

markably perceptive, we think, in recognizing that a problem exists with respect to the officeholder seeking re-election and the non-incumbent challenging him. Legislation that would treat incumbent and challenger alike actually would wind up helping to insure the re-election of the incumbent. The league is similarly farsighted in recognizing that limits on campaign spending should not be allowed to restrict the full discussion of campaign issues and candidates.

The league, in short, has done its homework and discovered, in the process, that the problem of reforming the methods by which political campaigns are financed is fearfully complex—too complex for easy, unthinking answers.

We have suggested before in this space that the most appealing feature of proposals for the public financing of political campaigns is that they eliminate the necessity of thinking through all the problems. One simple answer, the public-financing proponents seem to be saying, will solve all—or nearly all—the problems.

The League of Women Voters is to be commended for reminding us that complex problems rarely have easy answers.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Feb. 6, 1974]

STILL ANOTHER PITFALL

One of the political facts of life in the United States to which proponents of public financing of political campaigns have paid little or no attention is that, despite the hoopla, the biennial battle for control of the U.S. House of Representatives takes place in roughly 50 of the House districts—districts evenly enough divided to go either way. These 50 districts constitute 20% of the House. In the other 80% of the districts, congressional candidates are either not opposed at all or are opposed so feebly that no real contest is involved.

The advocates of using money from the federal Treasury to finance congressional, as well as presidential, elections seem not to have taken that circumstance into account. They would make federal funds available to challengers even in districts in which, in normal circumstance, the incumbent would be unopposed for re-election.

Most, but by no means all, of such districts are in the Deep South, where, for all practical purposes, Republican candidates for Congress rarely have a chance. Hence, in 1970, there were no Republican congressional candidates in seven of Louisiana's eight congressional districts, in two of Kentucky's seven, in three of Arkansas' four, in three of Florida's 12, in five of Georgia's 10, in three of Massachusetts' 12. In the same year, there were no Democratic candidates in one of Ohio's 24, in one of New York's 41, in one of Texas' 23.

Candidates run unopposed in such districts not as the result of some diabolic scheme, but because practical politicians have calculated, on the basis of long experience, that there is no chance of unseating the incumbent or that one party's registration is so much larger than the other that an election's outcome is foreordained.

Yet any of the various plans for financing political campaigns out of the public-revenue would make funding available to both parties on an equal basis.

It is difficult to see what principle of equity would thereby be served.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Feb. 14, 1974]

THE HEADLONG RUSH

One of the ironies of Congress' consideration of campaign reform is the seeming unwillingness of key congressional leaders to wait until the facts are in. The abuses that campaign reform is aimed at correcting have been around, in one form or another, for at least a century. Yet the spirit in Congress appears to be one of demanding an instant answer—or what at least passes as an instant answer.

Only last week, as an illustration, the Senate Rules Committee gave its assent to a proposal for financing presidential and congressional campaigns out of the federal Treasury and to offer matching funds for candidates in primary campaigns. The Rules Committee's action, which puts the measure a long step closer to approval by the full Senate, came before the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities (the so-called Watergate committee) had even started to work assembling its final report. Yet campaign financing was one of three major areas in which the Senate asked the committee to delve. It needs to be remembered, of course, that the prolonged Watergate inquiry was undertaken in the first place for the purpose of recommending new legislation. But the Senate seems determined to act on a proposal to transform the face of political life in America without waiting for even a hint of the committee's recommendations.

Public financing of political campaigns is, in our judgment, a drastic, wholly unwarranted device to remedy what many have seen as the shortcomings of the status quo. Perhaps its appeal lies in its very simplicity. But therein also lies its principal failing.

No measure that would go so far to changing the system by which Americans elect their leaders should be undertaken without extensive, exhaustive inquiry. But it appears to be precisely that kind of inquiry that the Senate leadership appears determined to avoid.

SKYLAB MAY HELP FOOD INDUSTRY GROW

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News in a recent article by Mr. Leroy Pope, UPI business writer, outlines the number of contributions to the food industry derived from the Skylab program. Mr. Pope discusses hospital feeding,

fortified foods, and a number of other significant discoveries that will find direct applications in our daily lives. I commend Mr. Pope's article to your reading. The article follows:

SKYLAB MAY HELP FOOD INDUSTRY GROW

(By Leroy Pope)

NEW YORK.—Lessons learned in feeding astronauts aboard the various Apollo spacecraft and the Skylab may have significant applications in the food industry.

Hospital feeding is one area. Lessons learned in space eventually may be important in preparing foods for campers and vacationers, for boaters, for people engaged in scientific and other explorations in remote areas and to some extent the military.

This is the conclusion of Dr. Robert Pavey, a Cornell University-educated nutritionist who has had overall direction at Swift & Co., Oak Brook, Ill., of preparing foods and menus for the astronauts in the Apollo and Skylab ventures.

Whirlpool Corp. of Benton Harbor, Mich., was the prime contractor on both programs, and Swift obtained the subcontract to supply all the meat and meat-related foods and some vegetables and fruits.

"Companies that were drawn into the program," Dr. Pavey said, "include Pillsbury for bakery products; Oregon Freeze, dried products; General Foods, Kraft, special clinical nutritional foods."

It was a big jump from the pouched, liquefied foods sucked through straws by the astronauts on the early space trips to the varied stock of 70 virtually fresh foods enjoyed by the crew of Skylab. In the process, much was learned, Dr. Pavey said.

Not all that was learned concerned the food itself. For example, work with official of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) helped Dr. Pavey develop a compact, insulated combination stove and table that can hold unmelted ice cream next to a steaming main course.

Another mechanical development was an improved warmer tray that could have a revolutionary effect on the preparation of meals for airliner passengers and in schools and other institutions.

Dr. Pavey said the program developed more variety in five kinds of foods that have special clinical nutritional applications. These are:

Formula foods—used for "nutrification" of patients and convalescents who refuse most regular foods. They can correct deficiencies quickly.

Fortified foods—adding potassium to orange juice for example or adding some other mineral or vitamin designed to combat a specific medical problem.

Bite size foods—prepared to enable very ill patients to feed themselves and thus lift their morale.

Adjustment foods—those with few or no calories.

Intermediate moisture foods—also used to tempt very ill patients to feed themselves.

Dr. Pavey developed the Skylab menu with a staff of about 20 in a laboratory at Oak Brook. The 70 items included such delicacies as filet mignon and lobster newburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 21, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Reverend Joel W. Pugh, Episcopal Church, Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Representatives in Congress here assembled; that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consulta-

tions to the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people. Fill them with the love of truth and righteousness; and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve this people in Thy fear. Grant that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors that peace, truth, and justice may be established among us for all generations; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5236. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in Utah to the record owners of the surface of that property.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2747) entitled "An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate under that Act, to expand the coverage of the Act, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. STAFFORD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that, pursuant to section 1126(c) of title 46, United States Code, the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy; and Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, appointed Mr. PASTORE and Mr. COOK as members of the same Board of Visitors.

The message also announced that, pursuant to section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, the Vice President appointed Mr. GRAVEL to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; and Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, appointed Mr. LONG and Mr. BEALL as members of the same Board of Visitors.

THE REVEREND JOEL W. PUGH

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Joel Pugh offered the prayer this morning, and I want to pay high tribute to this fine man who is the minister in the church which I attend every Sunday, the Episcopal Church at Falls Church, Va. He was formerly the chaplain of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn.

In the gallery today are distinguished people with him, including his wife, Mrs. Caroline Pugh, and his father-in-law, Lord Redcliffe-Maud, an independent Member of the House of Lords and master of University College at Oxford.

With them is my wife, who is a vestryman of the Falls Church. This Episcopal church, which was built under the leadership of Augustine Washington, still stands on the outskirts of Washington today. The congregation dates back to 1732 and the present building is over 200 years of age. George Washington was a member of the vestry as well as his father, Augustine Washington. I am very proud of my beloved wife and the fact that she now serves on the vestry of this historic church.

Mr. Speaker, we indeed have a distinguished heritage represented in the minister who has offered our prayer today. I pay tribute to this fine man who has offered the prayer and to those who went before him in this historic church where he conducts his able ministry.

EULOGIES TO THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES M. TEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this announcement is to advise the membership that the closing date for printing the eulogies and encomiums to the late Representative Charles M. Teague of California, has been set for Friday, March 29, 1974. All copy for insertion must be submitted before this cutoff date so as to be included in the final publication of this compendium of eulogies.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 103]

Ashley	Frelinghuysen	McSpadden
Blatnik	Froehlich	Martin, N.C.
Brasco	Gettys	Melcher
Brynhill, N.C.	Gibbons	Metcalfe
Burke, Calif.	Goldwater	Minshall, Ohio
Burke, Fla.	Gray	Parris
Carey, N.Y.	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Chappell	Gude	Pritchard
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Reid
Clark	Harrington	Reuss
Conyers	Harsha	Rodino
Diggs	Hebert	Roncallo, N.Y.
Dingell	Hogan	Rooney, N.Y.
Downing	Hollifield	Rosenthal
Evans, Colo.	Huber	Ruppe
Fisher	Jarman	Ryan
Flynt	Jones, Tenn.	Teague
Forsythe	Kluczynski	Yatron
Fraser	McEwen	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 376 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

LEGISLATION REQUIRING CEILINGS ON CONTRIBUTIONS, CAMPAIGN SPENDING, AND PUBLICATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS

(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, I could take the well of the House on a question of personal privilege on a full page ad that appeared this morning in the Washington Post, but I do not want to waste 59 minutes; 1 minute will be enough.

Mr. Speaker, John Dingell, Sr., who was a longtime Member of this House, had a saying which I think is very timely. He used to say: "Love those who seek the truth; distrust those who have found it."

That certainly applies to John Gardner, the head of Common Cause. A more succinct saying we have in Ohio is "Beware of a man who keeps telling you how honest he is."

Every time Mr. Gardner comes into my office, I put my hand on my billfold.

Yes, the Democrats are having a fund-raising dinner tonight, and the name of every contributor will be on a list open to the public. We cannot say as much for those who contribute to Common Cause. The people who send in contributions to Common Cause are misled into believing that they have something to say about the policies of this organization. The truth of the matter is that policies are made by two people: John Gardner and Fred Wertheimer.

Such an ad as was run in the Washington Post could not be run in my State of Ohio because it is a political ad, and political ads in Ohio are required to have the signature of some individual.

One of the delays in bringing a bill to the floor is in writing an amendment to force Common Cause and other lobbyists like it to make public their list of contributors. We will have a bill within a few weeks, maybe within a few days, which will have strict ceilings on contributions, reasonable limits on campaign spending, publication of all contributions. It will apply to all candidates of all parties, and we hope to be able to apply it as well to common crooks like John Gardner, the head of Common Cause.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. A strong letter to Mr. Gardner follows.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 941, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on next Tuesday or any day thereafter during the week to bring up House Joint Resolution 941, a joint resolution making urgent supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, as provided in legislation approved by the Congress last year.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 999) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 999

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and are hereby elected members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Carlos J. Moorhead of California, and Tennyson Guyer of Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1000) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1000

Resolved, That the following-named Member be, and is hereby elected a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs: Robert J. Lagomarsino of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11793, FEDERAL ENERGY ACT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11793) to reorganize and consolidate certain functions of the Federal Government in a new Federal Energy Administration in order to promote more efficient management of such functions, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

CHET HUNTLEY

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that this Nation learned the news that Chet Huntley, for 14 years a stalwart and dominating figure in news reporting, died early yesterday morning. His was a reporting style which, allied with that of his partner on the NBC nightly news, David Brinkley, brought to millions the qualities of trustworthiness and sympathy in the recounting of the news of the day. I first remember Chet Huntley from the Huntley-Brinkley coverage of the 1956 Democratic Convention when I was interviewed on the floor while working for a Kennedy Vice Presidential nomination. From that day until July 31, 1970, when Chet Huntley did his last television news broadcast, Chet Huntley displayed to me as to countless other Americans the kind of dispassionate, thoroughly honest reporting that made him the giant of his profession that he truly was. I am sure that the broadcasting audiences of those 14 years—and indeed of his 16 years in the profession that preceded the Huntley-Brinkley show—join with the members of the House in a profound sense of loss. Our heartfelt sympathies go out to his family on this sad occasion.

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING STILL PRINTING RATION COUPONS FOR GASOLINE

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

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are not going to have gasoline rationing, but I wish someone would tell the Bureau of Engraving and Printing that so they could stop churning out those thousands of ration coupons.

The Federal Energy Office tried to deny Tuesday that the presses were still running, but finally conceded they would continue producing the coupons through the end of the week. I learned from a foreman at the Bureau, however, they are not scheduled to shut down the operation until the end of the month.

I am told the Bureau has already spent \$12½ million on the coupons apparently without any authority. The Energy Office says it is cheaper to continue producing the coupons than to stop the presses.

Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of confusion and muddled thinking that has stretched the credibility of the administration beyond all limits.

If the President had read the energy bill we sent to him just a short time ago, he would have found in it such things he now says Congress is holding up. The provision for a special energy administration, authorization for mandatory energy conservation measures, protection for workers who lose their jobs because of energy shortages, and data reporting requirements are examples of the things the President says he wants and which were included in the energy bill passed by Congress.

I am sure not even the President could honestly expect Congress to act on some of his other proposals, such as relaxing controls on new nuclear energy plants and revising complex tax legislation, without proceeding very carefully.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President should pay more attention to his own administration and let the Congress do its work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1974, I was detained in my office, discussing with a delegation of Communications Workers a matter of great importance in our area of the Niagara Frontier, and so missed rollcall No. 97.

Had I been able to reach the floor to vote, I would have voted "yea."

CHET HUNTLEY: A GIANT OF OUR TIMES

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I join in mourning the untimely passing of Chet Huntley—truly a giant of our times.

With the late Edward R. Murrow and a handful of other network pioneers like Walter Cronkite and David Brinkley, Mr. Huntley was responsible for honing and perfecting television journalism until it evolved into perhaps the most perva-

sive medium of communication the world has ever known.

The fact that more Americans get their national news from television than any other source is in large measure due to the strength and character of Chet Huntley.

When Mr. Huntley joined NBC in the early fifties, the network's news operation was still in its infancy—a technological novelty not, at the time, taken too seriously by the general public.

By the time he returned to his beloved Montana in 1970, the nightly network news was depended on by tens of millions of our countrymen. I think this amazing growth in the influence and prestige of televised news occurred in part because people who watched him every evening simply believed in Mr. Huntley. All that exposure might have diminished a lesser man, but Mr. Huntley was at the peak of his influence when he stepped aside.

As a onetime news broadcaster of far less achievement, I applaud Mr. Huntley's career—and regret only that he did not have longer to enjoy his well-deserved semireirement back home in Montana.

INCREASING PERIOD OF BENEFITS UNDER TITLE XVI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 13025) to increase the period during which benefits may be paid under title XVI of the Social Security Act on the basis of presumptive disability to certain individuals who received aid, on the basis of disability, for December 1973, under a State plan approved under title XIV or XVI of that act, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 15, insert:

Sec. 2. (a) The last sentence of section 203(e)(2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (as added by section 20 of Public Law 93-233) is amended by striking out "April" and inserting in lieu thereof "July".

(b) In the case of an advance or advances to the unemployment account of a State under title XII of the Social Security Act made before the date of enactment of this subsection, section 3302(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be applied as if the "second consecutive January 1" referred to in subparagraph (A)(1) of such section were January 1, 1975, or, if later, such second consecutive January 1 as determined under such subparagraph without regard to the provisions of this subsection.

Mr. MILLS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the Senate amendments.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS moves to concur in the Senate amendments to the text of the bill (H.R. 13025) with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendments to the text of the bill, insert the following:

Sec. 2. The last sentence of section 203(e) (2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (as added by section 20 of Public Law 93-233) is amended by striking out "April" and inserting in lieu thereof "July".

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill as it passed the House deals with a very urgent matter which should be settled without delay. The bill passed the House on March 5 under suspension of the rules. It is extremely important that final action be taken on the measure before the end of the month. The purpose of the bill as passed by the House is to prevent some 150,000 to 200,000 recipients of the supplemental security income program from going off the rolls at the end of March. These are the recipients who were added to State disability programs between June and December of 1973 who were affected by the rollback provision contained in Public Law 93-233 which requires that an individual determination of eligibility for supplemental security income benefits under the Federal standards of disability must be made.

Under the bill, payments to the individuals affected may continue to be made for any month in calendar year 1974 on the basis of presumed disability until an individual determination of eligibility is made with respect to each such individual.

This provision of the bill was agreed to by the Senate without any change.

The Senate added an amendment to the bill by adding two provisions which are completely unrelated to the subject matter of the House-passed bill. Both of the changes in the Senate amendment relate to the unemployment compensation program.

The first of these changes would extend the present temporary authority to certain States to pay extended unemployment compensation to workers who have exhausted regular unemployment compensation payments. This temporary authority is due to expire at the end of this month and would be extended for an additional 3 months until July 1 under the Senate change. The second change contained in the Senate amendment relates to the recapture provisions which are designed to assure that States that obtain advances from the Reed loan fund in the Federal unemployment trust fund repay those advances without unnecessary delay. I am urging that the House agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment under which the House would in effect agree to the first of these changes in the Senate amendment and disagree to the second change.

Let me explain each of the changes contained in the Senate amendment, in more detail.

The first change made by the Senate amendment relates to the State "on" and "off" indicators which are used to

trigger the Federal-State extended unemployment compensation program into and out of operation in individual States. A series of measures has been enacted during the past several years relating to this subject matter. These special laws have been required because the permanent law under which the extended benefits program is triggered in and out of operation has proven to be inadequate to deal with the type of unemployment that has existed in a number of States during the past 3 years. It is my hope that a permanent solution to this problem may be obtained in time to prevent future patchwork legislation such as has been adopted in the past and which the instant Senate amendment represents.

Under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act, up to 13 weeks of extended benefits may be paid to workers who exhaust their regular unemployment compensation payments. The benefits under the extended unemployment compensation program are financed 50-50 from Federal and State unemployment tax revenues. In order to have the program go into effect in an individual State, the insured unemployment rate in the State must be at least 4 percent and it must be at least 20 percent higher than it was in comparable periods in the prior 2 years.

A provision was enacted by Public Law 93-233 which permits States to pay extended benefits if their insured unemployment rate exceeds 4 percent without having to meet the requirement that insured unemployment must be 20-percent higher than it was in the prior 2 years.

This authority in Public Law 93-233 was limited to weeks of unemployment beginning after December 31, 1973, but before April 1, 1974. The change contained in the Senate amendment provides for a 3-month extension of this authority by changing the termination date from April 1, 1974, to July 1, 1974.

It is estimated that some 22 States would be affected by this part of the Senate amendment. Only six of these States, however, are now paying extended benefits under the authority provided for by Public Law 93-233. These States are Alaska, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Washington. It is estimated that some 16 other States could participate in this authority but it is not expected that they will all do so.

Most of these States could now participate in the existing authority but they are not doing so. These States are Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia.

It is estimated that the maximum total cost of carrying out this provision would be \$161 million during the 3-month period for which it is effective. This estimate is based on the unrealistic assumption that all of the States that are eligible to participate in the extended benefits program by reason of the provision would elect to do so. This cost would be paid for from Federal and State unemployment tax revenues. The maximum Federal cost, therefore, would be approximately \$81 million.

The second change contained in the

Senate amendment, which would be rejected under the motion, relates to the repayment of advances to State unemployment accounts from the loan fund in the Federal unemployment trust fund. This change should be rejected because it would establish an extremely bad precedent. As a practical matter, it would affect only two States, which have outstanding advances from the loan fund at the present time.

Under present law, if a State has an unpaid balance of its advances from the loan fund on January 1 of 2 consecutive years and has not reduced its balance to zero before November 10 of the second consecutive year, then the unemployment tax rates are increased for all employers in the State for the following years until the advance that has been made to a State is repaid.

The provisions of law relating to this matter are quite complex but in effect they provide a penalty in the form of an increase in the net Federal unemployment taxes paid by employers in a State under which such taxes would increase from the basic rate of 0.5 percent of taxable payroll by an additional 0.3 percent of taxable payroll for each year in which these penalty provisions apply. Under these provisions, the net Federal tax would be increased from 0.5 to 0.8 percent in the first such year, to 1.1 percent in the second such year, and 1.4 percent in the third such year, and so on.

There are additional penalty provisions which would apply beginning with the third and fifth such succeeding years. These repayment provisions of the law are too technical and elaborate to discuss in detail at the present time, but their elaborateness demonstrates their importance. The law was intentionally written to assure that the States will not be derelict in their efforts to repay the advances they have received from the loan fund.

The second part of the Senate amendment would provide for a 1-year hiatus in the application of these repayment provisions. I do not believe there is justification for this action. If the law were amended to provide for such a grace period, it would be difficult not to continue to do so indefinitely in the future. This would completely undermine the effectiveness of the recapture procedures in the law.

Advances from the loan fund have been obtained by only a few States since the loan fund was established by legislation enacted in 1954. At the present time, advances are outstanding to the States of Connecticut and Washington. In addition, I am informed that the State of Vermont has a pending application for a loan. Loans were obtained earlier by only four States. These loans were made in the late 1950's or early 1960's to Alaska, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Oregon. At that time, Oregon repaid its loan before the recapture provisions applied to it. Alaska, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, however, came under the recapture provisions.

At the time that Alaska, Michigan, and Pennsylvania were subject to the recapture provisions, however, the advances to those States and other States that had

been made under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 had not been repaid. For this reason Public Law 88-173 was enacted on November 7, 1963, which provided for a stretching out of the period in which repayment of advances from both the loan fund and the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act had to be made.

That legislation, however, did not go as far as the Senate amendment would. It did not completely prevent the recapture provisions from coming into operation. In addition, the situation facing the States affected by the legislation was more serious than the problems facing the States affected under the Senate amendment since the State accounts had been affected by two recent recessionary periods and there were two recapture procedures involved.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress once more the importance of moving this legislation through to enactment. It is important that the agencies operating the supplemental security income program and the unemployment insurance program in those States now paying extended benefits under Public Law 93-233 know what the law will provide with respect to their programs after April 1 since benefits they are now paying could not be paid after that time unless this legislation is enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, we on our side are in complete agreement with the position just outlined by the chairman of our committee on H.R. 13025.

The measure must be enacted into law before April 1, otherwise supplemental security income payments to a substantial number of recipients will have to be stopped. The purpose of the bill was explained in detail when it was passed by the House 16 days ago, and the chairman has summarized it again today. Therefore, I will not belabor the point.

The other body has not altered the bill which we passed, but has added an amendment which would make significant changes in the unemployment compensation program. The chairman has moved that the House agree to the first of these changes and disagree to the rest of the amendment.

The part of the amendment, added by the other body, to which we would agree under the motion, would extend for an additional 90 days the provision of Public Law 93-233 which permits States to participate in the extended unemployment compensation program if their insured unemployment rate is 4 percent or more. They would not have to meet the additional requirement of permanent law that their insured unemployment rate be 20 percent higher than it was in the 2 preceding years.

Under present law, the States may disregard the 20-percent increase criterion

through this month. Under the amendment added by the other body, this temporary authority would be extended through June.

It has been estimated that as many as 22 States could be affected by this part of the amendment, and that the maximum total cost would be \$161 million, of which about \$81 million would be borne by the Federal Government.

I agree with the chairman's motion, and I also hope, very strongly, that in the future we can seek and find permanent answers to unemployment compensation problems instead of taking a piecemeal approach. I certainly do not feel that it would be wise now to accept the other part of the amendment. Present law allows the States up to 2 years to pay back advances which the Federal Government may provide if needed for the payment of unemployment benefits. The other part of the amendment would give the States an additional year for repayment, and I believe the chairman is correct in stating that an extension of the grace period now would pave the way for further extensions, and that such action would undermine the effectiveness of the repayment provisions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House approve the motion made by the chairman of my committee.

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, is this measure the gentleman is presenting to us now similar to the bill we passed this fall in the extended benefits program?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, we passed a bill last year, as the gentleman from Texas rightly points out, to extend these special benefits under the extended unemployment compensation program to April 1 of 1974. The provision we are proposing to agree to here, would extend that for an additional 90 days, or to July 1, 1974.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, if I recall the colloquy we had this fall on the extended benefit program, there was a feeling that I had from the gentleman's committee that the committee would give the House more notice of this kind of legislation, and that we would not make automatic extensions.

It seems to me that what the gentleman is doing is, once more he is agreeing to the other body's desire to extend benefits for another 90 days, and possibly some 22 States will benefit and the other 28 States will be paying for the benefits of those States. This is a serious problem, and this is not to say anybody wants to be harsh in their attitude.

But this is another extension of the unemployment benefits. What will this program cost us eventually, this 3-month extension?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it could possibly cost, they tell me, as much as \$161 million, the Federal and State combined, at the very most.

Mr. PICKLE. The Federal figure is \$81 million, at the most, and \$161 million is the combined figure?

Mr. MILLS. The combined State and

Federal figure is \$161 million; \$81 million of the \$161 million would be Federal money, at the very most. This is the maximum figure.

Mr. PICKLE. Whatever it is, \$81 million or \$161 million, that means employees in all these other States are going to be paying for the benefits of these individual States.

There is certainly a problem in this area, and either through this program, or other unemployment programs pending, we are going to try to give help to those who are unemployed, and we should.

However, I say to the gentleman that the time must come when the gentleman's committee ceases to come here on a conference report without any notice and slide through another benefit program that is not available to the other States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to protest the benefits, but I do think the gentleman's committee must give more consideration to the Members when such a measure as this is brought before us.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been pending at the Speaker's desk for some days. This is a matter that was called to my attention shortly after I returned during the first half of March. I did not bring it up immediately, but delayed so I could discuss it with members of the committee who were interested in the subject matter and also with people downtown. Everyone I have discussed it with has been very anxious to have this bill passed by the House.

This basic measure—to which these amendments were added—affects people in the gentleman's State as well. If we do not take this action, there will be many of these 150,000 or 200,000 people who are disabled who will not be eligible to continue to receive benefits under the Federal program that began on January 1 this year. That is what we are talking about. These people must continue to receive benefits until an individual determination of their eligibility can be made. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I want to accept the amendment which my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE) was discussing in order to get the pressure off the unemployment compensation issue, because if we do not do this, we are going to be faced with a request to do something that I am sure the gentleman would view as being much more far-reaching and perhaps more contrary to his own viewpoint than this amendment would be.

Certainly it would be described in that fashion in my own thinking.

What we want to do is gain time to give the Congress a chance to carefully review the situation, because I find there are some weaknesses which developed in what I thought was a sound piece of legislation when it passed the House nearly 5 years ago.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I believe the program is a good program, I believe it is a good concept, and it works well, except I think that certainly the triggering figure is set a little bit low.

Mr. MILLS. That is true.

Mr. PICKLE. Would the gentleman

say that when the other amendment comes to the floor, this is the vehicle that we should use and not the other one?

There is a good chance we are going to get both.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I dislike, as much I am sure the gentleman from Texas does, the establishment of procedure in the other body of attaching amendments to legislation that are not even germane. If the gentleman feels that way, if I feel that way, and if the Congress feels that way, we could have changed the rules in handling these matters in relation to our deliberations in conference.

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

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the State of Texas does not come under this extended coverage; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. According to the latest estimates, it is not possible for the State of Texas to reach the point where it can trigger in its unemployment figure during this 90-day period.

Mr. KAZEN. It is very unfortunate, because in my own city there was a recent base closing, and we have a consistent unemployment rate, which has now reached the figure of 19.8 percent unemployment, and yet my people cannot take advantage of bills like this.

Mr. MILLS. No, it cannot, because the law itself looks at the unemployment rate within the State as a whole. We have never been able to break it down to areas less than that of the State as a whole. We have not been able to do it.

We are dealing now with a type of unemployment on occasion that causes us to wonder why it is not possible sometimes to do what the gentleman speaks about, because the gentleman knows and I know that unemployment that may be brought about through some lack of energy, for instance, could result from closings of some bases by the Government or some change in the governmental policy, which could affect one area of the State disastrously although it does not have uniform effect in the State as a whole.

This type of unemployment I think is sufficient to cause the committee to give consideration to the gentleman's idea.

Mr. KAZEN. I wish the chairman would give consideration to that situation. Our unemployment consistently stayed between 10 and 12 percent, but within the last 18 months it has gone up to 19.8 percent. Yet the President in his Houston message last week said that the national average was 5.2 percent. Well, you can imagine what my people feel like—5.2 percent is not bad, but, my gosh, 19.8 percent is disastrous.

Mr. MILLS. It is a lot worse. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12920, the Peace Corps authorization for fiscal 1975. This bill authorizes \$82.3 million to finance the operations of the Peace Corps in fiscal 1975, plus an additional \$1 million for increases in pay, salary, retirement, and other benefits which may be authorized in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps is now 13 years old and, in my opinion, remains one of the most successful bilateral foreign assistance programs ever conceived. To date, over 50,000 Americans have served overseas with the Peace Corps, assisting other countries with their development needs. At present there are 6,500 Peace Corps volunteers serving in over 60 countries, and, it is anticipated that in fiscal 1975 Peace Corps will be fielding 6,800 volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, just as the needs of the developing countries have changed over the last 13 years, so too has the character of the Peace Corps in order to meet those changing needs. The developing countries have been demanding more volunteers with special skills, and the Peace Corps has been responding to this need by providing more experienced personnel. The developing countries have been making a greater effort to integrate Peace Corps operations with their overall development programs, and the Peace Corps has responded by going to in-country training and greater host country involvement in the operation of the Peace Corps. This trend is consistent with the shift in our foreign policy from the paternalism of the sixties to partnership in the seventies. I support these new directions at Peace Corps and the plans contained under this authorization for continuing and expanding on these policies.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) will be offering an amendment to increase the readjustment allowance for regular volunteers from \$75 a month to \$100 a month, and for volunteer leaders and heads of households from \$125 a month to \$175. These basic allowances, which are set aside for volunteers to be used during the transition period to new jobs when they return to the United States have been in effect since the very inception of the Peace Corps, even though the cost of living over that period has risen 56.4 percent. The proposed increases in the Harrington amendment are still below that cost-of-living increase, being 33 and 40 percent, respectively. I would therefore urge support for and adoption of the Harrington amendment which will have the effect of increasing the authorization by only \$2 million.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today we must consider a measure of extreme urgency, H.R. 13025, which originally passed the House on March 5.

During Senate consideration of this measure an amendment was added that is of vital importance to those areas in our country suffering from excessive unemployment. This amendment would continue for an additional 3 months a provision under which States can elect to provide an additional 13 weeks of extended benefits under certain conditions. Present law will expire on March 31, however, passage of this amendment will extend this provision through June 30.

The unemployment rate in my own State, Rhode Island, has been severely affected by the closing of the Quonset and Newport Naval Bases. The extensive and growing caseload is putting a severe strain on the State's unemployment fund.

Present law allows States up to 2 years in which to pay back advances which they may receive from the Federal Government if they need them to pay unemployment compensation benefits. This amendment would allow an additional year for repayment to States whose advances would otherwise be due for repayment this year.

I commend the Senate on these amendments and urge their unanimous adoption by the House this afternoon.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to concur with the Senate amendment to extend unemployment compensation benefits for an additional 13 weeks. The plight of the over 5 million unemployed American men and women is an increasingly desperate one, and while this amendment will not solve all their problems, it will insure that many of them can avoid financial destitution in the coming months.

While I can readily support temporary legislative efforts such as this, it would be more appropriate to find solutions to the root causes of unemployment in this country. We must work to make the promotion rather than the elimination of jobs, the order of the day. We must convince the present administration to abandon their reckless and illconceived economic policies, policies which help the other peoples of the world, while abandoning the economic needs of millions here at home.

While it is true that millions of unemployed men and women will be grateful at our actions here today, the mere fact that they have been relegated to relying on public assistance is a bitter pill to swallow. Let us help these people stay afloat for now, but not ignore the real need, to find a job. Our foremost economic priority should be the assurance of employment for every able-bodied American. There is no matter more important to the future economic health and well being of this Nation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the title of the bill, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to increase the period during which benefits may be paid under title XVI of the Social Security Act on the basis of presumptive disability to certain individuals who receive aid, on the basis of disability, for December 1973, under a State plan approved under title XIV or XVI of that Act, and for other purposes."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the title of the bill (H.R. 13025).

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

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendments, as amended, were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill and that I may be permitted to extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter in connection with my statement.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO S. 1745, SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1745) to provide financial assistance for research activities for the study of sudden infant death syndrome and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House engrossed amendment insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Act of 1974".

SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME RESEARCH

SEC. 2. (a) Section 441 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "an institute" and inserting in lieu thereof "the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development".

(b) (1) Such section 441 is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 441." and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The Secretary shall carry out through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development the purposes of section 301 with respect to the conduct and support of research which specifically relates to sudden infant death syndrome."

(2) Section 444 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "The Surgeon General" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary", and (2) by striking out "The Surgeon General shall, with the approval of the Secretary" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary shall, in accordance with section 441(b)",.

(c) (1) Within ninety days following the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and the close of each of the next two fiscal years, the Secretary shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives the following information for such fiscal year:

(A) The (i) number of applications approved by the Secretary in the fiscal year reported on for grants and contracts under the Public Health Service Act for research which relates specifically to sudden infant death syndrome, (ii) total amount requested under such applications, (iii) number of such applications for which funds were provided in such fiscal year, and (iv) total amount of such funds.

(B) The (i) number of applications approved by the Secretary in such fiscal year for grants and contracts under the Public

Health Service Act for research which relates generally to sudden infant death syndrome, (ii) total amount requested under such applications, (iii) number of such applications for which funds were provided in such fiscal year, and (iv) total amount of such funds. Each such report shall contain an estimate of the need for additional funds for grants or contracts under the Public Health Service Act for research which relates specifically to sudden infant death syndrome.

(2) Within five days after the Budget is transmitted by the President to the Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for each of the next two fiscal years, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives an estimate of the amount requested for the National Institutes of Health for research relating to sudden infant death syndrome and a comparison of that amount with the amount requested for the preceding fiscal year.

COUNSELING, INFORMATION, EDUCATIONAL AND STATISTICAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. (a) Title XI of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART C—SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

"SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME COUNSELING, INFORMATION, EDUCATIONAL, AND STATISTICAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 1121. (a) The Secretary, through the Assistant Secretary for Health, shall carry out a program to develop public information and professional educational materials relating to sudden infant death syndrome and to disseminate such information and materials to persons providing health care, to public safety officials, and to the public generally.

"(b) (1) The Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities, and enter into contracts with public and private entities, for projects which include both—

"(A) the collection, analysis, and furnishing of information (derived from post mortem examinations and other means) relating to the causes of sudden infant death syndrome; and

"(B) the provision of information and counseling to families affected by sudden infant death syndrome.

"(2) No grant may be made or contract entered into under this subsection unless an application therefor has been submitted to and approved by the Secretary. Such application shall be in such form, submitted in such manner, and contain such information as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribed. Each applicant shall—

"(A) provide that the project for which assistance under this subsection is sought will be administered by or under supervision of the applicant;

"(B) provide for appropriate community representation in the development and operation of such project;

"(C) set forth such fiscal controls and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this subsection; and

"(D) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(3) Payments under grants under this subsection may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions, as the Secretary finds necessary.

"(4) Contracts under this subsection may be entered into without regard to sections 3648 through 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 44 U.S.C. 5).

"(5) For the purpose of making payments pursuant to grants and contracts under this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977.

(e) The Secretary shall submit, not later than January 1, 1976, a comprehensive report to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives respecting the administration of this section and the results obtained from the programs authorized by it."

(b) The title of such title XI is amended by adding at the end thereof "AND SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME".

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, the House recently passed legislation designed to support study on the causes of sudden infant death syndrome. The House bill was an amendment to a similar bill passed by the Senate and at my direction a compromise has been worked out on the few minor differences between the bills. That compromise has passed the Senate and has been sent to us as an amendment to our bill.

It eliminates the few differences between the bills. The first of these was that the Senate bill provided \$24 million in specific authorizations for research on the causes of sudden infant death syndrome, while the House amendment provided that research on SIDS be continued and expanded under existing authority.

The compromise eliminates the \$24 million authorization but does provide for detailed oversight of the research and funding for SIDS.

The Senate bill also provided a \$12 million authorization to fund regional centers conducting statistical, informational and counseling programs on sudden infant death syndrome. The House amendment did not call for these regional centers but did authorize \$6 million for similar programs.

The compromise eliminates authority for regional centers, but does provide \$9 million for support to informational, statistical, and counseling programs on SIDS. The Senate bill also provided grant and contract authority for educational and informational programs on SIDS, while the House amendment directed that these programs be conducted by HEW with existing funds. The compromise contains the House's provision on this matter.

The only other difference between the bills was on reporting progress made under the legislation and here again the compromise contains the House provision which we have already accepted. The differences between the bills were minor to start and have been resolved largely in favor of the House provisions so there seems to be no reason to not vote for this compromise.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the chairman. I

would like to ask the chairman if this matter was worked out in a conference between the House and the Senate or if this was done between the staffs of the majority of the House and the Senate.

Mr. STAGGERS. Let me say that with the agreement of the Senate, it is essentially the House bill, Dr. CARTER. It is essentially the same as the House bill.

Mr. CARTER. However, if we are to support this legislation, we should know fully how it was considered. The way in which the conclusions were arrived at was not according to the usual procedures and, therefore, subject to objection.

It was not done by a conference of the Members, but only by a meeting of the staff. I shall not object, Mr. Speaker, but I do reserve the right to object. I do want to point out to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), the chairman of the committee, that this matter of concern has previously come up time after time where agreements have been arrived at by members of the staff on the majority side without appropriate consultation with the minority members. This is certainly not in accord with the promise I received from the gentleman that the minority will be considered in such actions.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from West Virginia if the minority was consulted at any time concerning this legislation?

Mr. STAGGERS. I did not think they needed to be, since we retained the House version.

Mr. CARTER. This was a compromise that was worked out by the staff, and not by a conference between the House and Senate Members. I am objecting to this procedure.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. CARTER. I yield further to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman knows that the differences were small, and were infinitesimal, with the exception of the \$24 million which the Senate agreed to knock out, and I did not think it was worthwhile to bother the gentleman from Kentucky on those small differences.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the way in which many serious errors result, because if we permit our staff to work out compromises between the House and Senate without consulting the minority, we violate the usual procedures. I am only asking that we appropriately observe these procedures.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from West Virginia, is it true that this agreement was worked out and never submitted to the members of the conference, the managers on the part of the House, the majority as well as the minority; is this true?

Mr. STAGGERS. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Chair gave directions to the staff. There was no conference on this bill because it is a small bill and because the differences between the House and Senate bills were very small. I directed the staff to work

out the small differences with the Senate, which they did generally by getting the Senate to agree to the House version. The Senate then amended the House bill with the compromise and we are now trying to agree to that amendment. This is appropriate parliamentary procedure, which allows us to avoid the trouble of a conference when faced with such small differences. If the minority does not feel it was appropriately consulted, I apologize for that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I cannot hear the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman would wait 1 minute, there is not a staff member on my staff, whether Democrat or Republican, whom I did not hire them that way, and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) knows that, and every staff member is picked in that way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is not the question.

Mr. STAGGERS. Well, what is the question?

Mr. GROSS. The question is: was the agreement reached in this matter by the staff without having been agreed to by the managers in the conference on the part of the House, by either the majority or the minority?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is not true, because I was consulted and gave directions to the staff as to what we could do.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a conference report signed by the Members of the House?

Mr. STAGGERS. There is not for the reasons I explained. I brought this up before our committee this morning.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It was my understanding, when the gentleman from West Virginia spoke to me about calling this matter up, that this was a valid conference report. Apparently it is not. Is the gentleman going to object to further proceeding?

Mr. CARTER. This is a very worthwhile bill, and I hesitate to object. But since it has been brought up in a manner contrary to the usual procedures. I am constrained to object.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will say to the gentleman that he should know it was brought up before the committee this morning. I stated then as to what I intended to do on the floor. There was no objection raised. I would say to him that I was the one who directed the staff to do what they did, and it is the House bill that came back to us. I see nothing wrong with it.

Does the gentleman wish to object to this today?

Mr. CARTER. I object because the minority was not notified and had no participation in the negotiations between the House and the Senate.

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

Mr. CARTER. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS TO CARRY OUT THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 994 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 994

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12920) to authorize additional appropriations to carry out the Peace Corps Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 994 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 12920, a bill to authorize additional appropriations to carry out the Peace Corps Act.

H.R. 12920 authorizes the appropriation of \$82,256,000 for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1975. It also authorizes an additional appropriation of up to \$1 million for increases in salary, pay, retirement and other employee benefits.

The bill also relieves disbursing and certifying officers of the Peace Corps and Action from liability from erroneous payments of readjustment allowances made to volunteers, except in cases of fraud.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 994 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 12920.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 12920, the Peace Corps Authorization, is House Resolution 994. This is an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The primary purpose of H.R. 12920 is to authorize \$82,256,000 for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1975. With an authorization for 6,800 members, this means a cost of over \$12,000.00 per Peace Corps member. However, the Peace Corps member will receive only \$75 per month. In my opinion, this is far too much for administrative and other costs.

The bill also authorizes an additional \$1,000,000 for increases in employee benefits. It also relieves disbursing and certifying officers of the Peace Corps and Action from liability for erroneous payments of readjustment allowances made to volunteers between March 1, 1961, and February 28, 1973, except in cases of fraud.

The committee report indicates that the total cost of the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1975 should not exceed \$83,256,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule.

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

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

I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 380, nays 9, answered “present” 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—380

Abdnor	Clausen, Don H.	Frenzel
Abzug	Clawson, Del	Frey
Adams	Clay	Fulton
Addabbo	Cleveland	Fuqua
Alexander	Cochran	Gaydos
Anderson, Calif.	Cohen	Gilman
Andrews, N.C.	Collier	Ginn
Andrews, N. Dak.	Collins, Ill.	Goldwater
Annunzio	Collins, Tex.	Gonzalez
Archer	Conable	Goodling
Arends	Conlan	Grasso
Armstrong	Conyers	Green, Oreg.
Ashbrook	Corman	Green, Pa.
Ashley	Cotter	Grover
Aspin	Coughlin	Gubser
Badillo	Crane	Gunter
Bafalis	Cronin	Guyer
Baker	Culver	Haley
Barrett	Daniel, Dan	Hamilton
Bauman	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hammer-schmidt
Beard	Daniels,	Hanley
Bell	Dominick V.	Hanna
Bennett	Danielson	Hansen, Idaho
Bergland	Davis, S.C.	Harsha
Biesler	Davis, Wls.	Hastings
Bingham	de la Garza	Hawkins
Blackburn	Dellenback	Hébert
Boggs	Delaney	Hays
Boland	Dellums	Hechler, W. Va.
Bolling	Denholm	Heckler, Mass.
Bowen	Dennis	Heinz
Brademas	Dent	Heilstoski
Bray	Derwinski	Henderson
Breaux	Devine	Hicks
Breckinridge	Dickinson	Hillis
Brooks	Diggs	Hinshaw
Broomfield	Donohue	Holifield
Brotzman	Brown, Calif.	Holt
Brown, Mich.	Brown, Ohio	Holtzman
Brown, Ohio	Brownhill, N.C.	Horton
Brownhill, Va.	Brownhill, Va.	Dulski
Buchanan	Duncan	Hosmer
Burgener	du Pont	Howard
Burke, Calif.	Eckhardt	Hudnut
Burke, Calif.	Edwards, Ala.	Hungate
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, Calif.	Hunt
Burleson, Tex.	Elberg	Hutchinson
Burlison, Mo.	Erlenborn	Ichord
Burton	Esch	Johnson, Calif.
Butler	Eshleman	Johnson, Colo.
Byron	Evans, Colo.	Johnson, Pa.
Camp	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.
Carney, Ohio	Fascell	Jones, N.C.
Carter	Findley	Jones, Okla.
Casey, Tex.	Fish	Jordan
Cederberg	Flood	Karth
Chamberlain	Flowers	Kastenmeier
Chisholm	Foley	Kazen
Clancy	Forsythe	Kemp
Clark	Fountain	Ketchum

Koch	O'Byren	Obey
Kuykendall	O'Neill	Stanton, James V.
Kyros	Owens	Stark
Lagomarsino	Landrum	Steed
Latta	Leggett	Steele
Lehman	Perkins	Steelman
Lent	Patten	Steiger, Ariz.
Litton	Pettis	Steiger, Wls.
Long, La.	Peyser	Stokes
Long, Md.	Pickle	Stratton
Lott	Pike	Stubblefield
Luken	Poage	Stuckey
McClory	Podell	Studds
McCloskey	Powell, Ohio	Sullivan
McCormick	Preyer	Symington
McCollister	Price, Ill.	Symms
McDade	Price, Tex.	Talcott
McEwen	Pritchard	Taylor, N.C.
McFall	Quile	Teague
McKay	Quillen	Thomson, Wis.
McKinney	Railsback	Thone
McSpadden	Randall	Thornton
Macdonald	Rangel	Towell, Nev.
Madden	Regula	Udall
Madigan	Rhodes	Ullman
Mahon	Riegle	Van Deerlin
Mallary	Rinaldo	Vander Jagt
Mann	Roberts	Vander Veen
Maraziti	Robinson, Va.	Vanik
Martin, Nebr.	Robison, N.Y.	Veysey
Martin, N.C.	Rodino	Vigorito
Mathias, Calif.	Roe	Waggonner
Mathis, Ga.	Rogers	Walde
Matsunaga	Roncalio, Wyo.	Walsh
Mayne	Rose	Wampler
Mazzoli	Rostenkowski	Ware
Meeds	Roush	Whalen
Melcher	Rousselot	White
Mezvinsky	Russell	Whitehurst
Michel	Ruth	Whitten
Milford	Rupp	Widnall
Mills	St Germain	Wiggins
Minish	Sandman	Williams
Mink	Sarasin	Wilson, Charles H.
Mitchell, Md.	Sarbanes	Wilson, Calif.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Satterfield	Charles, Tex.
Mizell	Scherie	Winn
Moakley	Schneebell	Wright
Mollohan	Sebellus	Wyatt
Montgomery	Seiberling	Wydler
Moorhead, Calif.	Shipley	Wylie
Moorhead, Pa.	Shoup	Wyman
Morgan	Shriver	Yates
Mosher	Shuster	Young, Alaska
Moss	Sikes	Young, Fla.
Murphy, Ill.	Sisk	Young, Ga.
Murphy, N.Y.	Slack	Young, Ill.
Murtha	Smith, Iowa	Young, S.C.
Myers	Smith, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Natcher	Spence	Zablocki
Nedzi	Staggers	Zion
Nichols	Stanton	Zwach
Nix	J. William	

NAYS—9

Bevill	Hanrahan	Rarick
Brinkley	Landgrebe	Snyder
Gross	Passman	Taylor, Mo.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Thompson, N.J.

NOT VOTING—42

Anderson, Ill.	Gibbons	Parris
Blatnik	Gray	Patman
Brasco	Gude	Rees
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Wash.	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Hogan	Reuss
Chappell	Huber	Roncalio, N.Y.
Dingell	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Fisher	Jones, Tenn.	Ryan
Flynt	Kluczynski	Schroeder
Ford	Lujan	Skubitz
Fraser	Metcalfe	Stephens
Frelinghuysen	Minshall, Ohio	Tiernan
Froehlich	Nelsen	Treen
Gettys	O'Hara	Yatron

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Tiernan with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Neisen.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Froehlich.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Roncalio of New York.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Parris.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Treen.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Fisher with Mrs. Schroeder.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12920) to authorize additional appropriations to carry out the Peace Corps Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12920) with Mr. PIKE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

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

The bill which is being presented for your consideration today would grant a 1-year extension to an organization which, in my opinion, is one of America's best investments abroad—the Peace Corps.

For 13 years, the Peace Corps volunteers have been helping poor people in every part of the world to achieve a better life.

It also provides thousands of young Americans with an unequalled opportunity to gain an understanding of the complex problems which confront the less developed countries—problems which influence the larger issues of peace and economic progress for all nations.

Because of the experience gained in their service abroad, Peace Corps volunteers return home better equipped to help solve our own domestic problems as well as those problems which our country must face on the world scene.

PURPOSE

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 12920, authorizing appropriations to carry out the Peace Corps Act in fiscal year 1975, has three main purposes:

First, it authorizes \$82,256,000 to finance Peace Corps operations during the coming fiscal year.

Second, it limits the amount which can

be appropriated to pay for possible employee salary and benefit increases to \$1 million in fiscal year 1975.

Third, it will rectify a \$315,000 imbalance in the Peace Corps readjustment allowance account which resulted from overpayments made to Peace Corps volunteers between March 1, 1961, and February 28, 1973.

COMMITTEE ACTION

As demonstrated by the final vote of 22 to 2, H.R. 12920 was ordered reported from the committee with strong bipartisan support.

While the full executive branch request of \$82,256,000 to finance Peace Corps was approved, the committee made one substantive amendment in the administration's proposal:

In place of an open-ended contingency authorization to pay for possible increases in employee salaries and benefits during fiscal year 1975, the committee placed a \$1 million ceiling on funds authorized for this purpose.

Two amendments were voted down by large margins.

One of the defeated amendments would have increased the funding authorization to \$115,700,000.

The other amendment rejected by the Committee would have doubled the readjustment allowance for volunteers. According to the Peace Corps Director, this issue is under study and if an increase in the allowance is found to be justified, a proposal will be included in the administration's fiscal year 1976 request.

BUDGET BREAKDOWN

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to say a few words about the budget proposed in the bill before us.

The authorization in section I of the bill represents an increase of \$5,255,000 over the authorization for fiscal year 1974.

The budget presented to the Committee by Action/Peace Corps officials shows that the authorization requested for fiscal year 1975 is divided primarily among three activities:

First, \$46,369,000, an increase of \$2,625,000, is budgeted to support the training of 4,800 volunteers, an increase of 100 over fiscal year 1974, and to finance 6,800 volunteer man-years in the field, an increase of 310 over the last fiscal year;

Second, \$34,887,000, an increase of \$2,391,000, will be used to finance support costs of Peace Corps programs and agencywide support costs; and

Third, \$822,560, or 1 percent of the total authorization, will be devoted to upgrade the planning, program development, and evaluation capability of the Peace Corps.

The committee agreed that the modest increase in volunteers is justified due to the increasing demand for skilled, job-experienced volunteers by host countries.

In relation to their increasing demand for skilled volunteers, I would also like to point out that these countries are paying more out of their own pockets to support Peace Corps activities in their countries. It is expected that their contributions will increase by 20 percent this year alone.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCE IMBALANCE

The readjustment allowance provisions were approved by the committee on the recommendation of the General Accounting Office. The GAO felt that this legislation is needed to clear up a shortfall that has been on the books for some time—and that it should be done in this way.

I would like to give a brief explanation of how that imbalance developed.

As you may know, the Peace Corps sets aside \$75 a month for each regular volunteer. At the end of his service, the volunteer receives that money to help him readjust to life back in the United States.

In case of emergency, volunteers are permitted to draw from this account during their service abroad.

Due to an inadequate accounting system, the latter provision led to large numbers of small overpayments to some volunteers over a period of several years.

Some of these overpayments were recovered but credited to the wrong account in the Treasury. In other cases, emergency withdrawals were not reported to Washington before final payment of the readjustment allowances. In many cases, the names of the recipients of the overpayments are unknown.

The total imbalance in Peace Corps accounts amounts to less than \$6 per volunteer.

This is not a large amount, but the General Accounting Office wants it cleared up.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion—I believe that the Peace Corps has been and continues to be one of America's best investments abroad.

The concept of volunteerism in our overseas programs is as relevant today as it was when President Kennedy launched the Peace Corps in 1961. For these reasons, I urge the approval of H.R. 12920.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield,

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if it is not true that the Peace Corps has had one of the highest administrative costs of any agency in terms of the amount of money expended?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, those costs were high in the beginning, but I think over the 13-year period Peace Corps has done a better job in downgrading their administrative costs. As the gentleman knows, they were running a little over 30 percent years ago, but they reduce them to about 26 percent. Peace Corps wide salaries today average \$10,736 in comparison with \$13,834 for other Government agencies also. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa was present when it was developed in the hearings that Peace Corps has abolished some higher level jobs, and reduced others, especially some of those here in the District.

Mr. GROSS. Are not the administrative costs presently running about 27 percent?

Mr. MORGAN. I believe this year they run somewhere around 26 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in the

light of the tremendously high administrative costs, what excuse could there possibly be for these overpayments totaling \$315,000?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, as the gentleman knows, the Peace Corps is not solely responsible for this imbalance, because the Treasury Department is also involved here. Some of the money was returned, and evidently was credited to wrong accounts.

In other cases, the overpayments were small and would be costly to collect. But we are very fortunate the overpayments are small. As we all know, it is not unusual for many agencies to have some overpayments. They have different authorities, however, whereby they can balance off these overpayments. But the Peace Corps has nothing in their legislation whereby they can write off these overpayments.

In our social security system, if an individual can prove that he or she is in need, he or she can write off similar overpayments. But Peace Corps cannot. We must have this amendment to enable them to correct this situation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 12920, which would authorize appropriations for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1975.

Chairman MORGAN has already described the bill in detail so I will devote my comments to the progress of the Peace Corps under the ACTION agency.

I think it is important to point out that at a time when many of our foreign assistance programs are under fire here at home and overseas the Peace Corps has become the program with the most support among the American people.

A recent survey of American attitudes toward the problems of developing countries and programs designed to help them, which was conducted by the Overseas Development Council, showed that of those interviewed 88 percent rated the Peace Corps as being effective in providing aid to developing countries.

While this may be a surprise to some, it is not to me, Mr. Chairman, or to anyone who knows and understands the great job the Peace Corps volunteers are doing overseas.

Peace Corps works at the grassroots level in 68 countries where the help is most needed and where it can be disseminated most effectively.

The Peace Corps of today consists of people with skills. They speak the language of the countries in which they service, and they live at the same level as the people they serve. As a result, they are accepted by the people to whom they are teaching the skills necessary for their very survival.

Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps is a people-to-people program, and therein lies its effectiveness and its continued success.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

Mr. WHALEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12920.

I believe that the Peace Corps is one of the best foreign assistance programs sponsored by our Government. A good example of the effectiveness of the Peace Corps is its involvement in the Sahelian drought relief efforts.

Since the early 1960's, Peace Corps has been one of the principal agencies providing development assistance to the Sahelian nations now suffering from the drought. The Peace Corps involvement in the area has not been limited to stopgap measures. On the contrary, Peace Corps volunteers have been working on medium and long-term projects such as irrigation, well construction, reforestation, health, and nutrition.

As we all know, the Peace Corps is basically a manpower program. In the past the absence of material support from donor agencies limited Peace Corps' effectiveness in the area; however, since the severity and magnitude of the problem was discovered last year, Peace Corps has been receiving strong support from donor agencies such as Aid, Oxfam, et cetera.

In the last year Peace Corps volunteers who speak the language, know the area, and have the confidence of the people, have been instrumental in helping these donor agencies to deliver effectively all kinds of assistance to the people of the Sahel. This example of Peace Corps involvement and effectiveness in the Sahel region is yet another proof of the tremendous job the Peace Corps is carrying out in the 69 countries it serves. It is an effort that commands our respect and admiration.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON).

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps is doing well and even expanding in the Near East, north Africa and south Asia areas. Programs which began in the early 1960's continue in India, Afghanistan, Nepal, Tunisia, Morocco, and Iran, and some 700 volunteers are now in these countries. Since September 1973, the Peace Corps has expanded to some of the smaller states of the Persian Gulf—Bahrain, Oman and the Yemen Arab Republic. The Peace Corps can point with pride and satisfaction to its successes in all these states, many of which have poor populations and dire needs for basic technical and vocational skills.

As the Peace Corps comes of age in some of these countries, the willingness of the states to contribute more to the volunteers' operations has increased. The contributions of Iran and Tunisia are noteworthy, and Iran's contribution increased \$60,000 this past year. Iran, with all its oil revenues, should be expected to contribute even more next year and the Peace Corps should actively seek greater Iranian financial participation.

EMPHASIS ON PROGRAMS

While education programs at all levels,

including teacher training and vocational training, continue to preoccupy most of the volunteers working in these regions, agricultural and rural development programs have become increasingly important in recent years and now they account for one-fourth of all the Peace Corps' activities. This change in focus reflects in part the increasing orientation of our bilateral aid programs with the poor and with the problems of remote and rural regions within countries. Mother and child health care, nutrition, nursing and TB control programs also receive substantial attention in some of these countries.

In Iran, Tunisia, and Morocco, the Peace Corps has supplied a large number of architects and urban planners who have over the years contributed an impressive number of building designs and town plans as well as training local citizens in the important art of urban planning. In recent years, one focus of these architects and planners has been low-cost housing.

Another important field in which the Peace Corps has provided essential skills and in which local talent is not yet fully trained is in the area of professional business services including public management and accounting. These skills, so necessary for the running of effective government at all levels, are often in short supply outside the main ministries in the capital, and sometimes, they are scarce even there. The Peace Corps has emphasized helping others acquire the technical training so that they can be more productive citizens.

RECENT SUCCESSES

Mr. Chairman, last year during the floor debate on the Peace Corps authorization, several members of our committee, including myself, pointed to certain outstanding recent achievements of the Peace Corps. At that time, I mentioned the good work of volunteers in Iran over the years and the diversity of technical skills they were giving and teaching to Iranians. I also mention the role volunteers played in Afghanistan during Operation Help, an impressive disaster relief operation which helped save some 200,000 people from starvation.

Three quick examples might highlight some of the Peace Corps' many recent accomplishments in other countries. The involvement of the Peace Corps in urban affairs in Tunisia dates back to 1962, but in the last few years the accumulating results have become impressive. The volunteers have designed over 150 buildings in Tunisia's urban centers and they have restored some 50 monuments of historical, cultural, and religious importance. In addition, the volunteers have developed over 50 comprehensive town plans for various rural centers throughout the countryside. Today, some of these architectural service programs are shifting to teaching or rural town problems, including low cost housing. But the success of the Peace Corps in this area is serving a basic development need of a friendly country.

In Morocco, the Peace Corps has been

developing an interesting program with an American university. The University of Minnesota agricultural intern program now gives prospective volunteers a special agricultural training course in the senior year prior to a summer Peace Corps training session and arrival in Morocco. The idea of a built-in Peace Corps program that utilizes existing academic institutions in a constructive, time- and money-saving approach offers a new direction to the Peace Corps for fulfilling its needs and those of the host country.

What the Peace Corps did in Afghanistan in 1972 during Operation Help it did in Nepal in 1973. A fire in the Singha Durbar Secretariat building in Kathmandu did substantial damage to eight key government ministries, but Peace Corps volunteers were on hand for some time to help restore vital government services and repair the damage. And in another part of that remote country, four diligent volunteers involved in a fisheries extension program increased the number of fingerlings distributed to fish farmers from 5,000 to 200,000 in a couple of years. These actions helped this poor country to tap important resources that otherwise might have remained undeveloped and underutilized.

In late 1973, the Peace Corps also began small programs in three countries of the Arabian Peninsula, Bahrain, Oman, and the Yemen Arab Republic. Some 50 volunteers will be stationed there soon and will be working on a variety of programs in health, education, central economic planning, and water supply.

Yemen and Oman are two of the least developed countries in the world, and Oman now has to spend a substantial portion of its budget on an internal insurrection. Both states need all the help we provide to train their citizens in basic bookkeeping, accounting, and management skills as well as trying to open up remote regions of the countries which may still be almost totally inaccessible. It is hoped that these two programs are able to establish themselves and help convince those states and some of their oil-rich neighbors that American technology and skills can make a significant contribution to the development of the entire Persian Gulf region.

Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps continues to be an important instrument of American foreign policy. Volunteers carry an essential message to ordinary citizens around the world, a message that America does care about helping others help themselves. The technical and vocational skills we export through the Peace Corps are sent because others want and need those skills and because they are willing to help pay for them. As long as others desire such assistance on that basis, we must be willing to provide it as best we can.

I urge my colleagues to support the Peace Corps.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON).

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Evidently a quorum is not present. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 105]

Addabbo	Gibbons	Podell
Anderson, Ill.	Gray	Rees
Ashley	Gubser	Reid
Bingham	Gude	Reuss
Blackburn	Hanna	Roncallo, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Brasco	Hebert	Rooney, Pa.
Burke, Fla.	Hogan	Ryan
Carey, N.Y.	Holifield	Schroeder
Carney, Ohio	Holtzman	Smith, N.Y.
Chappell	Huber	Steed
Clark	Jarman	Stephens
Conyers	Jones, Tenn.	Stuckey
Diggs	Kluczynski	Symington
Erlenborn	Latta	Thompson, N.J.
Esch	Leggett	Tiernan
Fisher	Madigan	Treen
Flynt	Martin, Nebr.	Wiggins
Ford	Metcalfe	Wilson
Forsythe	Minshall, Ohio	Charles H.
Fraser	Murphy, N.Y.	Calif.
Frelinghuysen	O'Hara	Yatron
Froehlich	Parris	
Gettys	Patman	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PIKE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 12920, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 364 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON) had been recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, to speak against the Peace Corps is to speak against one of the "sacred cows" we have in this country. As the distinguished ranking Member pointed out, this is one of the most popular programs we have with respect to foreign aid.

Of course, the Peace Corps was a noble concept, but in actual practice, as it has worked out, it has not lived up to the expectations or the claims that were made on its behalf.

I do not know how many Members have actually ever spoken with those returning Peace Corps volunteers, but I have, and almost inevitably they speak about the failures of the program. They are all severe critics of the program, from my experience.

Last year a lady returned to my district after a period of time in Morocco. She and her husband had been volun-

teers over there. When she got back, she was so disillusioned about this program and about its waste that she wrote this article, and I want to read the article to the membership, because to me it epitomizes what has happened in this particular program.

For those Members who still have open minds on this subject, I think they will find it a devastating article. The article follows:

Recently my husband and I returned from Morocco as Peace Corps volunteers and have a few things to tell the public about how tax money is being spent overseas.

Here's my story:

After three months of intensive language training we were sent to our stationed sites for our two years of diligent work.

My husband was scheduled for four hours of teaching a week. That was all. After much hollering to Peace Corps and the director of his school he was given an extra two hours.

Later he learned that another school just out of town needed a physical education teacher since theirs had not yet shown up so he asked permission from Peace Corps to go to the school and ask to teach.

The Director of P.C. (Peace Corps) flatly refused him permission and told him to relax, enjoy himself and not to make waves. He had a job and that was it.

My husband went anyway and the school put him to work. After a month of working at the two schools he was busy. Then the P.E. instructor came who was supposed to have the position. Back to six hours.

He formed volleyball and basketball teams but when students are in school from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., there leaves little time for extra activities. Studying Arabic for two hours a day and mingling with the people kept him going—but barely.

The only thing that saved us was the fact that there are many Moslem holidays and school is out—so we traveled. During November, December and January we had five vacation periods and spent three and one-half weeks out of the three months at our site.

Here is my point: most people sign up to go to these countries for a challenge and to work but many times it just isn't possible.

Peace Corps spends millions of dollars in training, medicals, living allowances and transportation. And to what avail? So many, many volunteers aren't doing anything of any value for the countries they're in.

Peace Corps gives volunteers a generous living allowance allowing them to hire maids, rent nice apartments and Villas with nice furnishings, and all kinds of food that's available. * * * Vacation money is also allotted.

Would anyone be surprised to know that many volunteers stay only because of travel benefits. They spend time flying to Rome, Paris, Munich, the French Riviera and Spain.

We were the lucky ones who had jobs—many volunteers are unemployed. Jobs fall through, teachers are turned out by school directors because they look too young and many times are younger than 25 years old students. No cooperation with foreign governments and it goes on and on.

Peace Corps doesn't send you home because it's a black mark from Washington about job situations in that country. So volunteers stay—some of them—because they don't want to think they've failed.

You see we go through the training and the staff builds up with volunteers so full of idealistic thoughts on integrity and loyalty and so forth that you get the idea if you terminate it is your fault because you lack these qualities.

In countries like Afghanistan and India help is needed for their people. They work

to survive famines and droughts. But in Morocco, Thailand, and Liberia, etc., the United States Government is doling out terrible amounts of money for volunteers to have a pleasant junctet.

May I close with this—Morocco was a five-year project country. This past February Peace Corps Morocco threw a fantastic booze party celebrating their 10th anniversary in Morocco. It so happens that little Third World country has outgrown the Peace Corps, but it sure makes a nice five-year holiday playground for the staff members.

Some day I hope people will wake up and protest our Government funding.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, at the request of Mr. BROOMFIELD, was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I want to ask the gentleman if he would inform the Members as to what country this volunteer was in and for what period of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In Morocco, and she got back last year in May. Her name is Mary L. Johnson, and her husband's name is Allen.

The point I want to make is I have spoken with many, many returning Peace Corps volunteers. In my hometown, Fort Collins, Colo., we have had a number of them volunteer from Colorado State University. It is not unique. I have talked to people who returned from South American and Asian countries. It is the normal procedure, they tell us. This one just happened to write her story.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with him that for too long everybody has turned their back on this operation. Traveling in a number of these countries I have yet to see a great deal accomplished by the Peace Corps. It was a great thing for the liberals of this country who wanted to send people to various countries, but for them to come in here and ask for an additional \$9 million over last year's budget, I think is completely beyond reason.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KOCH was allowed to proceed out of order.)

PRIVACY

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) and I will be having a special order on April 2 on the subject of the congressional commitment to privacy. Members of the House will be receiving letters from our colleagues Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEMP, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, inviting their participation in that debate. This is a bipartisan discussion because this is a bipartisan matter, and one deserving support without regard to party affiliation.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and certainly join with in mentioning the fact that there will be a special order which will be sponsored by Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEMP, and myself.

The concern over privacy seems to have come of age. There is a great deal of discussion about it. Currently, there are over 207 different pieces of legislation in the House and I think 62 in the Senate. This is an issue which we need to address ourselves to. I would urge every Member of the House to come and participate and shed light on this issue and point out some of the problems we have in the whole area of privacy.

So I congratulate the gentleman for making his announcement and join with him in sponsoring this special order.

Mr. Chairman, privacy is control over knowledge about oneself, requiring a sense of security and a justified, acknowledged power over aspects of one's environment. This is not just an absence of information about ourselves, it is the feeling of security in controlling information. The issue of information protection or data surveillance involves the Congress determining proper legal limits to information collection and use and granting appropriate controls to American citizens.

For a decade, Members of the House have been involved in investigating Federal information practices and those of the private sector. Familiar issues are these: the proposal to create a Federal Statistical Data Center, lengthy debate over enactment of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, controversial debate over 1970 decennial census plans, number, size, and pervasiveness of Federal data banks, extending Federal employees' right to privacy, and U.S. Army civilian surveillance practices. Most of these subjects are still current topics of conversation and debate.

The 93d Congress follows recent tradition in commitment to restoring and retaining rights of privacy of individuals. As of March 13, 1974, in the House there were 207 different sponsors and cosponsors of 102 bills and resolutions in the privacy field; there were also 62 Senators making or cosponsoring legislative proposals. The fact that a majority of the total House and Senate support such action is heartening. It is the lack of cohesion, the fragmented approach to congressional action which, in part, has slowed progress in enacting broad purpose legislation. Nevertheless, important legislative accomplishments are in the making, and the list of bills introduced is impressive.

Individuals would be apprised of the records held by Federal agencies and have certain rights of access and other protections; and a Federal Privacy Board would be created to regulate personal information practices in legislation before the Government Operations Committee. Two days of hearings have been held.

Legislation to amend the Freedom of Information Act to limit exemptions to disclose information was passed.

A code providing standards of fair information practices, patterned after an HEW Advisory Committee report is before the Judiciary Committee.

Bills governing financial disclosure by financial institutions are before the Banking and Currency Committee.

The practices of distributing, selling, or otherwise making available lists of names and addresses of individuals would be prohibited by several measures.

Bills to protect the political rights and privacy of individuals and organizations and to define the authority of the armed forces to collect, distribute, and store information about civilian political activity are pending.

Employees of the Federal Government would be protected against unwarranted government invasions of privacy if several bills are enacted. April hearings before the Post Office and Civil Service Committees are planned.

The use and dissemination of criminal arrest and other law enforcement records, particularly related to the National Criminal Identification Center's programs are now before the Judiciary Committee and a first day of hearings was held on July 26, 1973.

Resolutions are pending before the Rules Committee to create a Select Committee on the Right to Privacy. This would allow for greater House concentration of many facets of privacy protection.

Measures to prohibit the requirement that persons provide their social security number on any occasion not relating to their social security account are before the Ways and Means Committee.

Other legislation would restrict wiretapping, transfer of personal income tax records, limit mandatory decennial census questions, and prohibit unsolicited commercial telephone calls.

Mr. KOCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12920 which would authorize additional funds for the Peace Corps.

H.R. 12920 would provide \$82,256,000 for fiscal year 1975. This represents a \$5.3 million increase over the 1974 appropriation, but still is less than the \$88,027,999 million authorized in 1973.

The Peace Corps is an important national asset which represents a highly successful innovative idea in foreign policy.

Since its inception in 1961 under the resourceful leadership of R. Sargent Shriver, the Peace Corps has been an important means for sharing American know-how with others and helping less developed countries solve their own problems. By the living, working and sharing arrangement of the Peace Corps, its volunteers help promote world peace through a better understanding of our country.

There have been problems as there are in every successful program, but the training program and screening process

have been altered to better serve the host countries. Today's volunteers are more mature and experienced in the skills requested by the underdeveloped countries.

Mechanics, farmers, specialists in watershed management and soil conservation are among the current volunteers in many technical areas of expertise. Other volunteers are specialists in rural development, education, health, urban problems, business, and public management.

Peace Corps volunteers with specialized knowledge are needed in the less developed countries for priority tasks. Curtailment of the Peace Corps operation would create serious problems in these countries which have grown to depend on the services of Peace Corps volunteers in their schools and on their farms.

The emphasis in the Peace Corps is on quality not quantity. This authorization will help train more volunteers raising the total to 4,800.

I urge the continued support of my colleagues for H.R. 12920. The Peace Corps is a program that benefits all its participants and we must provide for its future.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues, which would raise the readjustment allowance for Peace Corps volunteers and would also provide the necessary authorization for additional appropriations to cover this increase.

The Peace Corps has lately recognized that the needs of developing host countries are greater and more complex than first thought and has begun emphasizing the recruitment of volunteers with special skills to meet this need. This program has succeeded to the point where it now has the involvement of older, highly educated and skilled volunteers. No doubt this has improved the caliber of the Peace Corps and contributed to its value and interest for the host nations.

However, we need more skilled volunteers and the low volunteer pay has made it difficult to recruit them. Skilled volunteers are generally older and if they have families, will probably have greater financial obligations. The original Peace Corps authorization set readjustment allowances in 1962 at \$75 per month of service for individual volunteers and \$125 per month of service for couples with a child. Today this is a paltry sum, considering that in the intervening 12 years the Peace Corps allowances have remained the same while the Consumer Price Index jumped nearly 50 percent.

The amendment seeks a modest increase in volunteer allowances to place them more in line with the current standard of living. It would raise the \$75-per-month allowance to \$100 per month, a 33-percent increase; and the \$125-per-month allowance to \$175 per month, a 40-percent increase; and provide for additional appropriations to accomplish this. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first phrase of section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2502(b)), ending with a colon, is amended to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$82,256,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act."

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the latest, sad chapter in financing what is undoubtedly one of the most overblown and unproductive organizations ever created in Washington, the so-called Peace Corps.

It not only authorizes the outrageous sum of \$82,256,000—to be taken, of course out of the hides of the already staggering U.S. taxpayers—but it also perpetrates the rape of those taxpayers by granting an unprecedented amnesty to Peace Corps officials who were so careless, untrained, or worse, that they handed out \$315,000 in erroneous "readjustment" allowances to Peace Corps employees.

This legislation should be rejected out of hand for that reason alone, for to now excuse those officials for errors of this magnitude only invites other bureaucrats to do likewise, knowing full well that there exists a comfortable precedent that will hold them harmless, no matter how excessive their errors may be.

It can be safely predicted that the ink will hardly be dry on this bill before Federal agency and department representatives will be lining up in the Halls of Congress, clamoring for equal immunity for their employees, and using this bill as their precedent and justification.

The "forgiveness" provisions firmly set the Government of the United States on the road to saying to its officials and employees, "You need have no fear, no fear whatever, of making mistakes with the taxpayers' money, because Uncle Sam will protect you from exposure to the citizens."

If the foregoing was not enough reason for the rejection of this bill—and it is—the state of the domestic economy would provide more than enough. This Nation has poured out its wealth around the globe for more than a quarter of a century in the most stupendous and continuous river of assistance ever seen or even known to mankind. The result is that the United States is busted. We are teetering on the brink of bankruptcy. Our debt is greater than the combined debts of all the other nations of the Earth, and yet here it is proposed to provide another walloping handout.

This money will disappear without a trace, just as did the hundreds of millions already poured out in this ill-conceived operation.

Here is the opportunity to save more than \$82 million, and dedicate it to a

desperately needed payment on the Federal debt.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the House to practice a little fiscal sanity here today, and reject this bill.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 3, strike out "the first phrase" and insert in lieu thereof "so much".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 4, strike out ", ending with a colon," and insert in lieu thereof "as precedes the first proviso thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 8, strike out "Act." and insert in lieu thereof "Act:."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRINGTON

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON: Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$82,256,000" and insert "\$115,700,000" in lieu thereof.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise this afternoon not to seek a rollcall on this amendment, but perhaps because it is timely to comment on efforts made to negate the value of the Peace Corps experiment, on the basis of what the results have been in the cumulative record of congressional and administration support.

What I propose to try to do is to at least have this House momentarily be made aware of the state of the world, and the disarray that is collectively the lot of what passes for civilization—disarray that we have to contend with.

My argument today is not necessarily predicated on the narrow ground of what this amendment may present, perhaps, as a means of solving the problem of providing interim employment for young people, after receiving their formal education. Instead, it is to recognize, trite as it may seem, that we are a global community. The hemisphere that we share with Latin America, for example, will see that part of the world grow in 24 years to double its present size, in population. Another part of the world, Africa, will within 27 years double its size. In the withdrawal symptoms that I note day to day, whether one measures them by the vote of this body in dealing with the International Development Bank or in the disinclination toward further foreign aid, or the variety of other ways in which I see us turning inward, I think that the relative pittance of an expanded Peace Corps is worth the effort, especially in the

ironic scope of a \$304 million budget submitted by this administration, because the Peace Corps provides a generation of Americans a chance to come face to face with the problems that they are going to deal with, or perhaps we will all be trying to deal with if we are to survive in some fashion over our lifetime. Perhaps my amendment can be written off as naive. It can be written off, perhaps, as insensitive to the kinds of problems that have been cited by the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Colorado. But I would prefer to see this country make some mistakes in that direction if the mistakes serve to bring the citizenry face to face with those realities faced by the rest of the world.

The facts I do not think are in dispute are as follows: We have seen a sharp increase in the last 3 years, from 19,000 applicants in 1970 to 33,000 applicants in 1974, in interest in Peace Corps positions. We have seen as recently as last year, a gap of more than 1,700 positions between the number of volunteers produced by the Peace Corps and the number actually sought by would-be host nations. We have seen a gradual chilling of interest, whether it be with malice aforethought or by inattentiveness on the part of this administration, in the whole Peace Corps concept, and we can see this in the budget, which has been reduced substantially over the course of the last 4 or 5 years, from 1963's high of \$115.7 million to a low, in the 1972 request, of \$71.2 million.

My point in suggesting today that we at least return to where we were in the 1968 and 1969 budgets is not to contend with the reality of the likelihood of getting the administration or the committee or the Congress to change its mind; it is just to point out what has been rather grimly pointed out by someone who I think is as well documented, Robert Heilbrower, in a recent essay, "The Human Prospect." This essay, which will be the subject of a lengthier work to be published this month, reflects on the healing prospects for mankind, and the kinds of problems we face in—demographics, in food supply, and in armaments growing without control—to name but a few. These are the kinds of things, it seems to me, which are going to seriously test the civilizations, which we have tried to keep together, over the course of the next century.

We can, and should, expose a part of the generation of Americans who are going to have the responsibility of wrestling with these problems to the magnitude of them. If we can make them advocates of a cause, which I hope will go away from the "nation-state" concept and the ills that has brought, to a recognition of the interdependence of those who share the same human condition, I think the effort will be well made.

My point in offering this amendment today is not to test what I think is basically a foregone conclusion. A disinterested administration, and certainly this House, are at this point not prepared, in view of what has happened over the

course of the 93d Congress, to reverse the pattern of foreign aid in general. My point is just to suggest that if we are really to face our responsibilities beyond those of the moment, we unmistakably must conclude that the more young people we can enlist to the cause of our global responsibilities, the more we can challenge their idealism, the more likely we are to begin to deal with the problems we face as a nation, and, more importantly, as a world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARRINGTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to add my voice to that of his very eloquent statement.

His position is one that is most forthright. I just wanted to praise the gentleman for taking this time to address the House and offer his amendment, and the sentiments which the gentleman has expressed I subscribe to 100 percent.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I appreciate the gentleman's patience in waiting for me to yield to him and also what the gentleman said with respect to my remarks.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs in their recommendation of \$82 million is recommending the same amount as was requested by the administration.

I think it should be pointed out it would be very difficult for the Peace Corps to use during this fiscal year any or all of the increase recommended by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The Peace Corps programming cycle alone takes 18 months from the time a request is developed in the field to the time the volunteer is on the job. In order for the Peace Corps to field the additional volunteers, which presumably would be mandated by the increase, it would have to abandon its planning and its programming and its training process and revert to the old and unpopular way of fielding bodies without regard to whether or not they actually have a well-planned job in which to serve.

The committee and the Congress has opposed and discouraged this practice throughout the years, and now the Peace Corps is becoming what we all believe to be a very effective program. We do not think we should revert to the unsound practices of the past.

As we can see, there are only two options left to the Peace Corps if the amendment were to be approved. First, not using the additional funds, and second, recruiting and fielding volunteers without the necessary skills, without well-planned programs to work in and without adequate support. In my opinion both options speak for themselves in opposition to the amendment as proposed.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I can sympathize with the factual concerns the gentleman suggested regarding the operations of the Peace Corps, but I would suggest that in an era of ascending unemployment, as demonstrated by statistical data, we may see an increase in interest on the part of this country's population in the Peace Corps service. We must also consider the fact that the Peace Corps has had a 25-percent shortfall in supplying or meeting the needs of the host countries. I would suggest that we in the House ought to be willing to serve as a prod to get the Peace Corps to be a little more responsive to those realities.

On a pragmatic basis, as a means of dealing with the realities a new crop of college graduates might find themselves facing, this proposal of \$115 million should find acceptance as a way to meet this need and to meet the demands of the world as a whole. There is ample reason to try to suggest to the administration, via this amendment that they broaden rather than narrow the Peace Corps, and move in the direction of increasing the scope of program and participation.

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

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not really know very much about this subject but one of the discouraging things it seems to me about this body is that so often we debate important matters without really talking about the issues particularly at all. If I thought we could spend \$115 million here and do all the good things my idealistic friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, wants to do, I would spend it. On the other hand, if we are wasting the money sending people on junkets and doing nothing, as my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, suggests, then \$82 million is entirely too much.

I would like to see a debate here in which the gentleman from Michigan and the chairman of the committee answered the gentleman from Colorado. If he is wrong, that has not been made clear.

I would like to see somebody stand up who would give us some idea that \$115 million would really do the good things the gentleman from Massachusetts advocates, if there is anything to that. We just talk around here in a vacuum. And I do not know what the fellow in the middle is supposed to do except take a chance, and he might as well flip a coin. This is no reflection on this particular debate. It is just all too typical of what goes on.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I would like to respond to the gentleman from Indiana and point out this is one of the great problems we had when the project started in 1961. It was then a crash program and, obviously, presented new problems that the volunteers had to work to resolve.

I would like to point out that we presently have about 6,500 in the Peace

Corps. This bill provides for an increase of only 310 which I think is reasonable.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was not adopted by the committee. The committee has very carefully reviewed the program. We allowed a very small increase, as the gentleman from Michigan stated, an increase of 310 volunteers for the fiscal year 1975. This is all the Peace Corps can use affectively.

Now, the gentleman who spoke before me stated that it takes 13 months to cycle a volunteer into a job. This period cannot be shortened without lowering the quality of the program. A \$115 million authorization could result in a crash program and produce the very thing the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON) talked about. We would not want that to happen and so I have to oppose the increase in these funds.

Now, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado, the only thing I can conclude regarding the distinguished gentleman's constituents in Morocco, is that they must have had rich parents, because a Peace Corps volunteer in the field only receives on the average \$140 a month for food, clothing, housing, and local transportation. He cannot have a very big time on that, especially overseas with today's value of the dollar.

I know many, many devoted Peace Corps volunteers, who really went out on their assignments with a missionary spirit, who gave of themselves and sacrificed many advantages. They were not all young people, some were older. Our average Peace Corps volunteer today is 28 years old. He is not a youngster fresh out of college. We are sending many skilled and trained volunteers over there. The Peace Corps, in my mind, has continued to be moved by the same kind of missionary spirit which has been a part of its tradition from the start.

I know some volunteers have come back disgusted; but that happens even to some Members of this body who come here for one term and go home feeling disillusioned because they have not found the Congress, the Government, and the world to their liking.

I do not know how anyone could go overseas and have a big junket in a foreign country living on less than \$140 a month.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with the questioning whether or not these people are giving accurate stories. This is not the first time I have heard this. I have heard it many, many times.

Let me ask the gentleman this. How many hours were spent in committee hearings in preparation for this? How many people were interviewed? How many committee members ever talked to returning Peace Corps volunteers?

Mr. MORGAN. I have talked to many volunteers over a period of years. I re-

member in 1968 when we were in Chicago at a convention of my party that they were out there in large numbers. They were enthusiastic supporters of the Peace Corps, even though they may have differed with many older people about our domestic politics.

I have talked with some Members that have come back from overseas visits, and with many members of my committee who have been in foreign countries and have seen good Peace Corps projects, especially in Latin America, particularly the country of Colombia, very worthwhile projects; and in Africa, where the Peace Corps has had some worthwhile projects; and in other parts of the world.

Sometimes we come up with a bad apple in a barrel. Sometimes people are not satisfied with their assignments in a foreign country. Sometimes they do not fit their assignments. This can happen. I am sure some volunteers, including the couple in Morocco, had legitimate complaints. But we cannot judge the whole Peace Corps operation by the experience of two dissatisfied volunteers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with the gentleman, we cannot judge the Peace Corps like that; but again and again we hear reports that there needs some kind of oversight and direction. We never get a report back to the Congress where the thing is succeeding and where it is failing. It seems to me that could be the function of this committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, our committee has visited many of these countries in which the Peace Corps has projects and, of course, we are examining the Peace Corps operations and budget every year.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. My question, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps similar to the one that has just been discussed here. That is the amount of oversight which is being given in the training program.

I know that we all are the victims of rumors and protests from time to time from our constituents, but I would not dare repeat something which came to my office last week about a training program where one young man was abused almost beyond belief, sexually and otherwise. I just cannot think that we should continue to fund this program without some specific oversight, some direction and some course of corrections.

Some of the things that are going on, as well as some of the philosophies being taught and practiced, should be checked more thoroughly. As well as a more in-depth research into the character and reputation of the applicants.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORGAN

was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call to the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina one report which reflect on how the committee does function with respect to its oversight responsibilities. Here is a report of a staff survey team which we sent out to the field in February, 1973. The report reviews carefully Peace Corps operations in the field, identifies problems and suggests remedies. I will make sure the gentleman gets a copy of this report for his reference.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I came to the Chamber expecting to vote for this bill, but it seems to me that my colleague from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON) raised some serious questions which have not been satisfactorily answered at this time. I am wondering if the chairman of the committee would be willing to respond to these questions.

Could the chairman tell us exactly how much time was spent on hearings on workload factors, a specific line of questioning Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado has raised? It is a very serious matter if volunteers are being sent over there and are working 4 hours a week, cannot receive additional teaching assignments, cannot find an outlet for their idealism. The taxpayers are not getting their money's worth. If this is true the program ought not to be increased, but curtailed.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how much time the committee spent on this.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee spent 2 days in hearings on this bill. We heard all the witnesses who requested to be heard. We had no outside witnesses, no ex-Peace Corps volunteers or others requesting to be heard.

As I said earlier, the committee studies this program during the year, here and in the field, and through staff investigations. I am not saying that there are no dissatisfied volunteers. There are some. Chances are that a few Peace Corps volunteers are dissatisfied with their training and with their assignments. When we find such cases, we look into them and call them to the Agency's attention.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, specifically, did the hearings elicit any information about the workload of Peace Corps volunteers sent to Morocco or other countries?

Mr. MORGAN. No, we did not break down program operations in individual countries during the hearings.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman did not hold hearings? Would that not be an appropriate function of the committee?

Mr. MORGAN. This is the first complaint we have had about Peace Corps work assignments in Morocco where there are over 150 volunteers. If the gentleman from Colorado had called this

complaint to my attention, I certainly would have developed it during the hearings. I would be glad to pursue it with the Peace Corps after passage of the bill if the gentleman has not done so already and wishes us to do so.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stated hearings had been held, in response to a question asked earlier, and held up a pamphlet saying that this was a staff committee survey.

The gentleman made mention of the fact that a study on oversight had been held, a staff committee survey was presented. What exactly is a staff committee survey?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, members of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs are often sent on investigative assignments to view the operation of programs under our committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. BEARD. What exactly do they do? Do they go out in the field themselves?

Mr. MORGAN. They go out into the field on the instructions of the committee.

Mr. BEARD. They go to the other countries, and they visit with members of the Peace Corps?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BEARD. So how much direct contact do the members of the committee and those who are supposed to be legislating have with these people? Where do they come in?

How many actual minutes of hearings have the members held regarding complaints and problems?

Mr. Chairman, there have been problems and complaints regarding the Peace Corps ever since I have been up here, and I am amazed to find out that these are the first two complaints the committee has heard about.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee travel on study missions abroad, they also attend subcommittee and committee briefings and hearings at which these programs are discussed. They also study reports prepared by committee staff and by the GAO. I may add that we investigate every complaint that is sent to the committee; we investigate each one. If the gentleman has a complaint and he sends it in tomorrow, we will investigate it.

Mr. BEARD. Who investigates it? Would the members be involved in it?

Mr. MORGAN. The members who have appropriate jurisdiction, the full committee and the staff of the full committee.

Staff investigations are going on all the time and the committee is apprised of the results, just as it was in 1973, after the field study of the Peace Corps operations in Asia.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think this year the full committee had about an hour and a half hearing—perhaps it was 1 hour and 15 minutes—on the Peace Corps. That is about the extent of it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not correct. We had a 2-day hearing.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG) yield.

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the dialog concerning this legislation. I had a meeting last week with some people, including an ambassador of one of the African countries, and he gave me a very fine report on what they had accomplished there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG) has expired.

(On request of Mr. HUNT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ARMSTRONG was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, as I said, the reports were good. However, as to the caliber of the people who were now coming to them, he said they were older people with a little bit more actual knowledge of the job.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussion that has developed here, whether we could not in the legislation or in the review of the history here, develop something whereby a team of people could be appointed to look into various complaints, actually look into them. I do not mean to ask the Peace Corps or to ask the people who are there what happened, but we could have someone really look into it, just as in the instance of the country I asked about and got the very good report.

I think this might solve our problem, because it is becoming rather irritating in some of its facets.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am glad to assure any Member that if he has a complaint of any sort about matters under our jurisdiction, we will pursue it overseas or in Washington or wherever necessary. If there is a legitimate complaint, we will be glad to look into it.

I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey that there are some very good reports coming back about the Peace Corps, especially about the work of the more skilled volunteers who are being sent overseas.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take the floor in support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee, Dr. MORGAN, in saying that complaints are investigated.

I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee on State Department Personnel and Foreign Operations, which has jurisdiction over personnel in any field of foreign operations. Sometimes complaints come to my committee, and we look into each and every one of them. I will just give the Members one example.

I did not wait for this complaint to come. I read a story in the Washington Post about the Peace Corps Director in Thailand, who is a former astronaut by the name of Eisle.

The story said that the reporter went to interview him and asked him how much his salary was as country director, and he said, "That's none of your damn business," and there were a few more comments like that.

There was another report that he had a party on a yacht up there that cost \$700 of Peace Corps funds.

So I called the Director of the Peace Corps and asked him to come to my office, and he did. I said, "Have you read this article?"

He said that he had.

I said, "How much of it is factual?"

He said, "Well, the part about the party is not true. He paid for it himself."

I said, "What is his salary?"

And I believe he said—I am speaking from memory—that it was about \$34,000 a year, which is a pretty fancy salary.

Of course, all the astronauts who want to turn their achievements, whatever they may have been, into cash, want to get a pension when they quit.

Then they usually get to endorse some products, and this one got a job in the Peace Corps. "Well," I said, "what do you propose to do about this fellow?" He said, "We are going to replace him." I thought that was salutary, and I thought he ought to be replaced.

I went home the next week. I was making a speech in a county I have only had for about 4 years, and I told about this situation and pointed out that the matter had been brought to the attention of the Congress and that the proper committee had looked into it and that something was being done.

A lady came up afterward and said, "Do you know his first wife is from this county and is a constituent of yours?" I said no, I did not. She said, "Do you know this chap walked away from his four children and would not support them and his wife had to go to work to support them?" I said, "I do not know that, either, but I am glad that they are going to fire him and they should have fired him."

So we do look into these things. You know, in an organization as big as the State Department or the Peace Corps or any of the others you will have complaints some of which may be justified and some of which may not be justified. I did not look into whether or not Mr. Eisle had a psychiatrist 24 hours a day with him. I do know some former astronauts did and have. We have one running for the Senate in Ohio; his name is John Glenn. When I knew him, when he was first a candidate, he was out of the business of being an astronaut and into the business of being a candidate, but he had his psychiatrist who was still being paid by NASA. I said, "What is this psychiatrist for?" And he said, "Oh, we all have a psychiatrist with us 24 hours a day."

Now, obviously, in the case of Mr. Eisle, they did not send his psychiatrist with him to Thailand, so we had to bring him home from Thailand, or they are bring-

ing him home, but the point I am trying to make is that the committee does exercise oversight. Just because you get a couple of foul balls in an organization, you cannot condemn the whole organization.

I support the chairman when he says each and every complaint brought to the committee is looked into, but I believe I should say not each and every complaint is justified; some are and some are not. However, the committee does exercise oversight.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think it is strange, Mr. Chairman, that Peace Corps officials, with their highly paid administrative staff, did not know what this director in Thailand was doing. I do not know how much time elapsed before this was called to the attention of the gentleman from Ohio or how much time it took to get him by the nape of the neck and out of there, but does it not seem strange that most of these scandals are never discovered by the costly administrative staff in the Peace Corps, I would ask my friend from Ohio?

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. All I can tell you is when I had the Director of the Peace Corps up in the office he told me that he had been to Thailand and had planned to remove the gentleman in question in any case but they were leaving him there until they got another director back in and out there. I told him if he was as bad as he appeared to be and bad enough to be released, they ought to remove him and leave them without a director until a new one got out there. He did not necessarily take my advice, but I decided I would not push it any further since he gave me his word he would be replaced.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to think, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the committee is riding herd on these as well as other activities under the foreign giveaway program, but it is not riding close herd on the activities of some of these people.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I agree with the gentleman that we are not giving them enough oversight. Perhaps during the week of the Easter recess the gentleman from Iowa could join me and we might go out and take a look at a couple of them.

Mr. GROSS. I have an idea that if you and I were to inspect the operations of the Peace Corps and the so-called technicians in the foreign giveaway program, that we could spend 6 months going around the world and never track down some of these misfits.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt about it. But the gentleman from Iowa, I think, if the gentleman will yield further—

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

Mr. HAYS. I heard about the time that the gentleman from Ohio made a trip

unannounced, without even letting the State Department know, to Colombia, and walked into the Ambassador's office the next morning, after I got there late the night before, and told him I wanted to look over the foreign aid situation. And I thought the Ambassador's teeth were going to fall out on the floor because they did not know I was any closer to Colombia than Washington.

I found out a lot of things which were straightened out subsequently.

So I just say to the gentleman from Iowa that we do not have enough time to do that more often, and I wish we could, and I will plead guilty to the fact that we do not give as much oversight as we ought to.

Mr. GROSS. The best way to cure the situation is to get rid of this outfit. Our foreign affairs around the world are in a shambles today, not necessarily because of the Peace Corps, perhaps despite the Peace Corps, but they are in a shambles. This organization is making no contribution to a better situation for the United States internationally except to spend \$100 million, or close to it, every year, as it has been doing since 1961.

Let me say with respect to this amendment, and I include the Peace Corps as a whole, that there is an old saying that in the expenditure of public money, it appears to belong to nobody, and therefore it is easy to bestow it on somebody. That is the story here today.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am inclined to agree with some of the things the gentleman says, because we do not give enough oversight because we do not have time to. But, let me just say this about that trip to Colombia, that I looked at the Peace Corps too, while I was there, and I found in that country, in my judgment for whatever it is worth, that the Peace Corps was doing a lot more good than the foreign aid program.

Mr. GROSS. Which, in view of some of the sorry foreign aid projects, could mean something or absolutely nothing as far as the Peace Corps is concerned.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to remark that when the gentleman from Ohio and others say that all complaints are looked into, I am a little bit reminded of the story about the investigation that Abraham Lincoln made one time when someone asked him for a credit rating when he was a practicing lawyer back in Springfield, Ill. He wrote them back a letter, and he said that this fellow was in a room with a table and two chairs, and that there is a large rathole in one corner, and Lincoln said, "The rathole will bear looking into."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONYERS was allowed to speak out of order.)

SPEAKER ASKED TO RESPOND TO NIXON
MEDIA BLITZ

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I sent this letter to the Speaker of the House less than an hour ago, and I think it is of sufficient importance to read it to those Members who are in the Chamber at this time:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing you today to urge in the strongest possible way that you promptly speak out in defense of the House of Representatives and its Judiciary Committee. During the past month the President has held two news conferences and has appeared in Chicago and Houston. Those appearances were televised in their entirety and they have been complemented by news briefings and appearances on talk shows by Presidential aides.

The President's media blitz is creating the impression that it is the House of Representatives and its Judiciary Committee that should be under impeachment investigation, not Richard Nixon. Operation Candor has been replaced by Operation Deception and unless it is answered in the same media which carry the wholly erroneous charges, the institution of our government which has elected you its Speaker may be fatally damaged. Therefore, I urge that you immediately contact the three major networks and demand the right to respond to blatant misstatements by the President. You would be doing so not as a Democrat, but as the Speaker of the House, and as a representative of the Congress itself, not the third district of Oklahoma. Should the networks refuse what would basically be a nonpartisan request under the Fairness Doctrine, which would surmount the problem seen by our distinguished colleague Torbert Macdonald when he announced hearings this morning to change the Equal Time Doctrine to allow response to the President's partisanship, I would then suggest you petition the Federal Communications Commission.

In my opinion, the constitutional role of the House through its chosen vehicle, the Judiciary Committee, has been violently misinterpreted by the President. I see at least six areas where serious errors must be corrected:

1. The idea that it is the President who determines what constitutes an impeachable offense, not the House of Representatives.

2. The idea that "bribery, treason and other high crimes and misdemeanors" relate solely to indictable crimes and not to crimes against the general welfare which cannot be incorporated in the criminal statutes because they are crimes only a President has the power to commit.

3. The suggestion that the Judiciary Committee intends "to pull a U-Haul trailer up to the doors of the White House and cart away documents to be pawed through on a fishing expedition", instead of the limited request already made for information and the responsible desire to know how White House files are catalogued so that a fishing expedition would, in point of fact, not be necessary.

4. The suggestion that Special Watergate Prosecutor Jaworski had gained "everything he needs" while, at this very moment, he is reported to be preparing additional subpoenas to be served on the White House to gain information which was requested as far back as August 1973.

5. The President's historical inaccuracy in claiming all Presidents had resisted congressional demands for documents when the same Presidents specifically said that such a necessity for confidentiality did not include impeachment inquiries.

6. The allegation that Richard Nixon is the Presidency itself, not just one President.

Should you feel that you yourself would not be the ideal spokesman in this matter, I believe it would be appropriate for you to designate whomever you may choose. But be-

cause of your position of absolute leadership within the house, you should initiate the request.

The President, after all, has had many hours of prime television time due to his position as leader of the Executive Branch, not as leader of the Republican Party. As I mentioned, he has predicated his defense against our impeachment inquiry on defending the presidency itself. Therefore it would be wholly appropriate for you to demand the right to clarify the President's misstatements because of your role in the Legislative Branch.

The truth is being blurred because of the domination of television and the airwaves by the President and his agents. If ever there were a time for the Speaker to speak, it is now.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS,
Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2502) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) In addition to the amounts authorized for fiscal year 1975, there are authorized to be appropriated for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1975 such additional amount as may be necessary not in excess of \$1,000,000 for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law.

"(d) The Director of ACTION is authorized to transfer to the readjustment allowance, ACTION, account at the Treasury Department from any sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act in fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$315,000 to rectify the imbalance in the Peace Corps readjustment allowance account for the period March 1, 1961, to February 28, 1973.

"(e) The Director of ACTION is authorized to waive claims resulting from erroneous payments of readjustment allowances to Peace Corps Volunteers who terminated their volunteer service between March 1, 1961, and February 28, 1973, notwithstanding the provisions of section 5584 of title 5, United States Code, and notwithstanding the fact that the names of the recipients of such overpayments may be unknown.

"(f) Disbursing and certifying officers of the Peace Corps and ACTION are relieved from liability for improper or incorrect payments of readjustment allowances made to volunteers between March 1, 1961, and February 28, 1973, other than any cases known to have resulted from fraud, notwithstanding the provisions of section 82a, 2, c of title 31, United States Code.". The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes', approved August 11, 1955 (31 U.S.C. 82a-2), and of section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes', approved December 29, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 82c)."

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, beginning in line 3, strike out "such additional

amounts as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof "not in excess of \$1,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, beginning in line 2 strike out "section 82a-2, c of title 31, United States Code." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes', approved August 11, 1955 (31 U.S.C. 82a-2), and of section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes', approved December 29, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 82c)." MODIFICATION TO COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment which appears on page 3 of the reported bill be modified by striking out the figure "33" on page 3, line 9, and inserting in lieu thereof "31".

Mr. Chairman, this modification merely corrects a typographical error in the reported bill.

It inserts a reference to title 31 of the United State Code in lieu of the incorrect reference to title 33.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The modification to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHALEN

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHALEN: Page 3, after line 9, insert the following:

Sec. 3. (a) Section 5(c) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$75" and inserting "\$100" in lieu thereof; and

(2) by striking out "\$125" and inserting "\$175" in lieu thereof.

(b) Section 6(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2505(1)) is amended by striking out "\$125" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$175".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall only apply with respect to months of satisfactory service beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) In addition to amounts authorized for fiscal year 1975, there are authorized to be appropriated for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1975 not in excess of \$2,103,000 for increases in readjustment allowances authorized by this section.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this amendment I would like to cover three points.

First a bit of background is in order. As I think all Members know, Peace Corps volunteers serve for a period of 2 years. During that period of time they receive no pay. Rather they receive a subsistence allowance. This means that during this very productive period of their life, they receive no income and, therefore, are unable to accumulate any savings. In recognition of this fact the Congress in passing the 1961 Peace Corps Act provided for a \$75 a month readjustment allowance to volunteers and a \$125 a month readjustment allowance for

heads of families and for Peace Corps volunteer leaders. This money would accumulate to the credit of the volunteers, the heads of families, and the Peace Corps leaders and would be given to them at the end of their 2-year term.

As the title of this section suggests, this money would then be used by the returning Peace Corpsman in readjusting to domestic civilian life. He would, of course, require some funds during that period he was seeking work. It also would cover other costs of readjustment, such as outfitting himself or herself in a new wardrobe, replacing the car he or she sold prior to joining the Peace Corps, and providing funds for the Peace Corps volunteer to further his or her education.

Second, what does this amendment propose? The amendment proposes an increase of \$25 a month, from \$75 to \$100 for volunteers and an increase from \$125 to \$175 a month for heads of families and for Peace Corps leaders. This represents, respectively, an increase of 33 1/3 percent and 40 percent. The total cost of this amendment, if it were incorporated in this measure, would be \$2,103,000. The amendment is so written that this in no way would affect the authorization of approximately \$82 million. Rather it would represent an increase over the \$82 million authorization figure.

Third, why should this amendment be adopted? In my opinion, the premise of this amendment is reflected in two words: Inflation and equity. Since the \$75 and \$125 figures were adopted in 1961, the Consumer Price Index has increased by 56.4 percent. Yet there has been absolutely no increase in the readjustment allowance to Peace Corpsmen. Thus inflation is an important consideration.

I also say equity, because the Federal Government has recognized the problem of inflation in other programs which it carries out.

Let me give three examples. Since 1961, maximum social security benefits have increased by 221 percent.

Since 1961, the salary of GS-7 and GS-11 employees to which the disability benefits of Peace Corpsmen are tied has increased by 73.6 percent and 73.9 percent, respectively.

Since 1966, educational benefits to GI's have increased by 120 percent.

If the bill recently adopted by the House of Representatives is approved by the Senate in the same form, this would be increased to 150 percent.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very modest proposal in my opinion. As I suggest, it will cost only an additional \$2 million. It will not enable the returning Peace Corpsmen to meet the increased cost of living which has accrued since 1961, but I think certainly it represents a significant start in that direction.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him on an excellent amendment. I support it very strongly.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. WHALEN, to raise the readjustment allowance for Peace Corps volunteers. Under the amendment, the allowance, which

has not been raised since the Peace Corps began in 1961, would be raised from \$75 a month to \$100 a month for a volunteer and from \$125 to \$175 a month for a volunteer leader, who is often a family head. The authorization level in the bill is also increased to cover the costs of these raises.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that Peace Corpsmen are not volunteers in the strict sense of the word. While they do not receive salaries for wages while overseas, they do receive living expenses as well as such housing, transportation, and equipment assistance as may be necessary for them to serve effectively. In addition, they do receive a readjustment allowance for each month of satisfactory service completed. This allowance is payable, except under special circumstances, on the return of the volunteer to the United States.

The readjustment allowance was intended to assist volunteers during the period of transition from their overseas assignments back to life at home in the United States. After 2 years of Peace Corps service, the volunteer returns to the United States faced with the necessity of finding a job, finding a place to live, often returning to school, and readjusting to life in this country after a considerable absence. He often has little or no money with which to accomplish his readjustment, because he has not received a salary for his 2 years' service. But because the readjustment allowances have not been increased for 13 years while living costs have skyrocketed, these allowances are not adequately fulfilling the function they were intended to. As one returned volunteer has told me, they are "grossly inadequate to meet our needs."

Why is this the case? A brief look at some economic statistics, Mr. Chairman, states the reasons very well for the gentleman's amendment.

First. While the allowances have remained stationary since 1961, the consumer price index has increased 56 percent from 1961 to January of this year.

Second. An extensive study of returned volunteers has indicated that almost two-thirds of them attend school following their service. There, they are faced with mounting expenses. In the decade 1961 to 1971 alone, public higher education costs went up 50 percent and private higher education costs increased 70 percent. These costs have continued to grow since 1971, as any Member with children approaching college age or in college is well aware.

Third. Although Peace Corps volunteers are not technically employees of the U.S. Government, for purposes of computing disability benefits they are considered to be at the civil service GS-7 level. This pay level has increased 74 percent since 1961, while the volunteers' remuneration has not budged.

Fourth. The readjustment allowances are comparable in purpose to veterans' education benefits. The VA benefit level, Mr. Chairman, has increased 120 percent since 1966 alone, while returned volunteers have had zero increase.

Adoption of this amendment would help to alleviate the stunning economic

burden faced by these volunteers. After giving 2 years of their lives in public service, often under conditions of hardship, they should not have to face further hardship upon their return to the United States. They deserve better from their country.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the premise of the Peace Corps. Would the gentleman agree that the Peace Corps originally said it was going to be a matter of service whereby people could give of their skills to those others that needed the advantageous educational benefits talked about?

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, yes, that is correct. If I may point out, as I suggested earlier, they are not paid for this service. They are provided with a subsistence allowance.

Mr. HUNT. I am not talking about that.

Mr. WHALEN. Congress also has recognized that when these volunteers return they will have certain costs in adjusting to civilian life. I pointed out some of these costs in my opening statement.

Mr. HUNT. What readjustment do they need when they come back to jobs they have selected for themselves, when it is a job they are going to come back to in the States that they have left? What is this readjustment allowance?

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the Peace Corps parents in the Congress. My daughter, Terry, and my son-in-law, Gene Thompson, are in the Peace Corps as Peace Corps volunteers. They are stationed in Guatemala and work with the people of Guatemala. They are teaching students in a number of rural schools how to grow vegetables. Then they teach the parents of the children how to prepare the vegetables in their homes. Finally, they will train native Guatemalans to continue such instruction programs in other schools and communities to broaden out the program and carry on the program after my daughter and son-in-law have returned to this country.

Now, the need for better nutrition in Guatemala is apparent. There they are in a very fertile country where it is very easy to grow vegetables but few are grown. The capability for doing so is there and it is easy.

Yet, it is not done. But adequate nutrition levels are not being met either. So the program they are carrying out has obvious good potential. It is good work; it may be humble work, but it is very important work for families in Guatemala and those rural areas where they are performing their services.

But, here is what is involved with their decision, that is, the decision of my daughter and son-in-law and others like them when they volunteered for the Peace Corps: They are storing their furniture; they sold their Volkswagen; they terminated their jobs; they prepared

themselves to live in Central America for a little over 2 years.

When they return, they have to readjust. They are going to have to see about new jobs. They are going to have to see about their clothing, which may not be adequate after spending 2 years in Central America. Also, I suppose they are going to look for another Volkswagen, or similar transportation. All of this is relocation cost, and for the Peace Corps volunteers at the level established in 1961 for relocation, allowance is far too low due to the inflation that has occurred since then. Mind you, inflation that is occurring during the present 2 years that these volunteers are working in foreign countries puts them farther back financially when they return.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some criticism of the program. We have heard some obvious dissatisfaction with the Peace Corps from various Members of the House here this afternoon. But, I trust that the criticism is not leveled at the individual Peace Corps volunteers who are sincerely attempting to perform their service and who, on completion of their service, return to this country and want to again readjust themselves into productive life here in the United States.

I think in all fairness that we should recognize that the amendment proposed goes directly to serving, if I might use the term, the lower echelon of the troops in the Peace Corps, and give them the opportunity to come back after their service is performed and readjust themselves beneficially into their everyday life here in the United States.

I believe the amendment gives us an opportunity for performing the right function of this House to recognize that these volunteers should have somebody looking after them here in the House of Representatives, and treating them fairly. I think that is exactly what the amendment does.

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman did not misunderstand my remarks to be critical of those individuals who have given of their time overseas. I think I was trying to reflect their disillusionment with the whole process when they come home. Certainly, I mean no criticism of those individuals who have generously devoted themselves to what they thought was a worthwhile effort to begin with.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I interpreted the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado in that light, and I hope in all fairness that he will support the amendment.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the entire 5 minutes. I would just like to point out the difference between—in all due respect to my friend from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), who is the father of the Peace Corps volunteer—that my administrative assistant is the father of a Mormon missionary.

The way this works is that he has to pay the money out of his pocket person-

ally to support his son on the mission who is not only trying to help the people with technical information and technical knowledge, but is also trying to help them spiritually.

When he comes back, his family will have the expense of getting him back on his feet. He has been working on summer work for the last 3 years, putting money away so that he could go overseas for 2 years as a representative of his church and to promote not only the best interests of his religion, but also the best interests of his country.

I think it is a great illustration of the difference between private efforts and Government.

The Government sends a young person overseas on a 2-year trip, and we somehow think that person should expect to be relocated at Government expense when he comes back. There is no such program provided for the relocation and adjustment of a Mormon missionary who goes out into the field; he gets no such benefit when he gets back.

I think for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I will vote against the amendment, and the bill, with all due respect to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the next-to-the-last word.

Mr. Chairman, I never cease to marvel at those Members of the House of Representatives who are so free with the taxpayers' dollars. This amendment would add another \$2 million plus to this \$84 million bill.

So what this means is that we would just reach out and add another \$2½ million to a program that ought to have been abolished long ago.

This year as in previous years, the proponents cannot point to any substantial accomplishments as a result of the operation of the Peace Corps through all these years and the hundreds and millions of dollars that have been spent on it. And yet, with the greatest of ease, the proponents now offer an amendment to add another \$2½ million to a boondoggle that never should have been started.

Mr. Chairman, the public cannot afford organizations of this kind roving around the world.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) talks about members of the Peace Corps returning to civilian life. I am not aware that they ever left civilian life. Perhaps I should ask the gentlemen from Ohio: Did they ever leave civilian life?

They do not wear uniforms, do they? They are not lieutenants, colonels, sergeants, or privates. When did they leave civilian life? Why do they have to be readjusted to civilian life? They go into the Peace Corps of their own volition; they are not compelled to do anything.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be defeated out of hand.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is difficult to oppose. I am sure the ranking minority Member will take the same view of it as I am taking.

The committee considered two separate amendments which were offered to raise the readjustment allowance. They

were not worked out in as much detail as is this amendment. I am almost certain that if this amendment had been offered in the committee, the committee would have looked upon it much more sympathetically than we did upon the other two amendments.

Nobody can say that there is no justification for increasing the readjustment allowance. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) pointed out that the allowance was set at \$75 per month in 1961, some 13 years ago. It has remained unchanged since that time. In the meantime, prices have gone up and inflation is becoming worse every day.

However, if the Peace Corps readjustment allowance is increased, something may have to be done with respect to the domestic volunteer programs which work under similar circumstances and come under the same ACTION agency.

I would think that if the executive branch has some more time to look at this thing, and if it comes back with a proposal to raise the readjustment allowances for Peace Corps volunteers and for domestic volunteers, there would likely be less friction within the ACTION agency.

I believe, of course, that the readjustment allowance raise is justified. I like the method and the approach of the amendment, because it provides for financing the raise. If the additional \$2 million in authorization is granted, the program could move ahead as planned without any reductions.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my agreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN), the chairman of the committee, regarding this matter.

Also, I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) for his amendment. It not only would increase the readjustment allowance, but would provide the additional funds needed to pay for the increase.

I think it is worth pointing out, however, that the ACTION agency is reviewing the readjustment allowance problem, not only for the Peace Corps, but, as the chairman of our committee indicated, for the domestic programs as well.

This review is going on at the present time. We will be awaiting a report on the study and the agency's recommendations, which will be of great interest to the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if we could have some commitment from the gentleman from Ohio that he would offer a comparable amendment to the domestic volunteer program when it comes up here, I think we could give him some assurance that we would support that.

Mr. WHALEN. I certainly would offer that amendment when the domestic volunteer program comes up. I think it would be inappropriate to defer action on the Peace Corps, however, until we can get action on that program. The problem still persists.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHALEN) there were—ayes 28, nays 45.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the committee rises.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. PIKE), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12920) to authorize additional appropriations to carry out the Peace Corps Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 994, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 294, nays 103, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—294

Abdnor	Brown, Ohio	de la Garza
Abzug	Brynhill, N.C.	Delaney
Adams	Buchanan	Dellenback
Addabbo	Burke, Calif.	Denllums
Anderson, Calif.	Burke, Mass.	Denholm
Anderson, Ill.	Burton	Dent
Andrews, N. Dak.	Butler	Derwinski
Annunzio	Carney, Ohio	Dingell
Arends	Cederberg	Donohue
Anderson, Ill.	Chamberlain	Downing
Ashley	Chisholm	Drlinan
Aspin	Clark	Dulski
Badillo	Clausen,	du Pont
Baker	Don H.	Eckhardt
Barrett	Clay	Edwards, Ala.
Bell	Cleveland	Edwards, Calif.
Bennett	Cohen	Eilberg
Bergland	Collins, Ill.	Erlenborn
Bieser	Conable	Esch
Bingham	Conte	Evans, Colo.
Boggs	Conyers	Evins, Tenn.
Boland	Corman	Fascell
Bolling	Cotter	Findley
Brademas	Coughlin	Fish
Bray	Cronin	Flood
Breaux	Culver	Foley
Breckinridge	Daniels,	Ford
Brooks	Dominick V.	Forsythe
Broomfield	Danielson	Fountain
Brotzman	Davis, Ga.	Frenzel
Brown, Calif.	Davis, S.C.	Frey
Brown, Mich.	Davis, Wis.	Fulton

Fuqua	Mallary	Sarasin
Giaimo	Martin, Nebr.	Sarbanes
Gilman	Martin, N.C.	Schneebeli
Ginn	Mathias, Calif.	Schroeder
Goldwater	Matsunaga	Sebelius
Gonzalez	Mayne	Shipley
Grasso	Mazzoli	Shriver
Gray	Meeds	Sisk
Green, Oreg.	Melcher	Skubitz
Green, Pa.	Mezvinsky	Slack
Hamilton	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Hammer-	Miller	Staggers
schmidt	Mills	Stanton,
Hanley	Minish	J. William
Hanna	Mink	Stanton,
Hansen, Idaho	Mitchell, Md.	James V.
Hansen, Wash.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stark
Harrington	Morgan	Steed
Harsha	Mosher	Steele
Hastings	Moss	Steelman
Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
Hays	Murphy, N.Y.	Studds
Hechler, W. Va.	Murtha	Sullivan
Heckler, Mass.	Natcher	Symington
Heinz	Nedzi	Talcott
Heilstoski	Nelsen	Taylor, N.C.
Hicks	Nix	Thompson, N.J.
Hillis	Obey	Thomson, Wis.
Holifield	O'Hara	Thone
Holtzman	O'Neill	Tierman
Horton	Owens	Udall
Hosmer	Patten	Ullman
Howard	Pepper	Van Deerlin
Hudnut	Perkins	Vander Jagt
Hungate	Pettis	Van Veen
Hunt	Peyser	Vanik
Johnson, Calif.	Pickle	Veysey
Johnson, Pa.	Pike	Vigorito
Jones, Ala.	Podell	Waldie
Jordan	Preyer	Walsh
Karth	Price, Ill.	Wampler
Kastenmeier	Pritchard	Ware
Kazen	Quie	Whalen
Kemp	Quillen	White
Koch	Railsback	Whitehurst
Kyros	Randall	Widnall
Leggett	Rangel	Williams
Lehman	Rees	Wilson, Bob
Lent	Regula	Wilson,
Litton	Rhodes	Charles, Tex.
Long, La.	Riegle	Winn
Long, Md.	Rinaldo	Wolf
Luken	Rodino	Wright
McClory	Roe	Wyatt
McCloskey	Rogers	Wydler
McCormack	Roncalio, Wyo.	Wylie
McDade	Rosenthal	Wyman
McFall	Rostenkowski	Yates
McKay	Roush	Young, Ga.
McKinney	Roy	Young, Ill.
Macdonald	Royal	Young, Tex.
Madden	Ruppe	Zablocki
Madigan	St Germain	Zwach
Mahon	Sandman	

NAYS—103

Alexander	Gettys	Nichols
Archer	Goodling	Passman
Armstrong	Gross	Poage
Ashbrook	Gunter	Powell, Ohio
Bafalis	Haley	Price, Tex.
Bauman	Hanrahan	Rarick
Beard	Hebert	Roberts
Bevill	Henderson	Robinson, Va.
Biaggi	Hinshaw	Rose
Blackburn	Holt	Rousselot
Bowen	Hutchinson	Runnels
Brinkley	Ichord	Ruth
Broyhill, Va.	Johnson, Colo.	Satterfield
Burgener	Jones, N.C.	Scherle
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, Okla.	Selberling
Burison, Mo.	Ketchum	Shoop
Camp	King	Shuster
Carter	Kuykendall	Sikes
Casey, Tex.	Lagomarsino	Snyder
Clancy	Landgrebe	Spence
Clawson, Del	Landrum	Steiger, Ariz.
Cochran	Latta	Stuckey
Collier	Lott	Symms
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Taylor, Mo.
Conian	McCollister	Teague
Crane	McEwen	Thornton
Daniel, Dan	McSpadden	Towell, Nev.
Daniel, Robert	Mann	Treen
W., Jr.	Maraziti	Waggoner
Dennis	Mathis, Ga.	Whitten
Devine	Milford	Wiggins
Dickinson	Montgomery	Young, Alaska
Duncan	Moorhead,	Young, Fla.
Eshleman	Calif.	Young, S.C.
Gaydos	Myers	Zion

NOT VOTING—35

Andrews, N.C.	Gibbons	Reuss
Blatnik	Gude	Robison, N.Y.
Brasco	Hogan	Roncallo, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Huber	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Jarman	Rooney, Pa.
Chappell	Jones, Tenn.	Ryan
Dorn	Kluczynski	Smith, N.Y.
Fisher	Metcalfe	Wilson,
Flowers	Minshall, Ohio	Charles H.,
Flynt	O'Brien	Calif.
Fraser	Parris	Yatron
Frelinghuysen	Patman	
Froehlich	Reid	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Gude for, with Mr. Huber against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Patman.

Mr. Yatron with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Flowers.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Reuss.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Roncallo of New York.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Robison of New York.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Froehlich.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Burke of Florida.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Parris.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Committees of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 104, the rule on Peace Corps authorization bill, H.R. 12920, I inadvertently voted "present" thinking it was a quorum call. Later I was informed as to my error but it was too late to correct the vote. Had it been possible to register my vote I would have voted "aye."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader if he is in a position to inform us of the program for the rest of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, there is no further legislative business for today and upon the announcement of the program for next week, I will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of March 25, 1974, is as follows:

Monday is District day, with the following District bills:

H.R. 8747, repeal smallpox vaccination requirement for students;

H.R. 12832, District of Columbia Law Revision Commission; and

H.R. 12109, Advisory Neighborhood Councils referendum.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week the House will consider the following bills:

H.R. 69, Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments, with votes on amendments and the bill;

House Joint Resolution 941, urgent supplement appropriations for veterans readjustment benefits;

H.R. 12412, Foreign Disaster Assistance Act, with an open rule, and 1 hour of debate;

S. 2770, pay structure for medical officers and other health professionals, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 12565, Defense Department supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1974, subject to a rule being granted.

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

If the distinguished minority leader will continue to yield?

Mr. RHODES. I am happy to yield.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 25

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

FEEDING THE ELDERLY

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was most gratified to see that yesterday the House passed, by an overwhelming majority, H.R. 11105 to amend the Older Americans Act, to provide a nutrition program for older Americans.

Most of my constituents are senior citizens, or about to become so. It is my pleasure that so many of them are my personal friends. My parents—and my grandmother—are alive and vibrant and young, for all their years. For that I am truly honored.

And so I understand, I believe, the problems of my friends who have retired and who live on pensions. I know that, too often, those pensions are not enough to take care of the simple everyday needs of a retirement family. Some of these people receive financial assistance from their children. Some invested wisely when they were younger, and are now able to enjoy their retirement years in relative comfort. Would that it were so for every American aged 60 and over. But we know all too well that this is not the case.

Too many of the elderly must manage to get along on the pittance they receive from social security. Their existence is hand to mouth, hounded to find a way to get along on less and less and still retain some shreds of human dignity. These are proud people, Mr. Speaker, they have paid their dues. They worked hard all their lives believing that, when they stopped working, they could relax and enjoy life for the first time. But for all too many of them, their retirement has become a time of counting every penny and denying themselves even the small pleasure of a daily newspaper.

So much has been written on the difficulties of surviving these days on a fixed income, that I am sure we all know the litany by heart. And yet, we must not lose our awareness of just how hard it is for these people, some of whom must try to live on the minimum social security payment of \$140 per month. I defy any of my colleagues to live on that sum, out of which must come payments for rent, food, a telephone, medication. You could not spend more than \$2 a day for food, and in these days when a can of tuna fish costs nearly \$1 and a quart of milk over 40 cents, you may well understand just how so many of our elderly have been condemned to the lingering torture of slow starvation.

Being old is often referred to as the "golden years," but for all too many Americans, these years are not golden but black with misery, loneliness, and hunger. Even those of the elderly who have retired on a decent pension have a hard time making ends meet when prices are rising at the rate of almost 10 percent a year. Just think of what this rate

of inflation means to families whose incomes are not fixed, and then think of how much greater the burden is on those who must live on a pension.

The Older Americans Act is a valuable piece of legislation, because it acknowledges the debt that each of us owes to the elderly, our parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles. They were the ones who made this country which we have inherited. Our responsibility extends not only to those in our immediate families, but to all the elderly, for each and every one of them has added in some way to American society. We would not be meeting our responsibility if we were to let these people slowly starve to death in the loneliness of their apartments. By authorizing this money, we were providing the poorest of the elderly one decent meal a day, in a place where they can get out and meet other people, see that they are not alone in the world, learn that somebody does care about the quality of their lives. It is not too much money to spend to bring a little pleasure into lives that once seemed dreary and meaningless.

The dollars spent under this authorization are a small sum in comparison to the benefits that the elderly, and this Nation, will derive. I was proud to have cast my vote for H.R. 11105, and gratified to know that so many of my colleagues felt the same way. I hope that this legislation is only the beginning of a concerted action by this Congress to improve the quality of life for all of America's elderly.

TRY IT IN HANOI, MISS FONDA

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the recent use of office space in the House of Representatives for Miss Jane Fonda to hold a "seminar" on American imperialism is highly questionable, to say the least. Free speech—on the floor of the House or Senate, or by witnesses appearing before congressional committees—is one thing. But providing tax-supported facilities, which they certainly were in this case, to give Miss Fonda a platform for anti-American harangues, seems to be a little too much.

However, a question comes to mind, which I feel might be put to Miss Fonda, rather notorious for her support of North Vietnam during the Vietnam war, and her 1972 trip to Hanoi, where she made anti-American propaganda statements. These statements, I would like to point out, were used by the North Vietnamese—along with those of some Members of Congress, I am sorry to say—to "prove" to American prisoners of war that their country has forgotten and deserted them. POW's testify to that fact; it is indisputable; some have also told me this sort of thing was the worst punishment they had to endure during their captivity.

To the best of my knowledge, Miss Fonda has never had anything good to say about her country, which has given her awards and praise and considerable

financial return for her undisputed ability as an actress. But the question is this; I will put it in the form of a letter:

Miss JANE FONDA,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MISS FONDA: You were recently given the privilege of using office space in the U.S. House of Representatives' office building to lecture a seminar on American imperialism, and tell your audience what a terrible thing it is. By implication, from this and other statements you have made, the American society is repressive, aggressive, and dictatorial, according to your interpretation. Also, from other statements you have made, one may assume you feel the North Vietnamese society and government is exactly the opposite.

Tell me, Miss Fonda, did you ever think what the reaction of the North Vietnamese would be if you asked permission to use official Government facilities to attack them? Isn't the fact that you had the freedom to say these things, in your own country (and I assume you still consider the United States your own country) proof positive that what you say is wrong? Could you conceive of doing anything like this in the Soviet Union? In Red China? Or, again, in North Vietnam?

Just where is this "freedom," Miss Fonda? If this country were one fraction as bad as you say it is, would you have been able to do this?

I think you owe your fellow citizens an explanation, and your reply to this letter will, I assure you, be inserted in the Congressional Record. After all, everyone, in this country, has the right to be heard.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Member of Congress.

STATE DEPARTMENT DECLASSIFIED DATA ON ARMS SHIPMENTS TO ARABS

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the State Department, after 4 months of prodding, has finally declassified data on U.S. commercial arms shipments to Arab nations between 1966 and 1972.

I have previously reported to this body the little-appreciated fact that the total U.S. economic and military assistance to the Arabs between 1967 and 1973 was 2.4 times the total Russian assistance to the Arabs over the same period.

The data which I bring to public attention today are one more part of the puzzle surrounding the U.S. stance in the Middle East during the arms buildup that preceded the attack on Israel in October 1973. These data officially confirms the sale to Saudi Arabia of Hawk missiles, their support equipment, and revolvers; to Lebanon, armored cars; and to Saudi Arabia and Libya—after Colonel Qaddafi came to power—of C-130 air cargo planes. The dollar value of the sales just disclosed by the State Department, \$47.6 million, is but a small part of the total U.S. economic and military assistance to the Arabs between the 1967 Mideast war and the Yom Kippur war—an astonishing \$8.952 billion—which I revealed on February 19, 1974, in this body. The \$8.952 billion in U.S. assistance to the Arabs compares with \$3.807 billion in U.S. economic, military, and private assistance to Israel over the same period. The official disclosure by the State De-

partment of previously classified sales of Hawk missiles and other implements of war to Arabs, which I am releasing today, is but one more illustration of the fact that the U.S. policy in the Middle East has been the opposite of what it has appeared to be—namely, to favor the Arab countries, not Israel.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1974.
Hon. CLARENCE D. LONG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LONG: In connection with the Hearings of the Sub-Committee on Foreign Operations with Related Agencies held on November 14, 1973, your office requested certain commercial export statistics concerning selected Arab countries.

On February 22, Mr. Gregory Rushford, Legislative Assistant in a meeting in your office asked if Messrs. Schnee, Trout and Bryant could arrange the declassification of the commercial exports of Significant Defense Articles mentioned in the Semi-Annual Reports (1968-1971) published by the Department of State for Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and Lebanon.

I am pleased to inform you that we have been able to arrange the declassification of these statistics. This information is enclosed.

I trust that this information has been responsive to your inquiry. However, if you have any further questions please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

LINWOOD HOLTON,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

COMMERCIAL EXPORTS TO SELECTED COUNTRIES OF SIGNIFICANT DEFENSE ARTICLES ON THE U.S. MUNITIONS LIST

Time frame, country, and commodity	Quantity	Value (thousands)
January to June 1968, Saudi Arabia:		
Hawk missiles and support equipment	132	\$6,235
Revolvers (.38 cal.)	1,200	60
July to December 1968, Saudi Arabia:		
Aircraft cargo C-130E	4	10,680
Revolvers (.38 cal.)	3,400	165
Hawk missiles ¹	159	5,544
January to June 1969: None		
July to December 1969, Lebanon: Commando V-100 armored cars	6	279
January to June 1970, Libya: Aircraft cargo C-130E	3	10,650
July to December 1970:		
Libya—Aircraft cargo C-130E	3	10,500
Saudi Arabia—Aircraft cargo C-130H	2	3,536
January to June 1971: None		

¹ Exported previous 6 months.

ERNIE PETINAUD: McCORMACK AWARD RECIPIENT, 1973

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives has honored one of its most distinguished employees, Ernie Petinaud. I am proud to have attended the ceremony this morning during which our friend Ernie was named the recipient of the John W. McCormack Annual Award of Excellence for 1973.

Ernie, who retired in December as headwaiter of the House Restaurant, was honored by the House leadership for his 40 years of service on Capitol Hill.

The John W. McCormack Annual

Award was established in 1970 as a commemoration to the distinguished and dedicated service of the former Speaker during his 45 years in Congress. Previous recipients of the award are: 1970, Lewis Deschler, House Parliamentarian; 1971, Turner N. Robertson, Chief Page; 1972, Robert M. Menagh, Superintendent, Radio and Television Gallery.

On March 4, 1925, the day Calvin Coolidge was inaugurated President, Ernie began his career working for the House Restaurant until 1930 when he left to work in New York. He returned to the House Restaurant in 1938, and from that time forward he made lasting friendships with the Members of Congress and their wives and guests.

Long after leaving the Congress and the hustle and bustle of Washington, my wife, Helen, and I will remember the thoughtfulness of Ernie and his charming wife, Jeannette. More than the maître d' of the Members' dining room, Ernie himself is an institution. He seemed to take the greatest pleasure in doing things for others.

His consideration for the Members of Congress, their families, our staffs, and the thousands of visitors to the Capitol Building is unmatched in sincerity and I know that I echo the sentiments of all who know Ernie well, or who have met him only once, in saying that we appreciate his hard work, his personality and his perseverance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD Ernie's remarks upon being presented the John McCormack Award this morning:

To the Speaker, the Honorable Carl Albert, the House leadership, Members of the House and friends:

To the awards committee which nominated me as a candidate and named me as recipient of this wonderful tribute, I offer my sincere and grateful appreciation and thanks.

I have reaped the harvest of my labors and the compensations from my work have been very rewarding. In receiving this great citation, I assure you that I will cherish it more knowing that it is an award given in the name of someone to whom I owe a great deal for all the kindness and appreciation that he has always shown me, and others.

I speak of none other than the Honorable John W. McCormack, one of God's noblemen and one of my best friends through the years.

So, on behalf of my wife and myself, we wish everyone here God's blessings in health and happiness. Again, I say thanks.

"UNIONS FIGHT HOUSE REORGANIZATION"

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the excellent column of Mike Causey—the Federal Diary—appearing in the Washington Post for Wednesday, March 20, 1974, is headed "Unions Fight House Reorganization." Mr. Causey describes the efforts of Federal and postal unions to:

... gut a pending reorganization of the House committee system, "because of their fear that the proposed abolition of the Post

Office-Civil Service Committee . . ." could undercut their clout on Capitol Hill and delay future drives for improved civil service fringe benefits.

I have no doubt that Mr. Causey is correctly reporting this situation. However, I would like to take this opportunity to offer some unsolicited and friendly advice to those Federal and Postal Union lobbyists who are making this attempt to gut the proposed reorganization effort. I stress that this advice is intended to be friendly, and is based on my own sincere concern for the welfare of public employees and labor. If there is any doubt about this concern, it may be allayed by consulting my labor voting record and by noting my authorship in the California State legislature 14 years ago of the State's first law establishing the right of public employee unions to organize and be recognized.

Federal employees are lagging behind their counterparts in private industry, and in most large States, in their fringe benefits and in their rights to organize and bargain collectively, not because of an unfriendly Congress, or congressional committee, but because of an unfriendly executive branch, headed by an unfriendly President. Quite obviously public employees are moving strongly on almost every front toward comparability in all respects with their counterparts in private industry. For the Congress to recognize this by placing responsibility for all labor relations matters in one Committee on Labor with responsibility for both the public and private sectors, will aid this progress, not retard it. It would be extremely shortsighted for public employee unions, or labor in general, to oppose this reorganization of House committees merely because they fear change, or think that they might have to deal with less friendly committee members.

As a matter of fact, just the opposite would probably be true. I have tried to make an educated guess as to the composition of a new Labor Committee arising out of the proposed reorganization, and, in my opinion, this is how it might shape up: Chairman, JOHN DENT, with 18 years' seniority; subcommittee chairman, THADDEUS DULSKI, 16 years; DOMINICK DANIELS, 16 years; WILLIAM FORD, 10 years; JOSEPH GAYDOS, 8 years; BILL CLAY, 6 years; MARIO BIAGGI, 6 years. DULSKI, DANIELS, FORD, and CLAY are now on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. DANIELS, FORD and CLAY are on both Post Office and Civil Service and the Education and Labor Committee—as well as BILL LEHMAN. JOHN DENT and JOSEPH GAYDOS are on Education and Labor but not Post Office and Civil Service.

On the Republican side, I would guess that the ranking members would be: ASHBROOK, ESHLEMAN, BILL STEIGER, LANDGREBE, and HANSEN, which would probably compare favorably with the existing Republican lineup on Post Office and Civil Service of GROSS, DERWINSKI, JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, HOGAN, ROUSSELOT, and so forth.

Because of what I expect will be a rather large turnover in the House this year, particularly on the Republican side, I anticipate that there will be a substan-

tial number of new Members, mostly Democratic and mostly friendly to labor, who will be available to fill the lower ranking slots on this new Labor Committee. Under these circumstances, I cannot possibly conceive of how my friends in labor and within the Federal establishment can possibly be hurt. I anticipate that, instead, they will be considerably better off.

Beyond the rather parochial point of view concerning whether a committee is friendly or unfriendly, there is a much bigger issue. The effective functioning of the House is a matter of paramount importance to the whole Nation. The low repute of the Congress in the public eye can only be corrected if we place the public interest first in all we do. The proposed reorganization can be legitimately attacked only for failing to achieve its goal of a more effective Congress. To attack it because it inconveniences lobbyists, or causes the loss of a committee chairmanship, or creates committees of a temporarily different ideological complexion, or, worst of all, merely to resist change, does not serve the Nation's interest, or the interest of the vast majority of the Members of Congress who are interested in doing the best job they can for their constituents.

No reorganization is perfect. This one is not perfect. But it must be measured by different criteria than those evidenced in this article if we are to equip ourselves to solve the massive problems that face the Nation today.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the article follows:

REORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Federal and postal unions and retiree groups are working frantically behind the scenes to gut a pending reorganization of the House committee system.

The lobbyists fear that the abolition of the Post Office-Civil Service Committee, recommended by a special Committee on Committees, could undercut their clout on Capitol Hill and delay future drives for improved civil service fringe benefits.

Under the shakeup proposal the 25-member committee, which is generally favorable to the welfare of the 3.8 million federal workers and retirees, would be disbanded. Portions of authority would be picked up by an expanded Labor Committee, and other vital functions would be transferred to a beefed-up Government Operations Committee.

The changes would upset long-established (and generally successful) lobbying practices of the unions and the special understandings they have now with most members of the committee which deals exclusively with civil service and postal matters.

The unions are counting on help from Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), one of the most powerful members of Congress. The Ways and Means Committee, which Mills chairs, would lose jurisdiction under the reorganization for Social Security, unemployment compensation and foreign trade matters, which have made Mills a congressional kingpin.

Union leaders—including the national AFL-CIO hierarchy—hope that Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.) whose special committee has proposed the changes, can be persuaded by his colleagues not to push hard for the reforms. Bolling was mandated by the House to come up with a streamlining plan, but it has irritated many members who would lose the chairmanships of committees, subcommittees or senior roles in powerful programs.

Bolling's 10-member special committee decided to split the duties of the Post Office-Civil Service Committee (as well as abolishing the Internal Security Committee) partly on grounds that it has less to do these days. The Postal Service has become a semi-independent corporation and federal pay fixing, once the major province of the committee, now is handled automatically.

Backers of the status quo argue that the committee, chaired by Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski (D-N.Y.) has an even more important oversight responsibility now that the Postal Service is going its own way, and that a full-time committee is needed to keep track of skyrocketing federal fringe benefit costs.

Government unions and pressure groups hope to persuade the Democratic (and Republican) caucuses to delay reorganization approval, if they can't have it killed outright. They hope to whip up back-home opposition to the changes during the Easter recess and that the opposition will sway enough members' votes to kill the reorganization.

WHEAT SHORTAGE A REALITY

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1973, it was predicted that the United States would find itself short of certain commodities, such as wheat, and that it would reach a point where we would either have to shortchange our own people or turn a cold shoulder to our hungry neighbors overseas. It now appears that the dire prediction regarding the wheat shortage is becoming a reality.

We are currently experiencing unconscionably high food costs and the possibility of severe shortages of certain commodities, particularly wheat and feed grains are expected to escalate this spiralling cost even further.

The American consumer must be assured adequate food at reasonable prices. At the same time our traditional customers overseas and those needy nations which depend on the United States for food assistance must not be ignored.

It is beyond dispute that the world supply of wheat is finite and close to exhaustion; that no one knows if we are already overcommitted; and that there is a clear and present danger that the United States will run out of wheat in the very immediate future.

Time is of the essence. Given the present threat of a serious wheat shortage, time is of the essence. I have urged the administration to begin negotiations now so that appropriate action can be taken promptly.

In a letter to Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz, I suggested that the U.S. Government, in recognition of the embargoes placed upon wheat by most exporting countries, the spiraling cost of wheat and its relationship to inflation in this country, and present danger of a dire crisis in wheat supply, consider the following recommendations:

First. An immediate temporary embargo on the exportation of wheat of all classes for the minimal period necessary be imposed.

Second. A requirement that the Department of Agriculture report back within a specific time as to—

The actual inventory of wheat on hand: Classes; quantities; and where located;

The crop yield: Classes, quantities, and amounts still to be harvested;

The domestic requirements for wheat: Classes, quantities, and the nature of use which explanation of factors which might change estimated quantities and the parameters of change; and

The foreign commitments for wheat: Classes, quantities, destination, prices, with explanation of factors which might change estimated quantities and the parameters of change.

Daily, the price of wheat continues to reach new highs on the commodities market despite predictions of a record crop in the United States. An unparalleled domestic scarcity of wheat, flour, and bread is evident.

The effect on the economy and welfare of our country cannot accurately be predicted at this time, but many experienced bakers foresee additional bread price increases of 10 to 20 cents per loaf or more; or no bread at all.

The high price of wheat and concomitant high price of flour, animal feed grains, other raw agricultural products and their derivatives has had repercussions throughout our economy. The ramifications go beyond the necessary passthrough of these costs to the housewife. They affect the ability of the millers to compete with foreign governments for badly needed supply.

We must face reality and recognize that a severe wheat shortage is apparent. Action must be taken to avert a calamitous crisis and to protect the American consumer.

RAILSBACK COMMENDS WENDELL WYATT

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, one of my best friends in Congress—WENDELL WYATT—has recently announced his retirement. While I know he will enjoy returning to Oregon, he will certainly be missed here. When I first came to Washington WENDELL WYATT gave me good counsel, and, over the years, I have come to regard him as one of the most competent lawmakers with whom I have had the privilege of serving.

His recent announcement on retiring not only explains his reasons for leaving Washington, but also contains a good number of points based on his experience as a U.S. Representative. WENDELL points out the need for a thorough and objective investigation into matters relating to Watergate, the need for objective evaluations of public officials, and the problems of the ever-increasing size of the Government. In addition, he explains, as so many of us feel, what a truly rewarding and stimulating experience serving in Congress is.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my comments:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT

My report to my constituents indeed will be bi-partisan. Four months ago, I spoke to you of our problems processing the Federal Budget, concrete steps taken toward congressional reform, and the many frustrations which accompany membership in the House of Representatives.

I pointed to the increase in the size of each member's workload, an increase which seems to have grown faster than the proliferating dimensions of the federal government, itself.

At times, I may have sounded discouraged, but hopefully, I did not give you the impression that I was distraught. I concluded that talk, four months ago, by saying that I was not complaining about the job of a Congressman, but only seeking better understanding of its parameters. I mentioned that I welcomed the challenges in spite of the growing frustrations, and although the burdens of the office were sometimes awesome, it was nevertheless possible to achieve.

That was four months ago.

I was greeted on this return trip home with some speculation over my designs for the future, particularly in connection with the Governorship of our great state, a chief executive position of immense authority, having few of the drawbacks of the Congressional committee system.

Now is the time to clear up rumors. I shall not seek the Governor's job.

In addition, and to dispell other rumors, I have decided not to seek re-election to the office I now hold.

I do so for very innocent reasons. I promised myself long ago that I would never become a doting Claghorn in the halls of Congress. Commensurate with this, I have by-passed opportunities to serve in the Republican House Leadership, knowing in good faith that I would not remain long enough to adequately fill one of those positions. I would like to have more time with my wife, children, and grandchildren, time which this job does not allow. And I do not want to further jeopardize my health. And I think that it is time for someone else to shoulder the burdens of the office. Faye and I are looking forward to returning from our exile in Washington, and resuming life in Oregon, the state we both love.

Having said that, there are a few other things I'd like to say. For me, this announcement serves as sort of a catharsis.

When my term of office expires, I will have been in Congress for a little over ten years. Counting the special election which sent me to Washington, I will have had my name on the ballot six times. That is a lot of scrambling for a Republican who is elected from a District which has a substantial Democratic voter registration advantage. I have enjoyed victories at the polls averaging over 70% of the vote, meaning that at least half the Democrats in my District crossed party lines to keep me in office. I am deeply appreciative of this fact, and at the same time, no one ever had to show me their party affiliation credentials when they came to me with a problem, large or small.

But, living in a world of political reality during these ten years, I have not always been able to say precisely what I wanted to say. Today I can. There is no bitterness in my swan song. My time as the Representative from Oregon's First District has been tremendously exciting and an experience which few are able to enjoy.

But a few things bother me, and I'd like to share them with you as if we were having a quiet cup of coffee around a kitchen table. If some of my thoughts appear partisan or prejudiced, that is because they are. I am no different from any one of you.

For starters, let's talk about Watergate. It is deplorable—pure and simple. If our President had planned to mess up as badly, he could not have pieced together such a

fumbling with 20 years of careful forethought and the assistance of the Rand Think Tank.

But does this necessarily mean that we should abandon all sense of perspective when we evaluate what has transpired? It shouldn't, but there is every indication that we have. My office has received well over 6,000 letters demanding that the President of the United States be hung tomorrow from the highest yardarm. Is this due process? Not hardly.

The Presidency is a man-killing job. Think back to how Harry Truman was vilified, as was the non-charismatic Lyndon Johnson, coming to office through the tragic demise of the charismatic John Kennedy.

Were those administrations blunder-free? I remember "national security" used then to justify such horrors as the Korean War, the Bay of Pigs, and the Vietnam War.

I have had on my desk for many years, a little placard with an inscription of an Indian Prayer which says, "Great Spirit, grant that I may not criticize my neighbor until I have walked a mile in his moccasins."

I have pondered that simple prayer and wondered about President Richard Nixon. I wonder how he feels about the over-night self-righteousness of Senators Ervin, Inouye, and Talmadge, who voted repeatedly not to investigate a former President's association with Bobby Baker, Billy Sol Estes, and others. Or how he feels about Egil Krogh, beginning his six months in prison and facing likely disbarment from legal practice, when Daniel Ellsberg walks free, and in some circles as a minor folk hero. And I can well imagine that the President has few doubts in his mind whether the report of the grand jury in Massachusetts would remain sealed if he, Richard Nixon, had been driving the car at Chappaquidick.

Maybe these sound like cheap shots, and maybe they are. But you don't have to go far for cheap shots these days. You don't have to go to *Parade Magazine*, or the *National Enquirer*, or even the gossip column. All you have to do is look at the front page of any newspaper. And then you need a stopwatch to determine how quickly the blood-thirsty segment of our population will rush to crucify another public official. A common cry these days is that the public has lost confidence in their elected officials. Please show me which elected official is in any way connected with Watergate, other than then proven accusations that have been leveled against the President. Aren't you a little tired of all the innuendos?

We, the most forgiving nation on earth, who afford the lowest, most despicable criminal the benefit of our constitutional process; who feed, clothe and house the most irresponsible citizen from cradle to grave, and who send untold sums of money and manpower around the world to aid and assist the less fortunate, we will not afford the President of the United States the presumption of Innocence.

I, for one, am going to afford the President procedural due process. The House Judiciary Committee is compiling for the first time, legally admissible evidence (something lacking in the Senate Watergate hearings) and if impeachable evidence is contained in their findings, then I will vote the dictates of my judgment when that time arises. But in the impeachment process, the House of Representatives acts as a Grand Jury, and in what other grand jury do its members announce a pre-determined verdict of guilt or innocence? None, of course, for they would be instantly removed. I am saddened by the number of my own colleagues who have disregarded this fundamental principle of the system they were elected to preserve. And I am simply appalled that so many people in the United States are so ignorant of this basic constitutional precept.

Enough of Watergate—I have some other things to say.

One is about citizen-action groups.

A member of Congress has always had traditional pressure and influence from four distinct sources: his Party, his Constituency, Labor and Business. He is under almost constant seige from two or more of these groups. A decent Representative acknowledges competing interests when they occur, and votes his conscience. No single one of these four, under any circumstances, is going to be "right" all the time, and most Representatives understand that.

Now comes the citizen-action group—ostensibly devoid of partisan interests, under the "holier-than-Thou" guise of sanitized public concern for better government.

Some of Ralph Nader's off-shoots, John Gardiner's Common Cause and other like organizations, at times have been very, very irresponsible, and they, of course, are instant experts on many subjects. They circulate among their members, positions which are determined generally in Washington by a small paid staff, interested in self-preservation, and generally of a rigid political persuasion. These positions are passed along to the membership, not in the form of argument pro and con, but usually with an attractive public relations label, and with only one side of a two-sided issue presented. This leads to emotional reaction among membership, and a complete lack of understanding and even tolerance in many cases, of any other point of view, and tends to destroy the reasoning process. These organizations exert as much, or more, influence as any other lobby groups, but because of the form of their organization, they are not treated the same as other lobbying organizations.

I have considerable trouble with the choice of issues which some of these groups make. There is not one I am aware of which has chosen to address some of the real major problems of the day, and attempted to present both sides of the issue, and press for some action. I am talking about the elimination of the electoral college, modernizing the method of choosing the Vice President, legislative budget reform to return a semblance of sanity to federal fiscal policies, reform of the impeachment process, and the list goes on.

I have a personal example of misuse of the label "citizen-action group," and it involves Ralph Nader publication entitled, "Citizens Look at Congress." A profile was written on each Member, and mine was written by a young lady spending a summer in Washington. Theoretically, I think that these studies could have been of great value to the voting public, if they had, in fact, been non-partisan, written by competent, experienced individuals, and were focused upon relevant aspects of the job that was being done. But, aside from the many half-truths, untruths and misquotes which were contained in my profile, and which I had no opportunity to refute, the following insight was contained on page one of "A Citizen's Look at Wendell Wyatt."

Wyatt with without striking verbal or behavioral mannerisms; he is physically nondescript, and is not a stylish dresser.

I guess I wasn't wearing my Levis that day. In any event, I caution you from touting "citizen-action groups" as anything other than certain citizens trying to get their way like the rest of us. I have many friends who are members of such groups, and I commend their interest in the legislative affairs of our country. However, it is the facts, and all the facts, that should be made available so each of us can make our own decision.

Another topic that I would like to mention is what I consider to be government's woe-ful marriage to the Eastern establishment. Now, I respect those individuals who possess the intelligence and opportunity to attend the Ivy League institutions. They undoubt-

edly, receive a very fine education. But I do think that too many in the federal government have equated this accomplishment with the attainment of divine knowledge, and this is quite wrong. You have no idea of the difficulty that I have had attempting to find positions for talented Westerners in our government, when that same position is being sought, or handed to, someone with Eastern credentials. Why the "powers-that-be" cannot simply look at what we have done for ourselves in the West, and what they have done to themselves in the East, I'll never know. Proof again, that you can't teach common sense in the classroom.

Of course, I am concerned with the ever-increasing size of the federal government, but that is not so much of a personal beef as it is a personal fear. It is simply impossible to solve every personal misery by a new federal law sloganized title. I wonder how much more federalism our system can tolerate, and particularly, the effect it will have on those American attitudes and ethics which brought the country to greatness. This is a terribly large topic which time does not permit pursuing, but I intend to maintain an active interest in this area as a "concerned citizen."

Although I may be without striking verbal or behavioral mannerisms, physically nondescript, and a poor dresser, I must admit that I was extremely proud of the fact that I was often referred to as a "doer" in the House of Representatives, and that people came to me when they wanted a job done. If I had possessed a strong desire to see my name in lights, there were ample opportunities to call a press conference and glean headlines by demagogically demanding that something be done immediately, something over which I had no control.

A real pleasant surprise to me on first arriving in Washington, was to learn that the vast majority of Members of Congress are extremely hard workers. Most Members that you read about concentrate their efforts on press relations. It is easy to play the demagogue and to live politically on press releases. But those Members who carry the heaviest burden seldom have time to also do the press-agency work.

In retiring, I will have the satisfaction that I did the job to the best of my ability. My voting attendance record for ten years will have averaged over 90%. No constituent ever complained of not receiving a response to an inquiry or less than my full effort to resolve a particular problem. I will be returning less wealthy financially for having gone to Congress, but infinitely more enriched by satisfaction and experience than if I had stayed at home. One of the deep satisfactions is the strong support I have had from many faithful friends in all walks of life, and the kind treatment by the news media. My staff has been hard working and diligent and has made my job easier. My fellow barristers have also been of enormous assistance, and I shall always be grateful for the help that they have given me, that has made my years in Washington possible.

I will miss the excitement of Washington, the many friends and associations that I have made in ten years, and the privilege of representing Oregon in the Congress of the United States: the greatest country in the world during the greatest time of man.

Thank you for that privilege. It will be pleasure to return home.

OIL EMBARGO AND RHODESIAN SANCTIONS

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the thoughtful attention of

my colleagues a clipping from the Pittsburgh Press of February 23.

The paper reports a statement by Jack Sheehan, the United Steelworkers legislative director in support of the repeal of the Byrd amendment. Mr. Sheehan strongly disputed charges that the embargo has or will cost steelworkers their jobs. The text of the article is as follows:

USW BACKS RHODESIAN CHROME BAN

The United Steel Workers Union (USW) has challenged a claim by some segments of the steel industry that a ban on Rhodesian chrome imports would cause a loss of jobs here.

Jack Sheehan, USW legislative director, said the union has called on the U.S. House to pass legislation adopted earlier by the Senate in support of a boycott adopted by the United Nations in 1968.

"The United Nations adopted the boycott to protest and put pressure on the all-white Rhodesian government that discriminates socially, politically and economically against a majority black population," the USW director said.

He "strongly disputed" charges that the embargo has or will cost steelworkers their jobs.

"What is at stake," Sheehan said, "is not a

threatened loss of jobs but a moral commitment to a people in need, and a statement of support is one of the few bold steps taken by the world organization."

Black miners received \$39 a month compared to \$540 for their white counterparts in 1970, Sheehan noted.

In order that the record may be clear, I also wish to insert the text of the communique by the Security Council Sanctions Committee regarding U.S. imports from Southern Rhodesia. It should be noted that the Security Council Committee, after examining the report, expressed its concern about continued violation of sanctions by the United States.

The text of the communique is as follows:

TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE BY SECURITY COUNCIL'S SANCTIONS COMMITTEE REGARDING UNITED STATES IMPORTS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

The Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia today issued the following press communique:

By a report dated 25 January 1974 the Permanent Mission of the United States to the

United Nations submitted to the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia a list of shipments of chrome ore, nickel and other materials that were imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 October 1973 to 31 December 1973.

After examining that report, the Security Council Committee at its 184th meeting expressed its concern about this continued violation of sanctions. It also decided to ask the Secretary-General to request the Governments of the countries of registration of the ships concerned to investigate the circumstances in which cargoes of Southern Rhodesia origin, the carriage of which is prohibited by Security Council resolution 253 (1968), were carried on their vessels.

The text of the United States report which include the quantities involved is reproduced below:

"In conformity with the statement made by the United States representative on 22 March 1972 at the Committee's 68th meeting, I am submitting for the information of the Committee a report on shipments of strategic materials that have been imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 October 1973 to 31 December 1973. Attached please find a list of these imports."

PRESS RELEASE SC/3516, FEB. 7, 1974

Vessel (country of registry)	Date of arrival	Port of importation	Port of embarkation	Commodity	Quantity (tons)
Morganstar (South Africa)	Dec. 24, 1973	Baltimore, Md.	Lourenco Marques	Nickel cathodes	22
Yellow Stone (United States)	Dec. 31, 1973	Baton Rouge, La.	Beira	Chrome ore	16,805
Helenic Destiny (Greece)	Dec. 30, 1973	Charleston, S.C., Boston, Mass.	Lourenco Marques	Asbestos fiber, chrysotile asbestos fiber	645
Ocean Pegasus (Greece)	Nov. 9, 1972 ¹	Baltimore, Md.	do	Charge chrome (ferrochrome)	556
Venthisikimi (Greece)	Oct. 6, 1972 ¹	Burnside, La.	do	do	1,119
Costos Frangos (Greece)	Feb. 11, 1973 ¹	do	do	High carbon ferrochrome	2,239
Adefpoi (Liberia)	Mar. 18, 1973 ¹	do	do	do	550
Nortrans Unity (Greece)	Apr. 10, 1973 ¹	do	do	do	839
Missouri (United States)	May 22, 1973 ¹	do	do	do	555
Merriman (United States)	July 9, 1973 ¹	do	do	do	1,372
Sun River (Norway)	Sept. 17, 1973 ¹	do	do	do	1,488
Safina E. Najam (Pakistan)	Dec. 1, 1973	do	do	do	778
Wildenfels (West Germany)	Oct. 2, 1973	do	do	do	974
Steinfels (West Germany)	Dec. 13, 1973	do	do	do	325

¹ Arrival report recently received, not previously reported.

LABOR—FAIR WEATHER FRIEND—
XIV

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the thing that must be understood about the attack made on me by the so-called Labor Council for Latin American Advancement is that this is not an organization based in my district of San Antonio.

AFL-CIO union groups in San Antonio support me. I would like to include in the RECORD as an example of this support, a copy of the news release and resolution issued by the American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO, of San Antonio in respect to the attack made on me by the LCLAA.

POSTAL WORKERS SUPPORT CONGRESSMAN

The San Antonio Local of the American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO overwhelmingly adopted a strongly worded resolution supporting Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez. The action came during the union's regular monthly meeting, Saturday, January 19th at the Labor Professional Center, 611 N. Flores here in San Antonio. The protest by the local postal workers stems from a December 19th Washington, D.C. news release by the newly formed, AFL-CIO backed, Labor Council for Latin American Advancement

(LCLAA) who accused Congressman Gonzalez of such anti-labor activities as "union-busting" and ". . . on the side of big business and against the Farrah strikers, . . ." The incident which caused the Washington, D.C. action involved a December 8th meeting Congressman Gonzalez had with the non-union workers who were thrown out of work by the closing of two San Antonio Farrah plants.

Mr. Herbert Diaz, General President of the local postal union explained to the rank-and-file members that in a four hour legislative breakfast with Congressman Gonzalez at the St. Anthony Hotel on January 18th the facts and circumstances surrounding the controversy were discussed.

Also attending the breakfast from the APWU were H. C. Barrios, Chief Steward, Robert Mendoza, Director of Legislation, Hector Arzola, Shop Steward, and Don Gignac, Editor and Publicity Director.

The Congressman, according to Diaz, was embittered by this attack and particularly disappointed that no representative of the AFL-CIO either locally or nationally conferred with him regarding his actions before releasing the unfortunate public statement. He felt, as Congressman of the 20th District he had a duty to do what he could to get the plants re-opened. He reminded the union delegation of his unequalled record of legislative support for labor and working people since being a San Antonio City Councilman. He believes his record speaks for itself and certainly does not reflect union-busting or any other anti-union sentiments.

During the debate over this issue at the Saturday union meeting it was pointed out by Robert Mendoza, Legislative Director of the APWU, that the Washington, D.C. LCLAA leaders did not have the courtesy of coordinating with him before or after releasing their unwarranted statement. Ironically, Robert Mendoza is an elected member of the National Executive Board of the LCLAA and took part in its founding conference last November.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez of San Antonio, Texas has been a true and helpful friend of organized labor generally and of postal unions in particular; and

Whereas, Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez has consistently supported, defended, and championed the causes of true trade unionism at all levels of government for more than two decades; and

Whereas, the Washington, D.C. leaders of the newly formed Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA) without prior coordination with San Antonio LCLAA National Executive Board members or other representatives of the San Antonio AFL-CIO Council published and released on December 19, 1973, an unfounded and unfair statement accusing our beloved Congressman of anti-union activities; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the San Antonio Local, American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO here assembled condemns the arbitrary actions of these Washington, D.C. union leaders; and be it further

Resolved, That the National President of

the American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO convey our feelings to AFL-CIO National President George Meany asking that the LCLAA leaders responsible print, publish and release a retraction of their December 19, 1973, attack against the Honorable Henry B. Gonzalez, Member of Congress, 20th District.

CONGRESSMAN DRINAN SPEAKS AGAINST DISMANTLING FEDERAL MACHINERY TO ATTACK EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1974, the Employment Section of the Civil Rights Division at the Justice Department will lose its authority to initiate pattern or practice suits against private employers engaging in employment discrimination. While the overall record of the Justice Department in civil rights matters during the Nixon administration is far from adequate, the Employment Section has performed exceedingly well in meeting its responsibilities to enforce the Federal fair employment practices law, title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In my judgment, the loss of this authority will cause a marked diminution in the enforcement activities and effectiveness of the Federal Government in the vital field of equal employment opportunity.

In 1972, Congress amended title VII to give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—EEOC—the power to institute court actions. At that time EEOC was given concurrent authority with the Justice Department to initiate pattern or practice lawsuits. EEOC was not assigned exclusive jurisdiction because of the understandable administrative difficulties which would arise as EEOC geared up to implement its new powers. It was thought then that 2 years would be sufficient time to effect the transition.

The hopes of 1972 that EEOC would become a vigorous and efficient agency in the Federal efforts to eliminate employment discrimination have not been fully realized. In the period from March 24, 1972, to February 7, 1974, EEOC has not filed any pattern or practice suits.¹ Of the 154 complaints it has filed, 11 have been dismissed and 2 have come to trial. Twelve of these suits have terminated in consent decrees. These judgments, however, do not generally include hiring goals, which are essential to insuring that the effects of past discrimination are eliminated. Nor do they generally have reporting provisions which are important for monitoring compliance with the decrees. With respect to backpay and other monetary awards for women and minorities victimized by the illegal practices, the EEOC decrees have provided approximately \$100,000.

In the same period of time, the Employment Section of the Civil Rights Di-

vision filed 36 pattern or practice suits, the only kind of suit it is authorized to bring. Fifteen of those actions resulted in judgments, either by consent decree or after trial. All included hiring goals which set specific timetables for increasing the number of women and minorities in jobs from which they were previously excluded. Concerning backpay and other monetary awards for the minority and female victims of discrimination, the Employment Section obtained over \$5 million from the defendants. It should also be noted that the Employment Section recently secured the largest amount ever awarded in any contested civil rights case. On January 31, 1974, a Federal court in Atlanta ordered Georgia Power Co. to pay over \$2 million to black victims of job discrimination.

There are other important differences in the operations of the EEOC and the Employment Section. The Justice Department is free to initiate investigations without first receiving a written complaint. It is not required to defer to State and local agencies, and it may file suits without first seeking voluntary compliance. On the other hand, EEOC is bound by a number of procedural obstacles which cause considerable delay in the enforcement of the statute: it can only upon a written charge, it must defer to State and local civil rights agencies, and it must attempt conciliation before instituting suit. It is no wonder that the backlog at the EEOC presently approaches 90,000 complaints—no one is quite sure as to the practice figure.

As best I can determine, a vast segment of opinion among civil rights organizations and private attorneys who litigate in the employment field believes that the Employment Section should retain its authority over private pattern or practice suits. I am aware, for example, that the Legal Defense Fund of the NAACP, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, and Americans for Democratic Action have all expressed the view that Justice should not lose that authority at this time. At a recent civil rights conference called to explore the Department's civil rights record, Burke Marshall and Stephen Pollak, former assistant attorneys general in charge of Civil Rights Division, concurred in that view.

In addition the Government agencies which have fair employment responsibilities appear to favor retention of jurisdiction for the Employment Section at least for a period of time. In its report of June 29, 1973, the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council stated:

The members of the Council agreed that eliminating the "pattern or practice" authority of the Department of Justice at this time could result in a dilution of government authority and could be counterproductive.

The Council then directed the EEOC and the Justice Department to propose the best method of retaining the pattern or practice jurisdiction in the Department. That report was signed by William Brown, the then chairman of the EEOC, and representatives of the Justice Department, the Labor Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the Civil

Rights Commission, which, in a separate letter to the Office of Management and Budget on October 30, 1973, supported again the retention of jurisdiction.

It is argued that if the Civil Rights Division is allowed to retain pattern or practice authority in the private sector, such action would be a retreat from the ultimate goal of locating all fair employment functions in one agency. To allay those fears, two observations should be made. First, institutional arrangements, however desirable in theory, should always be evaluated in practice. If a bifurcated enforcement structure is working, there should be no reluctance to retain it, unless a unified approach can be demonstrated, beyond peradventure, to result in fact in greater enforcement.

Second, the loss of authority to the Justice Department would not in fact achieve the goal of consolidation. The Civil Rights Division would retain exclusive authority to bring suits against State and local agencies—although the scope of that authority is subject to vastly different interpretations. I am advised that agencies which are presently defendants in Justice Department suits plan to move to dismiss those complaints after March 24.

Furthermore, after March 24, the Civil Service Commission would still retain its jurisdiction over Federal employment practices, and the Office of Contract Compliance in the Labor Department would keep its authority over contract compliance. The only thing that would be accomplished by giving EEOC exclusive authority over private pattern or practice suits would be a severe reduction in the effectiveness of Federal efforts to eliminate employment discrimination.

I should note, in all candor, that I am apprehensive about any recommendation that would allow the present Department of Justice to retain some of its jurisdiction, particularly in the civil rights field. On reflection and after a careful examination of the facts and all points of view, however, I have concluded that the elimination of the authority in question would be a mistake at this time.

The heart of the matter is this: the loss of jurisdiction to the Civil Rights Division will deprive the Federal Government of an important tool in eliminating employment discrimination without any concomitant gains. Dismantling an effective weapon in the fight against employment discrimination seems to me to be foolish. It is unfortunate that it will occur on March 24.

RESURRECTION OF THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, re-
cognition of the Executive orders, today previously authorizing the IRS to turn over farmers' tax returns to the Department of Agriculture is a significant step in repairing the damage done to the Constitution and restoring the right of privacy to the American people.

¹ These statistics are based upon information furnished by the EEOC and the Justice Department. They exclude the settlement with AT&T, which was the product of joint action by EEOC, Justice, and the Labor Department.

Big Government has been far too insensitive to the right of personal privacy of our people. I hope that this Presidential act marks a permanent change of direction.

HIGH TIME FOR MEAT PRICE MESS TO BE INVESTIGATED

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, when the President replied to questions on beef prices by the broadcasters Tuesday evening, I had hoped he would take the questions concerning beef prices asked by the broadcasters. I had hoped that he would establish a policy of this administration within the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies to find out why consumers have been paying high prices for beef in the stores while producers are taking drastically lower prices for their cattle. Last summer cattle prices touched \$60 per hundred, broke sharply recently, and are near the \$40 mark which is about a 30-percent drop.

Consumers should be benefiting from the lower prices while cattle feeders are sustaining huge losses of \$100 per head, mostly because of higher feed and other operating costs.

The President's reply to one of the questions was that farmers are having it pretty good, but anybody in the cattle feeding business would vigorously dispute that statement. They know better and so should President Nixon. He should examine the information that is available in the Department of Agriculture's "Livestock and Meat Situation" for February of this year which indicates that the cost and expense of feeding a 1,050-pound steer comes to \$556.88. To cover this cost it requires a sale price of \$53.04 per hundredweight just to break even. Since the market is about \$10 lower than that, that amounts to a loss of over \$100 per head.

Feedlot operators are not having it good. No way. On the contrary, the losses are so substantial as to create a concern among many of us that many feedlot operators will either be forced out of business or put so low in the hole that they cannot restock their feedlots. That would mean less beef available in the last half of this year and the first quarter of 1975, and if consumers think prices are tough now, look out for a period of scarcity when there would be a real excuse to raise the price at the supermarket meat counters.

Consumers simply have not received the lower beef prices that they are entitled to considering the drop in cattle

prices. In August when cattle were reaching close to the \$60 figure, the retail price as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics read like this: Round steak, \$1.88; hamburger, \$1.03, and rump roast, \$1.60. The latest comparable figures available from the Bureau of Labor Statistics are for February when we find round steak, \$1.93; hamburger, \$1.10, and rump roast, \$1.87. Cattle are much cheaper than they were in August, yet the statistics show in February consumers not only did not get the break they should have in price reductions, but were actually paying more for the same items than they did last August.

So the cattle feeders are having it bad, not good, and the consumers are having it bad, too, despite the fact that there has been a 30-percent drop from the high point in cattle prices last summer.

The Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations will hold public hearings on April 2, 3, and 4 to investigate this paradox of low cattle prices with high retail prices and why.

Even the calling of these hearings may result in retail price drops. It is high time they do come down to reflect the lower cattle prices.

I am including table 9 from February USDA Livestock and Meat Situation that lists the cattle feeding expenditures:

TABLE 9.—CORN BELT CATTLE FEEDING, SELECTED EXPENSES AT CURRENT RATES¹

[Dollars per head]

Selected expenses	1972				1973				January 1974
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	
00 pound feeder steer	230.82	241.80	254.76	266.16	304.62	322.44	347.88	301.20	303.48
Transportation to feedlot (400 miles)	3.84	4.08	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.56	4.56	4.80	4.80
Corn (45 bushels)	48.15	50.40	52.20	55.80	60.75	76.05	104.85	100.80	117.00
Silage (1.7 tons)	15.56	15.71	15.79	16.90	18.70	21.39	26.59	26.23	31.08
30 percent protein supplement (270 pounds)	14.90	15.26	15.74	17.50	21.11	24.25	24.65	23.63	24.84
Hay (400 pounds)	4.60	4.42	4.23	4.53	5.15	5.00	4.83	5.13	6.40
Labor (6 hours)	11.70	11.70	12.06	12.06	12.18	12.66	13.08	13.26	13.56
Management ²	3.90	3.90	4.02	4.02	4.06	4.22	4.36	4.42	4.52
Vet medicine ³	2.00	2.03	2.05	2.10	2.20	2.32	2.41	2.46	2.55
Interest on purchase (9 months)	13.41	14.05	14.80	15.46	19.42	20.56	22.18	20.78	23.33
Power, equip, fuel, shelter, depreciation ⁴	9.25	9.40	9.51	9.73	10.19	10.72	11.15	11.37	11.79
Death loss (1 percent of purchase)	2.31	2.42	2.55	2.66	3.05	3.22	3.48	3.01	3.03
Transportation and marketing expenses (100 miles)	4.78	4.89	4.94	5.04	5.09	5.20	5.25	5.35	5.40
Miscellaneous and indirect costs ⁵	4.00	4.07	4.12	4.21	4.41	4.64	4.83	4.92	5.10
Total	369.22	384.13	400.85	420.49	475.25	517.23	580.10	527.36	556.8
Selling price per hundredweight required to cover feed and feeder costs (1,050 pounds)	29.91	31.20	32.64	34.37	39.08	42.77	48.46	43.52	45.98
Selling price per hundredweight required to cover all costs (1,050 pounds)	35.16	36.58	38.19	40.05	45.26	49.26	55.25	50.22	53.04
Feed costs per 100 pound gain	18.49	19.06	19.55	21.05	23.49	28.15	35.76	34.62	39.85
Prices:									
Feeder steer (600-700 Kansas City per hundredweight)	38.47	40.30	42.46	44.36	50.77	53.74	57.98	50.20	50.58
Corn per bushel ⁶	1.07	1.12	1.16	1.24	1.35	1.69	2.33	2.24	2.60
Hay per ton ⁷	23.00	22.08	21.17	22.67	25.75	25.00	24.17	25.67	32.00
Corn silage per ton ⁸	9.15	9.24	9.29	9.94	11.00	12.58	15.64	15.43	18.28
30 percent protein supplement per hundredweight ⁹	5.52	5.65	5.83	6.48	7.82	8.98	9.13	8.75	9.20
Farm labor per hour ¹⁰	1.95	1.95	2.01	2.01	2.03	2.11	2.18	2.21	2.26
Interest annual rate ¹¹	7.75	7.75	7.75	7.75	8.50	8.50	8.50	9.20	10.25
Transportation rate (per hundredweight per 100 miles) ¹²	.16	.17	.17	.18	.18	.19	.19	.20	.20
Marketing expenses ¹³	3.10	3.10	3.15	3.15	3.20	3.20	3.25	3.25	3.30
Index of prices paid by farmers (1910-14=100)	422	429	434	444	465	489	509	519	538

¹ Represents only what expenses would be if all selected items were paid for during the period indicated. The feed ration and expense items do not necessarily coincide with experience of individual feeders. For individual use, adjust expenses and prices for management, production level, and locality of operation.

² Assumes 1 hour at twice the labor rate.

³ Adjusted quarterly by the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities, services, interest, taxes, and wage rates.

⁴ Average price received by farmers in Iowa and Illinois.

⁵ Corn silage price derived from an equivalent price of 5 bushels corn and 330 pounds hay.

⁶ Average price paid by farmers in Iowa and Illinois.

⁷ Converted from cents per mile for a 44,000-pound haul.

⁸ Yardage plus commission fees at a Midwest terminal market.

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on the forthcoming termination of the administration's authority to impose wage and price controls and to follow up my statement of last Monday when I commented in gen-

eral terms on my view that we must return to a free economy.

Phase I was an across the board freeze. Phase II was the most successful, phase III was a disaster and phase IV has created great uncertainty. Some

are suggesting a phase V but my suggestion is that we phase out.

Three years ago my constituents responded to a question in my annual legislative questionnaire indicating that 74 percent of them favored the imposition of wage and price controls. If they were filling out that questionnaire today, I would bet the percentages would be more reversed with the vast majority opposing any further economic controls.

Mr. and Mrs. Walter Peck, who head the legislative committee of the American Association of Retired Persons, in Petaluma, Calif., recently wrote me asking:

What good did price controls do? Actually prices have gone up and up and are still going up.

Their views are the thoughts of the American people. The wage and price control attempts of the past two and a half years have given the Congress and the American people an effective lesson in classical economics—in the application of the law of supply and demand.

While it would be un-American not to be in favor of holding down prices, we have all learned that holding the price of hamburger to 69 cents a pound does not do much good if there is no hamburger available.

The same is true at the gasoline pump where we all know we would prefer having an adequate supply without waiting in line to the alternative of an artificially low price. It is no service to the consumer to hold down the price of an article if the low price causes the item to be in short supply.

For example, the Cost of Living Council thought it was doing the consumer a favor by requiring service station dealers to roll back their margin on gasoline. We rapidly found out, however, that the lack of conservation incentive on the automobile driver and the lack of entrepreneurial incentive on the service station owner combined with other factors for disastrous shortages.

When wage and price controls were imposed, the working man and woman felt that the controls could halt inflation in prices while their salaries caught up. If this occurred in any industry, I am not aware of it.

In fact, in most cases controls only worsened the situation and increased the gap.

In one case I am aware of, for example, a bargaining agreement between northern California carpenters and their employers was negotiated in the summer of 1971—before the beginning of the initial wage-price freeze. Even though that agreement reflected economic conditions at that time—a time when the rate of inflation was less than it is today—this agreement has not been permitted to take effect.

The frustration of the carpenters at not being able to take advantage of an agreement reached nearly 3 years ago is surely compounded when they face the shortages caused by the same rules which have reduced their pay checks from the amounts they anticipated.

The case of the carpenters is only one

of many I could cite. The Petaluma Cooperative Creamery, in my district, was also adversely affected by the interference of the Cost of Living Council in what was a freely negotiated collective bargaining agreement. The end result in this instance was a decision that was both unfair and, in the long run, inflationary.

Of course, agricultural production and consumption has paid an unconscionably high price. Fruit producers and canners have been particularly affected through both price and quality controls and, as always, the ultimate loser is the consumer.

While collective bargaining agreements have been one of the obvious targets of wage and price controls, another similar target has been the health care industry. Even now that there is general agreement to end governmental control of the economy, some are still suggesting that controls be ended for every sector of the economy except medicine.

I suppose this is because increased medical costs are usually attributed directly to doctors since they are in direct, personal contact with the patient. Generally unseen, but more responsible for medical cost increases is the rapidly improving and increasingly sophisticated medical care technology, research, and equipment.

This equipment is becoming a growing part of medical practice and, though it is expensive, it must be paid for. If there exists no incentive to recover its cost, then it is clear there will be no investment in the equipment and a lower quality of medical care can be the only result.

This new technology is itself being constantly made obsolete and, though it is responsible for far better care, it is expensive both from the standpoint of requiring more extensive training of medical personnel and from the standpoint of the growing use of mechanization and space-age gadgetry.

The state of the medical art is far beyond anything that could have reasonably been predicted even 15 years ago. It is also very expensive.

The fact that it is expensive is not sufficient reason for the Congress to retain the health care profession under controls while removing them from the rest of the economy. A nurse—who is probably underpaid anyway—should not be asked to struggle along with her present financial situation when all of her costs could very well be rising.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that there are far more nurses and technicians who would be adversely affected by the continuation of controls than doctors who would be.

And, worse yet, the effect of controlling medicine would be devastating to the current trend toward greater utilization of paraprofessionals in medical practice. These people are being counted upon to free doctors from routine matters and, by doing so, increase the supply of health care and reduce its cost. If young people do not have a financial incentive to enter this field, they simply will not do so.

Thus, controls cannot be applied selectively and should be removed entirely.

In my judgment, one of the very worst examples of the impact of wage and price controls can be seen in the after effects of the so-called rent controls.

Ordinarily, rent adjustments can be made through the turnover of apartments or mobile home spaces. In this case, the vast majority of increases in rents are made at the time a person begins occupancy of an apartment or space. He can then choose a rent in his price range and be reasonably certain to be free of frequent price changes.

The rent control program promptly ended this practice, however, and the rental market in the United States has been in chaos ever since. Both landlords and tenants have suffered financially and, in many cases, mental anguish from this ill-advised program.

It does not take much insight to see what frequent increases in a basic expense such as rent can do to an individual living on a fixed income. This was made worse by the fact that the rent control program necessarily imposed its complicated formulas and calculations on a nationwide basis and no variation was allowed regardless of individual circumstances.

Fortunately, rent controls have been removed and I do not know of anyone in the administration or in the Congress who believes the Cost of Living Council should get back to rent control.

This means that the situation will eventually resolve itself and rents will eventually be handled again on an apartment-by-apartment basis so a tenant can expect and receive a degree of stability in his rent costs.

On the other hand, what about the renter who has faced several rent increases in a short period of time? I have heard from hundreds of renters in the Second Congressional District who have had as many as three rent increases in a single year.

These people are victims of a Federal program whose supporters said it would help. As is the case very often the Federal effort gave a short-term gain of minimal rent increases but had long-term results that have been appallingly harmful and not in any way equal to the temporary short-term improvements.

We can help in a small measure by controlling inflation more adequately so that the amount of money required for the basic housing expense might be saved from other areas of the family budget.

The worst of it is that only time can solve the problem. This means that those involved can expect no relief or assistance until the point of equilibrium is reached which is not much solace to those whose rents have been raised.

The situation is improving gradually and the improvement is reflected in the mail I receive from my constituents, but I still receive too many complaints.

With the problem with rents firmly in mind, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on the real solution to the economic problems we face. We hear a wide variety of proposals to deal with the problem of inflation, but we hear very

little about the ways we can end inflation itself.

There is no substantial disagreement that a basic cause of inflation is the lack of control over the Federal budget. Since the budget represents about a quarter of the entire gross national product, the continuing large deficits we have seen in recent years weaken the dollar and keep the economy off kilter.

The relevant factor in the private sector is the development of a supply and demand situation that I referred to on Monday, but it is up to the Federal Government to provide the leadership for the private sector has neither the incentive nor the ability to pull its share of the load.

The first and most essential effort to control inflation must be control of Federal spending plans. This is made difficult by the fact that no one wants his own favorite programs cut, but it must be done. We cannot halt the inflationary spiral without it.

The second most important solution to the problem will come with making certain that Federal economic policies reflect economic realities. Wage and price controls did not reflect these realities and consequently failed to be of assistance and simultaneously compounded an already serious problem.

Promises are a prominent part of the national political picture. Achievements are not so prominent. Many times the Congress has approved legislation with wildly exaggerated claims, but the implementation of the law has often shown that too much attention was given to the promise and too little to performance and the relative costs and benefits.

I could list a number of examples of this problem, but they are not as important as the overriding need to make certain we do not attempt to repeal economic laws. It is simply not possible.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to reject proposals to extend wage and price controls wholly or partially. I think this is the best contribution we could make toward returning to a strong and stable economy.

NAMING CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS CENTER AND CROSS TIMBERS NATIONAL GRASSLANDS IN HONOR OF LATE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would rename the first Civilian Conservation Corps Center and the Cross Timbers National Grasslands in honor of the late President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Such designations would constitute a most befitting tribute to one who had such a deep personal interest in youth and in the conservation of our Nation's natural resources.

The first CCC center, known as Arrowood, is located near Franklin, N.C.

The Cross Timbers National Grasslands is located in Wise and Montague Counties in Texas.

It is with genuine appreciation and knowledge of the contribution that Lyndon B. Johnson made to youth and conservation that I sponsor this legislation. He was my friend and for many years a fellow colleague here in this Chamber. He had been serving as Texas State director of the National Youth Administration before winning a special election and taking his seat here in the House of Representatives only a few weeks after I had taken the oath of office for the first time. I can testify as to his intense interest in youth and conservation causes, not only while he served in this body but also after he went to the Senate and then to the White House.

Little could be said to add to the renown and high regard held by the public for the CCC, which helped countless thousands of young Americans grow in physical and moral strength while they improved the beauty and recreational aspects of our Nation's forest and mountains. Highly important, but much less known, is the National Grasslands located in Wise and Montague Counties in my State of Texas. These lands were worn out and run down until under national programs they were purchased and the process of their rehabilitation began. This area is demonstrating what can be done to reclaim land which heretofore we have thought could no longer be productive.

This proposal to designate these centers in honor of the late President has been discussed with Lady Bird Johnson and I understand that she has expressed a warm interest in it and supports this move to so honor her late husband. I hope the measure can be promptly enacted.

ELIMINATING TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS FOR THE ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis has emphasized the importance of mass transportation to every American. It has also revealed, on the whole, how neglected these systems are. For the commuter, it is to say the least a frustrating and uncomfortable experience. For the elderly and handicapped, using public transit services are sometimes humiliating, often impossible.

Over the last decade the Federal Government has become increasingly aware of the needs of the handicapped and the elderly. We have made remarkable gains in removing many of the barriers preventing these people from enjoying life to the fullest possible extent.

When President Johnson in 1968 called problems in the design of the Nation's buildings the greatest single obstacle to employment of the handicapped, he said that it should be a na-

tional goal to make all buildings, museums, stadia, and transportation facilities accessible to every American.

Congress responded to this very real need. Public Law 90-480 requires that all buildings constructed with Federal funds eliminate architectural barriers preventing use or posing unwarranted hindrances to all potential visitors. Despite this great step forward equal access to public buildings is not meaningful without equal access to transportation to these buildings.

The handicapped, who must spend an inordinately large portion of their income on special transportation services, are forced to do so in order to lead a normal life. The energy shortage and skyrocketing inflation have intensified these problems. The ability to use inexpensive transportation services has become imperative, but steep stairs, narrow doorways, and other barriers still prevent thousands of people from using buses and subways. Unfortunately, the administration has made no effort to rectify a terrible burden imposed on those least able to bear it. I hope that this legislation would provide the impetus to eliminate these barriers and thereby allow greater utilization of mass transit facilities by the handicapped and elderly rider.

The legislation I am today introducing would eliminate the gap in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1973. While the METRO subway system under construction here in Washington would have to meet the needs of the handicapped commuter, there is no uniform requirement for such provisions nationwide. This legislation would amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to insure that transportation facilities built, and rolling stock purchased with Federal funds shall be designed and constructed so as to be readily accessible to the physically handicapped and elderly.

I believe this legislation is urgently needed in our effort to create mass transportation systems in the United States that are more responsive to the times and travel needs of its patrons. Transportation links the requirements of life together with their fulfillment—food, shelter, clothing, and health. It should not be so just for the more fortunate members of our society, but for all Americans. I urge the Congress to give immediate consideration to this proposal so that all of our people can enjoy the benefits of mass transit.

The text of the bill is reprinted here-with:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1612) is amended by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Secretary shall require that any bus or other rolling stock used for mass transportation purposes and any station, terminal, or other passenger loading area, improved or constructed in whole or in part with Federal funds or under authority of

Federal law after June 30, 1974, be designed with features to allow utilization by elderly and handicapped persons."

SURPLUS FOOD COMMODITY PROGRAM SHOULD BE CONTINUED

(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, the Department of Agriculture has proposed that as of June 30, 1974 the food commodity distribution program for institutions be terminated. This will have a severe impact on many poor people throughout the Nation.

Section 4(a) of Public Law 93-86 authorized the USDA to supply institutions with free food through June 30, 1974. The surplus foods involved are delegated to institutions such as camps for underprivileged children, child care centers, orphanages, senior citizen homes, and public schools participating in the school lunch program. The Department of Agriculture now provides \$260 million worth of commodities to the Nation's schools, \$20 million worth to charitable institutions, and \$1 million worth to the Red Cross. In many cases, this food sustains the institutions, and they would be forced to shut down if this supply were cut off.

The New York City Bureau of School Lunches receives \$3.5 million worth of Federal surplus food annually. This amount of commodities would cost the city approximately 25 percent more if purchased on the open market.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Clayton Yeutter, in a memorandum to Secretary Butz, recommended a phase-out of this program. Traditionally, USDA has supplied the programs with surplus commodity items. Now no commodity items are in surplus. Assistant Secretary Yeutter has proposed that the participating institutions be given cash payments instead; but food bought individually by institutions will be more expensive than that purchased by the Department's combined buying power. Furthermore, there will be no assurance that future Department budgets will reflect increases in the cost of food. Legislation has been introduced both in the Senate and the House to extend authority of the USDA to continue purchasing and distributing commodities. I have cosponsored H.R. 13380, a bill to this effect, and urge my colleagues to follow suit.

The following is a letter I have written to Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, informing him of my strong feelings regarding this deplorable situation, and asking for his cooperation.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1974.
Secretary EARL L. BUTZ,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was greatly distressed to learn that the recommendation has been made to terminate the Food Commodity Distribution Program for institutions. The food involved has in many cases been the mainstay of many charitable institutions such as camps for the under-

privileged, day care centers, and senior citizens homes. Without this supply, the very existence of many establishments will be threatened.

The phase out of the food program is due, according to USDA statements, to a lack of surplus farm commodities available for distribution.

Obviously, the need for food continues to exist, and the mechanism must be found to continue the program, even if it needs to be restructured so as not to encompass only surplus commodities.

I am co-sponsoring H.R. 13380, a bill which would extend section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, P.L. 93-86, renewing authority of the Department of Agriculture to continue this much needed program. I urge you to do all in your power to see that this program is not discontinued.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

DREW PEARSON PRIZE LUNCHEON

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1973, at the National Press Club there was held the annual Drew Pearson prize luncheon at which Drew Pearson awards were made to those who had done exceptional and outstanding work in investigative reporting in the tradition of the great Drew Pearson.

This is always a most significant occasion in recognizing the contribution to our American way of life of freedom of the press and freedom of television and radio and particularly outstanding investigative reporting in these media of communication. This occasion always puts a much needed emphasis on what it means to our Republic and the freedom of our people to preserve the historic freedom of these mediae. Mr. Donald Larrabee, president of the National Press Club opened with an able statement pointing out the relationship between free media and a free society and preserving the integrity of Government officials in such a society by such officials being constantly exposed to the most searching inquiry of public media. Mrs. Drew Pearson, in her usual moving way, spoke of the long and warm friendship which Drew Pearson enjoyed with former Chief Justice Earl Warren, the speaker of the day. Mrs. Pearson then introduced the award winners for this year: first, Mr. Jerry Landauer of the Wall Street Journal for excellence in investigative reporting for exposing the activities of former Vice President, Spiro T. Agnew, which led to his indictment and resignation from the Vice Presidency. Mr. Landauer graciously responded.

Mrs. Pearson also introduced Mr. Ward Sinclair of the Louisville Courier Journal as the recipient of an honorable mention award for his investigative reporting on the affairs of the United Mine Workers, including the Boyle-Yablonsky feud and the murder of the Yablonsky family. Mr. Sinclair responded very appropriately.

Mrs. Pearson then introduced Mr. Edward Fooey and Mr. Robert Pierpoint of the Columbia Broadcasting System who also received an honorable mention award for their investigation of the circumstances surrounding the granting and denial of national bank charters in Key Biscayne, Fla. Mr. Pierpoint responded with some remarks which were very well received.

Mrs. Pearson also introduced Mr. Charles Mollenhoff of the Des Moines Register and Tribune for sustained and significant contribution to investigative reporting over the past quarter of a century. Mr. Mollenhoff responded in his usual refreshing way.

Then Jack Anderson, the successor of Drew Pearson who was his intimate associate for a long time in Drew's lifetime, responded in his own inimitable way emphasizing the wisdom of the forefathers in building into our Constitution the safeguards of freedom of the press and freedom of the media and how essential is the scrupulous preservation of those freedoms for the protection of the assured freedoms of the people of this country.

The principal address was made by the former great Chief Justice of the United States, Hon. Earl Warren, who paid high tribute to Drew Pearson whose friendship he long enjoyed; the warmth of Drew Pearson's heart, the breadth of his concern for people, not only in this country but everywhere and the almost innumerable contributions Drew Pearson made to a better way of life in our country and in the world. The former Chief Justice emphasized how essential it is that officials in high office be subject to the scrutiny of the public in the performance of their function and how imperative in the preservation of a free society that the people are kept informed of the conduct of their public officials.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Congress and the people of this country who read this RECORD will have a better understanding of what the media of this country mean to the preservation of our way of life when they read the addresses delivered on this occasion. Hence, Mr. Speaker, I ask that following my remarks all the addresses and remarks to which I have averted appear in the body of the RECORD.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DONALD LARRABEE,
PRESIDENT, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Looking back on this year of trauma and trial for America, I can think of no time when those of us who report from Washington have had it so good, in terms of having a story to tell and telling it reasonably well. The story of corruption in high places is not an easy one with which to deal. It is unpleasant. People really don't want to hear the worst about their president and vice president. And they tend to be suspicious of those who bring the bad news. But we have risen to the challenge and it has brought out the best in us. Our credibility has been somewhat restored. But we are not home free!

Lou Harris, in his poll commissioned for the Senate Government Operations Committee, reported last week that with just two exceptions, the amount of confidence Americans display in every institution has decreased since 1966. The two exceptions are

March 21, 1974

the press—slightly up from its rating seven years ago—and television news which enjoys the confidence of 41 percent of the people today, compared with 25 percent in 1966. Public officials who were polled, I should add, have far less confidence in the press and TV news. So what's new?

What's new, of course, is that we are identified with the documented discovery that high public officials engaged in some low political practices in 1972. One year ago, we knew about Watergate but we didn't know much. We did not know the severe test to which our system would be put in the year that is ending.

On this rostrum last December, we applauded the Washington Post and its two bright young reporters for relentless pursuit of the Watergate story. But we took little note of the fact that most of us were very poor followers on this story.

We were, if you recall, still worrying about our skins—and I don't mean the football team. We were pushing for bills to shield the press. We were asking for special privilege in law. But as the press began to find ready, confidential sources around every corner—as Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson always have done—we lost interest in special privilege. The mood changed. We stopped asking for a special privilege that could just as easily be taken away.

And now, unless I misread my colleagues, we are prepared for the most part to rely on the First Amendment which remains one of the great freedoms that any government has ever bestowed on its citizens.

The First Amendment looks good to those of us in public communications at this point in time—perhaps because we are on top in the power struggle. But I fear that we stand in serious danger of forfeiting what we have gained if we fail to make prudent use of the power we now seem to enjoy.

There is much of which we can be proud in our performance, to be sure. We have forced a Senate investigation which will inevitably lead to reforms in campaign spending laws and hopefully eliminate the source of corruption—not only in presidential politics but in the entire system, too much tainted money and too many people buying favors. We have alerted the country to the fact that the presidency, right under our nose, has become larger than life in the past ten years—and larger than the law.

And as former Attorney General Elliot Richardson has noted so well, we have driven home the proposition that whatever a public figure's instinct might have been to cook up some secret scheme, he had best proceed on the assumption that it was going to get out. If, said Richardson, politicians read that lesson, that will have been a long-term, perhaps even a permanent contribution to the political process.

All of this is true and good. I would inject only this note of caution. In our zeal to demonstrate the misuse and abuse of power in the executive branch, let us not be so ravenous to expose, so hungry ourselves for power that we become irresponsible, that we disregard fundamental human rights.

My concern now is that we do not widen our credibility gap which, despite the good news in the Harris Poll, still exists. We have gained in public confidence since 1966. But can we take comfort in the fact that six out of ten people still do not believe what they hear and read? Have we done our job that well? Are we asking not only the tough questions but the right questions?

In the last analysis, our interest—the public interest—lies in improving the flow of information between government and the governed. We cannot expect the hostility and distrust of public officials to disappear overnight but new laws will never solve an old

communications problem. In Watergate, there may be a lesson for both public officials and journalists. Officials should accept the fact that their conduct must be submitted to continual scrutiny. For our part, we must be willing to conduct that scrutiny with an eye to information, as much as sensation.

As newsman, I think we ought to keep in mind the words of the immortal bard, George Reedy, who suffered as a press secretary to a president and who now preaches the word to students of history and journalism. Says George: The Congressional Record and the White House Record can be corrected, but not, at least at present, the record of the Fourth Estate.

And now to present the third annual Drew Pearson Foundation Awards for excellence in investigative reporting, I call on Mrs. Drew Pearson, Chairman of the Foundation. And I have just noted that this \$5,000 first prize is the largest single award in American journalism today. It is almost the Nobel Prize of Journalism in America. Mrs. Pearson.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MRS. DREW PEARSON

Well, thank you very, very much President Larrabee. Your speech was wonderful. I think you've got a glorious turnout here and I want to thank all of you kind friends and members of the press and honored guests for being with us today. And I particularly want to thank my good friend and Drew's great friend Earl Warren for giving us his time at this busy time of year and I want to tell Jack that I enjoyed your column this morning because mine wasn't mixed up. I got the right one. And it did refresh my memory about how tough investigative reporting was and actually I think it was much tougher when Drew was doing it because at that point in time the publishers were hardly ever on Drew's side.

So now, I want to give these awards. The first prize of \$5,000 for excellence in investigative reporting is awarded to Jerry Landauer of the Wall Street Journal. His articles exposing the corruption of the second highest official in the United States—once he began digging into the affairs of Spiro T. Agnew and the morass of campaign financing in Maryland, no cover-up was possible. His persistence in digging out the evidence was a prod to the prosecuting authorities. The Wall Street Journal and Mr. Landauer were undoubtedly aware of the personal risk of striking at a king. As a result of their courage the public and better government have been great beneficiaries.

LANDAUER: I am very deeply honored by this award and I would like to say a word or two just in thanks to various people—to Dennis — who edited the Agnew story. To Bill Kirby and Warren Phillips and the other folks at Dow Jones for running a newspaper that lets a reporter chase a story wherever it might lead, no matter how long it takes. Goodness knows some of mine have taken an awfully long time. To Joe Borkin who got me started in this business ten years ago by sharing with me the wealth of information that he had gathered about judicial ethics and to Mrs. Pearson and to all of you. Thank you very much.

The Directors of the Foundation have also voted an honorable mention award of \$1,000 to Ward Sinclair of the Louisville Courier Journal for his investigating reporting on the affairs of the United Mine Workers, the Boyle-Yablonsky feud and the murder of the Yablonsky family. In addition his exposure of the inequities of the mine wealth, health and safety of '68 helped bring about the '72 amendment in the law broadening the scope, particularly with respect to the Black Lung problem.

SINCLAIR: I would like to say thank you to everyone who had a part in making my pres-

ence here possible. And I am very pleased not only for myself and my bank account but for the fact that the Foundation has recognized a body of newspaper work that has I think uniformly been on the side of the underdog and these happen to be some underdogs who have won and it has been especially pleasant to be a part of that. Thank you very much.

We have voted an honorable mention award of \$1,000 to be shared by Edward Fooey and Robert Pierpoint of the Columbia Broadcasting System for their investigation of the circumstances surrounding the granting and denial of national bank charters in Key Biscayne, Florida. Despite the fact that the inquiry involved the close friend of the President, Charles Bebe Rebozo, Mr. Fooey and Pierpoint persisted in the investigation. In support of their efforts, CBS even involved the Freedom of Information Act to obtain documents indicating that Mr. Rebozo's friendship may have had a bearing on certain actions of the Federal government. The efforts of Mr. Fooey and Pierpoint are a credit to broadcast journalism and investigative reporting generally. The Foundation wants to commend the Columbia Broadcasting System for the backing it has given its reporters. None of us can be unmindful of the expressed threat of this administration to use every element of the Federal government including the Federal Communications Commission and the Internal Revenue System Service to punish its enemies.

PIERPOINT: Give a broadcaster a microphone and he'll take advantage of it. On behalf of Ed and myself we want to thank you Mrs. Pearson and the Foundation. I think this is a kind of a unique occasion because you have elevated us to a unique group. This is the first time that I am aware that a broadcast organization and broadcasters have received an award for investigative journalism and I sincerely believe that we have now achieved a pinnacle because the precedent set by Mr. Pearson and Mr. Anderson and the previous prize winners is something that we all would like to achieve and even having a part is a real honor. I have a feeling that the Committee looked on our efforts a little bit like Dr. Ben Johnson looked on the dog who walked on his hind legs—it wasn't that he did it so well, but that he did it at all. And the fact is that we in broadcasting are now doing it in investigative reporting and since it pays such fine rewards we will continue.

We have also voted to award for sustained and significant contribution to investigative reporting over the past quarter of a century a \$1,000 special award to Clark Mollenhoff of the Des Moines Register and Tribune. His exposures read like a dictionary of government corruption and private malfeasance. They extend from the tax scandals of the Truman administration through Dixon Yates, James Hoffa, TFX and the firing and re-instatement of Ernest Fitzgerald. And most recently the scandals of the Commodity Exchange Authority. For his devotion to investigative journalism I have the pleasure of awarding a check of \$1,000.

MOLLENHOFF: Mr. Chief Justice, Mrs. Pearson and ladies and gentlemen, these are changing times and it has made the prediction business kind of a snap. You have to assume the most preposterous, bizarre things possible, give yourself about six months and it will come true. Frankly Sinatra is one of those having the biggest problem coping with this change. A year ago he bought a Georgetown house to — Spiro Agnew. He sold it recently I'm told. They say now he has gone back to associating with gangsters to improve his image. And speaking of change—this one page is all that is left of a twenty minute speech that I had. Mrs. Bagley—

she's my Rose Mary Woods got her foot stuck on a pedal, pressed on a record button and in five minutes wiped out eighteen minutes of my indiscreet commentary. It's true, believe me. I'm willing to say it under oath and I hope she is. Whatever I have done to or in Washington in the last 23 years, I owe it to Dick Wilson. As Bureau Chief and as my boss he was responsible for my freedom although there are a lot of people who would question his wisdom but spare Dick the blame for the most audacious confrontations—particularly in recent months. I can tell by his pained expression that he often doubted but suffered in silence. Now this award I accept on behalf of myself and two investigative reporters in our Bureau George — and Jim — because while I am Bureau chief it's only possible to continue active investigation in this field because I have such fine colleagues to work with. Now I must confess my biggest blunder—I was going to suggest going into one of Mr. Pearson's big blunders too—I can do that to. In 1947 Drew wrote that there was a Delaware chicken farmer who had been elected to the U.S. Senate and it was one of the biggest political accidents of the age. He predicted that John J. Williams would be lost in the Washington shuffle and would never be heard of again. Years later as Senator Williams emerged as a symbol of integrity in government, Drew acknowledged this error. And now my big blunder. My assessment of Richard Nixon as a man experienced enough to understand the wisdom that good politics can be good government—now I don't regret the experience of the White House, in fact it has given me a kind of an up in the Watergate hearings. I can tell Herb Erlichman from Halderman without a program. Thank you.

Mr. LARRABEE. I would like to call on Jack Anderson for just a moment.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JACK ANDERSON

I would like to extend my personal congratulations to all the winners. I have reason to know how good a reporter Jerry Landauer was. Two years ago we were both checking into Spiro Agnew in Maryland and I was always two or three steps behind Jerry. I certainly do agree with what Don Larrabee has said and I think that this is a time when at least judging from my mail, the American people have been jolted by a series of news shocks. I think their faith has been shaken. They have believed in the presidency. They have had faith in the presidency. The President has been for the American people the father image, the embodiment of the nation, the only royalty that we have and there has been an American myth that whoever enters the Oval Office, no matter how dubious his past or how poor his qualities, that he sheds this and takes on a certain statesmanship that the eris something enabling about the office. And uplifting about the office that changes ordinary men into statesmen.

And this is what the American people believed and this is what they no longer believe. I think that those of us who have been writing the story that had to be written—and there are—to a great extent this has been a nation of ostriches and a lot of people that preferred to keep their heads buried in the sand. I want to say to them in behalf of my colleagues, we have not enjoyed writing the story. We get no pleasure out of the Watergate revelations.

I suppose I also agree with Don that it is probably also our duty to keep things in perspective and to that end may I say as I go across the country and talk to people, I find young people, in particular, losing their faith in the system. They feel the system has gone sour, that society is sick, that democratic processes don't work—if our founding fathers

had expected their presidents to be pure and noble and clean—if they had expected presidents never to abuse their power—if they had expected our presidents never to lie to the people or never to cheat—if that's what they had expected then the system has failed. But, you see, our founding fathers did not expect this. They expected quite the opposite. Our founding fathers, looking ahead, as Thomas Jefferson put it—he didn't know Richard Nixon's name but he saw him coming. He said of future presidents, we can have no confidence in the man. We must bind him down in chains. The chains of the Constitution. They wrote the Constitution to protect the people from the government—not to protect the President from the people. The words that you get out of the White House, words like presidential prerogatives, executive privilege and inherent powers—these words are not found in the Constitution. The words we find there are liberty and freedom and justice and general welfare.

Let me close with just this one little incident that happened just a few weekends ago. I was visiting with a friend of mine, I'm not going to embarrass him by mentioning his country but he represents one of the great democracies.

And during the weekend we got talking about Watergate and finally he turned to me, looked at me very seriously and he said, "We used to look up to your country. We used to look to the United States for leadership. We no longer can do so. We have been disappointed in you." Well, I said to him, "Would you answer a couple of questions for me truthfully?" He promised that he would—that he'd try to and I said to him, "Has your President ever abused his powers? Has your President ever been guilty of corruption? Has he ever trespassed on the freedoms of the people? Has this ever happened in your country?" Well, he smiled and said, "If I must tell the truth I would have to say that it has happened many times in my country." Oh, I said, "If that's so, when it happened were there front page stories? Did the press expose it? Did the radio and TV lay the facts before your people?" Well, he smiled again and he said, "Well, I'm afraid in my country the press wouldn't dare." I said, "We have a judge, just one of 450 Federal judges in this country. One of 15 just in the Washington area. He's an obscure judge. Son of an Italian emigrant. His name is John Sirica.

"Now he stood up to the most powerful man in our country. He challenged the President of the United States. And let me tell you something, he's got the President nervous. Did you have such a judge?" Well, he smiled again and he said, "No, in our country the judges are controlled by the ruling party." I said, "We've got a Senator named Sam Ervin been carrying a copy of our Constitution around in his pocket for 30 years. And he was sick at heart over the abuses of that Constitution. And he did something about it. He called hearings. He laid the facts before the people. Did you have such a Senator?" And this friend of mine, he said, no. He said, "Our Congress is also controlled by the ruling party." I said, "My friend, I like our system better than yours." And he smiled and said, "Now that I think about it, maybe I like your system better than ours too." Thank you.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HONORABLE EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, RETIRED

It has been a long time since I spoke from this rostrum, and I am happy that this Drew Pearson Awards Luncheon affords me the opportunity to renew my valued association with the members of the National Press Club, so many of whom I helped install as President of your Club during my active years on

the Court. Those were happy experiences for me. I had all the fun of starting in motion and none of the worry involved in administering the affairs of an organization as individualistic as the National Press Club.

And I suppose in its long history there was no one more individualistic than the man for whom this Award is named. In fact, for a long time, I have thought that the young people probably had him in mind when they coined the phrase about a person "doing his own thing."

He was unabashedly provocative. Some people thought he was divisive. But I remember the first time I met him was after World War II. He conceived the idea and organized the Freedom Train to rekindle the flame of patriotism in all Americans, not by urging them to go to war, but through the exhibition of the founding documents of the Republic and explanation of their meaning to our free way of life in order to inspire confidence in our institutions and strengthen our resolve to preserve them for ourselves and for those who are to follow us.

I was Governor at the time, and when Drew brought the train through California, I rode with it the length of the State, giving such help as I could to the cause which it represented. It was a good cause, and I am sure it was helpful in generating pride in the goodness of our institutions and the necessity of preserving them as the sheet anchor of our freedom. There was no hyperbole, no exhortation, no jingoism in the undertaking. It was a gentle appeal to real patriotism and in every respect was unifying.

I do not recall seeing him again until I came to Washington in 1953 as Chief Justice. That was a time of complete change of life style for me in my relations with the news media. For over thirty years in California, I was in politics and, like most politicians, if the news media did not approach me I would approach them. Believing in the right of the people to know what their public officials are doing, and also believing that it would help me in their appraisal of my work, I held two open press conferences each week of my eleven years as Governor. It was a mutually satisfactory arrangement, and relieved the necessity for a lot of investigative reporting on my administration.

Having been in and about courts all my adult life, I realized my press relationship in political life was not a proper stance for a judicial officer.

Believing there was no partial way of changing my relationship, I decided, in coming to Washington, to make a complete one hundred and eighty degree change of approach, and decline to discuss any of the judicial aspects of the Court work with the media. I did it promptly, and after the amenities relating to my induction into office were concluded, I submerged myself in another world. It was not only a strange but a difficult way of life for me after thirty years of free-wheeling with the press. And although I have never told the story publicly before, I will say to you today that at the outset it triggered for me the most traumatic experience of my more than fifty years in public life.

When I came to Washington the first week in October 1953, there was in progress an election for Mayor of New York. There was brewing at the same time a prison scandal over the influence used to effect the release of a notorious racketeer from a New York penitentiary. The two became enmeshed, and the names of a number of high public officials became involved in the scandal.

Mr. Robert F. Wagner, the eventually successful candidate for Mayor, only a few days after my induction, held a press conference concerning the prison scandal and naming certain persons implicated in it.

March 21, 1974

In the course of it, he also stated that one of the highest legal authorities in Washington, whose word was sometimes taken for the law, was enmeshed in it. He declined to name the official, and you can imagine what probing that unleashed. Reporters insisted on talking to me about the matter, but I instructed my secretary to say I was not available.

They waited at the entrances to the Court Building, but I entered the basement by car, and declined to recognize or halt for reporters at the entrance. I cut off the telephone in my hotel room, ate, and remained there until morning each day. As the weeks passed, some of the reporters wrote or wired me asking for an interview and saying they wanted to be helpful.

My name was not mentioned in the press, and I relied on the fact that it would not be without evidence to connect me with it. On the other hand, I felt sure that if I gave anyone an interview, there would be a story to the effect that "Warren denies he is implicated in prison scandal," and that would be an excruciating way to start off the proceedings on my confirmation as Chief Justice. So I sat tight and suffered in silence. My wife was not even with me, she having remained at Sacramento to move from the Governor's Mansion where we had lived for eleven years with our six children, and which I had left on four days' notice to open the 1953 Court Term in accordance with my interim appointment by President Eisenhower.

On the Saturday night before the election, I was in my hotel room alone having dinner, and turned on the television. It happened that Mr. Wagner was holding a press conference at the time, so I listened. During the course of it, one of the reporters said, "Mr. Wagner will you tell us if Chief Justice Warren is the man you referred to as being implicated in the prison scandal?" He replied, "Oh, no, I understand he is a fine man, and I am sure he would not be involved in anything like that." What a relief!

I did not know him or anyone in his organization at that time. In fact, my politics had always been in the opposite Party. I later met him as Mayor, and our trails occasionally crossed at public affairs. He was always friendly and spoke well of the Court.

I never heard another word about this nightmare, but I assure you it was a baptism of fire.

In keeping with my policy of not discussing the affairs of the Court with the media, I never saw or talked to Drew Pearson as a journalist, but, like most Washingtonians, I read his daily column in the Washington Post.

I did, however, come to know him a different way that culminated in a cherished friendship between Drew and Luvie and Nina and me. We were all blessed with the friendship of the late Agnes Meyer.

For several years, she would arrange a Summer cruise in some exotic part of the world—the Fjords of Norway; the Dalmatian Coast, the Greek Islands; the ancient cities of Asia Minor; the perimeter of the Black Sea; the Hawaiian Islands, etc. On these cruises, the Pearsons, the Bill Attwoods, Adalai Stevenson, Clayton Fritchey, always some members of the Meyer family, and Nina and I were included. They were wonderful experiences, and it was on these cruises that I came to know Drew Pearson.

Walking along a Hawaiian beach, a Norwegian Fjord, the ruins of Troy, the Carpathian Mountains, or in the Greek Islands afforded me an opportunity to learn his trend of mind. It was not there focussed on muck, but on understanding. I sat, and without participating, listened to him and Agnes Meyer discuss world affairs by the hour with personalities such as the King and Queen

of Greece; Chairman Krushchev of Russia; President Gheorgiu Dej of Romania; President Tito of Yugoslavia; Mayor Ake of Istanbul, and others. He was searching for and probing for reportable material—not to aggravate or increase the tension of the Cold War, which was so dominant in the Joe McCarthy days, but to see if some measure of accommodation could be found to enable the nations of the West and the East to find a way to live and let live alongside of each other.

He was a Quaker, as you may know, and in keeping with his faith, immediately after World War I, he undertook a mission into Little Montenegro which had been overrun and devastated by the central powers in the War. His mission there had been designed to build homes and restore family life in the devastated villages. On one of our cruises along the Dalmatian Coast from Athens to Venice, he decided to travel overland from the Yugoslavian port of Split to the interior of Montenegro where he had performed his mission. I agreed to go with him. It was a unique experience, and one that warmed his heart because we not only found in use the homes he had built a half century before but also some of the people who had worked for him and who were still living in them. The trip over the "Black Mountains" in a small car for several days was, indeed, a rough one, but it was enlightening to see life only a few miles from the eastern border of Albania almost the same as it was in Biblical times.

At home, Drew, as you all know, was a ferret for conflict of interest in Government. I suppose he made more enemies than any journalist of his day in pursuing that objective. He not only fought corruption but also the secrecy in Government which makes corruption easier. I have often conjured how he would have thrived on the opportunities for investigative reporting in these almost unbelievable times. He would have dug deep and fought secrecy in governmental affairs with a vengeance.

It would be difficult to name a more efficient ally of corruption than secrecy. Corruption is never flaunted to the world. In Government, it is invariably practiced through secrecy. That secrecy is to be found in every level of Government from city halls to the White House and the Hill, and if anything is to be learned from our present difficulties, compendiously known as Watergate, it is that we must open our public affairs to public scrutiny on every level of Government.

Some will say that it is the duty of public authorities to ferret out and prosecute conflicts and defilement of the public interest. But this falls far short of the mark. Law enforcement officers are not equipped to follow the daily work of our public servants, and I doubt if we would want them to be constantly looking over the shoulders of our people in public life just to see if they are performing their duties honestly. It is not the American way, and the practice could eventually lead to a police state.

But we do have the right to compel our public officials to keep the avenues of information open so the public can know and evaluate the character of their work from day-to-day. Then it would be the responsibility of the news media to inform the public of both the accomplishments and the derelictions of their officials.

It is an enormous job to alert the public because there are 2,872,000 Federal civilian employees, 2,832,000 state employees, and 7,612,000 in local government, making a total of 13,316,000 in 1971. All of them perform some duties for the Government, and often some obscure public official unknowingly even will perform some act that, if disclosed, might change the course of history.

As an illustration, conjure for a moment what a nation shattering service the house policeman and the city policemen whom he summoned rendered in making public the Watergate burglary. Had they succumbed to the blandishments and importunities of the burglars, all of the subsequent disclosures of conduct debasing our institutions might have remained a secret forever.

A similar occurrence could come under the scrutiny of anyone of these millions of public employees and if not disclosed might deprive the American people of a much needed opportunity to cleanse some level of our Government.

But even such a failure of disclosure might not be the fault of the particular employee. It could well be a lax method of accounting for official conduct or even a strict policy of secrecy imposed by the policymaking authority.

Such policies, whether they stem from indolence or design, are cancerous to the body politic and must, if our Government is to remain "of, by and for the people," be curbed by adequate legal guidelines and then by scrutiny of the people for use in the electoral process. The fulfillment of the latter, however, depends on the preservation and stimulation of a free press, because the people cannot be adequately informed by the Public Relations Departments of the numerous agencies which justify their activities through news releases and subtle propaganda.

The Pentagon alone is asking for \$25,023,000 this year for that purpose. The General Accounting Office, however, has objected to the amount before Congressional Committees on the ground that much more has been concealed for the purpose in other parts of the budget. That amount alone for public relations in the one Department, however, is over four times the total requested budget of the Supreme Court of the United States this year.

And with that amount of money, presumably to inform the public of the activities of the Pentagon, the Cambodian bombing was deliberately concealed from the American people until about two years after the fact.

There is but one protection against such deception, and that is the accessibility to inspection by the citizenry of public records on every level of Government, thus making them available for the news media.

We must realize that when we open up Government files and documents, we are not according the press any preference, but that we are making available to all citizens alike the opportunities to know what their Government is doing. It is then that the press becomes free through investigative reporting to inform the people of the actual state of affairs and put its interpretation on it. If it does the job well, the people are the beneficiaries.

The investigative reporting of the past year is entitled to high praise and the gratitude of every American. Without it, disclosure of fraud, bribery, perjury, conflict of interest, obstruction of justice, etc., would probably have passed without official action.

So if we are to learn from the debacle we are in, we should first strike at secrecy in Government wherever it exists, because it is the incubator for corruption. One would think this should be an easy thing to accomplish, but as in most public questions there are many facets to it, and as the old hillbilly from Arkansas said, "No matter how thin you make a pancake, there are always two sides to it."

The Congress has labored at great length on the subject, and in 1966 enacted the Freedom of Information Act. That Act recently was accorded a somewhat restricted applica-

tion by a sharply divided Supreme Court in the case of *EPA v. Mink*, 410 U.S. 73.

The dissenters wrote that the decision "wholly frustrates the objectivity of the Freedom of Information Act," and that "It is on its way to become a shambles." Fortunately, there was no decision of constitutional dimensions, the Court holding that the Act did not authorize the relief sought in the case. This would appear to leave the extent to which secrecy in Government might still be proscribed as one for legislative action.

In order to appreciate that a free press is a basic element of a free society, one need not subscribe to the aphorism of Thomas Jefferson that if it should become necessary to dispense with either government or a free press we could better afford to give up government.

Every thoughtful American knows that some of most cherished rights stem from the First Amendment—speech, the press, religion, assembly, and the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. To exercise these rights effectively, the people must know what the Government is doing. On the other hand, the increasingly complex world and nation in which we live undoubtedly call for some degree of confidentiality in the decision-making process, but to recognize that fact one need not subscribe to the bizarre contentions of the administration for boundless secrecy under the ensign of executive privilege and national security.

Nor need one believe that this should curtail the rights of the press to explore, probe and report to the public what its explorations reveal.

What I mean to emphasize is that whatever secrecy is to be permitted concerning governmental records in the highest as well as in the lower echelons should be fixed by law. As I have just reported, the law is now in a state of flux and more refinement is called for. The importance of the problem cannot be overstated. It must be obvious to all by this time that secrecy in high places spawned this great tragedy of our time, and that continued secrecy has prolonged the judicial inquiry into admittedly illegal conduct to a point which erodes the rule of law.

Only a rule of reason will solve the dilemma we find ourselves in. This is not an easy thing to evolve in these days when the solution of so many issues is polarized to the point of frustration. Yet the importance of this issue is so great that I would think there is sufficient acumen and patriotism in the elements of our society most intimately connected with the affairs of Government to solve it.

We are spending billions of dollars today to induce the Israelis and the Arabs to settle their ancient differences through reason. In recent years, we have spent upwards of 200 billions and lost 50 thousand of our young men to achieve what is denominated as "peace with honor" between two small countries on the other side of the world.

In light of these experiences, would it be reasonable to expect the professions of journalism, law and political science, together with their professional schools and representatives of federal and state government, all properly sanctioned, to be able jointly to study and define the essential areas of confidentiality in Government, leaving the rest open to public scrutiny so that "Even he who runs may read?"

I would think it should be and perhaps it might be the best way to avoid another Watergate which we can ill afford, and thus fulfill our Constitutional obligation to keep it possible for the people to govern themselves.

Finally, my congratulations to all of today's awardees. They have honored their profession by their investigative reporting, and

in doing so have fulfilled in the finest sense the responsibility of a free press to the people it serves.

JAMAICAN PROGRESS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, at the recent meeting of hemisphere foreign ministers one of the most outspoken representatives was the very able foreign minister of Jamaica. He minced no words in his discussion of differences between his country and the United States, yet he always spoke as a friend. It is this spirit of friendship that marked the frank discussions in Mexico City which gives rise to my own conviction that for the first time in many years U.S. hemisphere policy is on the right track.

In the February issue of "Hemispherica," the monthly bulletin of the widely respected Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom, Dr. Jordan M. Young, professor of history at Pace University, has written a timely article on the new sense of purpose among the Jamaican people which was so evident at the Mexico City meeting.

I know that all of those in the House who have had the pleasure of visiting the beautiful island of Jamaica and all of those who share my concern for the importance of good relations with our Caribbean neighbors will be interested in Dr. Young's conclusions:

JAMAICA OFFERS NEW LEADERSHIP

(By Jordan M. Young)

It seems almost unrealistic and romantic to visit a small island like Jamaica that is short in everything a society needs for the "good life" and to come away with the feeling that the Jamaicans will not only survive but will perhaps provide, for other third world countries, leadership and a balanced political and social program. Twelve-year-old Jamaica continues to surprise and inspire confidence not only in the Caribbean world but also on the African continent.

The source of this optimism is Prime Minister Michael Manley, whose People's National Party won control of Jamaica in February 1972. When the PNP won, the prophets of doom and despair were positive that any party that had been out of power for ten years would be in no condition to govern. They have been proved wrong, as Manley has offered an economic and political philosophy that is new and different, but that has not caused tension or a collapse of the political structure.

Michael Manley, son of Sir Norman Washington Manley (one of Jamaica's five national heroes), is superbly attuned to 20th century politics. The Prime Minister is effective on television and his personal appearances generally turn into euphoric revival meetings rather than political rallies.

Yet Manley is a stern schoolmaster, lecturing on the sacrifices that have to be made and the belt-tightening that must be done.

When social disorders broke out in December of 1973 he went on a nationwide broadcast and stated: "This country cannot survive if our people do not share a sense of recognition of each other's needs, as well as a sense of social obligation toward the needs of the whole society. It is in the absence of social obligation that the serious problem of social indiscipline occurs."

Full-page advertisements proclaim in bold type: "Your taxes are being used to provide skill training so that one day, men will be poor only by choice. Our society is plagued by unemployment and all its attendant miseries. Many jobs are unfilled and must remain unfilled until we create the skills we need." This is strong talk for a party that has been in power only two years.

It is difficult to pinpoint the changes that have taken place in the past few years. Economic conditions have not improved; what has been altered is the perception of what it means to be a Jamaican. There is now a conscious pride in the country and an attempt to sort out the significance of being an independent nation after more than 300 years of British Colonial rule.

One of the first steps was to change the educational system so that it would reflect the realities of a small tropical island with limited economic resources. England had invested very little in higher education. Junior and secondary schools were heavily weighted toward the classics. Florizel Glasspole, a member of the PNP with a long and distinguished record in the labor movement, served as Prime Minister Manley's first secretary of education, and instituted reforms which emphasized practical technical training in machine shop skills, woodworking and sewing skills. U.S. Peace Corps volunteers helped set up some of the new installations.

But Jamaica's biggest problems are of course economic. Throughout the raw materials producing countries the Arab oil embargo sent a shock of realization that they are perhaps not at the mercy of industrialized nations. The price of sugar has been skyrocketing and yet Jamaica is tied to obsolete per-ton cost accords within the British Commonwealth.

Prime Minister Manley in January 1974 flew to England to negotiate higher wages in the Caribbean. The island cannot meet sugar quotas and production will probably decline for 1973-1974. In 1970 Jamaica produced 370,000 tons; in 1971, 379,000 tons, and in 1972, 373,000 tons. Banana production has been falling, with only bauxite and alumina maintaining high levels of exports.

Manley has consistently stressed that the time is long overdue for an effective Caribbean alliance that will accelerate economic development. "The world at large will spare a handout for the weak," he recently said, "But it reserves its respect for the strong. Much as we welcome aid we attach an ever greater significance to trade and above all to trade on just terms."

Although the Prime Minister has surrounded himself with many competent political professionals, it is Dudley Thompson who appears to do most of the leg work with Africa and Third World countries. In February 1974, Thompson returned from a trip to Cuba and in a press conference predicted that within two years the Cuban Republic would be among the top purchasers of Jamaican goods, while Cuba promised to aid Jamaica with supplies of sugar and rice which are in short supply.

The Jamaican government, with its offers of financial aid, has not made any attempt to hide its sympathy for African Liberation Movements. At the Non-aligned Summit Conference, held in Algeria in September 1973, Manley declared: "We are willing to offer to the Organization of African Unity, that whenever it feels that volunteers can be trained to assist successfully in the overthrow of the racist regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia and the colonial regimes of Angolan Mozambique and Guinea-Bassau, we will undertake to recruit volunteers and send them across the ocean to Africa."

Crossing the mountains, from the south to the north shore of Jamaica, or driving to-

ward Maypen or Mandeville, one sees constant evidence of road and school construction, signs warning against unwanted pregnancies and billboards calling for more care in the handling of tropical fruits for export.

It is still easy to "live" in Jamaica and if the Prime Minister can convince people that they will be better off in agricultural jobs and still share the movement and excitement of the large cities, Jamaica may lead in finding a newer and simpler way of life with dignity and happiness for most of its people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL) after 1:30 p.m. today, on account of family illness.

Mr. PARRIS (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today and March 25, 1974, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. KOCH (at the request of Mr. THORNTON), for Tuesday, April 2, 1974, for 60 minutes, following the special order of the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RAILSBACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 30 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DRINAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MELCHER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PEPPER and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 3½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$731.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

Mr. KEMP in three instances.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. AREND.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.
Mr. HOGAN.
Mr. GOLDWATER in two instances.
Mr. STEELE.
Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. RAILSBACK.
Mr. ROBISON of New York.
Mr. REGULA in two instances.
Mr. BRAY in three instances.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. FINDLEY.

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

Mr. DRINAN in five instances.
Mr. DINGELL in 10 instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.
Mr. WALDIE in three instances.
Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.
Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in two instances.
Mr. O'HARA in two instances.
Mrs. SULLIVAN in six instances.
Ms. JORDAN.
Ms. SCHROEDER in 10 instances.
Mr. RUNNELS in two instances.
Mr. DELLUMS in 10 instances.
Mr. CAREY of New York in two instances.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. BADILLO in two instances.
Mr. ROE in three instances.
Mr. ROONEY of New York.
Mr. NIX.
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas.
Mr. DANIELSON in two instances.
Mr. MEEDS.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5236. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in Utah to the record owners of the surface of that property.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 20, 1974:
H.R. 2533. An act for the relief of Raphael Johnson.

On March 21, 1974:
H.R. 5236. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in Utah to the record owners of the surface of that property.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.)

under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 25, 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:

2080. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report recommending the designation of the lower 237 miles of the Suwannee River and portions of its tributaries and their immediate environs as an addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1276(b) (H. Doc. No. 93-246); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2081. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 and other related acts to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2082. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect Federal mine inspectors in the performance of their official responsibilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2083. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to conserve energy by providing temporary relief from restrictions on sizes and weights of motor vehicles using the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

2084. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of reports issued or released by the General Accounting Office during February 1974, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1174; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Select Committee on Committees. House Resolution 988. Resolution to re-form the structure, jurisdiction, and procedures of the committees of the House of Representatives by amending rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representative (Rept. No. 93-916) (pt. II). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on recruiting for high level positions in the Federal Government under the name request concept and examining functions of the Civil Service Commission (Rept. No. 93-925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11321. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABDNOR (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BEARD, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SEEBELIUS, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. STEELMAN, and Mr. TOWELL of Nevada):

H.R. 13654. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent persons killed or injured or whose property was damaged in the course of the occupation of Wounded Knee, S. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABDNOR (for himself, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 13655. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent persons killed or injured or whose property was damaged in the course of the occupation of Wounded Knee, S. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. REES, and Mr. TREEN):

H.R. 13656. A bill to amend section 1951, title 18, United States Code, act of July 3, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 13657. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax incentives to improve the economics of recycling waste paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13658. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to insure that transportation facilities built and rolling stock purchased with Federal funds are designed and constructed to be accessible to the physically handicapped and the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 13659. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969, to provide a formula to control the exports of wheat, soybeans, and corn from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 13660. A bill to establish a medal of honor to be awarded by the President to law enforcement officers for distinguished services above and beyond the call of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 13661. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law relating to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 13662. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to maintain a motorcycle unit within the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13663. A bill to require filing of domestic food price impact statement in connection with exports of U.S. commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13664. A bill to increase the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable under the veterans' laws by 17 percent, and to increase the monthly rates of pension payable under such laws by 15 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 13665. A bill to provide that income from entertainment activities held in conjunction with a public fair conducted by an agricultural organization described in section 501(c)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall not be unrelated trade or business income and shall not affect the tax exemption of the organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 13666. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to allow veterans of the Vietnam era and thereafter to receive educational assistance benefits for a maximum of 48 months; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13667. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to eliminate the time limitation on the provision of educational assistance to veterans who served on active duty at any time during the Vietnam era or thereafter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 13668. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prohibit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from seeking deficiency judgments with respect to certain loan obligations held by him; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 13669. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain interest forfeited by reason of premature cancellation of certain savings deposits shall not be included in gross income and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTON:

H.R. 13670. A bill to provide for protection of franchised dealers in petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. DOWLING):

H.R. 13671. A bill to prohibit the exportation of fertilizer from the United States until the Secretary of Agriculture determines that an adequate domestic supply of fertilizer exists; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 13672. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to school desegregation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS (for himself and Mr. BRINKLEY):

H.R. 13673. A bill to establish within the National Cemetery System the Fort Mitchell Regional Veterans' Cemetery in Russell County, Ala.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 13674. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mrs. MINK, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 13675. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest shall be paid to individual taxpayers on the calendar-year basis who file their returns before March 1 if the refund check is not mailed out within 30 days after the return is filed, and to require the Internal Revenue Service to give certain information when making refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 13676. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for outpatient surgery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming (for himself, Mr. FORD, Ms. SCHROEDER, Mr. MCKAY, and Mr. GUNTER):

H.R. 13677. A bill to amend the Mineral Lands Leasing Act to provide for a minimum royalties payment to the Federal Government for shale oil produced on Federal lands, to establish an oil shale area impact fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.R. 13678. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to extend its coverage and protection to employees of nonprofit hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DENT, Mr. FORD, Mr. FULTON, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 13679. A bill to provide for wheat export marketing stamps to regulate the price of wheat in order to stabilize food prices and to establish the National Wheat Council; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. BADILO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 13680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the credit for foreign taxes shall not be allowed in the case of taxes paid to a foreign country with respect to the income derived from any oil or gas well located in a foreign country, and to eliminate the percentage depletion allowance in the case of any such well; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 13681. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to remove the expiration date provided in Public Law 92-140 which authorized the creation of a limited copyright in sound recordings for the purpose of protecting against unauthorized duplication and piracy of sound recordings; to increase the criminal penalties for piracy and counterfeiting of sound recordings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13682. A bill to make it clear that the bonus value of food stamps is to be included in the hold harmless amount guaranteed to recipients of supplemental security income benefits under the Social Security Amendments of 1972, so as to assure that recipients in cash-out States do not suffer reductions in the benefits they actually receive; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 13683. A bill to repeal the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13684. 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. POAGE:

H.R. 13685. A bill to rename the first Civilian Conservation Corps Center located near Franklin, N.C., and the Cross Timbers National Grasslands in Texas in honor of former President Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 946. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 13 of each year as "American Business Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution to proclaim

April 30, 1974, as a National Day for Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H. Res. 1001. Resolution expressing 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; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

392. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa, relative to lowering the retirement age under the social security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 13686. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Klein-Maldovan and his wife, Nidya Josefina Alonso-Vega, and their children, Koroly Alonso, Freide, and Ilanit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H.R. 13687. A bill for the relief of William Alison Anders and Michael Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, March 21, 1974

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we lift our prayer to Thee in thanksgiving for another day in which to serve Thee. To all our natural powers, our human strength, and our instinctive drives add Thy divine strength and wisdom that we may serve this Nation according to Thy will and purpose. While we work today and plan for the tomorrows may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight. Bring us to the close of the day at peace with one another and with Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 20, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FACTS ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S 17 ENERGY PROPOSALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States, on Tuesday last, held a question-and-answer news conference in Houston, Tex. At that

time he took the Congress to task for its lack of energy on not passing the 17 energy legislative proposals which he had recommended to the Congress.

I would point out that the initiative, insofar as the energy legislation is concerned, has been in the Senate, and was there long before the President sent up his first proposal. But let us look at the 17 proposals he lists in a letter to me, under date of March 14, 1974. The first initiative he mentions is the windfall profits tax. A copy of that letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 14, 1974.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: As you know, I found it necessary to veto the Energy Emergency Act on March 6th. I can well understand and share the frustrations you must feel when legislation which has consumed great time and effort falls short of enactment, but for the reasons set forth in my message to the Senate on this subject, I felt that the act would hinder, not help, our efforts to solve this problem.

Now that the energy emergency bill is behind us, I would hope that everyone in the Executive and Legislative branches could join together in a spirit of constructive cooperation to pass the legislation that is still urgently needed for the future of our Nation.

I recognize that Members of the Congress have already made several proposals which merit attention and that others are likely to be forthcoming. This Administration will always welcome a healthy debate on these matters and seek to work with members of the House and Senate.

At the same time, I would hope that future energy bills passed by the Congress will be as direct and straightforward as possible without the burden of extraneous issues. Consistent with this approach, I have over the past thirteen months proposed a comprehensive package of seventeen legislative initiatives relating to energy. While some progress has been made toward enactment, a great deal remains to be done. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to summarize those initiatives for you:

Windfall Profits Tax—prevents oil producers from making undue profits as a result of the petroleum shortage by imposing a tax of up to 85 percent on that part of the selling price of domestic crude oil above its December 1, 1973 ceiling price.

Job Security Assistance Proposal—strengthens the unemployment insurance program that now exists by extending it to many workers not now covered and by providing additional benefits to those who lose jobs in areas where unemployment rates show that other jobs will be hard to find.

Special Energy Act of 1974—authorizes mandatory energy conservation measures and rationing (if it should become necessary)

and grants to States to carry out energy emergency programs.

Natural Gas Supply Act—allows competitive pricing of newly developed gas supplies, thereby encouraging exploration and development of new wells. This bill should be of the highest priority.

Mandatory Reporting on Energy Information—requires all domestic energy companies to report energy inventories, production, cost, and reserves. Such information is needed to enable the Government to determine and carry out energy policies more effectively.

Naval Petroleum Reserves—allows limited production of oil from Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 and provides funds for further exploration and development of reserve No. 1 and exploration of reserve No. 4.

Mined Area Protection Act—establishes standards to govern surface effects of coal mining. This is needed to encourage the development of State programs which permit the mining of coal in a manner that is environmentally safe. The absence of clear legislation in this area is inhibiting the development of our coal reserves.

Deepwater Port Facilities Act—authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant permits for the construction, licensing and operation of ports beyond the three-mile limit. These facilities would permit the use of ships that are economically and environmentally sound for the importation of petroleum.

Mineral Leasing Act—places all mineral exploration and mining activities on Federal lands under a modernized leasing system. This proposal would assure that persons obtaining leases have an interest in early exploration for oil, gas and other minerals.

Drilling Investment Tax Credit—provides a tax credit similar to the investment tax credit for costs incurred for exploratory drilling for new oil and gas fields in the United States. Approval of this provision would provide an important incentive for new domestic oil and gas exploration.

Foreign Depletion Allowance—changes the present law to eliminate the 22 percent depletion deduction permitted in computing U.S. taxes on foreign production of oil and gas. This proposal would eliminate any incentive that percentage depletion provides for investment in foreign oil and gas development rather than U.S. energy resources.

Foreign Tax Credits—limits foreign tax credits available to U.S. oil and gas companies operating in foreign lands. Taxes paid to foreign oil producing countries by U.S. oil companies operating abroad have increased dramatically. It is no longer realistic to treat these payments to foreign governments entirely as income taxes creditable against the U.S. tax; it is proposed that the excessive portion of these payments be treated as an expense rather than as a tax credit.

Appliance and Motor Vehicle Energy Labeling Act—requires that major appliances and motor vehicles be labeled to show their energy use and efficiency so that consumers will have the information they need to make wise choices in purchasing.