken one step in eliminating capital gains on houses by giving individuals an indefinite postponement of capital gains tax as long as they buy another house. The real inequity occurs, however, when people decide they do not want to live in a house any more and they want to move into an apartment. In many instances after all those years of postponing capital gains tax, the time to pay the tax comes when an individual can least afford it, when he or she is a senior citizen living on a fixed income. This situation came to my attention when an elderly woman in Delaware called me and told me that she literally could not afford to move out of her house, even though the cost of maintaining the house was beyond her budget. She had lived in the house for over 40 years, so it had a very low basis. Because it had appreciated over the years, the capital gains tax would have been sizable. She needed to realize all the gain if she were to continue to live comfortably. If you think about it, however, much of her gain was simply due to inflation. In short she was paying a tax on inflation at a time she needed every penny she could get to provide for her future. This bill would give senior citizens a chance to realize the fruits of a lifetime investment without having to pay a substantial tax.

The last measure would remove what I consider one of the obvious inequities in the social security laws. This is a country where we pride ourselves in self-reliance, but our laws place a \$2,100 limitation on the outside income that social security recipients may earn before their benefits are reduced. I have received many comments from senior citizens who object to the provision and believe that it destroys any incentive for them to go out and supplement their meager social security income. My bill would remove this limitation all together, leaving the elderly to remain productive members of society and still allow them to fully benefit from the social security system to which they contributed for so many years.

Marshall McLuhan said that "a com-

munity in which the elderly do not play an integral and central role is not really a community at all." If we do not lift some of the financial burdens that our elderly must bear in this fast-moving society, they will not be able to be active, productive members of the community. If that is the case all of us will be the losers.

HOLD THE LINE

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I am aware, just as every Member of this body is aware, that the recent budget proposed by President Nixon contains a significant pay increase for the Members of Congress; Presidential appointees, including members of the President's Cabinet; Federal judges; and top level executives in the administrative branch of Government.

On previous occasions, when such measures were presented to this House, I have spoken in opposition to them and I intend to do so again this year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that this Congress has the responsibility to curtail public spending and that the Members of Congress should rightfully set the example. The national debt of these United States is rapidly approaching one-half trillion dollars and I am told that this debt exceeds the combined indebtedness of all other countries throughout the world.

I have just returned from my district and I find my constituents to be universally opposed to further increases in salary levels which they view as being quite adequate at the present time. The sentiments expressed by those Alabamians who have written to me and spoken with me personally about this matter are identical to those views expressed in an editorial entitled "Hold the Line," which appeared in that outstanding Alabama newspaper the Birmingham Post-Herald on February 8, and in an editorial in the LaGrange Daily News entitled "Congress Sets Sorry Example," also of February 8.

I can hardly see how this 93d Congress can ask for prudence and thrift in other branches of Government unless we begin right here in this House by saying "no," to the recommended pay increases as contained in the President's budget.

I suggest that Members who share these sentiments should sign the discharge now at the Speaker's desk. This will provide a means to bring the matter before this body for a vote. I also hope that each Member takes the time to read the two editorials which so ably express the views of so many Americans regarding this matter.

HOLD THE LINE?

During the next few weeks members of Congress will be forced, one way or another, to decide whether in these times of economic stress and in the face of pressures toward a more austere way of life for all Americans, they can get away with approving a boost in their own salaries.

And American taxpayers will have a chance to watch many of their elected federal representatives try to wiggle out of making that agonizing decision publicly.

President Nixon's budget provides for these raises, as well as for similar boosts for presidential appointees, including cabinet members; top-level careerists in the executive branch, and federal judges. The general plan is for a 7.5 per cent raise in each of the next three years, which, when compounded, means about 24 per cent. In the case of the members of Congress, this would hike the current figure of \$42,500 to \$52,800 by 1976.

Under the law, the raises become effective automatically unless Congress votes against them by March 6.

Naturally, most members of Congress want the raise, but they have a major problem in saying so. This is an election year when every member of the House and one-third of the senators must face the voters. They have no liking for the prospect of watching their opponents make political capital of the fact that the incumbents voted to give themselves more money—in times like these.

Consequently, they'll do everything possible to avoid the issue.

Soon after the budget was submitted on Capitol Hill, Rep. H. R. Gross, R-Idaho, traditional House gadfly, and Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, introduced resolutions condemning the proposed raises. These resolutions were referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both chambers. And there, unless enough pressure is brought to bear, they will be allowed to die, and no member of Congress will have been called upon to stand and be counted. The raises will be in force.

However, if a vote is forced to the floor of either House or Senate there's a good chance a majority of the members won't have the gall to vote themselves the money. Only one chamber need vote against the proposal to kill it.

In due fairness, it should be noted that the salaries affected by the proposed raises have been frozen for five years. However, it should be noted further that congressional prerequisites—fringe benefits—involve such items, among others, as cheap insurance, munificent pensions, free haircuts, free postage, free travel and subsidized restaurants add up to sizable dollar additions to the base pay.

The larger view of salary scales for federal officials in general, in whatever branch; also brings into focus the long-debated problem of "comparability" with jobs of similar responsibility in private industry. During most of the nation's history, federal officials were, by comparison, underpaid. Sometimes, grossly so.

However, in recent years federal officials have made great economic strides. The plea that they are poor relations is no longer valid.

So, we come back to the original question: is this the right time for federal pay raises; or should they be deferred for a year or two? Or should Congress scale down the raises to a more modest level, say 5 per cent per year.

If concerned taxpayers have thoughts on the subject—and they should—now is the time to make those thoughts known. Write your congressman and senators and tell them what you think. And send a copy to the chairmen of the Senate and House committees. They are:

Sen. Gale W. McGee, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C. 20510.

Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Remember—if no action is taken on the floor of either House or Senate, the raises go through as proposed.

CONGRESS SETS SORRY EXAMPLE

Prematurely, as it turned out, President Nixon told Congress two years ago in his message on the State of the Union that "the inflationary psychology which gripped our nation so tightly for so long is on the ebb."

Far from having ebbed, the inflationary expectations which have prevailed so long are even more widespread now than they were two years ago. The responsibility rests with the federal government itself.

Congress demonstrated its own inflationary expectations in the federal pay act of 1967 when it created an advisory commission to review congressional salaries and those of other top-ranking employees in the legislative, executive and judicial branches every four years and to make pay recommendations to the President.

With their submission by the President, the recommendations become effective within 30 days unless one congressional branch or the other votes to the contrary.

Congress never would have created such a commission if it had thought for a moment that a pay cut ever would have been justified by declining living costs.

Thus it betrayed its own inflationary expectations, as it did later when it attached a cost-of-living escalator to Social Security retirement benefits.

With this example before them, other less comfortably protected individuals in both the public and private sectors proceeded to press for whatever they could get, and the national leadership was in no moral position to admonish restraint.

In 1964, Congress voted itself a raise of about 33 per cent—from \$22,500 to \$30,000.

In 1969, it voted itself a 41 per cent raise—from \$30,000 to \$42,500.

The 41 per cent increase between 1964 and 1969 contrasted to a 14 per cent rise in living costs during the same period.

Expected now is a presidential proposal to raise congressional pay by 7 per cent in March and by 7 per cent in each of the two ensuing years.

Such a proposal, along with its foregone acceptance by Congress, would set a sorry example on the part of a government which constantly admonishes the private sector to practice wage and price restraint.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT OF 1970 SHOULD NOT BE EXTENDED

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which expresses the sense of the House "that the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 should not be extended beyond its present expiration date of April 30, 1974."

It is also my intention, Mr. Speaker, to sponsor a special order in the House on or about March 6, 1974, in order to allow my colleagues to join me in a discussion of the need to abolish the controls completely. As you are probably aware, the Committee on Banking and Currency is expected to hold hearings sometime in March on the future of economic controls in this country.

Since the controls were first imposed in August 1971, they have introduced intolerable distortions in the operation of the free market mechanism, while at the same time permitting the primary cause of inflation, unrestrained Federal spending, to go unchecked. In addition, economic controls have provided a major cause of the "demand-pull" inflationary pressures that we are now experiencing in such vital commodities as food and gasoline. To continue the controls can only further aggravate the shortages that are so severely affecting every consumer in our Nation. In an article which ap-

peared in *Newsweek*, December 31, 1973, Dr. Milton Friedman, professor of economics at the University of Chicago, stated conclusively: "The key to today's shortages is the price freeze ordered by President Nixon on August 15, 1971."

As one who has opposed the use of wage and price controls ever since this discretionary authority was first given to President Nixon in 1970, I am convinced that if this body takes the lead now in passing my resolution, and refuses to extend the controls, even selectively or on a stand-by basis, we can restore economic stability. In testimony before several committees of the House and in statements I have made on the floor, I have consistently supported the following initiatives as being the real and only solutions to curbing the inflationary spiral:

First. Congressional control of the budget.

Second. Balancing Federal spending with anticipated receipts.

Third. Systematic repayment of the public debt.

Fourth. Congressional control over the Federal Reserve Board and thereby controlling its creation of new money:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power "To coin money, regulate the value thereof."

If some of you still believe that selective controls are necessary, I would like to direct your attention to an article written by Dr. C. Jackson Grayson, Jr., chairman of the Price Commission during phase 2, which appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* on February 6, 1974. Dr. Grayson states:

Continued controls are not going to help the shortage problem. If anything, they will prolong shortages because of the lack of increased incentive (profits) to invest and expand quickly. Management, labor, and capital will delay action or even flow elsewhere. The result could then reach a point where arguments would be made that the federal government must invest to expand capacity through direct investment (to wit, the proposed federal oil and gas corporation).

While some people would agree with the philosophy of total decontrol, they would stop short of energy decontrol. For the same reasons as given above, I would not.

Yes, prices will increase. (They are going to increase anyway, with controls.) Yes, prices would increase more rapidly with decontrol. But the solution to the shortages would also be faster as price served its function of rationing and as incentives were increased for supply of more energy sources. Again, help for people with lower incomes should be done with mechanisms other than continued wage/price controls.

Similar arguments can be made for also removing controls from other sectors popularly nominated for long term controls—construction, health, food.

It's easy to get into controls, but as we are now witnessing, hard to get out. It is time to act with courage. Let's get out, and let's get out completely.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in sponsoring similar resolutions, and to participate in the special order in March.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 should not be extended beyond its present expiration date of April 30, 1974.

DISAPPROVAL OF PAY INCREASE

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which is identical to H.R. 2154, sponsored by my distinguished colleague, and minority leader Congressman JOHN J. RHONES. The bill provides that if a resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President for pay increases under the Federal Salary Act of 1967 has not been reported at the end of 10 calendar days after its introduction, then it is in order to move to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution. The resolution could then be brought to a vote as a highly privileged resolution.

Under the existing circumstances, H.R. 2154 offers the only possible method of securing a vote in respect to the currently proposed congressional pay increase. If adopted, this bill would offer such a method in the future for a vote by the full House so that salary increases for Members of Congress and certain officials of the executive branch and judiciary would not take place automatically but would be subject to a vote upon the merits of the recommended increase.

The Federal Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries has recommended a 25-percent increase for Members of Congress and similar pay raises for other high governmental officials. Although the power to set pay levels for Members of Congress and those officials on the executive schedule of compensation, I want to share with my colleagues my views in opposition to this increase and my support for a resolution of disapproval, which must be passed by either House of Congress by March in order to counter the Commission's recommendations.

I realize that the escalating cost of living has adversely impacted citizens throughout the Nation, and that those who serve in Congress have not been exempt from the shrinkage in buying power of the dollar. In fact, there are high demands brought about on a Member's salary by virtue of conscientious service in Congress. But this is not the central question. We are faced with the question of equity and, in my judgment, an increase would be inequitable to the taxpayer's of our Nation. I appreciate this opportunity for explaining my reasons for opposing it.

First, I am basically against an administrative procedure whereby a significant sum of Federal funds may be expended without the requirement that Members of Congress take a stand. These salaries are a congressional responsibility in which those who would benefit should not be enabled to stand behind procedural formalities.

Second, but not less importantly, is this grave problem of governmental spending and rising national debt. It is becoming more and more evident that a significant portion of the cure for our economic ills lies in improving congressional control over the spending mechan-

ism. I have sought, during the 93d Congress as well as in the past, to approach all legislative proposals with a sense of fiscal responsibility. A 25 percent total increase, even in increments, does not meet this important test. The Federal Salary Commission's jurisdiction includes many officials of the executive and judicial branches of our Government; the recommended increase for this group would cost \$25 million annually in salary costs. The addition of retirement benefits to this figure would inflate the already large price tag.

Third, it was the U.S. Congress that passed the Economic Stabilization Act and subsequent amendments and extensions. Although many segments of our economy have been "decontrolled" and wage guidelines are now generally voluntary standards, the 5.5-percent-pay-increase percentage is adhered to as one means of controlling inflation. To my way of thinking, it would be most inconsistent with the spirit of the law as well as a poor example of responsible leadership to implement an aggregate 25-percent increase in the compensation of those who head the three governmental branches. I am aware that it has been 5 years since an increase in the Federal executive salary schedule and that, in the last 4 years alone, consumer prices have risen 20 percent. However, it is becoming more and more imperative that the Government operate within strict budget limits if we are to maintain a healthy economy and avoid additional acceleration in inflation and increased taxes. Under these strictures, many existing governmental programs have been curtailed or abolished.

Finally, there are millions of Americans who must continue to manage their households on fixed or retirement income; it is this group of citizens who are most severely burdened by the effects of years of inflation. It is my view that, taken from the perspective of the taxpayers who must foot the bill, the recommended increase is not justified and, further, such a raise in our own salaries would constitute a harsh insult. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2154 and, once the pay recommendation is brought to the floor, to vote against it.

LOST CAUSES

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago yesterday after the remarkable Democratic victory in a long-held Republican seat in Pennsylvania, I brought some smiles to the Republican side of the aisle when I mentioned this could foretell the loss of some 70 Republican seats.

Perhaps laughter, rather than smiles will be induced today, when I note that if the pattern in yesterday's Michigan election holds, there will be over 100 Republicans who will not be returning to the House of Representatives. That should provide a real chuckle for our Republican colleagues. We Democrats, of course, may be only dreaming—but the thought does make life more enjoyable.

The two special elections held thus far show a phenomenal fall off in the Republican vote compared with the Democratic vote.

This fall off has been totally ignored by the political experts who kissed off the first special election—Pennsylvania 12—as proving nothing one way or the other.

Nonetheless, in that election the Republican vote fell 32 percent below the average GOP vote in the 10 previous elections while the Democratic vote remained virtually the same as the Democratic average over the past 20 years.

The phenomenon occurred in the second special election—Michigan 5—held yesterday. The Republican vote dropped a whopping 55 percent below the average for the past 10 elections while the Democratic vote was only 7 percent below the average.

In both instances, the GOP vote fall off is even more severe when compared with the GOP average in the past decade only rather than in the past two decades.

A fall off in voter participation in special elections is to be expected; however, it should affect both parties, not just one. Thus something other than normal fall off—be it Watergate, the energy crisis or the economy—is causing great numbers of potential Republican voters to either stay at home or vote Democratic.

Following is a summary of the vote fall off in two special elections held thus far:

	Pennsylvania 12		Michigan 5	
	Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican
Average vote				
1954-72	61,086	89,015	57,099	103,295
1974 vote	60,550	60,320	53,008	46,159
Fall off	1 — 536	2 — 28,695	3 — 4,091	4 — 57,136

¹ 1 percent. ² 32 percent.

³ 7 percent. ⁴ 55 percent.

A NEW FORMULA FOR TITLE I OF ESEA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, within the next several weeks the House will be considering H.R. 69, the bill reported by the Education and Labor Committee to amend and extend the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

One of the most controversial sections of that bill during the first session of the 93d Congress was the formula for the distribution of title I funds among school districts throughout the Nation.

In its deliberations in late January, the Education and Labor Committee adopted a new formula for title I which I believe rectifies many of the problems with the old formula. Let me tell you briefly about the elements of the new formula and how those elements insure that a more equitable distribution of funds will emerge.

First, the bill improves upon the old law by adopting a more flexible and realistic approach to the definition of low income. Since 1965 when ESEA was first

enacted, we have used the set dollar figure of \$2,000 to identify low-income people. That figure remained the same through 1974 and did not reflect such obvious variables as the size of family in income requirements. Because of that, it made no difference whether a family had one child and a \$1,950 income or five children and an income of \$2,050.

Above the \$2,000 line one did not get counted, below the line all were counted.

The committee bill for the first time moves to the use of the so-called Orshansky definition of poverty. That definition was utilized by the Bureau of the Census at the time of the 1970 census and is now regularly used by almost all Federal agencies concerned with programs in the human resources area. It is this definition which is used when one hears reports that last year so many million people were below the poverty line or that a certain program is directed to assist those in poverty.

At the time the 1970 census was taken, the index ranged from \$1,632 for a farm family of one to \$5,820 for an urban family of eight. Clearly this sort of flexibility is much more equitable than use of a single income figure which does not permit refinements for family size.

Two. The committee bill reduces the reliance of the formula on the AFDC caseloads in a particular area or State. In the past as much as 70 percent of the money a given State has received has been because of the size of the AFDC caseload and the payments which are made under that program. The recent HEW validity check of all 50 States indicates that nationally 10.2 percent of the caseload is not eligible under the law for assistance. Another 22.8 percent receives payments in excess of eligibility and 8.1 percent are underpaid. In total, the error rate in the AFDC program in the period from April to September 1973 was in excess of 40 percent of the total caseload.

If that error rate were equitably distributed, the problems would not be as great. Regrettably, the error rate runs from a low in Maine of less than 13 percent to a high in New York of over 60 percent making it totally impossible to devise some simple way to discount the error rate.

In addition to this problem, it is well known that the AFDC program is not reflective of need in areas with high concentrations of Chicanos and orientals. A study done last year by the Los Angeles schools clearly shows that areas with high concentrations of very low-income people from either of these racial backgrounds did not reveal AFDC caseloads in proportion with other types of population. That is apparently because in those communities there is a stigma against going on welfare and a feeling that friends, neighbors, and relatives will help out. In certain areas it may also be because of the presence of illegal aliens who wish to conceal their status.

AFDC is also a program that is biased against rural areas. Testimony before our committee by officials of the Social Rehabilitation Service at HEW confirms the fact that people in rural areas are more reluctant to accept public assistance.

Finally, AFDC is a program with a unique administrative structure. Although most of the money is Federal, the rules are made to some extent in each State. Because of that, 26 States have programs where the father can be present in the home, and the family can still receive assistance. In the other 24 States, that is not true. Hence, in some States one rewards a school system for the presence of broken families. In a neighboring city in a different State, just the opposite situation may hold true. It is also up to each State to set payment levels and to determine eligibility. That means that poor States have lower payments, and some States require little verification. Hence, error rates like the 60 percent in New York.

In order to reduce double-counting, the committee amendment counts two-thirds of AFDC above the eligibility line. Further reduction of reliance on AFDC is accomplished by moving the threshold above which AFDC children are counted from the \$2,000 figure in current law to the dollar figure which is adjusted each year to reflect the poverty line. In 1973 that figure is about \$4,200 for an urban family of four.

Third. The old law reimbursed States at one-half their State cost or one-half the national cost, whichever was higher. This led to situations where some very low spending States, particularly in the South, were utilizing the national average and getting a much greater payment rate than anyone else. Alabama with a 1971-72 per-pupil cost of \$563 was using one-half the national cost of \$970 and, therefore, was eligible for a payment of \$485 per child. Illinois on the other hand, with a per-pupil cost of \$1,075 was using one-half of its cost or \$537.50, only \$52 more than Alabama even though the actual differences in cost were more than \$500 per child. At the other extreme New York was using one-half of its total cost of \$1,513 and, therefore, becoming eligible for per-pupil entitlements of almost \$756.

In regard to this last point, it is interesting to note that although New York's average per-pupil cost is more than 150 percent of the national average its average salary for classroom teachers is only about 120 percent of the national average—\$11,803 versus \$9,705. The extra costs in New York are apparently due to a large degree to the very rich pension system which that State maintains.

The new law proposes to pay each State 40 percent of its actual State per-pupil costs with a proviso that no State would receive less than 80 percent of 40 percent of the national average nor more than 120 percent of 40 percent of the national average. What this means is that under the new formula Alabama will be entitled to \$310, Illinois \$430, and New York \$465. Since the current law is only funded at 36 percent of entitlement, the actual difference to any State is not as great as might be indicated by these figures.

Use of a payment rate of 40 percent instead of the former 50 percent rate also decreases the authorizations for the program to a realistic level. Under the old law authorizations in fiscal 1974 were more than \$5 billion for title I. Under the

new law the title I authorization is reduced to \$3.2 billion, a figure 40 percent greater than the President's 1975 budget request.

Four. Finally, the new title I provisions also contain a specific directive to the Secretaries of Commerce and HEW to devise methods to update title I counts of children in a timely fashion to prevent the "10-year shock" that occurred last fall when the results of the 1970 census became known and applicable to the distribution of funds. When that happened, there were a great many changes that occurred in the program caused by the fact that census figures had not been updated since 1965. The new bill incorporates provision for the Bureau of the Census to expand its current population survey to enable it to determine the number of children below the poverty line in each State and directs the Secretaries of HEW and Commerce to report back to the committee within a year on devising a way to update allocation methods within States. The combination of these two factors should enable the executive branch to update allocation in a regular fashion and not wait to find out the results of a new census in 1980.

It should also be noted in this regard that the formula contains a provision guaranteeing that no district will receive less than 85 percent of the funds it received in the previous year. This is to enable those districts who have lost population to absorb those losses in a fashion which does not cause chaos in the local district. This provision also insures that the allocation of funds does reflect real shifts in population and does not continue to provide full funding to those school districts which have fewer eligible children.

The committee formula is a good formula. Some may criticize portions of it, but to date no one has been able to come forward with another formula that does so well in meeting the problems created by the old formula.

AMERICA'S CREDIBILITY AS A RELIABLE ALLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, with so much attention fixed upon the current turmoil that has seemingly engulfed the entire globe the last few months, I feel that at this time it is especially important that the Congress consider House Concurrent Resolution 268 which I am reintroducing today. American policy towards the Republic of China, and by extension, all of Asia, deserves careful scrutiny now in order to prevent any serious difficulties from enveloping us in the future. Twice before the United States has suffered from precipitant withdrawals from Asia at the apparent conclusion of hostilities. Cautious considerations now can be of incalculable value in the months and years ahead. In this regard the Congress, even more than the executive branch, needs more thoughtful analysis and foresight in the determination of foreign policy.

Through previous discussion in several special orders and the growing list of cosponsors of this resolution, the Congress has been able to focus attention on the need for a realistic assessment of American policy toward China. There are two basic reasons why it is so vitally important that, as the resolution states—

The United States Government, while engaged in a lessening of tensions with the People's Republic of China, do nothing to compromise the freedom of our friend and ally, the Republic of China and its people.

First a dispassionate evaluation of the current situation in Asia makes continued close cooperation with the Republic of China an indispensable element of protecting American security and correlative maintaining stability and peace in East Asia. Second, America's credibility as a reliable ally and as a Nation genuinely committed to the values of individual liberty and national sovereignty are integrally related to continued diplomatic relations with the Republic of China.

Having just recently approached the threshold of conflict with the Soviet Union in the Mideast, it behooves us to carefully reexamine America's strategic posture throughout the world. We have seen how the rhetoric of détente can turn rapidly into the reality of a military alert. And in that reality of crisis in the Mediterranean we discovered that only Portugal among our European allies stood firmly with us. We must not make a similar mistake in Asia and allow a dialog with the People's Republic of China to corrode and eventually destroy partnerships bound together in blood on battlefields from Korea to Vietnam. The Republic of China, with her political stability, military, and economic power, remains a linchpin in our all too fragile alliance structures.

Many more Americans would be aware of our strategic requirements in Asia if so many of our messengers from mainland China were not mesmerized by the extravagant show carefully orchestrated by the rulers in Peking. If American interests are to be effectively perceived in Asia, then we must focus our attention on the reality of concrete actions rather than the polite public pronouncements. No one doubts that in the Mideast the principal support for aggression has come from the Soviet Union, but we hear little about the responsibility for the continued fighting in Southeast Asia. The campaign by the Communist Chinese to overthrow the government in Cambodia has not abated with the withdrawal of American forces from the region or the signing of a cease-fire. Instead, they have become the main supplier of weapons to the Communist forces in Cambodia, whether they be Khmer Rouge, North Vietnamese, or Vietcong. The President explicitly recognized this threat with his emergency request for \$200 million in aid to Cambodia at the same time that he sought assistance for Israel. In the international diplomatic community the Chinese Communists have led an attempt to replace the Khmer Government in the United Nations with deposed Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

In other activities, the Communist

Chinese have encouraged the Arabs to continue fighting in the Mideast and abstained from all major cease-fire proposals in the United Nations, have seized the Paracel Islands from the Vietnamese, have driven over 50,000 refugees fleeing into Hong Kong this year, and have quietly built their Navy up to the fourth largest in the world while maintaining the biggest standing army. These actions merely reconfirm in a more eloquent language the Maoist adage that "political power comes out of the barrel of a gun."

Only in the past several weeks we have also witnessed a resurgence of ideological fanaticism within mainland China. Western music, loudly applauded only a few months ago, is now being subjected to the bitterest of derisive scorn. Whole cities have been closed off to foreign visitors as a new so-called cultural revolution begins to ominously sweep across the land. Even the most revered philosophical leader in Chinese history, Confucius, is now the principal target of a government orchestrated campaign of public abuse and ridicule. Any state which can exercise such erratic vicissitudes of public policy should not be relied upon as durable basis for the construction of foreign policy.

Logic should indicate that the language of Oriental détente is governed more by the barrels of a million Soviet guns posed on China's northern frontier than any serious reconsiderations of Maoist doctrines. Neither American security nor that of the free nations of Asia should be sacrificed for the transient needs of one Communist dictatorship pitted against another.

In contrast to the actions taken by the Communists, the Republic of China has continued to exercise a responsible role in world affairs despite being the victim of unjustified diplomatic setbacks. Rather than being governed by rigid ideological dogma, the people on Taiwan have benefited fully from the rich cultural tradition of Chinese civilization. Moreover, the Republic of China has become a nearly perfect model of the tremendous economic progress that can be unleashed in a developing country through the conjunction of political freedom and individual industriousness.

The United States has just passed the first anniversary of the conclusion of the longest and most unselfish war in our Nation's history in order to bolster the security of the free people of Asia. To sacrifice the freedom of the 15 million people of the Republic of China through any form of diplomatic subterfuge would betray our Nation's most basic philosophical commitment to humane values. Surely the remarks a few months ago by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger regarding one small beleaguered country in the world must equally pertain to the Republic of China as well.

The United States in the postwar period has supported the concept that international conflicts should not be settled by force. It has, moreover, supported the concept that nations should not be eliminated simply by the superior numbers or in any manner of their neighbors.

By supporting this resolution the Con-

gress can reaffirm their adherence to these basic concepts.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 268 is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Government, while engaged in a lessening of tensions with the People's Republic of China, do nothing to compromise the freedom of our friend and ally, the Republic of China and its people.

CONGRESSMEN COSPONSORING HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 268

Mr. Addabbo	Mr. Landgrebe
Mr. Anderson of Illinois	Mr. Leggett
Mr. Archer	Mr. Montgomery
Mr. Ashbrook	Mr. Moorhead of California
Mr. Bafalis	Mr. Murphy of New York
Mr. Baker	Mr. Myers
Mr. Blackburn	Mr. Price of Texas
Mr. Broyhill of Virginia	Mr. Rarick
Mr. Buchanan	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Burgener	Mr. J. Kenneth Robinson
Mr. Burke of Florida	Mr. Rousselot
Mr. Chappell	Mr. Satterfield
Mr. Don H. Clausen	Mr. Scherle
Mr. Del Clawson	Mr. Sikes
Mr. Cohen	Mr. Smith of New York
Mr. Conlan	Mr. Snyder
Mr. Crane	Mr. Spence
Mr. Davis of Georgia	Mr. Steiger of Arizona
Mr. Dennis	Mr. Symms
Mr. Derwinski	Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin
Mr. Dickinson	Mr. Treen
Mr. Dorn	Mr. Vander Jagt
Mr. Duncan	Mr. Veysy
Mr. Fish	Mr. Waggoner
Mr. Fisher	Mr. Whitehurst
Mr. Gilman	Mr. Winn
Mr. Goldwater	Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California
Mr. Gross	Mr. Bob Wilson
Mr. Gunter	Mr. Won Pat
Mr. Hanley	Mr. Wyman
Mr. Hansen of Idaho	Mr. Young
Mr. Hinshaw	Mr. Zablocki
Mr. Huber	Mr. Zion
Mr. Hudnut	
Mr. Hunt	
Mr. Hutchinson	
Mr. Ichord	
Mr. Kemp	
Mr. Ketchum	

THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE SITUATION

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if the United States relinquishes its control of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama, there may be real and lasting damage to the entire Free World.

In one quick afternoon's visit recently, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger flew to Panama to sign accords which paved the way for future United States talks with Panama on a new treaty that would end American control of the canal. This is the culmination of many years of negotiations and debate between our two countries.

The agreement that Secretary Kissinger signed is therefore a new beginning or perhaps it could be called the start of phase II. Ahead are difficult negotiations not only between the two countries, but also involving Congress and the Pentagon.

The United States completed construction of the canal in 1914 after ten long years of hard work. We took up the project after the French had failed. The United States paid Panama \$10 million and agreed to pay \$250,000 a year rent in perpetuity—forever—for the area. Since then, the annual payment has been raised to \$2 million a year.

Cost to the United States of building the Canal was \$380 million.

Panamanians can be broken into several groups on the canal issue. Those who prefer to keep things as they are, but would like an increase in rent make up one group, probably the majority.

Another group is composed of activist youth who want the United States out now.

A third wants a sea level canal built 25 miles north of the present canal at U.S. expense. This group would concede to the U.S. control of the present canal for 22 years.

Still another group wants the Canal Zone and canal immediately though they would be willing to grant the U.S. partial jurisdiction even while preferring total control by Panama. One in this faction is Fernando Manfredo, Panama's Minister of Commerce and Industry and a member of the Panamanian team that has been negotiating the issue with the United States.

The 371-square-mile area Manfredo wants for Panama contains housing and clubs, churches, a theater, commissary, a hospital, and a clinic and he would like it for nothing. As if that were not enough, he wants Panama to have major jurisdiction over the remainder.

A revolutionary coup headed by Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos of the National Guard has been in control of Panama since President Arnolfo Arias was overthrown in 1968, 11 days after he was elected. This military regime of Panama has been friendly with Communist countries.

Russia has constantly supported the efforts of Panama to gain control of the canal. It has been reported that the Russians have expressed an interest in building a new sea level canal or modifying the present canal to handle larger vessels, similar to the manner in which the Russians did the Aswan Dam for the Egyptians.

Obtaining ownership and control of the Panama Canal from the United States has been a longtime goal of the Russians. John Reed, American journalist who covered the Russian revolution, reported that Lenin realized the importance of the canal and was determined to force the United States to give up unilateral control of the waterway.

The strategic nature of the canal to international commerce and to the military defense of the Western Hemisphere are two good reasons why the United States should never let the canal slip from its control.

If the canal ever becomes totally owned and controlled by Panama, it may very well become a victim of Russian takeover, because Panama, I feel, will be unable to resist the pressure the Russians no doubt will apply.

I don't like the direction in which we

are going. Unless we can reverse the trend of recent years, one day we may be asking the Russians for permission to use the Panama Canal. This is unthinkable.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on House Resolution 803, on February 6, I was necessarily away from Washington. I was forced to miss both of the votes which were taken on the resolution to give subpoena authority to the Judiciary Committee in order to carry out its responsibilities pertaining to the impeachment resolutions that have been introduced.

I take this time, therefore, to announce that had I been able to be here I would have voted in favor of final passage of the resolution (rollcall No. 21) and against setting a specific deadline for completion of the inquiry (rollcall No. 20).

My vote in favor of the resolution is based upon the simple fact that the committee must have the necessary powers to obtain the evidence it determines is relevant to its inquiry. And, it must have the backing of the full House in this regard.

My vote against setting a deadline is based upon my feeling that nothing could be worse than to force the committee to complete its investigation at a certain time and then find new information or developments at a later date. A deadline requires an inflexibility that is neither required nor proper.

The impeachment investigation by the committee must be detailed, thorough, and complete. To do less is an abdication of our responsibility and my votes will reflect my desire to see to it that no procedural problems inhibit an honest, full, and fair investigation.

Neither the President, the Congress, nor the country stands to benefit from an incomplete investigation.

POLICE BRUTALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. METCALFE, is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the February 9, 1974, issue of the Nation.

The article was written by Mr. George Bliss, chief investigative reporter for the Chicago Tribune. Mr. Bliss has received the Pulitzer Prize on two occasions: in 1962 for his investigations of the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District; and in 1973 for supervising an investigation of Chicago vote fraud.

POLICE BRUTALITY IN CHICAGO: BAD APPLES ON THE BEAT
(By George Bliss)

CHICAGO.—Claude Bailey is a 14-year-old boy who had part of his life destroyed on his first run-in with police. Claude, who lives in a substantial middle-class, all-white neighborhood in Chicago, was a promising athlete who had been named the most valuable player on his grammar school team. But Claude dropped his dream of playing foot-

ball in high school when a policeman's blow blinded his left eye. He was mistaken for a suspect in a crime he hadn't committed and for which he was never charged.

At the time when Metcalfe was under medical care, Rep. Ralph H. Metcalfe, an important black political leader of Chicago and a former Olympic track star, made public a report, "The Misuse of Police Authority in Chicago." [See editorial, "The Metcalfe Report," *The Nation*, September 17, 1973.] The report and accompanying recommendations were garnered from a series of hearings conducted by a "blue-ribbon" panel convened by Metcalfe in 1972, following persistent complaints to Mayor Richard J. Daley and Chicago police officials that Chicago police were guilty of numerous acts of brutality principally in the black and Spanish-speaking areas of the city. Daley and police officials almost completely ignored the complaints. The police department failed to send a representative to the Metcalfe hearings.

Vernon Jarrett, a black columnist on the *Chicago Tribune*, accurately predicted that the Metcalfe report would be attacked by the city administration and the police department as slander of "Chicago's finest." At the same time, Jarrett said, the more militant in the black community would consider it too soft. Police abuse, as well as police graft, shakedowns and other unethical activities, is a fact of life, Jarrett continued. He added that the abusive treatment of citizens by Chicago police, particularly the unnecessary use of force, cannot be denied.

At the time the Metcalfe report became public, four *Chicago Tribune* reporters had already spent more than a month on an in-depth investigation of police brutality. Their task, which was to require almost four months of intensive digging for additional facts and evidence on a highly controversial subject, was to find out who was right, Metcalfe or the city administration. The eight-part series of special reports on police brutality, printed in November, had an impact that brought about almost immediate corrective reform at almost every level of government in Chicago. The *Tribune* found Metcalfe substantially correct in all but one of his charges. He had said that the problem was almost exclusively in the ghetto areas of the city. The *Tribune* investigation found it to be citywide.

Many readers angrily criticized the paper for publishing the series, but the editors also received hundreds of phone calls and letters registering indignation and relating stories of abuse and beatings by policemen. "They [the readers] see it as an attack on the police force, rather than the attack on official crime which it really is," the *Tribune* replied editorially. In Chicago, it was pointed out, a policeman is a policeman twenty-four hours a day. He carries a gun, night stick and handcuffs. There are more than 13,000 policemen in Chicago, and most of them are dedicated, honorable and courageous. But some have abused their public trust.

Reporters talked to hundreds of alleged victims, interviewed hundreds of persons who claimed they had witnessed illegal police acts, examined thousands of documents and arranged polygraph tests whenever possible. The newspaper found that the Internal Affairs Division (IAD) of the police department, responsible for investigating such abuses, continued to be seriously negligent in its duties, despite years of public criticism. Documented cases of brutality showed that the IAD often ignored basic investigative techniques. Its investigators often failed to seek out key witnesses, monitor relevant court testimony or use the polygraph. The IAD had a surprisingly low score in sustaining brutality complaints against policemen. In the five-year period through 1972, the department received 5,251 complaints from citizens who alleged police abuse. The IAD

sustained only 144. In 1973 the IAD compiled its "best" record ever, sustaining about 8 per cent of the brutality complaints.

"I wish I could say I didn't sustain a single case," said IAD Director Alfred Conrad. "I'm not proud of high figures here." Conrad, a veteran of thirty-two years on the force, has a staff of policemen selected from the general ranks of the department. The department has traditionally and strongly resisted the suggestion that anyone from outside the department should investigate allegations of police misconduct. The argument is that only another policeman can fully understand the subtleties of the policeman's duties. There are sixty-two investigators on the IAD staff, which operates on 1 per cent of the annual department budget.

Some IAD investigators, it was found, merely sent out letters telling witnesses to come to the IAD offices at a time picked by the investigator. If they didn't show up, the investigator considered them uncooperative and dropped the case. Chicago police officials insisted that their program of investigating misconduct was working well. But they could find no reasonable way to explain the career of Patrolman Michael Winfield.

Winfield was certified as a policeman on February 19, 1967. The first brutality complaint against him was registered on April 11, 1967. On August 11, 1968, when Winfield met Bennye Moon and her family, it was a wonder that he was still a policeman. He had been on the force for eighteen months and in that time had accumulated fifteen complaints, including eleven from citizens who charged physical abuse and malicious and threatening conduct.

When Winfield applied to join the force he said he had no arrest record, though he had been convicted of assault and disorderly conduct. His former employer told the police department that he was "a hot-head, arrogant and short-tempered." But the Chicago civil service commission, over objections, certified him. In June 1968, the police superintendent had on his desk five separate misconduct complaints against Winfield and two recommendations from district commanders that he be fired; also a file warning of Winfield's questionable mental stability and recommending a psychiatric review. The recommendations were ignored and Winfield continued to work on the streets, with the exception of a thirty-day suspension without pay for a brutality case. Then he met Bennye Moon.

Mrs. Moon, a 45-year-old emigrant from an Oklahoma sharecropper's cabin, was walking home from the drugstore that day with her son, Cornell, and her daughter, Diane, who was far along in pregnancy with her second child. Winfield stopped them a few doors from their house. He called Cornell over, ordered him to put up his hands and then put handcuffs on him.

When Cornell dropped his hands, Winfield shouted at him and then smashed him across the face with his revolver. When Bennye screamed at Winfield he swung his revolver and hit her across the face, shattering her lower left jaw. She started to sag to the street and grabbed his lapels to keep from falling. Winfield kept swinging and she finally fell, unconscious and bleeding, her shoulder dislocated, her teeth knocked loose and her head cut. Diane ran up to her mother's still form on the ground and Winfield hit her in the mouth and struck her swollen stomach with his night stick; she, too, fell to the ground.

The Moon family went to the hospital and its members were later charged with aggravated battery and resisting arrest, charges that were eventually dropped. Diane's son, Eddie, was born the following October. He is now 5 years old. He has a deformed left eye, a bone protruding from his chest and a congenital heart defect. Doctors say they cannot be sure his defects came from Winfield's blow, but Diane is sure.

The police department fired Winfield on February 13, 1969, for one of the fifteen complaints filed against him before the Moon incident. The department completed its investigation of Bennye's complaint a month later. It agreed that the Moons had been beaten in an unprovoked attack.

And police brutality was supposed to be foreign to the exclusive Rogers Park neighborhood of Chicago. But on a sunny Father's Day morning, quiet, matronly Harriet Bauman, 36, was cleaning her \$60,000 home when she had her first encounter with police. She was eventually charged with resisting arrest and assaulting a police sergeant. She said that the sergeant had pulled her out of her house and chased her across the street and into a neighbor's house. She said she was thrown across a railing of the neighbor's porch and handcuffed and thrown down a flight of stairs while the sergeant addressed her with obscenities in front of her children and neighbors. Although her story sounded wholly unbelievable, witnesses and a polygraph test arranged by the Tribune supported it.

Once upon a time the Chicago Police Department had a psychological screening program second to none in the nation. But then politics, as it is played in Chicago, came onto the scene. *Tribune* reporters were told that the psychological testing program was dropped because it was screening out many recruits sponsored by ward committeemen and other city politicians. So for a two-year period the Chicago Police Department was without a program to test police recruits for sadistic tendencies or emotional instability. It is estimated that more than 1,000 policemen were hired without any screening.

The police department, the *Tribune* found, systematically dismantled its widely acclaimed psychological testing program—one that had served as a model for programs in major cities across the country. And for two years police department officials lied, assuring anyone who asked that the department was using the best testing in the nation. The consequences were shocking.

On a beautiful June morning 70-year-old Otto Saxinger and his wife drove over to Lincoln Park in their beloved 1936 Dodge, a car Saxinger had bought when it was new and carefully preserved ever since. But before they got home from their little jaunt, Saxinger found himself in a police station, charged with assault and battery, resisting arrest and failure to signal a turn. His wrists were cut and bleeding because the arresting officer had jammed handcuffs on Saxinger so tightly that they cut through the flesh.

The *Tribune*'s investigation discovered more complaints about handcuffs than about any other aspect of police abuse. Citizens charged that handcuffs were used as instruments of torture, leaving wrists bleeding, swollen and scarred. In theory and common practice, handcuffs are a piece of safety equipment that can prevent injury to a policeman and those around him. But by simply tightening the metal bracelets a policeman can turn them into an instrument that stops circulation, draws blood and paralyzes nerves.

Saxinger still bears the scars on his wrists. When he and his wife pulled the car into an alley to garage it a policeman pulled up behind. Saxinger said the policeman accused him of not having a brake light but Saxinger showed him the brake lights were working. When the policeman started writing a ticket for making a wrong turn, Saxinger made his mistake. He said he was "so mad at the policeman and his attitude" that he spoke up.

"Buddy, some day somebody is going to take you by the legs and wrap you around a post," he said. Saxinger found himself looking down the barrel of a gun. He was handcuffed and tossed head first into a squad car. Saxinger pleaded with the policeman to loosen the handcuffs but he was taken to a

police station and charged with assault and battery and the rest.

Saxinger filed a complaint of brutality with the police department Internal Affairs Division, but said he has never heard what happened with its investigation. The IAD told reporters the complaint was dismissed as unfounded. Saxinger volunteered to take a lie test but his high blood pressure interfered with the readings.

Gorki Tellez, editor and publisher of *El Manana*, the largest Spanish-language newspaper in the Midwest, was manhandled by police while he was attempting to cover a student-police confrontation at a high school. He said he was handcuffed so tightly that his wrists began to bleed and he couldn't use his arm for a week. He thought a man in his position could do something with a complaint of brutality. Tellez said his paper gets phone calls almost daily from Spanish-speaking people complaining of police misconduct.

But the experience of Tellez was minor compared to that of Leroy Watts. He was on his knees, pleading for his life as his recent landlord, Patrolman Maurice Beacham, stood over him. They were in Watts' former apartment in a building owned by Beacham, and Beacham was angry because Watts had left in the kitchen some plastic bags filled with trash. Frantic with fear, Watts leaped to his feet and ran into the next room. Beacham followed and shot him in the left arm. Watts stumbled into still another room, and Beacham shot him in the right hand.

The police department had an impressive list of evidence, witnesses and polygraph tests to show that Beacham willfully shot Watts. But Beacham continued to work every day as a policeman, and Watts, though alive, is still recovering from his wounds and unable to work. It was only after the *Tribune* printed the series that any action was taken against Beacham. He was suspended from the department and then indicted by a county grand jury on attempted murder and other charges.

Then there was the case of Jose Maldonado. His problem started during the winter months when his baby was hungry and his wife discovered there was no milk in the house. Maldonado got into an argument with several policemen over double parking when he went into the store to buy the milk. He was pistol-whipped and kicked in the groin in a hospital, and had to have his scalp sewn together in three places. He also had been charged with assaulting and attempting to elude two policemen, and with drunk driving. Maldonado was convicted and fined \$1,000 and placed on two years' probation. The secretary of state's office suspended his driver's license for a year because of the drunk driving charge.

A \$3-an-hour factory worker, Maldonado had to take a second job to pay legal fees, fines and medical expenses. In company with a reporter, Maldonado took a polygraph test and passed on each question relating to his behavior when confronted by the policemen. One of the policemen was suspended for ten days, but police never informed Maldonado of this. And neither was the court apprised that the policemen were found guilty by the IAD. Finally, the judge who had sentenced Maldonado read his story in the *Tribune*. He called Maldonado into court and vacated the fine. The secretary of state's office agreed to lift the license suspension.

The *Tribune* told in detail the experiences of people brutalized by police in more than thirty specific cases. The reaction to the series came on numerous fronts as public officials announced determination to halt police brutality once and for all. Cook County state's attorney Bernard Carey summoned a grand jury to investigate police brutality and shortly afterward three policemen were named in indictments. They face charges ranging from attempted murder to perjury and false arrest reports. More grand jury action is expected.

Marlin Johnson, president of the Chicago Police Board, ordered acting police superintendent, James M. Rochford, to:

Prepare a new psychological screening program for recruits.

Set up a plan to re-evaluate policemen already on the force who show signs of emotional instability.

Investigate police recruiting methods which have been admitting a decreasingly small number of applicants from minority groups.

Mayor Daley spoke out against police brutality and has said he would seriously review a proposal for an independent city agency to investigate police conduct, a plan he had rejected in late 1972. State's attorney Carey said he would form a special unit in the prosecutor's office to handle police brutality cases. At the same time, new legislation was introduced in the Illinois General Assembly which would make it mandatory for all police agencies in the state to give psychological and other testing to policemen. The state agency would have the power to suspend a policeman found guilty of brutality.

It is possible, but not yet certain, that Chicagoans may soon be able to look on a policeman, whose salary they pay, without having the blood freeze in their veins.

H.R. 12777

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. COLLINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1974, I introduced with cosponsors H.R. 12777, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include breast prosthesis among the items and services for which payment may be made under the supplementary medical insurance program—medicare.

Unfortunately, due to a staff error the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. POWELL) was inadvertently included on the list of co-sponsors. I hope that this will not cause any undue hardship to the gentleman from Ohio and regret that the error occurred.

CONGRESS REPLIES TO THE PRESIDENT'S TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 16, Majority Whip JOHN MCFALL spoke on nationwide radio, on behalf of the Congress, in response to President Nixon's transportation message. Mr. MCFALL is also the chairman of our Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee.

In his remarks, JOHN pointed out that the legislation sent up by the President falls far short of what we need. Neither bill—nor both of them put together—represent anything like a massive, broad based assault on our transportation problems.

I insert the full text of Mr. MCFALL's remarks into the RECORD:

FEBRUARY 16, 1974.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. MCFALL OF CALIFORNIA, HOUSE MAJORITY WHIP, ON TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVES OF THE CONGRESS

(Response in behalf of the Congress to President Nixon's Radio Broadcast of February 9)

I am speaking to you today on behalf of your Congress about the serious challenges facing our nation's transportation system and what we must do to meet them.

In his radio message last week, the President rightly recognized that our transportation system—the nation's lifeline—is no longer working at maximum efficiency and must be improved.

In cooperation with this and previous Administrations, the Congress has enacted a long and productive list of measures to improve that system—from the creation of the Department of Transportation in 1966 to the Airport Development Act in 1970 to the Northeast Rail Reorganization Act of 1973. We recognize the continuing need for improvement in our transportation system, and we pledge our determined efforts to reach this objective.

Last week, the President submitted two transportation bills to the Congress: one dealt largely with urban highways and mass transit, the other with railroads. The Congress welcomes in these bills what appear to be some helpful changes in policy on the part of the Administration.

However, we must regretfully say that neither of these two proposals represents anything that could be described as a massive, broad based assault on our nation's basic transportation problems.

In the Unified Transportation Assistance Act, the President for the first time acknowledges the necessity for mass transit operating assistance. This will be welcome news to our hard-pressed cities and states. In the past, the Administration has flatly opposed such legislation, including the operating assistance bill now pending in House-Senate conference.

However, we should also understand what the Unified Transportation Assistance Act does not do. It has been billed as a big-money recommendation. However, it does not provide the big infusion of funds that it seems to imply. The act would simply rearrange funds, and in some cases cities and states would come up with less than they thought they had.

For example, mass transit operating assistance, under the President's proposal, would not be available unless a city gave up construction money to get it. Thus, while one hand giveth, the other taketh away.

After 1977, all money would be thrown into a common pot, subject to far more demands than it could fulfill. The Administration would make the fund available for mass transit construction and operating assistance as well as highway construction. As the range of choices widens, the money available to cities for each purpose diminishes.

The bill also fails to provide cities and states with the guidance which they desperately need to make increasingly sophisticated transportation decisions. In fact, the bill would intensify pressure on the cities and states: we would be requiring them to make more difficult choices without giving them the necessary direction or information. No state can make the best use of its transportation money if it doesn't know how its system will affect—or be affected by—adjoining states' systems or the nation at large. And we cannot know this until we develop the national transportation policy that Congress has demanded for so long.

The other thing the bill does not do is to tell us what will happen to the highway trust fund. After 1977, the bill would shift the burden for urban highways as well as mass transit to the general taxpayer. There is no mention of the highway trust fund—as if the Administration expected to let it die.

The President's other bill—the Transportation Improvement Act—would set up a loan guarantee program for the railroads. This follows an initiative marked out by the Congress in 1971 when it drafted and considered the Surface Transportation Act. At that time

the Administration strongly opposed the legislation. Today, the President has recommended a rail assistance plan which incorporates a broad loan guarantee program. In the present Congress, similar legislation has already passed the Senate and is now pending in the House.

The Transportation Improvement Act also revives an Administration attempt to make major changes in the government regulation of railroads, including rate-making and the abandonment of rail service. A few years ago, the Administration urged radical deregulation as the way to help railroads out of their financial difficulties. The Congress rejected that concept, and rightly so. Deregulation would have unleashed ruinous competition among the carriers and severely damaged the industry. Although the deregulation proposals in this bill are more moderate, the Congress will want to examine them carefully.

It has been the stubborn insistence of the White House on three inadequate precepts—deregulation, special revenue sharing and reorganization of the Department of Transportation—that has held up the formulation of a national transportation policy. None of these, nor all of them together, can substitute for transportation policy, and the Congress will continue to push for the development of one.

This Congress is seeking to build with President Nixon a better record of cooperation and achievement on transportation matters. Furthermore, we will need everyone's help, from the Administration to every American. Only if we all strive together can our nation achieve the vital, flourishing, prominent transportation system that our well-being today and our children's future demand.

GET RID OF OFFICIAL GOLD PRICE—DO NOT INCREASE IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the latest increases in the market price of gold—to \$152 yesterday—have again raised the question of a uniform multiple rise in the official price. A tripling or quadrupling has been mentioned in the financial press. The increase would have to be sufficient to preclude the possibility of a repetition within the next decade or so.

These rumors have arisen despite the decision taken in November 1973, permitting monetary authorities to make sales from their gold reserves in the private market, and thus finance oil imports or any other type of net payments outflow.

Whenever controls of one sort or another have resulted in two prices for a single commodity, the incentive to make profits by selling from one market to the other has tended to erode the dual price system. For example, under present circumstances, officials at their own volition can sell gold to private parties at the market price, but one central bank is not supposed to sell it to another to finance a payments deficit. Yet, while the lower official price exists, billions of international reserves are immobilized.

The remedy, however, does not lie in a uniform increase in the official value of gold. This would have the following undesirable consequences:

First. It would tend to reinstitute gold as a primary, if not the chief, reserve asset, and accordingly displace special

drawing rights—SDR's—from their growing and potentially primary reserve asset role in the future. An increase in the official value of gold to approximately the market level would more than triple the reserve asset value of official gold stocks and obviate any need for the creating of additional SDR's for years to come. In fact, existing SDR's might even be withdrawn from circulation.

Second. An increase in the official value of gold would cause private hoarders to sell substantial portions of their gold stocks to monetary authorities. These transfers could create huge increases in the money supplies of many different nations and would greatly intensify the inflationary pressures that economic policymakers are now attempting to combat, with limited success.

Third. Unless the official value of gold were increased to substantially more than its current market price, monetary authorities around the world might subsequently fear to take any action that could introduce a major new element of private demand into the gold market. Consequently, the right of American citizens to invest in gold at their own discretion would probably be further postponed.

Fourth. We have seen from our experience under the two-tier system—when the private market price of gold threatened to fall below the then \$35 per ounce official value—that a new much higher official price for gold would effectively become a floor. Therefore, in the event, however improbable it may seem today, that market forces once again began to depress the price of gold, monetary authorities would again be obliged to take action preventing the free market price from slipping below the official level. Monetary authorities would then effectively be placed in the role of subsidizing the operation of mines wherever throughout the world gold is produced—including South Africa and the Soviet Union.

Fifth. An increase in the official value of gold would again put the international monetary system on the old commodity standard roller coaster that has intermittently plagued international monetary relations since nations first began cooperative efforts to regulate money internationally. In another decade or two we would again experience rising pressures for another change in the official price.

For these reasons, a uniform increase in the official price of gold is no solution to our present dilemma. But there is a superior alternative: abolition of the official price of gold. This move would entail severing the link between SDR's and gold, and redefining special drawing rights in terms of a bundle of currencies.

Abolishing the official price of gold would have the following advantages:

First. It would bring a further reduction in the role of gold as a reserve asset. An important step was taken in this direction when in August 1971 the United States suspended interconvertibility between gold and dollars. Abolition would continue this progression.

Second. It would not preclude individual central banks from holding gold at their own discretion, and using it as a re-

serve medium if they choose to do so. Monetary authorities could continue to use gold as a medium for settling debts at bilaterally negotiated prices, or at the free market price. Thus, the reserve asset role of gold would not be eliminated. It would just no longer be guaranteed.

Third. It would resolve the issue of further periodic increases in the official value of gold in the IMF system.

The suggestion to abolish the official value of gold does raise a number of difficult technical issues. For example, what should be done with the gold currently deposited with the IMF? If the gold tranche positions of IMF members are to be converted into SDR's, at what rate? Perhaps the conversion could be carried out at the market price of gold and at the exchange rates obtaining at some time in the recent past.

In any case, these technical difficulties are no reason to forego the benefits to be derived from abolishing the official price of gold, rather than increasing it.

IS UNCLE SAM CHECKING YOUR PHONE CALLS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, after months of scandal emanating from the Government's abuse of power and contempt for the rights of privacy; amid charges that the Internal Revenue Service and other agencies were used for political purposes, one might have expected the Federal Government to mend its ways. Or at the very least, that public exposure would have put the fear of God into them. Apparently this administration's arrogance and contempt for civil liberties has yet to be checked.

Recent IRS action in subpoenaing the telephone records of the New York Times as well as those of several other newspapers and individual reporters is a frightening example of the administration's present attitude. These records were not subpoenaed in the course of a tax investigation but solely to trace the sources of reporters' stories. This is a clear abuse of power. The IRS implicitly conceded this when they agreed to a New York Times demand that they return the records under threat of a suit.

Our liberties should not depend on an individual's ability to force the Federal Government, in court, to desist from illegal actions.

This administration is operating under a new concept of law. Any action is legal and proper until the courts specifically enjoin them from taking it. Their own responsibility to act in accordance with the law and the Constitution seems nonexistent.

Yet President Nixon is always quick to point out that he has certain inherent rights and powers as President which the Congress may not challenge and which the courts may not adjudicate. It is clear what is happening. Mr. Nixon hides behind the Constitution like a spoiled child behind his mother's apron. After some particularly malicious act he claims the safety of his protected status. A wise mother in such a situation will

discipline her child and the American people might do well to take a lesson.

The entire issue of Government access to individual records needs to be carefully examined. Major institutions which possess revealing files on their customers, including banks and telephone companies, have been all too willing to comply with Government requests for information without proper consideration for the rights and needs of their customers. While the phone company must accede to subpoenas and authorized Government requests for the toll-call records of their subscribers this information has frequently been made available on an almost casual basis. Formal procedures for the release of files are necessary as well as adequate provisions for informing people when their files are checked.

The abuse in the case of investigative reporters is even more ominous. For it endangers their sources of information and becomes a handy Government device for stifling the free press.

Government examination of private records also creates a pervasive distrust, at times approaching paranoia, among citizens. Probably everyone here has at one time or another speculated as to whether his telephone was tapped. We grow accustomed to this fear and learn to ignore it, but it is not pleasant. Similarly the knowledge that a ledger of our private calls; who we speak to, when, and for how long, is open to Government agents is a chilling enough thought however innocent our calls may actually be.

Legislation is needed. Safeguards must be built into the still developing system where computer-stored knowledge on our private lives increases daily. However no legislative safeguards will be sufficient to protect us as long as powerful agencies within the Government feel justified in extending and abusing the powers at their command.

I am a cosponsor of the "Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1973." That bill regulates the disclosure of financial information by financial institutions to governmental agencies to protect the constitutional rights of citizens and to prevent unwarranted invasions of privacy by prescribing procedures and standards governing the disclosure of such information.

I am drafting legislation to place similar restrictions on the private records of phone calls and electronic communications in the hands of telephone companies and other entities involved in the transmission of private communications.

There have been enough of these sneaky third-party subpoenas, buggings and similar shenanigans by the foot-loose, high and mighty muckety-mucks who as often as not are running political inquisitions for higher ups. The right to privacy ought to prevail and I urge my colleagues to act as quickly as possible on these matters so that they may be disposed of in this session of Congress.

PANAMA CANAL: MASS NEWS MEDIA INTIMIDATION OF THE CONGRESS INTO SURRENDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to this body on February 4, 1974, I warned that Secretary of State Kissinger would make a flying trip to Panama to sign an "agreement on principles" to govern the negotiations of a new canal treaty. That blueprint for a quiet surrender of the Canal Zone and canal was signed by him on February 7 and it was given the widest publicity as another "great diplomatic triumph," especially in the newspapers of Panama.

As stated on other occasions, I can think of no better way for the administration to bring about another confrontation with the Congress than by proposing a giveaway Canal Zone treaty, for the issue is nonpartisan and the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, will dispose of such treaty where it belongs—in the wastebasket.

The response to the recent "Dear Colleague" letter calling for sponsors or co-sponsors of a resolution in support of continued U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone has been gratifying. This should serve as a further warning to our officials attending the current meeting of American foreign ministers now in session in Mexico and which Kissinger will attend later this week that surrender of either the zone or canal will not be tolerated.

As expected after the February 4 address and the introduction of various resolutions in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone, there has been what appears to be an organized drive of obvious origin to gain public support for the seductively phrased giveaway program and to brainwash the Congress into acceding to what may be presented as a fait accompli. Such scheme calls not for acceptance but for repudiation.

Leading newspapers in the drive for the giveaway have been the New York Times and the Washington Post. An editorial in the first commended what it called the Good Start on Panama and the latter sent a reporter to the Isthmus to cover the situation.

The New York Times editorial called for a "vigorous follow-through" on the negotiations. The two news stories in the Washington Post from the Isthmus avoided presenting the realistic issues involved and attempted to beguile by inconsequential trivialities and sloppy sentimentalism hostile to the United States. All three writings were superficial, and this despite the ready availability of extensive authoritative documentation on every major aspect in the canal equation.

Mr. Speaker, it is well to bear in mind that the above mentioned newspapers, the New York Times and the Washington Post, led the Nation in the propaganda after World War II in picturing Mao Tse-tung as a gentle, high-minded agrarian reformer and in no sense linked with Red causes. Furthermore, let us also recall that these two newspapers led in the clamor describing Fidel Castro as a highly motivated friend of the United States and not in any way a Communist revolutionary. In a subsequent speech, Castro declared that throughout his

adult life he had been a Communist. As to Mao Tse-tung, after his installation in power by U.S. officials, he likewise showed his real colors, triggering the wars in Korea and Viet Nam that cost tens of thousands of American lives. It is only natural that these two sheets should wish the United States to surrender its sovereignty over the Canal Zone to a declared admirer of Castro. He is Omar Torrijos, the dictator of Panama.

In order that Members of the Congress may be informed as to the nature of the prosurrender propaganda that they will face, I quote the indicated New York Times editorial and the two Washington Post news stories as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1974]

GOOD START ON PANAMA

As Secretary of State Kissinger said, the agreement between the United States and Panama on eight principles to govern negotiation of a new Panama Canal treaty has created a favorable climate for the meeting of American foreign ministers in Mexico next week. Whether it will fulfill Mr. Kissinger's prediction of a "first step toward a new era" in inter-American affairs will depend on how promptly the treaty can be concluded and ratified.

As previous abortive efforts to conclude a new treaty demonstrate, these tasks will not be simple. The Administration seems willing eventually to meet all of Panama's reasonable demands; but the governments are still apart on the most emotional issue of all: the date on which sovereignty over the waterway and the Canal Zone will finally be transferred to Panama.

Once that is agreed, the Administration will have to mount one of its most effective efforts ever to win Senate approval of a treaty certain to be opposed on national security grounds by Pentagon forces and many among the "Zonians"—the 12,000 Americans who live in the Canal Zone. And Panamanian politicians and businessmen must for once stand up to those who will charge that their Government has sold out to Washington.

"There is opposition in both our countries to a reasonable resolution of our differences," Mr. Kissinger acknowledged at the signing of the Joint Statement of Principles in Panama. "Old slogans are often more comforting than changes that reflect new realities." He and President Nixon must now go to work to expose the emptiness of those old slogans and to point up the long-range dangers for this country in trying to perpetuate a relic of another era.

The eight principles are rooted in common sense and intelligent compromise, reflecting Panama's consuming desire to regain control of its territory but also legitimate American concern for the operation and defense of the vital waterway. What is required now is a prompt start on the final negotiation and then a vigorous follow-through by both governments.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 15, 1974]

U.S. COURT WEIGHS UPON PANAMANIANS

(By Dan Morgan)

BALBOA, PANAMA CANAL ZONE.—In the little magistrate's court which sits between the police station and the Elks Lodge atop a hill here, almost everything was American, except the defendants.

Shortly after 8:30 a.m. the 10 accused filed in. All were Panamanians, charged with offenses ranging from possession of marijuana to trespassing.

A constable called the court to order in English and Spanish. Families and friends sat down, and an American police officer read the charges in the first case—the government of the Canal Zone versus Vilma Cordero.

Mrs. Cordero stood, slouching slightly and nodding when addressed by Judge John

Baker a patient, slow-talking graduate of West Point and Yale Law School.

Finally he said to the constable, "I don't think she understands. Please read that in Spanish."

A few minutes later the woman was escorted back to jail, to await a hearing later in the day on a charge of reentering an American air force base after being ordered to stay out.

Few places in Panama better illustrate the basic issue that gives rise to the tensions in and around the Canal Zone than the Balboa Magistrate's Court.

Thousands of Panamanians, and many Americans, have passed through the lower court. Now the increasingly nationalistic population of Panama wants to recapture sovereignty over the Canal Zone which, among other things, would end trials of Panamanians by Americans.

Although the United States has offered to make concessions to Panama, probably by allowing the Republic more canal revenues and turning over some zone for needed urban expansion, many Panamanians say that American law prevailing over the 530-square miles of the Zone angers them most.

Over the years, many economic tensions between the two nationalities have been eliminated.

The old double standards for jobs and pay—the "gold role" for Americans, the "silver role" for Panamanians—has been curbed.

Half or nearly half of the engineers, nurses, and doctors now working in the Zone are Panamanians. Of the 15,000 employees of the Panama Canal Co., a United States government agency, more than 11,000 are local people paid higher wages than countrymen working outside the Zone.

Although none of the 187 pilots who guide vessels through the canal is a Panamanian, two now are in training, and there are American-run apprenticeship programs in many other fields.

Some effort also has been made to diminish a harsh side of American law in the Zone. Forty of the Zone's 300 policemen are Panamanians, and so are many court personnel.

Yet none of that satisfies Panamanians who hate the fact that American law governs a large area of their country.

"It's not right," exclaimed a local newspaper editor recently, as he drove his car on Fourth of July Street, the Zone's boundary in Panama City.

"One minute I am in Panama. The next I can be picked up by a foreign policeman, tried in a foreign court and sent to a foreign jail—in my own country," he said.

Similar emotions were expressed recently by a truck driver, who lives in an \$18-a-month cottage in San Miguelito, a poor suburb of Panama City.

"There must be one law," he said. No more American police, no more American courts, no more American judges." Otherwise, he predicts violence of the kind that caused 21 deaths in 1964.

It seems to make little difference to Panamanians that most Zone police are correct and meticulous or that Judge Baker runs his court smoothly and speedily.

Many say that being in American courts in the Zone is a confusing and somewhat frightening experience. American Judicial officials also concede that penalties tend to be somewhat more severe than those for similar offenses in Panamanian courts.

About 90 Panamanians are serving long prison terms in the American penitentiary at Gamboa. Americans convicted by the District Court in the Zone usually are transferred to prisons in the United States.

About 10 times a year, the American governor signs deportation orders against Panamanians—meaning they cannot re-enter the enclave, which halves their country.

Administration of justice in the Canal Zone requires dozens of persons. Last year,

2,075 cases were tried in magistrate's court, and about 8,000 traffic violations were handled outside the court.

It is far from clear how this burden ultimately will be shifted to the Panamanians. A joint judicial administration, with Panamanian and American judges, has been discussed, but even such a fusion would not settle the question of whose law prevails.

At present, the Canal Zone Code is based on laws passed by the Congress, as is the case in the District of Columbia.

This may be at the root of the tense situation here.

"It's just getting worse and worse," said an American engineer who works on the only railroad between the country's two largest cities. Panama City on the Pacific Coast and Colon on the Atlantic side.

Last week, some people threw rocks at the train and broke several windows, he said.

Rising nationalism makes many of more than 40,000 Americans living in the Zone nervous and defensive.

"People have the idea that we are like the British colonialists, or that we kick a Panamanian every time we cross the street," said the Zone's American governor, David S. Parker. "Actually, the Americans here work hard. They do fan out into the country and many speak Spanish."

Gen. Omar Torrijos, Panama's leader, has called the sovereignty issue "our only religion." His political fortunes are firmly hitched to a settlement that would help restore Panamanian jurisdiction relatively soon.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1974]
PANAMA'S LEADER ON SPOT—TORRIJOS' POLITICAL FUTURE TIED TO NEW CANAL PACT

(By Dan Morgan)

PANAMA CITY.—The reputation, and perhaps political survival, of Gen. Omar Torrijos of Panama is on the line as his government prepares to start final negotiations with the United States on a new Panama Canal treaty.

Although Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger said here last week that "vital United States interests" would have to be preserved, Torrijos has done little to prepare his countrymen for the compromises that many diplomats feel probably are inevitable.

As a result, Torrijos, who has survived two challenges to his power since he seized control in a 1968 coup, may be caught in a squeeze between the left and the right as negotiators begin work on details of an agreement.

The Canal Zone issue is central to Panamanian politics and any moderates who may have existed in the past have been driven out of sight by Torrijos' fiery, nationalist rhetoric.

Torrijos is a new kind of man in Panama's political scene. The pre-1968 rulers of the country tended to be drawn from wealthy families—the "oligarchy" as it is called here—which made fortunes in sugar and other commodities.

Torrijos, a man of humble, back-country origins, is described by aides as a "Latin populist." His following is among farmers and workers, and he has courted these groups with improved social benefits.

His ideology is vague, but his ambition, according to friends, is less so: to rise above his own humble background to the stature of a "continental man" such as the late Salvador Allende of Chile.

In moving toward that goal, the Canal Zone issue, with its strong emotional appeal to Panamanians, has been an asset.

"They will be getting out, gentlemen," he has promised, and even has boasted that if the treaty negotiations break down a generation of Panamanians will be ready to give their blood for freedom.

Diplomats and others agree that last week's visit here by Secretary of State Kissinger, and the signing of an eight-point joint decla-

ration, bolstered the 44-year-old military leader.

However, the aura of success could fade quickly if the final treaty fails to live up to Torrijos' earlier promises.

On the left, Torrijos has succeeded in muffling opposition by taking a tough public line with the Americans on the Canal issue, placing some leftists in political and judicial jobs, manipulating the Marxist-oriented student organization and outlawing the Communist Peoples Party. However, any sign that Torrijos is getting soft on the Americans would spoil this relationship.

There also are many signs that intellectuals, businessmen, priests, and others critical of military rule now see opportunity in the Canal Zone issue to embarrass Torrijos.

There is a new boldness on the part of critics, and one group the National Civic Movement, has demanded public discussions of the treaty proposals.

Only a few hours after Kissinger left off last week, some opponents of the strict, military-backed government described the joint declaration as a victory for the United States because it allegedly conceded nothing new.

"This was nothing but paperwork," said a businessman. "The Americans are going to get everything they want. Either you get control, or you don't. Who is going to make the final decisions in the Zone? The Americans."

On the right, there is an uneasy truce between Torrijos and the business community which controls the local economy. Torrijos exiled some members of the oligarchy, but others are still around, and they tend to despise Torrijos' earthy, populist style and social policies.

Several years ago, Torrijos became dissatisfied with the writings of the English-language newspaper Star and Herald, which is run by the wealthy Duque family. He insisted in a change of management, but the family simply appointed another of its members to run the paper.

When a local radio station ran a commentary suggesting that discussion about the role of the oligarchy, a favorite Torrijos theme, should be expanded to include the "military oligarchy," the station was closed down briefly.

Financially, Torrijos' government does not appear to be in a strong position to extract concessions from the United States. The country's foreign debt, mainly to the United States, is one of the highest in Latin America.

The American connection is evident everywhere, from housing projects financed through the U.S. foreign assistance program, to Dairy Queens, Kentucky Fried Chicken shops and Chase Manhattan Bank branches. The country does not have its own paper currency, using the American dollar for this purpose.

From the glittering gambling casinos of Panama City to the country's 55 banks, with their \$2.2 billion in deposits, money and international finance are the lifeblood of the republic. Many of the financial threads lead to the United States, or to American business subsidiaries.

Numbered bank accounts, unrestricted movements of foreign capital and negligible taxes on profits on foreign investments have lured millions of dollars from all over the world.

Any tampering with this capitalist paradise immediately sends shock waves through the country, and gives a taste of what might happen if the government gave full vent to nationalism.

That was demonstrated last October when the government issued a new law aimed at controlling rents, providing incentives for low-income housing construction and imposing a greater measure of supervision over the real estate industry.

Some business entrepreneurs viewed this

as a first, halting step toward nationalization.

In the words of a local economist, the measure "panicked the business community" and provoked a show-down between government and private interests that still is not resolved.

No matter what forces are at play for the future, Torrijos is now in full command. He has the apparent solid backing of the 8,000-man National Guard, which he commanded, and the support of his friend, Manuel Noriega, the powerful chief of intelligence.

But the government is obviously aware of the potential dangers which the explosive Canal Zone issue holds for it.

At a press conference the night of Kissinger's departure, Foreign Minister Juan Tack appealed for confidence in the government.

"Panama didn't choose the way of being a protectorate," he said. "Therefore we have to complete this process. Whoever believes we are just playing at it, or having an academic game is very wrong. We are planting flags of national dignity."

RULES OF PRACTICE IN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD at this point the Rules of Practice in Proceedings before the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards.

Mr. Speaker, notice is hereby given that, pursuant to section 5 of the act of December 18, 1973 (87 Stat. 742; Public Law 93-191), the Rules of Practice in Proceedings before the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards, as hereinafter set forth, have been prescribed and established by the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards at its organizational meeting held on February 4, 1974.

Subsection (e) of section 5 provides in part that the Commission "shall prescribe regulations for the holding of investigations and hearings, the conduct of proceedings, and the rendering of decisions under this subsection providing for equitable procedures and the protection of individual, public, and Government interests. The regulations shall, insofar as practicable, contain the substance of the administrative procedure provisions of sections 551-559, and 701-706, of title 5, United States Code. These regulations shall govern matters under this subsection subject to judicial review thereof."

In view of the fact that a commission of the legislative branch is not authorized to publish documents, such as these rules of practice, in the Federal Register (44 U.S.C. 1501), the commission has determined to provide public notice thereof by printing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition to the notice hereby given, copies of the rules will be made available to any person upon request to the commission.

Due to the fact that the only remedy now available to persons who may wish to commence a proceeding on a violation of the franking privilege as it relates to the House of Representatives, is the filing of a complaint and proceedings before the commission under

section 5 of the act of December 18, 1973 (87 Stat. 742; Public Law 93-191), the commission has determined that these rules shall take effect immediately.

Although the commission does not anticipate any specific future changes in these regulations, the commission would appreciate, and therefore invites comments or suggestions which might assist in future revision of the rules. Comments should be submitted with at least 10 copies and may be mailed to the commission at 207 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Rules of Practice in Proceedings before the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards as hereinafter set forth are made effective immediately.

The rules, issued in Washington, D.C., on February 19, 1974, are as follows:

RULES OF PRACTICE IN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

ANALYSIS OF RULES

- Rule 1. Authority for rules.
- Rule 2. Scope of rules.
- Rule 3. Informal dispositions.
- Rule 4. Office, business hours.
- Rule 5. Complaints.
- Rule 6. Notice of hearing.
- Rule 7. Service.
- Rule 8. Filing documents for the record.
- Rule 9. Answer.
- Rule 10. Default.
- Rule 11. Amendment of pleadings.
- Rule 12. Continuances and extensions.
- Rule 13. Hearings.
- Rule 14. Change of place of hearings.
- Rule 15. Appearances.
- Rule 16. Hearing officers.
- Rule 17. Evidence.
- Rule 18. Subpensas.
- Rule 19. Witness fees.
- Rule 20. Depositions.
- Rule 21. Transcript.
- Rule 22. Proposed findings and conclusions.
- Rule 23. Decisions.
- Rule 24. Motion for reconsideration.
- Rule 25. Modification or revocation of orders.
- Rule 26. Computation of time.
- Rule 27. Official record.
- Rule 28. Public information.

RULE 1. AUTHORITY FOR RULES

These rules of practice are issued by the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards of the U.S. House of Representatives, hereinafter referred to as the commission, pursuant to authority under section 5 of the act of December 18, 1973 (87 Stat. 742; Public Law 93-191).

RULE 2. SCOPE OF RULES

These rules of practice shall be applicable in all proceedings before the commission.

RULE 3. INFORMAL DISPOSITIONS

These rules do not preclude the disposition of any matter by the commission, if it determines that there is no reasonable justification for the complaint, or by agreement between the parties either before or after the filing of a complaint when time, the nature of the proceeding, and the public interest permit.

RULE 4. OFFICE; BUSINESS HOURS

The offices of the commission and the officials mentioned in these rules are located at the House of Representatives, 207 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, and are open Monday through Friday except holidays from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

RULE 5. COMPLAINTS

(a) Any person who believes that a Member of, or a Member-elect to, the House of Representatives, Resident Commissioner or

Resident Commissioner-elect, Delegate or Delegate-elect, surviving spouse of any of the foregoing, or other official of the House of Representatives authorized to use the frank is about to violate or, within the immediately preceding period of 1 year, has violated the use of the frank under sections 3210, 3211, 3212, 3213(2), or 3218, or in connection with the operation of section 3215, of title 39, United States Code, may file with the commission a signed complaint which names the person involved; states the legal authority and jurisdiction under which the proceeding is initiated; states the facts in a manner sufficient to enable the person named therein to make answer thereto; recommends the issuance of an appropriate order; sets forth the address of the complainant and the name and address of his attorney, if any.

(b) All allegations in the pleadings shall be made in numbered paragraphs, the contents of each of which shall be limited as far as practicable to a statement of a single set of circumstances, and a paragraph may be referred to by number in all succeeding pleadings. Each complaint founded upon a separate transaction or occurrence and each defense other than denials shall be stated in a separate count or defense whenever a separation facilitates the clear presentation of the matters set forth.

(c) Statements in a pleading may be adopted by reference in a different part of the same pleading or in another pleading or in any motion. A copy of any written instrument which is an exhibit to a pleading is a part thereof for all purposes.

(d) The person so named in the complaint shall be known as the respondent and the person filing the complaint shall be known as the complainant.

RULE 6. NOTICE OF HEARING

If the Commission determines that there is reasonable justification for a complaint filed under rule 5, it shall issue a notice of hearing stating the time and place of the hearing and the date for filing an answer, which shall not exceed 10 days from the service of the complaint, and a reference to the effect of failure to file an answer or appear at the hearing. (See rule 10.) Except for good cause shown, the hearing date shall be within 30 days of the date of the filing of the complaint.

RULE 7. SERVICE

(a) The commission shall cause a copy of the complaint to be served upon the respondent or his agent and in addition, if it determines there is reasonable justification for the complaint, the notice of hearing.

(b) Service of all papers shall be effected by mailing the same, postage prepaid registered, or certified mail, return receipt requested, or by causing said papers to be personally served on the parties or their respective agents, as appropriate, by an authorized representative of the commission. In the case of personal service the person making service shall secure from the parties or their agents, a written acknowledgement of receipt of said papers, showing the date and time of such receipt. Said acknowledgement (or the return receipt where service is effectuated by mail) shall be made a part of the record of the proceedings. The date of delivery, as shown by the acknowledgement of personal service or the return receipt, shall be the date of service.

RULE 8. FILING DOCUMENTS FOR THE RECORD

(a) Each party shall file with the commission pleadings, motions, orders, and other documents for the record. The Commission shall cause copies to be served promptly to other parties to the proceeding and to the hearing officer.

(b) The parties shall submit four copies of all documents unless otherwise ordered by the hearing officer. One copy shall be signed as the original.

(c) Documents shall be dated and state the title of the proceeding. Any pleading or other document required by order of the hearing officer to be filed by a specified date shall be delivered to the commission on or before such date. The date of filing shall be entered thereon by the Commission.

RULE 9. ANSWER

(a) The answer shall contain a concise statement admitting, denying, or explaining each of the allegations set forth in the complaint.

(b) Any facts alleged in the complaint which are not denied or are expressly admitted in the answer may be considered as proved, and no further evidence regarding these facts need be adduced at the hearing.

(c) The answer shall be signed personally by the respondent except for good cause shown.

(d) The answer shall set forth the respondent's address and the name and address of his attorney.

(e) The answer shall affirmatively state whether the respondent will appear in person or by his attorney at the hearing.

(f) If the respondent does not desire to appear at the hearing in person or by his attorney he may request that the matter be submitted for determination pursuant to paragraph (b) of rule 10.

RULE 10. DEFAULT

(a) If the respondent fails to file an answer within the time specified in the notice of hearings, he shall be deemed in default, and to have waived a hearing and further procedural steps. The commission shall thereafter issue an order without further notice to the respondent.

(b) If the respondent files an answer but fails to appear at the hearing, the hearing officer shall receive complainant's evidence and submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to the commission.

(c) If the complainant or his attorney fails to appear at the hearing, the hearing officer shall receive the respondent's evidence and submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to the commission.

RULE 11. AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS

(a) Amendments proposed prior to the hearing shall be filed with the Commission. Amendments proposed thereafter shall be filed with the hearing officer.

(b) By consent of the parties a pleading may be amended at any time. Also, a party may move to amend a pleading at any time prior to the close of the hearing and, provided that the amendment is reasonably within the scope of the proceeding initiated by the complaint, the hearing officer shall make such ruling on the motion as he deems to be fair and equitable to the parties.

(c) When issues not raised by the pleadings but reasonably within the scope of the proceedings initiated by the complaint are tried by express or implied consent of the parties, they shall be treated in all respects as if they had been raised in the pleadings. Such amendments as may be necessary to make the pleadings conform to the evidence and to raise such issues shall be allowed at any time upon the motion of any party.

(d) If a party objects to the introduction of evidence at the hearing on the ground that it is not within the issues made by the pleadings, but fails to satisfy the hearing officer that an amendment of the pleadings would prejudice him on the merits, the hearing officer may allow the pleadings to be amended and may grant a continuance to enable the objecting party to rebut the evidence presented.

(e) The hearing officer may, upon reasonable notice and upon such terms as are just, permit service of a supplemental pleading setting forth transactions, occurrences, or events which have happened since the date of the pleading sought to be supplemented and which are relevant to any of the issues involved.

RULE 12. CONTINUANCES AND EXTENSIONS

Continuances and extensions will not be granted by the hearing officer except for good cause shown.

RULE 13. HEARINGS

Hearings are held at the U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C. 20515, or other locations designated by the commission.

RULE 14. CHANGE OF PLACE OF HEARINGS

Not later than the date fixed for the filing of the answer, a party may file a request that a hearing be held to receive evidence in his behalf at a place other than that designated for hearing in the notice. He shall support his request with a statement outlining:

(a) The evidence to be offered in such place;

(b) The names and addresses of the witnesses who will testify; and

(c) The reasons why such evidence cannot be produced at Washington, D.C. The commission shall give consideration to the convenience and necessity of the parties and the relevancy of the evidence to be offered.

RULE 15. APPEARANCES

(a) The parties may appear and be heard in person or by attorney.

(b) When a party is represented by an attorney, all pleadings and other papers subsequent to the complaint shall be mailed to the attorney.

(c) Parties must promptly file a notice of change of attorney.

RULE 16. HEARING OFFICERS

(a) A hearing officer may be appointed by the commission for any hearing hereunder.

(b) The hearing officer shall have authority to:

(1) Administer oaths and affirmations;

(2) Examine witnesses;

(3) Rule upon offers of proof, admissibility of evidence, and matters of procedure;

(4) Order any pleadings amended upon motion of a party at any time prior to the close of the hearing;

(5) Maintain discipline and decorum and exclude from the hearing any person acting in an indecorous manner;

(6) Require the filing of briefs or memoranda of law on any matter upon which he is required to rule;

(7) Order prehearing conference for the purpose of the settlement or simplification of issues by the parties;

(8) Order the proceeding reopened at any time prior to a final decision for the receipt of additional evidence; and

(9) Take any other action authorized by the commission.

RULE 17. EVIDENCE

(a) Except as otherwise provided in these rules, the rules of evidence governing civil proceedings in matters not involving trial by jury in the courts of the United States shall govern. However, such rules may be relaxed to the extent that the hearing officer deems proper to insure a fair hearing. The hearing officer shall exclude irrelevant, immaterial, or repetitious evidence.

(b) Testimony shall be under oath or affirmation and witnesses shall be subject to cross-examination.

(c) Agreed statements of fact may be received in evidence.

(d) Official notice or knowledge may be taken of the types of matters of which judicial notice or knowledge may be taken.

(e) Authoritative writings of the sciences may be admitted in evidence, but only through the testimony of expert witnesses or by stipulation.

(f) The written statement of a competent witness may be received in evidence provided that such statement is relevant to the issues, that the witness shall testify under oath at the hearing, that the statement is in all respects true, and, in the case of expert witnesses, that the statement correctly states

his opinion or knowledge concerning the matters in question.

(g) A party who objects to the admission of evidence shall make a brief statement of the grounds for the objection. Formal exceptions to the rulings of the hearing officer are unnecessary.

RULE 18. SUBPENAS

At the request of any party, subpoenas for attendance of witnesses at a hearing may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the commission or of any member designated by him or by the commission and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member.

RULE 19. WITNESS FEES

Fees and expenses for witnesses for either party or for depositions requested by either party shall not be paid by the commission.

RULE 20. DEPOSITIONS

(a) Not later than 5 days after the filing of respondent's answer, any party may file application with the commission for the taking of testimony by deposition. In support of such application the applicant shall submit under oath or affirmation a statement setting out the reasons why such testimony should be taken by deposition, the time and the place, and the name and address of the witness whose deposition is desired, the subject matter of the testimony of each witness, its relevancy, and the name and address of the person before whom the deposition is to be taken.

(b) If the application be granted, the order for the taking of the deposition will specify the time and place thereof, the name of the witness, the person before whom the deposition is to be taken, and any other necessary information.

(c) Each witness testifying upon deposition shall be duly sworn, and the adverse party shall have the right to cross examine. The questions and answers, together with all objections, shall be reduced to writing and, unless waived by stipulation of the parties, shall be read to and subscribed by the witness in the presence of the deposition officer who shall certify it in the usual form. The deposition officer shall file the testimony taken by deposition as directed in the order. The deposition officer shall put the witness on oath. All objections made at the time of examination shall be noted by the deposition officer and the evidence objected to shall be taken subject to the objections. In lieu of participating in the oral examination, a party may transmit written interrogatories to the officer, who shall propound them to the witness and record the answers verbatim. Objections to relevancy or materiality of testimony, or to errors and irregularities occurring at the oral examination in the manner of taking the deposition, in the form of the questions or answers, in the oath of affirmation, or in the conduct of the parties; and errors of any kind which might be obviated, cured or removed if promptly presented, are waived unless timely objection is made at the taking of the deposition.

(d) At the hearing, any part or all of the deposition may be offered in evidence by any party who was present or represented at the taking of the deposition or who had notice thereof. If the deposition is not offered and received in evidence, it shall not be considered as a part of the record in the proceeding. The admissibility of depositions or parts thereof shall be governed by the rules of evidence.

(e) The party requesting the deposition shall pay all fees required to be paid to witnesses and the deposition officer, and shall provide an original and one copy of the deposition for the official record, and shall serve one copy upon the opposing party.

(f) Within the United States or within a territory or insular possession, subject to the dominion of the United States, depositions may be taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths by the laws of the United

States or of the place where the examination is held.

(g) Depositions may also be taken and submitted on written interrogatories in substantially the same manner as depositions taken by oral examination. When a deposition is taken upon written interrogatories and cross-interrogatories none of the parties shall be present or represented, and no person, other than the witness, a stenographic reporter, and the officer shall be present at the examination of the witness, which fact shall be certified by the officer, who shall propound the interrogatories and cross-interrogatories to the witness in their order and reduce the testimony to writing in the witness' own words.

RULE 21. TRANSCRIPT

(a) Hearings shall be stenographically reported under the supervision of the hearing officer. Argument upon any matter may be excluded from the transcript by order of the hearing officer. A copy of the transcript shall be a part of the record and the sole official transcript of the proceeding. Copies of the transcript shall be supplied to the parties to the proceeding at their own expense by the reporter. Copies of parts of the official record other than the transcript may be obtained by the parties from the reporter upon the payment to him of a reasonable price therefor.

(b) Changes in the official transcript may be made only when they involve errors affecting substance and then only in the manner herein provided. No physical changes shall be made in or upon the official transcript, or any part thereof, which have been filed with the record. Within 5 days after the receipt by any party of a copy of the official transcript, or any part thereof, he may file a motion requesting correction of the transcript. Opposing counsel shall, within such time as may be specified by the hearing officer, notify the hearing officer in writing of his concurrence or disagreement with the requested corrections. Failure to interpose timely objection to a proposed correction shall be considered to be concurrence. Thereafter, the hearing officer shall by order specify the corrections to be made in the transcript. The hearing officer on his own initiative may order corrections to be made in the transcript with prompt notice to the parties of the proceeding. Any changes ordered by the hearing officer other than by agreement of the parties shall be subject to objection and exception.

RULE 22. PROPOSED FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

(a) Each party to a proceeding, except one who fails to appear at the hearing or indicates that he does not desire to appear, may, unless at the discretion of the hearing officer such is not appropriate, submit proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and supporting reasons either in oral or written form in the discretion of the hearing officer. The hearing officer may also require parties to any proceeding to submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law with supporting reasons. Unless given orally, the date set for filing of proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be within 5 days after the delivery of the official transcript to the commission who shall notify both parties of the date of its receipt. The filing date for proposed findings shall be the same for both parties. If not submitted by such date, or unless extension of time for the filing thereof is granted, they will not be included in the record or given consideration.

(b) Except when presented orally before the close of the hearing, proposed findings of fact shall be set forth in serially numbered paragraphs and shall state with particularity all evidentiary facts in the record with appropriate citations to the transcript or exhibits supporting the proposed findings. Each proposed conclusion shall be separately stated.

RULE 23. DECISIONS

(a) *Findings and conclusions by hearing officer.*—Within 20 days after the hearing has been concluded, the hearing officer shall submit to the commission proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, with the reasons therefor, upon all the material issues of fact or law presented on the record.

(b) *Final decision by the commission.*—The commission shall render a final decision within 30 days after the hearing has been concluded. Such decision shall include findings and conclusions, with the reasons therefor, upon all the material issues of fact or law presented on the record, and the appropriate order or denial thereof.

RULE 24. MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

A party may file a motion for reconsideration of a final commission decision within 10 days after receiving it or within such longer period as the commission may fix. Each motion for reconsideration shall be accompanied by a brief clearly setting forth the points of fact and of law relied upon in support of said motion. The commission shall transmit a copy of the motion and brief to the opposing party, who shall file a written reply brief within 10 days after filing or such other period as the commission may fix. A copy of the reply brief shall be sent to the moving party by the commission.

RULE 25. MODIFICATION OR REVOCATION OF ORDERS

A party against whom an order has been issued may file an application for modification or revocation thereof. The commission shall transmit a copy of the application to the opposing party, who shall file a written reply within 10 days after filing or such other period as the commission may fix. A copy of the reply shall be sent to the applicant by the commission. Thereafter, an order granting or denying such application will be issued by the commission.

RULE 26. COMPUTATION OF TIME

A designated period of time under these rules excludes the day the period begins, and includes the last day of the period unless the last day is a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, in which event the period runs until the close of business on the next business day.

RULE 27. OFFICIAL RECORD

The transcript of testimony together with all pleadings, orders, exhibits, briefs, and other documents filed in the proceeding shall constitute the official record of the proceeding.

RULE 28. PUBLIC INFORMATION

The commission maintains for public inspection in its offices copies of all final decisions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is taken. The commission also maintains a complete official record of every proceeding, all other records, data, and files of the commission which shall be the property of the commission or such other places as the commission may direct.

THE REAL MEANING OF THE SOLZHENITSYN EXILE

(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, upon learning of the arrest and exile of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, I could not help but feel some measure of both sadness and relief. That this great writer was banished from his homeland for asserting his natural rights to free thought and expression is a tragedy for not only Mr. Solzhenitsyn, but for all those who respect the dignity

of the human intellect. Yet one could not understand Solzhenitsyn's crusade to expose Soviet oppression without expecting that some day the full weight of Soviet terror would be used to oppose him. From this perspective, we have cause to be thankful that the reprisals against him were not more vicious.

In my mind, there is no question but that this exercise of restraint by the Soviet Union is a response to pressure from the West and especially the United States. The Russian authorities correctly expected that any further brutalization of Solzhenitsyn would inspire a torrent of Western protest. Indeed, it is to the credit of Russia's Western critics that they have been able to exercise this degree of influence over her internal policies. But we must be clear about the nature of that influence. Russia was not persuaded by the strength of our arguments, for the Russian people remain in bondage. She was persuaded by the prospect that violence against Solzhenitsyn would jeopardize Soviet-American détente and the consequent economic benefits she expects to reap. The Soviet treatment of Solzhenitsyn should be viewed as an indication of Russian strategy in her move toward détente. In preference to guaranteeing emigration rights or relaxing its iron grip on thought and speech, the Soviet regime will apparently show its good will by using less than its strongest measures against its most renowned dissidents.

From the Russian point of view, the strategy is a clever one. It is designed to make us celebrate Solzhenitsyn's safety while we forget his message: that, for the Soviet people, liberty is an empty vision. Our response, Mr. Speaker, must be unequivocal. We must let the Soviet authorities know that we will not be pacified by token gestures. If our commitment to human rights is to be taken seriously, we must pledge an unrelenting effort to use our peaceful power toward the goal of freedom for the Russian people. It would be the cruelest turn of events if the exile of Alexander Solzhenitsyn were to diminish the pleas for freedom that he inspired. There is no reason for détente to be available to the Soviet Union free of charge. If she desires cooperation with the Western community, let her pay the price of adhering to those principles of justice and decency upon which that community is founded. To insist upon this condition would be the highest tribute we could pay to Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

SPN'S SHOULD BE REMOVED

(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, today many veterans are being prejudiced in their attempts to find employment because of numerical codes on their discharge papers: separation program numbers—SPN's—and reenlistment numbers. Just because a veteran has an honorable discharge does not necessarily mean that he has a good SPN. There are 530 of these numbers, although the Pentagon in-

tends to reduce the quantity to 126 as of July 1, 1974. Their meaning can be as simple as "expiration of term of service," or as damaging as "unsuitability—enuresis"—bed-wetting—or "unsuitability—homosexual tendencies."

These numbers are supposedly confidential and for use only by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, but their meaning is known by most major employers.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 7557, to ban the use of SPN's and re-enlistment code numbers on servicemen's discharge documents. This would help eliminate the problem today in which veterans are prevented from obtaining employment even if they are equally or better qualified than the nonveteran applicant.

The Department of Defense might have reason to retain information in their files on a veteran's conduct in the service. But there is no reason why a veteran should have to have such information coded on his discharge paper to prejudice a prospective employer.

Because of my concern over the unfairness of the SPN to the serviceman and the risk of invasion of privacy if the designation becomes known to a potential employer or any other person, I requested the Department of Defense to remove these numbers on future discharge papers by administrative action, and to reissue discharge papers without the numbers upon request. My correspondence has been with Lt. Gen. Leo E. Benade, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense. The most recent letter I received from General Benade, dated November 16, 1973, indicated that the Department of Defense intends to keep SPN's on the discharge papers. The Department of Defense conducted two studies on the use of SPN's—one in August 1972 and the other in October 1973. I have written to General Benade requesting that these background reports be sent to me. Should he refuse, I will seek to obtain them through court action under the Freedom of Information Act.

It is interesting to note that for some time the Air Force has recommended that SPN's be deleted from discharge papers because SPN's "reflecting adverse reasons for discharge are just as stigmatizing as an unfavorably characterized discharge." The Air Force has also acknowledged that as long as the meaning of SPN's is readily ascertained, individual privacy is susceptible to invasions.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

(Mr. ROUSSELOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, this week the House may consider two very significant pieces of legislation which purport to deal with the so-called energy crisis. These bills, S. 2589 and H.R. 11793, respectively, would vest the President with extraordinary emergency powers, including the power to ration gasoline, and would create a Federal

Energy Administration to take over from the Federal Energy Office the task of administering the program. This type of Federal intervention can only result in the same type of distortions and further shortages in the supply of gasoline that we have seen occur in all of our vital commodities as a result of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

Fortunately, there is at least one group of young people, with which I am proud to be associated, which is ready to take up the fight against energy controls. "Youth for the Energy Solution"—YES—a new organization sponsored by Young Americans for Freedom, recognizes the irony of granting even more power to the Federal Government, whose regulatory actions over the past two decades created the "crisis" in the first place. YES calls upon young people of all persuasions to help it "ration Government—not gasoline." I wholeheartedly support this effort and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Last Monday, February 13, 1974, Ronald F. Docksai, national chairman of YAF, conducted a press conference to announce the formation of YES, whose chairman will be Gary Giordano. I am inserting the text of a statement which Mr. Docksai delivered at that time in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

(Statement by Ronald F. Docksai)

Young Americans for Freedom chose this particular moment in the Congressional recess to announce the birth of a new organization, YES, Youth for the Energy Solution. YES will initiate a national youth campaign in opposition to schemes for the governmental rationing of oil. YES will sponsor letter-writing campaigns and visitations to congressmen, senators, and influential voices in the media; distribute thousands of leaflets to the general public; and spend time individually convincing congressmen in Washington, D.C. and in their respective home district offices, of the stupidity of rationing. We express our opposition to rationing, because we feel it is a scheme which, however intended, can only result in depleted energy supplies and a dramatic heightening of this current crisis which threatens us with the spectre of an energyless America.

We believe that only a free market approach, permitting demand to meet supply, will provide the incentive oil companies must have to finance the discovery, development and refining of needed oil resources. Such a plan as advocated by Dr. Milton Friedman, however, has won little notice or support in congress. And it is for this reason that we, young conservatives, hope to champion a cause for which there are all too few crusaders in the older community.

YES hopes to expose the recurrent myths which visit the public and encourage the anti-economic and irrational call for government rationing. The charge, for example, that the current crisis results from a close-knit conspiracy involving the government and a roomful of oily businessmen ignores the fact that over 7,000 different U.S. firms are engaged in the search for and the production of oil and natural gas, the largest producer of which accounts for only 9% of the total.

The suggestions by some tenants of the Liberal community that we must henceforth seek a long-term cutback in production ignores the fact that America is an energy-

intensive country, dependent on automotive commutation and fuel consuming industries. It is not, we would suggest, the work of Satan working for Shell Oil which has caused the current shortage, nor will our problems be exorcised away by rationing or other national socialist solutions. The cause of our present discontents is a critical lack of refined oil supplies, a shortage which resulted from the artificially low price of fuel forced on the oil companies by governmental agencies which, as always, are capable of making political, but not economic decisions. Drilling, refining and labor costs rise with inflation. Keeping them artificially low warrants a shortened supply and our running the risk of black-outs in the year ahead. At a time of depleting social mores and values, we certainly do not need re-institutionalization of that value known as scarcity, and that is what inevitably follows a system of government rationing.

Youth for the Energy Solution does not claim to know all the answers. We are young people, students who happen to have a politically conservative point of view. We believe that if any rationing should be implemented, it ought to be rationing the size of government, not oil. To this end, we urge senior political leaders to join our ranks in this effort, an invitation which does not exclude non-conservatives. Senator Proxmire and Congressman Arends led the effort which prevented Federal-slush funds being rewarded to failing industrial firms like Lockheed. It would seem natural that in a similar bid for economy in government, they should join in this fight against rationing and the expensive company of bureaucrats it would require. Once we are returned to a free market system in energy, we could join in an effort to end government subsidies to the oil companies, subsidies in the form of the oil depletion allowance (e.g., expensing of intangible drilling costs) and foreign tax credits against U.S. corporate income. Therefore, we hereby invite Senator Proxmire and Congressman Arends to lead other interested colleagues in this battle against the ever-growing Federal bureaucracy. Beginning February 19th, with the opening of the session's business, we will visit their offices as well as those of other political leaders to personally deliver our messages and invitations.

Finally, Young Americans for Freedom will be holding an emergency meeting of our National Board of Directors this weekend, February 15-17, at the Dulles Airport Motor Inn, to map out strategy to coordinate this young people's campaign against rationing.

We agree with the view of Dr. Paul McCracken, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who recently said that "Economies that are managed by license and edict and coupon books are also economies with the pervasive corruption and graft." If it is one thing Washington does not need more of, it is pervasive corruption and graft. Rationing would invite such a situation, and it would celebrate the victory of an economic socialism that should have died with the Pharaohs, one which poses the greatest current threat to our economic liberty and well being.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MAILLARD (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for February 20, 1974, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. BRASCO (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. COTTER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness in the family.

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. BAKER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUIE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LOTT, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALFE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PODELL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Ms. HOLTZMAN immediately following the prayer.

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

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. TREEN.

Mr. KING in five instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT in two instances.

Mr. ASHBOOK in three instances.

Mr. MILLER in six instances.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. HEDNUT.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. ZWACH in five instances.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. HANRAHAN in three instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. CONABLE in two instances.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. FISHER in four instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. SIKES in six instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina in 10 instances.

Ms. ABZUG in 10 instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. SISK.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. ROY.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. KYROS.

Mr. GUNTER in two instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. CORMAN in five instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in 10 instances.

Mr. PIKE.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. WALDIE in four instances.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. BURTON.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. HARRINGTON in five instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to according-ly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 20, 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:

1907. A letter from the Director of ACTION, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1908. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on budgetary reserves as of February 4, 1974, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 581c-1 (section 3, Public Law 93-9); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1909. A letter from the President, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Corporation for calendar year 1973, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 548(b); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1910. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1974 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1911. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1975 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1912. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of payments from the special bank account to the Lockheed Corp. for the C-5A aircraft program, covering the quarter ended December 31, 1973, pursuant to section 802(b) of Public Law 93-155; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 12854. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN (for himself and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.R. 12855. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide pension reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12856. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the mailing of letter mail to Senators and Representatives in Congress at no cost to the sender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK (by request):

H.R. 12857. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 as it relates to the conduct of charter bus operations by grantees of Federal financial assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 12858. A bill to provide for payments to compensate county governments for the tax immunity of Federal lands within their boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself and Mr. HARSHA):

H.R. 12859. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, and other related provisions of law, to establish a unified transportation assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 12860. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to clarify when claims must be presented for reimbursement of memorial services expenses in the case of members of the Armed Forces whose remains are not recovered; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12861. A bill to reestablish November 11 as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 12862. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and other persons, to make improvements in the educational assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12863. A bill to amend section 6103 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12864. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rates under that act, to expand the coverage of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H.R. 12865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that gain from the sale or exchange of an individual's principal residence shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12866. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiv-

ing benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12867. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a Formulary Committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12868. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income taxes or a payment from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 12869. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assure an adequate supply of chlorine and certain other chemicals and substances which are necessary for safe drinking water and for waste water treatment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 12870. A bill to amend the Lower Saint Croix Act of 1972 by increasing the authorization; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 12871. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for loans to small business concerns affected by the energy shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 12872. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of educational assistance allowances paid to eligible veterans and other persons, to improve veterans' educational assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 12873. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for loans to small business concerns affected by the energy shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 12874. A bill to provide that certain time spent by Federal employees assigned to the California offshore islands shall be considered as hours of employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 12875. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B of medicare for routine paparacolac tests for the diagnosis of uterine cancer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS (for herself, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. BADILLO):

H.R. 12876. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 12877. A bill to provide for payments to compensate county governments for the tax immunity of Federal lands within their boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12878. A bill to amend the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 12879. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to repeal the recently added provision for the establishment of Professional Standards Review Organizations to review services covered under the medicare and medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Cali-

fornia, Mr. FORD, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLZMAN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. LENT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. REES, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 12880. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 12881. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Museum; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 12882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate, in the case of any oil or gas well located outside the United States, the percentage depletion allowance and the option to deduct intangible drilling and development costs, and to deny a foreign tax credit with respect to the income derived from any such well; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12883. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 12884. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FASCCELL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LENT, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 12885. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself and Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 12886. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALFE (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. PODELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 12887. A bill to amend section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983) to permit suits against bodies politic and the District of Columbia with respect to certain violations of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. PODELL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 12888. A bill to regulate commerce and amend the Natural Gas Act so as to provide increased supplies of natural gas, oil,

and related products at reasonable prices to the consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself and Mr. HILLIS):

H.R. 12889. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to repeal the recently added provision for the establishment of Professional Standards Review Organizations to review services covered under the medicare and medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 12890. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus supplies and equipment to State and local public recreation agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 12891. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to assure that rates are compensatory, to allow more flexibility in establishing rates, to facilitate the abandonment of uneconomic rail lines, and for other purposes; to assist in financing of rail transportation and to develop a rolling stock scheduling and control system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12892. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, to revise and extend programs of health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 12893. A bill to commemorate the American Revolutionary Bicentennial by establishing a meetinghouse program, by making grants available to each of the several States for the purpose of acquiring and restoring certain historic sites with a view to designating and preserving such sites for use as meetinghouses in connection with such bicentennial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Ms.

ABZUG, Mr. BERGLAND, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GIBBONS, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 12894. A bill to establish an independent commission to administer the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 904. Joint resolution to proclaim April 30, 1974, as a National Day for Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.J. Res. 905. Joint resolution extending the filing date of the 1974 Joint Economic Committee Report; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.J. Res. 906. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the 28th day of September 1974 as Teacher's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. J. Res. 908. Joint resolution to designate the month of March of each year as Professional Social Work Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 871. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to John P. Murtha; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Res. 872. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FULTON, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HINSHAW, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HEDNUT, Mr. HUBER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, and Mr. SHOUP):

H. Res. 873. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the expenditure of money appropriated by the Congress for the Bicentennial celebration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIKES, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H. Res. 874. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the expenditure of money appropriated by the Congress for the Bicentennial celebration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H. Res. 875. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H. Res. 876. Resolution disapproving the

recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H. Res. 877. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. THONE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GODE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. FORD, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. FISHER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. McDade, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. PIKE):

H. Res. 878. Resolution declaring the sense of the House with respect to a prohibition of extension of credit by the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H. Res. 879. Resolution disapproving congressional pay raises; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina):

H. Res. 880. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H. Res. 881. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 should not be extended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SARASIN:

H. Res. 882. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WAGGONNER (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RARICK, and Mr. SATTERFIELD):

H. Res. 883. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12895. A bill for the relief of Frank Cappuccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Illinois:

H.R. 12896. A bill for the relief of Dr. Earl B. Sanborn, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

350. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to an accounting of American servicemen missing in action in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

351. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to State matching funds requirements for highway construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE—Tuesday, February 19, 1974

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 18, 1974, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Mr. VANCE HARTKE, a Senator from the State of Indiana, attended the session of the Senate today.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had appointed Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. COHEN, as members and Mrs. SULLIVAN, an ex officio member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1974.

The message also informed the Senate

that pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had appointed Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. MOSHER as members and Mrs. SULLIVAN an ex officio member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1974.

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

H.R. 11864. An act to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the General Services Administration, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling; and

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.

BILL HELD AT THE DESK

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mes-