After the orders for the recognition of Senators have been concluded, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, S. 3044. The pending question at that time will be on the adoption of the amendment by Mr. TOWER, amendment No. 1153. The yeas and nays have already been ordered thereon, and there is a time limitation on that amendment of 15 minutes.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 7:16 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 11, 1974, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate on April 10, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

John M. Maury, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

THE JUDICIARY

Wendell A. Miles, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Michigan.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be Representatives of the United States of America to the Sixth Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

John A. Scali, of the District of Columbia.

William E. Schaufele, Jr., of Ohio.

John H. Buchanan, Jr., U.S. Representative from the State of Alabama.

Robert N. C. Nix, U.S. Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., of New Jersey.

Barbara M. White, of Massachusetts, to be the Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixth Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, April 10, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

My meat is to do the will of Him who sent me and to finish His work.—John 4: 34.

Our Father God, whose loving kindness is over all Thy works and whose truth endureth forever may Thy blessing rest upon the Members of this House of Representatives who are called to serve our Nation and our world in these trying times. Grant unto them strength to endure, faith to keep them steady, and wisdom to interpret rightly the signs of this age in which we live.

May they serve with integrity and fidelity helping to build an order of life in this divided and discordant world in which men and women can learn to live together in peace and harmony with good will in their hearts.

"To serve the present age,
My calling to fulfill,
O may it all my powers engage
To do my Master's will."

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. 13542. An act to abolish the position of Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1866. An act to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes.

COMPREHENSIVE PRIVACY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague, BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., and I are introducing a bill intended to regulate the collection of personal information by both governmental agencies and the commercial private sector. We will circulate the bill to interested persons, both individuals and organizations, for comment. We know that refinements of its provisions will be necessary and we solicit constructive criticism of any of those provisions.

The Koch-Goldwater bill—thus called because of the toss of a coin—is the product of our joint efforts and is being introduced today by my colleague, BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., as the first sponsor. The bill will be circulated after the recess for cosponsorship by our colleagues.

The time is long overdue for this Congress to address itself to the invasion of personal privacy through the collection of personal data by the Government and the private sector heretofore left practically unregulated. The legislation takes into consideration the legitimate needs of both the Government and private sector in collecting and using data and provides safeguards for the privacy of individuals. The bill does not inhibit the collection of material needed for national defense considerations or for the pursuit of active criminal prosecutions but it does provide legitimate protections against the invasion of personal privacy. The sponsorship by BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., a Republican, and myself, a Democrat, with our differences in other fields, demonstrates that on the issue of personal privacy there is a common bond between conservatives and liberals. That is why I have high hopes that this legislation can be enacted this year.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS TO SIT DURING DEBATE TODAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee be permitted to sit during the debate under the 5-minute rule today.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO RECAPTURE LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believes that it is within the capacity of Congress to recapture some of the leadership it has so casually abdicated during the past 10 years. With some of the examples of congressional economic leadership to which we have been treated this week, however, perhaps we had better just forget it. Is proposing a massive tax cut really the best we can do at this point? Tired rhetoric about millions of workers losing their jobs when the unemployment rate has been stable for 3 months now, and simplistic solutions which insult the intelligence of the American people are not leadership but evidence of why we have lost leadership.

Three months ago the same voices were predicting an 8-percent unemployment rate and widespread factory closings. Even Leonard Woodcock, scarcely an administration puppet, now says that our troubled economy has held up surprisingly well and that we are in fact on the verge of a capital goods boom.

Cynical election year pressure for a tax cut is most disturbing at this time when our Ways and Means Committee is just about to begin working on tax reform. Unless governments spend less money, a fond hope and a faint prospect,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

when you cut back on the progressive income tax you inevitably encourage higher regressive taxes or inflation. Both of these hurt the poor and are the opposite of tax reform. Tax reform and tax relief are not the same thing, and I hope we will keep that in mind as we consider reform this time, and not drop the ball at the last minute as in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, inflation remains our No. 1 economic problem. It is not going to get better until the country's leadership in Congress, as well as elsewhere, starts pressing for economic understanding rather than short-term political advantage.

HIGH REGARD FOR PRESIDENT

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the reception world leaders accorded President Nixon in Paris that our President and our Nation are held in high regard around the globe.

President Nixon turned a sad occasion into triumph for American diplomacy. His actions in Paris will most certainly result in better international understanding.

The President met with leaders of more than 35 nations, including the major powers of Europe, Latin America, Southeast Asia. In addition, he laid the groundwork for his Moscow trip in June.

It is clear for his 3 days abroad that President Nixon is regarded as the leader among leaders of the world. American cooperation and advice is sought and heeded by all nations.

All of this comes amid the constant criticism from those who oppose the President here at home. There are those who say that the President is unable to govern because of the so-called Watergate affair; some have even gone so far as to say he was unable to conduct foreign policy.

The trip to Paris has proved them wrong. The President is governing—he is conducting foreign policy. He is doing all of this—and doing it well—despite the constant criticism.

I firmly believe his meetings with world leaders will have a lasting benefit for this Nation. I think it is firm proof that we have a strong President who is adding still new triumphs to his foreign policy efforts.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN FINANCE NONREFORM

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

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, after a number of markup sessions of the Committee on House Administration, it appears quite clearly that the committee action will amount to election campaign finance nonreform and a cozy system of election funding that will provide excessive power to special interest groups through the functioning of the special interests' heavily bankrolled political action committees.

To date, the committee has agreed to limit individual contributions to $1,000 for any candidate for Congress, Senate, or President. Clearly, this takes the large contributor's influence out of the election system.

But today, when amendments were offered to prohibit campaign contributions by special interest groups, the committee promptly turned them down.

I offered an amendment to the present draft bill providing that—

> No candidate or authorized committee may accept contributions from other than individuals or political party organizations.

This amendment was rejected, 7 ayes, 15 nays.

Mr. BUTLER then offered an amendment that:

> No principal campaign committee may accept contributions from other than individuals or political party organizations, except that it may accept contributions from other committees acting as agents for individual contributors, providing the individual so designates and the contribution is identified with respect to the original donor.

This excellent amendment was defeated, 12 ayes, 14 nays.

If campaign contributions have ever been used for leverage in the political system, then surely the political action funds of special interest groups top the list for influencing political officials. If we are truly to reform the political system, then special interest campaign money should be outlawed.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 11, TO MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1974, OR AFTER NOTIFICATION BY SPEAKER

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 475), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 475

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 11, 1974, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, April 22, 1974, or until 12 o'clock noon on the second day after its Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble whenever in his opinion the public interest shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the House and the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Clerk of the House that the House reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until April 22, 1974, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House from April 11 to April 22, 1974, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ALL MEMBERS TO HAVE THE PRIVILEGE OF EXTENDING AND REVISING REMARKS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 22, 1974, all Members of the House shall have the privilege to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the said adjournment.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 24, 1974.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER S. 1745, SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME ACT OF 1974

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the Senate bill (S. 1745), an act to provide financial assistance for research activities for the study of sudden 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 Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House 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 prescribe. 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.

"(c) 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?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman ask unanimous consent to call up this conference report?

The SPEAKER. It is not a conference report. The gentleman from West Virginia is asking to agree to a Senate amendment to a House amendment.

Mr. GROSS. By unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to explain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what is the bill, in the first place?

Mr. STAGGERS. There is a $24 million difference in the Senate bill which the House did not have. The Senate took up its renewed bill after we passed our bill and deleted the $24 million they had in their original bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says there is $24 million difference, which the House did not have in its bill. What does that mean?

Does it mean that this bill is $24 million above or below the original House version?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will explain it to him.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. When the Senate took the bill up again, they removed the $24 million from the bill completely. We did not have it in our bill.

There was another authorization in the bill, the Senate had the figure of $36 million in that portion. We had $6 million in ours, and when the Senate repassed the bill, they knocked out the $24 million to start with, which was for research. Then they came along with the other figure to carry out the purposes of the bill. They had $36 million in theirs; we had $6 million in ours. When they repassed the bill, they repassed it with the figure of $9 million.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman this:

Where could I find something in print that would tell me what occurred in conference as between the House and the Senate?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can say is that referring to the Senate bill, this is the bill they have repassed. It is our original bill with Senate amendments thereto, we wish to concur in the Senate amendment and pass the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXPLANATION IN REFERENCE TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT ON SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME ACT OF 1974

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

Mr. STAGGERS. We have cut this bill down to bare bones, and if this is delayed now, it will not be passed until sometime

after Easter, and that will mean hundreds of deaths.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) if I may, for a brief reply.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Any differences which were apparent between the two sides of the aisle have now been resolved, and certainly we on this side on the committee support the legislation as it is.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia that the bill should become law, and the bill should be passed.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHERLE. 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. 158]

Aspin	Downing	Mayne
Blatnik	Drinan	Minshall, Ohio
Bolling	Esch	Murphy, N.Y.
Bowen	Fish	Nichols
Broomfield	Fraser	Patman
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Pickle
Carey, N.Y.	Gray	Rooney, N.Y.
Cederberg	Griffiths	Shipley
Chisholm	Gubser	Shuster
Clark	Harrington	Smith, N.Y.
Collier	Hogan	Steiger, Wis.
Conte	Huber	Stuckey
Conyers	Hutchinson	Symington
Coughlin	Kazen	Teague
Danielson	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Litton	Tiernan
Dennis	McEwen	Udall
Diggs	Macdonald	Van Deerlin
Dingell	Maraziti	Wiggins
Dorn	Martin, Nebr.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

S. 1745, SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME ACT OF 1974

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 Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House 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 contract 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 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 prescribe. 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 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.

"(c) 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?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 9492, WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill

(H.R. 9492) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Chattooga River, N.C., S.C., and Ga., as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (82 Stat. 906; 16 U.S.C. 1274 et seq.), as amended, is further amended as follows:

"(a) In section 3(a) after paragraph (9) insert the following new paragraph:

"'(10) CHATTOOGA, NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA, GEORGIA.—The Segment from 0.8 mile below Cashiers Lake in North Carolina to Tugaloo Reservoir, and the West Fork Chattooga River from its junction with Chattooga upstream 7.3 miles, as generally depicted on the boundary map entitled "Proposed Wild and Scenic Chattooga River and Corridor Boundary", dated August 1973; to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall take such action as is provided for under subsection (b) of this section within one year from the date of enactment of this paragraph (10); *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this river, there are authorized to be appropriated not more than $2,000,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than $809,000 for development'."

(b) In section 7(b)(i) delete "five-year" and insert in lieu thereof "ten-year".

(c) In section 16 delete "$17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$37,600,000".

(d)(1) In section 4 delete subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior or, where national forest lands are involved, the Secretary of Agriculture or, in appropriate cases, the two Secretaries jointly shall study and submit to the President reports on the suitability or nonsuitability for addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system of rivers which are designated herein or hereafter by the Congress as potential additions to such system. The President shall report to the Congress his recommendations and proposals with respect to the designation of each such river or section thereof under this Act. Such studies shall be completed and such reports shall be made to the Congress with respect to all rivers named in subparagraphs 5(a)(1) through (27) of this Act within three complete fiscal years after the date of enactment of this amendment: *Provided, however*, That with respect to the Suwannee River, Georgia and Florida, and the Upper Iowa River, Iowa, such study shall be completed and reports made thereon to the Congress prior to October 2, 1970. With respect to any river designated for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system by Act of Congress subsequent to this Act, the study of such river shall be completed and reports made thereon by the President to the Congress within three complete fiscal years from the date of enactment of such Act. In conducting these studies the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall give priority to those rivers with respect to which there is the greatest likelihood of developments which, if undertaken, would render the rivers unsuitable for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system. Every such study and plan shall be coordinated with any water resources planning involving the same river which is being conducted pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244; 42 U.S.C. 1962 et seq.).

"Each report, including maps and illustrations, shall show among other things the area included within the report; the characteristics which do or do not make the area a worthy addition to the system; the current status of land ownership and use in the area; the reasonably foreseeable potential uses of the land and water which would be enhanced, foreclosed, or curtailed, if the area were included in the national wild and scenic rivers system; the Federal agency (which in the case of a river which is wholly or substantially within a national forest, shall be the Department of Agriculture) by which it is proposed the area, should it be added to the system, be administered; the extent to which it is proposed that such administration, including the costs thereof, be shared by State and local agencies; and the estimated cost to the United States of acquiring necessary lands and interests in land and of administering the area, should it be added to the system. Each such report shall be printed as a Senate or House document."

(2) In section 5 delete subsection (b) and reletter subsections (c) and (d) as (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) In section 7(b)(i) delete all after "Act" and insert in lieu thereof "or the three complete fiscal year period following any Act of Congress designating any river for potential addition to the national wild and scenic river system, whichever is later, and".

(4) In section 7(b)(ii) delete "which is recommended", insert in lieu thereof "the report for which is submitted", and delete "for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system".

The Clerk read the amendment to the Senate amendment, as follows:

Delete paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof:

"(b) In section 4 delete subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior or, where national forest lands are involved, the Secretary of Agriculture or, in appropriate cases, the two Secretaries jointly shall study and submit to the President reports on the suitability or nonsuitability for addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system of rivers which are designated herein or hereafter by the Congress as potential additions to such system. The President shall report to the Congress his recommendations and proposals with respect to the designation of each such river or section thereof under this Act. Such studies shall be completed and such reports shall be made to the Congress with respect to all rivers named in subparagraphs 5(a) (1) through (27) of this Act no later than October 2, 1978. In conducting these studies the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall give priority to those rivers with respect to which there is the greatest likelihood of developments which, if undertaken, would render the rivers unsuitable for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system. Every such study and plan shall be coordinated with any water resources planning involving the same river which is being conducted pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244; 42 U.S.C. 1962 et seq.).

Each report, including maps and illustrations, shall show among other things the area included within the report; the characteristics which do or do not make the area a worthy addition to the system; the current status of land ownership and use in the area; the reasonably foreseeable potential uses of the land and water which would be enhanced, foreclosed, or curtailed if the area were included in the national wild and scenic rivers system; the Federal agency (which in the case of a river which is wholly or substantially within a national forest, shall be the Department of Agriculture) by which it is proposed the area, should it be added to the system, be administered; the extent to which it is proposed that such administration, including the costs thereof, be shared by State and local agencies; and the estimated cost to the United States of acquiring necessary lands and interests in land and of administering the area, should it be added to the system. Each such report shall be printed as a Senate or House document.

"'(2) In section 5 delete subsection (b) and reletter subsections (c) and (d) as (b) and (c), respectively.

"'(3) In section 7(b)(i) delete all after "Act" and insert in lieu thereof "or for three complete fiscal years following any Act of Congress designating any river for potential addition to the national wild and scenic river system, whichever is later, and".

"'(4) In section 7(b)(ii) delete "which is recommended", insert in lieu thereof "the report for which is submitted", and delete "for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system".'

"(c) In section 7(b)(i) delete 'five-year' and insert in lieu thereof 'ten-year' and delete 'publish' and insert in lieu thereof 'notify the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Congress in writing, including a copy of the study upon which his determination was made, at least 180 days while Congress is in session, prior to publishing'.

"(d) In section 15(c) delete 'for the purpose of protecting the scenic view from the river,' and insert in lieu thereof 'within the authorized boundaries of a component of the wild and scenic rivers system, including the protection of the natural qualities of a designated wild, scenic or recreational river area,'

"(e) Delete section 16 and insert in lieu thereof:

"'SEC. 16. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, including such sums as have heretofore been appropriated, the following amounts for land acquisition for each of the rivers described in section 3(a) of this Act:

"'Clearwater, Middle Fork, Idaho, $2,909,800;

"'Eleven Point, Missouri, $4,906,500;

"'Feather, Middle Fork, California, $3,935,700;

"'Rio Grande, New Mexico, $253,000;

"'Rogue, Oregon, $12,447,200;

"'St. Croix, Minnesota and Wisconsin, $11,768,550;

"'Salmon, Middle Fork, Idaho, $1,237,100; and

"'Wolf, Wisconsin, $142,150.

"'(b) The authority to make the appropriations authorized in this section shall expire on June 30, 1979.'"

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment to the Senate amendment be dispensed with.

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I ask the gentleman from North Carolina to explain the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Kansas that an explanation is in order.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9492 was a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to include the Chattooga River of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia in the wild and scenic rivers system. This bill passed the House last December without opposition.

A second bill, S. 921, made some needed amendments to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and it, too, passed the House last December 2 without opposition. The other body chose this second bill as a vehicle to attach as an amendment the so-called Energy Emergency Act which the House rejected during the waning hours of the last session.

Later the House agreed to a unanimous-consent request which I made to take S. 921 from the Speaker's table and disagree to the Senate amendment.

Of course, this sent the bill back to the Senate but by that time the Senate had boxed itself into a corner so that it could not amend S. 921 which contained the House approved language.

The Senate then amended H.R. 9492, the Chattooga River bill, so as to include the provisions of S. 921 with some minor changes. This amendment was germane because both bills were in the nature of amendments to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968.

In the main, the language before us includes the two House bills. The Senate did change the language somewhat in regard to the inclusion of the Chattooga into the system but there is no substantive difference. The Senate added a paragraph which would extend the moratorium on water development projects for three complete fiscal years as it relates to future river areas which Congress may include in the study section of the bill.

The present House amendment strikes some obsolete language copied from the original act and tightens up the spending restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, the approval of this amendment will, I believe, lead to a conclusion of this relatively long, complicated legislative history. It is consistent with action which the House has already taken. I wholeheartedly endorse the legislation and recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia reserves the right to object.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, is the New River involved in this legislation, or any amendments thereto?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The answer is "No." This legislation and the amendment does not affect the New River.

Mr. WAMPLER. I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was concurred in.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1974

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1031 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1031

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14013) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 5 of rule XXI, except against sections 101 and 102 and the provisions contained under the heading "Payment to the Postal Service Fund" on page 27, lines 12 and 13, are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1031 provides that during the consideration of the bill H.R. 14013, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 5 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, which prohibit unauthorized appropriations and reappropriations, are waived. Sections 101 and 102 and the provisions contained under the heading "Payment to the Postal Service Fund" on page 27, lines 12 and 13, however, are excepted from this waiver.

H.R. 14013 includes supplemental appropriations for the following departments: Agriculture; Defense; Housing and Urban Development; Interior; Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; State; Justice; Commerce; Treasury; and Transportation. Supplemental appropriations are also included in the bill for the judiciary; the District of Columbia; the Atomic Energy Commission; and for foreign operations, military construction, and claims and judgments against the Federal Government.

The grant total of new budget—obligational—authority recommended in the bill is $8,657,162,043 which represents a net decrease of $1,855,573,900 from the estimates presented to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1031 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 14013.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand why we must have a rule waiving all points of order with one exception on this bill. This is a supplemental appropriations bill applying, I should think, exclusively, to fiscal year 1974.

If the authorizations have not been approved by this time, they never will be approved for this fiscal year. Why is this a rule here waiving points of order with one exception?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the points of order have been waived at the request of the Committee on Appropriations. As I understand it, most of the requests as they pertain to appropriations have already been approved by the House, though not yet approved by the Senate or signed by the President. The appropriations which are provided for in H.R. 14013 are within the authorized amounts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman be good enough to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to provide an answer to the question of why this waiver of points of order on a supplemental appropriation bill?

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Iowa that there are many points in this bill which would be subject to technical points of order unless points of order were waived.

For example, in many pay increases which were provided by Congress for civilian workers, instead of authorizing new money, we have authorized transfers from other appropriations in order to meet the requirement for pay increases. These transfers technically would be subject to a point of order.

We are also proposing the rescission of $1 billion in the Labor-HEW chapter for public assistance grants to the States, a 1-billion-dollar recovery of funds which were previously provided under erroneous estimates from the Office of Management and Budget. We cannot rescind this $1 billion unless a point of order is granted, because technically the Appropriations Committee does not have this right.

In certain other cases authorizing legislation has not been signed by the President; yet has passed either the House or Senate or both.

For example, in the Defense chapter, a request was made by the administration for large additional funds to improve our defense posture. The House has passed a bill approving these increases. It has not been acted on by the Senate and has not been enacted into law, so we would have to strike out much of the Defense chapter if we did not have this rule.

So, generally these are the points involved here and these are the reasons why we need a rule waiving points of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Hawaii permit me to ask the gentleman from Texas a question?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, why was the exception made with respect to a $230 million payment to the Postal Service?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas to answer the question.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a controversial matter in which the gentleman from Iowa had expressed an interest. The Appropriations Committee does not wish to trample on the authority of other committees. It has been

argued, I think, by the gentleman from Iowa, that this appropriation is subject to a point of order. Therefore, we did not make the request that the point of order be waived.

Mr. GROSS. So that I would be able to make a point of order to that section of the bill. I am just a little surprised.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we do not agree that the postal section is subject to a point of order. We disagree with the gentleman from Iowa as to whether it is subject to a point of order, but we did not want to deny our distinguished friend, who is so diligent and so effective on the floor, an opportunity to make a point of order if he saw fit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is more than kind; more than generous on this day. I hope this sort of consideration continues.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule on H.R. 14013, supplemental appropriations. This rule is a compromise satisfactory to the major parties involved. The rule provides a waiver of points of order for failure to comply with clause 2 and 5 of rule XXI, except against sections 101 and 102, and the provisions contained under the heading "Payment to the Postal Service Fund" on page 27, lines 12 and 13.

In the Rules Committee hearing, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee indicated that the waiver of clauses 2 and 5 of rule XXI was necessary because there are numerous points in this bill which violate these clauses. Clause 2 prohibits both unauthorized appropriations and legislation on general appropriation bills. Clause 5 prohibits reappropriations. Among the items in this bill which require a waiver of these provisions are some items in the defense chapter, for which the authorization has not yet been signed into law. There is language in title I providing additional funds for the Department of State, for which authorizations have passed the House, but have not yet been signed into law.

Throughout title I of the bill there are a number of instances where provision is made for funds to remain available until expended. Many are in accordance with existing authorization but some are not. It is not uncommon to carry such language which is designed to accommodate orderly administration of the relevant programs but for technical reasons some of these paragraphs are subject to a point of order.

In addition, scattered throughout title II, which provides for increased pay costs, there are many instances of the customary transfer language. Transfer language is provided in order to minimize the granting of additional new obligational authority and to facilitate to the maximum extent the absorption of increased pay costs within current appropriations. Technically, these provisions are subject to a point of order.

In addition to its request from the Appropriations Committee, the Rules Committee had a request from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that no waiver be granted on sections 101 and 102. Section 101 deals with the military assistance services funded program for South Vietnam. Section 102 establishes legislative restrictions on the enlistment standards for new entrants into the Armed Forces. The Rules Committee complied with this request.

In addition, no waiver was requested to cover a section dealing with payments to the postal services fund, and no waiver was granted on this section.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this rule represents a compromise which attempts to meet the requests of the major parties involved, and I support its passage.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations recommended new availability of $200 million for South Vietnam. Subsequently authorization was refused by the House. Consequently, the funding approval will be lost through a point of order. In substance, the House of Representatives is turning its back on a commitment to help South Vietnam in its fight for survival entered into in good faith by our Government and supported heretofore by the Congress. This does not help the American reputation abroad and is not something that I think we can be proud of at home.

An effort is in progress to resolve the problem in the Senate by a new interpretation on the availability of funds. It is very important that this be accomplished and that the House support any sound plan which can de devised. This may be the difference between success or failure by the South Vietnamese in staving off the continuing drive by the Communist forces to overrun that country or to force acceptance of a coalition government which, in substance, is the same as overrunning the country.

I think the records must show that South Vietnam has made a valiant fight for survival and they have done it without the participation of U.S. military personnel. It hasn't been easy, and their problems are becoming more and more severe. They are under heavy military pressure and they continue to suffer economic strains. A premature cutoff of help from the United States, which had been promised them, could be a blow they cannot survive.

It is very encouraging that South Vietnam's morale has continued high. The nation is holding its own against continuing Communist pressure. The North Vietnamese have violated the peace agreement time and again. They have continued a massive infiltration of forces—130,000 troops, 600 tanks, long-range artillery, and antiaircraft batteries. Within South Vietnam, they have built 12 airfields, an oil pipeline, and a road system. It would be interesting to compute the cost of the North Vietnamese invasion effort. I question that a billion dollars would suffice to pay for it. They are not playing games. They mean to conquer Southeast Asia.

Despite all the odds, the South Vietnamese appear fully determined to defend their country and they are demonstrating their ability to do so. It is because of continued pressure by North Vietnam that additional funds are required. Available funds have had to be expended faster than anticipated. Now, the South Vietnamese are running out of supplies. Remember, the South Vietnamese have inflation problems too. Congress has required that fuel be obtained outside U.S.-produced sources. This has cost more. Inflation in South Vietnam is 65 percent. The sharp increase in equipment prices in the United States has reduced the purchasing power of available funds. That is why additional funding is required.

The South Vietnamese have shown that they are a strong and self-reliant people with a responsible government. I do not think America wants to see North Vietnam take over the country and its 18 million brave people and to watch the blood bath and persecutions which will follow.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, because I want to associate myself with the expressions he has just made.

I do hope during the development and consideration of this legislation we can work out something which will rectify the error of the House the other day where by a 23-vote margin they denied these funds to South Vietnam. The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services strongly urges a favorable response to the presentation made by the gentleman from Florida.

I understand later on the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas, will also express his views on this subject.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

The House well recalls the valiant fight which he and the distinguished gentleman from Texas made in order to keep this section in the authorization bill in order to include the availability of funds for South Vietnam.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say to my friend from Florida that I think he has performed a very valuable service in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and pinpointing the necessity for our resolving this matter in some fashion that will permit us to keep the commitments and to reflect certainly a failure of a change in circumstances in South Vietnam which everyone anticipated at the time the so-called peace treaty was agreed to there. I think the gentleman will have to agree in light of the circumstances as in our appearance before the Committee on Rules and in light of the fact that the Committee on Rules had before it a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in which he voiced his objections to waiving a rule with respect to this matter, that our distinguished

chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, did use proper judgment in this matter in not requesting that there be a waiver on this point.

Mr. SIKES. I very much appreciate the contribution of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. 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. 14013) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours and that the time be divided equally between the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 14013, with Mr. O'HARA 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. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Members of the House that I believe this bill, although it provides for a large amount of expenditure, will not be very controversial except for two or three items that will be presented at a later time.

FUNDS FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

At the outset I would like to make reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services. They expressed regret that the House had not approved the request of the administration for certain additional funding authority for the South Vietnamese. I supported the additional amounts in the authorization bill which was before us last week. But in an up-and-down rollcall vote the House declined to provide any additional funds for South Vietnam.

I continue to favor additional funds for South Vietnam, but I would not support any effort by a roundabout method to provide these funds and deny the House the opportunity to be considered with respect to the decision which is made. In other words, if the House is willing to provide additional funds for South Vietnam and will so indicate that interest, then I will support that effort and I believe the Committee on Appropriations will certainly support that effort, but we will not be a party, I hope, to any legerdemain in order to provide additional funds.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today affects almost every department and agency of the Government as well as the District of Columbia.

This is the last large general appropriation bill planned for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. There are over 400 appropriation items in the bill. The various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations have held detailed hearings on the budget requests submitted by the President. Extensive testimony and other material is available to Members in the printed hearings which total some 2,600 pages in three volumes, and the report explaining the committee recommendations is available in the Chamber.

GRAND TOTAL OF THE BILL

The grand total of the bill is some $8.7 billion, which represents a net decrease of some $1.9 billion below the budget estimates considered by the committee. The committee also recommends transfers between appropriations in the amount of $69 million. In some cases, the committee has recommended transfers instead of providing new appropriations where it has been determined that availability is in excess of needs. The authority to transfer funds between amounts contained in the bill is $14 million, net, less than requested.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

Major items in the bill include the following: $3,399,274,095 for increased pay costs for military and civilian personnel carried in title II; $1,970,346,000 for manpower programs of which $350,000,000 is for public service employment; $208,584,000 for summer youth employment; and $1,411,762,000 for ongoing programs including administration; $1,858,612,000 for the Department of Defense for military programs including $1,096,400,000 for procurement; $637,012,000 for operation and maintenance; $119,400,000 for military personnel; and $5,800,000 for research, development, test and evaluation; $797,707,000 for retired pay costs for Federal, Foreign Service, and military personnel and for annuitant payments to the employees health benefits fund; $536,500,000 for food stamps and child nutrition programs; $230,000,000 for payment to the Postal Service fund; $177,335,000 for the Veterans' Administration for compensation and pensions and medical care; $113,220,000 for firefighting costs on Federal lands; $100,000,000 for emergency flood control measures; $94,004,000 for various transportation programs; $60,700,000 for initial funding for the Health Maintenance Organization Act of 1973; $20,000,000 for additional grants to States for basic vocational rehabilitation services; $20,977,448 for claims and judgments rendered against the United States.

DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTALS

The committee considered supplemental requests for Department of Defense functions totaling approximately $6,200,000,000. The total amount provided in the bill for the Department of Defense is $4,922,000,000, or a reduction of about $1,278,000,000 for the Department's request.

The largest single portion of the request for the Department of Defense is to provide pay raises for military and civilian personnel. This portion of the request which is included in title II of the bill has been reduced by $192,729,000 from the $2.6 billion requested.

The committee recommends the appropriation of approximately $1,100,000,000 for the procurement of military equipment and hardware. This represents a reduction of about $675 million from the request. In those cases where procurement reductions were made by the committee they were made because development and test programs were not completed, or inventory stockage levels were not low enough to warrant a special supplemental request. In fact, in a few cases the Department of Defense attempted to recover congressional reductions made in the original fiscal year 1974 request. In these instances, and in programs where new production starts were requested in the supplemental appropriations bill, the committee has denied the request.

The bill also contains large sums of money for increased readiness and modernization of defense forces, for fuel price increases and increased operating cost incurred by the DOD during the Middle East war. Despite very significant reductions in fuel consumption by the Department of Defense the committee found it necessary to include $352 million for fuel price increases. This compares with a request of $458 million for fuel price increases. The committee has also included approximately $133 million in the bill as a payback to the Department of Defense to replace weapons and other military hardware provided to Israel during the October Mideast war.

Finally, the committee has deleted from the bill a request of $24.8 million to accelerate Trident submarine construction from one per year as recommended and approved by the Congress last December to two per year. The committee finds that nothing has happened which should cause a change in the decision made by Congress last December. In fact, there appears to be more reason than ever to hold Trident construction to one per year.

BUDGET REDUCTIONS

Net budget reductions recommended in the bill aggregate $1,855,573,900. The largest reduction—$1,085 million—is in the Defense chapter to which I just referred and is composed of the following reductions: $9.5 million in military personnel; $297.3 million in operation and maintenance; $675.7 million in procurement, and $102.8 million in research and development.

Other significant reductions recommended by the committee in the bill include: $215.7 million for military and civilian pay costs—some 13 percent of pay increases in fiscal year had been absorbed by the departments and agencies, and this further reduction is based on more recent determinations; $278.8 million requested for the special assistance functions fund under HUD for federally insured and guaranteed mortgages—it

should be noted, however, that this reduction does not alter the outstanding liability of the Government; $217,000,000 additional rescission in grants to States for public assistance based upon overestimation of welfare needs—this action will not reduce welfare benefits or services to eligible recipients; $77 million in various programs in the transportation chapter; and $50 million in the food stamp program based on a smaller than anticipated rate of growth in participants.

BUDGET INCREASES

The bill includes two significant increases over the budget estimates, both of which are in the Labor-HEW chapter. The committee is recommending an additional $100 million above the $250 million requested for public service employment. Also included in the bill is $20,000,000 not budgeted for vocational rehabilitation, bringing the total amount available to $650 million, the full amount authorized for fiscal year 1974.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1974

As I indicated earlier, the accompanying bill is the last general appropriation bill now scheduled for consideration by the Congress for fiscal year 1974.

Excluding amounts in the accompanying bill, the Congress has to date considered budget requests for appropriation bill items for fiscal year 1974 totaling about $171,392,000,000. In its action on such appropriation bills, the House has reduced requests for new budget (obligational) authority by about $3,407,000,000. Senate action on the appropriation bills it has considered thus far has resulted in decreases amounting to about $2,621,000,000 in budget authority. In final actions in connection with these appropriation bills, the Congress has reduced requests by an amount aggregating some $3,020,000,000.

With the adoption of reductions in the amount of $1,856,000,000 recommended in the accompanying bill, the Congress will have reduced appropriation requests for the fiscal year 1974 by some $4,876,000,000. However, in nonappropriation bills—that is, legislative measures otherwise—the Congress has taken action—or inaction—which has the net effect of increasing new budget (obligational) authority by some $5,045,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974.

In connection with the figures which I have just cited, I again recommend for Members' attention the so-called scorekeeping report published periodically by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. This report represents the only comprehensive accounting of congressional actions and inactions affecting the Federal budget. The report is objective and has gained widespread acceptance in Congress and in and out of Government generally. Efforts are being continued to make the reports more informative and understandable.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I offer for the RECORD a summary table by chapter reflecting the budget estimates and amounts contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1974.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—SUMMARY

Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS			
Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection:			
New budget (obligational) authority	$575,650,000	$560,230,000	−$15,420,000
By transfer	(15,000,000)		(−15,000,000)
Defense: New budget (obligational) authority	3,412,741,000	2,327,412,000	−1,085,329,000
District of Columbia:			
Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority	2,550,000		−2,550,000
District of Columbia funds: New budget (obligational) authority	(12,134,400)	(12,092,400)	(−42,000)
Foreign Operations: New budget (obligational) authority	54,000,000	49,000,000	−5,000,000
Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, and Veterans: New budget (obligational) authority	460,974,000	179,345,000	−281,629,000
Interior and related agencies: New budget (obligational) authority	162,955,000	159,749,000	−3,206,000
Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare:			
New budget (obligational) authority	1,265,335,000	1,134,702,000	−130,633,000
Increase in limitation	(111,766,000)	(111,766,000)	
Legislative branch:			
New budget (obligational) authority:			
1974	2,474,000	2,516,500	+42,500
1973	300,000	300,000	
Total	2,774,000	2,816,500	+42,500
Military Construction: New budget (obligational) authority	29,000,000	29,000,000	
Public Works: New budget (obligational) authority	107,700,000	87,000,000	−20,700,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:			
New budget (obligational) authority	48,556,000	38,938,000	−9,618,000
By transfer	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	
Liquidation of contract authority	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	
Transportation: New budget (obligational) authority	176,782,000	99,754,000	−77,028,000
By transfer		(7,500,000)	(+7,500,000)
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government: New budget (obligational) authority	$577,807,000	$568,964,000	−$8,843,000
Claims and judgments: New budget (obligational) authority	20,977,448	20,977,448	
Total, title I—General Supplementals:			
New budget (obligational) authority:			
1974	6,897,501,448	5,257,587,948	−1,639,913,500
1973	300,000	300,000	
Total	6,897,801,448	5,257,887,948	−1,639,913,500
By transfer	(20,000,000)	(12,500,000)	(−7,500,000)
Increase in limitation	(111,766,000	(111,766,000)	
Liquidation of contract authority	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	
District of Columbia Funds (NOA)	(12,134,400)	(12,092,400	(−42,000)
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS			
New budget (obligational) authority	3,614,934,495	3,399,274,095	−215,660,400
By transfer	(62,963,600)	(56,397,800)	(−6,565,800)
Increase in limitation	(19,250,000)	(15,021,000)	(−4,229,000)
Liquidation of contract authority	(6,000,000)	(5,500,000)	(−500,000)
GRAND TOTAL—TITLES I AND II			
New budget (obligational) authority:			
1974	10,512,435,943	8,656,862,043	−1,855,573,900
1973	300,000	300,000	
Total	10,512,735,943	8,657,162,043	−1,855,573,900
By transfer	(82,963,600)	(68,897,800)	(−14,065,800)
Increase in limitation	(131,016,000)	(126,787,000)	(−4,229,000)
Liquidation of contract authority	(29,000,000)	(28,500,000)	(−500,000)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

This bill calls for $8.5 billion approximately. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct; $8.657 billion.

Mr. GROSS. That makes it one of the largest supplementals ever considered by the House of Representatives. Is it not?

Mr. MAHON. It is quite large, but there have been a number of larger ones involved, especially in wartime, but this is a very large supplemental.

I would point out it does not contain the restoration, generally speaking, of funds which were eliminated in budget reductions in appropriation bills in the first session of the Congress, in calendar year 1973. It is not a restoration generally of items that were disapproved last year. It is for new types of items. For example a large part of it, over $3.4 billion is for pay increases over which the Committee on Appropriations has virtually no control. There is also about $2 billion for manpower programs which were deferred due to the lack of legislative authorization.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, we have had pay increases in previous years. They are coming much more frequently nowadays. Even so, with a supplemental of this magnitude it seems to me that it is some kind of reflection upon the regular appropriation bills that were previously passed. It does not reflect very well insofar as I am concerned on those regular appropriation bills because this is a tremendous add-on and we are not going to win any war against inflation with supplemental appropriation bills of $8.5 billion coming along only 2½ months before the end of the fiscal year to which the money applies.

I am sorry to have to be confronted as one Member of the House of Representatives with a supplemental appropriation bill of this magnitude at this time in the fiscal year. It seems to me that this is unconscionable.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, let me say the fact that we have this huge sup-

plemental does not reflect upon the judgment of the Congress. Congress last year acted upon the requests which were made by the President through the Office of Management and Budget. We did not consider most of the items that are in this supplemental bill. So if we want to say that the requests from the President ought to have been greater last year and we should have considered these items last year, that is a different matter. But it would have ill behooved the Congress to exceed the budget by several billion dollars in order to add funds which we thought would be of doubtful value and which had not been requested.

Mr. GROSS. But here we are on the day of accounting. Last year, in considering some of the regular appropriation bills we were told how closely we had kept to the spending of the previous year or how we had undercut the budget. Now we are faced with a supplemental of $8.5 billion, to be added to the regular bills which changes, adversely, the complexion of what we did last year.

Mr. MAHON. This matter requires closer examination. We knew there would be pay act costs. That was obvious. We knew there would be additional requests submitted because the funds were not included in the individual budget estimates of the agencies. An effort was made in the executive branch to absorb pay costs to the extent possible and we supported that effort. In total some 13 percent of the pay act costs were absorbed and then the appropriations committee recommended the absorption of another $200 million. We also knew there would be additional costs for the veterans programs and for food stamps and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will indulge me one more question, I find on page 26 of the bill at the bottom of the page the heading "Bureau of the Public Debt," and of course it is very much involved these days and I am sure they are expanding and they will have to expand if we adopt an $8.5 billion supplemental appropriation bill.

I am sure they are expanding and will continue to expand if we adopt this $8.5 billion supplemental appropriation. In other words, we are spending $2¼ million to beef up the Bureau of Public Debt.

Going over to page 50, we find the Bureau of Public Debt getting another $1,850,000.

I cannot help but wonder why in two places in this bill we are beefing up the Bureau of Public Debt. Why were the two items not consolidated?

Mr. MAHON. The hearing on administering the public debt was held by Treasury-Postal Service subcommittee and the report reflects the action of the committee. I know my friend is concerned, as I am, with the growing Federal debt.

Mr. GROSS. There can be no question about the growing Federal debt.

Mr. MAHON. There is no question. It is a very regrettable situation. This Congress, as do all Congresses, has been getting deeper and deeper into the everyday-life decisions with respect to Government programs. There is hardly any aspect of life today that is not touched by some Federal program. Those who dance must pay the fiddler. Since we enacted certain legislation, we have to pay the bill.

Much of that legislation the gentleman from Iowa did not support and much of that legislation I did not support; but the Congress did support it and it is on the books.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who I think had a question.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, it was not a question, Mr. Chairman, other than to make an observation in support of what the gentleman said in response to Mr. GROSS. That is, in the manpower training field, the gentleman will recall last year when we had the regular bill, we had no authorization; so here we have in the supplemental nearly $1,900,000,000 for the entire gambit of the manpower training program, most or all of which would be normally carried in a regular bill, in the absence of authorizing legislation and it finds itself in the supplemental. That is no small amount, nearly $2 billion. Of course, the military and civilian pay costs, as the gentleman pointed out, is $3.4 billion; and the retirement pay costs are nearly $800 million. There is half a billion dollars in here for additional food stamps; so it is sizable supplemental.

Mr. MAHON. The situation is bleak, but not quite as bleak as the gentleman from Iowa characterized it. I would like to make that point.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not that kind of an optimist, is he, that he thinks the financial situation of this country is any less than bleak?

Mr. MAHON. Our fiscal situation is bleak.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Mr. MAHON. But there are different degrees of bleakness, perhaps. I hope that we will not provide funds above the budget. I hope we can continue to reduce expenditures below the budget and restrain ourselves in new authorizations and try to strengthen the fiscal integrity of the Nation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, to date the Congress has approved approximately $168.4 billion in appropriations for Federal programs in the fiscal year 1974. This figure is $3 billion below the administration request of $171.4 billion; however, the staff of our committee estimates that an additional $5 billion has been approved through other means for the current fiscal year, bringing the total new budget authority to $173.4 billion thus far, or $2 billion—1.2 percent above the administration request.

Now, in fiscal year 1975, the budget document and in various supplemental messages to the Congress, the administration requested approximately $10.5 billion in additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1974 program.

The largest portion of this request, as I indicated a few moments ago, is for pay costs resulting from the Government-wide salary increases which became effective in 1973 and which the Congress itself has authorized and voted for. Our committee has reduced the administration request overall so that we are now down to $8.7 billion of supplemental appropriations. This new amount will bring the total appropriations for fiscal 1974 to $182.1 billion, including the back door spending.

Mr. Chairman, our committee also recommended rescission of $1 billion in the fiscal year 1974 appropriation for HEW's public assistance program in response to the administration's request for a $783 million rescission. I made the point in the full committee that we might be treading on a little dangerous ground in increasing this rescission to a rounded $1 billion in view of some of the increased costs that might result later on this year in the medicaid and medicare programs, when all wage and price controls are eliminated and some of those costs are allowed to increase. They will obviously reflect themselves in public assistance costs around the country.

However, I think it is notable that we are in a position today to have a rescission in the neighborhood of a billion dollars in public assistance because it shows closer monitoring on the part of the administration in many cases and getting that information out to the States where investigations have disclosed 40 percent error in some cases, of overpayments—yes, some underpayments—but the job is being done administratively and we are grateful that there are these savings to be realized by that close monitoring of public assistance programs.

Mr. Chairman, earlier we made mention of those more significant items of increase here in response to the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and more specifically the $3.4 billion for increased pay costs for military and civilian personnel is involved in this bill. Again, that is action taken by the Congress which has to be supported by money to back up an authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned $1,970 million for manpower programs, of which $350 million is for public service employment.

The original request here was for $250 million for the balance of this fiscal year, and we know in the 1975 budget request for public service, we have a $350 million item.

There will be, as I understand it, some agitation later on while reading the bill, the possible offering of an amendment. We will have more to say at that time, and would defer anything further until then rather than take up the time of the House during general debate.

The gentleman from Texas, the chairman, has made mention of $1.8 billion for Department of Defense for military programs, including $1 billion for procurement, and retired pay costs are in here for $797 million. As I indicated, $536 million is for food stamps and child nu-

trition programs. Here again, we should make mention that as the cost of living goes up and the cost of food goes up, that is automatically reflected in computation of what we have to ante up to support the food stamp program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield at this time 10 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just want to deal with a few matters here in relation to two of the subcommittees which are concerned in connection with this supplemental bill. One of them is chapter II relating to the Department of Defense. Rather than taking up the time of my colleagues in reviewing that subject matter here, I would like particularly to bring to their attention pages 16, 17, 18, and 20 of the committee report which deals with the problems of military pay and of retirement pay in the Department of Defense.

I think much—well, in fact, there is not any doubt about it—much of the increase in this bill that we have before us in the way of a supplemental bill includes increased pay costs for personnel, and that permeates all agencies of the Government.

However, Members, is it accentuated as much as it is in the Department of Defense?

Mr. Chairman, of course, in order that we not break faith with those who have performed services in this department on the basis of legislation which the Congress has enacted, there was nothing that we could do except to provide these ever-increasing amounts of money.

Yet, I do think that it is important that we carefully understand the gist of the remarks that are made in the committee report that this House and particularly the Committee on Armed Services give some timely consideration to the problems that are there discussed. Not only through the so-called Rivers amendment have we found pay raises with the accompanying increases in subsistence and other payments to which these people are entitled, increasing at a rate higher than that of any other people in the Government, but that same factor explains the increase of a substantial part of the nearly half a billion dollars in supplemental funds for retirement pay in the Department of Defense, because these incomparable—and incomparable because they are higher—increases in military pay, have transformed themselves into greater retirement entitlement.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that must be dealt with by substantive legislation because, as a matter of practicality, we simply have not been able to deal with it in this appropriation bill.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making some very valid observations and very constructive criticisms in the areas to which he is addressing himself.

I inform the gentleman that the subject matter now before the Committee on Armed Services is before a subcommittee which is making a complete study and a complete revision of the entire system. We hope to resolve some of these problems which are so evident and which we do recognize.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for that statement. I think it does indicate a willingness and a desire to respond to a problem that has grown up in this area, of which we have become painfully aware, when we deal with dollars of this magnitude in this supplemental appropriation bill.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making an important contribution to the deliberation of the House. We know this is a big bill. It carries an enormous amount of money. But what is not generally known is that most of it is for pay of people, personnel costs. We need a lot of equipment that we cannot afford, because it is felt that we cannot have both.

Mr. Chairman, we shall have to start taking a more careful look at the situation. Personnel, however well qualified, cannot cope with great superiority in numbers of weapons. We must find a way to have both. Again I applaud the gentleman's statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his statement.

Mr. ZWACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, this is an appalling amount in this supplemental bill. There is now floating through the Congress some budget control legislation. Would that give us enough discipline so that this type of thing perhaps could be prevented? The gentleman from Wisconsin has had long experience in this area and I wonder, if we can get that budgetary control legislation through, would that prevent this tremendously large supplemental appropriation?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not sure it would completely. I think it will require the changes in the basic law to which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services referred. However, as a cosponsor of that budget control measure and one who is enthusiastic about its potential in permitting us to get a handle on the overall apropriation and spending of our Federal Government, I do believe that it would have the effect of bringing these problems to the attention of the House before we begin to act on these individual appropriation bills. Therefore it would have a beneficial effect.

Mr. ZWACH. I appreciate those comments, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If I might continue briefly, Mr. Chairman, the main thrust of the defense portion, title II, of this bill has been based upon the theory—outside of personnel costs now—of reacting to the lessons of the Yom Kippur war where our equipment admittedly played a prominent role. In that sense it is rather ironic that the so-called development, test, and evaluation funds where the Defense Department would be expected to deal with inadequacies and shortcomings in our equipment that may have been revealed there have failed of authorization and therefore have failed of funding in this measure.

There is one other matter I wish to touch upon briefly. That comes in another subcommittee which is so ably presided over by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) and that is the item in this bill for the development of Diego Garcia. I have been told an amendment will be offered later to strike out these funds in this bill, as I understand it, on the basis that this item does not belong in a supplemental bill, and second, because of expressions of reticence on the part of some other nations in that area.

I can sympathize with those who believe that this does not belong here, since it is primarily a new development in the military construction appropriation supplemental bill. If it were not for our experience with the lateness in each calendar year when we do finally get approval of military construction appropriation bills, I would adopt that point of view myself. However, we do know of that record of lateness. I do not believe there can be any doubt of the merits—I think the House was convinced of that when the authorization bill was before us last week—the essential merits of proceeding in Diego Garcia.

So, because of the probable lateness of the 1975 appropriation bill again this year, we are buying some time, which I believe we should do.

With respect to the reticence of some of the nations in that area, personally I have to doubt the true sincerity of some of the public expressions that have been made there. I have to believe a good part of it is for domestic political consumption, as happened in the case of our taking up the cause of freedom in our generation in Korea and in South Vietnam and in the Middle East. I have to believe that while most of them were publicly clicking their teeth, in their private thoughts they are thankful that the United States is in a position to take the initiative in this area, as it did in other areas of the world.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentlelady from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and her Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies for bringing out this supplemental funding necessary programs of the Forest Service.

I am particularly pleased with the inclusion of $6,213,000 for insect and disease control.

Mr. Chairman, forest insects and diseases in an average year kill an estimated 2.4 billion cubic feet of timber and, additionally, cause an equal amount of growth to be lost. This represents approximately 40 percent of the total vol-

ume of timber harvested, with 9 billion board feet of this average loss in the sawlog class. The total economic loss from forest insects and disease is greater than $500 million annually in terms of stumpage values. Insect and disease pests are the greatest single factor in reducing the potentially available timber resource.

The proper combination of mild weather coupled with numerous other contributing factors has enabled insect populations to expand to record levels this year in most geographic regions of the country. The resulting losses of merchantable timber and the impact on forest resources will also be at record highs.

An aggressive suppression program—which the bill before us funds—can help keep these insects under control.

Primary targets of this suppression program are four of the major forest pests—the southern pine beetle, gypsy moth, spruce budworm, and Douglas-fir tussock moth. In the South and Southeastern United States, southern pine beetle populations have been higher than at any time in the past for which records are available. The outbreak area now involves 58 percent of the 85.2 million acres of susceptible pine forests in the South. The current level of infestation is expected to continue and, if unchecked, will greatly increase.

The gypsy moth continues to infest stands in the Northeast with 1.4 million acres of hardwood defoliated during 1973. Significant increases in defoliation have occurred in Pennsylvania as the moth continues to spread to the South and West along the periphery of the outbreak area.

The spruce budworm remains in outbreak status across the northern half of the country with 2.5 million acres in Maine, 1.5 million acres in the Lake States, and 4.6 million acres in the Northern Rocky Mountains having been defoliated. Populations are on the increase, particularly in the Western States.

The Douglas-fir tussock moth has increased into outbreak status during the past 2 years. Over 800,000 acres of Douglas-fir and true fir on Federal, State, and private lands in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana were defoliated during June and July of 1973. The current outbreak has caused approximately a billion board feet of mortality and growth loss valued at $54.8.

At the present time, no chemical is registered for use in suppressing the Douglas-fir tussock moth. The only known control for the moth is DDT. The Forests Subcommittee and the full Committee on Agriculture have approved legislation authorizing and directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue permits for the use of DDT on forests and other agricultural lands whenever the Secretary of Agriculture deems it necessary. Further action on this legislation was postponed when EPA issued a conditional order allowing the use of DDT to control the tussock moth in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

One of the conditions laid down in the EPA order was that the Forest Service continue testing in an effort to find an alternative to DDT in the control of the tussock moth. The Forest Service is continuing accelerated research programs and pilot projects to extend promising research results. The funds contained in this supplemental are essential if the Forest Service is to continue these efforts. It is unfortunate that these funds will be available only until June 30, 1974.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to again commend the gentlelady and her subcommittee for their efforts in this regard. I fully expect to support the legislation before us.

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

Mr. RARICK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to associate myself with the views of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana and commend him for his endless fight to place before the House the tremendous damage being done by the pine tree beetle to the American forests. I also want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for providing supplemental funds to fight this destructive pest.

Mr. RARICK. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) such time as he may consume.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) on his statement. The subject of forestry in all of its aspects is one which concerns many of us and is very important. Forestry in our country is a major industry. In this connection in particular, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the work of the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) whose subcommittee has dealt so effectively in this bill with the need for certain additional appropriations required in forestry. I compliment Mrs. HANSON and her subcommittee for a very fine job, one that is of great importance to the future of the Nation's forests.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14013 contains supplemental funding to operate the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1974 of almost $1.1 billion. None of the funding requested by the administration in this supplemental will assist the Veterans' Administration in providing additional personnel assistance which is so vitally needed by the 58 regional offices which process veterans claims. There is a pressing need in these offices to provide decent service to veterans throughout this country, particularly Vietnam veterans, in processing their claims on a timely basis for education and training benefits and for more prompt action on claims for service-connected compensation, pensions, and other readjustment benefits.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this body, I am sure, are aware of the serious problems which developed over the past few years in the veterans education and training program. While the problem had been festering for some time, its serious magnitude surfaced at Christmastime in the VA regional office at Los Angeles when it was learned that between 6,000 and 8,000 long-overdue checks for GI education and training allowances had not been delivered. When this situation came to light, the President ordered the VA Administrator, Donald Johnson, to take necessary action to pay these veterans immediately. Johnson and other VA officials had repeatedly denied for over a year that any major problem existed at Los Angeles, or elsewhere, in the VA education program.

Mr. Chairman, during the period between Christmas and New Year, I am told the Veterans' Administration in Los Angeles distributed almost a million dollars in cash in a frantic effort to comply with the President's order and in an attempt to cover their past bungling.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of this very serious problem in Los Angeles, the House Veterans Affairs Committee undertook a comprehensive national survey and contacted the presidents of more than 600 educational institutions located in all 50 States. A variety of institutions were chosen at random. These institutions were asked to relate their experiences with the advance pay system, to give a report on delayed checks and to describe their contacts with the Veterans' Administration. The responses to that survey are now in. A sample of some of the problems encountered by schools in working with the Veterans' Administration in the GI education and training program will be detailed at the end of my statement.

Mr. Chairman, at the recommendation of the Veterans' Administration, the Congress authorized a system of advance payments so that the veteran would have a check waiting for him when he enrolled. In certain areas serious problems have developed with the advance payments system. For reasons never adequately explained, all those applying for advance payment did not receive their checks on time. There have been reports of checks sent out without names; checks sent out with only part of the names; bundles of checks for veterans sent to the wrong school; and the method of addressing the check using the veteran's name in care of the school resulted in the post office sending back many checks. Once the veteran fails to receive his advance check on time, it has proven almost impossible in many cases to get his checks back in sequence.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee uncovered many cases reported where veterans received no money from September 1973 until January or February 1974. The favorite alibi used by the Veterans' Administration is that the veteran did not return his enrollment certification card. This is undoubtedly true in some cases; but there is ample documentation where schools have returned certificates as many as three times, yet these cards did not seem to release the checks. Many schools report that they, in their advice to veterans, are afraid to try the advance payment again because of its poor performance.

The breakdown of the advance pay system did not occur in all areas. The re-

gional offices located in the less populated areas seem to have generally been able to make it work. The problems developed in populated States such as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Florida, California, et cetera. In those States there were many serious failures reported. Despite this, schools are still supporting the advance pay system and recommend that it be retained if the VA can straighten out the problems.

Mr. Chairman, the schools responding to the survey are complaining that veterans are not receiving effective service by calling VA telephone assistance numbers. Veterans complain that they are treated rudely, that they are shuffled from one clerk to another and never get a call back even though this is promised. Again, this is not reported in all areas. Some regional offices receive very high marks for cooperation, while those in the more populous areas are the subject of constant complaints because they did not deal with the veteran in a courteous and effective fashion.

Mr. Chairman, as the President indicated, press representative Sara McClendon had no difficulty determining that the education program was in trouble, but at this point, there is no indication that Administrator Johnson either perceives the nature of his problems or knows what to do about it. He has been directed by the President to make a self-investigation and report on his own failure to properly organize and administer his Agency. Obviously, very little can be expected from such a self-investigation.

A vivid example of the Administrator's incompetence to deal with this issue is dramatically illustrated by his response to an invitation from the Veteran's Affairs Committee to help cope with this problem.

Mr. Chairman, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee asked the Veterans' Administrator to provide an estimate of additional personnel that would be needed to improve the advance pay system and respond to veterans in an effective way. On March 1, 1974, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs responded by saying:

> We do not believe more people at this time would solve our problem. Additional staffing requires a minimum of six to eight months training before they become effective—therefore, it is our opinion that a request for more people in the proposed area is not warranted.

Yet, just 19 days later the Administrator directed his chief subordinates to conduct a survey on a crash basis to determine what additional personnel and equipment were needed to "cure their problems in terms of manpower and equipment" for the remaining months of fiscal year 1974 and also in 1975. He had stated just a few days prior to that time before the Subcommittee on Appropriations that no additional personnel or funding were needed to meet his workload demands.

The regional office directors' response to Mr. Johnson's request indicated a need for over 1,500 additional personnel and in many offices there were additional space and equipment requests as well as a need for additional telephone service to serve veterans on a timely basis.

Apparently Administrator Johnson felt that these additional needs were excessive and new guidelines were devised. The regional office directors were told to submit their requirements based along sharply narrowed guidelines. On April 3, 1974, approximately 1 month after stating that he needed no additional personnel, Administrator Johnson advised the Veterans' Affairs Committee that almost 500 additional personnel would be needed, but no request has been forthcoming for additional funding from the administration.

Mr. Chairman, this abrupt change of heart by Administrator Johnson clearly indicates a lack of administrative capability on his part, and the President's directive that a "crack management team"—headed by Johnson—be established, will only add further chaos to an already unsatisfactory situation.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is misleading and misinforming the Congress. He appears to be a very hard man to help; however, Mr. Chairman, I feel that all of my colleagues in this Chamber agree that the Congress stands ready to assist the Veterans' Administration in solving their problems by providing whatever resources are needed. However, the duty of the administration is to promptly identify these problem areas and propose to the Congress what they need to carry out the mission of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, the Administrator has failed to do this in connection with this supplemental appropriations request. This could cause even more chaotic conditions during the upcoming fall enrollment period.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the Veterans' Administration has failed in its responsibility to properly and promptly serve the needs of veterans in general—and Vietnam era veterans in particular—by failing to properly administer its present resources and to request from the Congress what else it needs to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I want veterans of this country to know Congress stands ready to meet the needs of the men and women who have served our country in time of war—and I have called upon the administration to find competent administration for VA and to insist that the agency meet its responsibilities to the veterans of America.

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the RECORD at this point relevant documents and other material pertinent to the above remarks:

FEBRUARY 22, 1974.

Hon. DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: This confirms a telephone conversation of yesterday with Mr. Odell Vaughn, Chief Benefits Director, regarding staffing of the Veterans' Benefits Office, with particular regards to operation of the education and training program.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that there is not sufficient staff available in the field offices to handle the administration of the education program. If relief is to be obtained, the supplemental appropriation being considered by Congress March 5 appears to be the proper avenue.

I would appreciate being advised at the earliest possible time, and no later than March 1, as to your estimates of needed additional personnel for the improvement of this program. I would appreciate knowing, also, whether you expect to make a formal request of the Appropriations Committee for additional funds for this purpose.

It is our desire to cooperate in the improvement of this program. Therefore, I look forward to your early response.

Sincerely,

WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Chairman.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1974.

Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We sincerely appreciate your interest in the veterans of this country and we share in your concern that they promptly receive the benefits to which they are entitled.

We are aware of operating problems that cause delays in veterans receiving their checks and you can be assured we are doing everything possible to alleviate the problem.

We do not believe more people at this time would solve our problem. Additional staffing requires a minimum of six to eight months training before they become productive.

In addition, we have opened an office in San Diego to relieve Los Angeles of a portion of their workload. We are in the process of realigning the stations into a unit concept for processing awards which will, in our opinion, expedite handling. Six stations have converted and four more are due by April 1, 1974, with the balance converted in FY 1975.

New procedures, such as advanced pay and prepay, should operate with a minimum of error now that we have experience. Workload projections for next year indicate a reduction in the majority of items and particularly in the number of trainees we expect to have in training.

Therefore, it is our opinion that a request for more people in the benefits area is not warranted.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator.

MARCH 20, 1974.

Hon. DON E. JOHNSON,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: This has reference to my letter of February 22, 1974, and your reply of March 1.

In response to my request for information as to additional personnel needed to administer the education and training program on an efficient, timely basis, you responded that you did not believe more people at this time would solve your problem, and you stated it was your opinion that a request for more people in the benefits area is not warranted. In your letter you made reference to the process of realigning the stations into the unit concept for processing awards which will, in your opinion, expedite handling.

Tentative inquiries which we have made do not confirm this opinion. There is an indication that some of the stations' current experiences with the unit concept are that they are actually losing their productivity levels, probably because Central Office has dictated a totally rigid concept and given the station directors no latitude in making adjustments. Unless some changes are made,

we cannot agree that the present approach to the unit concept will be any answer to expediting the handling of education and other claims.

In your letter you stated that the workload projections for next year indicate a reduction in a majority of items and particularly in the number of trainees you expect to have in training. Training loads have risen substantially in the last year, and we have no information which would indicate that there will be a reduction. In fact, with rates increased and the eight year limitation on training time removed, there may be an increase. If there is a further decline in employment opportunities, there certainly will be an increase.

Reiterating the opinion expressed in my letter of February 22, we do not believe that the field offices of the Veterans Administration have adequate personnel to handle their workloads. The current use of overtime is excessive, and many offices seem to be in trouble in handling the routine operations such as incoming mail, filing, etc. It is apparent that many offices are not able to handle their telephone calls in an effective, courteous way.

We undertsand that a request has now been made of the field stations to submit information as to the numbers and types of personnel needed to deal with their workloads effectively. We would like to have a copy of the responses of the stations at the earliest possible time, and if at all possible, by Friday afternoon, March 22.

Our appropriations committees are still considering VA appropriations. If something is to be done about this situation, it must be done immediately. Your cooperation in furnishing the information requested would be very much appreciated and, of course, as indicated in my letter of February 22, if you have changed your opinion as to the needs of the Agency, we would like to have your own estimates as to the additional personnel and funds which may be needed to operate on a current and efficient basis.

Very truly yours,

WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Chairman.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1974.

Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of March 20, 1974, concerning the possible need for additional staffing in the Department of Veterans Benefits to administer the education and training program. Mr. Odell W. Vaughn, Chief Benefits Director, has also discussed this matter with Mr. Oliver Meadows, your Committee Staff Director.

With the national publicity and attention toward our difficulty in delivering many GI education checks promptly or regularly, we launched an all-out effort to do whatever we possibly could to identify the magnitude and causes of the problem, and correct it prior to the next fall enrollment. In exploring the problem, the Chief Benefits Director, on March 19, 1974, canvassed our Regional Office Directors through the four Area Field Directors, as to whether they felt additional staffing was needed. The question was directed to the administration of the education and training program. However, replies came back covering all other programs and areas, including Personnel, Director's office, Loan Guaranty, Finance, etc., totalling 1,586 additional people. Copies of these replies are enclosed, as you requested. The Chief Benefits Director, believing that these replies are generally not responsive, again requested another Regional Office canvass with the focus to be placed on the education and training program alone, and whether it was felt additional staffing was needed in adjudication, school liaison, telephone units, and other activities of this program. When we have received this later data we will be happy to share it with you.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1974.

Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a follow-up to my letter of March 26, 1974, and yours of March 20, 1974, concerning staffing needs in the Department of Veterans Benefits to administer the GI education and training program.

In a second round of discussions with our Regional Offices and the Area Field Directors, we have agreed that immediate additional staffing is necessary at some offices, to improve the operation of this program due to workload increases, backlogs affecting case processing, and present difficulties in check delivery. I have already allocated 200 more positions to those offices which need them most, and we plan to authorize 250 to 300 more within the next week. This will cover our needs as established in the foregoing discussions. It will not be necessary to request comparable staffing increases in the Fiscal Year 1975 appropriation at this time. We can reprogram Fiscal Year 1974 funds for the present need, but we cannot predict at this point how long the need will continue through Fiscal Year 1975. Should tuition allowance or extension of entitlement legislation be enacted, we will definitely need a supplemental appropriation, including additional staffing, and it is clear that we will have to maintain *some* of the higher staffing level into Fiscal Year 1975.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator.

DISTRIBUTION OF 494 POSITIONS

Station	1st 200 (Mar. 29, 1974)	2d 294 (Apr. 1, 1974)	Total
Area I:			
New York	10	16	26
VBO	7	13	20
Baltimore	2		2
Buffalo	2		2
Boston	2		2
Manchester		2	2
Newark		10	10
Pittsburgh		8	8
Providence		2	2
San Juan		4	4
Togus		2	2
Total	23	57	80
Area II:			
St. Petersburg	23	15	38
Houston	20	9	29
Atlanta	17	4	21
Columbia	12	7	19
Winston Salem	7	5	12
Huntington		4	4
Jackson		6	6
Little Rock		10	10
Louisville		2	2
Montgomery		10	10
Nashville		7	7
New Orleans		8	8
Roanoke		6	6
Waco		10	10
Total	79	103	182
Area III:			
Cleveland	19	2	21
Detroit	9	3	12
Chicago	7	5	12
Indianapolis	3	4	7
Muskogee	2	3	5
Wichita	2	4	6
Fargo		1	1
Lincoln		2	2
Milwaukee		3	3
Philadelphia		6	6
St. Louis		4	4
St. Paul		2	2
Total	42	39	81
Area IV:			
San Diego	16	2	18
San Francisco	20	15	35
Honolulu	6	2	8
Phoenix	6	6	12
Los Angeles	8	25	33
Juneau		1	1
Denver		9	9
Boise			0
Ft. Harrison		2	2
Reno		2	2
Albuquerque		5	5
Portland		9	9
Manila			0
Salt Lake City			0
Seattle		16	16
Cheyenne		1	1
Total	56	95	151

HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE SURVEY OF PROBLEMS WITH ADVANCE PAYMENTS FOR GI EDUCATION AND TRAINING BENEFITS

At the recommendation of the Veterans Administration, the Congress authorized a system of advance payments so that the veteran would have a check waiting for him when he enrolls. In certain areas serious problems have developed with the advance payments system. For reasons never adequately explained, all those applying for advance payment did not receive their checks on time. There have been reports of checks sent out without names; checks sent out with only part of the names; bundles of checks for veterans sent to the wrong school; and the method of addressing the check using the veteran's name in care of the school resulted in the Post Office sending back many checks. Once the veteran fails to receive his advance pay check on time, it has proven almost impossible in many cases to get his checks back in sequence.

There are many cases reported where veterans received no money from September 1973 until January or February 1974. The favorite alibi used by the Veterans Administration is that the veteran did not return his enrollment certification card. This is undoubtedly true in some cases; but there is ample documentation where schools have returned certifications as many as three times, yet these cards did not seem to release the checks. Many schools report that they, in their advice to veterans, are afraid to try the advance payment again because of its poor performance.

Here are what some schools have said about the advance pay system:

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK CITY

"This past school term revealed that only 16%, or 2,600 of our veteran population, applied for or received their first check. Of the 16%, 25% or 760 of our students who requested advance payment never received them. Of the 2,600 who applied for advance payment, only approximately 12% received their payments on time."

NEW YORK COMMUNITY COLLEGE, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

"Out of approximately 1,100 requests, the school received some 800 checks. Of those who received the initial check on time, some 40% did *not* receive the second check without repeated verification of attendance by the college. The VA contended that the colleges were not sending back the first check payment confirmation card (1999V), but we know that this was not the case at our institution. . . . Unfortunately, those who asked for advance payment and did not receive their first check, waited months before

the situation was resolved. In most instances, this was due to a wrong facility code number being listed for the colleges. To date, we estimate that 40 veterans have not yet been paid by the VA for the Fall '73 semester."

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE, SANTA MARIA, CALIF.

"The problems of delayed payments were the worst of any previous years. Out of 1,057 veterans certified for advance pay, 307 did not arrive in time for registration, or 29%. Out of a total of 2,434 veterans certified for the fall semester, 732 had problems with a delayed check, or 30%. As of the meeting with the Veterans Administration on December 17, there were still approximately 50 to 60 hard-core problems still unpaid."

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE, BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

"220 veterans signed up for advance pay. As of January 14, 1974, the first day of class, we had received 30 checks."

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, PASADENA, CALIF.

"The new advanced pay procedures used this year were a total failure."

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO, CALIF.

"In the fall of 1973, CSU, Chico had approximately 900 requests for advance payments. Of this number, only 300 checks were actually received; a dismal 33%."

BREVARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CAMPUS IN COCOA, MELBOURNE AND TITUSVILLE, FLA.

"Our experience with the Advance Pay Procedure initiated last Fall semester by the Veterans Administration did show difficulties. Specifically, the major problems were that veteran students' checks did not arrive at the times promised, leaving great numbers of veterans who had depended on the checks financially destitute."

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MIAMI, FLA.

"The idea of advance pay is an excellent one and should be continued. However, as implemented for the past Fall Term, the overall result of the advanced pay procedures was a major disaster."

HARRISBURG AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, HARRISBURG, PA.

"To say the least, it was a fiasco. This system allows both veterans and institutions to request advanced payments. This causes problems in controlling checks since the institution does not know which students are doing what."

Secondly, only about fifty of our six hundred eligible veterans applied for advanced payments, yet some *three hundred* checks were sent to our institution. To say the least, this caused some confusion between our office and students. This problem was magnified when the Veterans Administration failed to notify the recipients that their checks had arrived at the school. I might also add that most of those advanced pay checks arrived after classes began and after the deadline for tuition had passed. Some arrived as late as November 1, 1973. We began classes on August 22, 1973."

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.

"One thousand (1,000) student veterans participated in the program at the University Park campus for the fall term, 1973. Of these 1,000 veterans only 43% received their check in advance of the beginning of that term; 25% of the remaining 57% received their advance pay check at least 2 weeks after the beginning of the fall term. The remaining 32% received their check later than those veterans who did not elect to participate in the pre-payment program. We appreciate the concept of the advance payment, and are confident it will operate more efficiently in the future with the intervention of your committee."

WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE, WEST CHESTER, PA.

"Our experiences with the new advance pay procedures have been less than satisfactory. In order for the veteran to get the full benefit of the advance pay program, it has proved necessary for him to apply a minimum of thirty days in advance. The majority of the advance pay applications at West Chester State College were submitted five to seven weeks prior to the start of the fall semester. In spite of our following the proper procedure, many veterans were still not paid in September."

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

"Of the approximately 2700 veterans, at California State University, Los Angeles, submitted for Advance pay, about one-half of 1500 received their money when they were scheduled to. This was about a 50% success rating. Pretty poor in our opinion."

HOUSE VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE SURVEY OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO SERVICE TO VETERANS BY VETERANS ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANCE OFFICES

In many areas of the country, veterans in schools are complaining that veterans can receive no effective service by calling VA telephone assistance units. Veterans complain that they are treated rudely, that they are shuffled from one clerk to another, and that they never get a call-back, even though this is promised.

Here are some typical reports by schools regarding telephone calls by veterans:

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK CITY:

"My major criticism of the administration of our regional VA office is that many of the counselors who work with the veterans give them misinformation. My staff and I were trained by the VA about its rules, regulations, and procedures by department chiefs. It seems to me that the counselors who are working in contact should have extensive training. I have spoken to several people on the phone and received the same misinformation given to veterans."

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO, CALIF.

"The Contact Division, which was the division set up at the Veterans Administration Regional Office for the purpose of taking inquiries for nonreceipt of the veteran's check, has been nonresponsive."

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

"A great majority of our inquiries, and those made personally by veterans, do not receive this type of attention. On desperate problems (e.g. no money for two months) we suggest and encourage the veteran to contact his local congressman and/or Senator to provide assistance. While this will usually work during normal periods in the year, these legislators find that they receive less than speedy and effective response during peak problem periods (like the Fall of 1973). Our local Senators and Congressmen can probably verify this statement."

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, PASADENA, CALIF.

"Our experience with the people in the West Los Angeles Office of the VA has been rather poor. It used to be exceedingly difficult to get answers by the telephone; this year it is impossible because they are not even answering the phone. If we write letters, it requires 1½ to 2 months to get a reply, or to get some needed forms. Our veterans tell us that they feel they get a run-around when they have to go to the VA office, being shuffled from one person to another."

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

"In the majority of cases our experience with the Veterans Administration has been one of complete frustration and confusion. They have been insensitive to the veterans needs as well as to our repeated attempts to rectify the many problems encountered. We could never develop a workable method of handling problem cases with the Veterans Administration due to their inflexibility and lack of willingness to make exceptions to standard procedures. We do not, the veterans do not, receive effective or timely responses from the Veterans Administration. As a matter of fact, there are many times when there is no response at all."

CENTRAL YMCA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CHICAGO, ILL.

"We have *not* been able to develop a workable *method* for handling problem cases because, not only is each problem case different, but when contact is made with the VA, the person there always seems to be different. Different counselors and adjudication officials at the VA have different methods for dealing with cases, and resolution always seems to depend on their own place in the structure, their current case load, and one's personal relationship with them. Our staff tries to establish a good personal working relationship with one or two different officials in order to get action of problem cases. Establishing a consistent method, however, is difficult. Adjudicators do not have the same information; we confirm this by having the same staff person call a different adjudicator to describe the same problem, and we get different answers. It also happens that students, when they call personally, either get *no* answer or a different one than that given our staff."

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON-NORMAL, ILL.

"The VARO Chicago is making efforts to provide universities with efficient channels to handle problem cases as they are presented by the certifying officials. However, there seems to be a breakdown in these procedures when the problem inquiry originates with the veteran rather than the institution. This university has been making efforts to encourage veterans to contact the Regional Office through the use of the toll-free telephone lines established by the VA. While most veterans express a willingness to take actions to resolve their own problems, and most have positive responses to initiating their own inquiries as the need arises, they report frustration at dealing with the VA. Although the contact workers who take the inquiry from the veteran inform him that he may expect either a telephonic or written response from the Regional Office within ten to fourteen working days, veterans report that it is the exception rather than the rule when they are recontacted at all."

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, ILL.

"The toll free telephone numbers to the Contact Division or VARO, Chicago, which a veteran can use to check his records, have proven rather ineffective. The most common complaints received from veterans are "no reply" or no resolution of problems."

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, MACOMB, ILL.

"According to Western's veterans, one area that has not been successful is the toll free phone referral bank. Even though calls are now channeled to various respective adjudicators, the general experience has been very institutional and non-committed. Replies to inquiries if made at all, have a time lag of 4 to 6 weeks."

BREVARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CAMPUS IN COCOA, MELBOURNE, TITUSVILLE, FLA.

"Specifically, many veterans complained that their telephone inquiries were not being answered. We suggest that VA telephone service be extended and enlarged . . . and that institutions be allowed to use the toll-free lines to contact adjudication officials when necessary."

FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

"We are also not in complete agreement that the toll-free lines for veterans are of any real assistance. Most of the time, the veteran was bounced back and forth between whomever he could get to in St. Petersburg and the College, with instructions to ask the College such things as, "Is my enrollment certificate in". Or, "Has my monthly attendance card gone out?" The veteran would be given one question at a time. In retrospect, one can only assume that this was a delaying action which would keep the veteran occupied while the pay procedure finally caught up with him. In almost every instance, we had provided the necessary paperwork, but the veteran was not receiving a check."

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MIAMI, FLA.

"Prior to the current academic year, responses by the VA's Adjudication Section in St. Petersburg were efficient and almost immediate. However, during the past Fall Term everything fell apart. Responses were either slow or unsatisfactory."

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE, FLA.

"The toll free telephone number which they developed has not proven to be of the kind of assistance that it was intended to be. Rarely has a veteran received an answer to a question placed on the toll free number in less than two weeks. The average in these cases has been around three weeks."

HARRISBURG AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, HARRISBURG, PA.

"Most veterans who needed to call the regional office's toll-free line to alleviate problems were often greeted with hostility from the people at the other end. Also, the turn-around period for problem solving often took more than a week, and often the office never notified the veterans of the subsequent changes."

WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE, WEST CHESTER, PA.

"In regard to our experiences in contacts with the VA, there are two basic methods for a veteran to contact the VA headquarters in his area. The first method involves the veteran's direct call to the "Benefits Section". If he is ever able to get through with the telephone number used by thousands of veterans, his problems really begin. Unidentified workers barely listen. They take your name and number and promise to return the call. Several days later, the veteran repeats the process. After frustration sets in, the veteran can accept the alternative or bring his problem to my office. If you wish to experience his frustration, I strongly suggest an experiment—Call GE8-5225.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, in reading the report on this second supplemental appropriations bill for 1974, I regret to find that the committee has failed to recommend a supplemental appropriation for representation by court-appointed counsel of indigent defendants for that aspect of the Criminal Justice Act which is applicable to the District of Columbia.

This oversight is extremely regretful, and while I have no formal amendment to this House bill, I did not believe that the record on this issue should be completely silent. I realize that this matter is considerably more involved than appears on its face; but, I would have hoped that some action could have been taken to ameliorate the difficulties that the District of Columbia Superior Court is now experiencing in attempting to comply with the Supreme Court rulings on the right of counsel.

I can assure you that the District of Columbia is doing everything that is possible to meet with the legislative intent as was contained in the House report on the appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce, dated June 22, 1973—House Report 93-321, 16. The difficulties, however, lie not in what actions the city has taken, but in the restrictions placed upon the CJA moneys by this committee and the committee of conference in its amendment No. 42—House Report 93-625, 10.

As a minimum, I would hope that the conferees of this House will be amenable to some suggestion that will permit the District to continue to comply with the court's ruling in *Argersinger* v. *Hamlin* (407 U.S. 25, 1972) without having to dismiss the cases for lack of available counsel.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the mayor of Cleveland, the Honorable Ralph Perk, has discussed with my staff the question of whether funds provided under title II of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act could be used to cover the costs of public employment between April 1, 1974, and the enactment of the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1974.

I have an opinion from the Solicitor of the Department of Labor which suggests that those funds could be so used. I would like to enter the text of that opinion at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1974.

Memorandum for: William H. Kolberg, Assistant Secretary for Manpower.

Subject: Authority Under the Proposed CETA Appropriations Language to Provide Funds to Communities to Carry Out Public Employment Programs After April 1, 1974.

You have asked for my view as to whether funds under the proposed CETA appropriations language (attached) may be used by a community to cover the costs of a public employment program after April 1, 1974. As I understand the situation, some communities have, since April 1, spent all the funds available to them under the Emergency Employment Act. These communities anticipated having funds available to them under Title II of CETA by April 1 to continue employment for those hired under the EEA program. As such funds are not yet available, you would like to know whether these communities may, when they do receive CETA funds, use those funds for PEP program costs occurring after April 1.

I believe such funds may be so utilized by the communities involved, as CETA contemplates a transitional period in which funds under it may be used to carry out programs initiated under the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Emergency Employment Act. Section 3(a) of CETA states specifically that CETA funds may be used toward this end; it reads as follows:

SEC. (3. (a) To the extent necessary to provide for the orderly transition of supporting job training programs, and to provide continued financial assistance for such programs prior to July 1, 1974, the Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance in the same manner and on the same conditions as provided in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as in effect prior to June 30, 1973, title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, as in effect prior to June 30, 1973, from funds appropriated pursuant to this Act.

Thus, section 3(a) makes clear that there shall be an orderly transition from EEA programs to CETA programs, and it authorizes the Secretary to provide CETA funds for EEA programs during this transitional period.

The funds made available for CETA under the proposed appropriations language would, therefore, be available to finance EEA programs during the transitional period, unless the appropriations language provided otherwise—which is not the case. Indeed, the proposed appropriations language specifically appropriates $100,000,000 "for activities of the type provided in the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 as authorized in Section 3(a) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. . . ."

It is my view, therefore, that funds under the proposed appropriations language may be used by a community during the CETA transitional period to cover the costs of a public employment program after April 1, 1974, including costs incurred prior to the enactment of the CETA Appropriations Act.

WILLIAM J. KILBERG,
Solicitor of Labor.

COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, and sections 326 and 328 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1951 and 1961), $1,898,584,000, including $250,000,000 for activities authorized under title II of said Comprehensive Employment and Training Act and $100,000,000 for activities of the type provided in the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 as authorized in section 3(a) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, plus reimbursements, to remain available until June 30, 1975: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities and for the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, although I do not plan to offer amendments to the supplemental appropriation bill, I have a few very brief comments I would like to make regarding the defense section.

First, I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for its frequently effective scrutiny of the request, and for its deletion of much of the more obvious padding, particularly in those funds requested under the heading of "Readiness." At the same time, I wish the committee had been more rigid in deciding what funds are really urgently needed on a supplemental basis and what funds can reasonably wait for the regular fiscal year 1975 appropriation. One effect of this supplemental is to decrease the apparent magnitude of the major increase in defense spending we are asked to provide for fiscal year 1975.

Second, I feel it is a serious mistake and entirely unwarranted to rush into the Diego Garcia construction without proper consideration. The need for haste is

not apparent, and the possible pitfalls are most consequential.

Gentlemen, the purpose of the Diego Garcia request is to create a major American naval commitment in the Indian Ocean before Congress has time to consider its implications. The question before us is not whether we can afford the relatively trivial sum needed for construction of the facilities. The question is whether we want to station a major naval force in the Indian Ocean on a permanent basis.

I for one am skeptical. On very short notice we can now send a carrier task group or two into that part of the world. I am not impressed by talk of how many bases and how many rowboats the Soviets have in that part of the world. Their cruisers and destroyers are limited by the 20- to 50-mile effective range of their ship-to-ship missiles; their two carriers, half the size of our big ones, can only operate low-performance small-payload vertical-takeoff aircraft with combat radii not much longer than that of their missiles. In contrast, any American carrier carries high-performance F–4's, A–7's, and 9–6's, that can carry large payloads on combat radii well over 500 miles, and soon will have the F–14 with even longer range. In short, a single American carrier could wipe out the entire Soviet surface fleet before the Soviets could get close enough to scratch the carrier.

Now it may be that Soviet submarines could put our carriers out of action. But if this is the case, a refueling base would not help us; it will only create a choke point and tell the Soviet subs where to look for us.

The only advantage Diego Garcia would give us is it would let us have a carrier in the area today rather than the day after tomorrow, and I have a great deal of difficulty in conceiving of a realistic situation in which we would need this.

In addition to acting as a naval base, Diego Garcia will have a runway capable of handling our largest transport aircraft. I have heard it said that in another Middle East crisis in which we were denied the use of European airfields, we could supply Israel through the back door by using Diego Garcia as a refueling stop. Would the British risk an Arab oil embargo by letting us use Diego Garcia in such a crisis? Would the Arabs allow us to overfly their territorial waters? Would our transports be able to fly safely across the Sinai Desert during hostilities?

At this time, my answer to all these questions would be "No." Perhaps I am wrong. Perhaps the Pentagon has good answers to my questions. But we have not had time to hear them. That is why I think we have to insist on taking up Diego Garcia as part of the regular fiscal year 1975 budget. There is no reason why we cannot wait, and every reason why we should.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the pending supplemental appropriation bill carries two provisions which I offered as amendments in committee, which are vital to the people of my State and to other areas of the lower central South.

The first amendment provides $20,000,000 to the Soil Conservation Service to expedite projects under its control and particularly for restoration of areas damaged by flooding and severe storms during past year. These funds, together with $80,000,000 for similar repairs and works on Corps of Engineers projects are within the $100,000,000 budget estimate submitted by the President on March 26, 1974, in Senate Document 93–67.

Emergency measures are urgently needed to correct hazardous conditions which could result in loss of life and damage to property. The longer restoration is delayed, the greater the damage to land and water resources will be.

The second provision is for $80,000,000 to accelerate the levee raising and for other essential projects to meet present needs along the Mississippi River and tributaries. This fund, together with $20,000,000 for similar repairs and works on Soil Conservation Service projects are within the $100,000,000 budget estimate submitted by the President on March 26, 1974 in Senate Document 93–67.

While the Corps of Engineers did a fine job of trying to contain the disastrous floods of 1973, a detailed analysis by the Corps indicates that an adjustment is necessary in project design in flowlines in several reaches of the river and that the height of the flowline would have to be raised as much as 5½ feet in order to pass a potential project design flood. With the approach of the spring flood season along the Mississippi River, all available data on current hydrologic conditions indicate a strong possibility of a recurrence of the 1973 flood conditions. The committee believes it urgent to expedite the raising of levees and to meet other problems in the most critical areas in order to help prevent a repeat of last year's floods and a continuation of existing problems.

Mr. Chairman, these items were recommended by the President and by the Office of Management and Budget and must be retained.

Mr. Chairman, the regular appropriation's bill for public works will be reported by our subcommittee some time in May, when we will provide funds to meet the many problems of my district and of the Nation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in our continuing consideration of this Supplemental Appropiration bill. I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will speedily and overwhelmingly approve the amendment that is designed to provide adequate funding for the tragically increasing number of unemployed.

Workers and their families, Mr. Chairman, who are already beseiged by rising costs that are in excess of 10 percent, and who are now the victims of unemployment resulting from the energy crisis, urgently need personal and family income protection. In the automobile industry alone, for example, there are 200,000 workers unemployed.

Funds from the new Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, which are meant for help in such emergencies, will not be available until the beginning of the new fiscal year next July 1. For this "gap period," the Appropriations Committee has approved $100 million, but Mr. Chairman, this amount falls far short of the actual requirement. And the funds from the Supplemental Appropriations bill, which provide $250 million for public service employment under CETA title II, can only be utilized in areas with unemployment of 6.5 percent or more.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of the level of unemployment, the displaced workers must still provide for themselves and their families; and they must provide for them now. For those in desperate financial straits food, clothing, and warm and adequate shelter are immediate human concerns and they do not wait for levels of employment to rise or fall.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, communities throughout the country are now using the last of the PEP funds. Adoption of this amendment, before us, providing the necessary transitional funds, will also help curb greater unemployment and rising welfare rolls in those areas where the jobless rate is still at a level below 6.5 percent.

It is for these unemployed workers, whose efforts in the past have done so much to promote the economic stability of this country and who now, for reasons over which they have no control, are without adequate unemployment income protection, that I urge the House to resoundingly approve the amendment without further delay. By this legislative action, Mr. Chairman, I also truly believe we will be making a prudent national investment in the best interest of all our citizens.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the additional budget requests in the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1974 for summer youth jobs.

Under the new Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, the administration is requesting $208.6 million for summer jobs for youths. This amount together with $91.4 million in unobligated funds from fiscal year 1973 would provide a total summer youth program of $300 million or about the same level as 1973.

These funds would provide a total of 709,200 job opportunities at an average cost of $423 per job.

It is imperative that these young people are given the opportunity to work this year. For many young persons, these jobs help break the poverty cycle. They increase the availability of jobs by finding new work opportunities and by encouraging the development of part-time employment arrangements which improve the young workers' employability.

I strongly urge the House to concur with this additional appropriation request.

In addition, the committee strongly recommends, and I quote from page 61 of the report—

The continued support of the summer youth recreation programs, including the hiring of recreation aides and cost of youth transportation, similar to the way this program has operated in the past.

Ninety percent of our population resides in metropolitan areas. Twenty-five percent of my city of Chicago's population is between the ages of 8 and 21 years of age.

Recreational opportunities which are commonplace to most of our nation's youth are not available to the economically disadvantaged and underprivileged children locked in the inner city.

Recreation is not just sports, but art, drama, music—in essence all leisure time pursuits. Without Federal funds for recreation support, city administrators will have to curtail or eliminate many programs essential to these youths. The prospect of a long, bleak summer awaits thousands of American youngsters if we fail them.

Mr. Chairman, and my distinguished colleagues, I earnestly hope that these committee recommendations will be passed by this body. If our Nation's future is deemed to be truly in the hands of our youth, then I urge your support on these vital issues.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, in this supplemental appropriation the American taxpayer once again is being asked to hand over millions of tax dollars to support the Thieu regime in South Vietnam.

Just as last week when the House refused to give the Saigon Government increased military aid, I hope that my colleagues will take a serious look at how these economic assistance funds are to be used.

I, for one, am opposed to American tax dollars being utilized by the Thieu regime for political and military objectives—objectives generally in direct violation of the Paris Peace Agreement.

We must not be mistaken about what these funds will be used for; although the stated purpose for this $49 million is for "refugee relief assistance," the actual way they will be used will probably be very different.

I am inserting a series of articles at this point which deal directly with current refugee relief programs, and I think these articles point out how Thieu has distorted these programs for his own political and military gains:

[From the American Report, Feb. 11, 1974]

THIEU'S RELOCATION PROGRAM: PAPER FARCE, HUMAN TRAGEDY

(By Deborah Wiley)

After the pollution of Saigon and the tension of clandestine meetings with former political prisoners, riding in a bus down the highway north of Danang was a relief. I had almost forgotten that Viet Nam could have fertile rice fields dotted with mounds of ancestral graves and children tending water buffalo. Green mountains leveled off into seashore.

The relief was short-lived. A close look revealed craters pitting the fields, barbed wire marking off sections where mines were known to be. Across the mountainside stood defoliated trees.

A little later we reached a Return to Village site.

As we approached the entrance to the village it was clear that, for some reason, the people were held there. Held captive? Barbed wire surrounded the settlement of one-and-a quarter-room bamboo houses that stood in the shadow of a tower for ARVN troops who kept all coming and going in clear view.

There were no trees, no grass. The houses were in rows, about a yard apart. Standard policy for refugee families returned to village is the provision of rice allotments for six months, a small amount of money and tin to rebuild a home. The people of this village had received only promises.

Some villagers pointed to a line of trees in the distance—the actual site of their village and fields. Again and again we heard, "All we want is to farm our land."

But the area is "insecure," some of it actually controlled by the other side. And the troops—the Saigon army—won't allow them to venture out.

No rice allotments, no farming. A few plants were miraculously growing in the sandy soil. An old woman lay in her bed starving. Two houses away a little boy ate a watery rice soup. Down the way a woman and child gulped finely chopped banana stalks; the mother explained that they once considered it pig food, and handed us some to taste. I could hardly swallow.

A few miles away, we visited another Return to Village site on the sandy banks of the seashore. Some of the people could go to their land during the day—from 7 A.M. to 5 P.M.—by checking out and reporting in. Then the barbed wire gates are closed for the all-night curfew.

They explained that the fish nets stretched above the water are next to useless since they cannot use them at night. During the day the fish can see the nets and avoid them.

We talked with a young mother of four about the lack of food. She showed us a small basket of withered greens—discarded by other villagers—that was all her family's food supply. The tiny kitchen had two bare pots and one empty shelf. Her field is too far away to get there and back with any time for farming before curfew.

Later, in another village, a young woman explained to me that *normally* one family would not starve while neighbors had manioc roots to make soup. But the situation now is not normal.

A young man talked with us about his duties as a Rural Defense Force cadre. He explained that he lives close to the people so he knows what they are thinking, although he isn't originally from their village.

"I keep tight control over these people," he said, then took us to his office to demonstrate how. It was in his home that I saw the only meal being eaten.

Out came stacks and stacks of photos, one for each family. Above their heads, within the photo, hung a picture of President Nguyen Van Thieu. The man explained the multi-purpose photos. First he checks the houses every day. Every member of the family must be in the photo and each person in the photo must be accounted for. Secondly, if the NLF comes into the village, they will see from the duplicate print each family has that they are loyal to Thieu. And if a person or family disappears, he has "proof" that they were loyal to Thieu and, therefore, that the Front must have kidnapped them.

Finally, he explained, if a person wants to move to another city, permission must be obtained from the village officials. A picture of the person is then forwarded to his or her destination; if the traveler doesn't arrive, remaining family members are arrested.

The man went on to explain that he had copies of the Phoenix list of suspected communists from past years. In fact, he boasted of arresting three infrastructure the previous week. (Asked what he meant, he explained that the infrastructure were three women accused of trading with the NLF.)

There was no relief from the hot mid-day sun glaring on the sand. As we walked away, I thought of the hopes these people must have had when they were leaving the refugee camp "to be returned to their village." The crushed hopes must have hurt more than long, unfulfilled hopes.

From a distance I looked back at the outposts and barbed wire surrounding the village and remembered reading that the movement of refugees was for strategic, not humanitarian purposes—placing "loyal Thieu supporters" in an area, raising a flag and calling it GVN territory.

On down the road we stopped to read a sign hammered into the ground at the side of the road. "Refugee settlement will begin here at edge of road and go back 800 meters. 150 square meters per person." There was nothing but sand in the area—no buildings, no grass.

More pain for refugees. Or perhaps the word has gotten back that they'll "return to village" where no village ever stood.

A USAID (U.S. Agency for International Development) official in Saigon working in Relief and Rehabilitation, gave us a document purporting to explain the Return to Village and Resettlement program:

". . . With the ceasefire—and despite continuing military activity which generated additional refugees—the GVN has succeeded in turning refugee emphasis once again to Return to Village and Resettlement programs. About 235,000 people have already been returned home this year, while another 170,000 have been resettled in new homes. At least half of the remaining 300,000 refugees are expected to be able to participate in one of the two programs by the end of the year, and all are planned to be out of the camps sometime within the first six months of 1974.

"A number of special allowances provided to refugees when they return home or resettle give them a much-needed first step toward becoming self-sufficient. They receive funds to construct new houses, food allowances to help them survive while new crops are being planted, and development benefits (such as the construction of schools, dispensaries, roads, markets or wells) to assist in the formation of a viable community.

"These long-range programs of return and resettlement—both strongly supported by the U.S. Government—offer major humanitarian and economic benefits to South Viet Nam as a whole as well as to the individual refugees. The programs offer the country an efficient, effective and popular method of increasing agricultural production. Abandonment and virgin land is put to use; so is excess manpower, which might otherwise require continued welfare assistance."

Welfare assistance? A viable community? Major humanitarian and economic benefits? Surely the American officials in Saigon know their claims are farcical. Do members of Congress who voted $75 million in Fiscal Year 1974 to benefit refugees and other victims of war have any idea of the travesty? Does Henry Kissinger know the results of Article II of the Paris Agreement?

Does anyone care?

[From the Washington Post]

SAIGON PLANS TO RESTRICT REFUGEE MOVES

(By Peter Osnos)

DANANG.—The South Vietnamese government will not permit hundreds of thousands of refugees from Communist-held areas to return to their homes after the cease-fire takes effect and will punish them if they try, according to U.S. officials here.

South Vietnamese troops and police have been ordered to restrain the refugees, forcibly if necessary, American sources say, and even refugees from government-held areas will be allowed to go back to their villages only a few thousand at a time.

As an example of the government's position, an elderly man at a refugee camp just outside Danang said police had warned him that if any member of his large family disappears, the rest will be stricken from food distribution rolls.

If peace comes, the old man said, he will return to his village in a Communist-occupied portion of Quangtri Province "at any cost." He is too old, he complained, to endure the sufferings of the crowded, barbed wire-enclosed camp.

President Thieu is said to consider strict control of the South Vietnamese people to be the most important task of his government in the uncertain cease-fire period. To allow a gradual slipping away of refugees anxious to return to their native villages, Thieu evidently believes, would loosen his control over the rest of the population.

Predictably, U.S. intelligence sources say, the Vietcong regard getting people to move back to Communist-held districts as their top priority. So the conflicting pressures on the refugees seem certain to continue.

In all, American figures show that there are now 641,000 people living in refugee camps throughout the country and an untold number, certainly in the millions, who left their homes at some point in the war and may soon wish to return. Many of these fled to Saigon and other major cities, others merely went from one village to another.

On paper, the South Vietnamese government controls about 90 per cent of the population and between half and two-thirds of the land, including most of the inhabited territory of the country. In fact, a sizable percentage of the people are in marginal or contested areas where Communist influence is as great as the government's.

American officials here and in Saigon say that for the foreseeable future every effort will be made to keep all refugees in place, ostensibly so that resettlement can be "orderly." A propaganda campaign to that effect has been mounted, and families that wait their turn will be rewarded with building materials and a small sum of money to help them rebuild.

It is acknowledged, however, that once people begin to understand the meaning of the cease-fire—that the day of United States and South Vietnamese bombers and heavy artillery from both sides is past—they will begin to move and it will be next to impossible to stop them: The draw of the ancestral homeland is far stronger, regardless of its political complexion, than government promises of tin and piastres.

The only people over whom Saigon has direct authority are the 641,000 living in camps. They left their villages in the midst of last spring and summer's heavy fighting and depend on the government for food and shelter. Few if any have substantial resources of their own.

Of the total number in the camps, about 75 per cent—some 400,000 people—are from Quangtri, Binhdinh, Kontun and Binhlong, the provinces that are wholly or very largely in Communist hands. These are the people most directly affected by the government's restrictive orders.

The largest concentration of these refugees is in the Danang area, where 258,000 people are crammed into 34 sites fashioned from abandoned U.S. installations and barren sandflats. Virtually all are from Quangtri.

The South Vietnamese government "has made it clear all around," said one U.S. official, "that anyone from the Communist areas is going to have to relocate elsewhere."

The government has announced its first resettlement program for Quangtri, involving about 17,000 people who are scheduled to be returned in mid-February to their villages in the one district firmly in government hands. The over-all plan calls for moving 50,000 people in the next few months.

At that rate, and given the inevitable delays, it would take years for the refugee camps to be emptied, and it is unlikely that many of the people living there would be willing to wait. At Camp Brooks, one of the biggest camps, 11 families are jammed into each barracks with no privacy or sanitary facilities.

Schools and dispensaries are rudimentary, and the refugees say there is not enough food and what is available is of poor quality.

The old man who said he would go home at any cost was one of the few at the camp who would speak out, emboldened by his great age. Why should he stay there, he demanded. In his village, he said, he had seven acres, three water buffalos and 35 pigs.

Other refugees said they did not wish to return home until the Communists had left, but it was not clear whether this attitude stemmed from anti-communism or a continuing fear of the consequences of living where bombs and artillery so frequently fell in the past.

Last year, a group of several thousand Quangtri residents were moved south to Phuoctuy and Longkhanh provinces shortly before the offensive began. The move was complicated by Communist attacks on the resettlement sites.

American advisers say that besides the security problems, the relocations have been hampered by the desire of many of the resettlers to go home after a few months, even if home is the sterile sandy dunes of the coastal Quangtri plain.

Refugees and officials agree that the government has been unusually efficient in curbing whatever organized activity there has been in the camps for a return to Communist-held areas. U.S. intelligence sources said that systematic sweeps of the enclosures have been made by troops and special police to arrest Communist agents and sympathizers identified by informers.

The word has been passed that anyone inciting the refugees will be locked up. "If they resist," Saigon newspapers quoted official sources as saying, "they will be shot."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 24, 1973]

UNITED STATES-SAIGON REFUGEE PROGRAM CRITICIZED

(By Daniel Southerland)

There are signs of disillusionment among American aid officials here over the way the U.S. and Saigon governments are handling the Vietnam refugee problem.

Among the criticisms voiced are these:

Refugees are being "resettled" on land which is too poor to lead to economic self-sufficiency. In cases where forests are available, they are often denied to the refugees because (it is alleged) government officials can reap sizable profits by letting private contractors sell the timber.

The Saigon government, with U.S. support, is moving refugees to insecure areas in an effort to consolidate and expand its territorial control.

These were two of the main objections voiced by one of two former assistant relief and rehabilitation officers of the U.S. Agency for the International Development (AID), Edward L. Block, who recently resigned because of their misgivings over the handling of the refugee program. The other is Leon J. Van Wagoner. Both have considerable background and experience in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Block indicates there are others who share their criticism and have either quit or decided against another tour of duty here.

For the past five or six months, Mr. Block's job has been to work with the Saigon officials responsible for land development and for drawing up resettlement guidelines. His work has taken him on number of trips to the provinces.

Mr. Block described Dr. Phan Quang Dan, the Minister of State for Land Development and Hamlet Building, as a hard-working official. But he said that Dr. Dan had taken so much responsibility into his own hands that he could not possibly provide careful coordination and planning.

Dr. Dan had made an effort to cut down on the thousands of nonexistent refugees, called "ghost refugees," who had swollen the aid rolls. But much too little was done too late, said Mr. Block.

He said he was convinced that very high-level Vietnamese officials were profiting from the aid supposedly going to "ghost refugees."

LARGELY FUNDED BY UNITED STATES

The refugee relief and rehabilitation program is a big one, involving close to a million refugees. It is almost entirely U.S. funded.

But according to Mr. Block, U.S. officials refused to use the leverage which they possessed to bring significant changes in Saigon's handling of the refugee problem. Higher-level U.S. officials routinely suppressed critical reports coming from Americans working in the field, he said.

Mr. Block explained that he had not made known his views to U.S. aid investigators who questioned him about his resignation because he feared that they might distort what he had to say in their reports.

He believes that the channelling of American aid to refugees through private voluntary or international agencies would be more effective than continuing to pump it through AID and the Saigon government.

LABELED "AN INSULT"

In a recent letter to a staff member of the U.S. Senate subcommittee investigating refugee problems, Mr. Block described the U.S. aid-funded relief and rehabilitation program here as a "massive bonanza for the government of Vietnam, a disaster for the refugees, and an insult" to the American people.

"Many of the new refugees sites (even the highly praised Suoi Nghe project) are in danger of eventually collapsing or are already collapsing due to insufficient land and lack of required support from the government of Vietnam," wrote Mr. Block.

"We have come to discover in South Vietnam that if an area had good soil, plentiful water, and is safe, there is inevitably somebody farming or claiming it," Mr. Block said in his letter.

"If an area has poor soil, few water resources, and the government of Vietnam would like to make it a buffer zone, then the land is available for refugee resettlement," he said.

"Return-to-village and resettlement site-development projects are usually bogged down in 'administrative delays' while the 'administrators' decide on their own cut. . . . To make matters worse, controls over the expenditure of AID-provided funds are practically nonexistent, and this has led to inexcusable fiscal irresponsibility.

"AID-provided refugee relief funds are being spent for such unauthorized items as government of Vietnam social events, additional allowances to military dependents, the installation of telephones, land rentals, and even roofing for churches."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 12, 1974]

SAIGON RESETTLING 150,000 PEASANTS IN DEVASTATED QUANGTRI

(By Philip A. McCombs)

QUANGTRI.—More than a year after fleeing their homes, 150,000 peasants are returning to this bleak and devastated landscape 400 miles north of Saigon in an ambitious government resettlement project.

Most appear happy to have left the squalid refugee camps where they have been living, but some said the government had forced them to return home against their will.

They said they were frightened at moving in along an uneasy ceasefire line under the guns of a large Communist army that the Saigon government says could invade at any time.

Most are afraid of hitting unexploded bombs and grenades while recultivating their fields, and complain that government bull-

dozers that were supposed to clear the fields did not do a thorough job.

Many also complain that the government does not give them all the money and building materials they had been promised and they say they suspect that the aid has been embezzled.

Government officials say, however, that the return-to-village project here is going smoothly. They concede that a shortage of bulldozers, money and materials has made things difficult, but say that the resettlement is vastly superior to letting the refugees languish unproductively in camps at government expense.

They also concede that the return-to-village project, mosty funded by U.S. aid, like other refugee programs in this country, has been tainted by widespread official corruption.

But they said that guilty officials have been arrested, and American sources confirmed that administration of the program has been considerably cleaned up in recent months.

The government has come under strong attack in the past for resettling refugees in areas far from their original homes, a policy it still follows and defends on the ground that refugees cannot be returned to dangerous or insecure areas.

You can see the returnees by the thousands living in tin shacks sprawled along the highway as you drive to this northernmost city in South Vietnam.

The government-controlled area here—a 15 mile-wide strip between the mountains and the sea south of this city—still seems scarred and empty more than a year after the raging battles and massive B–52 airstrikes of the 1972 Communist spring offensive ravaged it.

Quangtri City itself, from which you can look across the cease-fire line marked by a river at the camps and waving flags of the Vietcong's Provisionary Revolution Government, still lies in ruins.

None of the refugees is returning to live in the city itself. Of the more than 300,000 persons who fled this province in 1972, about half will return to live in the countryside around Quangtri City and on the coastal strip to the south.

The rest, whose home areas the government no longer controls because the Communist occupy most of the province, will be resettled in other areas of South Vietnam, mostly in provinces near Saigon.

Eighty thousand refugees have returned here in the past eight months, and thousands more are coming all the time.

Nguyen Dac, 54, a stonemason working on a pagoda along the highway south of here, said all the people in his village were evacuated to camps in Danang in 1972.

"When we received the government order to return a few months ago," he said, "only two of the seven hamlets in the village wanted to return." He said the villagers were fearful of recent floods in the area and also because they knew their hamlets were located near the Communist zone.

Negotiations with the government lasted a month, said Dac, at the end of which "The government sent trucks and forced the people to get on them. The government cadres told the peolpe if they wanted to stay in the camps they would no longer provide food for them."

Actually, he said, people from only one hamlet could return to their original lands. Those from the other six hamlets had to move down the road a way since their old area is now held by the Communists.

Mrs. Nguyen Thi Ngon, who was also working on the pagoda, told a different story. "Almost all the people in my village wanted to go back home," she said, "and when they received the order they all went happily." She said this was because her village is not located near the Communist lines.

But there was another problem, one that Dac's village did not suffer. "There are 333 families in my village," said Mrs. Ngon, "but only 200 of them received corrugated steel sheets and lumber to reconstruct their houses."

Northeast of Quangtri, on a rutted dirt road that later becomes the "Street Without Joy" of French times, a big red banner over the road says, "Welcome to the People Who Are Returning to their Native Villages."

The other side of the banner has another sign: "We Accuse the Vietcong of Violating the Cease-Fire and Destroying Peace."

A short distance beyond this is a small school made of grass, where scores of children flocked around me crying out, Mr. American, Mr. American."

The area is considered the most dangerous for resettlement, and a school teacher was asked what plans there are to save the children in the event of an attack.

"If there's an attack," he said, "we'll ask the children to hide temporarily in a bunker, and then their fathers and mothers will come to pick them up immediately because their homes are situated nearby."

The teacher said that the cease-fire line is located less than a mile to the northwest of the school across flat land, and one could only wonder if there would be sufficient time for the parents to get away safely with their children.

Ngoxadong hamlet is located about a mile beyond the school, and there the Nguyen Chon Chau family invited me into their small house for tea.

"I'd leave here if I could," said Chau, 50. "If I had money and could live somewhere else I'd get out of my native village immediately."

His wife, Nguyen Thi Thiu, 52, held her two-year-old granddaughter in her arms and said, "I am constantly afraid of an attack, night and day. All the children would be killed and wounded."

She also said, "The government let us come back here, so if an attack occurs and the people are all killed, then the government will be responsible."

Her husband said the family had been happy to return, but Thiu disagreed with this, saying, "Because the government ordered us back, we had to come back. If we did not obey, we would not have received any more relief food."

Chau said that he had received a rice allowance and some tin roofing and lumber from the government, but was still waiting for the cash grant amounting to $60 that had been promised him.

The family said they remembered seeing U.S. fighter planes destroy their home and hamlet as they watched from a distance. That was in 1972. They said they felt no anger at the U.S. because as Chau said, "The Vietcong had moved in and occupied the hamlet."

They remembered the Communist tanks that moved down the dirt road in front of the house at 8 a.m. one morning, and the infantry that accompanied the tanks.

"Will they attack again?" asked Chau.

"I don't know," I said, "but if they do you had better run fast."

"Which way?" asked Thiu.

[From The Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1974]

(By Philip A. McCombs)

QUANGTRI; AN EERIE SILENCE

QUANGTRI.—The northermost city in South Vietnam, Quangtri remains nothing but rubble more than a year after it was destroyed in the Communist spring offensive of 1972.

Unlike the situation in the populous plains around Saigon, where fighting continues daily, there seems to be a real cease-fire here.

An eerie silence hangs over the area. You can look northwest a few hundred yards across the Thachhan River at a Communist encampment with its large blue, red and gold flag atop a tall pole.

Trucks and jeeps can be seen moving on the Communist side of the river. Five or six persons stand on a boat loading there, in line, their hands behind their backs, as if waiting for someone from this side to come over.

Then they turn and leave. Whoever they are, they are on their own land now, their own country, 20 miles south of the old Demilitarized Zone.

You drive up here across a beautiful, lonely shattered landscape. A cold wind howls over the scrubby piedmont. Majestic mountains rise to the west, and the land slopes away eastward to the white sand beaches of the South China Sea.

Refugees are everywhere, having returned here to begin again. They live in tin shacks that line the roads.

This entire area was devastated by shelling from both sides and by American B–52s. Even now there are vast quantities of rubble, shell casings, and destroyed, rusted vehicles full of bullet holes beside the highway.

Children rummage in the litter, collecting the round, heavy cardboard containers that once held artillery shells.

They haul the containers to their tin shacks where the containers are stacked and then burned like firewood, a new kind of natural resource in seemingly endless supply.

There is a seven-mile stretch of Route 1 south of here that the peasants have named "Street of Terror," in memory of the thousands of soldiers and civilians who died there in 1972.

The stretch of road lies not far west of the road that the French called the "Street Without Joy" because of the death and horror there almost two decades ago.

A lovely new pagoda is under construction along the Street of Terror to memorialize those who died. On a pillar in front of the pagoda, red lettering chipped into concrete proclaims:

"In the new year of 1972 this province suffered a war and was destroyed. In the spring, the grass and the land suffered a typhoon of war . . . The people fell down and died here. Innocent women lost their legs. Even small children who were born only a few days earlier died in their bamboo baskets."

Everyone, the memorial goes on to say, lost someone.

The South Vietnamese soldier who is aiming his .45 semiautomatic Colt pistol at my head is drunk. But his hand is steady, his arm stiff and straight.

I am very polite, and exceedingly apologetic for having rolled through his checkpoint without having come to a full stop.

He relents and lowers the pistol after a few moments. I drive on, carefully. No other checkpoint had required such a stop.

In the flatlands around Saigon and in the Mekong Delta, one fears mainly that a stray Vietcong will forget the neutrality of newsmen. Here in the far north, where there are few Vietcong among the sparse population, one fears mainly the South Vietnamese army.

The soldiers often menace approaching vehicles with their weapons when they want rides. Since there are scores of them who want rides on any given stretch of highway, this becomes a problem.

You can either pick up a carload and thereafter plead that there is no more room, or cross your fingers and ignore them.

The Americans have gone, but there are traces of them everywhere.

The sheets and blankets in the hotels in Danang and Hue, for example, are official military issue for the most part and bear the "U.S." imprints.

The maps in various South Vietnamese military headquarters bear the old Ameri-

can names for places as well as new Vietnamese names.

The 101st Airborne Division's famous fire support base Bastogne 15 miles southwest of Hue, for example, has now been renamed Phuxuan by the South Vietnamese who occupy it.

Landing Zone Jane, Landing Zone Stud . . . Checkmate . . . Anzio . . . Betty . . . Sharon Arsenal—these have also received Vietnamese names.

But a Vietnamese captain said that most government soldiers still use the old American names.

"If you ask the soldiers where they are stationed, they will say Bastogne," he said.

For some reason a U.S. Cobra helicopter gunship that was shot down in a field just northeast of here in government-controlled territory in 1972 has been left where it fell.

It appears to be in fairly good condition, and is startling in appearance because of a large red mouth with white fangs that the Americans painted on the front to make it look fearsome. The paint still seems harsh and bright.

Theories differ on why it is there. Some say it was left in memory of its pilot, one of the last Americans to die in Vietnam.

Others say the rockets in its pods are still active and it is too dangerous to remove it.

Whatever the reason, it remains a horrible, grinning monument to the war that ravaged this land.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 14, 1974]

SOME TRACTS IN VIETNAM REVERT TO OLD LANDLORDS

(By David K. Shipler)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, January 13.—The Government has begun to slip back after having reached the brink of success in dissolving large land holdings, distributing them to poor tenant farmers and thus eliminating one of the Vietcong's most potent political issues.

Here and there in secure areas around the country, Vietnamese plantation owners are coming back to reclaim land they abandoned because of the war. Some local officials are demanding that peasants relinquish land titles they were given just a few years ago.

The recent developments have partly eroded what had been one of the most ambitious land-reform programs in Asia, financed largely by American aid and undertaken in 1970 as a frankly political effort to woo peasants from allegiance to the Vietcong.

In its three and a half years the program has clearly diminished grievances over land ownership by transferring 2.5 million acres to farmers, relieving them of onerous rents that frequently ran to a third of the crop or more.

The main target of the reform and the main area of its success was the rice-rich Meong Delta, where tenancy has been virtually eliminated. The current backsliding—affecting provinces adjacent to Saigon and parts of the Central Highlands—does not yet appear to have revived the land issue for the Communists, but some legislators and Government officials are worried that it will.

"It has been one of the most important strategic national policies in this nation's struggle, but now a reverse process seems to be taking place," declared Vu Cong Minh, a member of the National Assembly's Agriculture Committee.

"Thousands of farmers are still tenants and others who have got their land titles under the Government's Land to the Tiller program are again becoming tenants," he said in an interview. "Former landowners and corrupt officials are trying by all means to steal away their land. The situation is becoming quite serious. National policies are being undermined. The process must be stopped."

His views are shared by other legislators on the committee, one of whom said in exasperation, "The land-reform situation is now in a complete mess!"

Fifteen miles northeast of Saigon, in the village of Binh An, a young farmer named Lan walked slowly among his banana trees and pea plants and pig pens, perhaps for almost the last time.

FINALLY SETTLED ON 5 ACRES

He had come from North Vietnam as a boy, when the Communists defeated the French in 1954. After years of moving from place to place, he and his parents and brothers and sisters finally found these five acres to rent, and in 1968 they began farming. Three years ago, under the land-reform program, the family was awarded title.

Then late in October, Mr. Lan recalls, three Vietnamese, all speaking French, appeared in the village. They showed a paper identifying them as representatives of a French planter, André Farinol.

"They said that the French had set up an embassy here," Mr. Lan reported. "They said they do not care if there are now Vietnamese or Americans living on this land. The French are coming back, so Mr. Farinol is reclaiming his land."

Less than a month later Mr. Lan and hundreds of farmers in Binh An and nearby villages received pieces of brown paper on which were printed formal notices from the village committees:

"It is kindly requested that you come to the office of Binh An village at 8 A.M., Nov. 24, for withdrawal of your land title. Do not forget to bring your land title with you. Absence is not permitted."

Convinced that village officials were merely acting on behalf of former landlords, the farmers appeared but refused to relinquish their titles. That is where the matter stands.

"If the land is taken, we would have to move out again and find some other piece of land, but it would be very hard—we have put our money here," said Mr. Lan, who was afraid to allow his full name to be used. "Right now we are very fearful."

According to sources in the central Government, such efforts by local authorities to retake land have been made in various parts of the country, most seriously in the provinces of Bien Hoa, Long Khanh and Gia Dinh, which are near Saigon.

The officials say that one device being employed is an old so-called urbanization program originally designed to take land for the development of industry, housing and other projects.

A knowledgeable official reported that even though the Government had virtually no money for such development, some farmland was being designated for urbanization—including a third of Bien Hoa Province—with the result that titles were being withdrawn and restored to former landlords, who either charge the farmers rent or throw them off the land.

Asked about this, Bui Huu Tiem, Director General of Land Reform, replied: "We must respect the law and we must also respect the interests of the landowners. Now, a landowner comes back and says, 'My land is within the urbanization program. You have wrongly distributed it. Now you must give it back to me.' So we have to give it back to them. Of course, in most cases these farmers can stay on and continue to till the land, provided they pay some rent to the landowners."

SIGNIFICANT GAIN REPORTED

Even with these difficulties, the current land-reform effort has achieved a more significant shift of ownership patterns than any previous Government attempt.

For years the Vietcong, and the Vietminh before them, had made land reform a central theme of their revolution. "Cadres were instructed to turn every issue into land terms," Douglas Pike wrote in his book, "Viet Cong."

In the early nineteen-sixties Vietcong land reform meant assassinating some landowners and driving others from their villages. Tenants were ordered not to leave the villages to pay rents. Landlords or agents who came to collect were killed, according to Robert L. Sansom in his study, "The Economics of Insurgency in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam."

The South Vietnamese Government responded by arresting farmers who had accepted land titles from the Vietcong, Mr. Sansom reported. In fact, he added, the Government so strongly identified with landlord interests that the village tax-collecting mechanism became a first step to the Government's assumption of a rent-collection role on behalf of absentee landlords. In many cases the Government itself served as landlord.

Though the late President Ngo Dinh Diem initiated a land-reform program in 1956, it remained weak and ineffective well into the sixties, partly because the Americans were uninterested.

LAND ISSUE SLIGHTED

Even as the United States slid deeply into the war, "United States officials did not believe that land-based grievances were important," Mr. Sansom wrote.

A 1967 report for the United States Government by the Rand Corporation concluded: "From the point of view of Government control, the ideal province in South Vietnam would be one in which few peasants farm their own land, the distribution of landholdings is unequal, no land redistribution has taken place, large French holdings existed in the past."

By 1970 the American view had changed and so had that of the Government. The new Land to the Tiller program required the award of title, free of charge, to any farmer who was tilling land and paying rent. Some land was exempt, including property owned by religious sects and up to 12.5 acres of an individual landlord's land for a cemetery or for ancestor worship. Each farmer received up to 7.5 acres and each landlord could keep no more than 37 acres to farm himself or with wage labor.

POCKETS OF CORRUPTION

Landlords were compensated by the Government at a rate of 2.5 times the value of a year's crop, with 20 per cent in cash and the rest in Government bonds. Officials estimate that the program will cost $400-million.

Despite its sweeping nature, the program has left pockets of exploitation and corruption. Some officials report that a number of landlords distributed land among members of their families and obtained the compensation, but continued to benefit from the crops.

In other cases tenant farmers simply continue to pay exorbitant rents, either because they have not heard about the program or because they are unwilling to change traditional relationships with landlords.

Mrs. Pham Thi Ut has five children, and she cannot feed them all on the rice she has left after paying nearly a third of her crop in rent for the land she farms in Dong Hoa, 12 miles northeast of Saigon.

Why did she never try to get the land title? "I never thought of it," she said. "I have known the family for so long. They are very rich. They do not have to till the land themselves. They own a car and a shop and do business in town. I just feel uneasy about acquiring their land."

In the nearby village of Hoa An, 60-year-old Bui Van Bay is farming a patch of a rubber plantation, but the owner plans to replant rubber trees next year.

"I heard about Land to the Tiller," he said. "I did not like to get land from other people

that way so I did not fill out any paper, so I still do not have any land and I do not know what will happen next when the rubber trees are replanted.

"Of course, I certainly regretted not having asked for some land before," he added, "but I still feel it would not have been honest to get land from other people."

The program's exemption of sect-owned land has been criticized since both the Roman Catholics and the Buddhists have considerable holdings.

Vo Van Tieu of Dong Hoa, who has tilled pagoda-owned land for a decade, says he would have enough rice to feed his three children and 17 grandchildren if he did not have to pay a third of his crop to the head monk.

But Mr. Tieu is not resentful. "It is for the pagoda," he explained, "so it is for the purchase of incense and the cult of Buddha, so I feel it is like a service to Buddha."

Mao Tse-tung: "The first part of our struggle was a peasant revolt. The aim was to free the farmer from his overlord, to win not freedom of speech, voting or assembly, but the freedom to survive."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 23, 1973]

"LET US GO HOME," VIET VILLAGERS ASK

(By Thomas W. Lippman)

THANTHUY, SOUTH VIETNAM.—As if on cue, the inhabitants of Thanthuy's moldering shanties come out to plead with their unexpected visitors: We are hungry. This land is poor. We want to go back to our village. Please ask the government to let us go home.

If this is not the bleakest, poorest village in South Vietnam, it must be close to it. The 2,267 people live in tin and plywood huts clustered on a treeless sandspit, unrelieved by greenery or commercial enterprise. There is no school, pagoda or market, but there is a barbed-wire enclosed compound.

TV's, bicycles, soft-drink stands, radios and photographs of President Thieu that have proliferated elsewhere are not to be seen. The villagers bear the scarred, unsmiling faces and tattered clothes of the downtrodden. The commercial bustle of Danang, less than 10 miles to the north, seems as remote as the moon, and Thanthuy's residents can only go there with special permission, anyway.

Thanthuy was once a prosperous village, the inhabitants say, with houses of brick and tile and fruit trees sprouting from the fertile soil. But that was four years ago and two thirds of a mile away toward the seacoast, where the village used to be until the Americans burned it down and the South Vietnamese government forced the villagers to move.

They have not been allowed to return, because the government wants them near the road where they can be kept under control. So they stay where they are, surviving under an all-night curfew.

"The authorities have told us many times that we can go home in the near future," said a gnarled old farmer, "but the near future doesn't come." His daughter, shifting on her seat to conceal a crude wooden substitute for her own foot, said nothing. She lost the foot in a mine explosion a month after the cease-fire.

As the old man spoke, the steady rumble of artillery fire could be heard in the background. Thanthuy is one of the uncountable places in South Vietnam where it looks as if it will be a long war.

"These people all have relatives in the Vietcong, so the government has no confidence in them," said Maj. Doan Phuoc Hue, the chief of Dien Ban district, which includes Thanthuy. "That is one of four villages where we have to have special security measures. We have to arrest people from time to time because we suspect they are providing food to the enemy."

On the pacification charts, this is listed as a village that the government controls, but it is the kind of control that jailers have over prisoners, as local officials admit, and not altogether effective. The village chief was not available to be interviewed because he was in Danang to be treated for wounds suffered in a recent skirmish, and troops from the militia outpost were repairing a road intersection that had been mined the night before.

Thanthuy is in Quangnam Province, about a mile south of the former U.S. base at Marble Mountain, on the southern outskirts of Danang, and about 2.5 miles in from the South China sea. This part of Vietnam has been under Communist influence, if not domination, for more than 20 years, and some of the bitterest battles fought by American troops involved the attempt to control the insurgency in southern Quangnam.

The residents of the village say the Vietcong took it in 1966 and held it for three years, although government officials say it was never officially acknowledged to be Communist-controlled.

Because of its location, it posed a threat both to Marble Mountain and to the Danang province capital of Hoian a few miles south. So in 1969, after combined air and ground attack, the Americans and South Vietnamese cleared the village, burned the houses, and herded the villagers westward, across the dunes, to a resettlement site near the Danang-Hoian road.

"I don't know where the Vietcong are now," said a 60-year-old farmer. "But we cannot go back because the government won't let us. I have enough land here to grow rice."

"They said we were spread out too thinly for security," another man said.

The Marble Mountain base, which was protected while Thanthuy was burned, is deserted, the last of the G.I. signs fading in the rain. And the direct road from Danang to Hoian is still usable only by military vehicles traveling in convoy. If the destruction of the village achieved anything beyond the embitterment of its people, there is no sign of it.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Dec. 12, 1973]

REFUGEE MASSES RETURNING TO QUANGTRI

(By Matthew J. Seiden)

QUANGTRI, SOUTH VIETNAM.—In the biggest resettlement project in the history of the Vietnam war, hundreds of thousands of refugees are being moved back into this flat—and dangerous—landscape of sand dunes, barbed wire and rubble.

Leaving the squalid refugee camps of Danang, nearly 80,000 persons have already returned to the ruins of their villages within a few miles of the front lines in this northernmost border province.

The rest are being settled on new sites in this and other provinces, since their original villages remained in Communist control after the furious fighting that leveled Quangtri city last year.

The battle for Quangtri drove at least 300,000—and according to some estimates as many as 600,000 persons—from the province last year.

To get these people out of the government refugee camps and the makeshift slums of Danang and Hue, the United States has funded a controversial $2 million resettlement plan administered by the South Vietnamese government.

Critics of the plan say the refugees are being sent back into this dangerous border province for military and economic, rather than humanitarian, purposes.

According to these critics, the refugees, who are armed and trained as "local defense forces," are sent home at great risk, to strengthen the government's control of otherwise "insecure" areas.

In addition, the critics point out that after the first six months, resettled refugees are usually no longer eligible for food rations that cost the government millions of dollars in the temporary refugee camps.

While government supporters do not deny the military and economic advantages of the resettlement project, they insist that humanitarian motives come first.

To the people who are taking the risk, the move home is an occasion for both great joy and fear.

"We are afraid of being so close to the front line, and we are afraid of digging up old explosives in our fields," one old man said. "But it is good to be home again."

Although there have been no reported military incidents, at least 3 persons have been killed and 20 wounded by explosives left buried in the rubble after last year's fighting.

According to Americans who work closely with the project, the success of the 24 resettled hamlets varies widely from place to place.

Where the land was good, the destruction light and enough men survived to do the heavy work, the villagers hope soon to be self-sufficient again.

But some of the hamlets, especially those hit hardest by recent floods, required an extension of the six-month free rice supply to avert starvation and collapse.

Taken all together, the picture painted by these articles shows that Thieu is taking funds earmarked for humanitarian objectives and using them to keep himself in office. And so I ask: To whom have we made a commitment in Vietnam? Is it to Thieu and the repressive and corrupt administration he fronts? Or is it instead to the citizens of Vietnam, the real victims of over three decades of war and unrest?

Did we spend billions of our tax dollars, did we lose 50,000 American lives for this? I hope not.

Mr. Chairman, despite President Nixon's empty rhetoric, there is no "peace" in Vietnam, and there is certainly no "honor" for America if we continue to pour resources and men into a futile effort to prop up Thieu and his friends. We must give serious consideration to how our tax dollars are being spent in Vietnam. Today, we may only be talking about a relatively small amount of some $49 million, but remember that Thieu's buddy, American Ambassador Martin, has already said that he thinks that Thieu needs "a large infusion of American aid over the next 2 years" and Martin has specifically mentioned a total of $850 million.

Yet, of the State Department requests for aid to Thieu, only about $70 million has been asked for humanitarian assistance. Where, then, will the remaining $780 million go? It is not clear to me and, therefore, I assume that it will be used to keep Thieu in power—and that is all.

Finally, I would like to refer to an article I have here from the Saigon Post of March 9 describing a new economic assistance commitment to Thieu from the Japanese Government.

I find this to be an interesting situation, because on one hand the committee report justifying this increase in supplemental aid imparts a sense of urgency in the need for these funds and an indication that only this Nation's urgent help can keep the refugee programs going. Yet, at the same time, Thieu has been negotiating for at least 8 months for substantial Japanese assistance in this same area. And so I wonder if the mem-

bers of the committee knew of these negotiations, and if we would be making this so-called urgent appropriation if they had known that these funds were forthcoming from Japan.

Mr. Chairman, the American people cannot afford to support Thieu and his corrupt, repressive regime. It is time we gave serious consideration to the assistance commitments we have given—and will be asked to give in the future—with Saigon, and that we in Congress begin to realize that such commitments are not in the best interests of peace or of the people of Vietnam.

The article follows:

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS: JAPAN AID ACCORD SET FOR SIGNING

(By Le Lien)

The US$50 million aid pledged by Japan to the RVN will be made available immediately after the signing of an agreement scheduled to take place here within this month by Foreign Minister Vuong Van Bac and the Japanese Ambassador to Saigon, it was learned Thursday.

The US$50 million aid broken down into 30 million as loan proper and 20 million as humanitarian aid, was approved by the Japanese Diet last year following a meeting between Japanese Prime Minister Tanaka and President Nixon who proposed that Japan assume the role of leading contributor to post-war rehabilitation and development in the whole Indochina.

The US$20 million gift is contingent on the obligation by the RVN government to buy building equipment and farm machines and tools from Japan for war refugees. The US$30 million loan will enable this country to buy whatever it wants but only from Japan. The loan calls for an interest rate of 2.75 per cent per annum and a term of 30 years with a 10-year period of grace.

The credit was negotiated in eight months with the RVN government bargaining for more favorable terms.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, in the section of this supplemental relating to the Department of Defense, there is an item providing an additional $116,147,000 for the operation and maintenance of the Army. Some of this increase is due to the increase in fuel costs. In the committee report, on page 22, there is reference to the committee's concern that the Department of the Army may have overstated its need for fuel. From the committee report, it sounds like the Army may have been trying to hoard fuel. I hope the committee will continue to urge the Army—and the other services—to save fuel. I hope that the committee will be able to provide estimates on the amount of fuel which will be used in fiscal year 1975 as compared to fiscal year 1974 or 1973.

I am particularly worried about the unnecessary use of fuel by the Army Reserves in northern Ohio. Recently, the Reserve units in Ohio were switched from 1st Army Command at Fort Meade to 5th Army Command out of Texas. As a result, the units will now be training in camps in the West instead of the East. The result could be an enormous increase in the amount of fuel used by some Ohio units. I have called this situation to the attention of the Army. The unit involved was the 428th Supply and Service Co. Last year it went to a camp in upstate New York. This summer it is going to a camp in upstate Wisconsin—several hundred miles further. As a result, the unit was originally assigned nearly twice the amount of fuel it used last year. When I pointed this out to the Army, they apparently made some changes. By reducing the number of vehicles which this company will take to camp from 44 to 31, the company will cut down on the amount of gasoline used and actually use less than last year. Assuming that this does not result in a significant cut in the unit's effectiveness, the Army is to be commended for this action.

However, there are other units that are in the same situation. For example, the 682d Heavy Equipment Maintenance Co. will be making the same switch. I have not received any comments from the Army on whether a way will be found to save on the amount of fuel used by this unit.

I am concerned that there may be a large number of other units using additional fuel. I asked the Army whether the Reserves would be using more or less fuel in 1974 than in 1973. They told me that they planned a 10-percent fuel savings. But when I asked how much fuel was used by the Reserves in 1973, no one could tell me. If the Army has no total record on 1973 fuel usage—how will they be able to tell if they really are saving fuel?

I hope the committee will provide oversight to insure that the maximum fuel efficiency is obtained.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, while I support H.R. 14013, the fiscal 1974 supplemental appropriations measure, I have some reservations about the section of this bill that provides $49 million in aid to the South Vietnamese Government, to finance, according to the committee report, "commodity imports," and for use in other "humanitarian programs" including refugee relief assistance.

I am concerned that a portion of these funds might be diverted to other uses which I would consider unacceptable—for example, support of the prison system or police operations of the Thieu government. Because there is no prohibition in this legislation specifically preventing the expenditure of a portion of the $49 million for such purposes, I urge my colleagues, for purposes of clarification of legislative intent, to record their views that none of the moneys contained in this bill are to be used to finance the prison-related or police-related activities of the Thieu regime.

A more serious problem—and one which I strongly urge my colleagues to consider as we debate H.R. 14013, concerns the nature of the "refugee relief" programs for which funds appropriated by this bill are to be used. Considerable evidence has emerged to indicate that very few benefits from these U.S.-financed programs actually reach the people for whom we intend aid. There is substantial evidence of corruption and mismanagement of these programs all down the line of Vietnamese officials involved. Two programs particularly suspect are those labeled "Return to Village" and "Resettlement."

Both programs are intended to help victims of bombed-out and destroyed villages by offering relocation facilities and temporary shelters as well as special food distribution programs and assorted services. In actuality, the facilities created by these programs are little more than government-run concentration camps where entry and exit are controlled by armed guards. Villagers are not free to leave at will, and necessary functions—such as crop growing—are next to impossible. There have been reports of people nearly starving in the camps for lack of arable land, while government officials take what relief food managed to make its way through the levels of corruption into the barbed-wire compound.

These activities, I note, suggest violations of article 11 of the Peace Accords, which guarantee refugees "freedom of movement, freedom of residence, and freedom of work."

Two American AID officials recently resigned in protest to the way in which the United States and Saigon governments are handling the refugee problem. As indicated in an article by Daniel Southerland that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor in December, the text of which I request be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, the Saigon government is deliberately resettling refugees into areas too poor to lead to economic self-sufficiency, and is using refugees as political pawns in an effort to consolidate and expand its control over territories "insecure" or disputed. These refugee programs are almost entirely funded by U.S. taxpayers. In the words of one of the former AID officials, the programs are "a massive bonanza for the Government of Vietnam, a disaster for the refugees, and an insult" to the American people.

Senator KENNEDY'S Subcommittee on Refugees of the Senate Judiciary Committee has also turned up disturbing evidence of corruption in the refugee program and its failure to be of any real benefit to the refugees. A subcommittee "Study Mission Report," entitled, "Relief and Rehabilitation of War Victims in Indochina: 1 Year After the Cease-Fire," released on January 1, 1974, contained memoranda from AID officials in Vietnam sharply critical of the refugee program. One such AID memorandum, dated July 9, 1973, contained the following:

Although the Tu Chung hamlet population has been reported RTV'd for two months (and have not been receiving in-camp food distribution for this period) very little has been accomplished this far to develop a viable village. Only temporary shacks have been constructed and most people are not living in them. One or two wells have been dug but other than this no infrastructure development . . . is even in sight.

The same AID memorandum said of the Duc Luong village:

According to U.S. advisors, the Duc Luong people have been given no land . . . and are required to pay rent on land occupied for their living area. However, the district chief informed us this is only a temporary holding area where people are being placed until a proper resettlement can be found. He has a few locations in mind, but has not definitely decided where to put them. In the meantime the Duc Luong people have not received any allowances . . . He has received funds

to pay their resettlement allowances, but is awaiting a final decision . . .

Of the Binh Duc village in the Binh Son district:

The people from Chau Binh and Phu Quy hamlets were not allowed to return to their original hamlets because of insecurity. They have been placed in Chau Thuan hamlet which, in a number of cases, is a considerable distance from their fields.

Another memorandum from U.S. AID officials, dealing with the "Return to Village"—RTV—program, surveys the results in Pleiku Province in October of 1973. The memorandum, dated October 31, 1973, reads in part:

The ARVN troopers in Plei M'Rong area apparently went plundering again. The recently returned Plei Towanly villagers . . . allegedly lost half their anticipated rice crop to the ARVN soldiers and their dependents. The people complained the soldiers of a yet unspecified mechanized and artillery unit with some dependents helped themselves in harvesting the rice crop despite pleas from the people. It was further alleged the soldiers held the people, who complained, at bay with the use of tear-gas grenades and threats of booby traps. . . .

From the evidence of these memorandums, it appears that the refugee programs are near-total shambles. The refugees are being herded around, because the Saigon government wants to establish control over one area or another. Sometimes the peasants are allowed to return to their villages, only to find that the fields have not been cleared of mines and booby traps, and that such assistance is not forthcoming from the Saigon government. Other refugees have found that even after planting their crops—as in the case above—ARVN troops loot the harvest, allegedly to prevent its falling prey to the PRG.

I believe that the United States has a responsibility to the refugees and other victims of the Indochina war. I am not convinced, however, that the current programs are a satisfactory response to these obligations. It seems to me, on the basis of evidence such as that I have offered on this occasion, that the Congress should initiate a full-scale, broadly based investigation of the refugee programs, and the use of American funds which are intended to be of assistance to refugees, but more often than not, it seems, are not. We as Members of Congress should not allow the continuing, and tragic, scandal of U.S.-financed "refugee programs" to continue without far closer supervision and substantial reform.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 24, 1973]

UNITED STATES-SAIGON REFUGEE PROGRAM CRITICIZED

(By Daniel Southerland)

There are signs of disillusionment among American AID officials here over the way the U.S. and Saigon governments are handling the Vietnam refugee problem.

Among the criticisms voiced are these:

Refugees are being "resettled" on land which is too poor to lead to economic self-sufficiency. In cases where forests are available, they are often denied to the refugees because (it is alleged) government officials can reap sizable profits by letting private contractors sell the timber.

The Saigon government, with U.S. support, is moving refugees to insecure areas in an effort to consolidate and expand its territorial control.

These were two of the main objections voiced by one of two former assistant relief and rehabilitation officers of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID), Edward L. Block, who recently resigned because of their misgivings over the handling of the refugee program. The other is Leon J. Van Wagoner. Both have considerable background and experience in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Block indicates there are others who share their criticism and have either quit or decided against another tour of duty here.

For the past five or six months, Mr. Block's job has been to work with the Saigon officials responsible for land development and for drawing up resettlement guidelines. His work has taken him on a number of trips to the provinces.

Mr. Block described Dr. Phan Quang Dan, the Minister of State for Land Development and Hamlet Building, as a hard-working official. But he said that Dr. Dan had taken so much responsibility into his own hands that he could not possibly provide careful coordination and planning.

Dr. Dan had made an effort to cut down on the thousands of nonexistent refugees, called "ghost refugees," who had swollen the AID rolls. But much too little was done too late, said Mr. Block.

He said he was convinced that very high-level Vietnamese officials were profiting from the aid supposedly going to "ghost refugees."

LARGELY FUNDED BY UNITED STATES

The refugee relief and rehabilitation program is a big one, involving close to a million refugees. It is almost entirely U.S. funded.

But according to Mr. Block, U.S. officials refused to use the leverage which they possessed to bring significant changes in Saigon's handling of the refugee problem. Higher-level U.S. officials routinely suppressed critical reports coming from Americans working in the field, he said.

Mr. Block explained that he had not made known his views to U.S. AID investigators who questioned him about his resignation because he feared that they might distort what he had to say in their reports.

He believes that the channelling of American aid to refugees through private voluntary or international agencies would be more effective than continuing to pump it through AID and the Saigon government.

LABELED "AN INSULT"

In a recent letter to a staff member of the U.S. Senate subcommittee investigating refugee problems, Mr. Block described the U.S. AID-funded relief and rehabilitation program here as a "massive bonanza for the government of Vietnam, a disaster for the refugees, and an insult" to the American people.

"Many of the new refugees sites (even the highly praised Suoi Nghe project) are in danger of eventually collapsing or are already collapsing due to insufficient land and lack of required support from the government of Vietnam," wrote Mr. Block.

"We have come to discover in South Vietnam that if an area had good soil, plentiful water, and is safe, there is inevitably somebody farming or claiming it," Mr. Block said in his letter.

"If an area has poor soil, few water resources, and the government of Vietnam would like to make it a buffer zone, then the land is available for refugee resettlement," he said.

"Return-to-village and resettlement site-development projects are usually bogged down in 'administrative delays' while the 'administrators' decide on their own cut. . . . To make matters worse, controls over the expenditure of AID-provided funds are practically nonexistent, and this has led to inexcusable fiscal irresponsibility.

"AID-provided refugee relief funds are being spent for such unauthorized items as government of Vietnam social events, additional allowances to military dependents, the installation of telephones, land rentals, and roofing for churches."

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words on page 9, line 6, of H.R. 14013.

In my opinion, it is extremely important that we realize just who and what we are aiding if we vote to give $49 million in supplemental economic aid to South Vietnam.

This aid is earmarked for war refugees. But there is mounting evidence that the aid is not reaching the refugees. According to many accounts, a huge portion, perhaps even the major portion of our aid to refugees goes into the already well-lined pockets of corrupt military and civilian officials of the Thieu regime.

Where aid does reach the refugees, it is often meager and the "villages" and "resettlements" appear to be very thinly disguised concentration camps. The village chief of at least one camp at Cam Thanh in Quang Nam province has reportedly admitted quite openly that the reasons for setting up his camp were more military and strategic, than humanitarian.

As we consider further aid to Vietnamese war refugees, both in fiscal year 1974 supplemental appropriations and in the upcoming fiscal year 1975 budget, I feel it is incumbent on the House to inspect very closely how that aid money is being used, and to take whatever action is necessary to be certain that American tax dollars are actually helping to heal the wounds of war in Vietnam—not to dig them deeper.

I submit for my colleagues' consideration the following eyewitness testimony regarding the misuse of refugee aid by the Thieu regime:

TESTIMONY OF DIANE M. JONES ON BEHALF OF THE FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS ON SOUTH VIETNAM ECONOMIC AID, MARCH 28, 1974

My name is Diane M. Jones. I am testifying today on behalf of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, whose policies are made by Friends appointed from twenty-two Friends' Yearly Meetings and ten other Friends' organizations, but which does not purport to speak for all Friends.

I wish to thank the Subcommittee for this opportunity to share my experiences and views as you consider the Administration's request for supplemental funds of $54 million for economic aid to South Vietnam for fiscal year 1974.

Along with my husband, Michael Jones, I have spent 2½ years in South Vietnam, serving as Saigon representative for the American Friends Service Committee, associated with the Quaker rehabilitation project in Quang Ngai in central Vietnam. We have lived in Vietnam for two periods: first, from August 1970 through October 1972, and more recently from October 1973 until early February 1974. While in Vietnam I learned to speak Vietnamese, which I believe helped me immensely in understanding the people and the extremely complex situation there.

As a result of my experiences in Vietnam, in particular my most recent post-"ceasefire" experience, I wish to testify to this committee against an increase or even a continued high level of American economic aid to the Saigon government.

The principle of substantial economic aid for South Vietnam is supported by many well-intentioned Americans as a way of helping to repair a society which has suffered the ravages of twenty-five years of bloody warfare. However, my own observations and my conversations with Vietnamese people during my recent visit have led me to conclude that, for the most part, American aid is not humanitarian, that it does not reach the people, and furthermore that no economic aid administered solely through the government in Saigon can have the effect of healing the wounds of war in Vietnam.

Today I will limit my remarks solely to the largest portion of aid that USAID labels as strictly "humanitarian," namely, aid to refugees. I will attempt to relate to the subcommittee only my direct personal experiences in this regard.

The American-supported program for refugees in South Vietnam now has basically two major components, both aimed at removing refugees from refugee camps: (1) moving them back to their home areas, under the "Return to Village" program, and (2) moving them to new areas under the "Resettlement" program. Last December and January I was able to visit a number of both "Return to Village" and "Resettlement" sites in a number of provinces.

"'Return to Village." The conditions I found in the Return to Village camps I visited were appalling. In the first place, despite the name, these camps looked nothing like villages, but like concentration camps, some of them totally surrounded by barbed wire or bamboo stake fences, with tall military watchtowers on the perimeters. In camps in Quang Tri, Quang Nam, and Quang Ngai provinces, I learned that people were not allowed beyond the camp boundaries, except during certain hours of the day, for example, between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. The inhabitants of these camps had to register with camp officials when they left and when they returned.

In Xuyen Phuoc camp in Quang Nam province, I talked extensively with a government official, who told me his job was political control of the population. This official was a member of the "Rural Development" Corps, which is also an American-funded and -advised program. He showed me stacks of pictures, one picture of each family in the camp, posing in front of an anti-communist slogan and a portrait of President Thieu. He said that he had to check daily each family against their family portrait to see if anyone had entered or left the camp without registering with the camp officials. He told me that any resident who desired to move away from the camp must have written permission from the camp authorities and must report again to the local police upon reaching his or her destination. If anyone disappeared without asking permission, he said, the person's family could be arrested.

The political control in the Return to Village camps I visited has a strong impact on living standards. Because inhabitants were allowed outside the camp only between fixed hours of the day, because in some cases they had to walk a long way to reach their farm land, or in other cases had no farm land available to them, they could not support themselves adequately. For example, at Cam Thanh Return to Village camp in Quang Nam province, villagers told me that they could not grow anything because all of their farmland was on the other side of the "ceasefire" line, and that the Saigon government troops guarding the camp would not allow them to go back and farm their land, even during the daytime. At the time I visited, people in that camp were eating chopped banana tree stalk and were fearful of starvation in the coming weeks. We interviewed the village chief of that camp and he acknowledged that the camp residents all wished to go back to their original farm land, but "They cannot," he told us, "because the communists are out there." We asked him why the villagers were brought to such a miserable camp in the first place. His straightforward answer surprised me: "The reasons for setting up this camp were more strategic than humanitarian," he said.

"Strategic" seemed to me a very apt description for the "Return to Village" campsites I saw. A close friend of mine described to me a "Return to Village" camp on the Batagnan peninsula in Quang Ngai province, where his elderly parents now live. When the Paris peace agreement was signed, his parents were living in their home village area, which was at the time under the control of the Provisional Revolutionary Government. Two months later Saigon government troops shelled the area, moved in, rounded up the people into a barbed-wire enclosure, and called it a "Return to Village" camp. A Saigon government outpost was established concurrently with the camp.

The Resettlement Program. The second thrust of the U. S.-aided Saigon government program to deal with refugees is the "Resettlement" program. Refugees from areas which are contested or controlled by the Provisional Revolutionary Government are being encouraged by the Saigon government to resettle in new areas, in camps or new villages which are controlled by Saigon. Under this program large numbers of refugees are now being moved from central Vietnam to provinces in the South, including Binh Tuy and Long Khanh. Governmental promises to the new settlers are many but they often fall short of fulfillment. We met settlers in Binh Tuy province who had been waiting seven months for the government to dig the wells it had promised to dig and clear the farmland it had promised to clear. We met women settlers in Dong Den camp, also in Binh Tuy, who, despite government promises, had had to clear by hand the plots of land for their own houses. Like the government's representative at the camp, they had no idea when their future farmland would be cleared out of the thick jungle.

Stories of large-scale corruption in the system are widespread and believable when one sees the conditions in those camps and talks with the inhabitants. The American adviser in Binh Tuy, whose main duty was to advise the resettlement program, told me, for example, that corruption was one reason why land was not being cleared for the settlers. He said the Saigon Resettlement office was paying out 110 thousand piastres per hectare to VECCO Corporation, a U.S.A.I.D.-supported organization, for clearing. They were then subcontracting the job to someone else, who was in turn subcontracting the job again. When the contract got down to the actual people who were clearing the land, there was only 45,000 piastres per hectare left, and the bulldozer operators did not feel it was worth their while. The same American adviser reported finding corruption in rice distribution. The Saigon headquarters was paying top market prices for good rice, but the people were receiving the lowest quality—that which is usually used as animal feed. A Catholic priest who has worked with new settlers told me that in a well-digging operation with which he was familiar, fully 90% of the funds from Saigon were raked off the top before they reached the diggers. One of the women we spoke with in Dong Den camp, sitting sadly on the dirt floor of her half-finished bamboo house, said, "You foreigners send a lot of money to Vietnam for programs like this one, but we people get only what trickles through the fingers of the government officials."

In the Resettlement plan, as in the Return to Village program, questions of military strategy often seem to take priority over consideration for the welfare of the refugees. The American adviser in Binh Tuy told me in January 1974, that the area for the Dong Den resettlement camp was taken over from the "V.C." after the Peace Agreement was signed. Saigon government troops newly encamped near the resettlement site confirmed his statement. He added that he hoped for the settlers' sake there wouldn't be any fighting but he wouldn't be surprised if the "V.C." tried to retake the area, which they considered theirs.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Committee a report dated January 27, 1974, to the Senate Subcommittee on Refugee Affairs. On page 16 is reprinted a letter by a U.S. embassy officer describing the "Resettlement" program in the area which I have just been referring to. He writes: "The people will move into areas that were previously considered marginal, thus secure the area, improve movement and security along major routes of communication, develop the agriculture and economic situation in the province and bring economic viability to the country as a whole." This letter clearly indicates the importance which strategic considerations are given in the administering of our "humanitarian" aid programs for refugees.

In summary, I would like to emphasize to this subcommittee the overwhelming weight of opinion among Vietnamese people, including religious and political leaders with whom we spoke, that American economic aid is doing very little to help the common people, but is doing much towards maintaining a politically intransigent and domestically unresponsive government in Saigon. I would like to share with you what was to me an extremely impressive conversation I had with a Buddhist monk in January. I had just been on a visit with two American friends to two of the Return to Village campsites I mentioned above, places where people were living in conditions of near starvation. Returning that evening to the pagoda, which was a center for gathering emergency food supplies for the camps, I said to the head monk: "If these two friends of mine were members of the U.S. Congress and saw the conditions in those camps they would probably go back to Washington and recommend an increase in U.S. economic aid." The monk became visibly agitated when I said this. He glared at me and asked: "Are you planning to go back to American and ask for more American aid for Vietnam?" I threw the question back to him and asked what he would recommend. "I am a Buddhist monk," he said, "and my first concern must be for the welfare of my followers—the people who live in those camps. If American aid is continued, they will continue to live in those camps. If it is stopped, eventually the government will be forced to allow them to go back to their homes. They will be hungry for a few months until their first rice crop comes in, then they will be all right. The only truly humanitarian thing the U.S. Congress can do is to stop the support that keeps those camps in operation."

I acknowledge, and I am sure that most members of this subcommittee share the concern, that the United States has a responsibility to offer help to millions of Vietnamese civilians who have suffered so much through the endless years of war. However, I believe that most Vietnamese would agree with me that our highest priority at this point should be in committing ourselves to making a working peace in Vietnam, that is, committing ourselves to use the only tool for peace at our disposal, the Paris Peace Agreement. As long as we continue pouring vast amounts of economic and military into the South (up to 86% of total Saigon costs), thereby maintaining one of the two South Vietnamese parties to the complete exclusion of the other, we are, by any reasonable interpretation, violating Article 4 of the Peace Agreement, which prohibits U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of South Vietnam. We are also making it much harder

for the two South Vietnamese parties to come to any understanding with each other.

I urge this committee to consider all aid requests—this supplemental request as well as the $474 million increased ceiling for South Vietnam military aid and the upcoming and very large Fiscal Year 1975 military and economic aid requests—in the light of what should be our principal objective in South Vietnam, namely, implementing the Paris Peace Agreement.

[From the New York Times, March 8, 1973]

CONTINUING REFUGEE PROBLEMS

HORDE OF GHOST REFUGEES GET U.S. FOOD IN VIETNAM

(By Henry Kamm)

DA NANG, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 7.—Many tens of thousands of nonexistent refugees from Quang Tri Province are being fed at American expense. American and Vietnamese officials close to the problem agree that cheating and corruption at all levels of involvement—from refugees getting an extra pound or two of rice a day to high Government officials in the upper reaches of a kickback pyramid—exceed previous experience, however rich.

In a departure from Vietnamese custom, refugees are not being cheated in the first instance by officials appointed to dole out American assistance to them. They themselves cheat, by declaring nonexistent members of their families or registering their families in more than one camp.

Kickbacks prevalent

Because low-level officials know of this petty cheating, they make the refugees kick back to them part of the meager proceeds. On the next echelon, the small kickbacks make a more considerable sum, and so on up the line.

When, for instance, a camp chief has made enough for a motor scooter for himself and a television set for his family, he is replaced. At succeeding levels of the bureaucracy the gains are bigger, and the officials are less likely to lose their jobs.

The Vietnamese officials are in the main unwilling or, in exceptional cases, unable to stop the cheating, and Americans feel powerless to act against it without at the same time endangering relief for the real refugees from Quang Tri, who may total well above 200,000.

In the opinion of qualified experts, the Quang Tri refugee problem, now nearly a year old but not publicly discussed, illustrates the costly pitfalls of American financial assistance.

When Quang Tri, the northernmost province of South Vietnam, was nearly overrun in the Communist offensive last spring, its population was 317,000. Today, after large numbers remained behind under Communist control and many others were killed in the fighting and sustained bombing that followed the offensive, 327,000 people are listed as Quang Tri refugees and food for that many is issued at American expense.

Officials and others involved agree on the practices by which the relief rolls are swollen but differ on the degree of swelling.

A South Vietnamese official close to the problem before the offensive believes that only half the refugees exist. A foreigner with years of first-hand experience with the people of Quang Tri puts the number at 180,000 to 190,000, while American officials put it at 200,000 to 250,000. All this makes for a range of 75,000 to 160,000 phantom refugees.

Close to 2 billion piasters, or more than $4 million, has been spent for the Quang Tri refugees since Oct. 1, and spending since last May, when the refugees began to pour southward, is estimated at $1-million, a month.

The American and South Vietnamese officials have been ready to accept refugee figures suspected of exaggeration because they lend credence to contentions that while the Communists can capture territory they cannot win control of the people. The idea that almost all the people of the province escaped southward also overcame qualms about the heavy bonding and shelling of Quang Tri after its fall, since the areas under attack could be depicted as depopulated.

Provincial officials, at the Quang Tri headquarters that has been moved down to this city in Quang Nam Province, believe that many more people than the Government acknowledges—and American advisers accept—remained behind. Many did so because two densely populated areas, Cam Lo and Gio Linh, were overrun before they could escape. Others sympathized with the Communists. Still others tried to assemble their families but were cut off.

Original reports that most of the population had escaped were implicitly abandoned when tens of thousands of people were said to have been liberated in the Government counteroffensive that led to the recapture of Quang Tri City.

Well-placed Vietnamese sources put the number of people who remained behind or were killed at perhaps as many as half the population. A senior American official believes the total to be a quarter to a third.

Atmosphere of catastrophe

The tens of thousands who streamed southward moved in a chaotic flow, under heavy enemy pressure and in an atmosphere of catastrophe that threatened to engulf the country. Most washed up here at Da Nang, where deserted American military camps provided shelter.

Faced with strangers and drawing on experiences that had taught them that distributing officials would deprive them of some of the benefits due them, the Quang Tri people began to cheat.

Insisting that personal and family documents were lost, they declared children, parents and brothers and sisters who did not exist. Because new camps were opened as the flow of refugees required it and the urgency of the situation precluded verification of claims, many refugees found it expedient to register in several camps.

Since no attempt could be made to group people by hamlet and village with officials who knew them, substitute officials—interfamily chiefs in place of hamlet chiefs and zone chiefs in place of village chiefs—were named.

As the lower-level chiefs began to know their families and discover the inflation of the claims for the rations of rice, condensed milk, fish sauce and salt, they demanded kickbacks to keep things quiet. A family that had claimed, say, seven members instead of four was obliged to surrender one "ghost" to the interfamily chief.

Two sources of tribute

At the next level, that of the zone chief, tribute is collected both from individual refugees and from interfamily chiefs. But, authoritative sources said, the highest rate of kickbacks is at the level of the camp chief.

He is the key person in the 34 camps in the Da Nang area, where 259,000 recorded refugees live. It is he who certifies the numbers in his camp, determining the food that is delivered.

Most of the camp chiefs has been chosen from among arriving Quang Tri provincial public servants since Oct. 1, when the provincial authorities took over refugee administration from the Da Nang municipality. Shortly afterward the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Da Nang and three of their principal assistants were removed upon the disclosure of extensive profiteering on rice for the refugees.

A Vietnamese source familiar with the situation said that corruption had been so general that most of the camps had had to change chiefs more than once in the five months since Quang Tri officials began to run them. He estimated that about 100 civil servants and army officers had served in that period.

"They make enough money, and when it becomes obvious, they are returned to their previous duties," the source said. "No one has ever been punished."

Avoiding difficulties

Camp chiefs are named by the province chief, Col. Phan Ba Hoa, but since Colonel Hoa was preoccupied with military matters, his deputy, Bui Hoanh, was the principal official dealing with population matters.

Recently Mr. Hoanh returned to the Interior Ministry in Saigon. Ministry officials tell inquirers that he was dismissed from his Quang Tri job, but informed sources here said he had arranged the transfer to avoid difficulties.

Vietnamese officials said that the Americans were hampered by their status as advisers. When they press hard in a particular situation, one said, the corrupt officials give a little without abandoning the opportunities for further gain.

At American urging, a series of night checks have been run in camps to verify the existence of the people listed as residents. They have resulted in a gradual cutback in inflated lists, but a senior American official in Saigon conceded that he had no confidence in the policemen making the checks.

A Vietnamese official said that no one was to blame—that the entire system was based on corruption. Anyone who comes to inspect is merely invited to share in the pot and usually accepts, he explained.

The social welfare chief of Quang Tri, Ngo Van Vinh, had been active in pressing for the dismissal of dishonest camp officials and urging the reorganization of the camps along former village lines, the aim being to make it possible to reduce cheating to the 10 per cent considered normal in such operations.

Told not to make waves

As a consequence he was warned by provincial and Saigon officials that if he continued to stir up trouble the Americans might become difficult. Mr. Vinh asked for a transfer, but he was recently relieved, and an inquiry into alleged misfeasance on his part has begun. The inquiry, according to senior officials in Saigon, concerns administrative shortcomings at the time of evacuation of Quang Tri City, when Mr. Vinh was one of only two top aides to the province chief who remained to organize the population's escape as much as possible.

A senior official in the Ministry of Social Welfare expressed full confidence in Mr. Vinh and said he should be decorated rather than investigated. American officials who know him share the ministry's confidence.

The American officials here and their superiors in Saigon, aware of the low-level cheating and high-level corruption, find themselves in a dilemma. They consider their prime task to be the housing and feeding of the refugees, and they must work through the Vietnamese authorities to perform it.

The Americans find it difficult to get upset over refugees who declare "ghosts" to get one more pound of rice a day. "At their level of poverty," one said, "all they get is enough extra rice to sell so that they can eat a few vegetables or dried fish with their rice."

As for the corruption among officials, the Americans are concerned but see no solution except to maintain pressure on the authorities or to bring over more Americans. "To be realistic," a senior American said, "it costs much more to import Americans than to let the Vietnamese do it the present way."

A tribute to the care

The most important thing, he continued, is that the Quang Tri refugees receive sufficient

food and are as well housed as possible—which is poor by Western standards—and that outbreaks of disease are prevented despite great crowding.

Visits to several camps and conversations with refugees and those taking care of them confirmed that, in fact, some of the cheating is a tribute to the care.

In addition to phantom refugees, a sizable number of real people who live in the camps and receive rations are not the Quang Tri refugees they say they are.

They may be people who left Quang Tri before the offensive, having found life difficult in the overpopulated, insecure and unproductive region. They may be from Thua Thien, the province south of Quang Tri, where a living is difficult to make, or soldiers who were stationed in Quang Tri but whose families lived elsewhere.

They are in the camps here because they are fed regularly and because the former American installations, though crowded, often have electricity and fresh water—luxuries to the peasants of this region.

"People around me cheat, people under me cheat and people over me cheat," a saddened Vietnamese official said, apologizing for speaking badly of his country.

"My biggest worry is that one day America will say that now it will wash its hands of Vietnam," said the Social Welfare Minister, Tran Nguon Phieu.

American and Vietnamese officials involved in refugee affairs fear that the principal harm done by the corruption and the cheating may be to hasten that day.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to increase by $150 million the amount of funds appropriated to be spent under the transitional provisions of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 for public service employment jobs in communities which experience less than 6.5 percent unemployment. As he and other members of the committee have pointed out, the $100 million figure by which the full committee has recommended that the administration's request be increased would result in a funding level 17 percent below that of the October 1973 level—when unemployment was 4.6 percent. Unemployment now seems sure to stand at 6 percent before the fast approaching termination of this fiscal year. It seems to me only good commonsense to continue to fund the public employment programs in the States at at least the October 1973 level while the unemployment rate remains so high.

No less an economic authority than Mr. Arthur Burns, the respected Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank Board, has recommended the PEP programs as one good way to meet the dual problems of high inflation and unemployment nationwide. He would favor higher levels of PEP funding to offset these trends. Furthermore, similar proposals have been endorsed by the League of Cities and Towns and the National Conference of Mayors. They recognize, as do those of us from areas which do not meet the 6.5-percent unemployment mark, that this next year will be fraught with real difficulties for large parts of this country if increased transitional funding is not appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this Congress does not share a reduced commitment to offset unemployment with public spending. If anything, the economic vicissitudes of the past 5 months—with accompanying, ever-higher unemployment—should have strengthened both the commitment and the beneficence of the Congress. I make no secret that I favor a strong public sector role in the national economy as a balancing and stimulative tool for high employment and economic development. But, regardless of how Members view this proposition, they ought, I believe, to support this one time only $150 million increase for decidedly human reasons.

This Congress has a basic, unaltering, and oft-repeated commitment to provide viable employment opportunities instead of a welfare state which discourages employment. Keeping PEP funding on a par with existing funding will help insure a decent amount of public service job turnover and will help to keep our unemployment rolls down.

In closing, I can only repeat that this amendment does not commit any new increases in public service employment funding. It merely maintains that which is presently provided. Moreover, these funds are transitional funds. With the onset of manpower revenue sharing, the program will largely be phased out, because of the high unemployment qualification cutoff. This is the last opportunity that we will have to help cushion the effect that this major abandonment will have on many cities and towns. I sincerely trust that my colleagues will not neglect to provide at least the funding that they have hitherto been receiving.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, we can point with pride to the success of the summer youth employment programs, the recreation support program, and the youth transportation program. The dual purposes of providing gainful employment and a source of income to our poverty youth and, at the same time, keeping these young people occupied and out of trouble during the long summer months are of signal importance to our whole society.

The appropriation level set by the administration will not only decrease the number of summer jobs, but will completely eliminate the recreation support program and youth transportation program. These two programs are not luxurious extras and are absolutely necessary to the continued maintenance of the summer jobs program.

In New York City, the recreation program supplements Neighborhood Youth Corps projects in 160 community locations, and will require $2.83 million to just duplicate the summer 1973 level of effort. Last year the city received $149,130 to offset the costs to our youth of getting to and from their summer jobs and recreation programs. Without this money for transportation, there is little reason to even have the summer jobs program, because these children just simply will not be able to get to their jobs.

I wholeheartedly support my colleague, Mr. ROYBAL'S amendment, which will provide an additional $81 million for the summer jobs program, $3 million for the recreation program, and $2 million for the transportation program.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, in mid-January of this year southern Oregon suffered its second very serious flood in a decade. The damage was tremendous—in loss of property and most tragically in the loss of life. On January 25, President Nixon declared 17 Oregon counties a disaster area. Although Federal assistance cannot undo the damage to life and property, Federal programs have begun to help, and are needed to continue to help, Oregon recover from this calamity.

Federal programs provide different kinds of assistance to alleviate the many kinds of problems created by a flood disaster. The Federal Disaster Assistance Administration has done a great deal in providing emergency assistance by opening public roads, providing food and emergency assistance to individuals whose homes suffered damage from the flood, directing indivduals to the appropriate assistance, and coordinating other Government flood relief projects in the area.The Army Corps of Engineers has done a highly commendable job of providing emergency aid during the actual flood—controlling the overflowing rivers, protecting people and land—and has since begun the authorized necessary repair work on flood control structures damaged in the flood.

On March 23, following Agriculture Secretary Butz' declaration of the Oregon counties as a disaster area, the Department of Agriculture, through the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, released an initial allocation of $1 million, with more to be made available as needed, for cost-sharing assistance to farmers for removing debris from farmland, and for grading, shaping and releveling eroded land areas. The Farmers' Home Administration has further provided needed loans for rebuilding and repair. These Federal disaster assistance programs have been made available to the Oregon flood area.

There is still, however, one type of assistance which is not available through any of these channels and which is urgently needed. The Soil Conservation Service, with adequate funding, could provide assistance to communities and groups of individuals who are still in need of assistance to correct hazardous conditions resulting from the flood which could further jeopardize life and property if not quickly corrected.

Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 authorizes the Soil Conservation Service to provide assistance for safeguarding lives and property in areas damaged by flood and resulting from conditions remnant from a disaster. The assistance includes establishment of vegetation on denuded areas, streambank stabilization, control of eroding areas, repair of water control structures, and removal of sediment and debris from clogged streams where these conditions create a hazard to lives and property.

Each year the Soil Conservation Service may use $300,000 of the watershed and flood prevention operations appropriation for emergency measure assistance. This year these funds have already been used, as has also the carryover from 1973 supplemental funds, for as-

sistance in the Hurricane Agnes and the Black Hills disasters as well as in the Mississippi River Valley flood area.

As a result, no additional funds are left to be allocated for repairing flood damage in Oregon and other areas in need of emergency assistance from the Soil Conservation Service. The House Appropriations Committee has included in its request for supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, $20 million to supplement the Soil Conservation Service disaster funds. This need is based upon estimates for assistance in areas which have been surveyed and where repairs have been estimated by the local and State Soil Conservation Service personnel. Included in the $20 million, $1.5 million of which is slated for Oregon, is an estimated $700,000 needed for repair work along the Applegate River in Josephine and Jackson Counties in my congressional district.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to vote in favor of the second supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 14013.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Air Force", $50,800,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee position to limit the number of high school dropouts who can be enlisted into the Armed Forces in fiscal year 1974, even though it will be lost through a point of order. The provision deals with the numbers of non-high-school graduates, who can be brought into the military services during fiscal year 1974. After careful consideration, last year the Committee on Appropriations recommended and the Congress adopted a limitation which stated that not to exceed 45 percent of the total persons enlisted into the military services could be non-high-school graduates. The provision also limited the availability of funds for the enlistment of mental category IV personnel to not more than 18 percent. We feel that fully qualified personnel are essential for the operation and maintenance of modern sophisticated military equipment and to defend themselves against such equipment.

In looking into this matter we found that non-high-school graduates taken into the military services have four times the failure rate of high school graduates. We found that the percentage of personnel in the brig or in the stockades who are non-high-school graduates far exceeds their proportion of the force. A proportionately higher number of non-high-school graduates desert.

We have had experience in recent years with lowering the standards of enlistments. The Navy was not getting into the service the numbers of people the Navy wanted so they lowered the standards and took in greater numbers of non-high-school graduates and mental category IV personnel. The result was riots on the aircraft carriers *Kitty Hawk* and *Constellation* in October of 1972. The Navy was forced to eliminate from the service 5,200 marginal performers, the vast majority of whom were non-high-school graduates during fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, the question here is of the quality of the personnel in the military services under the all-volunteer force concept. Two of the military services are having difficulty in attracting the numbers of persons which had been budgeted for. The services want to keep their budgets high, and they want to keep the numbers of personnel high even though there is no clear evidence as to what the appropriate number is.

Those who want to eliminate this provision are either so committed to the all-volunteer force that they refuse to critically analyze it or those who feel that the strength of the Armed Forces should be maintained at budgeted levels regardless of the extra cost of doing so.

The Marines feel that they cannot, without taking in additional numbers of non-high-school graduates, meet their enlistment goals in this fiscal year. I say that meeting the enlistment goals is far less important than maintaining the quality of the military force. It is rather ironic that the Marine Corps which has been going throughout the land with the slogan "We need a few good men" has now reversed itself and wants greater numbers of men who are not so good.

The Marine Corps did not request in a budget amendment that section 718 be waived. At the time they made their supplemental request they could have done so. We have nothing from the President, nothing from the Secretary of Defense, and nothing from the Office of Management and Budget indicating that the administration is in favor of such a waiver.

The Air Force enlists 95 percent high school graduates. The Air Force has almost no drug, a.w.o.l., or desertion problem when compared to the rates experienced by the other services. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force told us last week that he attributes that to the fact that he has a very low percentage of non-high-school graduates in the Air Force. With a high percentage of high school graduates he has avoided discipline problems.

The Army is not pressing for a waiver of section 718. The Secretary of the Army has stated that he would prefer having greater flexibility, but that the Army can live with section 718. So can the Navy. The only problem is that of the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps problem may not be real when the high school term ends this year. The Marine Corps may then obtain the numbers of recruits which they desire, but they are behind schedule now. In my opinion, they have overreacted and the Committee on Armed Services has overreacted in this matter.

I say the law of the land should remain the law of the land for the remaining 3 months of this fiscal year. The Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee should address this matter in the hearings now being conducted and can prepare whatever action necessary for fiscal year 1975. We should not act in haste. We should not panic because of a letter from one of the military services. We should be certain that we maintain the military force capable of defending the country, not just a lot of people on the payroll. We should keep quality controls on the all-volunteer force at least through the completion of fiscal year 1974.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations was instrumental in having inserted into the Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1974 a provision which limited the numbers of non-high-school graduates—dropouts—who could be brought into each military service during fiscal year 1974 to not more than 45 percent of the total persons enlisted. It was felt that the time has come to "draw the line" with respect to the all-volunteer force and thus make a serious attempt to judge if the concept will work.

As you know, the all-volunteer force is not new. In fact, as early as 1967 there was considerable talk of moving toward the all-volunteer force. In that year the House Armed Services Committee passed legislation to make military pay comparable to the pay of other Government employees. In 1969, the administration adopted the all-volunteer force concept and in 1971 the Congress passed the necessary legislation to increase pay rates in the lower grades, both officer and enlisted, to make them comparable with rates paid by private industry for similar skill levels. Each year as we moved toward the all-volunteer force, necessary, but costly, steps were taken to insure that it would succeed. These steps have resulted in increased cost of manning a smaller defense force.

I refer to such items as the combat arms enlistment bonus which was added in 1971 and will cost nearly $70 million in fiscal year 1975. Recruit advertising costs have increased nearly twentyfold in 4 years—from about $5.4 million in 1970 to $95 million this fiscal year. During the past 10 years the percentage of the Defense budget devoted to manpower, civilian and military, has increased from about 40 to 45 percent to over 56 percent today. Recruiting costs are up about sixfold and will break thresholds established by the committee for fiscal year 1974.

There has also been a downturn in the overall quality of enlisted force as measured by high school graduates and the Armed Forces qualification test.

Less than 1 year ago all of the services validated on their own volition certain goals with respect to the percentage of high school graduates that they would enlist during fiscal year 1974. The Army said that it would obtain about 70 percent of its force requirements from high school graduates and the Marine Corps about 65 percent. Last summer before this committee reported the fiscal year 1974 defense appropriation bill, the Army ran into some recruiting difficulties and announced a lowering of standards and still another increase in the size of the recruiting force.

Under these circumstances, the com-

mittee decided that it was time to "draw the line" for at least 1 year and see what the Department of Defense could do with respect to meeting its manpower requirements under a given set of conditions. It became obvious that if the Congress were willing to continually increase the ante—the dollars which would be pumped into the all-volunteer force—and if the Department of Defense continues to decrease its personnel requirements from the standpoint of moral, mental and physical qualifications the all-volunteer force would succeed at least on paper. However, the resulting force could represent a total failure with respect to the Defense needs of this Nation.

Thus, the Congress said, let us have no more degradation in manpower quality at least for the remainder of fiscal year 1974. Standards were established using the two key factors employed by all of the military departments in accepting enlistments; namely, high school graduation and mental category. Because one of the services may run as much as 12,000 to 15,000 short in its recruiting goals for fiscal year 1974 because of the requirement to limit high school dropouts to 45 percent of the force, the Congress is being pressured into taking ill-conceived, short-run action to help this service out, while failing to address the much larger question of "can the all-volunteer force succeed under a reasonable set of quality standards?"

Certainly, the all-volunteer force can succeed, and we all want it to succeed, but there has to be some limit with respect to the amount of resources that the program should consume and the quality of the force to be employed. Otherwise, there will be no valid check made of the success or failure of the concept.

I say that the Congress should first direct the Department of Defense to live with its quality standards for the remainder of this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 101. Section 737(a) of Public Law 93-238 (87 Stat. 1044), is amended by deleting "$1,126,000,000" and inserting "$1,326,000,000" in lieu thereof.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 101.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if I may elaborate a bit, when this bill was written by the Appropriations Committee, the Committee on Armed Services had reported a bill providing a $1.6 billion ceiling for aid to South Vietnam, so the Committee on Appropriations, in recognition of what appeared to be an authorization which was on the way, provided an additional $200 million in this bill, making the figure $1.3 billion. In the action by the House last week the additional funds for aid to South Vietnam were stricken by the action of the House. Therefore, the authorization which the Committee on Appropriations had expected was not approved and so these funds in excess of $1.26 billion are not authorized. We did not ask for a rule waiving points of order and should not have under the circumstances and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I point out that this section increases the obligational authority for the support of the South Vietnamese forces in excess of the amount currently authorized and, therefore, is not in accordance with clause 2 of rule XXI which provides that:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law . . .

So, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 101, but I would like to state that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT), is very much interested in this matter and I am sure he wishes to be heard on it and to join in this point of order which I urge.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Louisiana seeking to be recognized on the point of order?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the gentleman from Texas indicating my interest in this matter, since the Armed Services Committee raised the question before the Rules Committee on this item.

If the gentleman from Texas had not raised the point of order against his own bill, I was on my feet to raise it at that time. I certainly do join him in raising the point of order but with a great deal of reluctance because it indicates and involves again the serious situation in which we find ourselves as related to Vietnam.

Section 101 of the "General Provisions—Department of Defense," appearing on page 7, lines 13 through 15, is subject to a point of order.

The language of that section would increase the expenditure ceiling of $1,126,000,000 in existing law, and increase it to $1,326,000,000.

This provision in H.R. 14013 is subject to a point of order since it violates clause 5 of rule XXI, which provides that—

No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations. . . .

Also, the section is subject to a point of order since there is no legislative authorization for this increase in appropriations.

Public Law 89-367, as amended, provides the basic legislative authorization for the Military Assistance Service Funded—MASF—program. That statute presently establishes the spending limitation for fiscal year 1974 at $1,126,000,000. Therefore, section 101 is also in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

I shall not delay the Committee any longer except to concede the point of order raised by the gentleman from Texas and to concur in it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA). For the reasons stated by the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Louisiana, the provision is not in order and the point of order will be sustained.

The Clerk will read.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been sustained in that section. Section 101 is now out of the bill.

Mr. GIAIMO. I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be appropriate now for the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense shall be used for the enlistment or pay of non-prior service personnel during fiscal year 1974 when the enlistment will cause the percentage of non-high school graduate enlistments of the service concerned to exceed 45 per centum or the mental category IV enlistments to exceed 18 per centum of the total non-prior service enlistments for the entire fiscal year.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 102, page 7, lines 16 through 23.

Section 102 is subject to a point of order since it is in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The language of section 102 places a limitation on "the funds available to the Department of Defense" and prohibits their use for the enlistment or pay of non-prior-service personnel during fiscal year 1974 when the enlistment of such personnel will, among other things, cause the percentage of non-high-school-graduate enlistments of the service concerned to exceed 45 percent.

This restriction on the use of funds previously appropriated is in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI since it goes beyond the subject matter of the bill. Under the rules, the limitation must apply solely to the money of the appropriation under consideration and may not be made applicable to money appropriated in other acts.

Furthermore, under the guise of an appropriate "funding limitation," it is actually a clear-cut effort to establish legislative restrictions on the enlistment standards for new entrants into the Armed Forces, and is, therefore, also in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI as legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

Now, section 102 states:

SEC. 102. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense shall be used for the enlistment or pay of non-prior service personnel during fiscal year 1974 when the enlistment will cause the percentage of non-high school graduate enlistments of the service concerned to exceed 45 per centum or the mental category IV enlistments to exceed 18 per centum of the total non-prior service enlistments for the entire fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this section is subject to a point of order for one specific reason; namely, the section says that none of the funds available to the Department of Defense shall be used, and so forth. So the fact is that this language covers not only the funds in this bill, but the funds provided in other bills. I think for this specific reason, the section is subject to a point of order.

Of course, it would be possible to offer an amendment stating that none of the funds made available in this bill shall be used for these purposes. In that case, I think the language would not be subject to a point of order; but as to the point of order which the gentleman from Louisiana has raised and for the reason which I have stated, I concede the point of order.

I strongly support the language in the bill as provided, but I recognize the situation which comes before the House at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Louisiana seeking to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly concur in the acceptance of the gentleman from Texas, as it now stands; however, I must take cognizance of the situation that maybe other language will alter or subvert this language. In that event, I make a point of order against this language, because I submit this language cannot be subverted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. For the reasons set forth by the gentleman from Louisiana with respect to the scope of limitation, that is, that it applies not only to funds appropriated by this bill, but applies to all funds available to the Department of Defense, the point of order of the gentleman from Louisiana, as conceded by the gentleman from Texas, will be sustained. The Chair will not undertake to speculate on whether or not a point of order would lie as to the possible amendment the gentleman from Texas mentioned. If such an amendment is offered, of course, it would be the privilege of the gentleman from Louisiana to make a point of order and at that time the Chair would listen to arguments on any such point of order and rule.

But with respect to the point of order made by the gentleman from Louisiana to this section, the point of order is sustained.

Does the gentleman from Texas have an amendment?

Mr. MAHON. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 1:

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", $5,859,000, of which $1,097,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if this is the amendment of the gentleman from Texas?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has offered a pro forma amendment to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the measure before us, in the consideration last week of the authorization bill certain language was approved with respect to the number of high school graduates that could be enlisted into the services. I do not have the language before me at this time, but it intended to prohibit anyone from being barred as an enlistee who was not a high school graduate.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the issue is somewhat cloudy, I have hesitated to offer a perfecting amendment to the language which appears in the bill here today, but I do wish to say frankly that I am of the opinion that the language, when we delete the provision to which reference has been made, is not subject to a point of order, and in my opinion it is valid language. In my opinion, it is a prohibition, it is a restriction, it is a limitation on an appropriation bill. However, there will be time and opportunity to consider this matter further. In view of that situation, I have not pursued the matter further at this time, but when we get back into the House, I shall ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain material in regard to this matter.

Mr. Chairman, we need to have the most trainable people possible in the Armed Services. We need that for several purposes. Those who serve in the Armed Services need to have pride in their service, and people who enter the Armed Services need to be qualified and capable and trainable. Military service today is not just a matter, as in the old days, of carrying a musket. One has to be able to learn to operate and maintain highly technical devices. So, I do think it important that we not take into the Armed Services more people who are probably not sufficiently trainable than the percent provided in the provision of law which governs today; that is, not more than 45 percent of enlistees can be non-high-school graduates.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a sound position, and I do not wish to yield my views or the views of others in the House with respect to this matter. Therefore, I felt that for clarification of the record comment should be made at this time.

Under permission granted, I include a list of reasons for the retention of the limitations on the enlistment of non-high-school graduates:

1. Non-high school graduates (dropouts) have four times the failure rate of high school graduates.

2. The brig/stockade population of all of the services is composed of far higher percentages of non-high school graduates than high school graduates. The Marine Corps, which is the principal service affected by the limitation, has the worst record. The Marine corps brig population averages about 2,000 at any one time. About two thirds are non-high school graduates.

3. Last year, General Jaskilka, U.S. Marine Corps, testified that "We know that the non-high school graduates contribute a disproportionate share of the desertion and absentee rates."

4. The Committee asked the Marine Corps to screen some records at random in order to come up with more definite data. The Marine Corps examined the files of 69,911 non-prior service males who enlisted between June 1972 and April 1973. Only 2.5 percent of high school graduates were involved in one or more incidents of desertion, while 9.0 percent of the non-high school (dropouts) were deserters (absent for over 30 days) at least one time.

(Reference—Part 4 of hearings on the FY 1974 Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, pages 983 and 984.)

5. Secretary of the Army Callaway stated the following during this year's posture hearing:

"First of all, on the limitation imposed by this committee of 55 percent high school graduates, the Army, as you may recall, has never complained about that. As a matter of fact, we applaud the careful attention of this committee to quality. We think it is very important that this committee be as interested in quality as we are. We applaud that."

6. The Navy lowered its recruiting standards in late 1971-early 1972 with drastic results. Serious riots took place on the carriers Constellation and Kitty Hawk in October 1972. This resulted in an early release of 5,200 for poor performance.

7. The Marine Corps which is pressing the hardest to have Section 718 eliminated has by far the worst desertion and AWOL record of any of the other services. The rates are twice as high as those of the Army. The Marine corps has about 7,000 deserters at large at any one time.

8. Section 718 does not have racial implications. Data available to date show that more whites have been affected by the high school limitation than have blacks.

9. The 55 percent high school graduates required by section 718 is a full 10 percent lower than the Marine Corps' own established goal.

10. The Services have all rapidly increased the enlistment of women and all women are required to be high school graduates. This has the effect of increasing the percentage of male non-high school graduates.

11. Use of low enlistment standards will risk loss of broad based support of American citizens needed to make the all-volunteer force a success.

12. The Air Force maintains 95 percent high school graduate enlistments. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force states that this is the major reason for the low number of drug and discipline problems.

13. The taxpayer is paying reasonably adequate wages for military manpower. The Congress has a responsibility to see that this manpower is motivated and trainable to do the job.

The following is the statement included in the House report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1974 with regard to non-high-school graduate personnel:

RECRUITMENT OF MENTAL CATEGORY IV AND NON-HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATE PERSONNEL (SEC. 718 OF PUBLIC LAW 93-238)

The Committee expressed its concern in its report on the fiscal year 1974 Defense Appropriations Act with respect to what appeared to be an overall deterioration in the quality of military personnel recruited under the all-volunteer force concept. During 1973 enlistment standards were lowered. Many personnel enlisted who were subsequently discharged as undesirable even though a most elementary check of their background would have indicated that they would not meet the standards. The Committee was instrumental in placing a limitation on the percentage of non-high school graduates and mental category IV personnel who could be recruited during fiscal year 1974 made a part of Public Law 93-238.

This provision limited the number of non-high school graduates who could be enlisted to not more than 45 percent and limited

mental category IV personnel to 18 percent. The limitation is well below the goals and objectives of all of the services with respect to the enlistment of high school graduates. The Marine Corps which had the lowest goal hoped to recruit 65 percent high school graduates. The congressional guideline allowed the Marine Corps to miss its own goal by 10 percent without incurring any penalty in total strength.

Precisely what the Committee feared might occur has now occurred. The Army and the Marine Corps are having difficulties recruiting the numbers of high school graduates which they require and are requesting the repeal of Section 718. The Committee believes that the standards of our military forces should not be further reduced.

This shortfall in high school graduates has occurred despite the recruitment of far more women this year than in past years. Each female recruit must be a high school graduate, and thus, her enlistment will permit another male high school dropout to enlist. Also, the Committee understands that the numbers of personnel enlisted with GED (General Educational Development) certificates in lieu of a high school diploma has increased substantially. These personnel are counted as high school graduates for purpose of Section 718.

The American taxpayer is paying adequate wages for military manpower and expects to receive a well-motivated and trainable force in return. Thus, the Committee believes that the limitation of Section 718 should remain in effect and, therefore, has restated it in this bill as Section 102. The Committee is adamant that fiscal year 1974 be completed and a full assessment made before another degradation in overall enlistment standards is permitted. We feel that it would be a serious mistake for the Congress to be rushed into this simply because one or two services are currently experiencing some recruiting difficulty. However, the Committee is most willing to discuss with the services alternative limitations which may be more acceptable to them, which will insure that a quality force is recruited and that the taxpayer receives a fair return on his dollars spent during review of the fiscal year 1975 budget.

The Department of Defense has been busying itself in recent months with the release of a lot of data to include public relation briefs, film documentaries, etc., all of which conclude that the all-volunteer concept is a great success. This may be another case of only releasing the "optimistic" statistics in order to convince the public that a program is successful. In the end this approach may only serve to mislead those who are demanding a "positive attitude" toward the all-volunteer force and who should be the most concerned that this new system will really work over the long run. The Committee is concerned that data being circulated by the Department understates the cost, overstates the quality of the personnel, and appears to disregard such apparent problems as recruiting additional personnel to make even small increases in the size of the armed forces during periods of tension; the effect of low-quality standards "turning off" more qualified personnel who may otherwise have enlisted; the effect on Reserve Forces; the higher enlistments and re-enlistment rates of non-high school graduates with its cumulative effect on quality; the maintenance of a reasonable racial and social/economic balance over the long run, etc. These and other aspects of the all-volunteer force will be discussed in more detail in conjunction with the fiscal year 1975 Defense Appropriation Bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I understand he has very properly said that further discussion of the matter will come at the proper time. We can then dispose of that matter. However, in view of his explanation of that particular section which was held out of order, I think it is best at this time to also offer for clarification of the RECORD the situation in which we now find ourselves in respect to the Vietamese situation. This letter addressed to me is from the Secretary of Defense and discusses the problem.

I think the House should have the privilege of knowing what it says. The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1974.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As a part of its FY 1974 supplemental submission, the Department of Defense requested an increase from $1.126 billion to $1.600 billion in the Congressional limitation for support to MASF programs. This did not involve a request for additional appropriations, but rather an increase in the authorization in order to permit the Department to reflect obligations of $1.395 billion against the limitation from available FY 1974 and prior year funds and to provide flexibility for reprogramming of up to $205 million, as might be required.

As was indicated in our justification to the Congressional Committees, we were recording obligations against the limitation applicable to both the $907.5 million of new FY 1974 funds as well as approximately $487.5 million of carryover balances. Included in these carryover balances was an amount of $266 million which represented a statistical charge of estimated obligations to the limitation on the basis of Army ammunition delivered from stock in prior years. This was consistent with our interpretation of the MASF authority and past practices in which the value of such "pay back" has been charged to the ceiling to represent the replacement on the value of such deliveries.

In its action on our FY 1974 MASF limitation, the Senate Armed Services Committee directed that a planned "pay back" charge relating to certain helicopters which had been delivered earlier from Service stocks was not required. In expressing its opinion to the Conferees, the Department of Defense indicated that it could accept this position provided that it were generally understood as a governing groundrule. Subsequent determinations by Counsel indicated that this Congressional decision should be viewed as a specific exception to the interpretation of the MASF authority and with the past practice that such "pay back" request to the Congress does, in fact, reflect the inclusion of the $266 million ammunition item as a charge to this year's ceiling.

It must be emphasized that the Department has presented this year's program on the basis of the understandings which had been reached with respect to past practices. Should the Congress make a specific determination that the $266 million need not be charged to the ceiling, then this would, of course, be acceptable to the Department of Defense. However, in our view an increase in ceiling represents a more straight-forward presentation of the authority requested.

Sincerely,

J. R. SCHLESINGER.

Mr. Chairman, I share this letter with the Members in order that we may proceed to resolve the very difficult situation to which the gentleman from Texas had previously referred. The gentleman concurs that we may have a basis and a background and an understanding and another avenue of approach on which we can walk in order to come ultimately to the conclusion which I am sure a majority of the Members of this House desires.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that if the Defense Department were allowed to change the form of their accounting system, which I understand is a deobligation of already reported obligated funds, and now reobligating them in this year, would that not be subverting the wishes of the House as expressed in the Congress last week on the armed services supplemental bill?

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to that, it could possibly be argued that this action would be subverting the action taken by the House last week, particularly on the vote. However, I do not agree with that statement.

This is a statistical bookkeeping job, and as a matter of fact, I do not believe the vote which was taken last week reflects the view of the House. Nearly 100 Members were absent that day.

When we check the list of those Members and check how they voted, we understand and anticipate that if those 100 Members were here and heard the amendment, it would not have been accepted and we would not be in the spot in which we find ourselves.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman one iota, because we must remember that the House voted clearly and loudly last year as well as last week relative to all military funds, to stop the bombing, and the Members certainly expressed their desire to cease our expanded commitment in South Vietnam.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADDABBO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to call attention to the fact that the committee in the other body in approving a new approach to this problem certainly does not consider what they are doing to be a subterfuge, and I would be reluctant to join in calling it a subterfuge. They are seeking what appears to be the best approach that is left to help a beleaguered people following the House action.

Mr. ADDABBO. I agree with the gentleman from Florida. It is an approach for the Pentagon to subvert the wishes of the House by reobligating and spending more than the $1.126 billion which the House authorized and appropriated last year. By reobligating it and changing the bookkeeping systems they have achieved their goal of $1.4 billion plus.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield further, it is not an effort for the Pentagon to preserve their position but, rather, an effort to preserve the sovereignty of South Vietnam and to keep that nation alive.

We are committed to help South Vietnam. We are not doing it with manpower; only with funds. If we fail to do that, they may go down the drain, and I do not think the American people want that. The limited amount of money that may be required to help maintain their existence is well worth the expenditure

called for. I would hope the question does come back to the House. I believe the vote will be different.

After all, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana has pointed to the fact that 100 Members were absent at the time of the last vote on assistance for South Vietnam. I am inclined to think that if there were a test vote today, there would be a change in the position of some of those who voted against this action last week.

Mr. ADDABBO. All I can do to answer the gentleman from Florida is to state that if the South Vietnamese were so intent on preserving themselves, they would not be reducing their own military budget and asking us to increase our contribution to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, many of us are wondering both at home and in the Congress why there is a loss of faith in Government on the part of the American people. This is a classic example of "why" right here. We have to be honest and level with the people. Let me refresh your recollection on what we are doing here today and what we did last week.

Last week, this Congress strongly voted to hold the Department of Defense and its military assistance money for Vietnam authorization under a limitation. It voted and insisted as the will of the Congress and the American people that the Defense Department should not expend more than $1.126 billion. They wanted $1.6 billion in the authorization bill last week. Our Committee on Appropriations was ready to give them not $1.6 billion but $1.326 billion. That is an addition of $200 million, for whatever reason, justified or not. The fact of the matter is that this House last week made it eminently clear that the American people were tired of throwing money down the drain in whatever amounts the administration or the Department of Defense asked for in Southeast Asia and Vietnam. The House by its action said very clearly "You shall not spend more than $1.126 billion." Therefore, the gentleman from Texas quite properly today withdrew the section which was subject to a point of order and which would have elevated the amount in the appropriation to $1.3 billion.

It is clear, then, that the Congress has spoken or, at the very least, the House of Representatives has spoken. $1.126 billion is the amount that shall be spent in Vietnam.

The people are watching, and Members both in this chamber and in the other chamber are watching to see that there is no hanky-panky and that there are no attempts or efforts made to circumvent the will of the Congress.

I submit that the letter which was just read today by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, which is a letter from the Secretary of Defense, is an attempt to do by executive fiiat, mind you, what Congress has said you shall not do. This letter is establishing a record to, in effect, authorize the Department of Defense and the administration to spend an additional $266 million over and above the $1.126 billion authorized by the Congress both today and last week.

Now, what are we doing? Do we speak for the people, or do we not? Do we enact laws, or do we not? Indeed, I remind you of the statements which are attributable and chargeable to our Ambassador in Saigon several weeks ago saying that the executive agencies should withhold vital information from the Congress. The Members know the battle that is raging over that statement. We cannot tolerate this kind of action any longer. We have tolerated it too long.

Congress and the people are saying that $1.126 billion is the authorized amount. But you know how this order can be circumvented. There are many kinds of bookkeeping methods. They can deobligate funds which have already been obligated. They can remove them from the obligation items in this year's budget. And I submit that if we lie supinely and let them do that they will find the additional $266 million and, I suspect, they already have found it. It will not show up in the bottom line figure. The bottom line figure will still show $1.126 billion. But in fact—in fact, I submit—they will be spending the $1.126 billion and an additional $266 million—the very thing that this Congress last week said, "you shall not do."

Naturally, the people lose confidence in you and in me, and all of us in Government, when this type of activity goes on.

Why are we saying this? We are saying this because after 10 long years we are tired of these endless expenditures for a lost cause.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the American people have made it crystal clear that we are tired of this endless involvement in Southeast Asia. I think this Congress has also made it clear that neither South Vietnam, nor our own Defense Department can continue to come to Congress and to the American people, and particularly to the American taxpayers who, God knows, are harried enough these days, and say, "We want a blank check from you for whatever amount we decide is necessary either in Saigon or in the Department of Defense."

That is what is happening here today.

I think that we have an obligation to make the record clear that we intend for the Department of Defense to abide by the will of this House and of this Congress when this legislation is finally enacted into law.

And when this legislation goes to the other body, and if the $1.126 billion remains in the bill, as I suspect and hope that it will, then I do not want to see any fancy bookkeeping by the Department of Defense which, in fact, is going to find an additional $266 million for which they are already preparing the record, as is suggested by this letter submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services by the Secretary of Defense.

I for one do not intend to tolerate this, and I shall hold those in the agencies responsible. I urge my colleagues to do likewise; to restore the confidence of the people, in Congress, to compel the executive agencies, and particularly the Department of Defense, to abide by the will of the people as reflected by their elected representatives, and to stop these evasions of the people's will once and for all. Ten years is too long a time, and the time is now to put an end to this practice.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman from Connecticut agree that the committee—our own Committee on Appropriations—has found that the Pentagon could have lived within the original $1,126,000,000 ceiling if it had tried to?

Mr. GIAIMO. I suspect they could have. I do not know what their situation is at the moment.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Was that not stated in our own committee report?

Mr. GIAIMO. My impression is that they can live within the $1,126,000,000 limitation.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would the gentleman also agree if there should be a new offensive, or if for some other reason the South Vietnamese should need additional money, the Congress could probably appropriate it in a very quick time?

Mr. GIAIMO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I think if the Department of Defense and the administration feel that they need this additional $266 million, they should come in with an immediate request for it, justify it, and ask Congress to vote it, but not play bookkeeping games.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would the gentleman also agree that what we need very much are special hearings on the sloppy accounting by the Pentagon of these MASF expenditures in the past, so that we will know just why these overruns happen? Is it not true that the chairman has agreed to hold such hearings this summer?

Mr. GIAIMO. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not know whether the chairman has agreed to that or not.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Could I ask

the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON)?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman from Maryland we, of course, are at this time and have been for a few months holding hearings, and will hold hearings for additional weeks. We will explore the handling of funds in South Vietnam, as we have before. At the time the war was going on and American troops were over there fighting in great strength, the accounting problem was quite different. It seems to me to be quite a different problem at this time. Congress is entitled to the most accurate and correct accounting as to the funds which are being expended and as to the programs which the U.S. taxpayer shall support.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I want to praise the Chairman for his position on this matter. I will ask the Chairman if he will agree that it does not do us any good to hold hearings and issue pronouncements if we do not hold the lid on the administration and make it live within the moneys appropriated by this Congress.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further. Of course, it is the obligation of all agencies of the Federal Government to live within the funds provided, and we would certainly make no exception in this case or in any other cases, so far as I am concerned. I think that we must maintain our power over the purse as provided to us under our system of government. I would say that in my opinion additional funds are required beyond the $1,126,000,000, but if Congress does not in a forthright way provide those funds, then those funds cannot be made available by legerdemain. So I am not in favor of taking any action which tends to bypass the regular appropriation process and the regular authorizing process of the Government.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would the chairman agree with the announcement in the committee's report and say that the reason for the request to raise the spending ceiling was because someone did not make an attempt to live within the original $1,126,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, there are many reasons for the problem which the Department of Defense has gotten itself into in regard to support in South Vietnam. The Department of Defense spent funds made available at too rapid a rate in the early part of the fiscal year.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Were they not warned, as a matter of fact, that they were spending funds too rapidly?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, they knew what funds were available, $1,126,000,000. They have explained to some extent the problem which confronted them, and they did have to spend the money week-by-week and day-by-day on a pro rata basis. But the Pentagon does have some merit in its position. As I see it, we did provide $1,126,000,000, and unless we provide more, the Pentagon will just have to live within it, for good or ill.

Mr. Chairman, at a later time I will ask for permission to revise and extend my remarks, and I will have an additional statement.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the colloquies that have taken place in the last half hour. I wonder if someone can give us a quick rundown on the amount of money in this bill to pay for our participation in the war in the Middle East. If there is to be argument over the what and why in Vietnam, how about the Middle East? How much money in this bill for the Middle East, can someone tell me, as a consequence of U.S. involvement in the Middle East war?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, on page 15 of the report, with which the gentleman I know is somewhat familiar, this language appears:

> The supplemental request includes approximately $231,000,000 for costs related to the recent war in the Middle East. Of that amount, some $90,000,000 is related to the cost to the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the increased tempo of operations during the Middle East war.
>
> A total of approximately $140,500,000 is related to additional costs of the replacement of material furnished or to be furnished to Israel.

The gentleman knows and has participated in discussions of this type of matter previously on the floor, and as the gentleman will remember this Congress provided $2.2 billion for aid to Israel in connection with the recent war.

Mr. GROSS. And the money in this bill is in addition to the $2.2 billion previously appropriated?

Mr. MAHON. The funds are for part of the cost of replacing equipment which was provided to Israel. This Congress over a long period of years has provided funds totaling many hundreds of millions of dollars to Israel, as my friend knows.

Mr. GROSS. And there will be more money poured out in that area I am sure because we are now becoming involved in the reopening of the Suez Canal. I do not know how far down the road that is going to take us from a financial standpoint, but does the gentleman think we have reached the climax of our involvement in the Middle East financially speaking?

Mr. MAHON. I would hope so. Our Government has evidently made an agreement that we will undertake to participate in the task of clearing mines out of the Suez Canal. Whether this is good or bad I would not venture an opinion at this time, but this would cost a great deal of money. How that money will be provided is not quite clear to the Appropriations Committee. We discussed this with the Defense Department officials, but how the Defense Department proposes to provide the funds for clearing the canal is not clear and has not yet been determined.

Of course, we have provided large sums to Israel and what may happen in the future we do not know. If the able Secretary of State is able to bring about an accommodation and a settlement of this issue, which we all pray may be accomplished, then the spending for aid to Israel would certainly be dramatically reduced.

Mr. GROSS. This Government does not expect to see any of this money repaid to the United States, including the $2.2 billion that went to Israel? Does it?

Mr. MAHON. Much of that money was given as a grant and some of it was a matter of loan. I would not think a small country such as Israel would be able to raise the funds in the foreseeable future or in the long-range future to meet fully this obligation.

Mr. GROSS. And when we made that contribution of $2.2 billion, Israel already owed us $1 billion. Is that not true?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I am not sure of the exact figure, but there was a considerable amount owed by Israel to the United States. Of the debts owed to the United States by Israel, a certain amount of interest payments have been made, some millions of dollars; but I do not have the exact figure at the moment.

Mr. GROSS. I say to the gentleman that when the President of the United States unilaterally intervened in the Middle East war, it was my privilege to take the floor of the House a few days after the fighting started to say that I did not know who would win the war in the Middle East, but I did know one thing for sure and certain, that Mr. and Mrs. Average American would pay the bills. Little did I know the extent of the bills they would pay, not only to finance Israel, but the additional billions of dollars it would cost Americans due to the increased costs of petroleum products as a result of slapping the Arab leaders in the face, and their immediate closing of their oil valves, precipitating a fuel crisis.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 8:

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", $2,434,000, of which $300,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1972 and $1,000,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, for the purpose of discussing matters here which relate to Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make my position with regard to additional funds for South Vietnam very clear. I strongly support the provision of additional funds in this fiscal year for military assistance for South Vietnam. I voted for the authorization of additional funds on the floor last week. I voted for the appropriation of additional funds in the appropriation bill during the consideration by the committee. I believe that in spite of the problems and inadequacies which have been discussed, there is a need for some additional money, not necessarily the full amount requested.

However, I believe that the provision of additional funds for assistance to South Vietnam as well as funds for any other purpose must be provided by law and with the full participation of the elected representatives of the people.

I will support the provision of additional funds but if Congress does not see

fit to provide additional funds in a forthright way, then I am not in favor of making funds available by changing accounting procedures or by changing reports, or by any other legerdemain, and I will oppose any attempts to accomplish in committee reports what cannot be accomplished by law.

I believe that the people of South Vietnam by and large continue to fight for their freedom and that they are worthy of our support. I believe that the Government of North Vietnam continues to invade the territory of South Vietnam. But I believe that this case must be presented in a straightforward way and that if Congress does not see fit to provide additional funds the South Vietnamese must use those supplies and equipments which have already been furnished until additional authorizations and appropriations can be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 11:

COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, and sections 326 and 328 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1951 and 1961), $1,898,584,000, including $250,000,000 for activities authorized under Title II of said Comprehensive Employment and Training Act and $100,000,000 for activities of the type provided in the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 as authorized in Section 3(a) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, plus reimbursements, to remain available until June 30, 1975: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities and for the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Page 12, line 15, strike out "$1,898,584,000" and insert "$2,048,584,000", and on line 17 strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$250,000,000".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered jointly by myself, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN).

It is a very simple thing. It involves jobs. A year ago Congress was funding about 140,000 public service jobs from the PEP programs. Last October we were funding 102,000 jobs. The bill before us today will fund approximately 85,000 jobs when considered in conjunction with the next fiscal year's appropriations.

That decrease in jobs funded under this bill comes despite the fact that unemployment today is 5.1 percent, one-half percent higher than it was in October; 534,000 more people are out of work now than were out of work last October.

Very briefly, the administration asks for $250 million to fund title II of the new Manpower Act we passed several months ago to make money available only to areas which have 6½ percent unemployment or more. It will create together with next year's budget about 76,000 jobs.

The committee added to that amount $100 million and specified that it be spent under the old PEP program, which means every area of the country will be eligible. The catch to that is that only about 8,500 jobs will actually be created in the areas which have less than 6½ percent unemployment. In my judgment, that is simply too few jobs to do much good.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. To the $100 million the committee added, we would add $150 million in additional money, which would be available to all areas of the country; both areas above 6½ percent unemployment and areas which have less than 6½ percent. That would, in short, bring the number of public service jobs funded to about the same level as were funded last October before the energy crisis began.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is the very least we could do. The committee bill would actually cut the number of jobs from last year's level in the face of higher unemployment. I simply do not think that can be justified. I do not think that is going to impress anybody if we come from areas which have less than 6½ percent unemployment and tell them we provided a piddling 8,500 new jobs for that portion of the country which contains the majority of the people in this country who are presently unemployed.

The committee will probably say that we ought to wait until the regular bill is handled. I think there are two problems with that approach. One, we will have at least a 2- or 3-month gap between the expiration of the PEP programs and start up of the new program. Most importantly, the Labor Department is estimating that unemployment will peak well above the present level and will average 5.7 percent over the year. Mr. Stein was quoted as estimating that as late as last Friday. That means this program should be on board, on line now and not after the crisis is over and the economy is already on the upswing. If we wait for the regular bill, we will be waiting about 6 months too long.

Mr. Chairman, I have letters here from the Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the UAW, the AFL–CIO, the National League of Cities. All of them support the amendment, and I think they do so for good reason.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the Members to page 62 of the committee report. They will notice that the committee appropriates $85 million, which the committee says is necessary to provide for the increased costs of administration in State unemployment security offices resulting from increases in the number of unemployment insurance claims filed and paid in fiscal year 1974. It seems to me it is inherently inconsistent to agree on the one hand in this bill that there is a much higher rate of unemployment compensation claims, and yet not provide for increasing public service jobs to take care of the problem.

Let me also quote, if I may, from the hearings on the fiscal 1975 budget. Mr. NATCHER of Kentucky asked Dr. Burns of the Federal Reserve who is not known as an economic and fiscal liberal, whether he thought the amount budgeted for public service jobs was adequate. Mr. NATCHER said this:

Now, based on the past, based on the predictions you made this morning, I certainly agree with you and I want to commend you on the fine statement you have made. . . . I concur in your statement that the $250 million that is now before the committee certainly is not adequate and the amount which is in the budget for fiscal year 1975, $350 million, is certainly not adequate. Would you agree with that, Dr. Burns?

Mr. Burns responded:

Yes, I would be inclined to agree.

Mr. Chairman, it just seems to me that in the interests of equity, we ought to be funding more public service jobs than we are funding in this bill.

If Members think they can go back home and explain to their mayors, their county boards, their city councils, and their police departments why they thought that the public service jobs should be funded at a level of 17 percent less than that of last October, they will stick with the committee and vote against the amendment. If they think we need more jobs they should support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. O'HARA). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to lend my strong support to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The amendment, which would provide an additional $150 million for public service jobs this fiscal year, is vitally needed.

In its request for public service job funding, the Nixon administration requested only $250 million. And that money was sought under the new title II program of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. No request was made to fund the transitional public employment program authorized under section 3(a) of that same law.

Mr. Chairman, if Congress had followed the administration budget, only three-quarters of the public service jobs—about 73,500—available last October would be available in the last quarter of this fiscal year.

And we should remember that 6 months ago the unemployment rate was only 5.1 percent and it is up over 5.6 percent today with little sign it will abate.

So we can see that the $250 million administration request is clearly inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, we must commend the House Committee on Appropriations for adding $100 million to the administration request, and for providing the money where it will do the most good, under section 3(a), which provides support for jobs in all areas now hard pressed with high unemployment not just those areas which qualify for title II aid.

The authors of the CETA saw the need to provide this transitional assistance for areas which could not immediately meet the 6.5 percent unemployment requirement which triggers title II.

So the additional $100 million provided by the committee under title 3(a) will provide an additional 8,500 jobs.

But, Mr. Chairman, I must agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that Congress should provide $150 million more for 3(a) programs. For these funds, bringing the total for public service jobs up to $500 million, will mean that 100,000 vitally needed jobs will be available for the remainder of this year.

And I can speak from personal observation of the necessity of these funds, and for the support of public service jobs utilizing both title II and the transitional 3(a) programs.

For in one county which I represent, unemployment shot up to almost 9 percent in January after holding steady below 2 percent for months. The jobless rate there now fluctuates between 7 and 8 percent.

But tragically, Mr. Chairman, this abrupt rise in unemployment, not expected to subside soon, does not make the area eligible for title II assistance this year. There are other examples in northern Indiana where section 3(a) programs will help hard hit areas.

So I completely concur with this amendment to provide fully 100,000 public service jobs in the most flexible way possible, and I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for offering it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that if the Members on this floor think that we should be providing at least the same number of public service jobs which we provided in October, before the energy crisis began they will support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Obey amendment which will provide for an additional $150 million in emergency employment funds under section 5 of the current Emergency Employment Act. I do so with mixed feelings, however, first of all as one of the original architects of the CETA, I personally believe that the funds would have been better allocated to title II of the new act. This would have channeled the dollars into the areas of highest unemployment. The unemployment rate in the State of Michigan today is 10.2 percent for example, which is totally unacceptable and double that of the national average.

By placing funds into title II of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act we would have been able to place those funds where the need is greatest. However, I do recognize that while unemployment is not as rampant as in Michigan, we do need to provide for transfer of funds from the unemployment act to the new CETA. In addition, a large portion of the $150 million will go into relieving job displacement in Michigan.

It is my hope that these funds will be utilized immediately. It would be improper to speak on this amendment without giving proper credit to both the administration and the Appropriations Committee for recognizing the problem at hand. Over 6 months ago the administration proposed an additional $250 million for public employment and at long last the Appropriations Committee has acted on this request. Because of the job plight in Michigan I requested both the White House and the Appropriations Committee last February to add $500 million to title II for public employment programs. The Appropriations Committee has moved to add another $100 million to the $250 million requested, and with the additional $150 million we will have $500 million available to fight unemployment. I am hopeful that the appropriations bill will receive immediate attention in the other body and the President will sign the measure so we can get on with the problem of helping the unemployed.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

That amendment provides the fairest solution to the dual problem of finding a decent alternative to unemployment compensation for the jobless and making the transition to our new comprehensive manpower programs without placing additional burdens on the unemployed.

I speak with special fervor on this issue. Unemployment in Massachusetts is close to double the national average. In January, initial claims for unemployment compensation were running 24 percent above the same month a year ago. The jobless figure for the State rose from 180,200 in November to 197,600 in January. In western Massachusetts labor market areas, the unemployment rate runs from 6.8 percent to over 9 percent. One town has a 20.2 unemployment rate.

It makes no sense at all to cut the number of public employment jobs below the level we had last fall before we began to feel the impact of the energy crisis. It makes even less sense to make the cuts at the same time we have to increase funds to handle rising unemployment compensation claims.

The initial administration request for funds to implement the new title II public service employment programs was $250,000,000. That would have provided about 73,500 jobs, compared to 100,000 last October and 140,000 in fiscal year 1973. That was completely inadequate.

The committee's addition of $100 million under the transitional provision of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act raises the number of public employment jobs to over 85,000 and makes the additional ones available also in areas that do not qualify for title II programs.

I feel strongly that at a minimum another $150 million should be provided to bring us back to last fall's job level. The most equitable way to do this is through the transitional provision.

Title II is a new program. Even in areas with consistently high unemployment rates, there are problems to be worked out before it is in place. The title II machinery is new, and like all new machinery takes some breaking in.

Some areas would not qualify under title II. Unless we provide additional transitional funds, those areas will have to wait for substantial relief until a regular 1975 appropriation funds the title I programs. Recent experience shows that that may be well into the fall. In the meantime, PEP programs expire in many places at the end of this month. Being without a job at a time when prices are the highest in our history is tough enough. We cannot make it tougher because we are changing program horses.

I strongly support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, and I urge others to support it.

Mr. FRASER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my agreement with what the gentleman said and say that I strongly urge support of this amendment.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY.

If this amendment is adopted you will be providing a total of $500 million for public service employment in this bill and that is a very modest amount in the context of the current unemployment situation. In the summer of 1972 when the unemployment rate was the same as it is now we set aside $1.25 billion for public service employment. With this amendment we will be providing approximately 40 percent of the amount of money Congress provided 2 years ago and yet the unemployment prospects are worse now than they were.

Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, which I authored, we provided for public employment programs not only in areas of very high unemployment—the so-called title II program—but also in all areas under title I. This amendment will provide additional public employment funds for all areas at a time when all areas are suffering job displacement due to the energy crunch.

Unemployment is a problem everywhere and the unemployed worker who cannot find a job is just as badly off, no matter how many others there are like him in the area. With this amendment we will be able to make a modest contribution to the plight of the unemployed in all areas of the country as was contemplated by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act.

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

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with my colleague in stating that we are getting hit twice in losing out on this money, because the depart-

ment changed the method of computing the unemployed. It comes just as this new bill will be funded at a time when in my district I have three assembly plants of the automobile industry that have laid off thousands of workers who do not appear in these figures. So this is a hard blow for us.

I hope if you have any feeling or compassion for the thousands who have been laid off at our Cadillac plant in Linden, our Ford plant in Edison, and the General Motors plant in Clark, you will please help us with adding this money to this bill so that we can get a few more dollars to help these wonderful people who have been thrown out of work.

I hope Members will go along with us, because if you do not, you will hear a great deal more about this unemployment problem.

I believe this bill should have $3 billion in it to do the job when you consider the whole country.

Mr. Chairman, I am a depression mayor. I well remember when two of three people were out of work. If you believe in holding your finger in the dike, at least come up with this amount of money. Otherwise we will have another depression and go through another cycle. So please vote for the amendment to help some of these poor people who are laid off by the energy crisis.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, all during this year the local governments have been required to phase out this program; thousands of PEP employees have been laid off from their jobs, and unless this additional money is added we are going to see many more thousands laid off. The money that is being asked for here, an extra $150 million in addition to the $350 million for PEP programs already in the committee bill, will prevent further deterioration of this excellent program during the current fiscal year. It will not, however, come anywhere near to bringing us back to where this program was as recently as a year ago. At that time we were spending at a rate of $1.25 billion under the Emergency Employment Act. It does not make any sense to me during a time when unemployment is rising and will continue to rise to go from a billion and a quarter dollars down to $500 million. This may be the best we can get today, but I want to serve notice that we need to do much better when the regular 1975 appropriation bill comes along. We ought to at least get even with where we were and, if possible, do even better.

In one of my poorest counties only a third of the people they had hired under the PEP program are still employed, and unless we adopt this amendment even those few that remain will have to be terminated. I have talked to many people down my way and I can say without question that public service employment is about the most popular Federal program in my area. My local officials like it, the people support it 100 percent, and I think it is one of the best things we have done in a long time.

So I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS), who was the chief author of PEP, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the author of this amendment. They are performing a great service to this House. I earnestly hope that the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), which provides for an additional $150 million for public service employment programs for communities having less than 6.5 percent unemployment.

No one knows better than the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA), the need that we have in our own State for more jobs. With respect to unemployment, Michigan is one of the hardest hit States in the Nation. I am supporting the additional $150 million for public service employment provided by the amendment now before us, but I am doing so only after cautioning this body that what we should really be doing today is adding $1 billion to provide more jobs for the thousands of unemployed victims of the Nixon administration's mismanagement of our economy and mismanagement of our natural resources. We shall be adding $1 billion to their legislation today just to show these people that even though the Nixon administration is unable to respond to their problem, the U.S. Congress can—and will.

Mr. Chairman, this is a time of great national crisis—and our own State of Michigan is bearing the brunt of it. Unemployment is on the rise in Michigan, and it is rising at a terrifying and unprecedented rate.

The most recent figures I have available to me indicate that during the first month of this year the rate of unemployment in Michigan soared from 5.4 percent to 8.2 percent. Over the 2 month period ending in January, the number of claims for unemployment compensation increased by over 157 percent.

We experienced in Michigan during the month of January the second highest number of initial unemployment insurance claims in the Nation, and the problem threatens to get worse, and worse and worse. It is now predicted that by June—only 2 short months away—our unemployment rate will range from 9.5 percent to 12 percent.

Yet this year, despite the predictions of its own Labor Department with respect to rising unemployment, the Nixon administration would cut the public service employment program to 73,500 jobs. The committee partially restored some of these by adding an additional $100 million, but the additional $150 million which we propose today would do nothing more than bring the number of jobs back up to the level it was last October—before we felt the impact of the energy crisis.

Mr. Chairman, the additional $150 million provided for by this amendment is a mere drop in the bucket. It is typical of the band-aid approach the Nixon administration takes to unemployment problems when what is really necessary is major surgery. I deeply regret that because of the President's opposition to more funds to provide jobs for unemployed Americans this is probably the most we can realistically hope to provide—but nevertheless I will support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to increase by $150 million the appropriation for public service employment programs.

All this amendment seeks to accomplish is to maintain the 100,000 jobs under this program which was the level last October when the unemployment rate was only 4.6 percent.

Is that asking too much when the unemployment rate today is 5.2 percent and Manpower Administration predictions indicate a 6-percent unemployment rate by July 1?

It seems to me counterproductive, for us to allow the major Federal program which creates jobs for the unemployed to be reduced from the funding level it was 6 months ago.

Title II provides funds for public service employment in areas which have at least 6.5-percent unemployment. This amendment provides additional moneys to the $100 million already added by the committee in the transitional provisions of the act for communities which have less than 6.5-percent unemployment.

Six and one-half percent is an excessively high unemployment rate. But so is 5.5 and 5 percent. If this amendment is not adopted sizable areas within my own State of Massachusetts as well as in large areas of your own States which have unemployment of 6.2, 6, and 5.9 percent will be ineligible for severely needed Federal aid to provide jobs. The $100 million added by the committee will have minimal effect on the unemployment problem in this country. It means an increase nationally of merely 8,500 jobs for areas of unemployment under 6.5 percent. The Obey amendment provides an additional 12,000 jobs for these areas, thus the total number of jobs which would be created under the transitional provision of the act would be 20,500 for areas of unemployment under 6.5 percent. The Obey amendment would also add an extra 8,000 jobs for areas which have an unemployment rate of at least 6.5 percent.

If this amendment is adopted the State of Massachusetts would get an additional $7.13 million for jobs. This means nearly 1,000 more jobs would be available to citizens of my State.

We all know that most of the funds for public employment programs will expire in many communities by the end of April, thus leaving a large number of communities totally dependent upon the transitional provisions of the Manpower Act to continue their programs. These communities which contain nearly 60 percent of the Nation's unemployed desperately need this money now. They cannot wait until the regular appropriations bill is approved late this summer.

It is clear that if the Obey amendment is not adopted the future of the Emergency Employment Act is in grave jeopardy. I want to point out that in this act we have a program of proven value, one that works successfully and that is crucial to our Nation's welfare. The statistics on those who benefited from the program speak for themselves. For instance, more than 20 percent of those who participated in the public employment programs were teenagers, 27 percent were Vietnam era veterans, and 85 percent of all those who participated were not receiving any unemployment compensation. If it were not for this program, those 85 percent would have been on welfare.

I firmly believe that this country ought to make at least the same effort to fight unemployment during the next 14 months that we were making last year, and that is what the additional $150 million would accomplish.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The need for more jobs persuaded me to cosponsor this amendment with Mr. CONTE, Mr. PATTEN, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I congratulate Mr. OBEY for offering it.

This amendment should be considered, not on the basis that it is going to add $150 million to this particular appropriation bill, but that it is going to save money—yes, save money and incidentally save the pride and dignity of American citizens who want jobs not relief funds.

I really believe that this is true, because if we have increased unemployment, if people go without jobs, we are going to pay out of Federal and State revenues the welfare costs, and the costs of all of the dozen other programs that go to people on welfare: Food stamps, free medical care, public housing subsidies, and all of the others, too numerous to mention.

Also it has already been mentioned that a lot of this money will go to young people who might otherwise be without jobs this summer. There is an old saying about idle hands. I suggest that if there are jobs available for teenagers during the summertime, we could probably measure the reduced juvenile delinquency, and the reduced cost in detention home costs for kids who have nothing to do except roam the streets.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is literally a good investment. I think that these kinds of programs ought to be considered on the same basis that we consider reclamation programs, and that is on a cost-benefit ratio. The benefits in ratio to the cost, I think, argue for its support.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Members of the House to add this $150 million to title I.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAYDOS. I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon, for yielding.

I served on the committee at one time with the Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS), when this legislation was put together. I want to call attention to and remind my colleagues of just one very fundamental observation. This is the only Federal program which answers a citizen's request when he wants to exercise his right to work. This is the only Federal program where a man or woman can ask for a job, a right to work, and a right to pay taxes. It is that simple; it is that fundamental. The very modest increase should be doubled and tripled.

I support the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) in her position, and also the original sponsor of the amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize, I have always preferred a guaranteed job program to a guaranteed income program. The best possible welfare reform would be to actually make jobs available and remove the individuals from the welfare rolls. Unemployment robs the individual of his dignity. Unemployment contributes to the destruction of the family unit; unemployment increases welfare costs. Jobs, employment, restore dignity to individuals. Meaningful jobs bring about pride in the family relationship. Jobs, employment transform tax consumers into taxpayers.

We have spent millions and millions on studies of the unemployed, inventories of the poor. Let us save that money—and provide jobs for those who want employment—who seek jobs to support their families.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I am not here this afternoon to argue against the proposition of public employment but rather against the amendment that proposes to add another $150 million to what we already have in the bill, $350 million for public support employment.

The distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), made a claim here that he has got pockets of unemployment of 6—running up to 20 percent—and he proposes to put the money in title I, which does not meet the problem at all. The $250 million that we have got here in title II is the way that we get at these pockets of unemployment in excess of 6½ percent.

Let me address myself to these levels of unemployment as against last October when the rate was 4.6 percent. We had 102,000 people employed in public service employment. While unemployment has increased to 5.1 percent now, let us not forget we have got 214,000 more people working today than we had last October. Moreover, what these folks fail to recognize is that we have $140 million of carryover here in the Emergency Employment Act which is unexpended 1973 funds that will provide 40,000 jobs within the next 6 months between April 1 and September of this year. Add to that title II of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act in the supplemental at $250 million. That is 70,000 jobs, and then the $100 million that came as a result of Mr. OBEY's amendment in the committee adds 28,000.

If we add the 40,000 to the 70,000 to the 28,000, we have 138,000 jobs at a time when we have 5.1 percent unemployed. I say that is a pretty good match up against 102,000 people who were employed in public service jobs when we had an unemployment rate of 4.6 percent.

The proponents of the amendment are under the impression that the emergency employment program would terminate at the end of April. This however is not true, since the $140 million of unexpended funds I have alluded to are available for use, and the Department of Labor has informed sponsors that they may continue to spend their unused funds until they are all spent. Thus for the next 6 months, under the presently available EEA funds and the funds in the supplemental, almost 140,000 jobs can be provided.

I think we also have got to look at this thing in overall perspective. In 1973 we had obligations for manpower training programs and enrollment opportunities of $1.432 billion for 1,038,400 enrollment opportunities. In the 1974 appropriation bill including this supplemental we have obligations of $1.9 billion providing for enrollments in jobs of 1,300,000. So on that count we are well ahead of last year.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) cited the testimony of Mr. Burns before the full committee when we were having the overall budget hearings. I would make reference to the testimony of Mr. Burns in another section of that hearing in which he says in answer to a question about public service employment:

> That would be a direction in which I would move in the event unemployment rises to a dangerous level. I would make contingency plans now but I would not move in that direction just yet.

I think earlier in the year when public service employment was first being talked about in our hearings as an antidote for growing unemployment there were dire predictions that the 5-percent rate would grow to 5.5 percent and 6 percent. Members will recall we had all kinds of talk about the snowballing recession and how soon we were going to be in the throes of a depression. I would say the decline from 5.2 percent in January and February to 5.1 percent in March indicates to some degree how we are snapping out of this thing.

In the regular bill we have a budget request for $350 million for public service employment. We have $350 million

already in this supplemental which gives us a total of $700 million for public service employment. That is sufficient.

We have in the aggregate $8.7 billion in this supplemental. I listened to Members decrying how we are going over the budget and how we just cannot continue to do this without an increase in taxes, if we want to be that responsible. But here again we see Members falling all over themselves to support another increase of $150,000,000 to this bill. You cannot have it both ways.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I share his concern about the overall budget.

I must say if an amendment were offered to transfer the $150 million from various other studies, evaluations, programs into public service employment jobs I would support it. Also, it makes absolutely no sense to me to spend a major part of title I and II on the manpower training programs; an individual will go through one manpower training program, into another, and into a third training program, and then still be an applicant for welfare. What we need are jobs that provide income and dignity for the individual. I would hope most all the funds in title I would be spent on public service jobs—not training programs for jobs which do not exist because of lack of funds.

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

(On request of Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MICHEL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, a second point, in terms of last year's budget that there was $1.250 billion for the public service employment jobs. As I recall $1.250 billion.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, and in part that accounts for our carryover.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. With the Obey amendment we would have only $500 million, less than half the budget last year, for jobs. With the energy crisis and related problems the unemployment especially in certain areas has increased, so it seems to me the money for jobs is a better investment than either the training programs or putting people on the welfare rolls.

Mr. MICHEL. As I indicated in my earlier remarks, it was not my intention to decry the program as such although in the new manpower legislation we recognized our errors of the past and made changes in the percentage of what was considered to be a critical area of unemployment.

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

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

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, is it not true even if that amendment had all the appropriations, as we see it at the end of this year, the way we are going, we are still hundreds of millions under the President's budget request? We will be hundreds of millions of dollars in total appropriations under the President's request for the year?

Mr. MICHEL. Well, that depends on precisely what the gentleman is talking about for in the Department of HEW for fiscal year 1974, we are way over the budget as a result of add ons by this Congress.

Mr. PATTEN. The committee has added that if we go through with this, we would go over the President's budget.

Mr. MICHEL. I will be very glad when we finally get budget reform so we in the Congress will share this responsibility with the executive. Then in the future when we get to the point of considering $7 billion or $8 billion in supplementals, we will also have to go to the Committee on Ways and Means and say, "Boys, where are we going to get the money?"

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

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Is there not some inconsistency, when I interpret the position of the gentleman as being one where we have no adequate program providing for full employment by the administration, yet we expend all the money in our budget based upon the presumption that everybody is working? I cannot follow the argument of the gentleman at all.

Mr. MICHEL. There are all kinds of different views with respect to what full employment is. My own personal view is that a rate of 4 percent will seldom if ever be achieved in peacetime. If any one individual is unemployed, that is a tragedy for that family, but the historical record shows during the last 25 years we have only achieved full employment—4 percent or less—in wartime.

President Truman said 5 percent unemployment was "tolerable." During the 3 Kennedy years unemployment was 6.7 percent in 1961, 5.5 percent in 1962, and 5.7 percent in 1963.

I should say in conclusion I did not hear the Democratic majority clamoring for public service jobs in those days or even raising a critical voice against that rate of unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that when we go back into the House, I shall ask unanimous consent for all Members to have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with the Obey amendment which is now pending.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words. I hope I do not need the whole 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, Pennsylvania is not a small State. It is a rather large State. We have discovered upon investigation that almost every employment office jurisdiction in the State computes its unemployment percentages and figures from different schedules. In one office we find that if a worker fails to report for 2 weeks in a row for employment, he is counted as being unemployed. If he takes a vacation, if he goes somewhere to live with somebody else, his daughter or somebody else, for a couple of weeks, he is counted as not being employed.

There is not anybody in this room that can take an oath and be anywhere near right in stating that any figures we get from day to day, week to week, or month to month, on the unemployment figure in this country is anywhere near right at the point of time of giving it. We cannot measure from 1 week to another and get anywhere near an accurate figure.

For instance, during the shortage of oil we had plants laying off as many as 3,000 persons. They were off for 4, 5, and 6 weeks. That particular community would come under this particular 6½-percent figure for that long.

As we know, when our neighbor is out of work, we call it a recession. When I am out of work, it is a depression. When a person is unemployed in a community that has 6½ percent unemployment, that man is unemployed. He ought to be entitled to the same consideration.

We should not measure a person's unemployment status on the basis of the number of unemployed in an area, because it cannot be done that way. Take a small community, take a little community that has 4 percent or 4½ or 5 percent unemployment in a single industry, that community is injured a lot more than the city of New York with 7½ percent unemployment. Why? Because they have an unemployment built into their system. They have a large unemployment and the only community that will get any money under this, and here it is.

In the figures for the State of Pennsylvania as they work out, 32.4 percent of the unemployed of Pennsylvania will not be eligible for any kind of public service jobs under this 6½-percent cutout; 66.6 percent of my people, mostly in about 59 of the 67 counties of the State of Pennsylvania, will be absolutely barred from participation in this particular program.

I do not know what exactly we are hitting at. Is it the money I heard the Members talking about? We responsible persons in this Congress voted down $200 million for Vietnam the other day. We will have $50 million for this program over the program if we stay with this position.

Let me tell the Members something else. I just picked up the paper the other day and saw where we gave the Export-Import Bank, on borrowed money—not on assets, money this country has in the bank—on borrowed money, and loaned Italy $11,600,000 so that they can buy two aircraft from MacDonald. We are going to call that an export this year, We borrowed the money at about 7 to 10 percent, the Government; we turn around and give it to the Export-Import Bank; it loans it to Italy and Italy gets it for somewhere less than 4 percent, and they turn around and buy a couple of airplanes in the United States which they would not have bought otherwise. If they had the money, they would buy it from England or France or somebody.

We gave the Dow Chemical subsidiary in Brazil $17 million to add an addition to their chemical plant down there so that they can have a surplus of chemical made in Brazil, which is now supplied by American made chemicals. They can have a surplus so that they can send it back to the parent company in the

United States because they can get it made cheaper in Brazil.

We are talking about money. Why did not someone complain about that? Two hundred and twenty of us signed a resolution in this Congress of the United States to stop that kind of skulduggery. I do not believe it is fair to take two-thirds of the people in my State and say, "You are not going to participate in an unemployment program because you are less than six and a half-feet tall." I think that is wrong.

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

(At the request of Mr. GAYDOS and by unanimous consent, Mr. DENT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield.

Mr GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, along those points the gentleman has made, can the gentleman reconcile or explain the fact that this has now degenerated into a money argument when we are talking about jobs? It is too much money. How does the gentleman reconcile the fact that we have very little debate when we are talking about international development funds, the Asian Development Bank and other foreign spending agencies? Can the gentleman reconcile that, or is that his point?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I am making that point. I thought I made it. I want to say now that there will be no question about it at all—if this Congress decides these people cannot have the money, this is one Member of the Congress who is not going to vote for 1 red cent going out of this country under any kind of situation.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know of any program to which he, as a Congressman, can refer when a constituent asks him where he can get a job? Is there any other program other than this that can supply a job?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, yes, it is very simple. Give him the names of all the countries getting foreign aid. There are a lot of jobs over there.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say first in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, that the fact is that the public employment program funds have already expired for many areas of the country, and that I have been advised that workers in New York City will have to be laid off at the end of this month. Thus, there is no surplus available to be transferred in this particular program in many parts of the country.

I think the fact is, too, that the majority of the Government economists as well as private economists fully anticipate that there will be a rise in the jobless rate this year as a result of the persistent decline in the economy.

Mr. Chairman, already this country's minorities, in particular the blacks, Spanish-speaking groups, women, and youth have been bearing the brunt of the unemployment crisis. As we hear from our colleagues today, the crisis is now getting to the point where it is beginning to affect more and more people.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be clear to all of us that private enterprise cannot provide jobs for all who need them and that we must step in with a public service employment program. For a long time the argument has been used that one cannot provide a public employment program, because under the so-called Phillips curve, when there is full employment, there is going to be a rise in inflation. And the justification for allowing a high degree of unemployment was that inflation would affect the majority, and that in order to protect the majority from the problem of inflation, we had to permit what private enterprise normally brings about, and that is a degree of unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, we are now at a point in 1974 at which it is clear to all that the so-called Phillips curve does not work, because we now have both inflation and unemployment. It is obvious that if the relationship ever existed—I do not think it ever did—it does not exist now. It is clear now that the question of inflation does not have anything to do with the question of unemployment, and therefore, there is no longer even a theoretical justification left not to begin to use funds under the public employment program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is important that we begin now to allocate additional funds, because when we were debating this bill—I was a member of the committee and a member of the conference committee as well—the argument was used that we could not go beyond $250 million because of the fact that it would bring about an increase in the rate of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, since the bill was passed, there has been an even greater increase in inflation as well as an increase in unemployment. We must go back to the original arguments that were used in committee, and that is to fund this program at the level that we originally wanted to in committee, which includes not only the amount recommended by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but even greater amounts as well.

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

Mr. BADILLO. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made reference to public service employees in the city of New York who might lose their jobs. Would those be persons who would be employed under title II in PSEA?

Mr. BADILLO. These are persons who will lose their jobs.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if there are those who qualify under title II, they will not lose their jobs, and I will place in the RECORD the text of a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor that will indicate that those funds that ran out as of April 1, on the passage of this bill, will have used under title II the $250 million requested to assist those persons who are currently employed. I think that is perfectly legitimate and in keeping with the intent and purpose of the transition in the law.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason, there is no need to have this additional amount of money. That is what I have been saying in my argument all along for the benefit of those individuals who might be concerned. As a matter of fact, I happened to address a communication directly to the mayor of Cleveland, who had some 500 public service employees in the same category.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, there have been allocations of funds for specific cities, but many cities used up their quotas 3 months after the bill was passed. For example, the city of New York used up its quota 4 months after the bill was passed. Many cities in Puerto Rico used up their quotas 3 months after the bill was passed.

Mr. Chairman, there may be specific areas in which given cities may not have used their quotas, but in the cities which I am talking about the funds have been fully utilized and no additional funds are available.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my associates and colleagues, Congressman OBEY and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN and Congressmen CONTE and PATTEN, for considering this amendment which I feel to be extremely important not just to the big cities of the North but certainly to those of us in the South who at best have a hard time keeping up with the unemployment statistics.

In the State of Georgia it is hard to record the damage done to the mobile homes industry by the energy crisis or the difficulties caused by fuel allocation to the petrochemical industry and to the carpet and textile industry of that State. These are industries at which people usually work on a part-time basis and do a little farming on the side in order to meet the high cost of living. They are doing double duty, in other words, trying to make ends meet and are now caught at both ends of the spectrum with layoffs in the industry but also at home with the high cost of fertilizer and the inability to get the fertilizer that they need in order to keep their small farms going.

It is a difficult period for some of the rural areas of this Nation where we find ourselves making a transition from a former domestic economy to an international economy. We in the Congress and the administration are saying that they do not want wage and price controls any more. We are saying that we want a free market for goods. We are saying to the American worker and consumer, in effect, "We want you to pay the bill and do the suffering for this transition period."

Mr. Chairman, this amendment offers just a minimal stop-gap to provide employment through what we know to be difficult times when food prices have already gone up 20 percent and, given the agricultural markets of the world, we can anticipate almost another 20 percent increase. At the same time we find our people down South without jobs or the opportunity to get jobs.

I would like to say that in the city of Atlanta we consider ourselves very lucky. We brag or at least the Chamber of Com-

merce does that we have the lowest unemployment rate of any major city in America. However, I have come not to believe them very much. I have my own indicators of the unemployment rate in my city and my district. In 1970 and 1971 there was breaking and entering going on all over my neighborhood. In 1972 and 1973 we had an enormous absence of that kind of petty crime in part because of an economic boom. In the last few months we find that kind of crime coming back again. I see this as a kind of insurance for our young people who are in the mainstream of the economy in our American way of life which keeps them from having to enter the counter-economy of organized crime. If you do not know that there is a counter-economy, let me tell you that there is. You can go into almost any city in the country and place your order for whatever you want and somebody will steal it for you on consignment. That was our contribution to the Nation through the drug traffic.

Well, we have done a good job in cutting down the drug traffic, but whenever unemployment begins to rise, long before the statistics show it, crime begins to crop up again.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to increase the appropriation of funds to provide for public service jobs to combat rising unemployment.

Two hundred and fifty million dollars were requested by the administration to fund title II of the Comprehensive Employment Training Act of 1973. These funds are earmarked for communities with severe unemployment rates of 6.5 percent or more. The Committee on Appropriations acted wisely, I believe, in adding $100 million to be available to communities which have been fortunate enough not to have reached the horrendously high unemployment rate of 6.5 percent.

But even this is not enough. Another $100 million would only provide for 8,500 jobs in communities which contain nearly 60 percent of the Nation's unemployed. This does not even match the level of jobs provided by this program last October. Despite the Labor Department forecast of reaching a 6 percent unemployment rate this year, the administration would cut back on this public service employment program. The committee's recommended increase of $100 million is a step in the right direction, but total funding is still 17 percent below last October's level.

I will not burden you with repetition of the complex statistics and comparisons which have already been discussed here today. The point is that, in the face of rising unemployment, it would be negligence on the part of this body to back down from a commitment to a public service employment program adequate to meet expanding joblessness.

Passage of this amendment to add another $150 million for public service employment is but one more plug in the riddled dam that is our present economic management program. Public service employment is not and cannot be considered a cure-all. Through prudent administration, and by creating real positions with potentials for the future, this public service approach can play a significant role in ameliorating our present and future employment problems. But we must remember that it is only one part of the comprehensive approach to economic planning that is urgently needed.

Nine communities in the western part of my district were listed officially as having substantial unemployment as of February 1, 1974; these areas have had this problem for the past 6 years. This means that 6 percent or more of the work force in these communities remains unemployed and it is estimated that joblessness will remain at 6 percent or more for at least the next 2 months. There has been some improvement in these communities of Fitchburg, Leominster, Gardner, Shirley, Westminster, Lunenburg, Maynard, Stow, and Bolton, but the persistent employment problem remains.

It is essential that we take the step advocated by this amendment today. We must act now, while we have the opportunity, to make a significant contribution to the solution to rising unemployment, and the spectacle of unemployed Americans.

But, after taking this step today, we cannot be complacent until all men and women who seek work can find satisfactory employment. Tax reform, appropriate tax cuts, and counterinflationary measures are but a few of the components of the sound fiscal management program we must adopt.

Mr. Chairman, the approach we consider here today is a valuable tool designed to help those persistent pockets of unemployment. It will send our dollars into areas where they are most badly needed. I urge you to support this amendment, but not alone for itself. I urge you to support it as a part of a sound fiscal plan to improve our employment picture.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of opposing the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, well, well, well. So some of the Members have found out at this late date about unemployment, have they? Well, well, well. And they have their bowels all upset about unemployment at this late date, eh? Well, well, well.

Do you know where I come from? Yes, sure you do; sure you do. Thirty years ago when I came here the unemployment rate in my district was 19.7 percent. Put that in your pipe and smoke it, as my grandfather would say when he was there, God rest his soul.

Down through the years you have heard of the Flood-Douglas bill; you have heard of Appalachia; you have heard of EDA, all during the succession of these unemployment problems.

Now these people are going to cry about unemployment.

They were riding high, then, and eating high on the hog, and riding fancy in the areas you have heard from, oh, sure. Too bad about the rest.

You are taking the wrong forum, the wrong place, and the wrong time.

Let me remind the Members of the Committee that this is an appropriation bill, this a supplemental appropriation bill. Do you know what that is? Now, you are Members of the House, you are Members of the Committee. You are talking about regular procedure all over the country, and let us not abuse the law. This House must do things right. Congress must maintain its integrity with the Nation. We must not be held up to scorn. We must do what is right.

Then, do what is right.

This is a supplemental appropriation bill, that is what this is. Less than 3 months remain in the fiscal year.

Now, to do what you want to do, I am for it. Where do we go? When do we do it? I will be with you and the committee, what hour, what day? Against unemployment? Against unemployment? Why, certainly. I will be there with you, with or without the mustache. I know about it.

But, let us get back to earth.

They did not tell you what you are here for, a regular Congress performing as it should on a supplemental bill, making their speeches in the RECORD. "Look at what I said, here is a copy of the RECORD, look at what I said on such and such a day. I pleaded for you back home. Yes, sir, I am for my people, God, country, and Yale."

Now, watch this: As soon as this budget request came to this subcommittee I had my doubts, the budget request was for $250 million. Who would know better than I to have doubts? I proposed: Let us raise this $100 million. If there is any doubt, let us resolve it in favor—now, watch this—in a supplemental bill, in a supplemental bill. So we did. The committee raised it $100 million unanimously. That is what we did for reasons you know, the reasons you heard.

What date is this? Let me tell you this: in 2 months—in 2 months—I will be right here where I am right now, with the help of God, in this well, on the 1975 appropriation bill. We are now holding hearings this very week; $350 million more is requested in the 1975 budget.

Do you hear me over here? Three hundred and fifty million dollars more.

So we are against the unemployed? Somebody is out of their cotton-pickin' minds if you rebels believe that. If you believe that we are against the unemployed. That is outrageous. Let me tell you that if there is any sign, I pledge you my word, if there is any indication that this economic condition is going to be such that there will be a rise in the unemployment caseload—and, by the way, it was 6.1 percent when the Emergency Employment Act became law, and it is now 5.1 percent, do not forget that. It has gone down now.

If there is any change in economic conditions by the time the regular bill comes to the floor, the 1975 bill, let me tell the Members they will not have to say anything about it; I will; and so will this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. FLOOD was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr Chairman, we talk about the 6.5 percent unemployment rate

that we heard some of my friends mention here—the 6.5 percent. That is the law. The Congress made the law—6.5 percent. If we do not like that, change the law. I will be with the Members. I will be the first one to be with them. That is the law, but do not forget this. Under the transition provision in this act—the Members may not know this—there is provision to use this $100 million to help those people who might be unemployed in areas where unemployment is below 6.5 percent.

In addition to that, as my friend said, using any town one wants to—Cleveland, all right—I know what the situation is in Cleveland because I met with Members from that area. If the Emergency Employment Act funds run out, they can help employees on the payroll because the funds in this bill can be used to cover the cost of the public employment program after the Emergency Employment Act funds run out. Nobody will be hurt by this thing.

I know this is Easter and that tomorrow is Holy Thursday. I know all about that, but do not get this mixed up with Christmas. We do not have a problem. This is a supplemental appropriation. This is not the time. The Members would be wrong. They want to be right.

Oh, boy, especially over here they do not want to make any mistakes. Oh, boy, be careful. Be careful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto close at 3:40 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE yielded his time to Mr. PATTEN.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is terrible when we see a fellow put an act on like my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) did, because his heart was not in it at all. He did his duty as chairman. We could all tell it; right?

If he were talking about black lung, one could not hold him. Let me tell the Members the truth. This is not a supplemental appropriation, which he said 10 times. We passed an Employment Act last December and this is the original funding. I resent it being called a supplemental.

The other thing I want to say to the Members of the House is I will stand with my chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), that this Congress does not appropriate more money than the President asks for in his budget. The gentleman told us in the committee, that after this supplemental was passed we will still be under the amount of money the President asked for this year, and that is the position I want to maintain.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. On a point of order we knocked out $200 million for Vietnam, so that brings it down, and there is a $1 billion recession for welfare.

Mr. PATTEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) knows this is the last step. There is no more for 1974 authorization and we will be under the President's budget. This is not a supplemental. I just want to tell the Members that if they saw the unemployment lines I have seen we would make this for a larger amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRENZEL yielded his time to Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, it was said earlier that only through Public Service Employment could one get a job, if he becomes unemployed. The truth is there are a number of places: In the private sector, on-the-job training; in the public sector, on the job training; institutional training; in school work support; youth training service; in school work support; special target service; computerized job employment. There are a number of areas which we have financed with $1.9 billion in this area of manpower training and employment.

We are not going to be able to employ every individual unemployed today through public service employment. If we did that, with an average of $7,000 per public service employee and with 4.6 million unemployed, we would have to appropriate $32.2 billion to take care of everybody.

We just cannot take care of every unemployed person throughout the medium of public service.

When we initially conceived this program it was not intended to be a broad scale program to run indefinitely but only targeted on those areas with critical unemployment. That is why, as the Chairman pointed out, we changed the law to 6.5 percent.

Who can we criticize but ourselves for drawing that distinction? We did that because we said we are not going to have a self-perpetuating program where every time we come up with a bill every mayor and city council is going to come down and tell us how many people we have to fund on the city payroll in Peoria or Podunk or wherever it is. I thought we had general revenue sharing for that. How many of the Members will vote for that program the next time around?

This program is targeted for a critical area. We ought to keep it on target. I urge the Members to stay with the committee on this.

We will have a regular bill coming up, where $350 million has been requested for public employment. Do we really need more? We will have another opportunity at that time to look at this item. I say in this supplemental we have enough and we can talk about these amounts back home in good conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) made a most important point; this is not really a supplemental request. This is the initial request the initial funding for the comprehensive employment and manpower training program passed last December. It does not supplement what was in the fiscal year 1974 budget.

We can talk about the regular budget bill and that is fine. That budget bill is not going to get here for months.

In the meantime and these are the latest figures from the Conference of Mayors: In Seattle alone, 50,000 people are unemployed. This is not taking into account the energy crisis.

In St. Louis, energy related unemployment is 7,000.

Flint, Mich., 14-percent unemployment rate in February for 22,000 persons.

Los Angeles, jobs energy related, unemployment reached 25,000.

By summer, the regular budget bill that is going to come before this House will not even be out of the committee. When it comes before this House, it is too late for these people who need jobs now. It is too late for summer employment jobs for teenagers. Let us put this additional $150 million in jobs and save $150 million in welfare costs and related miseries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment to provide an additional $150 million for public service jobs. I feel it is crucial to do something about unemployment—and to do it now.

We are witnessing in this country today critical economic ills—rampant inflation, shortages of vital natural resources, increasing unemployment—all resulting from mismanagement of the economy by an administration which is blind to the needs of the average citizen.

The elderly and others living on fixed incomes have been victims of this economic downturn for some time. We are all familiar with the pathetic stories of destitute elderly people desperately shoplifting basic food staples from supermarkets as their only means of survival. In fact, every family has felt the crushing burden of inflation.

More recently, the working man and woman have fallen victim to our continuing economic crisis. Layoffs and unemployment are increasing to intolerable proportions. The Manpower Administration has projected a 6-percent unemployment rate before the end of this fiscal year—and that is a conservative estimate. Nixon and his economic advisers—who have carried the notion of benign neglect into the economic sphere—may consider such an unemployment rate "acceptable." But surely we in Congress, who represent the large numbers of working people in this country, cannot allow the present unemployment rate to accelerate unchecked.

Without this amendment, the funding of public service programs would be cut below last October's level when the unemployment rate was only 4.2 percent. The reason for the skimpy appropriation in this bill is the administration's insistence at pennypinching at the expense

of those unemployed—essentially persons put out of work by the administration's policies to begin with. Furthermore, without this amendment State and local governments may have to lay off additional workers.

Given the billions of dollars we are spending on subsidies to the defense industry, the farmers, and the oil industry—through tax breaks—we can certainly afford $150 million to create jobs for able-bodied men and women who are willing and anxious to work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me point out a few things. First of all, the administration witnesses at our hearings pointed out that the figure in this bill which we are trying to change was prepared last December. A few things have changed since then.

Second, Mr. Stein himself projected unemployment would average 5.7 percent across the entire year, which means it will hit substantially above 6 percent in a number of months to come.

In fact, in response to Mr. MICHEL's assertion that unemployment is not all that bad, the fact is that people employed last month in nonfarm jobs increased by 125,000. We are coming into the agricultural season, which is temporarily slowing down the rise in unemployment, but that will not continue. Let me also point out, the administration itself indicated that under their proposal, the peaking of the public service jobs will come next January. That is a little late for people that do not have jobs now.

Let me point out further, the energy crisis did not take jobs away only in areas that had 6½ percent unemployment or more. The energy crisis hit every area.

We have the power to do something about that by this amendment and I hope we do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the House would follow the urging of the best qualified men to speak on this subject, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW and the ranking minority member. They have urged that this amendment be defeated. I wish to join with them in urging the defeat of this amendment.

In the bill we are already providing $350 million for public service employment. We provided $100 million over the budget in this bill. We will have an opportunity in the regular Labor-HEW bill to provide additional funds for the following year, which begins on July 1.

With respect to the budget, let me say that in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, we are already more than $1 billion over the budget for this current fiscal year; so let us not go further above the budget. The committee on this particular item is recommending $100 million above the budget.

Now, the gentleman from New Jersey looks with some considerable concern upon my statement. I say that in the overall on all appropriation bills for the current fiscal year we are below the budget, but not in the field of Labor-HEW. We are above by over $1 billion on the Labor-HEW measure.

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

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

Mr. PATTEN. Why does the gentleman not tell me about the $8.5 billion collected in taxes to finance HEW? In the national debt they are going to have $15 billion over and above what they spend because of new social security taxes.

Mr. MAHON. The national debt is estimated to increase over $17 billion in fiscal year 1975, according to the President's budget request.

Mr. Chairman, there is another matter directly related to public service employment which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point. On April 3, 1974, the Comptroller General sent a letter to a Member of the Senate in which he stated that section 502 of the first supplemental appropriation for 1974, providing continuing appropriations for activities of the manpower administration of the Department of Labor, authorized the continuation of activities under the Emergency Employment Act which had expired on June 30, 1973.

The Comptroller General's opinion is based upon a finding that language added in the conference could only be applicable to continuation of emergency employment activities. The affected language refers to "necessary expenses for the activities of the manpower administration."

As we understand it, the Comptroller General's opinion would permit obligation of funds for public service jobs at an annual rate of $1,250,000,000. We also understand that the $350,000,000 we are now recommending for public service jobs would not substitute for any amounts used under the Comptroller General's opinion. Since the basic authority is different in the two cases, both amounts would be separately available.

Mr. Chairman, I have reluctantly concluded that in this instance I do not believe the facts support the Comptroller General's finding. I do not believe that it was the intention of the conferees on last year's supplemental appropriations bill to have section 502 cover extension of the Emergency Employment Act, nor do I believe that it was the intention of this body to continue activities under the Emergency Employment Act when it voted on that supplemental appropriation. The information I placed in the RECORD of December 19, 1973, summarized a number of the activities of the Manpower Administration which were specifically covered by language in the continuing appropriation. That summary made no reference to emergency employment activities. It did not do so because this House had specifically rejected an attempt to bring the Emergency Employment Act to the floor for extension in the preceding April. Further, the regular continuing resolution for 1974 specifically identified other programs of the Manpower Administration, including manpower development and training, and a provision of the Economic Opportunity Act. But that regular continuing resolution did not specify Emergency Employment Act activities. The language we added relating to "necessary expenses" was in our judgment needed to cover the range of activities in the Manpower Administration's salaries and expenses account.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the possible long-range impact of the Comptroller General's ruling. Traditionally, we have used the continuing resolution to cover situations where the Congress has not enacted authorizing legislation but is expected to do so within a relatively short period. In the present case, there is no indication that the Congress desired to reinstitute the emergency employment assistance program. In fact, this House had determined that it would not act on that program in favor of a comprehensive employment and training program which was later enacted and which is covered by provisions of the continuing appropriation. The Comptroller General's ruling might be interpreted as a precedent which could be used to bypass the regular legislative and appropriations procedures of the Congress in a way that seems to me to be undesirable.

I wish to make it clear for the record that the Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1974 was not intended to revive the Emergency Employment Act nor to make the $1.25 billion available for the Department of Labor to spend.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, the PEP program has been extremely beneficial to Cambria County and I would add my support to this amendment which would allow all the counties in the 12th Congressional District to continue to participate in this vital program.

The Emergency Employment Act of 1971, under the guidelines of the Department of Labor with the Cambria County Commissioners as prime sponsors, has successfully executed a PEP program in Cambria County during the fiscal years of 1973 and 1974.

The prime purpose of the public employment program is to make financial assistance available to public employers which will be used in providing unemployed or underemployed persons with transitional jobs, providing needed public services, and developing new career opportunities in Cambria County.

Cambria County as a prime sponsor under the supervision of Joseph P. Roberts, president of the county commissioners, was declared an eligible applicant and received a grant funding under section 5 and section 6 of the Emergency Employment Act.

Cambria County was allocated a funding level of $397,298 in Federal costs. These moneys include both regular and discretionary funds for summer employment. The county's share being $45,891. This was paid in a percentage of in-kind contributions, meaning the supervisors wages and fringe benefits were used in training of the participants under his employment.

The Federal grants also allowed for the county's share of the FICA and workmen's compensation charges to be paid out of the program.

Section 5 has a total enrollment of 224 participants, which includes a reg-

ular and a summer program for the fiscal years of 1973 and 1974.

SECTION 5 REGULAR PROGRAM

Federal cost of $313,894: 109 participants placed in training, projected as of June 30, 1974; 43 hired by employing agencies; 7 hired by public employers; 27 hired by private employers; 14 entered other programs, school, or armed services; 18 terminated for other reasons; cost per placement in unsubsidized jobs, $4,076; percent of placement, 70.64 percent; and rate of veteran hiring, 56.88 percent.

SECTION 5 SUMMER PROGRAM

The 1973 summer program with discretionary funds, $83,404: 115 summer program participants; 2 hired by agency; 4 hired by public employers; 6 hired by private employers; 103 returned to college; cost per placement for summer students, $734.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) providing additional funds for manpower programs.

The manpower program was initially established to combat the persistently high levels of unemployment prevailing in our Nation during the late 1950's. As unemployment rises once again, primarily as a result of our energy shortages, we need to renew our efforts in taking our citizens off the welfare rolls and bringing them into the mainstream of the gainfully employed. To do this, we must provide the funds and knowhow for training and educating those depressed groups of citizens who have such difficulty in procuring employment.

In November of last year, the House passed the Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1973, providing a new charter for those manpower programs operating under previous directives. This bill was an effort to decentralize and decategorize existing programs making them more responsive to local needs. In order to effectively implement this new charter, and to provide for the wise, locally controlled spending of our tax dollars, we must now provide full funding for the program's operations, giving the program an opportunity to prove itself.

The cost benefit of this program is perhaps its worthiest note, manpower programs will take our unemployed off of the welfare roles and make him a productive wage earner.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the gentleman's amendment when the vote is called for, and urge my colleagues to vote yea.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The facts of unemployment are clear. The national unemployment figure is 5.2 percent, representing 4.7 million Americans. This figure does not take into account those people who, out of frustration and despair, have stopped looking for work. It does not count those people working part time who would like to work full time, nor does it count those people working full time but earning less than adequate wages.

The current funding of the PEP program will expire in April. Most communities will simply lose out because of the restrictive eligibility requirements of the Comprehensive Education and Training Act—CETA—title II. What will they lose?

They will lose a program whose administrative costs were less than 2 percent. Thus 98 percent of the funds expended went right to the jobs themselves. Vietnam-era veterans comprised 37 percent of all participants; 41 percent were minority group members; 14 percent were former welfare recipients. The communities will lose all the benefits of a program that sent half of its participants directly into jobs—jobs that produce much needed tax revenues.

The Congress passed and the President signed into law on December 28, 1973, the Comprehensive Education and Training Act—CETA. Yet the regulations implementing this program have gone through six revisions and are still out for comments. The deadline for the last set of comments in the Federal Register is not until May 4.

The transitional authority given to the Secretary of Labor under CETA is much needed. But the amount of money asked for by the administration and the amount approved by the Appropriations Committee will not keep us at the level of jobs needed or authorized in the past by this Congress.

In CETA, Congress clearly mandated that the public employment program was to continue. This was not a transitional provision. In the Emergency Employment Act, Congress clearly mandated PEP. We cannot allow this program to fold because of the recalcitrance of the Nixon administration. I urge adoption of the Obey amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) which would provide an additional $150 million for public service employment under H.R. 14013, second supplemental appropriation.

Our public service employment programs have been of real value in combating the severe unemployment in areas such as my congressional district. The $350 million provided in the committee bill would only be sufficient for 85,000 jobs, yet last October 102,000 public service jobs were being funded. We should maintain adequate funding for this necessary program, for unemployment is still rising and we must maintain our efforts to slow this trend.

Under the committee bill the State of Illinois will receive $14,801,000. The proposed amendment would raise this sum to $21,701,000 and permit more jobs to exist under the program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this amendment and then pass H.R. 14013.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—ayes 236, noes 168, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—236

Abdnor	Gonzalez	Patten
Abzug	Grasso	Pepper
Adams	Green, Oreg.	Perkins
Addabbo	Green, Pa.	Peyser
Alexander	Gude	Pike
Anderson, Calif.	Hamilton	Podell
Anderson, Ill.	Hammer-schmidt	Preyer
Andrews, N. Dak.	Hanley	Price, Ill.
Annunzio	Hanna	Pritchard
Ashley	Hansen, Wash.	Railsback
Aspin	Harrington	Randall
Badillo	Hawkins	Rangel
Barrett	Hays	Rees
Bell	Hechler, W. Va.	Regula
Bergland	Heckler, Mass.	Reid
Biaggi	Heinz	Reuss
Biester	Helstoski	Riegle
Bingham	Hicks	Rinaldo
Blatnik	Hillis	Rodino
Boggs	Holifield	Roe
Boland	Holtzman	Roncalio, Wyo.
Brademas	Horton	Roncallo, N.Y.
Brasco	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Bray	Huber	Rosenthal
Breaux	Hungate	Rostenkowski
Breckinridge	Hunt	Roush
Brinkley	Hutchinson	Roy
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Broomfield	Johnson, Pa.	Ruppe
Brotzman	Jones, N.C.	Ryan
Brown, Calif.	Jones, Okla.	St Germain
Brown, Mich.	Jordan	Sarasin
Burke, Calif.	Karth	Sarbanes
Burke, Mass.	Kluczynski	Schroeder
Burton	Koch	Seiberling
Carney, Ohio	Kyros	Sisk
Chisholm	Leggett	Slack
Clark	Lehman	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Long, La.	Staggers
Cohen	Long, Md.	Stanton, J. William
Collins, Ill.	Lujan	Stanton, James V.
Conte	Luken	Stark
Corman	McCloskey	Steele
Cotter	McCormack	Stephens
Cronin	McDade	Stokes
Culver	McFall	Stratton
Daniels, Dominick V.	McKay	Stubblefield
Davis, Ga.	McKinney	Stuckey
Davis, S.C.	McSpadden	Studds
de la Garza	Macdonald	Sullivan
Delaney	Madigan	Symington
Dellenback	Mallary	Talcott
Denholm	Maraziti	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Mathias, Calif.	Thomson, Wis.
Diggs	Matsunaga	Thone
Dingell	Mazzoli	Thornton
Donohue	Meeds	Tiernan
Drinan	Melcher	Udall
Dulski	Metcalfe	Ullman
du Pont	Mezvinsky	Vander Jagt
Eckhardt	Mills	Vander Veen
Edwards, Calif.	Minish	Vanik
Eilberg	Mink	Vigorito
Esch	Mitchell, Md.	Waldie
Evans, Colo.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Walsh
Fascell	Moakley	Whalen
Fish	Mollohan	Widnall
Foley	Moorhead, Pa.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Ford	Morgan	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Forsythe	Mosher	Wolff
Fraser	Moss	Wright
Frenzel	Murphy, Ill.	Yates
Froehlich	Murtha	Yatron
Fulton	Natcher	Young, Ga.
Gaydos	Nedzi	Young, Tex.
Giaimo	Nix	Zablocki
Gibbons	Obey	
Gilman	O'Hara	
Ginn	O'Neill	
	Owens	
	Passman	

NOES—168

Andrews, N.C.	Burgener	Cochran
Archer	Burke, Fla.	Collins, Tex.
Arends	Burleson, Tex.	Conable
Armstrong	Burlison, Mo.	Conlan
Ashbrook	Butler	Coughlin
Bafalis	Byron	Crane
Baker	Camp	Daniel, Dan
Bauman	Carter	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Beard	Casey, Tex.	Davis, Wis.
Bennett	Chamberlain	Dennis
Bevill	Chappell	Derwinski
Blackburn	Clancy	Devine
Brown, Ohio	Clausen, Don H.	Dickinson
Broyhill, N.C.	Clawson, Del	Downing
Broyhill, Va.	Cleveland	Duncan
Buchanan		

Edwards, Ala.	Lagomarsino	Schneebeli
Erlenborn	Landgrebe	Sebelius
Eshleman	Latta	Shoup
Evins, Tenn.	Lent	Shriver
Findley	Lott	Shuster
Fisher	McClory	Sikes
Flood	McCollister	Skubitz
Flowers	Mahon	Smith, N.Y.
Flynt	Mann	Snyder
Fountain	Martin, N.C.	Spence
Frey	Mathis, Ga.	Steed
Fuqua	Mayne	Steelman
Gettys	Michel	Steiger, Ariz.
Goldwater	Milford	Steiger, Wis.
Goodling	Miller	Symms
Gross	Mizell	Taylor, Mo.
Grover	Montgomery	Taylor, N.C.
Gubser	Moorhead, Calif.	Teague
Gunter	Myers	Towell, Nev.
Guyer	Nelsen	Treen
Haley	O'Brien	Veysey
Hanrahan	Parris	Waggonner
Hansen, Idaho	Pettis	Wampler
Harsha	Poage	Ware
Hastings	Powell, Ohio	White
Hébert	Price, Tex.	Whitehurst
Henderson	Quie	Whitten
Hinshaw	Quillen	Wiggins
Hogan	Rarick	Williams
Holt	Rhodes	Wilson, Bob
Hosmer	Roberts	Winn
Hudnut	Robinson, Va.	Wyatt
Ichord	Robison, N.Y.	Wydler
Jarman	Rogers	Wylie
Johnson, Colo.	Rousselot	Wyman
Jones, Ala.	Runnels	Young, Alaska
Jones, Tenn.	Ruth	Young, Fla.
Kemp	Sandman	Young, Ill.
Ketchum	Satterfield	Young, S.C.
King	Scherle	Zion
Kuykendall		Zwach

NOT VOTING—28

Bolling	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Bowen	Griffiths	Nichols
Carey, N.Y.	Kastenmeier	Patman
Cederberg	Kazen	Pickle
Collier	Landrum	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	Litton	Rose
Danielson	McEwen	Shipley
Dellums	Madden	Van Deerlin
Dorn	Martin, Nebr.	
Frelinghuysen	Minshall, Ohio	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For an additional amount for "Howard University", $3,362,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADDABBO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADDABBO: Page 15, after line 13, insert:

"OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT"

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Child Development" for carrying out the Child Abuse Preventive and Treatment Act (P.L. 93-247), $4,500,000.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, for a change, I am not offering an antiwar amendment, but I am offering one to assist in carrying out the war against child abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I do not normally advocate legislating out of regular order. Particularly in relation to appropriations. I prefer to see the subcommittees conduct extensive hearings to accumulate the justifications and necessary evaluations before they recommend a funding level.

But I am today offering an amendment to fund the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act in this supplemental appropriations bill for the last quarter of this fiscal year by $4.5 million because I am convinced that this program is so desperately needed throughout the States and that it carries with it the potential for eliminating so much needless suffering, that I plead with the House to forgo this time the regular process.

Last December, by the overwhelming vote of 354 to 36, the House passed the authorization bill for this program. The Senate concurred and the President signed the bill into law.

But months have passed since we took that vote in the House and if we wait for the regular appropriations process, it may well take another 6 months before the money becomes available to even begin putting the program together.

Let me say that I have all the confidence in the world that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) the chairman of the subcommittee on HEW appropriations, will adequately fund the Center for Child Abuse in the 1975 fiscal budget. Mr. FLOOD was 1 of the original 114 House cosponsors of the bill, and he and his subcommittee are uniquely qualified to determine how well this act can help us rid ourselves of this national shame, child abuse.

But what I seek from the membership today is approval to provide the seed money now so that the administration can begin to organize the program, hire the necessary staff, and prepare its initial operations.

By doing that, the program will be functional by the time that the Congress concludes its regular appropriations process for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If we believe that child abuse is prevalent and that we must seek to determine how it happens, why it happens, what effect it has and hopefully, how to avoid its incidence as often as possible, then we must act quickly to implement the program. I believe the 354-to-36 vote indicates clearly that the House is on record that it believes the problems are real and that the House of Representatives wants to resolve them as best it can.

We have all learned the heartbreaking stories of child abuse, hundreds of hundreds of horror stories that result in maimed or murdered children. We have seen how early detection not only would save lives but would save families from utter and complete destruction from a senseless act of cruelty.

I will not take time to document these cases here in my limited time, for every day's newspaper documents the continuous problem of child abuse. Over 20 States have specific laws requiring teachers to report suspected cases of child abuse. I believe you feel as I that these needless acts of child abuse can, with help, be prevented.

I would hope you would support this amendment. It is for an excellent cause.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the House to support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from New York, Representative ADDABBO, to appropriate $4.5 million for child abuse for fiscal 1974.

We have come a long way in dealing with the child abuse problem, first, in its recognition; second, in the enactment of legislation which was, to the President's credit, signed by him in the latter part of January. But we are left without the tools. The tools in this instance represent the dollars that are so essential in enforcing the program.

I should like to congratulate my colleague from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) for introducing this amendment. We are talking about an abuse that required recognition—an abuse that has existed on the American scene since the beginning of time and which has now become an epidemic, with victims running into the thousands. I am confident that this legislation which was recently enacted by the House can end that abuse if it is funded.

Today we are talking about funding that should be immediately provided. The sums involved in this amendment are meager, but, as the gentleman said who introduced it, it is an interim amount to implement a very important law. I might add, it is also the essential first step we have delayed so long in taking.

Until last year I felt like a lone voice crying in the wilderness, but through the efforts of many in this country such as Dr. Vincent Fontana, director of the founding home in New York and others, who made me aware of the acuteness of this problem as far back as 15 years ago, the public and the Congress finally responded. Finally, after I, alone, had been introducing child abuse legislation ever since I came to Congress in 1969, we got some action and passed a bill.

We must not forget for a moment that we are faced with a terribly serious problem, which is rapidly getting worse. Last year over 700 children died in the United States from abuse and neglect, over 200 of them in New York City alone. Child abuse is the leading cause of death among infants and young children in this country. The passage of this amendment is essential if we are to successfully attack this problem.

I would like, also, to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS), chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, for his vital help on this matter.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) for offering this amendment and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) who first drew this matter to the attention of our committee, that is the need for special legislation. It was supported by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) as well. We produced a bill that is aimed at coping with what has been described as the tragic events by high officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There appeared before our subcommittee the Assistant Secretary for Human Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Stanley B. Thomas, who said:

In the face of apparently growing numbers of children neglected, maimed and even killed, we realize that we need to place in-

creased emphasis on our efforts in this area and that high priority must be given by the Department in assuming a leadership role in assisting and supporting the efforts of States and localities.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO), supported by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI), who introduced the original legislation, is for the purpose of implementing that judgment precisely.

I hope the amendment will be supported.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his comments.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to close the debate on the amendment. Wait until the Members hear this. I must reluctantly but very definitely oppose this kind of amendment. Wait until the Members see why. As the gentleman from New York said, yes, I voted for this bill. So did nearly everybody else. But that is not what we are talking about.

We are talking about appropriating the money. Wait until the Members hear this. This is dull, but may we have a little order, Mr. Chairman?

Members know why we are here. Nobody is talking here about the merits of the bill. Let me tell the Members, there has been no budget request for this program.

Let me tell the Members something else. We have had no hearings on this. Nobody in either body has had hearings. We have not had time to have any hearings. This became law on January 31 of this year, a few months ago. Nobody knows how this money would be used. We have not had the hearings and nobody can say.

Now, I have no idea and I am chairman of the Appropriations Committee handling this thing, and the gentleman from New York who introduced the amendment has no idea—no more idea than his grandmother. Nobody else has any idea what can be done and why. Nobody knows how much can be used. Nobody knows when. Nobody has proposed a thing.

For heaven's sake, in view of those things, I ask Members not to forget that we will be back here in a couple of months, we will hold hearings after the recess on this program, and we will be back in a few weeks with the 1975 appropriation bill dealing with this subject. We have not considered this matter.

Under all the circumstances I cannot imagine the Members would want to support the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not noted around this Chamber for being a big spender. I am not noted for being a liberal bleeding heart. But we are dealing with a subject here that has only recently been identified and the prospective measures to cope with it determined. We are also dealing in an area where small children and babies are being maimed and abused. By means of this expenditure we have the opportunity to stop it. The sooner we stop it, the better.

Now, this $4.5 million is a small enough fund. For the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) to plead in this Chamber that because the Committee on Appropriations has not yet got around to fine tuning just exactly how much ought to be spent in this area when the regular appropriation will eventually come up is a pretty poor excuse, in my mind, for delaying the money and thereby tolerating longer the kind of killing and abuse that is going on.

That money is going to have to be spent sooner or later. It is inhumane that it be later.

The Committee on Appropriations can well take into account the $4.5 million if it is appropriated now when it gets around finally to its regular appropriation bill. So let us get this program started in the meantime. Let us stop this killing and let us stop this maiming. In the interest of humanity and to protect large numbers of helpless babies and young children, let us vote for this amendment.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I deliberately was not going to take the floor after I heard my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) offer his amendment and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) speaking further in favor of it, because I was convinced there would be no opposition to this amendment.

I am amazed to find that the chairman of the subcommittee try to plead a case of not appropriating $4.5 million to help hundreds of thousands of children who are abused in this country today.

He stated that there were no hearings held, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) held numerous hearings in different parts of this country and what we found was just unbelievable. To think that this Congress might oppose in any way or speak of a delay of 3 to 6 months when we could be offering some protection to our children is unbelievable. I do not believe this Congress is going to do it.

I think an example that would be of importance to all of us would be to know the results of the States that have gone ahead with this legislation and have made it possible for people to report child abuse. I will give you one State specifically where in 2 months of this year because of the change in laws allowing child abuse to be reported without making the people responsible in a legal sense and being obligated in a legal sense to defend themselves, there have been more cases of child abuse reported in 2 months than in the previous 2 years.

I just hope that this House will act firmly and it will stand behind the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO).

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. I commend the gentleman from New York for his statement and commend him for his work on the bill. The act as passed calls for an authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, of $15 million.

The act also provides the Secretary shall within 60 days after date of enactment of the act appoint an advisory board on child abuse and that advisory board is to report back to this Congress within 18 months. If we wait for the regular appropriation, almost a year will have gone by and we still will not have the appointment of an advisory board, which this Congress said should be apponted within 60 days after enactment of this bill.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I hope that we will put aside some of the technicalities involved that the Appropriations Committee is considering now. We are talking about $4.5 million, when generally we talk about billions; when we get down to a figure like this when we are dealing with children's lives, let us act and do it positively.

I hope we do not even need a vote. I hope we can pass this bill that I helped sponsor by acclamation.

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

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, I hesitate somewhat to take the floor this afternoon for fear that some of these self-professed analyzers of our voting records will characterize me as being a child abuser or a child beater in opposing this amendment.

The father of four real fine children, all of whom we are mighty proud of and all of whom received their fair share of spankings, I still think there are good reasons for opposing this amendment.

The administration has already indicated in testimony before the Congress that it has identified $4 million in new program activity for child protection. Under the law that we passed and which was signed into law just January 31 of this year.

Implementation of the demonstration project the grant program and the State grant program will require issuance of regulations specifying the terms and conditions governing applications and grant awards. In the case of State grant activity, the distribution formula must be defined by regulations. HEW is currently in the process of developing these regulations. It will not be possible to issue proposed regulations, get back the comments from interested parties and incorporate those comments into final regulations before June 30 of this year.

In order to qualify for State grant funds, a State must meet a number of related criteria at State and local government level. In the case of many States, these criteria include changes that must be effected by the State legislatures. These changes in State child abuse laws and programs will require at least several months of preparation before they can be achieved. What I am saying is that we need not have this money added here in a supplemental bill because, as I said in testimony before the committee, they have already allocated some $4 million in new program activity for child protection. The Department should have a period for issuing regulations, allowing time for comment, then setting forth a positive program so that all of us know where we are going.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the Department is moving expeditiously, as we required them to do under the act. There will be plenty of time, with the regular bill coming along, to specifically earmark money for this program.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has passed legislation which has been approved by the President, to try to cope with the problem of child abuse. It is the law of the land. Insofar as I know every Member of the House proposes to support the law and do what he can.

The American people seem to be inclined to complain at Congress, charging Congress with a harum-scarum performance in financing some Federal programs. Certainly a better job can and should be done in the operation of Federal programs. Of course, the executive branch, not the legislative administers the laws.

Plans are not sufficiently mature for the funding of this program. Here is a program in which the Department is trying to get off on the right foot in order to prevent abuses and criticism and ill will. Yet it is proposed that we rush in with an amendment to provide funds before they are ready.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of the House will stay by the committee. Let us insist that a program be presented to us which will do justice to the law which has been enacted. At the proper time let us provide the funds that may be required in order that we may achieve the objectives of the legislation. This can best be done in the regular bill which is now under consideration by the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the amendment to H.R. 14013 offered by my colleague from New York to provide $4.5 million in supplemental funding for the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

As the House sponsor of this legislation, I feel strongly that the Congress must live up to the commitment we made in the act to apply Federal resources in combating the immense and pervasive problem of child abuse. It is essential that we give HEW the funding necessary to begin implementation of this program immediately. Although the legislation was passed in December and approved in January, the administration has refused to request any supplemental funding for fiscal year 1974 and has as yet made no request for fiscal year 1975.

Although I fully support this amendment, I recognize that the amount it appropriates is minimal in view of the many groups throughout the country, both public and private, which are currently seeking funds to implement or expand prevention and treatment programs. The Congress recognized the pressing need for the demonstration programs authorized in the act by setting authorization levels at $15 million for this fiscal year and $20 million for fiscal year 1975. I understand the Senate is moving toward a $10 million figure for this fiscal year. I feel that $10 million comes much closer to meeting the actual need, and hope the final figure approaches this amount. We cannot let the child abuse bill, by underfunding, become yet another empty promise to our Nation's children.

As an example of the type of efforts that could be assisted under this act, I am attaching a report made to the mayor of Denver by a child abuse task force appointed to look into the tragic beating death of a 4½-year-old boy. This boy's death was the second case in less than a year where a child, known by the authorities to be in danger from abusing parents, was returned to a lethal home environment because of inadequate followthrough procedures. It is clear that a program of this magnitude requires Federal, as well as State and local assistance.

The report follows:

MARCH 20, 1974.

DEAR MR. MAYOR: The Select Committee you appointed on January 22, 1974 has met weekly to review the circumstances of the death of Roy Aragon who died on January 6, 1974 at age four and a half years. The record of events as available to the Committee and our findings in this matter, are included in the confidential supplement to this report.

Our further concern has been to encourage and support cooperation among the agencies and professions involved in the protection of children in Denver. The Committee has met with representatives of many of these agencies. We have found them dedicated and concerned, trying to do the best job they can, often under impossible odds.

We do find, however, that there has been a lack of clarity in procedures within these agencies as to the actions to be taken when an incident of child abuse arises. We also find the need for closer cooperation among these agencies in pursuit of their respective responsibilities in regard to an abused child.

We find a need for more knowledge and education among these agencies as to the family dynamics of child abuse as well as to the awareness of the need for immediate response when abuse does occur.

We also find a lack of adequate staff, services and resources among these agencies if the children of Denver are to be protected and if child abuse is to be reduced.

As a result of the current concern for the protection of children from neglect and abuse, several important developments have occurred in Denver recently. For example, the Inter-Agency Child Abuse Review Committee established through the cooperation of the Juvenile Court and the Welfare Department, now reviews all reports of alleged child abuse to assure that necessary actions are taken to protect endangered children; the Court now issues ex parte orders where children are found to be in imminent danger, but the parents are uncooperative; the Interdisciplinary Treatment Team of the Welfare Department has been expanded so as to provide guidance of services for families in distress and children in danger; several agencies, including the Police, Head Start, the Juvenile Court, and County Departments of Social Services throughout the State are availing themselves of the training offered by the National Center on Child Abuse.

Among the substantive recommendations of the Committee are:

a. A Family Crisis Center to respond to all reports of child abuse or requests for help for distressed families.

b. A team response of police and social workers to reports of child abuse or neglect.

c. Expanded provisions for emergency shelter when children are removed from the home.

d. A Residential Family Treatment Center for families in distress.

e. A full-time pediatrician assigned to the Welfare Department.

f. The location of a Protective Services Team on Capitol Hill where most child abuse fatalities occur.

The Committee also recommends a program for developing community awareness of the responsibility for reporting instances of suspected child abuse and for supporting and funding the services needed to protect children and prevent abuse and neglect.

Furthermore, each agency is asked to appoint a Child Abuse Coordinator to assure appropriate internal procedures for responding to incidents of child abuse and to provide liaison with other agencies and professions concerned with child protection.

And, finally, we recommend that a Mayor's Citizens' Committee on Child Protection be appointed to foster and monitor the development and operation of the child protection system in Denver.

At this time, the Committee is submitting its report on the child protection system in Denver, along with its recommendations for a continued effort toward its improvement.

The Committee would like to express its admiration for Dr. Henry C. Kempe for his concern and courage in calling the plight of the abused child to the attention of the people of Denver. The Committee would also like to thank Mr. Fred Gillies of the Denver Post for his reporting on the events and actions that have occurred in these last few weeks for improving the protection of children in Denver.

Respectfully,

THE MAYOR'S SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILD ABUSE.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased last December when the Congress passed the Child Abuse Treatment and Prevention Act. However, I am extremely distressed that the Office of Child Development, which is responsible for the implementation of this act, has forestalled its activities by not immediately requesting the funds to adequately staff their office, much less to begin those activities necessary to implement the treatment and prevention programs authorized under this act.

The children of this country cannot wait for fiscal year 1975 for these programs; they desperately need funding in the current fiscal year. This program is vital to the health and safety of many of our Nation's children—child abuse is a much-masked, though seldom discussed, national problem which must be faced now. The congressional mandate was quite clear and the act was passed with an overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress. Any further delay in funding renders this clear expression of the will of Congress a nullity.

As one of the cosponsors of this act, I urge support of Mr. ADDABBO's amendment to provide immediate funding and implementation of the Child Abuse Treatment and Prevention Act.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—ayes 254, noes 149, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—254

Abdnor	Gray	Owens
Abzug	Green, Pa.	Parris
Adams	Grover	Pepper
Addabbo	Gude	Perkins
Anderson, Calif.	Guyer	Pettis
	Haley	Peyser
Anderson, Ill.	Hamilton	Pike
Annunzio	Hanley	Podell
Ashley	Hanna	Price, Ill.
Aspin	Hanrahan	Pritchard
Badillo	Hansen, Idaho	Railsback
Bafalis	Hansen, Wash.	Randall
Baker	Harrington	Rangel
Barrett	Harsha	Rees
Bell	Hawkins	Regula
Bennett	Hays	Reuss
Bergland	Hechler, W. Va.	Riegle
Biaggi	Heckler, Mass.	Rinaldo
Biester	Heinz	Roberts
Bingham	Helstoski	Rodino
Blatnik	Hicks	Roe
Boggs	Hillis	Rogers
Boland	Hogan	Roncalio, Wyo.
Brademas	Holifield	Roncallo, N.Y.
Brasco	Holtzman	Rooney, Pa.
Bray	Horton	Rosenthal
Breckinridge	Hosmer	Rostenkowski
Brinkley	Howard	Roush
Brooks	Hudnut	Rousselot
Broomfield	Hungate	Roy
Brotzman	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Ryan
Brown, Mich.	Jones, Ala.	St Germain
Buchanan	Jordan	Sandman
Burke, Calif.	Karth	Sarasin
Burke, Mass.	Kemp	Sarbanes
Burton	King	Schroeder
Carney, Ohio	Kluczynski	Seiberling
Chisholm	Koch	Shriver
Clark	Kuykendall	Sisk
Clausen, Don H.	Kyros	Skubitz
	Latta	Slack
Clay	Leggett	Smith, Iowa
Cleveland	Lehman	Staggers
Cohen	Lent	Stanton, J. William
Collins, Ill.	Long, La.	
Conte	Long, Md.	Stanton, James V.
Corman	Luken	
Cotter	McClory	Stark
Cronin	McCloskey	Steele
Culver	McCollister	Stokes
Daniels, Dominick V.	McCormack	Stratton
	McDade	Studds
Davis, S.C.	McFall	Sullivan
de la Garza	McKinney	Symington
Delaney	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Denholm	Madden	Thone
Dent	Madigan	Thornton
Derwinski	Maraziti	Tiernan
Diggs	Mathias, Calif.	Towell, Nev.
Donohue	Matsunaga	Udall
Drinan	Mayne	Ullman
Dulski	Mazzoli	Vander Jagt
Eckhardt	Meeds	Vander Veen
Edwards, Calif.	Melcher	Vanik
Eilberg	Metcalfe	Vigorito
Esch	Mezvinsky	Waldie
Eshleman	Milford	Walsh
Fascell	Minish	Whalen
Findley	Mink	White
Fish	Mitchell, Md.	Widnall
Flowers	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Foley	Moakley	
Ford	Mollohan	
Forsythe	Moorhead, Calif.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Fraser		
Frenzel	Moorhead, Pa.	Winn
Frey	Morgan	Wolff
Froehlich	Moss	Wright
Fulton	Murphy, Ill.	Wydler
Fuqua	Murphy, N.Y.	Yates
Gaydos	Murtha	Yatron
Giaimo	Nedzi	Young, Alaska
Gibbons	Nix	Young, Ga.
Gilman	Obey	Young, Ill.
Ginn	O'Brien	Young, Tex.
Gonzalez	O'Hara	Zablocki
Grasso	O'Neill	

NOES—149

Alexander	Flood	Preyer
Andrews, N.C.	Flynt	Price, Tex.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fountain	Quie
	Gettys	Quillen
Archer	Goldwater	Rarick
Arends	Goodling	Robinson, Va.
Armstrong	Green, Oreg.	Robison, N.Y.
Bauman	Gross	Rose
Beard	Gubser	Runnels
Bevill	Gunter	Ruppe
Blackburn	Hammer-schmidt	Ruth
Breaux		Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Hastings	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Hébert	Schneebeli
Broyhill, Va.	Henderson	Sebelius
Burgener	Hinshaw	Shoup
Burke, Fla.	Holt	Shuster
Burleson, Tex.	Huber	Sikes
Burlison, Mo.	Hunt	Smith, N.Y.
Butler	Hutchinson	Snyder
Byron	Ichord	Spence
Camp	Jarman	Steed
Carter	Johnson, Colo.	Steelman
Casey, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Steiger, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Jones, Okla.	Steiger, Wis.
Chappell	Jones, Tenn.	Stephens
Clancy	Ketchum	Stubblefield
Clawson, Del	Lagomarsino	Symms
Cochran	Landgrebe	Talcott
Collins, Tex.	Lott	Taylor, Mo.
Conable	Lujan	Taylor, N.C.
Conlan	McKay	Teague
Coughlin	McSpadden	Thomson, Wis.
Crane	Mahon	Treen
Daniel, Dan	Mallary	Veysey
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Mann	Waggonner
	Martin, N.C.	Wampler
Davis, Ga.	Mathis, Ga.	Ware
Davis, Wis.	Michel	Whitehurst
Dellenback	Miller	Whitten
Dennis	Mills	Wiggins
Devine	Mizell	Williams
Dickinson	Montgomery	Wilson, Bob
Dingell	Mosher	Wyatt
Downing	Myers	Wylie
Duncan	Natcher	Wyman
Edwards, Ala.	Nelsen	Young, Fla.
Erlenborn	Passman	Young, S.C.
Evans, Colo.	Patten	Zion
Evins, Tenn.	Poage	Zwach
Fisher	Powell, Ohio	

NOT VOTING—29

Ashbrook	du Pont	Nichols
Bolling	Frelinghuysen	Patman
Bowen	Griffiths	Pickle
Carey, N.Y.	Kastenmeier	Reid
Cederberg	Kazen	Rhodes
Collier	Landrum	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	Litton	Shipley
Danielson	McEwen	Stuckey
Dellums	Martin, Nebr.	Van Deerlin
Dorn	Minshall, Ohio	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military construction, Navy", $29,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. Chairman, originally I had intended to offer an amendment striking the funds being made available for Diego Garcia. Under the circumstances, because of the lateness of the hour and because we still have another bill scheduled, I will not offer it. But I would like to make a few points about Diego Garcia.

Mr. Chairman, as those who have read the committee report on this bill know, I oppose the $29 million contained in this bill for the Department of Naval Facilities on the British-owned island of Diego Garcia, in the middle of the Indian Ocean.

I oppose that appropriation for two basic reasons.

First, it is simply not necessary to appropriate money for this purpose in a supplemental appropriation bill. All you have to do is read the committee report to be convinced of that. It says, for example, that the Soviet naval presence in the Indian Ocean "could" expand dramatically, and "could" threaten our supplies of raw materials. From those two "coulds" the report concludes that a supplemental appropriation is "urgent."

Well, I do not know how two "coulds" make an emergency which necessitates the appropriation of money in a supplemental budget bill just a few months before the regular appropriation bill is acted on.

The purpose of supplemental appropriation bills is—and should be—to deal with situations which are of a special or emergency nature.

No one has even suggested that there is any kind of emergency here.

The only reason given for asking for this money in a supplemental appropriation bill is that construction of a runway can be advanced a few months. In my judgment the convenience of a construction schedule should be minor in comparison with some of the other considerations which have hardly been debated by this Congress.

Rather than confining our attention to narrow issues such as ship-days and the like, we should be giving a decent amount of attention to other larger questions:

Will this contribute to renewed naval activity by the Russians? Congress has scarcely considered that question.

What will it cost us if we do build up Diego Garcia and use it to support increased naval activity in the Indian Ocean?

Do we really want to thin out the 7th Fleet to do that? If we do not, will we be willing to pay the cost of new carriers which Admiral Zumwalt has testified would be necessary if we spent more than 6 months a year in the Indian Ocean each year.

Will India continue to resist Russian requests for base rights in India if we move into the Indian Ocean?

The Congress has scarcely considered these questions and our claim to partnership with the executive branch in foreign policy considerations is shown to be so much wind every time we blindly accept programs of this type without the serious consideration of broader questions that our rhetoric and our salaries would seem to require.

We are told that an expansion at Diego Garcia is needed to protect the sealanes in the Indian Ocean through which we get oil and other raw materials.

But if we do expand facilities on Diego Garcia, is that any guarantee that our supplies of oil will not again be cut off—not in the seas—but at the well-head?

The presence of a U.S. carrier task force in the Indian Ocean during the October war did not stop the Arabs from doing just that.

We are told that an expansion at Diego Garcia is needed because with the opening of the Suez Canal the Soviets will be able to increase their presence in the Indian Ocean.

If we are so worried about that, why are we putting out large sums of money to help open that canal.

And, in any event, how much will the Russians rely on the Suez Canal if, as everyone seems to agree, the canal is vulnerable in a crisis and would leave Soviet ships far from their support facilities.

We are told that we need to expand our facilities at Diego Garcia to balance an increased Soviet force which is already there.

But exactly what does the Soviet Union have in the Indian Ocean? The number of major surface combat ships in the Indian Ocean has never been substantial and, by far, the greatest portion of their increased activity in recent years is accounted for by minesweepers and other auxiliary ships.

We are told that an expansion of facilities at Diego Garcia will make it less costly for the United States to deploy ships and aircraft in the Indian Ocean. But Admiral Zumwalt has testified that there is a real possibility that an expansion of our forces in the Indian Ocean will require two or three additional aircraft carriers.

What about the cost? It is in the billions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, a permanent naval base on Diego Garcia may well be desirable. But we really have not thought about it, and we should. There is no emergency. There may be a need for this base, but it is not pressing, and we should use the time between now and the regular appropriation bill to assess other considerations and to obtain opinions besides those of the Navy.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are seeking a limited expansion of the present naval communications station at Diego Garcia. It has been approved by the Committee on Appropriations. It is located on one of the British Indian Ocean territories where we have fully satisfactory base rights and where there are no ecological problems. There are not many places in the world where that can be said. Let me stress the fact that there is no problem with the present Labor government of Britain on base rights. As recently as March 19, 1974, the Labor government labeled as untrue the press reports that the Government has reversed the position of the Conservative Party regarding Diego Garcia. All they are doing is reviewing treaties. They have given no indication to our Government that they have any reservations about base rights on Diego Garcia.

Diego Garcia will have to be counted a bargain by all comparisons. This applies to costs of military construction and importance to America's security, and it helps in our ability to show the flag whenever and wherever this is needed.

For costs of $29 million, it is planned to extend the airport, in order that all American aircraft can use it; to add fuel storage facilities, personnel and general support facilities. Some dredging will be necessary, but this would be provided from previously appropriated funds. Seabees will do the construction work. They are available and this saves money.

Diego Garcia is now only a communications station, a listening post. It is planned, basically, to provide also a filling station for U.S. ships which may be deployed to the area. It is very explicit that Diego Garcia is not planned to be a major U.S. naval or air base. It is not to be a storehouse for vast quantities of military equipment nor a staging area from which to launch an attack on other countries. There is no room for such additional facilities. It is simply a filling station which is required to insure the U.S. presence in the Indan Ocean. As such, Diego Garcia will provide guaranteed access for our ships and aircraft to U.S.-owned fuel supplies.

During the recent Mideast war, we sent a carrier task force to the Indian Ocean. It had to rely on makeshift supply efforts, and primarily on supplies 4,000 miles away, at U.S. bases in the Philippines. Had a more substantial effort been required of the Navy at that time, only a major, costly effort could have made our presence possible in the Indian Ocean.

Since that time, our situation has worsened. The very small force we have maintained in Bahrain has been told to get out. Our dependence upon Arab or African ports for supplies is very uncertain. Sometimes they will sell us fuel and sometimes they will not.

The claim has been made that providing these minimum facilities will, somehow, escalate the armament race with the Russians in the Indian Ocean. The obvious fact is that the Russians have escalated their efforts to gain influence over nations bordering the Indian Ocean and to obtain naval bases and airfields in these states, and they are doing very well. They have definitely obtained use of ports in South Yemen, Somalia, and Iraq. They are expanding naval facilities and, in some cases, airfields in these areas. They are in Chittagong in Bangladesh, presumably on a port-clearing operation, which seems to continue indefinitely. They built, for India, under a foreign aid program, a naval base at Visakhapnam. Some think the Russians have an accommodation there when they need it. The Indians deny giving Russia base rights but they have objected to our presence. That is not new. India, through the years, has consistently taken our money and voted against us. In short, Russian support for their fleet from ports and facilities in the Indian Ocean littoral is already far greater than our planned expansion at Diego Garcia. By contrast, we would provide our ships only with minimum fuel supply facilities.

The Soviet Union has the geographical advantage in the terms of aircraft operations in the region. The almost certain opening of the Suez Canal will benefit the Russians by shortening their supply lines from Black Sea ports and give them the option of relatively short deployment routes to the Indian Ocean for their Black Sea or Mediterranean Fleets. So in benefits to naval power, Russia will gain much more than any other nation.

Thus, it is clearly the Soviet Union which has gained a major advantage in the Indian Ocean and is pursuing that advantage. We need the additional facilities at Diego Garcia now to preserve our ability to maintain any semblance of a balance of power should future developments prove this to be necessary. Diego Garcia will provide only a minimal presence for the United States but at least, the American flag can show there. No additional ships would be required. We would be making more efficient use of those we have.

There is now a virtual power vacuum in the Indian Ocean, except for the presence of the Russians. The British are out; our presence is minimal. To abandon this base or its expansion is to surrender the right to an American presence in the Indian Ocean.

There are very important American interests all around the Indian Ocean littoral—they need the flag, too.

One final point. Some say we should wait for a treaty of nonescalation for the Indian Ocean area. When and how do you get such a treaty with the Russians? They do not want a treaty—they do not need it; they are already there in force. We are not. A treaty would only lock in the existing disparity. Do not forget SALT I and the wheat deals. The United States does not win when we negotiate with Communists. It is time to protect our own interests. I want the American flag to be able to fly anywhere it needs to fly.

Mr. Chairman, the committee also has approved a request to approve pay increases for military family housing for $3,866,000. This is an item which comes under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Military Construction. We have looked carefully into this request. We do not feel that it is possible for the military services to absorb the additional pay cost in the family housing maintenance area this year. There are a number of reasons. The required increases are much larger than usual due to dollar devaluation and increased cost of fuel and electricity. To defer the funds which are requested would merely increase the already nearly unmanageable backlog of maintenance for family housing. This would not be either good management or cost effective. The cost would be greater if the work were not done now. Buildings require maintenance and everyone knows what happens when maintenance is postponed too long. The building goes to pot.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER X.—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY: CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For an additional amount for "Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries", $80,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, concerning chapter X of this report—there are two items in this bill recommended by the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations and both are budgeted.

The first item is $100 million for flood control along the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

This additional funding is required because of disastrous and continuing flooding of the Mississippi Basin.

Of the $100 million, $80 million will be used to accelerate the raising of levees and other works, and for other essential projects necessary to meet present needs in this area.

A total of $20 million will be utilized for projects by Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, to complement the work by the Corps of Engineers in flood prevention and control.

Our subcommittee has determined that since available information indicates a recurrence of the 1973 floods as a strong possibility, the raising of the levees is a vital and important flood prevention precaution and should be carried out, and the committee so recommends for certain areas.

The President recommended this $100 million for this item on March 26, 1974, in a budget estimate submitted at that time.

The second item is a supplemental appropriation of $7 million for operation and maintenance costs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Specifically, these additional funds are required to finance the purchase of needed power and wheeling from the Centralia thermal project in the State of Washington.

The additional funds are essential to pay for increased power costs, during the energy crisis.

The committee feels that this appropriation is justified and needed, especially in view of the energy crisis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For an additional amount for "Payment to the Postal Service Fund", $230,000,000.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the subject matter contained in chapter XIII of the bill H.R. 14013.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the matter contained in chapter XIII of the bill H.R. 14013, dealing with the U.S. Postal Service, lines 10 through 13 on page 27 is in violation of rule XXI, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The cited rule states:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, based on my earlier experience with the first supplemental appropriation which came to the floor last November, I am under no illusion that I can singlehandedly persuade the Appropriations Committee to mend its ways and stop pumping unauthorized appropriations into the bottomless Postal Service well. But I believe it is important to make the effort for the purpose of protecting the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Anticipating that it might be challenged, the Appropriations Committee includes in its report an argument which purports to justify this appropriation of $230 million to the Postal Service.

The committee report cites section 2004 of title 39, United States Code, that section of the Postal Reorganization Act which authorizes transitional appropriations.

In support of its position the committee quotes an opinion of the Comptroller General, which in reality is no opinion one way or the other. The Comptroller General admits that:

The legislative history does not provide any specific guidelines as to what transitional appropriations the Congress intended to authorize by 39 U.S.C. 2004 nor as to the duration of the transitional period.

Mr. Chairman, I notice in the hearings on this appropriation that the Postal Service counsel, Mr. Louis Cox, makes it a point to disparage the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or at least its three senior members, on their knowledge of the Postal Reorganization Act. I find it unfortunate that Mr. Cox did not come before our committee with his comments, for had he done so, he might have been treated to some lessons in the legislative history of that act.

While the Postal Service counsel contends that section 2004 of the act existed in essentially the same form from the very first draft of legislation—and he is correct in this contention—he conveniently overlooks the fact that the language of that section—until the final compromise version emerged—was tied to a special set of conditions which are not carried over to the existing law.

I refer to language in the rate policy sections of the earlier postal reorganization bills which spelled out a specific use of the authorization contained in what is now section 2004. House Report 91-1104 on the bill H.R. 17070 on page 40 under section 1201(d) specifies the use of this authorization as follows:

During the transitional period mentioned in subsection (b) (that is until January 1, 1978) the Commission on Postal Costs and Revenues is enjoined to take into account the financial impact of rate changes on the users of the mail. To the extent that such impact requires, in the view of the Commission, less than full cost coverage overall, the President is authorized to seek transitional appropriations mentioned in section 1004.

As you see, Mr. Chairman, that authorization had a very specific purpose in the earlier versions of postal reorganization. Through actions overt or covert that language was carried into the present law, but it no longer has the meaning it originally had, and certainly does not apply to the $230 million appropriation before us.

The appropriation of $230 million which this bill seeks to make to the Postal Service is not authorized by law. The Comptroller General's opinion does not say it is authorized. In fact the Comptroller General recommends clarifying legislation be enacted since, he says:

The question of authorization of appropriations could well arise in the future.

This, to me, suggests that a specific authorization for this appropriation does not exist in law.

Mr. Chairman, I will take no more time with my point of order because I am convinced there is nothing in the Postal Reorganization Act, nor in the legislative history of that act, authorizing this appropriation. Under the precedents of the House, in the administration of rule XXI, it is the practice that those upholding an item of appropriation have the burden of showing the law authorizing it. I trust that the Chair will insist on those precedents.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, paragraph 2004 of the Postal Service Reorganization Act very clearly gives the authority for this appropriation, and I quote:

Such sums as are necessary to insure a sound financial transition for the postal service and a rate policy consistent with Chapter 36 of this Title are hereby authorized.

Now, the transitional period has still a long time to go, and all the history of the enactment of this legislation bears that out. We are now in the third year of the corporation's being in existence. Some provisions in the law of revenue have been provided for a 5-year phase. There was in the House version a 7-year transition period, and then a 10-year. The other body wanted to make it permanent for a subsidy to be paid to the Postal Service. The conferees agreed on the 13-year extension.

So, I say that the transition period still has 10 years to run. Therefore, an appropriation under this act is very apropos and very legal. The reason for this need to come here is beyond the control of the Postal Service managers, because when the last contract with the postal workers was made and approved by the Cost of Living Council last year, it necessitated a request for a rate increase. Under the law, the postal managers invoked a temporary rate increase and filed necessary papers for the permanent rate increase with the rate commission that is created in this Act.

The Cost of Living Council decided that they would delay the effective date of these rates going into effect, which caused a $230 million deficiency in the operating revenues for the Postal Service this year. The efforts to get the Cost of Living Council to be as consistent in legislating the rates become effective as they were in letting the wages become effective, are going on.

We were not able to get them to do that. They had authority to deny and they did deny that and created this deficit.

Therefore, in order to have a sound transition, this appropriation becomes necessary as provided for in this act.

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

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the gentleman from Oklahoma in his opposition to the point of order. The gentleman from Iowa has sometimes given me credit for being one of the fathers of this operation.

I think in the debate, particularly of the conference report, we made it clear, just as the gentleman from Oklahoma has stated, that the transition period was to run for 13 years, the compromise between 7 suggested by the House and a permanent period which the Senate wanted.

Therefore, I think the point of order is not well taken, and the gentleman from Oklahoma has carefully given us the history, the legislative history of this particular provision.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard in opposition to the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed appropriation of $230,000,000 is to reimburse the Postal Service for revenue lost as a result of the Cost of Living Council's interference with the orderly operation of the postal ratemaking machinery. I believe that this appropriation to the Postal Service is clearly authorized under 39 U.S.C. 2004, which authorizes the appropriation of "such sums as are necessary to insure a sound financial transition for the Postal Service and a rate policy consistent with chapter 36 of title 39."

The gentleman from Iowa glossed over this authorization in his remarks, and apparently would have us believe that it serves only the rather narrow purpose of meeting the "transitional expenses" of the Postal Service. However, I think the gentleman's analysis shortchanges not one, but two provisions of law.

First, he has chosen to ignore section 12 of the Postal Reorganization Act, which was specifically enacted to deal with "transitional expenses" of the Postal Service by enabling them to be met out of the Post Office Department appropriation under section 2201 of former title 39.

Second, the gentleman has presented a stilted view of section 2004 of present title 39. This section was not enacted to cover "transitional expenses" of the Postal Service, but to "insure a sound financial transition" for the Postal Service. Section 2004 was intended to serve as a multipurpose authorization for appropriations to maintain the fiscal stability of the Postal Service and the rate policies of the Postal Reorganization Act during the transition to postal self-sufficiency. Congress recognized that the gradual transition toward a user-supported Postal Service with a pay-as-you-go rate structure might be imperiled by unexpected postal liabilities or sudden emergencies. Section 2004 allows Congress to assist the Postal Service in any of the multitude of situations in which a financial emergency might otherwise force the Postal Service to borrow imprudently or to burden postal customers with sudden rate increases or service cutbacks.

In the present context, the Postal Service has been presented with a financial emergency of notable proportions. By intruding into the postal ratemaking process, the Cost of Living Council has cost the Postal Service nearly $236 million in lost revenue. There is no method, other than an appropriation, by which the Postal Service can responsibly recoup this loss.

It is difficult to conceive of an appropriation that would fit more squarely within the precise words of section 2004 than does the appropriation requested under the present circumstances. Such an appropriation would have the effect of insuring a "sound financial transition for the Postal Service" and maintaining "a rate policy consistent with chapter 36," notwithstanding the action of the Cost of Living Council.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) has pointed out that when a point of order is made against a provision of an appropriation bill on the ground that the appropriation is not authorized by law, the burden of establishing the authorization is on those who propose the appropriation. So the question before us is whether or not those proposing the appropriation have sustained that burden.

The Chair was aware that this point of order might be made and has had an opportunity to examine the committee report accompanying the bill which sets forth the legal basis for the proposed appropriation, the hearings relative to this particular item, and the law itself.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) has indicated, the committee proposing the appropriation relies on section 2004, transitional appropriations.

Transitional appropriations, according to the law, are "such sums as are necessary to insure a sound financial transition for the Postal Service and a rate policy consistent with chapter 36" of this title.

The Chair examined chapter 36 of the title and finds that chapter 36 deals with the setting of rates.

Chapter 36 provides for the setting of permanent and temporary rates and instructs that in section 3622 the rates and fees be set in consideration of the following factors—and it goes through a list of eight factors, including a requirement with respect to direct or indirect postal costs attributable to that class or type, and so forth.

According to the committee report and the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma, the appropriation is occasioned by the failure of the Cost of Living Council to approve a temporary rate increase proposed by the Postal Service, and, therefore, it seems to the Chair that the appropriation falls within the authorization of section 2004 inasmuch as it would be a transitional expense having to do with the setting of postal rates.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 27, strike out lines 10 through 13.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer strikes from the bill the $230 million appropriation to the U.S. Postal Service.

There are two points I wish to make in support of the amendment.

First, the Appropriations Committee report on this second supplemental appropriation announces a major change in postal policy with regard to subsidies, a change which should be decided by the legislative committee responsible for oversight of the Postal Service.

And second, while the legislative authority for this appropriation is doubtful at best, its justification is nonexistent.

The Appropriations Committee report, on page 99, says:

> The committee feels that the Congress must continue to subsidize the Postal Service in relatively substantial amounts until such time as the ratemaking process can generate sufficient revenues to achieve a self-sufficient status for the Postal Service.

Mr. Chairman, there is not one word in the Postal Reorganization Act to support that policy declaration of the Appropriations Committee. It is a policy statement so far-reaching that it amounts to a retraction of the break-even concept of postal operations that was so forcefully laid upon us by the proponents of so-called postal reform.

If such a decision is to be made, then the committee responsible for postal legislation should make it.

The Postal Reorganization Act laid the foundation for what was proclaimed to be an efficient, business type of operation, performing its service within its revenues and leaning on the taxpayers only for those funds necessary to provide public services.

The act also provided a cushion to the mail users so that rate increases to the self-sufficiency level would be absorbed gradually, and it authorized appropriations for such revenue foregone.

Those who followed the development of the Reorganization Act know that even these narrowly defined appropriations were written into law over the protests of the then Postmaster General who was arrogantly convinced that if the Congress got itself out of the picture he could "turn the Post Office around" and make it operate efficiently on its own revenues.

Now we have the spectacle of these self-annointed, highly efficient postal managers claiming that Congress gave them a key to the back door of the Treasury and that they can get unlimited amounts of money from the taxpayers whenever they feel they need it.

Mr. Chairman, I am more than a little concerned that if this appropriation is made and if a pending request for $284 million to pay the Postal Service debt to the Civil Service Retirement Fund is made, we will have, in this fiscal year,

appropriated more than $1,992 million to the U.S. Postal Service.

This is money over and above the billions in Postal Service revenues and in prereorganization days represented the "postal deficit" which was so loudly denounced.

Why is no one today denouncing the postal deficit?

When are we going to take off the kid gloves and make these postal managers accountable to Congress and the taxpayers for the money they are draining from the Treasury?

Why was there not a single peep of protest in the Appropriations Committee when, in spite of the appropriations already made or pending, Mr. Ralph Nicholson declared there was "an anticipated operating loss of between $300 and $400 million in 1974" for the Postal Service.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1975 budget is a little more precise on this figure. The budget of the Postal Service, shown on page 1046 of the Appendix to the Budget, shows a net operating loss for the Postal Service of $385,048,000 for fiscal year 1974.

And, I repeat, this operating loss takes into account all of the Postal Service revenues plus all of the appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is also important to examine the background of this request by the Postal Service for $236 million, of which the Appropriations Committee recommends we give them $230 million.

The reason why we are asked to bail out the Postal Service to the tune of $230 million is two-pronged, and each prong points right at the heart of postal management. First, in June of 1973 the Postmaster General negotiated a contract with the postal employee unions which contained some of the most generous provisions ever handed across the negotiating table, and second, postal management ran afoul of the Cost of Living Council.

In his annual report to Congress, Postmaster General Klassen reported that the annual costs of the 2-year labor contract "are projected at $1.4 billion for fiscal year 1975 and later years," so I have no doubt the cost is at least this much. In an article appearing in Dun's magazine of March of this year, Mr. Klassen is quoted as saying,

> We had no choice but to give the unions what they wanted, otherwise they would have gone on strike.

So with this financial burden to carry, there was no alternative but to increase postal rates, which the Postal Service proposed to the Postal Rate Commission on September 25, 1973. That rate request is still pending before the Commission.

When the Postal Service sought to implement temporary rate increases, the Cost of Living Council ordered a $236 million reduction of their temporary rate schedule, which the Postal Service accomplished by delaying the temporary rate increase by 2 months.

I have heard no argument that the Cost of Living Council acted illegally or that its order to the Postal Service was not within its authority.

If the Cost of Living Council action was legal, then I see no reason why the Postal Service should not live with it.

By appropriating this money to the Postal Service, Congress will, in fact, be overturning a decision of the Cost of Living Council, which opens the door to a petition by any other entity similarly affected by a Cost of Living Council order.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee report states that the only alternative to subsidy would be the reduction of service to an unacceptable level or the increase of postage rates to an unreasonable level.

I submit there is a more obvious alternative—efficiency and sound postal management. This, after all, was the whole purpose of the Postal Reorganization Act. While we have not seen much of either since passage of that act, we cannot solve the problems of the Postal Service with unrestricted, unauthorized, and unjustified appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) has explained in full detail the purpose of the amendment the gentleman has offered. I would like to remind my colleagues that a few years ago when we passed H.R. 17070, I had the bill H.R. 4, which would have taken care of the situation.

I think the gist of the entire argument lies in the statement that says:

> The Committee feels that the Congress must continue to subsidize the Postal Service in relatively substantial amounts until such time as the ratemaking process can generate sufficient revenues to achieve a self-sufficient status for the Postal Service.

If we adopt this language it will be setting a precedent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), who has spent a great deal of time trying to understand what the Postal Service is doing is right and correct in offering this amendment to reduce this unnecessary deficit financing. I would like to refer all of the Members to the report of the Committee on Appropriations to page 98, where the committee quotes the Cost of Living Council's analysis of what the additional revenues will be received by the Postal Service as a result of the substantial increase in postage that all of our constituents are now bearing. It is a $1.3 billion increase per year in revenues. That has been produced by the postal rate increases.

They are now asking for additional money from our Committee on Appropriations in this supplemental bill. There is no excuse for this request.

I urge my colleagues, if they really want to save money in a responsible and noticeable place on behalf of their constituents, who have just been badgered by a substantial increase in postage rates, over which we in the Congress have no control, that they should vote for this very simple amendment that has been offered by my good colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). It is a reasonable request. As stated the Postal Service is going to receive over $1.3 billion in increased revenue in this coming year as a result of that substantial postal increase.

All the gentleman from Iowa is asking is that we delete this $230 million on the basis that it is not needed, and represents only a 2-percent cut.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us not overlook today that we imposed a mandate upon the U.S. Postal Service when we approved the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970.

To give the devil his due, so to speak, and whether we like it or not, the Postmaster General is trying as best he can to concur with the mandate that we imposed, and that is to move steadily in the direction of a self-sustaining operation as of 1984. If we support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, we can look forward—and I do not mean this as a threat but this is fact, because the money is not there—to responding to our constituents when they are critical of further reductions in Postal Service, where rural routes may be combined, post offices closed, and a number of other things can happen, including the curtailment of Saturday service.

This dilemma does not happen to be the fault of the Postmaster General, but it happens to be the fault of an entity that we could not envision back in 1970 when we wrote this measure into law known as the Cost of Living Council. The administrators of the Postal Service, whether they be good or bad—and that is arbitrary—are doing what we told them to do.

They determined that the most recent postal rate increase was necessary if they were to concur with the law that we imposed upon them. When the Postmaster General sent this up to the Cost of Living Council, they played with it, so to speak, for a long period of time and then finally on a temporary basis disapproved the action, and they shelved the rate increase for a period of 2 months so that, as opposed to becoming effective in January, it would not become effective until March.

In the meantime, the Postmaster General and his team have some very fixed overhead obligations that have to be met.

As a result of that 2-month delay, they find themselves short by $236 million from the standpoint of their ability to meet this fixed overhead.

We have problems here. To support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is no way to correct these problems. We have a long-range program which I think is going to put this matter in a far better perspective than it is today, and very shortly we will be introducing the amendments to the Postal Reorganization Act which are very substantive and far reaching.

For what it is worth, the conclusion made by myself and other Members who are intimately familiar with this problem, is that in effect the Congress really did not mean what it said back in 1970 that this entity had to become self-sustaining, because if we really meant it that way, Mr. Chairman, if the American public thinks that 10 cents is a lot of money to pay for a first-class stamp, to use the vernacular of the street, "they ain't seen nothing yet."

Under this mandate there is but one place to go and get it, and that is from the user of the mail. On a day-to-day basis, the overhead of this gigantic entity continues to increase, the energy shortage, for instance, the cost of gasoline increase, for every penny-per-gallon increase in the cost is reflected in an addition to the overhead of the USPS by $1½ million. So we add this to a bag of other unforeseen problems, and they all then relate to the temporary dilemma that those who are attempting to administer the mandate that we imposed upon them find themselves in right now.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not true that the post office service, this new, efficient service we are talking about, has $11 billion on which to operate? And does the gentleman mean to tell me that, costing $230 million you, as an administrator could not find a way to cut back about 2 percent of a $11 million budget?

Mr. HANLEY. I will say to my friend, the operation as he knows was set up over a 12-month period.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am very well aware how this thing was set up. That is why I did not vote for it then, because I knew these kinds of problems would occur, just as the gentleman from Iowa did. I know the gentleman from New York is sorry he voted for some of the sorry parts of the Postal Reorganization Act.

Mr. HANLEY. There is no question about it that hindsight is always better.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Does the gentleman mean to stand there and say that this Postal Service cannot cut $230 million out of $11 billion revenues?

Mr. HANLEY. That happens to be the case because all of these moneys were obligated and accounted for. If they did not have to contend with the Cost of Living Council the rate would have been effected on a temporary basis while the Postal Rate Commission determined whether it was going to become permanent.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to speak for only a few moments. I know the hour is late and that there is another bill supposedly behind this.

I think this debate has deteriorated, fairly much, into a discussion of the question of whether or not we ought to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act. I respect the attitudes and opinions of my friends, the gentlemen from Iowa and California, but I think, basically, that is what they are seeking to do.

The question here, though, is not that question. It is a question of whether or not the $230 million that the Steed subcommittee in this instance has put in this bill is needed. The subcommittee is not very happy about this item, but we are unanimous in our opinion that this amount of money is needed by the Postal Service Corporation.

Let me tell the Members what the alternatives are.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) said, a moment ago, that the alternatives are "efficiency" and "sound management." We would like some more of that, too, if we knew how to get it, and I am sure General Klassen is making his best effort to try to produce that, but the only alternative we could find, if the $230 million item is not given to the Postal Service Corporation in this supplemental bill, is that we have to cut postal service further than it has already been cut.

How do we do that, in a labor-oriented or a wage-oriented enterprise such as the Postal Service Corporation, where approximately 85 percent of their costs are in wages?

We do it by eliminating jobs. We had a great deal of discussion earlier this afternoon, on another issue, about unemployment. If we take the $230 million we recommend to the Members here out of this bill, that is equivalent to the salaries of approximately 23,000 postal employees. I do not know that their elimination would be the result, I do not say it would, but that was the only alternative we could see on our Appropriations Committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, first, before the poor old Appropriations Committee gets the blame for everything, let me say that the dilemma, the problem we have today was created by the Cost of Living Council which was in turn created by the legislative committees and not by the Appropriations Committee.

The act that created the Postal Service Corporation certainly was not done by the Appropriations Committee. We are just trying to live within the act as the Congress saw fit to pass it.

I know some of the Members could have a good time beating the poor old Postal Service, but before we go too far with that, I think there are about three or four pertinent facts we ought to know.

The amount we have here is the amount we believe is going to be needed to keep the Postal Service going from now until July 1. If this amendment carries and this amount is taken out of the bill, I think we can get ready for the fact that 23,000 postal workers would have to leave their jobs.

The Postal Service is delivering at the rate of 91 billion pieces of mail a year. They are delivering this mail to 62 million homes, offices, and stores, gaining at the rate of 1 million new ones every year. They have to employ approximately 700,000 people to do this one job. Seventy-five percent of all these people are crowded into 100 post offices. The others are scattered into 31,000 post offices. Eighty-five percent of their budget is wages, so 85 percent of this amount needed today is for wages. If it is not made available, they will have to lay off 23,000 people.

I think most of us are familiar with the fact there are some postal employee organizations and if this amendment carries today, I would suspect that somebody will be hearing from them about what they think about this, because whatever else they want, I think they want an adequate Postal Service. I think the American people do, too.

If there was a better answer to this problem, I assure the Members we would have brought it to them. We have wrestled with this thing. We are not happy about it. We do not know any other sensible or realistic way to move with it; so we urge Members to support the committee and make sure we have an adequate Postal Service for the rest of this year.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. In response to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) who declined to yield, I would say if I was in the business of running the Postal Corporation, I think if I were going in the hole, as this Postal Corporation is doing, I would not have left the headquarters on Pennsylvania Avenue and opened a brandnew set of offices on the L'Enfant Plaza with all the expensive trappings that went into it.

I think the taxpayers and mail users could have been spared that kind of operation and also building mail centers all over this country, some of which have been abandoned at a loss of millions of dollars.

Mr. STEED. I will say this, if I were in the Post Office Department, I would have less to complain about, and if the gentleman from Iowa were in the Post Office Department, he would have less to complain about.

We are facing, I think, a very urgent need. I do not know any other answer to it. I do not think the House wants to adopt an amendment to wreck the Postal Service.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am sure the gentleman is aware that the present postal union contract provides there can be no layoffs. So I want to assure the House that under the present union contracts, there can be no layoffs, and there clearly is enough funding in an $11 billion revenue to pay present employees.

Mr. STEED. I do not believe we can have mail employees working without getting paid.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Does the gentleman mean that in an $11 billion budget, it cannot be reduced just $230 million?

Mr. STEED. Before they found out they would have this shortage, they had already spent half their year's authorization.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation for the Postal Service is clearly authorized by the Postal Reorganization Act as a "transitional expense" under 39 United States Code, section 2004. At the time Congress created the Postal Service and mandated that it become self-sufficient by 1984, it was realized that there would be occasions when emergency financial assistance would be necessary to insure a smooth transition over that 13-year period from a deficit-ridden Post Office Department to a break-even operation. The decision by the Cost of Living Council to delay for 2 months implementation of the January postal rate increase has created just such a financial emergency—revenues will shortfall costs by some $230 million. Unless that critical shortfall can be eliminated, mail service throughout the country will suffer. The Postal Service must recoup this loss of revenue from some source. With the clear authorization provided by section 2004 of the Postal Reorganization Act I believe that that source is this Congress. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to meet this emergency and support the full recommendation for a $230 million supplemental appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I hear the cries of "Vote, vote". I appreciate that we should have a vote, but I am fearful that in addition to wanting a quick vote, many Members will use this amendment as a means of striking at the Postal Service.

I would like to emphasize a few reasons why we should not. The Postal Service does not have much of a constituency these days; but we can well remember when they had too much of a congressional constituency. We in the Congress were over-involved with the Post Office. That is the reason we needed postal reform. We cannot expect the new operators of the Postal Service to perform a miracle, when we turned over to them a near-collapsed organization.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from California, they both sound so absolutely intent in support of this amendment, I would remind the Members that the two of them have been less than friendly to the Postal Service. Their normal attitude is one of belligerence against the Post Office Service exceeded only by their belligerence against the foreign aid program. I do not think I have to remind the Members of the House of the strong feelings of the gentleman from Ohio against foreign aid; but the facts of life are that under the procedure of the Cost of Living Council, the Post Office has a shortfall of $236 million.

If these funds are denied, then the responsibility for the cutbacks in service, the cuts in personnel, the steps that would have to be taken in lieu of the failure of Congress to provide $236 million, would fall on us.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Iowa does not intend that anyone suffer from a reduction in postal service because of an arbitrary action by the Congress at this point. This is a necessary figure. I urge its support, and I urge that the amendment be rejected.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, unlike the gentleman, I do not vacillate from one position to another with the greatest of ease. I opposed the Postal Corporation; the gentleman supported it. The gentleman apparently is willing to raid the taxpayers now to take care of the inefficiencies he promised the House would be ended, and all the other wonderful things the Corporation would accomplish.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has one great virtue, and that is consistency. Having opposed postal reform, he wants to make it not work. I suggest that to permit the postal reform we should follow the committee. These funds are absolutely needed. If they are arbitrarily cut, I do not see how we can expect the mail to be delivered when we tell the Postal Service that they have to operate under a shortfall.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am just as anxious to go home as the rest of the Members, but this is a subject which is rather close to my heart. I am somewhat inclined to support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa if in fact that would shake up and wake up the Postal Service.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions of the gentleman from Oklahoma. I recognize the problem he is faced with, and nothing I am saying is in criticism of his efforts. However, as I understand it, this will raise the amount to $2 billion we have poured into the Postal Service this year in subsidies, is that correct?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, it is not quite $2 billion, but it is the largest amount we have had to put in.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman, we of course went through all this great reform around here. I was not very happy with it at the time, but I went along like some of the rest of us and voted for it.

What was our subsidy to the U.S. Post Office in, for example, 1970? Does the gentleman have figures to give us some comparison of what this new fancy-dandy management is doing for us financially? It has already destroyed our service; it has gotten the whole American people aroused. I introduced a bill to repeal the whole act, and I have been swamped in support of my legislation.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, the only way I can answer the question realistically is on a specific percentage basis, because the amount of cost of the postal service we were providing under the old law for the 18 years I have been connected with it was between 10 and 14 percent a year. We were running a shortfall of about that size. This amount we have provided in here is in the neighborhood of 12 percent, so on a percentage basis we are about in the same situation now as we were before.

However, we have to remember that we are here today because of something beyond our control. The Cost of Living Council deliberately created this problem.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the problem the gentleman is faced with. As I said to my good friend from New York (Mr. HANLEY), I appreciate the problem he has. I think we need to use a sledge hammer to get the attention of these people downtown in connection with doing some things many of us are concerned with. That is why I am somewhat inclined to be sympathetic and to support my colleague from Iowa.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked what the contribution was from the Treasury to the old Post Office Department in 1970. It was approximately $700 million, as compared with a prospective $1,900,000,000 now.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, it is about the same percentage of the total then as it is now.

Mr. SISK. In other words, the subsidy in total is going to be a doubling, apparently.

I understand the gentleman's position, of course, with the increased costs, increased wages, and so on. Actually so far we have not saved a dime and we probably are in worse shape financially than we would have been had we kept the old system. Is that not correct, probably, on the dollars-and-cents basis?

I am simply trying to be fair.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would inform the gentleman fully if I had the time. We are making a little headway, but it is not dramatic. It is true that for all practical purposes we are in as bad shape now as when we started, but we do think it is going to improve.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the gentleman who preceded me in the well and some of us are tempted to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. I am here ready to acknowledge that the gentleman from Iowa was right and many of us were wrong when he warned us against the creation of the Postal Service. I think it

is a record of failure, and a scandalous record.

My city of Birmingham is one of 26 cities arbitrarily picked by the Postal Service as a "guinea pig" city in which there would be implemented a new experiment in postal service in which dedicated postal employees would be replaced by machines in many instances and services to the people, I am quite convinced, would further decline. Prior to the creation of the Postal Service I had almost no complaint about postal service in my congressional district. We have had a record of excellence that has gone on for many years in our area until now.

The story has been one of declining services and increasing costs ever since the establishment of the Postal Service. Just last week the Postal Service in my area announced that it was changing from a full service branch to an automated facility, one of its highest revenue-producing branches in a city that is growing and that has a growing office complex within it. This change would constitute a radical decline in services in one of the best revenue-producing branches in the Birmingham area.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first phase of a whole series of changes that they propose in my district, which I predict will worsen service even more and constitute a disservice to people in metropolitan Birmingham.

I warn the Members of this: We are only one of 26 "guinea pig" cities that have been picked out for this experiment. and I do not know that our fellow-sufferers yet know who they are or what Big Brother has in store for them. I want to remind the Members further that the Postal Service is the only unregulated monopoly in the United States.

The private monopolies are regulated at both State and Federal levels. No one in private business could curtail services and up prices without hearing from and probably losing his customers unless he has a complete monopoly.

All the monopolies are regulated except that of the Postal Service.

I will say to my colleagues that they ought to look with a sharp eye at what the Postal Service is now doing, and we might listen very attentively to what the gentleman from Iowa has been saying to us about it in the months since it was created.

In the Birmingham case, which is part of a national pilot project, radical changes were made based on a computer recommendation, based in turn, on an inadequate and superficial survey conducted within 1 day 2 years ago. No one who is a permanent resident of Birmingham was a party to this drastic decision. No one who has any knowledge of or sensitivity to the postal consumers in Birmingham had any part in it. A long tradition of excellence by our neighbors who have served us well is being brushed aside by outsiders with arrogant disdain for postal patrons and postal employees alike. This plan may, and I emphasize may, bring higher profits to the Postal Service, but except for some improvements in location or service which commonsense dictates should be implemented, the master plan for this pilot project could prove a major disaster for the people affected thereby.

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

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

May I say this: If the gentleman is unhappy with postal reform per se, I would ask him to please not relate his vengeance today in this manner, because it in no degree is going to correct the problems which the gentleman has referred to.

Several months hence we will have the opportunity to vote on the amendments to the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 which, as I said in the well, are very substantive. In fact, we invite all Members' contributions to our efforts. We hope very much as a result of this overture that we are going to be able to effect some changes to relieve many of our present problems.

I will ask the gentleman to please not deny these dollars because, although the gentleman mentioned that service in his area has been curtailed, I believe he can anticipate that it will be curtailed, not only in his area but in other areas throughout the country. We will have forced reductions because of the inability of the entity to meet its payroll, if this amendment prevails.

Again, Mr. Chairman, as I said in the well, the Postal Service is only doing what we imposed as a mandate. So let us not take it out in this manner today. Let us wait for several months, and then the gentleman can do his thing when it comes to debating and deliberating on the amendments per se.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman pledges that he will take action to make this unregulated monopoly more responsive to the people's representatives, I will accept that judgment, and vote against the amendment. He may be sure I will play an active role toward bringing this unregulated monopoly under firm control through the legislation he will bring to the floor, and toward replacing arrogance with excellence in the Postal Service.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 302, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—97

Alexander	Fountain	Poage
Andrews, N.C.	Fuqua	Quillen
Archer	Ginn	Randall
Ashbrook	Goldwater	Rarick
Baker	Goodling	Roberts
Bauman	Gross	Robinson, Va.
Bennett	Haley	Roncalio, Wyo.
Biaggi	Hammer-schmidt	Rose
Brasco	Hanrahan	Rousselot
Breaux	Harsha	Runnels
Brooks	Hays	Ruth
Broomfield	Hébert	St Germain
Broyhill, N.C.	Hechler, W. Va.	Satterfield
Burgener	Henderson	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Holt	Shoup
Burleson, Tex.	Huber	Shuster
Byron	Hungate	Sisk
Chamberlain	Ichord	Skubitz
Clancy	Jones, N.C.	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Jones, Okla.	Steiger, Ariz.
Cochran	Jones, Tenn.	Symms
Collins, Tex.	Karth	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	Ketchum	Thone
Cronin	King	Tiernan
Davis, S.C.	Lagomarsino	Veysey
de la Garza	Landgrebe	Waggonner
Devine	Leggett	Wampler
Dickinson	Lott	Ware
Dingell	Lujan	Wiggins
Dulski	Mathis, Ga.	Wright
Duncan	Montgomery	Wylie
Evins, Tenn.	Moss	Zwach
Flynt		

NOES—302

Abdnor	Delaney	Hunt
Abzug	Dellenback	Hutchinson
Adams	Denholm	Jarman
Addabbo	Dennis	Johnson, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Dent	Johnson, Colo.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Derwinski	Johnson, Pa.
Annunzio	Diggs	Jones, Ala.
Arends	Donohue	Jordan
Armstrong	Downing	Kemp
Ashley	Drinan	Kluczynski
Aspin	Eckhardt	Koch
Badillo	Edwards, Ala.	Kuykendall
Bafalis	Edwards, Calif.	Kyros
Barrett	Eilberg	Latta
Beard	Erlenborn	Lent
Bell	Eshleman	Long, La.
Bergland	Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.
Bevill	Fascell	Luken
Biester	Findley	McClory
Bingham	Fish	McCloskey
Blackburn	Fisher	McCollister
Blatnik	Flood	McCormack
Boggs	Flowers	McDade
Boland	Foley	McFall
Brademas	Ford	McKay
Bray	Forsythe	McKinney
Breckinridge	Fraser	McSpadden
Brinkley	Frenzel	Macdonald
Brotzman	Frey	Madden
Brown, Calif.	Froehlich	Madigan
Brown, Mich.	Gaydos	Mahon
Brown, Ohio	Gettys	Mallary
Buchanan	Giaimo	Mann
Burke, Calif.	Gibbons	Maraziti
Burke, Mass.	Gilman	Martin, N.C.
Burlison, Mo.	Gonzalez	Mathias, Calif.
Burton	Grasso	Matsunaga
Butler	Gray	Mayne
Camp	Green, Oreg.	Mazzoli
Carney, Ohio	Green, Pa.	Meeds
Carter	Grover	Melcher
Casey, Tex.	Gubser	Metcalfe
Chappell	Gude	Mezvinsky
Chisholm	Gunter	Michel
Clark	Guyer	Milford
Clausen, Don H.	Hamilton	Miller
Clay	Hanley	Mills
Cleveland	Hanna	Minish
Cohen	Hansen, Idaho	Mink
Collins, Ill.	Hansen, Wash.	Mitchell, Md.
Conable	Harrington	Mitchell, N.Y.
Conlan	Hastings	Mizell
Conte	Hawkins	Moakley
Cotter	Heckler, Mass.	Mollohan
Coughlin	Heinz	Moorhead, Calif.
Culver	Helstoski	Moorhead, Pa.
Daniel, Dan	Hicks	Morgan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hillis	Mosher
Daniels, Dominick V.	Hinshaw	Murphy, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Hogan	Murphy, N.Y.
Davis, Wis.	Holifield	Murtha
	Holtzman	Myers
	Horton	Natcher
	Hosmer	Nedzi
	Howard	Nelsen
	Hudnut	

Nix	Roybal	Treen
Obey	Ruppe	Udall
O'Brien	Ryan	Ullman
O'Hara	Sandman	Van Deerlin
O'Neill	Sarasin	Vander Jagt
Owens	Sarbanes	Vander Veen
Parris	Schneebeli	Vanik
Passman	Schroeder	Vigorito
Patten	Sebelius	Waldie
Pepper	Seiberling	Walsh
Perkins	Shriver	Whalen
Pettis	Sikes	White
Peyser	Slack	Whitehurst
Pike	Smith, Iowa	Whitten
Podell	Smith, N.Y.	Widnall
Powell, Ohio	Spence	Williams
Preyer	Staggers	Wilson, Bob
Price, Ill.	Stanton,	Wilson,
Price, Tex.	J. William	Charles H.,
Pritchard	Stanton,	Calif.
Quie	James V.	Wilson,
Railsback	Stark	Charles, Tex.
Rangel	Steed	Winn
Rees	Steele	Wolff
Regula	Steelman	Wyatt
Reuss	Steiger, Wis.	Wydler
Rhodes	Stephens	Wyman
Riegle	Stokes	Yates
Rinaldo	Stratton	Yatron
Robison, N.Y.	Stubblefield	Young, Alaska
Rodino	Studds	Young, Fla.
Roe	Sullivan	Young, Ga.
Rogers	Symington	Young, Ill.
Roncallo, N.Y.	Talcott	Young, S.C.
Rooney, Pa.	Taylor, N.C.	Young, Tex.
Rosenthal	Thompson, N.J.	Zablocki
Rostenkowski	Thomson, Wis.	Zion
Roush	Thornton	
Roy	Towell, Nev.	

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	McEwen
Bolling	du Pont	Martin, Nebr.
Bowen	Esch	Minshall, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.	Frelinghuysen	Nichols
Carey, N.Y.	Fulton	Patman
Cederberg	Griffiths	Pickle
Collier	Kastenmeier	Reid
Conyers	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
Corman	Landrum	Shipley
Danielson	Lehman	Stuckey
Dellums	Litton	Teague

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and the remainder of the bill be open to amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean the gentleman is waiving points of order on the rest of the bill?

Mr. MAHON. I am not waiving points of order.

Mr. GROSS. Opening it up to points of order?

Mr. MAHON. I am not waiving any points of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments then to the remainder of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SYMMS

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

(The portion of the bill to which the amendment refers is as follows:)

SEC. 305. None of the funds herein appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States military forces in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SYMMS: Page 57, line 22, after line 21, add:

SEC. 306. All funds appropriated in this bill be reduced by 5 per centum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of this amendment.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. Most of the Members of this body remember the old Bow amendments. This amendment is no more than the Bow amendment that was made famous by Frank Bow of Ohio. I think it was a good idea. It would cut 5 percent from every appropriation funded in this bill, 5 percent across the board, everything from the military to HEW.

It is high time that we start really taking a concern for the taxpayers of this country.

I read a poll the other day where the choice on the questionnaire read, "Do you want to raise taxes, raise the debt, or cut spending?"

Eighty-five percent of the people wanted to cut spending. Here is the opportunity to cut spending by 5 percent, a very minor, meager cut. Members cannot tell me that out of $8 billion that we cannot get by by cutting out $400 million.

I urge support of this amendment, and the taxpayers will appreciate such support.

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

Mr. Chairman, in this bill the Committee on Appropriations is recommending a net reduction of $1.9 billion. These reductions have been carefully made by the committee and these reductions are far in excess of the 5-percent reduction proposed in the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS). The committee has tried to discriminate with respect to various items but the amendment offered proposes a meat-ax approach.

The amendment says that all funds appropriated in this bill shall be reduced by 5 percent. The gentleman, in his explanation, advocates that each item be reduced 5 percent. This would be a sharp additional reduction in many items already reduced by the committee and would have disastrous effects in such areas as veterans' benefits, vocational rehabilitation, emergency flood control measures, firefighting costs, and many other programs which most Members feel to be quite essential.

Mr. Chairman, under all the circumstances, I believe the amendment is ill advised and I ask the House to disapprove it. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 145, noes 249, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

AYES—145

Abdnor	Gaydos	O'Brien
Alexander	Gilman	Pike
Anderson, Calif.	Goodling	Powell, Ohio
Andrews, N.C.	Gross	Quillen
Archer	Grover	Randall
Arends	Gubser	Rarick
Armstrong	Haley	Riegle
Ashbrook	Hammer-schmidt	Robinson, Va.
Bafalis	Hanrahan	Rogers
Baker	Harrington	Roncalio, Wyo.
Bauman	Harsha	Roncallo, N.Y.
Beard	Hastings	Rousselot
Bennett	Heinz	Roy
Biaggi	Henderson	Runnels
Biester	Hogan	Ruppe
Blackburn	Huber	Ruth
Bray	Hudnut	Satterfield
Brinkley	Hunt	Schneebeli
Broomfield	Hutchinson	Schroeder
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	Sebelius
Broyhill, N.C.	Jarman	Shoup
Buchanan	Johnson, Colo.	Shriver
Burgener	Johnson, Pa.	Shuster
Burke, Fla.	Jones, N.C.	Skubitz
Camp	Jones, Okla.	Snyder
Carter	Karth	Spence
Clancy	Kemp	Steelman
Clawson, Del	Ketchum	Steiger, Ariz.
Cleveland	King	Symms
Collins, Tex.	Kuykendall	Taylor, Mo.
Conable	Lagomarsino	Taylor, N.C.
Conlan	Landgrebe	Thomson, Wis.
Crane	Leggett	Thone
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Lent	Thornton
Dellenback	Lott	Towell, Nev.
Denholm	Lujan	Treen
Dennis	McCollister	Vander Jagt
Derwinski	McSpadden	Vigorito
Devine	Mann	Wampler
Dickinson	Martin, N.C.	Wiggins
Duncan	Mathis, Ga.	Williams
Eshleman	Mayne	Wilson, Bob
Fish	Melcher	Winn
Flynt	Miller	Wylie
Ford	Mizell	Wyman
Fountain	Moorhead, Calif.	Young, Fla.
Frenzel	Murtha	Young, S.C.
Frey	Nedzi	Zion
		Zwach

NOES—249

Abzug	Daniel, Dan	Hansen, Wash.
Adams	Daniels, Dominick V.	Hawkins
Addabbo	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Andrews, N. Dak.	Davis, S.C.	Hébert
Annunzio	Davis, Wis.	Hechler, W. Va.
Ashley	de la Garza	Heckler, Mass.
Aspin	Delaney	Helstoski
Barrett	Dent	Hicks
Bell	Dingell	Hillis
Bergland	Donohue	Hinshaw
Bevill	Downing	Holifield
Bingham	Drinan	Holt
Blatnik	Dulski	Holtzman
Boggs	Eckhardt	Horton
Boland	Edwards, Ala.	Hosmer
Brademas	Edwards, Calif.	Howard
Brasco	Eilberg	Hungate
Breaux	Erlenborn	Johnson, Calif.
Breckinridge	Evans, Colo.	Jones, Ala.
Brooks	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Tenn.
Brotzman	Fascell	Jordan
Brown, Calif.	Findley	Kluczynski
Brown, Ohio	Fisher	Koch
Burke, Calif.	Flood	Kyros
Burke, Mass.	Flowers	Latta
Burleson, Tex.	Foley	Long, La.
Burlison, Mo.	Forsythe	Long, Md.
Burton	Fraser	Luken
Butler	Froehlich	McClory
Byron	Fuqua	McCormack
Carney, Ohio	Gettys	McDade
Casey, Tex.	Giaimo	McFall
Chamberlain	Gibbons	McKay
Chappell	Ginn	McKinney
Chisholm	Goldwater	Macdonald
Clark	Gonzalez	Madden
Clausen, Don H.	Grasso	Madigan
Clay	Gray	Mahon
Cochran	Green, Oreg.	Mallary
Cohen	Green, Pa.	Maraziti
Collins, Ill.	Gude	Mathias, Calif.
Conte	Gunter	Matsunaga
Cotter	Guyer	Mazzoli
Coughlin	Hamilton	Meeds
Cronin	Hanley	Metcalfe
Culver	Hanna	Mezvinsky
	Hansen, Idaho	Michel
		Milford

Mills	Rees	Stratton
Minish	Regula	Stubblefield
Mink	Reuss	Studds
Mitchell, Md.	Rhodes	Sullivan
Mitchell, N.Y.	Rinaldo	Symington
Moakley	Roberts	Talcott
Mollohan	Robison, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Montgomery	Rodino	Tiernan
Moorhead, Pa.	Roe	Udall
Morgan	Rooney, Pa.	Ullman
Mosher	Rose	Van Deerlin
Moss	Rosenthal	Vander Veen
Murphy, Ill.	Rostenkowski	Vanik
Murphy, N.Y.	Roush	Veysey
Myers	Roybal	Waggonner
Natcher	Ryan	Waldie
Nelsen	St Germain	Walsh
Nix	Sandman	Ware
Obey	Sarasin	Whalen
O'Hara	Sarbanes	White
O'Neill	Scherle	Whitehurst
Owens	Seiberling	Whitten
Parris	Sikes	Wilson,
Passman	Sisk	Charles H.,
Patten	Slack	Calif.
Pepper	Smith, Iowa	Wilson,
Perkins	Smith, N.Y.	Charles, Tex.
Pettis	Staggers	Wolff
Peyser	Stanton,	Wright
Poage	J. William	Wyatt
Podell	Stanton,	Yates
Preyer	James V.	Yatron
Price, Ill.	Stark	Young, Alaska
Price, Tex.	Steed	Young, Ga.
Pritchard	Steele	Young, Ill.
Quie	Steiger, Wis.	Young, Tex.
Railsback	Stephens	Zablocki
Rangel	Stokes	

NOT VOTING—38

Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	Martin, Nebr.
Badillo	du Pont	Minshall, Ohio
Bolling	Esch	Nichols
Bowen	Frelinghuysen	Patman
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton	Pickle
Carey, N.Y.	Griffiths	Reid
Cederberg	Kastenmeier	Rooney, N.Y.
Collier	Kazen	Shipley
Conyers	Landrum	Stuckey
Corman	Lehman	Teague
Danielson	Litton	Widnall
Dellums	McCloskey	Wydler
Diggs	McEwen	

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA, 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. 14013) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a second 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 22, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—375

Abdnor	Drinan	Kuykendall
Abzug	Dulski	Kyros
Adams	Duncan	Lagomarsino
Addabbo	Eckhardt	Latta
Alexander	Edwards, Ala.	Leggett
Anderson, Calif.	Edwards, Calif.	Lent
Andrews, N.C.	Eilberg	Long, La.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Erlenborn	Long, Md.
Annunzio	Eshleman	Lott
Arends	Evans, Colo.	Lujan
Armstrong	Evins, Tenn.	Luken
Ashley	Fascell	McClory
Aspin	Findley	McCollister
Baker	Fish	McCormack
Barrett	Flood	McDade
Beard	Flowers	McFall
Bell	Flynt	McKay
Bennett	Foley	McKinney
Bergland	Ford	McSpadden
Bevill	Forsythe	Macdonald
Biaggi	Fountain	Madden
Biester	Fraser	Madigan
Bingham	Frenzel	Mahon
Blatnik	Frey	Mallary
Boggs	Froehlich	Mann
Boland	Fulton	Maraziti
Brademas	Fuqua	Mathias, Calif.
Brasco	Gaydos	Matsunaga
Bray	Gettys	Mayne
Breaux	Giaimo	Mazzoli
Breckinridge	Gibbons	Meeds
Brinkley	Gilman	Melcher
Brooks	Ginn	Metcalfe
Broomfield	Goldwater	Mezvinsky
Brotzman	Gonzalez	Michel
Brown, Calif.	Grasso	Milford
Brown, Mich.	Gray	Miller
Brown, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	Mills
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Pa.	Minish
Buchanan	Grover	Mink
Burgener	Gubser	Mitchell, Md.
Burke, Calif.	Gude	Mitchell, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Gunter	Moakley
Burke, Mass.	Guyer	Mollohan
Burleson, Tex.	Hamilton	Montgomery
Burlison, Mo.	Hammer-schmidt	Moorhead, Calif.
Burton	Hanley	Moorhead, Pa.
Butler	Hanna	Morgan
Byron	Hanrahan	Mosher
Camp	Hansen, Idaho	Moss
Carney, Ohio	Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, Ill.
Carter	Harrington	Murphy, N.Y.
Casey, Tex.	Harsha	Murtha
Chamberlain	Hastings	Myers
Chappell	Hawkins	Natcher
Chisholm	Hays	Nedzi
Clancy	Hébert	Nelsen
Clark	Hechler, W. Va.	Nix
Clausen, Don H.	Heckler, Mass.	Obey
Clawson, Del	Heinz	O'Brien
Clay	Helstoski	O'Hara
Cleveland	Henderson	O'Neill
Cochran	Hicks	Owens
Cohen	Hillis	Parris
Collins, Ill.	Hinshaw	Passman
Conable	Hogan	Patten
Conte	Holifield	Pepper
Cotter	Holt	Perkins
Coughlin	Holtzman	Pettis
Cronin	Horton	Peyser
Culver	Hosmer	Pike
Daniel, Dan	Howard	Poage
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Huber	Podell
Daniels, Dominick V.	Hudnut	Powell, Ohio
Davis, Ga.	Hungate	Preyer
Davis, S.C.	Hunt	Price, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Hutchinson	Price, Tex.
de la Garza	Ichord	Pritchard
Delaney	Jarman	Quie
Dellenback	Johnson, Calif.	Quillen
Denholm	Johnson, Colo.	Railsback
Dennis	Johnson, Pa.	Randall
Dent	Jones, Ala.	Rangel
Derwinski	Jones, N.C.	Rarick
Devine	Jones, Okla.	Rees
Dickinson	Jones, Tenn.	Regula
Dingell	Jordan	Reuss
Donohue	Karth	Rhodes
Downing	Kemp	Riegle
	Ketchum	Rinaldo
	King	Roberts
	Kluczynski	Robinson, Va.
	Koch	Robison, N.Y.
		Rodino
		Roe
		Rogers
		Roncalio, Wyo.
		Roncallo, N.Y.
		Rooney, Pa.
		Rose
		Rosenthal
		Rostenkowski
		Roush
		Roy
		Roybal
		Runnels
		Ruppe
		Ruth
		Ryan
		St Germain
		Sandman
		Sarasin
		Sarbanes
		Satterfield
		Scherle
		Schneebeli
		Sebelius
		Seiberling
		Shoup
		Shriver
		Sikes
		Sisk
		Slack
		Smith, Iowa
		Smith, N.Y.
		Snyder
		Spence
		Staggers
		Stanton, J. William
		Stanton, James V.
		Stark
		Steed
		Steele
		Steelman
		Steiger, Wis.
		Stephens
		Stokes
		Stratton
		Stubblefield
		Studds
		Sullivan
		Symington
		Talcott
		Taylor, Mo.
		Taylor, N.C.
		Teague
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Thone
		Thornton
		Tiernan
		Towell, Nev.
		Treen
		Udall
		Ullman
		Van Deerlin
		Vander Jagt
		Vander Veen
		Vanik
		Veysey
		Vigorito
		Waggonner
		Waldie
		Walsh
		Wampler
		Ware
		Whalen
		White
		Whitehurst
		Whitten
		Widnall
		Wiggins
		Williams
		Wilson, Bob
		Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
		Wilson, Charles, Tex.
		Winn
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Wydler
		Wylie
		Wyman
		Yates
		Yatron
		Young, Alaska
		Young, Ga.
		Young, Ill.
		Young, S.C.
		Young, Tex.
		Zablocki
		Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—22

Archer	Goodling	Schroeder
Ashbrook	Gross	Shuster
Bafalis	Haley	Skubitz
Bauman	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Blackburn	Martin, N.C.	Symms
Collins, Tex.	Mathis, Ga.	Young, Fla.
Conlan	Mizell	
Crane	Rousselot	

NOT VOTING—35

Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	McCloskey
Badillo	Dorn	McEwen
Bolling	du Pont	Martin, Nebr.
Bowen	Esch	Minshall, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.	Fisher	Nichols
Carey, N.Y.	Frelinghuysen	Patman
Cederberg	Griffiths	Pickle
Collier	Kastenmeier	Reid
Conyers	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
Corman	Landrum	Shipley
Danielson	Lehman	Stuckey
Dellums	Litton	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Kazen with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Carey of New York.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. McCloskey.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. du Pont.
Mr. Lehman with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Bowen with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and include tables and extraneous material on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1974 (H.R. 14013) just passed. Also, I ask that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their re-

marks on the amendment to the manpower section of the bill offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2770, REVISING SPECIAL PAY STRUCTURE FOR MEDICAL OFFICERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. STRATTON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2770) to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to medical officers of the uniformed services:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-984)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2770) to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to medical officers of the uniformed services, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 302 is amended to read as follows and the item in the chapter analysis is amended to correspond with the revised catchline:

"§ 302. Special pay: physicians

"An officer of the Army or Navy in the Medical Corps, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a medical officer, or a medical officer of the Public Health Service, who is on active duty for a period of at least one year is entitled, in addition to any other pay or allowances to which he is entitled, to special pay at the following rates—

"(1) $100 a month for each month of active duty if he has not completed two years of active duty in a category named in this section; or

"(2) $350 a month for each month of active duty if he has completed at least two years of active duty in a category named in this section.

The amounts set forth in this section may not be included in computing the amount of an increase in pay authorized by any other provision of this title or in computing retired pay or severance pay.".

(2) The following new section is added after section 302a and a corresponding item is inserted in the chapter analysis:

"§ 302b. Special pay: dentists

"An officer of the Army or Navy in the Dental Corps, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a dental officer, or a dental officer of the Public Health Service, who is on active duty for a period of at least one year is entitled, in addition to any other pay or allowances to which he is entitled, to special pay at the following rates—

"(1) $100 a month for each month of active duty if he has not completed two years of active duty in the Dental Corps or as a dental officer;

"(2) $150 a month for each month of active duty if he has completed at least two years of active duty in the Dental Corps or as a dental officer;

"(3) $250 a month for each month of active duty if he has completed at least six years of active duty in the Dental Corps or as a dental officer; or

"(4) $350 a month for each month of active duty if he has completed at least ten years of active duty in the Dental Corps or as a dental officer.

The amounts set forth in this section may not be included in computing the amount of an increase in pay authorized by any other provision of this title or in computing retired pay or severance pay.".

(3) That portion of the first sentence of section 311(a) preceding clause (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as appropriate, an officer of the Army or Navy in the Medical Corps above the pay grade of O-6, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a medical officer and is above the pay grade of O-6, a medical officer of the Public Health Service above the pay grade of O-6, an officer of the Army or Navy in the Dental Corps, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a dental officer, or a dental officer of the Public Health Service who—".

(4) By adding the following new section after section 312a and by inserting a corresponding item in the chapter analysis:

"§ 313. Special pay: medical officers who execute active duty agreements

"(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as appropriate, and approved by the President, an officer of the Army or Navy in the Medical Corps, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a medical officer, or a medical officer of the Public Health Service, who—

"(1) is below the pay grade of O-7;

"(2) is designated as being qualified in a critical specialty by the Secretary concerned;

"(3) is determined by a board composed of officers in the medical profession under criteria prescribed by the Secretary concerned to be qualified to enter into an active duty agreement for a specified number of years;

"(4) is not serving an initial active duty obligation of four years or less or is not serving the first four years of an initial active duty obligation of more than four years;

"(5) is not undergoing intern or initial residency training; and

"(6) executes a written active duty agreement under which he will receive incentive pay for completing a specified number of years of continuous active duty subsequent to executing such an agreement;

may, upon acceptance of the written agreement by the Secretary concerned, or his designee, and in addition to any other pay or allowances to which he is entitled, be paid an amount not to exceed $13,500 for each year of the active duty agreement. Upon acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, or his designee, and subject to subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the total amount payable becomes fixed and may be paid in annual, semiannual, or monthly installments, or in a lump sum after completion of the period of active duty specified in the agreement, as prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

"(b) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary concerned, or his designee, may terminate, at any time, an officer's entitlement to the special pay authorized by this section. In that event, the officer is entitled to be paid only for the fractional part of the period of active duty that he served, and he may be required to refund any amount he received in excess of that entitlement.

"(c) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as appropriate, an officer who has received payment under this section and who voluntarily, or because of his misconduct, fails to complete the total number of years of active duty specified in the written agreement shall be required to refund the amount received that exceeds his entitlement under those regulations. If an officer has received less incentive pay than he is entitled to under those regulations at the time of his separation from active duty, he shall be entitled to receive the additional amount due him.

"(d) This section does not alter or modify any other service obligation of an officer. Completion of the agreed period of active duty, or other termination of an agreement, under this section does not entitle an officer to be separated from the service, if he has any other service obligation.

"(e) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall each submit a written report each year to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding the operation of the special pay program authorized by this section. The report shall be on a fiscal year basis and shall contain—

"(1) a review of the program for the fiscal year in which the report is submitted; and

"(2) the plan for the program for the succeeding fiscal year.

This report shall be submitted not later than April 30 of each year, beginning in 1975.".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment. Except for the provisions of section 313 of title 37, United States Code, as added by section 1(4) of this Act, which will expire on June 30, 1976, the authority for the special pay provided by this Act shall, unless otherwise extended by Congress, expire on June 30, 1977.

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the Senate bill.

SAMUEL STRATTON,
BILL NICHOLS,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
JOHN E. HUNT,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
STROM THURMOND,
JOHN TOWER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2770), to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to medical officers of the uniformed services, submit the following joint statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amended the Senate bill to strike all after the enacting clause and insert new language and to amend the title. As a result of the House action, there existed a number of differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The differences are identified below, together with an explanation of the action thereon agreed to in the conference report.

DENTISTS, OPTOMETRISTS AND VETERINARIANS

The Senate bill limited the increased monthly special pay and new bonus-payment authority to physicians. The House added the professions of dentistry, veterinary medicine and optometry to both the special-pay and new bonus-payment authority provisions of the bill.

The House conferees strenuously defended the inclusion of the other health professions, pointing out that this was consistent with action of the House in passing legislation in the 92d Congress and that the Department of Defense had previously sought legislation in the 93d Congress to authorize bonus payments for any critical health profession used by the military.

The Senate conferees, however, stated that they had had no hearings on the other health professions and pointed out that both the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Environment had recently advised the Senate Armed Services Committee that the most immediate and critical problem involves physicians, and there is no need for special pay legislation for other than physicians. These officials indicated that the possible need for additional compensation for other categories of officers in the health fields would be kept under close and continuing review and that appropriate recommendations would be submitted to the Congress at a later date if found essential. More specifically, they further indicated that there is no need at this time for special-pay legislation covering any of the other health professions. The Senate conferees also pointed out that the increased monthly special-pay provisions of the bill were mandatory and that if the other professions remained in the bill the Secretary of Defense would have to authorize the pay increases on the bill's effective date regardless of whether a critical shortage existed in those professions.

Notwithstanding the strong representation made by the House conferees, the Senate conferees were adamant in their position of limiting the bill to physicians. The House, therefore, reluctantly recedes.

BONUS ELIGIBILITY FOR SENIOR OFFICERS

The Senate bill limited the eligibility for the new bonuses authorized in the bill to officers in the pay grade of 0–5 (lieutenant colonel/commander) and below and provided that those medical officers serving in pay grade 0–6 (colonel/captain) and above would remain in the present continuation-pay system.

The House amendment included language adding officers in pay grade 0–6 to those eligible for the new bonus-pay system.

The House conferees pointed out testimony from the surgeons general indicated individuals in the 0–6 grade are at a critical point in service where they are in important department head and teaching positions and failure to include these officers in the bill would seriously hamper the ability of the military medical services to retain these experienced senior officers. There may be other examples for the 0–6 medical officer.

The Senate, therefore, recedes.

MAXIMUM BONUS

The Senate bill limited the maximum bonus for physicians to $10,000 per year.

The House amendment increased the maximum bonus to $15,000 per year, the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

After extensive discussion, the conferees agreed on the maximum bonus of $13,500.

RESTRICTION ON PAYMENT OF BONUS

The House amendment contained language which had the effect of excluding from the eligibility for the bonus officers serving their initial active-duty obligation and officers undergoing intern or residency training.

The Senate bill was silent on these provisions, leaving the matter to administrative determination of the Secreary of Defense. The Department of Defense had indicated its intention not to pay bonuses to interns or those undergoing initial obligated service. The Senate conferees, while supporting the intent of the House amendment, pointed out that difficulties might arise with the language of the bill as passed by the House with respect to residency and initial obligated service.

The exclusion of all residents from the new pay bonus system could seriously impact on the Defense Department's ability to obtain physicians qualified in various subspecialties, the Senate conferees stated, since many military physicians do not enter subspecialty training until several years following the completion of their initial residency training. In the future, volunteers for such subspecialty training would be seriously limited if such training would result in a substantial pay cut for the highly qualified specialists concerned. The conferees, therefore, agreed on compromise language which would provide that exclusion from bonus eligibility would be limited to those undergoing initial residency training.

An additional problem pointed out by the Senate conferees had to do with possible inequities or adverse retention effect which could occur as a result of extended initial obligated service which some physicians have. Under the various procurement programs where a physician's education is sponsored by the service, physicians take on obligation in some cases as long as nine years. The Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences will require of its graduates a seven-year obligation. In some cases the obligated service varies by a number of years from service to service for the same period of training.

The conferees recognize that a student who gets medical training at government expense is getting some of the most expensive and most marketable training available and should be required to undertake a reasonable payback in service without a bonus. However, to avoid inequities or avoid adverse retention impact, the conferees agreed to language in the conference report which provides that the exclusion from new bonuses for those in initial obligated active-duty shall apply only for up to the first four years of such active-duty obligation. Nothing in this language shall operate to reduce the period of obligation of the individual concerned. The Department of Defense has the authority under the bill to provide, if it so determined, bonuses at a reduced rate for periods of obligated service beyond four years.

INCLUSION OF THE COMMISSIONED CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Senate bill contained no provision for payment of bonuses to members of the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service since they were not covered in the Administration proposal. The House amendment contained language authorizing the payment of bonuses to members of the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service on the same basis as such benefits are authorized for their military counterparts. Traditionally these officers have always been included in pay legislation affecting their military counterparts. Moreover, officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare appeared before the House Armed Services Committee and testified that such officers should be included and that their inclusion was now in accord with the Administration's program. The Armed Services Committee also received testimony expressing concern for the future of the Indian Health Service if the Public Health Service physicians were excluded from the bonus pay provisions of the bill.

The conferees agreed that only physicians of the Public Health service should be included in the bill.

The Senate, therefore, recedes.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The Senate bill contained an effective date of January 1, 1974. The House amendment contained language setting an effective date of April 1, 1974. Both the Senate bill and the House version passed their respective houses in the months prior to the effective date contained therein. The conferees, therefore, consistent with the intention of both houses, provided in the conference report that the effective date should be the first of the month following enactment.

TITLE OF THE BILL

The House had amended the title of the bill consistent with its inclusion of other health professions. Since these other health professions were deleted in the conference report, the House recedes from its amendment and accepts the title of the Senate bill.

SAMUEL STRATTON,
BILL NICHOLS,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
JOHN E. HUNT,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
STROM THURMOND,
JOHN TOWER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2771, REVISING SPECIAL PAY BONUS STRUCTURE TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. STRATTON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2771) to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay bonus structure relating to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93–985)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2771) to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay bonus structure relating to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

SAMUEL STRATTON,
BILL NICHOLS,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
JOHN E. HUNT,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
STROM THURMOND,
JOHN TOWER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the House to the Senate bill (S. 2771), to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay bonus structure relating to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

As a consequence of the House action, there existed five substantive differences in the House and Senate versions of S. 2771. The differences are identified below, together with an explanation of the action taken thereon in the conference report.

MAXIMUM REENLISTMENT BONUS

Under the Senate bill the maximum bonus authorized would have been $12,000. The House amended the bill to authorize a maximum of $15,000. Present law provides authority to pay a bonus of up to $15,000 for personnel in the Navy nuclear-power program and that authority expires in June 1975. The Department of Defense testified that its present plans call for using the $15,000 bonus only for personnel in the nuclear-power field when the present authority for that amount expires. The Senate conferees, therefore, receded from their position and the conferees agreed to a maximum figure in the bill of $15,000, with the understanding that the use of the maximum be limited to the nuclear field.

MULTIPLE-BONUS RESTRICTION

The House amended the bill to provide that bonuses should be administered in such a manner that a member's total reenlistment bonus for two or more reenlistments not exceed the amount to which he would have been entitled had he initially reenlisted for a total period of additional obligated service equal to the two or more reenlistments. The intent of the House amendment was to preclude service members from receiving more money for several short periods of reenlistment than for a single maximum reenlistment and to achieve thereby the personnel stability generally associated with longer reenlistments.

The Senate conferees recognized the worthwhile intent of the House amendment but insisted that the amendment would limit the ability of the Armed Forces to provide a meaningful bonus to highly trained individuals in a critical skill in the six to ten years of service timeframe. This is often a critical reenlistment period for personnel who have been given extensive and expensive training in technical skills. The Senate conferees pointed out that the Department of Defense expressed serious concern that the House amendment would greatly limit more effective use of the bonus in high skill areas.

The House, therefore, recedes.

EXPIRATION DATE

The Senate bill provided that the new Selective Reenlistment Bonus (SRB) contained in the legislation would become permanent law. The House provided an expiration date of June 30, 1977 for the SRB authority. The House conferees stated that it would be advisable to have the SRB authority reviewed by Congress after a reasonable period of operation.

The Senate recedes.

ADMISSION OF WOMEN TO SERVICE ACADEMIES

The bill as passed by the Senate contained a Senate floor amendment which would have authorized the attendance of women at the service academies. The House deleted the provision from the bill because the Senate language was technically defective and because neither body had an opportunity for hearings on the provision.

The Senate conferees strenuously maintained their position. However, the House conferees pointed out that the leadership of the House Armed Services Committee has indicated its intention to hold hearings on this legislation and such would be the most appropriate way of dealing with the matter. The Senate, therefore, reluctantly recedes.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The Senate bill has an effective date of January 1, 1974. The House amended the bill to provide an effective date of the first day of the month following the date of enactment. The House effective date is consistent with the intention of the Senate bill since the Senate passed the bill in December. The conferees agreed that there would be no purpose served by a retroactive date. The Senate, therefore, recedes.

CLARIFICATION OF INTERPRETATION OF BILL LANGUAGE

The House committee in reporting the bill indicated its intention that bonuses not be authorized for personnel for existing obligated service. There was brought to the attention of the conferees a problem that would exist, particularly in the Navy nuclear-power field, under the House interpretation of the language of the bill. In cases where commitment has been made to a man with a four-year enlistment and a two-year extension that he can cancel the two-year extension and reenlist for four years and receive a reenlistment bonus for the four-year reenlistment. The Navy expressed great concern that the language of the bill might be interpreted to require it to abrogate an understanding it had with enlistees and would operate in such a way as to cause serious retention problems in its most critical career field. The conferees, therefore, want it understood that while it normally does not expect bonuses to be paid for services for which there was an existing obligation, it is consistent with the conferees' understanding that full entitlement to SRB will be authorized for personnel who have already agreed to an extension period prior to the enactment of the legislation if they subsequently cancel this extension prior to its becoming operative and reenlist for a period of at least two years beyond the period of the canceled extension. Nothing in the bill should operate to deny the Chief of Naval Operations the authority to extend SRB entitlement to nuclear-power operators if they subsequently can cancel any outstanding extension period prior to its becoming operative and reenlist for a period of at least two years beyond the period of the canceled extension.

SAMUEL STRATTON,
BILL NICHOLS,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
JOHN E. HUNT,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
STROM THURMOND,
JOHN TOWER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, THURSDAY, APRIL 11, TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tomorrow, Thursday, April 11, to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13113, COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION ACT OF 1974

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1029 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1029

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. 13113) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to strengthen the regulation of futures trading, to bring all agricultural and other commodities traded on exchanges under regulation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 103 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. 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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidentaly a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 164]

Addabbo	Evans, Colo.	Meeds
Alexander	Evins, Tenn.	Minshall, Ohio
Arends	Fisher	Mosher
Ashbrook	Flood	Murphy, N.Y.
Badillo	Flynt	Nichols
Bolling	Fraser	Patman
Bowen	Frelinghuysen	Pickle
Brooks	Gettys	Powell, Ohio
Broomfield	Giaimo	Quillen
Broyhill, Va.	Gibbons	Railsback
Burke, Calif.	Griffiths	Rees
Burton	Gubser	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Hanna	Reuss
Cederberg	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Harsha	Ryan
Clay	Hébert	Shipley
Cochran	Holifield	Sikes
Collier	Kastenmeier	Stanton,
Conyers	Kazen	J. William
Corman	King	Stephens
Danielson	Landrum	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	Lehman	Teague
Dellums	Litton	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Long, Md.	Tiernan
Dingell	McCloskey	Udall
Dorn	McEwen	Wilson,
Drinan	Macdonald	Charles H.,
du Pont	Martin, Nebr.	Calif.
Esch	Mathis, Ga.	Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 348 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13113, COMMODITIES FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION ACT OF 1974

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida. (Mr. PEPPER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'NEILL was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it had been the intent of the leadership earlier in the day—and I might add that at that time we did not anticipate that the second supplemental appropriation bill was going to take the time that it did—and because there had been requests by so many Members to do so, we had thought that we could finish up this evening. However, it is obvious that a filibuster is taking place, and will take place, and there have been Members who have asked that we bring this matter up tomorrow at 10 o'clock. To do that would take unanimous consent, and I doubt that that would be possible but, in view of the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary is meeting tomorrow, that is impossible to do.

So, consequently, we would like to adopt the rule this evening, and when the rule is adopted then the motion will be made to adjourn, and the House will meet at its usual time of 12 o'clock tomorrow to complete the legislation.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1029 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 13113, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to strengthen the regulation of futures trading.

House Resolution 1029 provides that all points of order against section 103 of the bill are waived for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives—prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill.

House Resolution 1029 also provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections.

H.R. 13113 creates a new five-person regulatory commission to be called the "Commodity Futures Trading Commission." It will consist of four public members and the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee. All existing authority under the Commodity Exchange Act presently delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Exchange Commission will be transferred to the new "Commodity Futures Trading Commission."

H.R. 13113 provides that all commodities trading in futures will be brought within Federal regulation under the auspices of the new Commission. However, provision is made for preservation of Securities and Exchange Commission jurisdiction in those areas traditionally regulated by the SEC.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1029 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 13113.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I think that the majority leader, the gentleman from (Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) has already made it plain as to how we will proceed. I would, however, feel that I should point out that the Committee on Agriculture has had nothing to do with bringing this up at this late hour. The only reason for asking that it be brought up tonight was that we had understood that many of the Members wanted to go home and had hoped to go tonight or tomorrow morning. In an effort to try to cooperate, the Committee on Agriculture tried to expedite this matter so that Members could go home tonight or in the morning. But since there are those who felt that we should not take it up at this time but that we should take more time, we are, of course, acquiescing, and we will be here tomorrow, and we will be sitting here probably at the same time tomorrow night.

I think we all had better forget about going home. The Committee on Agriculture is going to try to expedite this tomorrow. I do not know what others are going to do, but speaking for the majority, it is my intention not to yield more than 2 minutes to anybody to speak on general debate tomorrow in an effort to try to enable those who want to get away from here and be able to get to their homes, if at all possible. I simply want to make it clear, because on so many occasions in some way, agriculture bills have been brought up—and it is not within the province of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to determine what time they are brought up—after 6 o'clock at night. We cannot help that.

The Members did not hear me take any time this afternon. They did not hear members of the Committee on Agriculture take up their time this afternoon. It was not this committee that brought about this long delay, and I think in all fairness the membership of this House should recognize that we have not occasioned this delay and we are not causing the delay that is going to inconvenience some of the Members tomorrow. But we are going to try to expedite the business. We are going to move it along as fast as we can, and we will be here tomorrow ready to do business.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1029 provides for the consideration of H.R. 13113, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Act of 1974. This is an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, and provides that the bill be read by titles instead of by sections. In addition, House Resolution 1029 contains a waiver of points of order against section 103 for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XXI, which deals with appropriations on a legislative bill.

In recent years the commodity futures trading industry has grown to the point where it now has a $400 billion annual trading volume.

H.R. 13113 consists of four titles. Title I creates a new regulatory commission, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The five-member commission will consist of the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee and four public members appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. No more than two of the public members may be of the same political party. All existing authority under the present Commodity Exchange Act presently delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Exchange Commission will be transferred to the new Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The Commission may hire additional staff, and will have its own general counsel and legal staff instead of relying on the Department of Agriculture general counsel. Provision is made for GAO access to the records of the Commission. Customer complaints initially will be considered by an administrative law judge and then reviewed by the Commission before a final order is entered. Appeals would be to the U.S. district court.

Title II provides broad new authority to the Commission over futures trading. All commodities trading in futures will be brought under Federal regulation. At present many commodities are not regulated. Contract markets will be required to establish their own customer claims settlement procedures complementing the Commission's procedures. The Commission will have authority through the Attorney General to seek injunctions to stop any person from violating the act. The Commission will have authority to impose penalties up to $100,000 in both administrative and criminal proceedings for violations of the act.

Title III provides enabling authority for persons in the commodity trading business to establish a voluntary futures association or associations which would regulate the practices of its members in the public interest.

Title IV makes it a felony for Commissioners, employees or agents of the Commission to deal in commodity futures or to give out confidential information to others.

The Committee on Agriculture estimates the cost of this bill to be $25,593,000 over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, too, hate to take up the Members' time, but I think when we are talking about a bill and a business that amount to approximately $400 billion in commodity markets, we either should take time to discuss it this evening or take time when it is appropriate to take time, because very seldom do we have a bill amounting to approximately $400 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 13113 because it represents a total lack of faith, I think, in our market-oriented free market enterprise system involving a $380- to $400-billion commodity market, the primary purpose of which is to provide stability to producers and an adequate supply for consumers. It also represents a lack of evidence that a new and far-reaching range of authorities proposed by the bill are either necessary or desirable. It also, Mr. Speaker, calls for the creation of a new and greatly expanded bureaucracy to perform the

duties that the present agency could more effectively and efficiently do if given ample authority and staff.

Certainly a new commission with a staff of another 1,000 people is not needed. As now written, the bill before us, H.R. 13113, could destroy the futures industry in this country.

The bill gives sweeping Government control over nearly every aspect of futures trading. If this legislation is passed, bureaucrats in Washington will run the market that heretofore has been an accurate reflector of economic conditions.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a futures market in this country that has gone from about $150 billion 2 years ago to around $380 billion, and it has been done by people who are experts in this business. Now we are attempting to write legislation that will take over one of the greatest free enterprise examples I have ever seen in this country.

Section 215 of this bill is particularly dangerous for it gives the newly created 5-member Commodity Futures Commission the power to decide when it should take control of the futures industry. The new Commission could take over the market if it decides trading is fluctuating too greatly. Under this section the newly created Commission could also take over the market during times of wide market fluctuations. We would point out that price fluctuations have existed for years and are likely to continue indefinitely. These fluctuations will continue to be a fact of everyday life in the United States for some time to come. The moment the new 5-member Commission is voted into existence, it will have immediate jurisdiction for assuming direction of the commodity futures industry.

Widescale injunctive powers are also vested in the Commission under Section 211. It can halt the transactions of any market or person who "has engaged, is engaging, or is about to engage" in any act constituting a violation of the law. This power of preventive injunction raises serious constitutional questions. It is a particularly ominous threat against the right to conduct business.

Injunctions could also be issued when an individual or market is thought to be in a position to "effectuate a squeeze or corner or otherwise restrain trading." Here there need be no suspicion of intended wrongdoing. Adequate protection already exists in the CEA and the exchange rules now. The mere possession of the power to do wrong potentially will suffice to justify an injunction. This power to enjoin even in the absence of suspicion of dishonest intention is most questionable. The power is compounded by the failure of the legislation to stipulate what is meant by the phrase "squeeze, corner, or otherwise restrain trading."

All contract markets will need Commission "licensure." To obtain it, each must prove it served an "economic purpose," otherwise the "license" can be denied.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

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

I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman.

I ask the gentleman from Texas, if these broad sweeping powers could be as destructive to the futures industry as the gentleman suggests, is it possible this $400 billion business might move over to the West Indies, to Grand Cayman or one of the other islands where they would not have to live under the rules and regulations of this Commission?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. The gentleman is possibly correct in that anyone who has any business in the commodities on these transactions knows if these traders are not allowed to trade on the floor they will take their commodity trade and go to Canada or to some other country where they can invest their money.

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he believes this Commission that would be appointed would be of a nonpolitical nature?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. It is supposed to be of a nonpolitical nature. I understand it can be from either political party.

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman.

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

Mr. SYMMS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well. I feel he probably has studied as hard as anyone on the committee this legislation and has first-hand knowledge of his own activities of the futures market and the practical aspects of the futures market. I believe we should follow his guidance. I want to associate myself with his remarks.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. I was curious about the gentleman's prediction that many traders would leave this country in order to trade in commodities in other countries if this legislation were to pass.

I will ask the gentleman if that is so, why is it that the Chicago Board of Trade and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange are not opposing this legislation? As I understand, it would be beneficial, not only to traders, but to the producers of this country. Is that not a rather curious position for them to take if the predictions of the gentleman of a mass emigration of American industry is true?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I might say to the gentleman that I have seen businessmen come down to the committees of this House and say, "We might as well lay dead, because it will pass anyway." This is what a lot of industry people said, that the committee is going to take action; we do not like it, but we are going to make suggestions and live with it. This is the best they feel they can live with and just because they came down and laid before the committee, I am not going to.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for his zeal; but I would point out this is supported by the Members of the Exchange.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to section 203 at this point, which states:

Under Section 203, the Commission will be able to put limitations on brokers and floor traders buying for their own accounts as well as for their customers. This provision is not necessary to keep brokers honest—market considerations are much more forceful—and its only effect will be to hurt the liquidity of the futures market.

We believe that the bill's premise displays both a lack of faith in as well as a lack of understanding of the mechanism of futures trading, and particularly the importance of speculators to the smooth functioning of the market. Speculation is the heart of the market and provides from 60 percent to 80 percent of the liquidity for futures transactions. Speculators help producers who want the highest price for their products and the consumers who want the lowest price for these same products. The speculator provides liquidity to the market place, and he levels the many peaks and valleys that would otherwise occur in the price structure in the price structure in the absence of the speculator.

The new Commission will also have the power under Section 208 to finally determine the location and number of delivery points of commodities. While we feel additional delivery points are desirable, the users of the market and the exchange themselves should be the ones to determine where delivery points should be located, not the new Commission whose decision is more likely to be based on political pressures rather than economic factors. This provision alone could destroy futures trading.

Over a period of many years, futures markets have developed under a system where buyer and seller were free to carry out mutually beneficial and voluntary transactions. This free enterprise system has served superbly the farmer, the merchandiser, and the consumer.

It is especially discerning to note that those who have pushed this legislation admit that they have no real evidence of serious wrongdoing taking place on futures markets. Some have called for stricter controls on futures trading based on the premise that food price increases *may* have been caused at least in part by manipulation and speculation, but this view was totally unsupported by the testimony presented at Committee hearings.

Thus, if this bill is passed, we will have yet another unfortunate example of Congress throwing reason out the window and the takeover of yet another great example of our free enterprise system functioning without government control and interference. Liberty and economic opportunity will again be trampled under foot by big government if this bill is passed and enacted into law.

I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, if this Commission is allowed to take over and tell who is going to trade on the floor and these people want to take their commission firms and move out and if they destroy the right of a man to go into the market, then certainly they will be moving out and will not provide the liquidity for a person who wants to sell his cattle or sell his corn.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. MAYNE'S question to the gentleman from Texas, there are several people in the industry and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange does not necessarily overwhelmingly approve this bill; but they were afraid to fight it because they might get something worse out of a future Congress.

I might refer to the March 4 issue of Barron's magazine in which they are very much opposed to this.

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

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

Mr. MAYNE. I am very familiar with the excellent article in Barron's and the help it gives to the premise of the gentleman. I am very happy for him to receive this long overdue recommendation; but I do not think it should influence this House to vote against this rule.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment just to inform my colleagues not to react, in this rather restive attitude we have tonight, against the rule. In the 14 years I have been here I have had the opportunity to observe the work of the Committee on Agriculture. This is the finest product this committee has brought to the floor of the House.

It is a result of long, careful deliberations. We have consulted with leaders of the futures industry all over the country, and I can say that in talking with the individuals who are the leaders of the trading centers, the Board of Trade in Chicago, the Mercantile Exchange, the leading agricultural and trading economists in the Nation, I cannot find one of these individuals who has not volunteered a highly favorable report on the final product of the Committee on Agriculture.

Therefore, I implore the Members to vote "yes," when the time comes on the rule.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, if it is true that every cloud has a silver lining, then the long overdue reforms contained in H.R. 13113 in the operation of commodity futures markets can be regarded as one worthwhile outcome of the incredible mismanagement by the Nixon administration of the economy of this country. The inflation we have experienced has been much more serious than a cloud, or even a cloudburst—it has been a sustained deluge which has seriously eroded the economic stability of this country and created havoc for the American people. And nowhere has inflation's consequences been felt more strikingly than in the prices of commodities which are traded in this country in futures exchanges.

The incredible increases which have occurred in food prices since August of 1971, when the price control authority of the Economic Stabilization Act was first put into effect, can be attributed only in part to the excessive speculation in commodity futures trading, but excessive speculation in futures has been a significant part of the problem of food price inflation. Basically, the soaring food price index reflected the failure of the administration from the very beginning of the controls program to impose price ceilings on any raw agricultural commodities. Coupled with an unrestricted export program, including the manner in which the Russian wheat deal was negotiated and allowed to take effect, the lack of controls over farmers' prices and the inadequate controls over commodity futures speculation in farm commodities have resulted in price increases at the retail level which have hurt the American family grievously, and particularly the lower income families and those on fixed incomes. Speculation in nonfood futures has contributed significantly to increases in other living costs.

If price controls had been imposed on raw agricultural and other primary commodities at levels reflecting a fair rate of return to the farmer or producer, any gyrations of prices in the commodities markets would have had minimal effect on retail prices. But because there were no controls on primary commodities prices, trading in commodity futures went wild, and we have all suffered as a consequence.

WIDE AND ERRATIC FLUCTUATIONS

As Congressman NEAL SMITH'S Subcommittee on Special Small Business Problems of the House Permanent Select Committee on Small Business pointed out in its recent report to the House, fluctuations in the futures markets have been "so wide and erratic" as to disrupt orderly marketing procedures and make the futures markets unreliable devices for producers and processors to protect themselves against cost increases or price declines. As for the consumer, although there is always a raging argument as to how much of an impact increases in futures prices have in pulling up spot prices, I think it is clear to anyone who has followed the futures markets over the years that sharp price increases in the futures contracts during periods of frantic speculation prompt those with supplies on hand of a traded commodity to hold out for higher cash prices. When the futures market is going up fast there is little incentive to sell at today's cash price if, on the basis of rising futures prices, you think that tomorrow's or the next day's cash price is going to be much higher.

So, inevitably excessive speculation in futures leading to sharp increases in the futures prices does pull up the cash prices, but when a downturn sets in on the futures market the cash prices are slow to follow.

Commodity futures trading is an old and legitimate mechanism for enabling producers and processors of basic commodities to set the terms today of the prices at which one will sell and the other will buy a set quantity of a certain product many months in the future. Even if there are sharp changes in the actual prices of those commodities in the intervening months, both the seller and buyer know that the price they have previously agreed upon will be firm, and they can both plan accordingly. But the futures exchanges are more than one-to-one relationships between a producer and a processor; they provide a daily market in which one party or the other can liquidate his futures position to a third party, who then shares the risk of rising or falling cash prices. Under normal circumstances, these markets are operated for, and participated in by, knowledgeable specialists in the commodities traded.

But a phenomenon has occurred in the commodities exchanges in the last 20 years or so by attracting to these volatile markets outsiders with little or no knowledge about the individual commodities but with loose money with which to gamble. These are people looking for fast action on which large amounts of money can be made overnight with modest investments based on the exchanges' traditionally low margins, often as low as 5 percent, or even less, of the value of the contracts traded.

COVERS COFFEE, SUGAR, AND OTHER COMMODITIES NOW NOT REGULATED

Twenty years ago, Mr. Speaker, during my first term in the House, rumors of a crop disaster for coffee producers in Brazil set off an orgy of futures trading in coffee in this country which in turn doubled and tripled the cost of a pound of coffee to the American consumer. When I called to the attention of the Eisenhower administration that the alleged coffee shortage appeared to be a hoax, the Federal Trade Commission undertook an investigation which confirmed that suspicion and pointed to excessive speculation and irregularities in coffee futures trading as a major factor in the incredible rise in actual coffee prices in the United States.

That bubble burst when the FTC issued its report, leaving in its debris many lost fortunes and millions of dollars of lost consumer purchasing power from 6 months of artificially high retail coffee prices. Nevertheless, up to now futures trading in coffee has never been brought under any form of Federal regulation.

A somewhat similar situation occurred in 1963 when sugar prices doubled—again accentuated by excessive futures speculation. But sugar futures also have continued to lie outside the regulatory scope of the Commodity Exchange Authority. As a matter of fact, many of the sugar futures speculators who got into this market in 1963 said they did so because it was not regulated.

H.R. 13113 will finally bring coffee and sugar, and a lot of other nonregulated commodities traded on futures exchanges, under Federal regulation for the first time, such as copper, lumber, silver, aluminum, lead, nickel, plywood, and many others. If this bill did nothing more than bring those vital and volatile commodities under regulation, it would serve a highly useful purpose.

But it does far more than that, by strengthening the Government's power to deal with a variety of highly questionable trading practices on all of the futures exchanges, and I will support it as far as it goes Unfortunately, it took a major upheaval in the economy of this country to bring about these long overdue reforms in futures trading.

However, H.R. 13113 ignores completely the one aspect of commodity futures gambling—and I use that word advisedly—which has made possible the worst excesses in futures trading. I am referring to the need for effective regulation of the downpayments—the earnest money, or "margin"—established by the exchanges themselves in connection with a futures transaction.

Margins in stock exchange transactions are regulated by the Federal Reserve Board in order to dampen down excessive speculation on borrowed money during inflationary periods. To buy stock valued at $18,000, for instance, the purchaser has to put down at least $9,000, and from time to time the Federal Reserve has set margin requirements for higher than 50 percent; at one time I believe it was as high as 90 percent.

ATTEMPT TO BRING MARGINS UNDER FEDERAL SUPERVISION

A year ago, when the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported out a bill to extend the Economic Stabilization Act, we included a provision giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to set margins on commodities futures trading—as part of our 1973 anti-inflation and mandatory price rollback bill which was defeated on the House floor. At that time, in order to speculate on an $18,000 futures contract for 40,000 pounds of cattle on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, the margin required was only $700. On what was at that time a $15,000 contract at the Chicago Board of Trade for 100,000 board feet of stud lumber, the margin set by the exchange was only $500. On the New York Commodity Exchange, a speculator on what was then a $16,500 contract for 25,000 pounds of copper had to put down only $750.

Incidentally, a copper futures contract for which a speculator had to put down only $750 in April 1973 is today worth approximately $33,000 because the price of copper has doubled in the meantime. And that is a pretty good return of $16,500 on an original investment of only $750. It is because such truly phenomenal profits can be, and have been, made in commodity futures trading with so little money down that the phenomenon of widespread public speculation has occurred in these markets, particularly during the past year when the stock market has been in the doldrums and commodity prices seemed for a long time to be going only in one direction. But, of course, for every winner on these commodity exchanges, there is also a loser and the losses can be extremely heavy, too.

Leaving the setting of margins strictly up to the managers and directors of the private commodity futures exchanges, with absolutely no power within the Federal Government to influence or supervise the margin-setting decisions, as H.R. 13113 would do, continues those exchanges in a clear conflict-of-interest situation. Their only interest in setting a particular margin level on a futures contract is to protect the exchange and its members against customer defaults. They have little or no interest in dampening down speculation during an inflationary situation because the more speculators who move into commodities in order to gamble, the more the exchanges and its members make in commissions.

EFFECT OF FRANTIC SPECULATION ON LEGITIMATE HEDGERS

It is the same as giving the New York Stock Exchange the power to set margins on stocks, rather than having the Federal Reserve Board make these decisions from the standpoint of the overall economic situation. If the New York Stock Exchange had the opportunity today to set minimum margins on common stocks, as the commodity exchanges do on futures contracts, it is probable that the margin on stocks would also now be only 5 percent instead of 50 percent, in order to stimulate more trading. But we learned in the 1929 stock market crash that when margin setting is left to the exchanges themselves and to individual brokers, margins are not based on any consideration of national interest. That has been the case in commodities.

And the result has been a chaotic invasion of the commodity markets by gamblers and amateur dabblers looking for quick riches. And, as my good friend L. C. "Clell" Carpenter, vice president of the Midcontinent Farmers Association, headquartered at Columbia, Mo., pointed out in his testimony before Congressman SMITH's Small Business Subcommittee last year, speaking also for the Missouri Farmers Association, the frantic trading encouraged by the exchanges placed legitimate hedgers in a serious financial squeeze in maintaining their positions, and he attributed this to excessive paper trading.

NEW COMMISSION SHOULD BE ABLE TO SUPERVISE MARGIN SETTING

If the new Commodity Futures Trading Commission created by H.R. 13113 is to be able to bring order out of chaos in these markets, and prevent chaos from excessive speculation, it should not be denied the power to supervise margin setting. I note that the Smith Small Business Subcommittee recommended that the Commission be given such powers.

This would not mean that legitimate hedgers would have to post the same margins as doctors, dentists, lawyers, secretaries, housewives, and others who come into these markets at the suggestion of stockbrokers looking for extra commissions. But the margin-setting power would not be left with the exchanges themselves, without supervision or regulation of any kind on this important aspect of the markets' operations. The margin setting should reflect national economic conditions rather than just the self-interest of the exchanges, for it is to the exchanges' interest, usually, to set the margins at levels which will attract as many new customers as possible, and those are levels which are often far too low for national economic stability.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, 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. PRICE of Texas. 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 347, nays 15, answered "present" 1, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—347

Abdnor	Daniel, Dan	Hicks
Abzug	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hillis
Adams	Daniels, Dominick V.	Hinshaw
Addabbo	Davis, Ga.	Hogan
Alexander	Davis, S.C.	Holifield
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Holt
Anderson, Ill.	de la Garza	Holtzman
Andrews, N.C.	Delaney	Horton
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dellenback	Howard
Annunzio	Denholm	Hudnut
Archer	Dent	Hungate
Arends	Derwinski	Hunt
Armstrong	Dickinson	Hutchinson
Ashley	Dingell	Ichord
Aspin	Donohue	Jarman
Bafalis	Downing	Johnson, Calif.
Barrett	Drinan	Johnson, Colo.
Bauman	Dulski	Johnson, Pa.
Beard	Duncan	Jones, N.C.
Bell	Eckhardt	Jones, Okla.
Bennett	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Tenn.
Bergland	Eilberg	Jordan
Bevill	Erlenborn	Kemp
Biaggi	Eshleman	Ketchum
Bingham	Evins, Tenn.	Kluczynski
Blackburn	Fascell	Kuykendall
Boggs	Findley	Kyros
Boland	Fish	Lagomarsino
Brademas	Flood	Latta
Brasco	Flowers	Leggett
Bray	Foley	Lent
Breaux	Ford	Long, Md.
Breckinridge	Forsythe	Lott
Brinkley	Fountain	Lujan
Brotzman	Fraser	Luken
Brown, Calif.	Frenzel	McClory
Brown, Mich.	Frey	McCollister
Brown, Ohio	Froehlich	McCormack
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton	McDade
Buchanan	Fuqua	McFall
Burgener	Gaydos	McKay
Burke, Fla.	Gettys	McKinney
Burke, Mass.	Gilman	McSpadden
Burleson, Tex.	Goldwater	Madden
Burlison, Mo.	Gonzalez	Madigan
Burton	Goodling	Mahon
Butler	Grasso	Mallary
Byron	Gray	Mann
Carney, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	Maraziti
Carter	Green, Pa.	Martin, N.C.
Casey, Tex.	Gross	Mathias, Calif.
Chamberlain	Gude	Mathis, Ga.
Chappell	Gunter	Matsunaga
Clancy	Guyer	Mayne
Clark	Haley	Mazzoli
Clausen, Don H.	Hamilton	Meeds
Clay	Hammer-schmidt	Melcher
Cleveland	Hanley	Metcalfe
Cochran	Hanna	Mezvinsky
Cohen	Hansen, Idaho	Michel
Collins, Ill.	Harrington	Milford
Collins, Tex.	Harsha	Miller
Conable	Hastings	Minish
Conlan	Hays	Mink
Conte	Hechler, W. Va.	Mitchell, Md.
Cotter	Heckler, Mass.	Mitchell, N.Y.
Coughlin	Heinz	Moakley
Cronin	Helstoski	Mollohan
Culver	Henderson	Montgomery
		Moorhead, Calif.

Moorhead, Pa.	Rostenkowski	Thomson, Wis.
Morgan	Roush	Thone
Mosher	Rousselot	Thornton
Moss	Roy	Towell, Nev.
Murphy, Ill.	Roybal	Treen
Murphy, N.Y.	Runnels	Udall
Murtha	Ruppe	Ullman
Myers	Ryan	Van Deerlin
Natcher	St Germain	Vander Jagt
Nedzi	Sandman	Vander Veen
Nelsen	Sarasin	Vanik
Nix	Sarbanes	Veysey
Obey	Satterfield	Vigorito
O'Brien	Scherle	Waggonner
O'Hara	Schneebeli	Waldie
O'Neill	Schroeder	Walsh
Owens	Sebelius	Wampler
Passman	Seiberling	Ware
Patten	Shoup	Whalen
Pepper	Shriver	White
Perkins	Shuster	Whitehurst
Pettis	Sikes	Whitten
Peyser	Sisk	Widnall
Poage	Skubitz	Wiggins
Podell	Slack	Williams
Preyer	Smith, Iowa	Wilson, Bob
Price, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Pritchard	Snyder	
Quie	Spence	
Railsback	Staggers	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Randall	Stanton, James V.	Winn
Rarick	Stark	Wolff
Rees	Steed	Wright
Regula	Steele	Wydler
Reuss	Steelman	Wylie
Riegle	Steiger, Ariz.	Wyman
Rinaldo	Steiger, Wis.	Yates
Roberts	Stephens	Yatron
Robinson, Va.	Stokes	Young, Alaska
Robison, N.Y.	Stratton	Young, Ga.
Rodino	Stubblefield	Young, Ill.
Roe	Studds	Young, Tex.
Rogers	Sullivan	Zablocki
Roncalio, Wyo.	Symington	Zion
Roncallo, N.Y.	Talcott	Zwach
Rooney, Pa.	Taylor, Mo.	
Rose	Taylor, N.C.	
Rosenthal		

NAYS—15

Ashbrook	Dennis	Pike
Baker	Devine	Price, Tex.
Camp	Hanrahan	Symms
Clawson, Del	Hosmer	Young, Fla.
Crane	Landgrebe	Young, S.C.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Grover

NOT VOTING—69

Badillo	Flynt	Martin, Nebr.
Biester	Frelinghuysen	Mills
Blatnik	Giaimo	Minshall, Ohio
Bolling	Gibbons	Nichols
Bowen	Ginn	Parris
Brooks	Griffiths	Patman
Broomfield	Gubser	Pickle
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Wash.	Powell, Ohio
Burke, Calif.	Hawkins	Quillen
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Rangel
Cederberg	Huber	Reid
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Collier	Karth	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Ruth
Corman	Kazen	Shipley
Danielson	King	Stanton, J. William
Dellums	Koch	
Diggs	Landrum	Stuckey
Dorn	Lehman	Teague
du Pont	Litton	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Calif.	Long, La.	Tiernan
Esch	McCloskey	Wyatt
Evans, Colo.	McEwen	
Fisher	Macdonald	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Kazen with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Diggs wih Mr. Carey of New York.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. McCloskey.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. du Pont.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Gubser.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Giaimo with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Koch with Mr. Corman.
Mr. J. William Stanton with Mr. King.
Mr. Bowen with Mr. Landrum.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Lehman with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Parris.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Ginn with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Powell of Ohio with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Ruth with Mr. Wyatt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATION TO REDUCE REGRESSIVE SOCIAL SECURITY TAX

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today with 20 additional cosponsors legislation to reduce the regressive social security tax.

This bill's cosponsors now number 120, and I ask permission to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the "Honor Roll" listing these Members names.

Mr. Speaker, these Members are to be commended for their foresight and for their attention to the tax problems of millions of American workers. For over half the population, social security taxes are greater than the Federal income tax, and something obviously has to be done to redress this situation.

In addition, under permission granted above I include in the RECORD the excellent article by the nationally famous reporter David Nyhan of the Boston Globe's Washington bureau, entitled "Burke Gains Support for Shift in SS Tax Load."

Also under permission granted above I include a resolution recently enacted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives memorializing the Congress to act swiftly on the legislation I have introduced to reduce the payroll tax:

SOCIAL SECURITY HONOR ROLL

Bella Abzug (NY).
Joseph P. Addabbo (NY).
Frank Annunzio (Ill).
Herman Badillo (NY).
Jonathan B. Bingham (NY).
Edward P. Boland (Mass).
Frank J. Brasco (NY).
George F. Brown, Jr. (Calif).
James A. Burke (Mass).
Yvonne Brathwaite Burke (Calif.)
Phillip Burton (Calif.)
Charles J. Carney (Ohio).
Shirley Chisholm (NY).
Frank M. Clark (Pa).
William Clay (Mo).
Cardiss Collins (Ill).
Silvio O. Conte (Mass).
John Conyers, Jr. (Mich).
James C. Corman (Calif).
William R. Cotter (Conn).
Paul W. Cronin (Mass).
Dominick V. Daniels (NJ).
James J. Delaney (NY).
Ronald V. Dellums (Calif.).
Ron de Lugo (VI).
Frank E. Denholm (S. Dak).
John H. Dent (Pa).
Charles C. Diggs (Mich).
Harold D. Donohue (Mass).
Robert F. Drinan (Mass).
Don Edwards (Calif).
Joshua Eilberg (Pa).
Walter E. Fauntroy (DC).
Daniel J. Flood (Pa).
William D. Ford (Mich).
Donald M. Fraser (Minn).
Joseph M. Gaydos (Pa).
Benjamin A. Gilman (NY).
Kenneth J. Gray (Ill).
William J. Green (Pa).
Bill Gunter (Fla).
Michael Harrington (Mass).
Augustus F. Hawkins (Calif).
Wayne L. Hays (Ohio).
Ken Hechler (W. Va).
Margaret M. Heckler (Mass).
Henry Helstoski (NJ).
Floyd V. Hicks (Wash).
Elizabeth Holtzman (NY).
Harold T. Johnson (Calif).
Barbara Jordan (Tex).
Joseph E. Karth (Minn).
John C. Kluczynski (Ill).
Peter N. Kyros (Maine).
William Lehman (Fla).
Mike McCormack (Wash).
Stewart B. McKinney (Conn).
Torbert H. Macdonald (Mass).
Ralph H. Metcalfe (Ill).
Parren J. Mitchell (Md).
Joe Moakley (Mass).
William S. Moorhead (Pa).
Thomas E. Morgan (Pa).
Morgan F. Murphy (Ill).
Robert N. C. Nix (Pa).
James G. O'Hara (Mich).
Claude Pepper (Fla).
Carl D. Perkins (Ky).
Bertram L. Podell (NY).
Melvin Price (Ill).
William J. Randall (Mo).
Charles B. Rangel (NY).
Ogden R. Reid (NY).
Henry S. Reuss (Wis).
Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (Wis).
Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (NJ)
Robert A. Roe (NJ).
Fred B. Rooney (Pa).
Charles Rose (NC).
Benjamin S. Rosenthal (NY).
Fernand J. St Germain (RI).
Charles W. Sandman, Jr. (NJ).
Paul S. Sarbanes (Md).
Patricia Schroeder (Colo).
John F. Seiberling (Ohio).
James V. Stanton (Ohio).
Fortney H. Stark (Calif).
Louis Stokes (Ohio).
Frank A. Stubblefield (Ky).
Gerry E. Studds (Mass).
Robert O. Tiernan (RI).
Richard Vander Veen (Mich).
Charles A. Vanik (Ohio).
Jerome R. Waldie (Calif).
Charles H. Wilson (Calif).
Lester L. Wolff (NY).
Antonio Borja Won Pat (Guam).
Gus Yatron (Pa).
Andrew Young (Ga).
Clement J. Zablocki (Wis).
Thomas L. Ashley (Ohio).
Les Aspin (Wis).
William A. Barrett (Pa).
Mario Biaggi (NY).
Mendel Davis (SC).
Joe L. Evins (Tenn).
Louis Frey, Jr. (Fla).
Ella T. Grasso (Conn).
Robert Hanrahan (Ill).
William Hungate (Mo).

Norman F. Lent (NY).
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr. (Calif).
Ray J. Madden (Ind).
Joseph G. Minish (NJ).
Lucien N. Nedzi (Mich).
Edward J. Patten (NJ).
Frank Thompson, Jr. (NJ).
Joseph P. Vigorito (Pa).
Bill C. W. Young (Fla).
Edward I. Koch (NY).

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 17, 1974]

BURKE GAINS SUPPORT FOR SHIFT IN SOCIAL SECURITY TAX LOAD

(By David Nyhan)

WASHINGTON.—Jimmy Burke's Social Security re-shuffle started slowly.

It got nowhere last year. By Feb. 26 of this year there were 65 congressmen who'd signed on as cosponsors. By March 3, there were 90. As of last week, 120 members had signed on.

And now US Rep. James A. Burke (D-Mass.), the 64-year-old self-styled "bread and butter congressman," is almost ready to go into the House Ways and Means Committee to argue for a tax cut for the little guy.

Burke is out to reform the Social Security system. Those little letters on your paycheck stub FICA (standing for the Federal Insurance Corporation of America), represent what you and millions of Americans pay each week into the fund that keeps widows, orphans and the elderly out of the poorhouse.

The recently increased Social Security tax is now at 5.85 percent of the first $13,200 of earned income. For more than half the population, Social Security taxes are greater than the Federal income tax, which is computed on a sliding scale.

Burke calls Social Security "the most regressive tax" because poor workers pay a higher share of their income than do the better-off. The Social Security tax currently peaks at $772 a year for every worker. Each employer has to match that amount for each employee.

Burke's proposal would reduce the Social Security tax from its present 5.85 percent to 3.9 percent, and raise the income cutoff level from $13,200 to $25,000.

"For the married couple with two children and an income of $7000 a year," says Burke. "My bill would cut the Social Security tax from the present $409.50 to $273 a year."

His proposal also calls for the US Treasury to pay one-third of the Social Security tab from general revenues, so that instead of the present system where the worker pays half and the employer pays half, the new system would have the worker, the employer and the government each paying one-third.

A dogged plodder on "little guy" legislation in his No. 3 position on the House Ways and Means Committee and his post on the 10-member Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Service Taxation. Burke has convinced more than a quarter of the 435 congressmen that his proposal is the best way to cut taxes for the average man this year.

All House members are up for re-election this fall, and they are at a near-fever pitch over Watergate and polls showing that all incumbents are down in the esteem of the voters. So what could be nicer for a campaigning congressman than to go to the polls on the heels of a tax cut?

"The reason I'm pushing now, Burke said in an interview last week, "is that we (Ways and Means) are going into tax reform after we get the hearings on unemployment compensation out of the way. I want all these co-sponsors to show we've got some strength.

"If we're going to have any tax reform this year, the way to do it is in the Social Security area, and further to close some of the tax loopholes."

Nowhere on Burke's list of cosponsors is the most important name of all, US Rep. Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of Ways and Means. The Arkansas Democrat, says Burke of his mentor, "is watching me like a cat watches a mouse."

Mills controls the traffic light on tax reform. Burke sees his opposition as "a lot of fat cats," particularly multinational corporations, whose tax havens would be assaulted to make up the Federal revenue that Burke's bill would cost.

But his scheme, Burke insists, "is the only chance working people will get for a tax break—Social Security is where he is getting slugged."

Coming as it does upon the heels of President Nixon's tax troubles Burke hopes the time is ripe to correct a tax system "that's punishing the fellow who works for a living and follows him to his grave."

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS RESOLUTION

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for federal participation in the costs of the Social Security Program, with a substantial increase in the contribution and benefit base and with appropriate reductions in Social Security taxes to reflect the Federal Government's participation in such costs

Whereas, there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill H.R. 12489 which if enacted into law would amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for federal participation in the costs of the Social Security Program, with a substantial increase in the contribution and benefit base and with appropriate reductions in Social Security taxes to reflect the Federal Government's participation in such costs; and

Whereas, said bill would grant tax relief to every wage earner with an income of $20,000 or less; and

Whereas, it is the sense of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that, in these times of severe inflation, every means should be employed to increase the spendable income of working people; and

Whereas, said bill, in addition to aiding the workers, would lower the cost of doing business for employers; therefore be it

Resolved, that the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the Congress of the United States to enact into law H.R. 12489; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me state that I intend to vote for impeachment of the President if the Judiciary Committee comes up with positive evidence of direct involvement by the President in "impeachable offenses." If they fail to do so, I, of course, will vote against impeachment.

It seems odd to me as a lawyer that a committee of the Congress, composed of 37 lawyers, that has hired about 50 more lawyers and spent nearly a million dollars in the last 5 months, still has not defined an impeachable offense nor has it charged the President with anything.

I can understand the reluctance of the White House to permit this committee staff to rummage through the files of the White House, helter-skelter, to see if they can find anything with which to charge the President.

With the Special Prosecutor's investigation, coupled with the vast Watergate hearings, added to the million dollar investigation thus far conducted by the Judiciary Committee, it seems to me they are on a desperate fishing expedition in the hope of finding something to justify their existence and vast expenditures of public funds.

I am shocked and dismayed at news accounts which indicate that the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee is now going to investigate the possibility of fraud in the handling of President Nixon's income taxes.

This is further proof that the staff of the Judiciary Committee is out to get the President in any way it can.

I say this because the announcement by the committee's counsel, Mr. Doar, comes on the heels of a very explicit pronouncement from the Internal Revenue Service saying it found no fraud.

The IRS on last Thursday said it has closed the audit on the President's returns and it added that no assertion of fraud was warranted. This is as plain as can be—yet now comes the judiciary staff saying it will look into the matter.

It seems to me that all of these public announcements—coupled with a flood of news leaks—are designed for one purpose: to convict the President in the public mind before he has his day in court. This is not the first time this has happened, and I presume we can be certain it will not be the last.

Nevertheless, I am simply at a loss to explain why the judiciary staff would try to revive a dead issue such as the possibility of fraud on the President's taxes.

The tax returns of the President and Mrs. Nixon have been subjected to perhaps the most thorough and exhaustive public investigation in the history of the Nation. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation looked over the forms for weeks on end and published a 2-inch thick book on its findings. The Internal Revenue Service did likewise.

These investigators looked into every angle of the President's taxes for the last 5 years. And when they completed the investigation, the joint committee said nothing of fraud. The IRS completed a similar investigation and stated very plainly that there was no fraud.

It seems as if these people on the committee staff are bent on destroying the Presidency. They are determined to make charges—whether there is reason or proof behind them—and paint an unfavorable public picture of the President.

I, for one, think it is high time the Judiciary Committee determines the scope of its investigation and bring these issues to a conclusion—one way or the other. I believe the American people are tired of seeing their President tried and convicted in the media.

GOVERNMENT GIVES—GOVERNMENT TAKES

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

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, "Why does the Government give with one hand and take away with the other? I just don't understand how this could happen." How many times have you heard that question from elderly constituents who cannot fathom the incomprehensible logic of the Federal Government in raising social security benefits, while cutting Veterans' Administration pensions.

Most directly affected by the Federal Government's inability to hold the line on inflation are the elderly and others on fixed incomes. We increase their social security benefits, to help keep abreast of rising prices, but the Veterans' Administration is required by law to reduce their VA pensions. The net result is that the VA pensioner not only receives no increase in overall income, but may be much worse off financially, since his rent and other costs often increase as a result of the new "windfall" from social security. This certainly was not the intent of Congress.

Last year when Congress increased VA nonservice-connected pensions, we did not raise the earnings ceiling. Many pensioners received reduction or loss of their pensions early this year and the same situation will arise again in 1975, due to the two social security raises scheduled this year, unless Congress acts promptly.

I am today introducing legislation which would give the veteran and his widow the benefit of the social security raises enacted by Congress during 1973. In addition, this legislation provides that the pensioner would be able to receive future social security cost-of-living increases without penalty to his VA pension.

I was very disappointed that the VA pension bill enacted by Congress late last year did not increase the earnings ceiling, and it is imperative that we act promptly this year on legislation to prevent any further erosion of the already limited income of our Nation's elderly veterans. I respectfully urge the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to schedule early hearings and take favorable action on the measure I am introducing today.

It is time for Congress to stop playing sleight of hand with the pensions of our Nation's veterans and their widows.

THE COUNTDOWN CONTINUES TOWARD THE ELIMINATION OF STAGNATING WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the countdown continues toward the April 30 automatic expiration of mandatory wage and price controls—the stagnating controls which have helped to produce shortages on the one hand and higher prices on the other, doubly impairing the livelihood of the American people. I am happy to join my able colleague from Texas, Mr. STEELMAN, in this countdown exercise in the hope that our Nation will never again make the same mistake with regard to controls.

The principal question facing the Congress is: Should these controls be extended beyond April 30? The answer is, "No." That is also the answer from groups as diverse as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO. And, the consumers—the people—echo the chorus.

These controls should not be extended. Look at what they have done to our economy—weakened it. Look at what they have done to our society—disrupted it. Look at what they have done to our people—disspirited them. Inflation is the issue, fiscal and monetary restraint are the solution and controls only divert attention of the people from the reality of immutable economic laws.

The problem of inflation—which wage and price controls were intended to lessen—is an economic problem. We compound it when we rely on political answers. The yielding to this temptation would demonstrate to the Nation the Congress reliance on political solutions to solve economic problems, and the people know that does not work. Phase I, and phase II, and phase III, and phase IV have proved that.

What are we to expect when controls do expire on April 30? Let us look to the postwar era following the removal of controls after the Second World War.

After price controls were lifted in 1947 there was a rise in prices. Why? Because the laws of supply and demand, which had been artificially regulated during the Second World War, began to return to normalized relationships. Prices thereafter, as the laws of supply and demand took effect, however, started to decline, and they steadily declined. And, production started upward, giving rise to more jobs and greater income. The lesson is this: We must not panic when prices start to rise, for if we keep our hands off the situation, they will decline, sometimes substantially. If we yield to the temptation, we are only postponing the day in which we must lift controls or risk the destruction of our economic system.

Let us resolve to make mandatory wage and price controls a thing of the past, an episode never to be repeated.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute today to the late B. Everett Jordan of Saxapahaw, N.C., who served with such great distinction in the Senate of the United States from 1958 through 1972.

With the passing of Senator B. Everett Jordan on March 15, 1974, the State of North Carolina lost one of its most distinguished citizens and our Nation lost one of its most capable, dedicated leaders.

I had the great privilege of serving with Senator Jordan in the North Carolina delegation in Washington throughout his purposeful years of service here, and I knew him as a tireless worker for the good of all of our people, as a man who could and did get things done, as a man deeply and genuinely interested in people and as a man always willing to listen to new ideas and to consider new approaches to solving old problems.

But, long before either of us came to serve in the Congress, I knew Senator Jordan as a public-spirited leader of our State. He was a successful businessman who spent the greater part of his life working for progress in his State and Nation.

He was one of the friendliest, most down-to-earth people you could ever meet, and this instinctive trait of his surely stemmed from a sincere interest in everyone with whom he came in contact—high and low alike.

All those who knew him mourned his passing, and no one could count the many people who knew him and could call him friend. There were countless thousands.

Senator Jordan was born on September 8, 1896 at Ramseur, N.C. His parents were the Rev. and Mrs. Henry Harrison Jordan. He attended Trinity College—now Duke University—in Durham, N.C. Elon College conferred an honorary LL. D. degree upon him in 1960.

During World War I, Senator Jordan served with the U.S. Army Tank Corps in France. After the war, he went with the U.S. Army of Occupation into defeated Germany.

Following the war, he married the former Katherine McLean of Gastonia, N.C., and they had three children: Benjamin Everett, Rose Ann Gant, and John McLean.

An extremely successful textile manufacturer, Senator Jordan long was active in the political life of North Carolina. From 1949–54, he served as chairman of the North Carolina Democratic Executive Committee. He followed that up between 1954 and 1958 as Democratic National Committeeman from North Carolina.

In 1958, Senator Jordan was appointed to the U.S. Senate to fill an unexpired term, and new fields of service opened to him. He was reelected in 1960 and in 1966, and rendered great service to the people of this Nation.

A Methodist Bible class teacher from 1927 on, Senator Jordan was active throughout his life in many areas of civic endeavors. He was chairman of the Alamance County Hospital Board of Trustees; a trustee of Duke University, American University, and Elon College; a Rotarian; and a Shriner.

At the time of his departure from the Senate, Senator Jordan was an influential and senior Member of the Senate and held the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. He was also chairman of the Senate Subcommittees on Printing, on the Library and on Computer Services.

In addition, Senator Jordan served as chairman or vice-chairman in alternate

years of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress.

He served in the same capacity—alternately as chairman or vice-chairman—of the Joint Committee on Printing.

In 1964–65 and 1968, Senator Jordan was chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

Senator Jordan was a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing and Stabilization; a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works and chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors; a member of the Senate Office Building Commission; chairman of the Coordinating Committee for the Construction of the Library of Congress—James Madison Memorial; a member of the Commission on Arts and Antiquities of the Senate; Vice President of the American Group, Interparliamentary Union; and a trustee of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague in the Congress, B. Everett Jordan of North Carolina, was an accomplished and dedicated public servant, as can be seen from these brief highlights of his life and Senate career.

His service here—his record of accomplishment—will not be forgotten. He played a key role in guiding the destiny of America during an extremely critical time in our history—a time span beginning in the cold war days of the 1950's and ending in the vastly changed atmosphere of the 1970's.

His wise counsel, his sound judgments, and his progressive temperment are sorely missed in the halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to include in the RECORD several newspaper articles about Senator Jordan. The first is an editorial, which appeared in the Durham, N.C. Sun on March 16, 1974. Typical of comments which appeared in newspapers all across North Carolina following the Senator's death, are the following:

LEFT HIS MARK IN STATE AND NATION

Seldom, if ever, has North Carolina had a more respected and effective United States senator than B. Everett Jordan, who died at his home at Saxapahaw yesterday after long years of service to the state and its people.

Although active in Democratic party politics, he never had held an elective office until he was appointed to the Senate in 1958. But he moved up rapidly in seniority, prestige and influence. And when he left the Senate he was one of its most highly regarded members.

Amiable, easy-going, soft-spoken and mild, he rarely raised his voice; but he could get things done. He was a folksy and friendly man—a man who liked to be liked by everyone, and who usually was.

He started out in life by sweeping floors in textile mills and ended up by owning them. A friend of education, he gave away much of his money to schools; but almost never would talk about it. In whatever job he set out to do—in the Senate or out—he sought results, not recognition. He usually got them.

During his political career, he always kept foremost in his mind the needs of North Carolina, as well as those of the nation. His influence in Congress, the White House and various government agencies brought to his state many benefits, and his role in quietly obtaining them sometimes has gone unsung.

He was a diligent senator. He also, in his quiet way, was an effective politician—one who shook hands and kept up with his friends and acquaintances, not just as a means of getting votes but because he was a man of warmth and one who had a real interest in his fellow man.

A true statesman has passed. So also has a friend.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Mar. 16, 1974]

DELEGATION MOURNS DEATH OF JORDAN

(By Jack Betts)

WASHINGTON.—The death of former U.S. Sen. B. Everett Jordan, D-N.C., Friday caught many of his old Capitol Hill colleagues en route to their home states, but North Carolina's congressional delegation paused to mourn the loss of the gentleman from Saxapahaw.

Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., D-N.C., said, "I am distressed by the passing of my long time friend and former Senate colleague, B. Everett Jordan. We have been friends since we were teen-agers in my home town of Morganton, where his father was a Methodist minister. We played baseball and went swimming together.

"I had the rare privilege of serving with him for 14 years in the Senate and we never had a disagreement of any kind in respect to matters relating to North Carolina."

Ervin said Jordan had rendered "great service" to the state, especially in agriculture, industry and the development of rivers and harbors.

"Everett deserves the thanks of North Carolina and the nation for his public services and I shall never cease to miss him," the senior senator said.

Sen. Jesse Helms, Republican from Raleigh who claimed Jordan's seat after former Rep. Nick Galifianakis won the Democratic primary in 1972, said, "Senator Jordan was first, last and always a gentleman. He was a beloved member of the Senate, always cheerful, always helpful, always ready with an anecdote."

Recalling their friendship of more than three decades, Helms said, "He was a great American. He loved his country and he understood the principles that made America great.

"Mrs. Helms and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wonderful family and assure them that their loss is shared by countless thousands of their other friends everywhere," Helms said.

The dean of the delegation, Rep. L. H. Fountain, D-N.C. of Tarboro, said, "We in the North Carolina delegation have lost a close personal friend, and the state and the nation have lost an able, faithful and dedicated public servant and one of its finest citizens."

In North Carolina, Gov. James Holshouser, the first Republican elected to the state's top executive post this century sent a telegram to Mrs. Jordan: "We are deeply saddened by the loss of Sen. Jordan," it read. "He will be long remembered and appreciated by the people of North Carolina for his able and distinguished service and his many contributions to our state. Our thoughts are with you and your family in this time of sorrow."

North Carolina Democratic Party Chairman James Sugg said Friday, "He made an outstanding contribution to North Carolina and the nation in political, civic and religious life. The Democratic party will always be grateful to him because when he was chairman, the first permanent party headquarters were opened."

North Carolina Secretary of State Thad Eure, a longtime close friend of Jordan's said, "His services as chairman of his political party and as U.S. Senator will be appreciated and remembered for a long time."

Former Gov. Terry Sanford, who is now president of Duke University, said, "Sen. Jordan believed in North Carolina and its people and he had the rare ability to translate that belief into legislation and a way of life. He once said his greatest satisfaction was in "doing the little things many would think about for people.

"As a successful businessman and public servant, Sen. Jordan lived what he believed and added distinction to an already distinguished family. Duke University, particularly, is in his debt and is proud and grateful for the opportunity it had to be associated with him as trustee and benefactor."

North Carolina Att. Gen. Robert Morgan, now a senatorial candidate, said, "Sen. Jordan had a distinguished record of service to North Carolina as a business leader, Democratic party figure and United States Senator."

Jordan's career was distinguished by integrity and dedicated service to his constituents. Morgan contained "He certainly left his mark on the state and his friends will miss him."

Lt. Gov. Jim Hunt said Jordan's personal character and long life as a public leader in the state "have been matched by few persons in our history.

"In the U.S. Senate he was an effective spokesman for North Carolina agriculture and industry. Our state is a better place because he was our Senator and worked so diligently for North Carolina," Hunt said.

Republican Rep. James T. Broyhill of Lenoir, reached at his offices there, remembered Jordan as "a good friend of mine. He was most helpful to me during our joint service in the Congress. He served his state in many ways, and though he was a loyal Democrat he always stood up in a bipartisan way in what he believed was right for North Carolina."

Sixth District Democrat Richardson Preyer of Greensboro recalled Jordan as "a great gentleman and a fine legislator."

Preyer said, "He did not seek the headlines but he was very effective. Some people are boxers and some are sluggers. The sluggers get the headlines but the boxers get more results.

"Senator Jordan was a boxer. He got results by the force of his integrity and character and by the respect in which he was held by his fellow senators, rather than by the headlines he created."

Preyer said his contributions to the state in improvements to the rivers and harbors "will probably never be equalled . . . we will all miss him very much."

Rep. Wilmer (Vinegar Bend) Mizell, Republican of Midway, said, "Mrs. Mizell and I deeply mourn the death of Sen. B. Everett Jordan. When I first came to Congress, the senator was one of the first to offer his assistance to me. He was a man who could be considered exemplary in the life he led of honesty, courage and integrity. These values, along with his strong Christian beliefs served him well, especially in the last period of his life."

First District Democrat Walter B. Jones of Farmville said, "I want to express my sorrow to Senator Jordan's family and to remember with deep appreciation his contributions to the state of North Carolina. His death is a tragic blow and he will be sorely missed by the people of North Carolina."

Rep. Charlie Rose, Fayetteville Democrat, said, "North Carolina has lost a great friend. Everett Jordan gave his life to trying to make our state and our country a better place to live. I think he did.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the death of Senator B. Everett Jordan.

When I first came to Congress, the Senator was one of the first to offer his assistance to me. He was a man who could be considered exemplary in the life he led of honesty, courage and integrity. These values, along with his strong Christian belief, served him well, especially in the last period of his life.

He was a man of conscience, a man of conviction, and a dedicated public servant. Senator Jordan will be missed by all of us.

At this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. Charles Oslin of the Winston-Salem Journal on the death of Senator Jordan.

[From the Winston Salem Journal, Mar. 16, 1974]

JORDAN WAS A PERSONAL SENATOR

(By Charles Osolis)

WASHINGTON.—Once on one of his frequent trips to Europe, Sen. B. Everett Jordan of North Carolina was invited to inspect some Polish meat that has been prepared for export to the United States.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Jordan had been instrumental in establishing tough inspection procedures on foreign meat.

Jordan could have given the meat a cursory inspection and let it go at that. Instead, he insisted on a guided tour of the slaughterhouse where the meat was prepared, so he could evaluate the conditions firsthand.

"That was not a pleasure trip. I can assure you," Jordan later recalled.

Jordan's habit of dealing with legislative matters on a personal, firsthand basis was one of the traits that characterized his 14 years in the U.S. Senate. He rarely made a speech on the Senate floor, but few senators could match him in the art of gentle persuasion in the aisles and cloakrooms.

"He made it clear at the outset," said Wes Hayden, one of Jordan's closest aides, "that he considered himself a service senator rather than an oratorical one, and that he would work in the way he considered most likely to achieve the things he felt the state needed.

"His main attribute," said Hayden, who was Jordan's press assistant and executive secretary from 1967 until he left the Senate early last year, "was that he was so warm, and so human and so unpretentious. He could get along with anybody."

That Jordan was one of the best-liked members of the Senate was illustrated by the dozens of tributes that filled the pages of the Congressional Record during the last month before he left office.

Former Sen. Margaret Chase Smith of Maine said Jordan was "more than just a good senator. He's a wonderful human being and I've never known a kinder man."

Although Jordan's longtime friend and colleague, Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., has earned a national reputation as a spinner of country stories and anecdotes to make his points, Jordan's colleagues say the junior Senator from North Carolina was no slouch at story telling either.

Sen. Jesse Helms, who replaced Jordan in the Senate, said yesterday that Jordan was always ready with an anecdote when he attended the weekly Senate prayer breakfasts.

"People would just beam when he came in the room," Helms said. "They'd all be ready for him to tell a story. His stories were always clean, but they were always funny."

Helms said Jordan was "first, last and always a gentleman. He was a beloved member of the Senate, always cheerful, always helpful. He was a great American who loved his country and who understood the principle that made America great."

Ervin, who had known Jordan since the two were teenagers in Morganton, N.C., said he and Jordan "never had a disagreement of any kind with respect to matters relating to North Carolina. Everett deserves the thanks of North Carolina and the Nation for his public service, and I shall never cease to miss him."

Rep. Wilmer Mizell of the 5th District said Jordan was one of the first members of Congress to offer assistance when Mizell was a freshman congressman in 1969. Mizell said Jordan led a life of honesty, courage and integrity, and "these values, along with his strong Christian belief, served him well."

Jordan left office in January of last year with few regrets, and with a sincere sense of accomplishment.

"I look back over my period in the Senate with a good deal of satisfaction," he said at the time. "I've enjoyed being here, and I feel I've done something for the people. I just hope North Carolina and the world will be better off for the years I've spent here."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Senator B. Everett Jordan marks the loss of a great North Carolinian. It was my pleasure to sponsor here in the House a bill which changed the name of the New Hope Dam and Reservoir on the Cape Fear River to the B. Everett Jordan Dam and Reservoir, and I am gratified he lived to see this accomplished.

During much of our contemporary service here, Senator Jordan served on the Senate Committee on Public Works and I served on the House Public Works Committee, with the result that we worked very closely together on many projects and programs of vital interest to our State. Hard working, conscientious, and dedicated, the Senator could somehow always find time to inform himself on even small details about projects, and on many occasions, I am sure he amazed the engineers and others with the knowledge he had.

The death of the Senator has served as a reminder to me that our State has been blessed by having had a number of distinguished men from both political parties to serve in Washington. Just a few years ago, we held four major committee chairmanships here in the House. Today, we have none, although a number of our Representatives rank high in committee seniority. Much has changed, the people and the issues; but the challenge faced by elected officials is the same—to represent their constituents as honestly and effectively as possible.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. Speaker, the late Senator B. Everett Jordan of North Carolina was one of my closest friends and one of the best friends North Carolina has ever sent to Washington. For many years until they left Washington, the Jordans had an apartment in the same building where Mrs. Taylor and I reside. This provided an opportunity for us to see each other often.

Senator Jordan was at home with everyone. Whether on the Senate floor or just chatting with a stranger in the hall he had a warmth and sincerity of personality which will long be remembered. He was loyal to his friends, listened to young people as well as old, was genuine, unceremonious, optimistic, down-to-earth, straight as an arrow, and made a great contribution to good government in our Nation.

Senator Jordan and his lovely and gracious wife, Katherine, will always be a source of strength and inspiration to my wife, Evelyn, and me. We miss them in Washington. We miss their positive personalities based on faith in the people of this country and in God.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. It was with great sadness that I learned of the recent death of Senator B. Everett Jordan of North Carolina, who served our State so well in the U.S. Senate from 1958 to 1973.

Senator Jordan was a good friend and adviser during the years we served together representing the State of North Carolina in the Congress. Senator Jordan always kept the interests and the welfare of North Carolina foremost in his work in Washington, and he never lost his close contact with the people who sent him to represent them in the Nation's Capital.

He was a conscientious legislator and paid close attention to his legislative duties and his committee work. He will be well remembered for his able chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, among other achievements.

Senator Jordan's family can be proud of his distinguished career as a legislator and of his record as a great North Carolinian. Mrs. Broyhill and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to his widow and his family at this sad time for them.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the subject of the special order today of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT NIXON IS OFFERED $1 MILLION FOR VICE-PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Richard M. Nixon now has in his possession a firm offer of $1 million cash for his Vice Presidential papers. Several businessmen, and incidentally a majority of them are Democrats, have made the offer and if their offer is accepted, then the papers will be publicized through a syndicate and books. One of the anxious purchasers is a former Governor of the State of Louisiana and at one time a very large contributor to the Democratic Party.

Many of Mr. Nixon's friends, and I am one of them, would hope that the same committee that said Mr. Nixon should not take a tax deduction on his Vice Presidential papers on account of a technicality should now be just as persistent in helping to establish that Mr. Nixon's Vice Presidential papers are again his own property.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not being fooled as much as some would think. Sound thinking Americans know very well that a double standard has been set. Mr. Nixon's predecessors were given hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax credits for their personal papers delivered to the Government, but President Nixon was deprived of the same privilege on a technicality. Why should President Nixon be treated differently than his predecessors? How many Members of Congress are willing to expose their income tax returns and financial records as freely and completely as did President Nixon?

Principle demands that we make it abundantly clear to the American people that Mr. Nixon's 8-year tenure as Vice President was the most active of any Vice President in the history of America. He suffered abuse and humiliation in many parts of the world, including Russia. His life was in danger many times because of his efforts to espouse the great American principle. Hundreds of incidents in his 8-year tenure as Vice President made his personal papers much more valuable than those of any of his predecessors. Any fair-minded person should admit that Mr. Nixon's Vice Presidential papers may well be worth in excess of a million dollars. Mr. Nixon is now being offered a million dollars for his Vice Presidential papers.

We will have to wait and see whether the President will accept the $1 million for something that is morally his, based upon history, or whether he will insist on giving that $1 million gift to the Government. I say "morally his," because the Democratic-controlled auditors of a Democratic-controlled committee have said he should not be allowed a tax credit in any amount for his Vice Presidential papers.

Mr. Speaker, we must inform the American people that President Nixon is now going to pay an additional $148,000 in income tax to the U.S. Treasury that other taxpayers would decline to pay because the law does not require it.

Those who would continue trying to embarrass our President by applying a standard to his tax liabilities not applied to other public officials may live to regret their action. It is now appropriate to ask that all elected public officials in America have their tax returns audited on the same basis and as thoroughly as President Nixon's returns have been. It would be proper, so as to get a balance, to turn these files over to a committee of the House and Senate for the audit, insisting that Democratic auditors check the returns of the Republican public officials, and the Republican committee be given the privilege of auditing the returns of the Democratic public officials. This system might generate sufficient revenue to balance the budget and create a surplus, that is, provided the same procedures are followed that were followed in auditing President Nixon's tax returns.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, for such an audit to be successful, the news media would have to give it the same amount of publicity that they gave to the audit of President Nixon's tax returns.

How many Members of Congress are willing to publicize their tax returns on the same basis as President Nixon? How many potential Presidential candidates in the Congress are willing to publicize their tax returns on the same basis as President Nixon?

Mr. Speaker, I want no part of this double standard. I believe in the integrity of President Richard M. Nixon. We were sworn in together as Members of the House 28 years ago. I know the kind of stuff he is made of. I know that the haters, the Communists, the extreme left-wingers along with some misguided, good Americans have been trying to destroy Mr. Nixon ever since he put that Communist, Alger Hiss, in jail. This effort goes back many years, back to the first Eisenhower-Nixon campaign, some 22 years ago. You may recall the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign had to be suspended because the haters and Communists made false and derogatory charges against Mr. Nixon, necessitating his going before the public with the facts which, incidentally, set the record straight and greatly enhanced the prestige of Mr. Nixon.

As a bookkeeper, I learned many years ago that for every entry you make on one side of the ledger, you have to make an offsetting entry on the other side of the ledger. The single entry system is being applied to Mr. Nixon. In other words, we are hearing only one side of the story. Many are trying to make perfectly honest mistakes appear as gross corruption and dishonesty. I contend that if this kind of political practice is carried too far by too many for too long, it will destroy our form of government.

Is it not strange that many members of my party, some selfish members of the Republican Party and the radical segment of the news media are constantly condemning and charging our President with crimes he has not committed and wholly without foundation. They play with words, deal in innuendo, quarter-truths and, yes, misrepresentation. Mr. Speaker, such a policy is not conducive to the principles of democracy that made our Nation so great, free, strong and wealthy so quickly. Unless many of our leaders with good intentions, and doubtless unknowingly backed by the haters, Communists and left-wing fringe of the news media, straighten up and fly right and cover both sides of important issues, then our form of government will be so changed that it will restrict the freedoms of all Americans.

By any fair analysis, Richard Nixon has made a great President. His foreign policy is superb and if we are to survive with the form of government that means so much to so many, it will be largely because of President Nixon's foreign policy. We are living in a dangerous world. If we fall under the domination of some foreign dictator, then domestic problems will no longer be considered too important.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has brought peace to the world, and if our President is left alone to advance his final plans for world peace, no doubt his efforts will bring enduring peace to the world. President Nixon is looked upon by leaders of practically every nation of the world as the greatest and most effective President America ever had, and most of them look to him for leadership.

Mr. Speaker, returning to the tax issue, I wonder if the auditors of Mr. Nixon's tax returns can justify in their consciences treating Mr. Nixon differently than his predecessors have been treated. It would appear that the investigators were on one side of the fence. I am of the opinion that the time is here when the American people are going to recognize this truism.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that when the income tax law was placed on the statute books, it was conceded that all Presidents of the United States would be subjected to unfair criticism and misrepresentations if their tax returns were made public. Mr. Nixon had to make his returns public because of a leak worse than Watergate. It is my understanding that it was the policy of the IRS to protect all Presidents from blackmail and harassment.

It has always been the policy for the President of the United States to send his Federal income tax returns directly to the Commissioner of Revenue by a White House messenger, and then the IRS would place the returns under lock and key. However, last year, some ambitious sneak in the IRS bureau maneuvered his way into the locked room containing many Presidents' tax returns and stole information from President Nixon's returns and leaked the information to certain segments of the news media.

Mr. Speaker, where are the investigators? Of course, Mr. Nixon's returns were perfectly legal and, no doubt, proper, and it was never expected that the Democratic auditing committee would do any less than try to embarrass him.

If the news media would publicize as freely and completely the good deeds and great accomplishments of President Richard M. Nixon for the same length of time they have publicized some of the imaginary wrongs of President Nixon and honest mistakes of President Nixon, then hold another Presidential election, in all probability, Mr. Nixon would carry all 50 States with a greater landslide than in the last Presidential election.

Since last November, through April 10, I have received 7,096 letters supporting President Nixon and only 289 opposing him. My files are available for any Member to see.

Let me say again that the haters, the Communists and the uninformed as well as some misinformed Americans supporting a formula that was created 25 years ago that Richard M. Nixon must be destroyed in the minds of the American people and made ineffective. No doubt, the formula was created shortly after he put Alger Hiss in jail. This drive has not abated and the haters and Communists

who are the nucleus of this group will certainly continue harassing President Nixon for the remainder of his 3 years in the White House, and chances are the same group of haters and Communists who have been after him for 25 years will stay after him as long as he lives.

Mr. Speaker, on my knees with my hands on the Holy Bible, I took several solemn obligations, firm and direct, that I would defend any member of the human family whom I considered worthy of my defense, and certainly that included the President of the United States. Furthermore, my belief in the integrity of Richard M. Nixon makes it more important that I speak my mind and express myself freely as I understand the record. Unless I arose to the occasion and offered some defense of this great man, I would by obligation be compelled to take demits from nine character-building and principle-supporting organizations that I belong to. I wish that others who are familiar with obligations they took would likewise, based upon principle and established facts, put aside selfish political position and rally behind our President.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the Vice-Presidential papers of President Nixon have a real cash value of $1 million or more. The President is being made a firm offer of $1 million for them. Several of the group of men desiring to purchase them are citizens and taxpayers of Louisiana. They have instructed me to tender to the President an offer of $1 million for his Vice-Presidential papers, with $200,000 to be paid immediately and the remainder to be paid within 15 days after the acceptance of the offer.

The group will organize a distribution syndicate that will publish the contents and write a book. Nothing will be published by the syndicate dealing with the papers until approved by the President or his designated agent. Morally, the papers belong to Mr. Nixon. He must now decide whether to sell the papers for $1 million or whether to give them to our Government.

Many people believe that since the double standard applied to Mr. Nixon deprives him of a tax deduction for his Vice Presidential papers, that they are again morally his. If the President should sell them, the income would help shore up the shattered, financial structure heaped upon him by the double standard formula.

Mr. Speaker, one of the truisms of life is that standards are set by people in order that they can believe in something. But double standards are set in order that people can deceive. On countless occasions in the last several months we have seen the application of the double standard to the President of the United States—a double standard which fuels and feeds deception. And one of the worst examples of the double standard is the way the critics of the President treated him regarding the gift of his Vice-Presidential papers to the U.S. Archives with a true value of over $1 million.

Certainly the impression has been created that Mr. Nixon has not paid his fair share of taxes because of an immoral deduction for the gift of his papers. Even worse, the impression has been created that President Nixon is the first public official who ever took this type of tax deduction which was perfectly legal.

That is why I want to take this opportunity today to set the record straight—to let the American people know that a double standard has been created and that the President of the United States is taking a bum rap because the complete story has not been told. The issue I am talking about is not whether or not the deduction was taken in time, I am talking about whether or not what the President did was unusual. A technicality did not change the value of the papers.

It is time for the reporters and other know-it-alls to let the American people know, with the same kind of massive coverage, the names of other people who took similar deductions from their income taxes. For anyone who wants to know the truth, it is hard to find unless you spend a good deal of time in the back pages of your newspaper.

If you have looked over the record, you will find that President Nixon is only one of many names on a list of distinguished public leaders who have taken tax deductions after giving their public papers. That list includes President Lyndon Johnson, former Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, former California Gov. Edmund Brown, former Kennedy aides, John Kenneth Galbraith and Theodore Sorensen, and many others. I would like to note that many of these men have been persistent critics of President Nixon's conduct while in office.

Let me start with Senator HUMPHREY. It turns out that Mr. HUMPHREY has donated papers to the Minnesota State Historical Society valued at $309,475. So far, according to the record, Mr. HUMPHREY has taken tax deductions on those papers in the amount of $199,153. Of course, these deductions taken by Mr. HUMPHREY were completely ethical, proper, and legal. My point deals with the double standard that is being practiced. Mr. HUMPHREY used the same appraiser, Mr. Ralph Newman, of Chicago, that Mr. Nixon used. Repeating, Mr. Speaker, a technicality does not change the value of President Nixon's papers.

Mr. Johnson took deductions on some of his papers which were donated in 1967 and 1968.

Who were some of the others who deducted their papers? Well, it turns out that Mr. Nixon's opponent in the 1962 California gubernatorial election took deductions in the amount of $105,000 from 1967–71. I wonder if Governor Brown is willing to pay his tax savings back to the Treasury?

Then there are the former Kennedy assistants—the men of Camelot who would never do anything for personal gain. It turns out that John Kenneth Galbraith took a $4,500 deduction for personal papers donated to the Kennedy Library. Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, took a $12,000 deduction for papers donated to the Kennedy Library.

Then there is the case which I think best exemplifies the double standard. I refer to Mr. Theodore Sorensen, former top aide to President Kennedy. Last November, Mr. Sorensen wrote an article in the New York Times. His thesis, of course, was that the Nixon administration was terrible, that the President had not paid his fair share of taxes, and that scandals would never have been tolerated in the Kennedy administration. Then, Mr. Sorensen wrote that President Kennedy—

> Paid his taxes in full—and expected the same from us.

It turns out that Mr. Sorensen did not live up to those standards because Mr. Sorensen, in 1968, claimed a $75,000 deduction for donation of his papers to the Kennedy Library. It is time for the media to ask Mr. Sorensen about the double standard.

Mr. Speaker, not all of the news media, but the radical element of the media can, when they so determine, take the greatest public official in America, put him in the gutter and convince a majority of the people that he is a crook. The same segment of the news media can take the biggest phony in America and make him appear superior to a combination of Einstein and Solomon. We are seeing this happen in America today.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, when the dust clears on President Nixon's taxes, the public may have a much more positive picture of their President. Consider:

Mr. Nixon was the first President in our history to disclose his tax returns voluntarily. Almost no other public figure has done that.

He also paid more than $25,000 of his own money to have an independent auditor review his personal finances to insure they were correct.

The President voluntarily asked a congressional committee to review his returns, and he promised he would pay whatever was found to be due.

Within hours of receiving bills from the IRS and the staff of the congressional committee, Mr. Nixon announced that he would pay the full bill even though his lawyers advised him that the law was on his side.

By paying without a legal fight, Mr. Nixon decided not to exercise the right of every American taxpayer to challenge the IRS in the courts.

The accountant who prepared the President's tax returns has said that 90 percent of the back taxes assessed against Mr. Nixon were unwarranted. Even the chairman of the congressional committee, Democratic Senator RUSSELL LONG, has said that the congressional report was "too tough" on the President.

Of the $467,000 that Mr. Nixon has agreed to pay the IRS in back taxes, over 30 percent of them—$148,000—were not even legally required. Those taxes are from the year 1969, for which the 3-year statute of limitations has expired, but Mr. Nixon has nonetheless voluntarily agreed to pay that extra amount. The congressional committee also made it clear that those funds were not legally required.

By paying the $467,000 and making a gift of the San Clemente property, Mr. Nixon is actually a much poorer man

than when he came into office 5 years ago. His assets then were over $300,000. The loss on the taxes and the gift of San Clemente totally wipe out the earnings of a lifetime.

Many of the decisions of the IRS and the congressional committee raise basic questions of fairness. It is worth asking whether the President and his family have been fairly treated when:

It is decided that Mr. Nixon is the only taxpayer in the United States not entitled to a special capital gains treatment when he sells his home and buys another that same year.

It is decided that Mr. Nixon is the first President—and probably the first public official—who must pay taxes in order to have his family members ride on Government aircraft.

It is decided that Mr. Nixon needs a deed in order to make a gift of his papers, even though Franklin Roosevelt needed neither a deed nor even delivery of his papers in order to make a gift and even though the Presidential Libraries Act requires no such deed.

It is decided that property appraisals made by firms employed by the President should be completely ignored in favor of IRS and congressional appraisals.

It is decided that Mr. Nixon should be the first President in our history to pay for security work done on his property, even though he never ordered it and even though previous Presidents have had work of a similar nature done on their property.

It is decided that the tax decisions themselves are to be made without advance consultations with the President's own attorneys and without giving them a reasonable opportunity to present a case for the President.

For months, there have been stories of personal wrongdoing on the part of the President and his family regarding their taxes. Throughout that time, no evidence—not a single shred of it—has been produced to prove those charges. The IRS has now formally stated that there was no fraud in the preparation of the President's tax returns.

The IRS books are now officially closed on Mr. Nixon.

It is to be wondered if the Members of the Congress, who now want to sit in judgment on Mr. Nixon, are willing to undergo the same public scrutiny as President Nixon. It is to be wondered if they will apply the same standards to themselves when they ride in governmental or corporate aircraft. And it is to be wondered if they too, when faced with a staggering tax bill, would stand so tall.

LEGISLATION TO EXTEND PRICE CONTROLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I will make today supplement the remarks I made yesterday beginning at page 10216 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As I indicated yesterday, I am introducing today a bill that would provide for an extension of price controls. I will include the text of the bill at the end of my remarks. It is revised, but only slightly, from the bill that accompanied my remarks yesterday.

I am proud to say that the following Members of the House are cosponsors of this legislation: Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Messrs. DRINAN, FOLEY, FRASER, HELSTOSKY, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Messrs. MINISH, MITCHELL of Maryland, PODELL, REES, REUSS, ROSENTHAL, ROYBAL, STRATTON, and VANDER VEEN.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was admittedly prepared in something of a rush and I would have to concede that in some respects it is sketchy and certainly it could be improved and amended by the appropriate committee. But I think it provides the general outline of the course we should take, and that course, as I indicated yesterday, is to extend controls at least as far as prices are concerned and not to allow inflation to run rampant.

It has been said that no witnesses appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee in favor of extending the controls provided for in the Economic Stabilization Act. I wonder just how carefully potential witnesses were canvassed because I know of a number of economists who strongly believe that some controls, apparently over prices, must be maintained; who strongly believe that we should set targets for the control of inflation; who strongly believe, as I do, that the failure, the utter failure of the administration's control program to date is no reason for abandoning controls altogether.

In proposing the extension of price controls I am very mindful of the fact that the AFL–CIO has taken a strong position against the extension of my controls. Mr. George Meany, as well as others, have been eloquent on the subject and I do not blame organized labor in the slightest for being totally fed up with the way in which the controls have been exercised to date.

Controls have been relatively effective holding labor in check, almost totally ineffective as far as prices are concerned, and completely ineffective as far as profits are concerned. However, I would respectfully submit to my labor friends that they are thinking of the past—they are concentrating on what has happened in recent years and they are not thinking of what we really should be doing from here on out.

The bill I have introduced today with these distinguished cosponsors suggests a course of action. I outlined it yesterday and I will not repeat that today. I hope that other Members who feel as I do that the threat of inflation is a horrendous one; that if something is not done we may see the cost of living rising not at a 10-percent rate as it has in the past year but at a rate of 15, 20, or even 25 percent as it has in other industrialized countries in recent years, will join with me.

I urge the Members of this body and my friends in organized labor to seriously consider whether it is not now imperative that we rethink the question of economic controls and pass as quickly as possible a bill that would prevent the enormous damage that inflation will impose on those least able to bear it.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I append to my remarks a copy of the bill I am introducing.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. 14189

A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act, to establish objectives and standards governing imposition of controls after April 30, 1974, to create an Economic Stabilization Administration, to establish a mechanism for Congressional action when the President fails to act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Stabilization Amendments of 1974".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. Section 202 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, is amended by deleting the existing language and substituting the following language:

"It is hereby determined that inflation has caused severe hardships, especially on people of fixed incomes, and has been accompanied by widespread unemployment; that these hardships fall inequitably and most heavily on those who are economically least able to bear them; that the economic stabilization program to date has been inequitable and has caused disruptive influence in the marketplace; that the government has the power to control such inflation through equitable stabilization of prices, rents, wages, salaries, dividends and interest and that actual and/or stand-by controls to accomplish such objectives are needed."

SEC. 3. Sections 203 and 204 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, are repealed.

SEC. 4. The Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, is amended by inserting the following new sections after section 202 and by renumbering sections 205–220 accordingly:

"OBJECTIVES

"SEC. 203. The objectives of this Act are to:

"(A) reduce inflation—

"(1) to an annual rate not to exceed 5 per centum by December 31, 1974;

"(2) to an annual rate not to exceed 4 per centum by December 31, 1975; and

"(B) reduce unemployment—

"(1) to an annual rate not to exceed 4.5 per centum of the eligible work force by December 31, 1974;

"(2) to an annual rate not to exceed 3.5 per centum of the eligible work force by December 31, 1975."

"STANDARDS GOVERNING IMPOSITION OF CONTROLS AFTER APRIL 30, 1974

"SEC. 204 (a). After April 30, 1974, the President shall impose controls if he finds that the absence of controls would result in inflation and unemployment at levels in excess of the objectives stated in section 203.

"(b) In making his determination as to the time frame, scope and level of price controls to be imposed under this section in each sector, the President shall take into account:

"(1) the hardship caused by inflation in such sector;

"(2) the extent to which inflation in each such sector can be moderated successfully through voluntary measures and cooperation in the absence of controls over that sector and related sectors;

"(3) the degree to which such control will inhibit the growth of supply in such sector.

"(a) by causing curtailment of production or productivity or,

"(b) by causing impairment of capital formation, of expansion of productive capacity, or of resource availability or,

"(c) by so stimulating exports as to create or exacerbate any domestic supply shortage;

"(4) the degree to which wages in such sector have been unduly depressed relative to other sectors.

"(c) The President shall impose wage controls in any sector only if he finds that the required degree of wage stabilization cannot be achieved either through voluntary measures or through the imposition of price controls in that sector resulting in a strengthening of the position of management in collective bargaining negotiations.

"(d) In the event the President finds that the imposition of controls is creating market disruptions or distorting distribution patterns, including but not limited to the stimulation of excessive exports, the President shall take such measures as may be authorized under this or any other law to offset such disruptions or distortions by allocation of available supplies or by export controls or both. If the President finds he lacks adequate authority to take such measures, he shall promptly propose appropriate legislation to the Congress.

"(e) For the purposes of this Act, the term 'sector' means any firm or industry or class of firms or industries that possess distinct economic characteristics.

"ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 205 (a). There is hereby established the Economic Stabilization Administration (hereinafter "the Administration") within the Executive Office of the President.

"(b) The President shall delegate such powers as he may deem appropriate under this or any other Act to the Administration. The President shall not delegate powers under this Act to any other agency and shall take steps promptly to transfer to the Administration the functions heretofore exercised by the Internal Revenue Service under the Economic Stabilization Act.

"(c) (reserved for standard provisions appropriate to the creation of a new agency.)

"(d) In addition to its other duties under this Act, the Economic Stabilization Administration shall—

"(1) develop and recommend to the President and the Congress policies, mechanisms and procedures to achieve and maintain the goals established by this Act;

(2) monitor compliance with commitments made by firms in connection with sector-by-sector decontrol actions;

"(3) review the programs and activities of Federal departments and agencies and the private sector which may have adverse effects on supply and cause increases in prices and make recommendations for changes to increase supply and restrain prices;

"(4) review industrial capacity, demand, and supply in various sectors of the economy, working with the industrial groups concerned and appropriate governmental agencies to encourage price restraint;

"(5) work with labor and management in the various sectors of the economy having special economic problems, as well as with appropriate Government agencies, to improve the structure of collective bargaining and the performance of those sectors in restraining prices;

"(6) improve wage and price data bases for the various sectors of the economy to improve collective bargaining and encourage price restraint;

"(7) conduct public hearings when appropriate to provide for public scrutiny of inflationary problems in various sectors of the economy;

"(8) focus attention on the need to increase productivity in both the public and private sectors of the economy; and

"(9) monitor the economy as a whole by requiring, as appropriate, reports on wages, productivity, prices, sales, profits, imports, and exports.

"(10) conduct a study, along with the Federal Trade Commission and such other agencies or departments of the Government as may be appropriate, on the inflationary effect of economic concentration and anti-competitive practices including—

"(i) the effect of Government subsidies, price supports and tax policies;

"(ii) the effect of joint ventures and mergers of all kinds, including conglomerate mergers, horizontal and vertical integration and geographic concentration, exclusive franchises, 'fair trade laws', interlocking directorates, stifling of technological innovation, and barriers to the entry of new competitors such as high advertising expenditures and other startup costs; and

"(iii) the effect of controls on exports and imports and resulting shortages, if any."

"SEC. 206. Whenever the President takes any action under this title to impose controls he shall, on the date of such action, submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate a report in writing setting forth controls imposed, referring specifically to the factors set forth in section 204. The President shall provide such other information as the Congress may request in the fulfillment of its Constitutional responsibility to regulate interstate and foreign commerce."

"CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

"SEC. 207 (a). Within 60 legislative days after a report required by this title is submitted, the Congress, by concurrent resolution, may disapprove the controls imposed.

"(b) If the President fails to act to achieve the goals set forth in Section 203, the Congress may direct the President to act by concurrent resolution. Such concurrent resolution shall have the force of law as if included in extenso in this Act. To this extent the powers of the Congress acting with the approval of the President are hereby delegated to the Congress acting by concurrent resolution.

"(c) (i) Any concurrent resolution introduced pursuant to paragraph (a) shall be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate, as the case may be, and one such concurrent resolution shall be reported out by such committee together with its recommendations within ten calendar days, unless such House shall otherwise determine by the yeas and nays.

"(ii) Any concurrent resolution so reported shall become the pending business of the House in question (in the case of the Senate the time for debate shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents) and shall be voted on within three calendar days thereafter unless such House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.

"(iii) Such concurrent resolution passed by one House shall be referred to the committee of the other House named in subsection (c) (i) and shall be reported out by such committee together with its recommendations within 10 calendar days and shall thereupon become the pending business of such House and shall be voted upon within three calendar days unless such House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.

"(IV) In the case of any disagreement between the two Houses of Congress with respect to a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses, conferees shall be promptly appointed and the committee of conference shall make and file a report with respect to such concurrent resolution within six calendar days after the legislation is referred to the committee of conference. Notwithstanding any rule in either House concerning the printing of conference reports in the Record or concerning any delay in the consideration of such reports, such report shall be acted on by both Houses not later than six calendar days after the conference report is filed. In the event the conferees are unable to agree within 48 hours, they shall report back to their respective Houses in disagreement."

SEC. 5. Section 218 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by striking out the words "April 30, 1974" and "May 1, 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "December 31, 1975" and "January 1, 1976", respectively.

SEC. 6. Section 4(f) of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971, Public Law 92–210, as amended by Public Law 93–34, is amended by striking out the figure "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "———" and by striking out the words "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "December 31, 1975".

SEC. 7. This Act shall become effective May 1, 1974.

SEC. 8. For purposes of administering and enforcing the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, nothing in this Act alters the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 as incorporated by reference in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, to shoppers who go regularly to the supermarket, to senior citizens who must live on fixed incomes, and to wage earners who find it increasingly difficult to make ends meet, the consequences of inflation are well known. They do not have to be shown statistics which indicate that the Consumer Price Index rose almost 9 percent last year. They do not have to be told that the price of eggs and chicken have more than doubled in the past 30 months. You do not have to prove to them that housing costs have increased significantly. They know also that the unemployment rate is too high for the public good.

Americans are fully aware of the economic situation in the country for they are its victims. They are aware also that the negative trends in the economy have accelerated during the Nixon administration. In the years preceding Richard Nixon, the Consumer Price Index rose annually a little more than 4 percent, and the unemployment rate averaged under 4 percent. Those days are gone.

The Nixon administration bears a large measure of the responsibility for the spiraling rates of inflation and unemployment. When the need for regulation became apparent, Congress enacted the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, a law which gave the President authority to control wages and prices. He refused to exercise that authority until August 1971. We went through four phases of uneven, and in some instances, arbitrary and capricious controls. The result: a steady rise in the Consumer Price Index, and a steady decline in consumer purchasing power.

Considering the manner in which Richard Nixon has administered the economic stabilization authority given him by Congress, it is not surprising that

there is widespread discontent with prices and wages, and disenchantment with the concept of controls. From quarters which should favor such regulations, we hear calls for their abolition.

But now is not the time for throwing up our hands in despair. If wages have been controlled more stringently than prices, it is the fault of the Nixon administration, not the economic stabilization law. If blue-collar wage earners and persons on fixed incomes have been more seriously affected than others, it is the result of deficient and inequitable enforcement by Nixon appointees, not the controls themselves.

There would be no need for regulation if the price-wage mechanisms were operating in the way textbooks describe them. But we have come to realize, at least since the Sherman Anti-trust Act of 1887, that the real world is quite different from the model. The failures of the system have required governmental intervention from time to time when the machinery has faltered. We are again confronted with the need for congressional action.

Economists are now predicting that, if price-wage regulation is abandoned altogether on April 30, 1974, we will experience a great rise in the consumer price index. No one, except the captains of industry, will benefit. While wage-price controls are not the perfect solution, they promise to provide temporary relief until long range strategies can be devised. The alternative—a total abandonment of regulation—promises to bring greater hardships and dislocations than we would experience under controls.

For these reasons, the bill introduced by Congressman BINGHAM, of which I am a cosponsor, is a serious proposal for remedying these difficulties. First, the bill sets percentage goals for inflation and unemployment for 1974 and 1975. Second, it directs the President, operating through a newly established Economic Stabilization Administration, to regulate prices as the first line attack on inflation and unemployment. It also provides guidelines for controlling the exercise of administrative discretion in regulating prices. The bill requires the president to take account of particular hardship in the sector controlled, wage levels relative to other sectors, inadequate supplies of goods and services in that sector, and other relevant factors.

The Bingham proposal recognizes the inseparable relationship between prices and wages. It goes without saying that some wages control will inevitably result from price control. However direct wage control would not be authorized unless voluntary wage or mandatory price controls fail. In my judgment that is a sound way of achieving wage-price parity, and also correcting the wage inequities created by Nixon's four phases.

The Bingham bill also incorporates an important legislative monitoring device: reserving to the Congress the power to veto unnecessary executive controls, or to impose required controls which the executive fails to promulgate. Together with vigorous and constant congressional oversight, these mechanisms would give us the ultimate check on wage-price regulation. In this way, we could insure that the congressional mandate is faithfully executed.

There are, to be sure, different approaches to the problem of regulating prices and wages. Economists and congressional representatives disagree. In my judgment, the proposal by Congressman BINGHAM holds the promise of rectifying the inequities in the previous program, and merits our serious consideration.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the administration's unfulfilled promise to the American consumer of relief from skyrocketing prices, is now into its 6th year. Food and fuel prices have led the inflationary spiral, but housing, health services and transportation cost increases have contributed significantly to the money pinch felt by millions of Americans.

I find it regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that the administration's inability or unwillingness to fairly and effectively administer the Economic Stabilization Act and its decision to abandon all controls, have been blithely accepted by some in Congress.

I believe it was a great mistake for the House Banking and Currency Committee to vote recently, to allow the Economic Stabilization Act authority to expire at the end of April. That is why I have agreed to sponsor legislation, first proposed by Mr. BINGHAM, to continue price controls through 1975. This legislation recognizes that the economic stabilization authority has in the past been used primarily as a bar to wage increases but very little to prevent price increases; and it thus terminates the President's power to impose wage controls except as a last resort and even then subject to a congressional veto.

Mr. Speaker, unless some price control authority is voted by the Congress, the American consumer faces another year of inflation that could make 1973 look tame by comparison. In fact, the last time controls were ended—in August 1973 when Mr. Nixon removed the food price freeze on all items except beef—the composite consumer price index rose 7.7 percent during this month—an annual rate of 92 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the administration, in its determination to play down the importance of or its role in, the inflationary spiral often points to the fact that the rate of inflation in other industrialized nations approaches or exceeds that in the United States. But as the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition has pointed out, this argument overlooks the fact that wages overseas have often kept pace with prices, while in the United States during 1973, they did not.

For example, food prices in France rose 9.5 percent in the 12-month period ending in September 1973, but wages were up 13.5 percent; in Italy food prices rose 12.5 percent but wages were up 21 percent; in Belgium food prices rose 9 percent, but wages rose 15 percent; even in Japan, where food prices are high and rose another 11 percent through September 1973, wages rose 18.5 percent. In the United States, wages rose only half as fast as food prices and real spendable earnings for working Americans actually dropped 3.3 percent through November 1973 from a year before.

The year 1973 was one of the worst inflationary periods in American history: All food prices were up 20 percent; meat, poultry, and fish were up 26 percent; cereals and bakery products 28 percent; fuel oil and coal 44.7 percent; dairy products 22.5 percent; gasoline and motor oil 18.6 percent; and, household services other than rent were up almost 9 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there is little or no let-up in sight; and things will almost certainly get worse for the average hard-working American family if price limits are set by the captains of industry and not by the Federal Government.

There is no question that in the past, the economic stabilization authority was used unwisely and inequitably. But in the hands of more thoughtful and even-handed administrators, price controls can be made to work for the benefit of the hard-pressed consumers of this Nation. It is our responsibility in Congress to continue price controls. Otherwise, the future looks extremely bleak for the buying public.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

DEATH OF PHILIP WILLKIE

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned today of the death this morning of Philip Willkie, an outstanding American and only son of a very famous American, the Republican nominee for President in 1940, the Honorable Wendell Willkie.

Members may wonder why someone from Ohio would be speaking about Philip Willkie. Well, the Willkie family lived in Akron, Ohio, during the 1920's and 1930's and were close friends of my family. Wendell Willkie once remarked that the years he lived in Akron were the happiest years of his life. I got to know Phil Willkie well when we were in law school together at Columbia. He was a man of honesty, brains, character, and courage, with a broad understanding of the political process and of American history.

I remember after we graduated from law school and I was practicing law in New York, I ran into a very prominent Republican black politician. He said he just had been out in Indiana helping to

campaign for Philip Willkie for the State legislature.

He said:

You know, that man really has courage. It takes courage to go out in some of those areas that were once strongholds of the Ku Klux Klan and talk about equal rights for black people.

Phil got elected to the State legislature and had a distinguished career there. He also had a distinguished career as a lawyer and banker in Indiana. Yet he always managed to be warm and human, not only to his family and friends, but to everyone who knew him.

Philip combined these qualities with a delightful sense of humor. One day he said to me:

You know, you speak with an Akron accent.

I replied:

I am sorry to learn that. I have been trying to lose my regional accent.

He responded:

I'm hanging onto mine—best political asset I got.

He brought credit on the profession of politics. He brought new credit to his illustrious family name. His passing brings a great sense of loss.

To his mother, wife, and children, I extend my deepest sympathy, and I am sure the same is true for others here.

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

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman took this time so that we would all have an opportunity to join with him in his remarks about Phil Willkie. Phil Willkie was also a friend of mine. He also happens to be or had been a constituent of mine in Rushville, Ind. We also were colleagues in the Indiana General Assembly and also colleagues in the Indiana bar; so I have known him in various capacities quite well over a period of years.

Phil was, as the gentleman from Ohio has said, one of the most engaging, likeable, intelligent persons who practiced law in Rushville.

He was also president of a bank. He was involved in industry. He owned some of the best farmland in Indiana, a good many acres of it.

He was a very public spirited citizen. His untimely passing is a loss to the community and his friends and his family, to whom I extend my sympathy.

I join with the gentleman from Ohio and his other friends in regretting his untimely passing.

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

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this matter up. I was very saddened today to hear of the death of Philip Willkie. I knew him for a long time. He was a constituent of mine when I represented Rush County. He was a friend of mine for many years. I knew his father, Wendell Willkie, and his wife and children quite well.

He was a capable lawyer. He spent most of his time in recent years in business.

He became an outstanding banker, very interested in banking and law in the State of Indiana. He was a capable businessman and farmer; a very public spirited citizen.

Mr. Speaker, we will all miss Phil. I certainly want to extend my deepest sympathy to his mother, his wife and their children.

LEGAL RIGHTS LOBBYING

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, previously, I have called my colleagues' attention to the questionable sources of funds of the organization known as Action for Legal Rights, a lobbying organization for the Legal Services Corp.

As I have noted previously, this is an active lobbying organization on behalf of a Federal program for which many of us harbor considerable misgivings.

Grantees of Federal funds have been contributing to the lobbying activities of the Action for Legal Rights organization.

If anyone has the slightest doubt about the intensive, well-orchestrated lobbying activities of Action for Legal Rights, I invite my colleagues' most serious attention to documents which have come into my possession and which I hereby submit for the RECORD.

In short, Action for Legal Rights has become so bold as to prepare for the use of all ALR coordinators telegrams to be sent to the President from Governors and mayors, to House and Senate conferees from State and local bar Presidents as well as from church, labor, and civil rights leaders.

This program, spearheaded by ALR executive director Mickey Bennett makes clear that the Washington-based ALR organization under his directorship is prepared to "place the official's name and title on the appropriate joint telegram."

All of this action, as Mickey Bennett makes clear, is simply because "it is imperative, of course, that Representatives continue to receive mass constituency mail."

I continue to feel, quite strongly, that there is an urgent need for a most serious organization of this entire questionable activity.

The documents follow:

ACTION FOR LEGAL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1974.

To: ALR Coordinators.

From: Mickey Bennett.

If I haven't already spoken with you about the enclosed, please call me.

Enclosed are the following items:

(1) fact sheet on H.R. 7824 (note the primary point: the Senate-Administration bill already incorporates House concerns and should therefore not be further compromised with the House bill);

(2) comparative print of the House and Senate versions of H.R. 7824;

(3) text of a joint telegram to the President from governors and mayors;

(4) text of a joint telegram to House and Senate conferees from State and local bar presidents;

(5) text of a joint telegram to House and Senate conferees from church, labor, and civil rights leaders.

Each of the telegram texts is to be approved (not sent) by the appropriate official, with said approval reported (by you) to this office so we can place the official's name and title on the appropriate joint telegram. As of this date, Governors Ford (D.-Kentucky), Salmon (D.-Vermont), and Curtis (D.-Maine) have approved the Governor's telegram.

The House-Senate conference has been delayed again. The Rules Committee adopted a rule today that will keep the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on the House floor two weeks, starting March 12. (Chairman Perkins will not go to conference on the corporation bill until the education bill has cleared the floor). House conferees may be appointed as early March 21, but conference will not start until the week of March 25. The Senate last week appointed Senator Nelson's Poverty Subcommittee as its conferees.

It is imperative, of course, that Representatives continue to receive mass constituency mail as well as to be encouraged by public and organizational officials to express support for the Senate-Administration bill to House Conference Chairman Perkins (if the Representative is a Democrat) or Ranking Minority Member Quie (if the Representative is a Republican). Perkins and Quie will be on the floor managing the education bill for the next two weeks. Representatives should drop by their desks and give them the message. Also, get your State Democratic delegation to write or go to Perkins collectively. And get all the supporting Republicans in your delegation to take collective action regarding Quie.

ACTION FOR LEGAL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C.

THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION (H.R. 7824)

In 1971 and again in 1972, the President proposed and the House and Senate adopted legislation transferring the national legal services program from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to a legal services corporation. The legislation was vetoed in 1971, and in 1972 it died in conference over the same issue: the Administration's insistence that the President have full power to appoint all of the corporation's board vs. Congressional insistence—especially by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee—that the board include nominees of various national legal organizations like the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools.

On May 11, 1973, President Nixon again proposed a legal services corporation bill. The bill was adapted by the House on June 21, but only after a coalition of conservative members organized by former OEO Director Howard Phillips added twenty-four amendments prohibiting vital attorney services. The House bill, for instance, prohibits legislative representation (7(a)(5)), sharply curtails all affirmative actions (6(e)), group representation (7(b)(5)), community education (7(b)(4)), and legal advice regarding picketing, boycotts, strikes (6(b)(5)), and ballot measures (6(d)(4)). It also eliminates back-up centers (6(a)(3)), prohibits the handling of many kinds of civil cases, including most juvenile (7(b)(6)), all habeas corpus (7(b)(1)), selective service (7(b)(8)), and non-therapeutic abortion (7(b)(8)), imposes restrictions far beyond the Hatch Act on attorneys' private and professional lives (7(a)(6)), etc., etc. In short, the House bill prohibits attorneys from offering traditionally recognized attorney services. Any "lawyer" working within such a struc-

ture would have to choose regularly between violation of the statute and violation of the Code and Canons of the legal profession.

During the summer and fall of 1973, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Senators Williams, Nelson, Randolph, Kennedy, Mondale, Cranston, Hughes, Hathaway, Pell, Eagleton, Javits, Dominick, Schweiker, Taft, Beall, and Stafford) and White House staff jointly drafted a bill that 1) reconciled past Committee-White House differences regarding board composition, and 2) recognized House concerns without eliminating functioning lawyers from the program. Regarding the board, the Committee simply acceded to the Administration position (1004(a)), and also provided for fifty state advisory councils appointed by the governor of each state (1004(f)). Regarding House concerns, the Committee expressly prohibited all selective service (1007(b)(8)) and non-life saving abortion cases (1007(b)(7)); it circumscribed attorneys' political activities (1006(e)(1)–(3); 1007(a)(6)); and it circumscribed (but not in violation of the Code and Canons) many professional activities: legislative representation (1007(a)(5)), group representation (1007(b)(6)), community education (1007(b)(5)), class actions (1006(d)(5)), and cases related to juveniles (1007(b)(4)), picketing, boycotts, strikes, demonstrations (1006(b)(5)), and ballot measures (1006(d)(4)).

The compromise bill was approved in writing by Melvin Laird (*Cong. Rec.* 12/10/73, S. 22403), by the American Bar Association (*Cong. Rec.* 12/10/73, S. 22408), by conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick (*Los Angeles Times*, October 26, 1973), and by numerous other organizations and editorial writers. On January 31, 1974, after voting cloture against a Phillips-organized filibuster, the Senate adopted the compromise bill 69–17. Prior to passage, a small group of Senators forced roll call votes on twelve restrictive amendments. The full Senate, however, voted down seven by over two-thirds majorities, and decisively defeated all but one of the others.

The House version and the Senate-Administration version of the corporation bill will be considered in conference about March 20. It is important that conferees recognize that the Senate-Administration bill not only represents the culmination of a three year effort by the Administration and the Senate to compromise their differences on the legal services corporation, it also incorporates the concerns expressed by House members in their version of the legislation. The conferees should adopt the Senate-Administration bill as the conference report.

JOINT TELEGRAM TO THE PRESIDENT FROM GOVERNORS AND MAYORS

We have long supported the national legal services program as an instrument which moves our nation toward its ideal of "equal justice under law." We therefore applaud the constructive efforts made during the last few months by representatives of your Administration and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to fashion a workable compromise on the legal services corporation bill. The Senate-Administration compromise not only eliminates Senate and Administration differences regarding the composition of the Board, it also incorporates the concerns expressed by House members when they considered similar legislation last June. The Senate-Administration compromise is the culmination of a three year legislative process which now deserves enactment.

We understand that the legislation goes to conference shortly, and we urge your support of the Senate-Administration version of that legislation.

JOINT TELEGRAM TO HOUSE AND SENATE CONFEREES FROM STATE AND LOCAL BAR PRESIDENTS

We support the legal services program and endorse the concept of an independent and professional legal services corporation. Thus we were disturbed when the corporation bill reported by the Education and Labor Committee was so destructively amended on the House floor last June. The constructive compromise of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Administration recognizes the concerns of House members, yet restores to the bill the balance which the House Committee worked so hard to achieve. The Senate-Administration bill provides a framework for the delivery of services in accordance with the Code and Canons of our profession. We therefore urge its prompt adoption by the Conference Committee meeting later this month.

JOINT TELEGRAM TO HOUSE AND SENATE CONFEREES FROM CHURCH, LABOR, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND OTHER CIVIC LEADERS

We strongly support the national legal services program and endorse the concept of a legal services corporation. While the compromise bill worked out by the Administration and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare establishes a corporation which is less independent and more restricted than we had hoped, it still provides the framework for a viable program. Since the Senate-Administration bill already reflects the concerns expressed by House members, we trust it will be adopted by the Conference Committee without further restrictive changes.

THE EMPIRE-STATE OF U.S.S.R.—CHIEF OBJECT OF POLTRADE

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the testimony presented on April 4 by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky before the Senate Finance Committee on the Trade Reform Act deserves the attention of every Member of Congress who is concerned with the issue of freedom and our trade with the Soviet Union. The testimony refutes what the author maintains are mythical points on the U.S.S.R. presented earlier by our Secretary of State. Also, as an original advocate of the poltrade policy, the witness urges a redirection of our economic leverage toward the empire-state of the U.S.S.R. and its numerous nations within. In terms of this basic direction the testimony concludes with specifics of an initial package deal with Moscow as poltrade concessions proportionate to the granting of the MFN status and measured credits. I urge our citizenry as well to read carefully the close argumentation contained in this testimony:

THE EMPIRE-STATE OF U.S.S.R.—CHIEF OBJECT OF POLTRADE

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

Mr. Chairman and Members, I gratefully appreciate this opportunity to advance fundamental views and facts basing our complete opposition to the extension at this time of the most-favored-nation status and credits, both public and private, to the Soviet Union. As longtime advocates of a realistic poltrade policy toward the Soviet Union and other totalitarian communist states, we urge also that no short-sighted compromises be made with regard to the necessary concatenation of human rights and political obligations with the trade medium. In fact, considering the incalculable values of this medium, I shall endeavor here to justify a realistically extended linkage so that we wouldn't be fleeced as, in miniature, we were on the celebrated wheat deal.

Within the allotted time and having dealt with this issue several times in Congress,[1] I should like to essentialize and itemize specifically the salient points supporting our position and also, in particular, to address this testimony to some of the myths that have already been officially expressed before this committee. As my testimony before the Mills Committee last year stressed, while we're considering more liberalized trade with the Soviet Union almost two decades after the first push in the post-World War II period, substantially nothing really has changed in the broad politico-economic context except our increasing comparative disadvantage in this context and, apart from the superficialities of PR diplomacy, no concrete evidence provided by Government or private sources has been offered to disprove this emperical generalization. Here, let me emphasize, too, that trade with the USSR or any communist-dominated state cannot be evaluated in a vacuum of political and social considerations. The typical American business man may have his P&L blinders on, but this crucial issue has full life-and-death meaning in the total politico-economic context of global strife today.

TRADE AND PEACE

First, as concerns tiresome trade/peace utterances regarding totalitarian powers, the lessons of history alone explode such rhetoric. The climate of peace fosters trade, not the other way around. Just as in the cases of persons, if a nation cannot profit from the lessons of its past experiences, it foolishly exposes itself to disaster, particularly one that is an open society, highly resourceful, and still respected worldwide for its standards of freedom and human rights. One incontestable lesson is that our trade with totalitarian powers, such as Imperial Japan, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy, did not serve the interests of world peace but rather contributed by the real aid given to the furtherance of their aggressive designs which led to World War II. If acute caution is not exercised today, this lesson can well apply to the militaristic USSR whose bid for global supremacy remains undiminished. Mr. Chairman, for documentation on this point, I respectfully request that the short chapter on "The Russian Trade Trap" in my recent book be printed as part of my testimony.[2]

BEEFING-UP TOTALITARIAN COMMUNIST POWER

A second historical lesson applies notably today to the USSR, i.e., the prime politico-economic utility of trade for the entrenchment of the regime, the suppression of internal pressures, and assisted implementation of its ultimate political goals. This applies to Brezhnev's policy as it did to Khrushchev's and Stalin's, with trade as a sieve to technologically bolster the USSR economy, overcome its planned deficiencies, and indirectly facilitate its top priorities of expansive military strength, a deepened dependence of the other COMECON economies, and the progressive flexing of political muscle in targeted areas of the Free World.[3] Over 90% of Soviet technology is ascribable to Western sources: as Stalin, Khrushchev and others have attested, we helped to lay the foundations of this totalitarian, imperialist economy; now

Footnotes at end of article.

Moscow seeks American technology in particular to beef up its composite totalitarian power while it pursues a course of tyrannical consolidation within its empire and one of global influence without.

ILLUSIONS OF SOVIET NATION, NONINTERFERENCE AND INTERDEPENDENCE

Of late, certain illusions have crept into this discussion of U.S.–USSR trade, such that cause one to seriously question the proponents' framework of understanding the USSR. Trade or any other matter cannot be accurately assessed within a defective, conceptual framework. Some of these illusions on the part of our leaders contributed heavily to the very formation of the USSR, to its economic growth, and to its dominance in Eastern Europe and Asia following World War II and the price we have been paying for all this is incalculable. The illusions of a Soviet "nation", a Soviet "people", and a Soviet "domestic structure" play havoc with existential facts and cannot but produce misleading policy proposals.[4] Given the different nations in the USSR, the various national republics, and the essentially international environment in the USSR, the prevalence of such illusions at this late stage really demands an official conceptual breakthrough regarding the very imperial nature of the USSR. The structure is far from being "domestic", and the concession made in the Moscow Declaration of '72, equating the USSR and U.S.A., was both contrary to objective reality and needless in fact. To underscore these points, Mr. Chairman, I request that the recent New York Times exposure of the latest Solzhenitsyn letter to the Kremlin be printed as part of my testimony.[5]

Logically, a nation-state concept and existence support non-interference in its truly domestic affairs; an empire-state concept, which is accurately conformable to the USSR, does not. With a long tradition in imperialist practice, Moscow has always insisted on non-interference in its imperial domain, and as a conceptual obverse to the Brezhnev Doctrine, it is applied also to the satellites in Central Europe. If Moscow's domain were extended to the Atlantic, the same cry of non-interference would be encountered. Moreover, the current illusion about a growing economic interdependence with the USSR indicate a miscomprehension of both the nature of the USSR economy and this empire texture of the state as a whole. The dominant economic trends in the USSR, with unremitting emphasis on heavy goods production and the military, the repressive consolidating process engineered by Moscow among the numerous non-Russian nations in this imperial complex, and the unrelenting push for some forms of "integration" of the satellite economies with that of the USSR point to a relative self-sufficiency that leaves little room for any meaningful interdependence with the West. To obtain grains when needed, to acquire the best of technology free of R&D costs, and for some period have all this paid with loans guaranteed by taxpayers of adversary states is a neat formula for the operation of the trade sieve, especially when strategicity, as reflected in the Kama River truck works, becomes increasingly blurred.

A NEEDED REDIRECTION OF THE POLTRADE CONCEPT

Perfectly consistent with this necessary overall view is the poltrade concept which I advocated several years ago in hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee[6] and which Senator Dirksen later advanced.[7] Briefly, the concept calls for trade in return for politico-social concessions. It must be emphasized that this linkage concept always pointed to peoples, situations and factors in the communist-dominated states. As this copy of a letter released by the American Federation for Soviet Jews shows—and which I request to have appended as part of this testimony—the concept was first applied to the Soviet Jews and their emigration.[8] On this point of emigration, my testimony last year in the House stressed the need to expand this to all the different nationals in this imperium in imperio.

But there is now the greater need to redirect the poltrade concept from the course it apparently has taken in the conduct of our foreign policy. Instead of the concept being applied to the peoples, situations and factors in the USSR, it appears to be increasingly employed to cover our weaknesses outside the Communist orbit; in short, our economic promises and pay-offs to Moscow and Peking for their twisting the arms of clients and proxies in Vietnam, Syria and elsewhere for temporary compromises and partial surcease of ideological assaults. This was never the intended objective of the concept, and the best way to correct its present misuse is to redirect it to its original objective. The empire-state of USSR—its many nations and peoples—is the chief object of poltrade.

When one reduces all this to basic perspectives and analysis, the question of how much Moscow, our chief enemy, will gain in technological and economic returns to strengthen both its empire reins and bid for global supremacy becomes a very fundamental one. The present course of exchanging economic benefits for momentary relief, compromises and abeyances in Free World areas is a definitely self-defeating one. The additional question is how tall a price will we be caused to pay as Moscow bolsters its sagging economy at little cost to its continued military build-up, now the largest in the world, and all sorts of intrigues, entanglements, and systemic warfare in the Free World? This real politico-economic price can be measured by having its economy shored up, indirectly facilitating its current consolidation process within, inadvertently discouraging opposition forces of freedom within its empire, and providing for much greater access for its operatives and agents in our environment than we could possibly have in its totalitarianized arena.

PROPORTIONATE POLTRADE CONCESSIONS

The external policy of any nation-state or of an Empire-state is reflective of its internal policies, institutions, and traditions. Changes in the latter will show in the former. The institutional nexus between the USSR's external and internal policies is almost ironclad. For the real economic aid Moscow hungers, especially our advanced technology, we as a nation, and in terms of our traditions of freedom and humanism, should strive to exact proportionate poltrade concessions in the internal policies of what is essentially a state of many different nations. In the current phase, the free and unlimited emigration of Soviet Jews is hardly enough for the billions of credits and investments planned.

As a signatory of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Convention and other treaties, Moscow should be caused to observe its obligations under these treaties through the poltrade process. As this point and under these treaties, Moscow itself is discriminatory and thus justifies discriminatory treatment in the form of a denied MFN status and check credits. The poltrade concessions we should seek for its qualifying for the status and credits are:

(a) open and free emigration not only for Soviet Jews but all the different nationals in the USSR, as Khrushchev himself suggested; [9]

(b) the reunion of families and the elimination of extortionate Soviet duty taxes on relief packages sent by Americans to the USSR;

(c) in the spirit of religious freedom, the resurrection of the major Ukranian Orthodox and Catholic Churches, which were genocided by Stalian;

(d) as advanced by many prominent American scholars, the beginning of direct diplomatic relations with the national republics since possible investments would be in their areas, two of the republics (Ukraine and Byelorussia) are in the U.N., and the USSR Constitution provides for this; and

(e) surcease of psychiatric and labor camp incarceration of dissidents.

In conclusion, among many other things, detente may be "a process of managing relations with a potentially hostile country in order to preserve peace", but the process has also to be founded on an appreciative understanding of that Empire-state, its tyrannical institutions, and moves toward global supremacy. Fall-back arguments on nuclear war, in themselves reflective of rational desperation, cannot obscure the instrumentalism of trade in the broader politico-economic framework that involves fundamental issues of national security, human rights, and the freedom of nations. It is not because of detente that Jews have been permitted to emigrate; rather Jewish agitation in the Free World and Moscow's technological hunger account for it. It is also not because of detente that Solzhenitsyn is in Switzerland, but again because of this hunger and the Russian's towering stature.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See *Trade Agreements Extension*, Hearings, H.R. 1 Part 2, 1955, pp. 2333–2356; *Trade Reform*, Hearings, Committee on Ways and Means, Part 11, pp. 3550–3591; "The Question of Expanded U.S. Trade Relations With the Soviet Union", *Congressional Digest*, Nov. 1973, pp. 285–287.

[2] "The Russian Trade Trap", *ch. 9, U.S.A. and The Soviet Myth*. The Devin-Adair Co., 1971, pp. 206–239.

[3] Keith Bush. "Soviet Economic Growth: Past, Present and Projected", *Radio Liberty Dispatch*, February 11, 1974.

[4] E.g., "Text of President Nixon's Press Conference", *The Washington Post*, Feb. 26, 1974, p. A12; Kissinger, "Detente", *Washington Star-News*, p. A–6; "U.S., Soviets Call Detente 'Irreversible' ", *The Washington Post*, March 26, 1974, p. 1.

[5] Theodore Shabad, "Solzhenitsyn Asks Kremlin to Abandon Communism . . .", *The New York Times*, March 3, 1974, pp. 1, 26.

[6] *East-West Trade*, Hearings. Part II. 1965, pp. 94–104.

[7] Senator Everett M. Dirksen. "Needed: A Realistic East-West Trade Policy", *The Reader's Digest*, June, 1969, pp. 129–133.

[8] Letter to Mr. J. K. Jamieson, Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, June 14, 1972, p. 2.

[9] *Khrushchev Remembers*, 1970, p. 522–525.

NO AMNESTY FOR DESERTERS AND EVADERS

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the subject of amnesty for Vietnam draft evaders and deserters has once again bobbed to the surface of national debate.

I have made my position on amnesty clear before, and I must say that the passage of time has not changed my opinion. I am still opposed to amnesty, not so much out of vindictiveness toward deserters and evaders, but out of respect

and admiration for those who chose to serve their country and its ideals. To grant amnesty would tarnish the esteem in which we hold those men who answered the call.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way to forget the over 50,000 Americans who died in this war. There is no way to forget the 300,000 Americans who were wounded in Vietnam or the 2½ million Americans who served there. There is no way to forget the sight of American prisoners of war returning home after years of hardship, with "God bless America" still their creed.

And as long as we remember the sacrifices of these brave men, we cannot look kindly on a draft evader or deserter coming home without paying some penalty for his actions. Those men who served had at some point the same option taken by the deserters and evaders. But they rejected it and elected instead to fulfill their military obligation.

One of the arguments most often advanced in favor of amnesty is that granting forgiveness will somehow help bind up the wounds of division brought on by the Vietnam war. But holding this argument up in the light reveals its transparency. Rather than having a healing effect, granting amnesty would reopen thousands of wounds suffered by those who served in Vietnam. The families and loved ones of those who maintained their loyalty and went to Vietnam, some to die there, would certainly experience no healing sensation by seeing those who refused to serve welcomed back with open arms.

There is bound to be a feeling of relief and charity following such a long and painful war, and well there should be. But I believe we should reserve our charity and our expressions of good will for those Americans who remained loyal to their country. Granting amnesty to Americans who turned their backs in a time of national need would write a very unhappy ending to this long, unhappy war and set a dangerous precedent in the event that a draft might be needed in the future.

MAXIMUM USE OF COAL RESERVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, for many years this Nation has lacked a policy aimed at gaining maximum use of our Nation's huge coal reserves while protecting our environment. It has been said that the United States is the Saudi Arabia of the world in terms of the size of our fossil fuel reserves. We have enough coal in the ground now to last for approximately 500 years. Yet, while coal makes up about nine-tenths of our fossil fuel reserves, it represents only 18 percent of our Nation's energy consumption.

One of the side effects of the energy crisis is a renewed concern on the part of all of us that the United States become energy self-sufficient as soon as possible. A key to any national energy self-sufficiency is the development of our coal reserves.

Recently, our distinguished Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, discussed the need for a national coal strategy before an audience at the West Virginia School of Mines in Morgantown. I am including a copy of the Secretary's remarks for the RECORD, and I commend them to any Member of Congress who is interested in an expert analysis of the potential of coal to meet our energy needs:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROGERS C. B. MORTON

If I were asked to name the energy source that has the greatest potential over the next twenty-five years, I would automatically say "coal." And if I were asked to say which energy sources has the greatest problems ahead of it, I would have to give the same answer.

This is a pretty fair arrangement. The potential is as given, in any situation, and you have to work with it as it is. We can do something about the problems, and we will. Tonight I would like to talk about both the potential and the problems of coal, and what we see to be some approaches to the problems.

One of the ironies of our energy problem is that we use so little of our most abundant energy source. Our current economically recoverable reserves of coal come to a little under 200 billion tons which is enough to last us for hundreds of years. This is about nine-tenths of our total fossil fuel reserve, yet coal supplied less than 18 percent of our energy needs last year. Our need, and our intention, is to increase coal's contribution to the fuel economy dramatically. We would like to see coal take over as much of the stationary heat and power load as is practicable, so that oil and gas can be conserved for use as specialty fuels and chemical building blocks.

The enlarged role we envision for coal will require greatly increased coal production—perhaps as much as 2 billion tons annually by 1985. This as you will recognize, is better than three times the 600 million tons that we produced in 1973.

This is a tall order, and two things will have to take place. First, we will need to make a market for this much coal, which is mainly a function of its environmental acceptability. Second, we will have to find ways of producing enough coal at acceptable social and economic cost, to satisfy the market we have created. The requirement here is for a coal industry capable of delivering the coal that will be needed.

Most of the verbiage and money coming out of government recently has been directed to the downstream end of the chain of coal problems; that is, how to clean up coal, either by changing it to low-sulfur fuels, or by removing the sulfur oxides during or following the combustion process. Under the President's energy program, the Department of the Interior is requesting $343 million for work in these areas during fiscal year 1975, with $2.7 billion more projected for the next four years, for a total of $3 billion over the five-year life of the program.

This is a vast commitment and a rousing vote of confidence in our ability to solve the problems connected with using coal. But we need to remember that at a time when we are talking about the great need for coal, making its use one of the prime objectives of our drive to restore our energy self-sufficiency, and spending billions of dollars to promote its utilization, coal production is declining, and has been for the past 3 years.

Let me hypothesize a bit. Assume that we really do triple coal production over the next 11 years. To get to this level of 2 billion tons we would need to open 280 new mines, each averaging 5 million tons a year, just to take care of the increase, let alone compensate for depleted mines and sections in the existing infrastructure. This figures out to opening one new mine every two weeks, starting next Monday. It would mean a capital requirement of between $20 billion and $30 billion, depending on the balance between surface and underground production. It will mean the recruitment and training of perhaps 200,000 to 300,000 miners, depending on productivity rates, retirements, and the surface underground balance. It will require a quota of mining engineers that will be a multiple of anything we are now producing or ever have produced in the past.

The problems are even tougher than I have outlined, because we won't be able to start the scale-up next Monday. The lead time on getting mines into production is at least 2 to 3 years for surface and 4 to 6 years for underground. It takes 1 to 2 years to train a miner and four academic years to get a mining engineer. The available time for expansion is telescoped by the net drag of these assorted lead times.

There are other problems. To date, most of the government's concern with coal production has focused upon the urgent requirement to improve health and safety conditions in the mines. We are proud of our record in this field, and we are determined to do even better in the future. But this has been one of the factors in the decline in productivity and loss of production we have witnessed since 1969.

Between 1969 and 1971 production per man-day in underground mines fell from an average of 15 tons per man-day to 12 tons. This is a decline of 25 percent and the price of coal has doubled. Most of us are aware of this fact. But it is also true that productivity in surface mining has also slipped badly over the same period—by about 20 percent, and the price of surface mined coal has risen by half since 1969. Stricter requirements for environmental protection and reclamation of surface-mined areas will, I expect, further cut into mining productivity and raise mining costs.

Now does this mean that we must compromise the gains we have made in environmental protection and worker health and safety for the sake of greater mine production? It does not. What it does mean is that we must now redouble our efforts to raise productivity by more efficient mining. There is much to do in the way of solving the problems that now limit the productivity of the extraction phase of coal operations, both underground and surface. The Department of the Interior has requested $47 million in research and development funds this year to assist the coal industry in solving these problems, and over the next five fiscal years the total may exceed $300 million. We are aiming not only at upgrading present mining methods, but developing new technology and new systems, and we're not shooting for peanuts. Our hope and objective is to double the productivity rate of 12 tons per man-day in underground mines, and do it between now and 1985.

One of our major efforts is to develop and demonstrate the technology needed to make longwall mining more generally suitable for use in the United States. Longwall got off to a pretentious start in the 1960's, but the bloom was off by the end of the decade and it currently contributes less than 3 percent of total production. We think it has great

possibilities, particularly if it can ultimately be automated.

We feel that a lot can be done to improve haulage, and we are aiming at a system that will provide a continuous flow from the mine face to the preparation plant. This would do away with one of the major bottlenecks in underground production and allow productivity and safety increases all along the line.

Roof support is another major area we are concentrating on, since roof falls kill more men and the inability to provide continuous roof support is the limiting factor in more mines than any other single thing.

Methane as always been a problem and it is going to get worse as mines go deeper and production rates increase. If we can develop an effective de-gasing and recovery system we can contribute to solving two problems, not just one.

The list is a long one. There is a bonanza waiting for us if we can learn how to mine the thick seams in the West, and we have money committed to this objective. Underground gasification could make productive use of resources now unrecoverable. We shall investigate systems for rapid restoration of overburden behind the extraction process in surface mining. These and many other programs are evidence of our active interest in improving the technology of coal mining.

But there are other problems that must be solved, and none is more important than to remove the uncertainty over government policy that has demoralized the coal mining industry for years. We simply must have some long-range, reliable ground rules on what will be permitted in the way of surface mining and under what conditions. The Administration has proposed an approach which will get to this objective in ways which are compatible with the special economic and environmental requirements of each of the principal coal mining States. The proposal has been before the Congress for three years. Meanwhile, numerous other legislative proposals have been introduced. Many, unsound, others openly punitive, still others completely prohibitive of surface mining operations. Is it any wonder that coal companies and their banks are unwilling to risk capital to open new mines in such a climate of uncertainty and abuse?

Let me cite another example. The sulfur emission standards developed by the various States under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 are due to go into effect on July 1, 1975. The Bureau of Mines has recently completed an exhaustive study which will shortly be published as a Mineral Industry Survey which analyzes the standards set by State Implementation Plans for each Air Quality Control Region. It then compares the sulfur content of the coals that are available to each of these AQCR's with the established emission standards, region by region. The conclusion of the study, backed by detailed analysis, is that under the best of presently foreseeable conditions a minimum of 200 million tons of coal a year cannot be burned after June 30, 1975, under the law which takes effect fifteen months from now. The study further concludes that this unusable fraction could range as high as 250 to 295 million tons a year between 1975 and 1980.

I want to emphasize that the stock mumbo-jumbo about whether these amounts are identified with the so-called "primary" or "secondary" standards does not apply here. The figures I have given represent the amounts of coal which may not, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, be burned after June 30, 1975 under the existing law. These are the amounts that will have to be foregone under the State Implementation Plans that are now effective.

Strict enforcement of the clean air law would result in shutting down half of our coal-fired electric generating capacity and a good part of our industry. Obviously, relief will have to be granted. But where, under what conditions, for how long, and applicable to what classes of users? Coal mines can be financed only through some sort of assurance that a market will exist long enough to amortize the investment. The uncertainty as to what we *will* do meantime paralyzes the investment decisions not only of the coal companies but of the railroads and utilities as well. Suspense is literally killing the coal industry. Banks and bondholders are going to demand something besides sporadic short-term variances as a condition for financing new coal mining ventures. We are never going to get the investment required even to maintain coal production at its present levels—let alone a 200 percent increase—in the present environment of confusion and uncertainty over the long-term outlook for capital committed to coal mining ventures. Something has got to give, and soon.

Last week the Administration transmitted to the Congress a number of proposals designed to correct the defects of the Clean Air Act without sacrificing its commendable objectives. Among the proposals are measures designed to give stationary sources additional time to comply with the established standards, but only when these sources are on a fixed schedule for full compliance, and to permit the use of tall stacks and fuel-switching to meet ambient air quality standards, providing all requirements for the protection of public health can be met. These measures are essential to avert the impending collision between the irresistible force and the immovable object fifteen months from now, and to give the coal industry, the railroads, and the utilities some consistent realistic guidelines as to what to expect from the Federal government in the way of air quality controls.

I have mentioned two basic requirements for meeting the demands for added production in the years ahead—realistic, coherent, long-range government policy and improved mining technology. There are many others: labor stability, access to capital, improvement of the transport linkage between producer and consumer, and perhaps most important of all, the development of a large group of engineers.

We need what I have termed a "national coal strategy" to get it all together. A task force comprised of representatives from a number of government departments and agencies is now being assembled to develop such a strategy; assess what will be needed to get from where we are now to where we want to be; and to develop specific goals and means of achieving them.

The group will be chaired by Dr. Thomas Falkie, who has just assumed his new duties as Director of the Bureau of Mines, and its charter will cover everything from the working face in the mine to the precipitators and scrubbers in the stack. I envision the task force as a gadfly—to be the constant witness for coal to labor, to the industry, and to Federal and State agencies concerned with coal in any way. You will be hearing more from this group in the future.

There is one more thing. The coal industry has been suffering the general troubles of an industry long in decline: lagging technology, an aging labor force, a lack of capital, and a general reluctance of up-and-coming young people to have much to do with it. Now, its hour has struck. The turnaround is here, and all of a sudden there isn't enough of anything. This will place a tremendous responsibility on the corps of professionals who comprise the technological leadership for the mining industry—not only those actively working in the mines, but those in mining equipment companies, in laboratories, classrooms, and in the regulating agencies of State and Federal governments. It is these people who must separate the dreams from the realities, who know what is do-able and what is not, and who must devise the ways of getting to the objectives that must be met.

And they will be well paid for their services. Beyond the money, which is always welcome, there is the satisfaction in knowing that there is no occupation where you could contribute more to the solving of the Nation's most pressing problem: that of providing itself with an adequate, reliable supply of energy. The problem will be around for a long time, and so will the demand for the services of those who can contribute to its solution. You couldn't be in a better spot.

After years of long-suffering and neglect, the mineral science colleges are also being challenged as never before. Last June, 260 baccalaureate degrees in mining engineering were awarded—a small number when compared to the number of lawyers the colleges turned out, but it was two and a half times the number of mining engineers that were graduated in 1970. And they all had well-paying jobs waiting for them when they got out—which couldn't be said of the lawyers. West Virginia University has long been a leading contributor to the ranks of mining engineers, particularly those who enter the business of coal mining. Moreover we maintain a close and valued relationship with the University's School of Mines through our Morgantown Energy Research Center operated by the Bureau of Mines. You have helped us greatly in the past; we hope that you will continue to do so in the future, and that in turn we may be of some assistance to you as we work together to solve the tough problems which now limit our ability to use our greatest fuel resource.

I am confident that the problems will be solved, by the professionalism, the imagination, and the dedicated hard work of the far-reaching fraternity of mining—particularly coal mining—as a vital, constructive, essential occupation which has deserved far more credit than it has received in recent years. But the long-overdue recognition is on its way. The only direction things can go is up, because the Nation, at long last, has finally begun to Dig Coal.

ABORTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have introduced an amendment to the Constitution to overturn the Supreme Court on abortion. While the House Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights has refused to hold hearings on this important issue, the Senate's counterpart, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, has held 3 days of hearings.

I testified before the Senate subcommittee today and I would like my testimony before that subcommittee inserted in the RECORD for the benefit of all my colleagues in the House.

STATEMENT ON ABORTION BY LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

I am Lawrence J. Hogan, Member of Congress representing the 5th District of Maryland.

I introduced a human life amendment in the House of Representatives (H.J. Res. 261) on January 30, 1973. Senator Helms' proposed amendment (S.J. Res. 130) is identical to mine.

It seems to me these hearings should address themselves to two questions: "When does life begin?" and "once it has begun, what legal rights does it have?"

It is my position that human life begins at conception and destroying that life through abortion is killing a baby, that is the crux of my opposition to abortion.

An argument often raised to support legal abortion is that restrictive laws are broken. This argument is inconsistent, and is not based on logic or jurisprudence. Virtually all our laws are broken, but that is hardly a legitimate reason for repealing them.

Twenty years ago few would have questioned that abortion is killing a baby. Now one is called upon to defend that statement. The public has been led to believe that there is some doubt as to whether or not human life exists before birth. Assuming for purposes of argument that there is some doubt, the moral course, it seems to me, should be to err on the side of protecting that life.

If you are a hunter and you see something move, and think there's a 50% chance of its being a wild boar and a 50% chance of its being a child, shouldn't you refrain from shooting? If society, buttressed by law, upholds the right of the child behind the bush to be safe from the assault of the hunter, why doesn't the law give a similar benefit of the doubt to the child in the womb?

Until fifteen years ago our laws did give this benefit of the doubt and there was less medical proof then than there is now that the unborn child is a human being. If it is not a human being, what is it? The woman seeks an abortion because she does not want to have a baby. If what's in her body is not a baby, then what could it possibly be?

Let's take a look at what it is. Physicians tell me that in the first month of life growth and development are rapid and dynamic, with the central nervous system (the brain) seeing its most important growth spurt, and the rhythmic contractions of the heart beginning. The primitive skeletal system has completely developed by the end of the eighth week, and the electroencephalogram has detected brain waves as early as 43 days. During the sixth and seventh weeks, the nerves and muscles begin working together for the first time, and the lips become sensitive to touch and, when gently stroked, the child responds. By the seventh week of life, the child's shape and form is unmistakably human. He now has all the internal organs of the adult. The stomach produces digestive juices, the liver manufactures red blood cells and the kidney is eliminating uric acid from the blood. His arms are still very short, but hands with fingers and thumbs are recognizable, and the legs have knees, ankles, and toes. From this point in development, until age 25–27 years, when full growth and development is complete, the only major changes will be in the size and sophistication of the functioning parts.

Fingerprints, which will never change throughout his life, develop at 8 weeks. The eyelids and palms of the hands become sensitive to touch about 8½ weeks. At this point, if the eyelids are touched, the child squints; if the palm is touched, the fingers close into a small fist.

The sex hormones—estrogens and androgens—have been identified as early as 9 weeks. At 10 weeks hormone growth is detectable and at 10½ weeks, the thyroid and adrenal glands have begun to function. Also at 10 weeks, the obstetrician can detect the child's heart beat.

By the end of the third month, or first trimester, the unborn child has become very active. He can now kick his legs, turn his feet, curl and fan his toes, make a fist, move his thumb, bend his wrists, turn his head, squint, frown, open his mouth, and press his lips tightly together. He can swallow and drink the amniotic fluid that surrounds him. Inhaling and exhaling respiratory movements begin to move fluid in and out of his lungs. And thumb sucking is first noted at this age. He has vocal cords, but cannot cry because he is not strong enough. The fingernails appear and he starts to urinate. By this time, every child shows a distinct individuality in his behavior and the words of noted behavioral psychologist Dr. Arnold Gesell become significant:

"By the end of the first trimester (twelfth week), the fetus is a sentient moving being. We need not pause to speculate as to the nature of his psychic attributes but we may assume that the organization of psychosomatic self is now well underway".

The child grows very rapidly during the fourth month of life. His weight increases six times and he grows 8 to 10 inches in length.

In the fifth month (16–20 weeks), the unborn child will become one foot tall, and weigh approximately one pound. Hair begins to grow on his head and eyebrows, and a fringe of eyelashes appear. The child sleeps and wakes, just as he will after birth, and he may even be aroused from sleep by external vibrations. The skeleton hardens and the muscles become stronger. Fnally, his mother notices his activities.

Dr. Gesell notes that:

"Our own repeated observation of fetal infants (an individual born and living at any time prior to 40 weeks gestation) left us with no doubt that psychologically they were individuals. Just as no two looked alike, so no two behaved alike. One was passive, when another was alert. Even among the youngest, there were discernable differences in vividness, reactivity and responsiveness. These were genuinely individual differences, already prophetic of the diversity which distinguishes the human family."

The reason I went into the detail, Mr. Chairman, is because it is important to know what unmistakably human characteristics this unborn child has even in the early stages of pregnancy.

I am not asserting that it is the function of the law to proclaim medical truths. That should be done by the medical profession, acting responsibly and in consideration of its tradition. The law, however, acts improperly when it pretends to assert medical fact or *ignores* medical fact. This the Supreme Court did on January 22, 1973. It pretended to assert as fact a lack of sufficent knowledge of the unborn condition as a basis for its later pronouncements, one of which was a new definition of "meaningful life."

Who of us is competent to say that one life is meaningful and another is not? The law is supposed to portion out justice, to mediate differences, to protect those unable to protect themselves, to defend the interests of the weak and to limit the forces of the strong. The law is *not* supposed to decide that one's life is not meaningful.

The one thing all human beings have in common is the existence of our life, along with the consensus that we are human. Philosophies may differ as to what attributes of this universal human life the law is bound to *protect*, but when there is serious disagreement whether or not life *itself* should be protected, the existence of *all* humanity is in peril.

Until a few years ago the law in America gave the benefit of every doubt to the existence and continuation of human life. Comment on a 1941 case before the New York Supreme Court summarized the legal tradition in these words: "It has been the uniform and unvarying decision of all common law courts in respect to estate matters for at least the past two hundred years that a child en ventre sa mere is 'born' and 'alive' for all purposes for his benefit." (175 Misc. 1022, 1024, 26 N.Y.S. 2d 140, 143 Sur. Ct. 1941).

The unborn child clearly could inherit by will or intestacy. If a decedent left a will stating that his estate should be divided among his children at the time of his death, unborn children have inherited on an equal basis with born children. Under the January 22 decision of the Supreme Court, a woman can enrich her *own* inheritance by aborting the unborn heir.

The unborn child can also be the beneficiary of a trust.

Historically, too, common law has acknowledged the rights of unborn children by granting stay of execution to pregnant women so that the child could live.

If the law has always afforded these legal rights to the unborn child, how can the law now deny the most basic of all human rights, the right to life itself?

The Governor of California, Ronald Reagan, recently stated that the California Criminal Code holds a man who strikes a pregnant woman, killing her unborn child accountable for murder, but if the woman herself kills her child that is now legal.

The nineteenth century saw the large-scale adoption of anti-abortion statutes at the state level. The pro-abortionists assert that the motive of such laws was the protection of the health of the woman involved. But there was nothing that suddenly made abortion more dangerous in 19th century America than it had been in 17th or 18th century America. An expert study of medical and legal journals of the period compels another conclusion. An 1887 article in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* criticized the increase of abortion "especially among the higher classes." The article continued, "This fallacious idea that there is no life until quickening takes place has been the foundation of, and formed the basis of, and has been the excuse to ease or appease the guilty conscience which has led to the destruction of thousands of human lives."

In the 19th century, more women were having abortions than previously, and society didn't approve, so laws were passed to prohibit it. Clearly, too, there was a growing medical objection to arbitrary distinctions among the different stages of pregnancy as scientific advances demonstrated the absolute humanity of the unborn child.

Has there been some new medical discovery in recent years proving that the unborn child is not human to justify abortion? No, gentlemen, the contrary is true.

Another area of law which is clearly prejudiced in favor of the unborn child is the law of torts. When advances in science were able to pinpoint damages, to clarify stages of development, to assign responsibility for harm, the law began supporting actions in tort for injuries done to unborn children. It is worthy of note that up until the 1970s, the response to the growing medical knowledge regarding unborn babies was a greater reverence for life, a stronger desire to protect it, a resolution by the legal profession to guard the beginning of life, increasingly recognized as delicate and vulnerable . . . and real.

There have been numerous examples in our judicial history where the law has gone to great lengths to protect the lives of unborn children. In several cases, women of the Jehovah's Witnesses faith who refused to have blood transfusions to save the lives

of their unborn children were forced by the courts to do so. The courts placed the life of the child above the mothers' religious beliefs.

The law has also allowed guardians to be appointed to represent unborn humans and to have suits brought against their fathers for financial support.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, allow me to speak as a politician. Until a few years ago abortion didn't mean very much to me. I didn't think very much about it. I somehow equated it with birth control. My brother, Dr. William J. Hogan, an obstetrician, had been trying to discuss abortion with me, but I kept putting him off, telling him it was not a "popular political issue." Finally, one day he came to my house and showed me color pictures of what unborn babies look like. I saw what some people call a "chemical reaction", sucking its thumb. I saw perfectly formed human babies just a few weeks from conception. I saw the pictures of a twenty-one week old "fetus", a little girl who survived. I saw other little babies who didn't survive, some scalded red from a saline solution which flushed them from the womb. I saw others torn apart by a suction machine, but in the material taken from the machine I could see a little foot and a little hand.

I was stunned. I was shocked and I was ashamed. I don't know what I thought abortion really was. I didn't think that much about it. But I *certainly* didn't think we were killing babies. How could I have been so stupid? If we're not killing babies, what *are* we doing?

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I urge you to look at those picture. You don't have to be a medical scientist to conclude overwhelming, as I did, that what we euphemistically refer to as a "fetus" is really a human baby, and what we euphemistically refer to as "termination of pregnancy" is really the killing of that unborn baby.

If those pictures don't show human babies, what do they show?

I was changed instantly from one who considered abortion as "not a popular political issue" to one who feels that it is the most important issue facing our society. It may not be a popular political issue, but it is, literally, a matter of life and death.

In 1857, the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision saying that it is lawful for one human being to own another human being as a chattel. That was the Dred Scott Decision that was a horrifying decision, but it took 11 years to overturn it.

On January 22, 1973, the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision saying that it is lawful for one human being to destroy another human being for convenience. Since then millions of human beings have been legally slain. We must, as soon as we possibly can, overturn that decision.

In its January 22 decision the Supreme Court declared that it "need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins." That was the most important of all the questions to resolve. The answer to the question of when life begins is not difficult at all. The answer has been established beyond any possibility of doubt by modern science. The Supreme Court is quite simply in error in its belief that experts have been unable to arrive at any consensus about this.

The fact is that both pro-abortionists and anti-abortionists agree on the answer to the question of when human life begins. Their disagreements raise, not on the scientific, factual question, but on the question of what moral value embryonic life, once begun, possesses, and what legal rights should be accorded it, and what should be regarded as appropriate ethical responses.

In 1967, the first International Conference on Abortion reached agreement by a 19-to-1 vote about the life of the unborn:

"The majority of our group could find no point in time between the union of sperm and egg, or at least the blastocyst stage, and the birth of the infant at which point we could say that this was not a human life. The changes occurring between implantation, a six-week embryo, a six months fetus, a one-week-old child, or a mature adult are merely stages of development and maturation."

Once the humanity of the unborn child is recognized, it follows that it is only good medicine to protect and foster the life of the child, just as one protects and fosters the life of the mother.

As Dr. H. M. I. Liley, who with her husband, Dr. Albert William Liley, helped pioneer the medical treatment of babies before birth, has well said: "... Modern obstetrics discards . . . the idea that the pregnant woman can be treated as a patient alone. No problem in fetal health or disease can any longer be considered in isolation. At the very least, two people are involved, the mother and her child."

There are those who assert that abortion is simply a medical procedure, isolated from the rest of reality, and the ethics governing it are no different from, say, an appendectomy. Today it is especially necessary to realize that abortion, as such, is not really a medical problem. Doctors who are doing abortions are not doing them for strictly medical reasons, but for social, economic, population-limitation, and other reasons, and to satisfy demand. The progress of modern medicine has, in fact, rendered what used to be called therapeutic abortions superfluous.

Essentially, what I am saying is that abortion is a medical procedure for which the patient, not the doctor, indicates a need, and, in this case, a demand. This is a profound shift in the ethical disposition of the medical profession, and in my view not a desirable shift.

Let me cite an example of this new medical ethic.

There is a case in the California courts now of a 4½ pound baby born through a saline abortion when the doctor was not present. The nurses put the baby into care equipment. The doctor ordered the care to cease. The mother, reportedly, indicated disagreement with the doctor, and, in any event, the nurses refused to kill the child, as ceasing oxygen would have done. As I recall from reading about it in the papers, a nurse asked the doctor, "What do you want to do, kill the baby?" To which the reply was, "Wasn't that the original idea?"

To those who argue that with abortion we are avoiding a generation of unwanted children, I might say that the years-long wait for adoption of babies indicates that these children are "wanted" by many would-be parents.

Let's be clear, Mr. Chairman: abortion is not birth control. Birth control prevents life from starting; abortion destroys life after it has started.

It is widely asserted that abortion is a perfectly safe procedure—more safe than childbirth, it usually goes. I might say it's highly unsafe for the unborn child.

Mr. Chairman, we have an obligation to not ignore the lessons of history. I remind the committee of the Germany of the 1930's. The medical profession at the time gave in on one point to being with ... and then on another ... and then another ... until pretty soon it had no principles left. "I had no idea it would come to this," lamented one of the men condemned at the Nurenberg trials.

To which a perceptive Judge replied, "It came to this the minute you first condemned an innocent life to death."

Those first innocent lives were the unborn children killed through abortions. They were followed by the mental parents, the incurables, the aged, the dependent, and eventually six million Jews.

The October 22, 1971, Baltimore *News American* headlined a story "aborting unfit suggested." It quoted the President of the National Academy of Sciences arguing for the upgrading of the human gene pool, through the means of aborting the genetically undesirable. It was glaringly implicit that this "upgrading" would have to be involuntary at some point or other. That is the suppressed premise of almost all these eugenic schemes. It is a premise—namely, the inevitability for one reason or another, of abortion.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to refer to Section 2 of the Constitutional amendment sponsored by Senator Helms and me. It relates to euthanasia.

Many predicted that, if abortion were allowed, euthanasia would follow. They were pooh-poohed by the pro-abortionists. I don't think anyone can deny that that is the trend of our Nation today. A cursory glance across any well-stocked current periodical shelf in a magazine shop or a library gives ample testimony to the plethora of material being written on euthanasia, stirring up the public consciousness and attention, creating the impression of a major issue. "Death with Dignity" it's called. It has a ring to it like "Termination of Pregnancy."

They are both part of the deterioration of our respect for life.

I think, gentlemen, our basic problem is the definition of health we all seem to have taken for granted. Formerly, health was defined as the "absence of discernible illness." That worked well, because such things as pregnancy and old age were not discernible illnesses. They were conditions. The World Health Organization came along, however, and restructured the definition of health. They say it's a "feeling of well-being." What, I ask you, is a "feeling of well-being?" And, even if I know what it is for me, it's probably something different for you. How can the medical profession deal objectively and consistently with something so subjectively determined? Obviously, if you're "sick" when you don't have a "feeling of well-being" and you don't have a feeling of "well-being" over being pregnant, you are therefore ill, and should be given an abortion to restore your "feeling of well-being".

Similarly, if you're aged and suffering some chronic disease, your "feeling of well-being" might be missing. Naturally, the next step is to say that you're not leading a "meaningful" life. The Supreme Court has told us that lives which are not "meaningful" do not have the protection of the law so what could legally prevent euthanasia?

As long as abortions are allowed for the "health" of the mother, and the World Health Organization definition of "health" is accepted by the United States officially, abortions will not be prevented.

Permitting abortion to save the life of the mother is an entirely different position, one which I accept, but not for her health, not for her feeling of well-being.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to understand precisely what the Supreme Court's abortion decisions held. There are few Americans who realize that a woman can get an abortion up to the moment of natural birth.

During the first trimester, the Supreme

Court said no abortion can be prevented by law. It is a decision for the woman and her physician.

During the next trimester the court may regulate abortion, but not prohibit it.

During the final trimester the State may prohibit abortion except where necessary "for the preservation of the life or health of the mother." The Supreme Court then went on to say that "the medical judgment may be exercised in the light of all factors—physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the womans age—relevant to the well-being of the patient. All these factors may relate to health." (Doe V. Bolton)

When you allow abortions subsequent to what the Supreme Court refers to as "viability" for reasons of "health" and you define "health" as a "feeling of well-being" a woman can have an abortion for any reason up to the moment of birth.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I urge you to approve a Constitutional amendment promptly to reverse the Supreme Court decision which, in effect, allows the destruction of human life up until the moment of natural birth.

RIGHT TO PRIVACY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity, on behalf of my colleague Congressman ED KOCH and myself, to announce that today we have jointly introduced an Omnibus Right to Privacy Act.

There can be no doubt that the time has come for the Congress to move to restore the personal privacy of Americans. The erosion of personal privacy has often been seen as an incidental and necessary part of the growth and application of technology. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Further, the rapid advance of technological applications of science has served to encourage thoughtless application and occasional deliberate misuse. Personal privacy is a basic element of the inalienable rights of all individuals. It is an essential element of a free, healthy society. The Congress of the United States is dedicated to the preservation of individual rights and freedom. Thus, it is logical and necessary that Congress address itself to this important issue, and it is in the spirit of assisting in that effort that we have introduced this legislation.

For the convenience of the Members, I am including a brief of the bill:

RIGHT TO PRIVACY ACT: SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATION

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

An individual's personal privacy is affected by the extensiveness of collection, use and disclosure of information about him.

Organizations keeping personal information should allow individuals the right to know files exist, to inspect them, and correct inaccurate statements.

The increasing use of computers and sophisticated information technology has greatly magnified the harm that can occur from misuse of personal information.

Personal information includes anything that describes an individual, such as his education, financial transactions, medical or employment records, and life-style.

SAFEGUARD REQUIREMENTS FOR PERSONAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS

All Federal, State and local governments and business organizations must comply with these requirements, whether having manual or computer based information systems.

Information collected should be appropriate to needs of the organization seeking it, maintained completely and competently, and personal information must not be given to third parties without the individual's consent.

When information is collected, the individual must be told if the request is mandatory or voluntary and what penalty or loss of benefit will result for non-compliance.

Several categories of privileged, sensitive information should be established by organizations and particular requirements set before the information is disseminated.

Information about Americans cannot be transferred to a foreign country unless the provisions of the Act are extended by any receiving country.

Persons involved in handling personal information must act under a code of professional secrecy and be subject to penalties for any breaches.

Anyone wishing to stop receiving mail because his name is on a mailing list can do so.

Individuals cannot be required to give their social security number for any purpose not related to their social security account.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Organizations using personal information must give annual public notice describing their information systems.

An individual may receive at reasonable cost a copy of his file including investigative reports, which must contain its uses and transfers to third parties, be able to challenge inaccurate or undocumented information and have his position in a dispute added to his file.

Individuals must be notified that information is being maintained about them.

EXCEPTIONS

Criminal law enforcement, national security, press files and certain administrative information systems are excluded if specifically exempted by statute or Executive order where Congress is duly informed.

FEDERAL PRIVACY BOARD

Establish a five member Federal Privacy Board serving on a full-time basis, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, having three year terms.

The Board will collect and publish information on personal information systems, issue regulations, conduct research on improving standards, inspect systems when noncompliance is suspected, hear requests for exceptions, and transmit annual reports to Congress and the President.

Only Congress can grant exemptions or exclusions from this Act. States and Federal Departments will be encouraged to establish privacy authorities to have the same duties as the Federal Board.

PENALTIES

There are civil and criminal penalties to be assessed by the courts, at the request of individuals or the Board.

Injunctions can be sought by the Attorney General to stop practices violating the Act.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT NOW TO BREAK THE TAX-AND-SPEND-AND-TAX CYCLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I have taken time this afternoon to permit Members an opportunity to discuss the budget and issues associated with taxes and spending, authorizations, and appropriations, revenues and deficits—and the inescapable inflation which arises from misdirected and ill-conceived Government spending programs which lead to further attacks on the integrity of the dollar.

Yet, this is indeed a time when this subject ought to be fully aired. As I said in an address to this House on February 5:

In my opinion, the President's budget message has to be the worst conceived of any on record—at least of any Republican President on record. It embodies the worst of Keynesian economic principles—planned deficits, the use of the Government's spending power to compensate for declines in other segments of the economy—all at the taxpayers' expense. It fosters inflation by spending a full $30 billion over this year's budget and by encouraging the Federal Reserve to print ever-increasing amounts of paper money—without increasing what stands behind it—to help pay the bills for which tax revenues are not enough.

It is hard, in all candor, to realize that a budget proposal resting on such misguided principles and proposing such outrageous levels of expenditures came from a President whose political party has historically, been known for the advocacy of fiscal integrity, less taxes and less spending, reducing the size of government and the number of its employees, balanced budgets and paying our own way now—rather than passing on our national debt to our children.

Few issues could be of greater importance to the discharge of responsibilities laid by the Constitution at the door of the Congress. Few issues could be of greater importance to the strength and vitality of our economy and of the economic and political freedoms which buttress it.

The importance of this issue is why we should move prudently but decisively toward the enactment of measures to reform the processes Congress uses in addressing itself to the budget and spending priorities, as well as emergency anti-inflation legislation, zero-base budgeting requirements, revenue limitation and expenditure control devices, the requirement of price tag fiscal notes on all bills and resolutions, and other related measures. I have sponsored and cosponsored bills to achieve these objectives, as have my colleagues participating in this special order, and we are proud to report that on some there is considerable progress being made.

I have risen on a number of occasions to address this House on issues associated with taxation and spending. I have probably spoken out on this particular subject more than on any other since I first came to the Congress. And, I have reinforced these statements, these words, with action—the introduction of congressional budget reform legislation, the sponsorship of a revenue and expenditure control proposal, and an emergency anti-inflation bill, and votes against budget-busting spending and a higher cost of living. There is, therefore, no need for me to restate matters today which I have already made the subject of discussion and debate.

I do wish, however, to address myself to a few key aspects of the discussion: the process in which Government is contributing to inflation, and the extent of our spending during the past several decades.

THE POLITICS OF INFLATION

As I have said on several other occasions, inflation is not an act of God; it is an act of politicians. And, as such, it is subject to remedial action by those same politicians. If inflation was started and fueled by politicians, it can be slowed and halted by those same politicians.

Inflation is, essentially, a political, rather than solely an economic, problem. And, unless we reverse sharply the way in which economic policy has become politicized, there is little hope of resolving these economic problems in the foreseeable future.

Political decisions on economic policy are characterized by a focus on short-term benefits at the expense of long-term costs. The abortive wage and price control program is a good example of such an error. This leads inevitably to crisis solutions that come to grips only with the immediate manifestations of a problem, not the problem itself. Because such a process fights the results of problems, and not their true causes, additional problems simply keep arising. Secondary crises thus arise as a consequence. And advanced market economy simply cannot function effectively under such policies because the crises ultimately undermine savings and capital investments and, as a consequence, economic growth itself. Greater use of economic regimentation will result in greater dependency and reliance on that regimentation. The process is called, history tells us, "the road to serfdom."

How does this relate to our discussion today?

The ever-increasing political focus on short-term benefits at the expense of long-term costs has been particularly evident in the budgetary process as too many candidates for political office—election or reelection—have vied with each other to capture supposed votes by proposing new or bigger expenditure programs. As a consequence, new spending programs now threaten to far outstrip the revenue generating capacity of the economy. Thus, as expenditures have increased, taxes to sustain those expenditures have risen less sharply, creating greater reliance upon deficit financing. Thus, we have a tax-then-spend-then-tax-some-more phenomenon, while simultaneously we have a pass-on-much-of-the-cost-to-our-children philosophy permeating ever-increasing rises in the national public debt ceiling. Both can seriously disrupt our economic strength. Yet, both continue virtually unabated.

Furthermore, inasmuch as deficits which are not accompanied by an expansion in the money supply induce sharply rising interest rates which thereby retard growth within the housing industry, there is a further tendency for the money supply also to expand. The result is a standard fiscal-monetary inflation such as we are now experiencing.

The underlying strength of the American economy has been its ability, until recently, to absorb much of these inflationary pressures without any significant evidence of slowed economic growth. However, the process cannot go on indefinitely, largely because of the difficulty of sustaining adequate capital expenditures in our current economic climate.

The question can be asked, "Just how much are we spending and taxing"? I have some answers.

HOW MUCH ARE WE SPENDING AND TAXING?

It always dismays me when I hear or read debate on taxes and spending, if that debate is couched principally in subjective terms or borne forward solely by philosophical persuasion. Our attitudes on taxes and spending arise naturally from philosophical orientation, as they should, but what I am saying is that we must never forget the vast storehouse of factual information from which there is no escape into subjectivity, irrespective of philosophical disposition. The facts are the facts, and they tell us a most certain story during these times.

First, the Federal Government's gross annual revenue has risen from $7 billion in fiscal year 1940—just 34 years ago—to $232.2 billion in fiscal year 1973, and upwards ever since to a projected annual revenue of $295 billion for fiscal year 1975.

The statistics are as follows:

TABLE 1[1].—SUMMARY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REVENUE, EXPENDITURES, AND DEBT, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1940–71

[In billions of dollars]

Item	1940	1948	1960	1971	1973
FEDERAL					
Revenue	7.0	47.3	99.8	202.5	232.2
General	6.2	44.3	87.1	156.9	161.4
Expenditures	10.1	35.6	97.3	226.2	246.5
Direct	9.2	33.8	90.3	198.7	NA
General	8.9	32.4	76.7	150.4	NA
Debt outstanding	43.0	252.3	28.3	398.1	468.4

[1] Excerpted from table 3, "Summary of Total Government Revenue, Expenditures, and Debt," "Facts and figures on Government Finance," Tax Foundation, Inc., 1973, at p. 15.

Second, the growth of the Federal Government's spending has outpaced those of other sectors of the economy. Between fiscal years 1960 and 1972, while per capita disposable income in constant dollars increased by 42 percent, Government purchases of goods and services increased by 134 percent—over three times as much. Private purchases of goods and services increased by 102 percent, markedly less—almost a fourth less—than those by the Federal Government.

During this same period, budget receipts increased by 126 percent, but actual budget expenditures increased by a startling 151 percent—26 percent over receipts—necessitating a rise in the public debt—the indebtedness of the Government of the United States borne by each and every one of us, and even by the unborn—by no less than 49 percent.

What are the statistics on this? They are as follows:

TABLE 2[1].—*Government and the changing economy*

[Percentage change in selected indicators]

	1960–72
I. The Federal Government:	
Budget receipts	126
Budget expenditures	151
Public debt	49
Expenditures for national defense and international affairs and finance	67
Domestic-civilian expenditures	246
Federal tax receipts (including social insurance taxes)	126
II. The economy:	
Gross national product	109
Government purchases of goods and services	134
Private purchases of goods and services	102
Per capita disposable income in constant dollars	42

[1] Excerpted from Table 1, "Government and the Changing Economy," Facts and Figures on Government Finance, Tax Foundation, Inc., 1973, at page 13.

Let us look further, for one moment, at the debt implications of those statistics.

The Federal debt outstanding during the period from fiscal year 1940 to fiscal year 1971 rose from $43 billion to $398.1 billion an 828-percent increase; and then rose, through November 30, 1974, to a total ceiling of $477 billion—a 1,010-percent increase over 1940.

The implications of those statistics upon the livelihood of every American cannot be missed; they are obvious.

To illustrate the waste of tax dollars which could be better spent in carrying the debt service, just consider that the estimated total interest payments on the outstanding debt of the Federal Government during this fiscal year of 1974 is $29 billion.

Third, the per capita growth in Federal expenditures, again from the period of 1940 through 1972, has been upward by 1,452 percent, from $77 in 1940 to $1,195 at the end of fiscal year 1972. That is $1,195 per person—every man, woman, and child—and it is going up even further for fiscal years 1973, 1974, and 1975. All the figures are not yet in, but we know the direction—up.

The statistics are as follows:

TABLE 3[1].—*Federal expenditures: Per capita*

[Selected fiscal years: 1940–72]

Fiscal year:	
1940	77
1942	266
1944	751
1946	485
1948	246
1950	298
1952	463
1953	509
1954	486
1955	451
1956	458
1957	484
1958	500
1959	534
1960	546
1961	577
1962	614
1963	634
1964	662
1965	675
1966	734
1967	847
1968	927
1969	978
1970	1,027
1971	1,102
1972	1,195

[1] Excerpted from Table 6, "Federal, State, and Local Expenditures: Per Capita and Percentage Distribution," Facts and Figures on Government Finance, Tax Foundation, Inc., 1973, at page 18.

Coextensively, the per capita gross debt of the United States increased from $326 in 1940 to $2,052 in 1972—a 528-percent jump, as borne out by these figures:

TABLE 4 [1].—*Gross debt of Federal Government: per capita*

[End of selected fiscal years, 1940–72]

Fiscal year:	
1940	326
1942	541
1944	1,513
1946	1,924
1948	1,727
1950	1,702
1952	1,664
1953	1,681
1954	1,683
1955	1,670
1956	1,630
1957	1,588
1958	1,594
1959	1,613
1960	1,591
1961	1,579
1962	1,604
1963	1,621
1964	1,629
1965	1,637
1966	1,633
1967	1,649
1968	1,739
1969	1,756
1970	1,820
1971	1,931
1972	2,052

[1] Excerpted from table 11, "Gross Debt of Federal, State, and Local Governments: Per Capita and Percentage Distribution," "Facts and Figures on Government Finance," Tax Foundation, Inc., 1973, at 23.

Fourth, we should look at the rate of increase in Federal expenditures according to an absolute standard. "If Federal spending has gone up," it is argued by some, "we should not be too concerned, for all spending has gone up. You pay more for everything now." One way to examine the validity—invalidity—of this assertion is to judge the growth in Federal expenditures in terms relative to a fixed standard—typically our gross national product. The question is simple, "Have Federal expenditures increased as a percentage of the gross national product?"

The answer speaks for itself. Not only have those expenditures increased in relation to the GNP, but they have doubled since 1940.

The statistics buttress this conclusion:

TABLE 5[1].—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES AND GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT, CALENDAR YEARS 1940–71

Year	Federal Government expenditures [2]	Gross national product	As a percentage of GNP
1940	10.0	99.7	10.0
1941	20.5	124.5	16.5
1942	56.1	157.9	35.5
1943	85.8	191.6	44.8
1944	95.5	210.1	45.4
1945	84.6	211.9	39.9
1946	35.6	208.5	17.1
1947	29.8	231.3	12.9
1948	34.9	257.6	13.5
1949	41.3	256.5	16.1
1950	40.8	284.8	14.3
1951	57.8	328.4	17.6
1952	71.0	345.5	20.5
1953	77.0	364.6	21.1
1954	69.7	364.8	19.1
1955	68.1	398.0	17.1
1956	71.9	419.2	17.2
1957	79.6	441.1	18.0
1958	88.9	447.3	19.9
1959	91.0	483.7	18.8
1960	93.0	503.7	18.4
1961	102.1	520.1	19.6
1962	110.3	560.3	19.7
1963	113.9	590.5	19.3
1964	118.1	631.7	18.7
1965	123.4	681.2	18.1
1966	142.8	749.9	19.0
1967	163.6	793.9	20.6
1968	181.5	864.2	21.0
1969	189.2	930.3	20.3
1970	204.5	976.4	20.9
1971	220.8	1,050.4	21.0

[1] Excerpted from table 20, "Government Expenditures and Gross National Product," "Facts and Figures on Government Finance," Tax Foundation, Inc., 1973, at p. 33.

[2] Includes expenditures for grants-in-aid to State and local governments.

Last, we should look at how our Government's growth rate compares to that of other countries. In this measure, we can determine several things, not the least of which is the degree to which we are moving toward a government-provides-everything psychology in our Nation and in these Halls.

The rate of direct taxation as a percentage of gross domestic product in the United States was by 1969 superceded by only three of the 26 principal free world nations—Sweden, New Zealand, and Denmark—all predominantly socialist societies. The figures since 1969 have served only to reinforce that 1969 level:

TABLE 6 [1].—*Tax revenues in relation to gross domestic product in selected countries*

[Calendar Year 1969]

Direct taxes as a percentage of GDP

Country:	
Australia	13.6
Belgium	10.8
Canada	13.8
Chile	6.7
China (Taiwan)	2.1
Colombia	4.3
Denmark	16.6
Finland	13.5
France	6.8
Germany, Federal Republic of	10.6
Ireland	7.6
Israel	11.0
Italy	6.9
Jamaica	5.7
Japan	8.3
Korea, Republic of	5.7
Netherlands	13.3
New Zealand	17.8
Norway	14.6
Philippines	2.7
Portugal	5.7
South Africa, Union of	10.5
Sweden	20.7
Switzerland	11.0
United Kingdom	15.1
United States	15.1

[1] Excerpted from Table 22, "Tax Revenues in Relation to Gross Domestic Product in Selected Countries," facts and figures on Government Finance, Tax Foundation, Inc., 1973, at page 35.

What do the statistics I have cited today tell us?

GOVERNMENT SPENDING MUST HAVE A CEILING

Government spending—and the raising of revenue requisite to that spending—must have a ceiling beyond which it invites both the collapse of the economic strength of the Nation and political freedom. Because Government works with numbers which are beyond normal human comprehension—who amongst us can really contemplate the size of 1 billion of anything; because it sees a broad scope of real or imagined issues; and, because it has not yet reached "the breaking point," the Congress finds it hard to impose self-restraints on the levels of its own authorizations and appropriations.

Yet everyone, even the most casual of observers, knows that Government has a never-ending appetite for the people's earnings which can be controlled only through the use of mechanisms which limit—by direction of the people—that appetite, such measures as budget reform, revenue limitation, and so forth.

The statistics which I have cited today prove the tendencies of Government to siphon off ever greater shares of the people's income for itself, yet that casual observer to whom I have alluded knows that all—I repeat, all—income of government must ultimately come from the people themselves, through personal income taxes, through corporate income taxes passed on to the consumers in the form of higher costs, through excises, posts, duties, and so forth.

Government must realize that it cannot indefinitely tax the people at constantly increasing levels without destroying the people's ability to support themselves and their families. Government's share of the wealth must not interfere with the ability of the people to produce wealth.

In the end, they will wind up defenseless, at the mercy of a vast special-interest-oriented Government bureaucracy they unwittingly helped to create, a bureaucracy which perpetuates itself through the consumption of the people's livelihood.

When one ponders over the marked rise in tax collections, as a percentage of income, the question posed is really twofold: Where will it stop? How can we make it stop—get a handle on it?

In my opinion, upon extensive observations of political and economic history, the answer to the former lies in getting that handle on the latter. In other words, it will not stop until mechanisms are devised to, first, stabilize, then eventually reduce—systematically—the ratio between Federal spending and gross national income.

No matter how hard this body must "bite the bullet" in determining that the present level of spending must be the maximum at which we must stop, we simply must arrive at agreement on an absolute standard against which priorities for Federal expenditures can be established by this, the first branch of Government. As long as we adhere to the ever-flexible, no-ceiling way in which the Congress authorizes and appropriates moneys today, we will continue to feed, at the expense of the people, the insatiable appetite of Government for dollars, giving credence to that classic Thomas Nast cartoon, "Taxes are politicians food."

We cannot urge remedial action on this urgent problem without first realizing that its ultimate resolution lies not only in the will of the Congress to assume its proper and full constitutional roles with respect to the purpose, but also in the issue being joined head on through a comprehensive, fully interrelated program effort. Piecemeal efforts to first attack spending here, taxes there, are inherently doomed to failure or frustration.

Only through a unified and unidirected effort will we be able to adequately meet this problem and to resolve it. It

will require a great degree of personal courage of convictions among the Members and a solid commitment to the institution of procedural devices to get us out of this tax-and-spend-and-tax morass.

What then is to be done?

This effort to get a firmer grip on the handles with which to control spending is not a hopeless task. There are many things which can be done—by both the Executive and the Congress.

I was—and am still—deeply concerned over the recent budget submitted by the President, proposing Federal outlays for fiscal year 1975 in excess of $304 billion—an increase of about $30 billion over fiscal year 1974. Together with 34 other Congressmen and Senators, we transmitted a joint communication to the President, expressing our concern and our intent to hold down spending.

Out of this exchange of correspondence on the fiscal year 1975 budget has come some interesting observations, and I wish to share them with my colleagues.

The debate over the nature of the spending surge has boiled down to an argument over which institution is most responsible for this spending surge: the Executive or the Congress? The Executive says, to paraphrase, "It's not my fault; you fellows in Congress mandated this level of spending." And the Congress says, to paraphrase again, "It is not our fault; if the Executive did not make proposals for so much spending, we could be better able to hold the line and to establish better priorities." Like most such exchanges, both—the Executive and the Congress—are somewhat right, and both are somewhat wrong. It is one of those gray areas again.

What can the Executive do? Several things, all important.

First, it can begin by submitting to the Congress only balanced budgets. If revenues are not going to be sufficient to sustain proposed spending, then that spending should be cut back. To do otherwise is to incur further deficits, pushing up further the size of the national debt and the amount which we and our children and grandchildren will have to pay back someday.

Second, it can begin reestablishing its spending priorities in such a manner as not to try to do everything, to please everyone who wants a share of the taxpayers' money. Some hard decisions must be made, between competing demands on the people's money, and the place where that should at least start is at the executive in making its budget recommendations.

Third, it can begin standing firm against the ever-rising demands from within the agencies for more and larger programs and more and larger bureaucracies to support them. This is, beyond question, an appropriate role for the Executive, for it is within the executive branch of Government that those agencies carry out the laws. Internal demands have added measurably to the size of the Federal budget over the past years. It is time to hold the line here, too.

What can the Congress do? A number of things, too.

First, it can proceed with the enactment of congressional budget reform proposals. The House and Senate have passed such a measure; it is now pending in the conference committee. These measures would give the Congress a greater voice in determining the initial size of the Federal budget proposal, establishing at the beginning of consideration of the overall budget request for a fiscal year the goal it wants to meet in keeping down spending. The Congress will establish a figure certain and try to keep the total of all appropriations bills at a level not to exceed that amount. This will certainly put added internal pressures on the Congress to better determine its priorities. Otherwise, the Congress too often acts as if the Treasury were an endless bank of money.

Second, we can implement the zero-base budgeting concept. This concept would require the Congress to begin the consideration of each budget request on a de novo basis. In other words, no program is taken for granted. Just because a program was funded during the previous fiscal year does not mean, if this concept is used, that it will be automatically funded the next year. If a program is of questionable utility, its advocates are really going to have to prove to the Congress that it should be funded further.

The use of the zero-base budgeting concept is intended to shift the burden of debate for the funding of programs away from those who question the success of a program to those who advocate its utility. This could be a major shift in the institutional dynamics of budgeting Federal programs.

Third, we should consider the enactment of a revenue control and expenditure determination requirement. Too often the Congress has tried to come to grips with these problems by simply trying to hold the line on spending. In all candor, this has never worked.

As Parkinson's Law states, "Spending always rises to meet income," or as the corollary to that Law states, "Spending always slightly exceeds present income in expectation of future growth in income." If these laws are true, can there be any wonder why we have not been able to hold the line on spending?

Recognizing these realities, about the only way in which we can truly remedy this endless cycle of tax-and-spend-and-tax is to enact a requirement that limits revenue—that limits government income. Such a proposal would fix a percentage certain beyond which the Federal Government could not go. Government's share of national income could not exceed a certain percentage of that income. As the economy grew, government would have more actual dollars with which to meet commitments, but it would not have a greater percentage of the people's income. Thus, there would be room for growth but the freedom of the people—the freedom which is lost or endangered when government takes ever-increasing shares of the people's livelihood—would be better protected.

I am working on such a proposal and have introduced, for discussion purposes, a first draft of such a measure, House Joint Resolution 816. I will have more to say on this as I approach the introduction of a revised measure.

As I indicated earlier in my remarks today, the Congress simply must come to grips with this matter. If we do not, we invite the collapse of our monetary and economic systems, and, ultimately, the ability of the Government to discharge its responsibilities.

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, why should we not be able to balance the budget when receipts continue to increase year after year?

Why should we not be able to create surpluses instead of deficits?

Why should we not begin to reduce the national debt instead of increasing it annually?

Why should we not do each of these things and also cut taxes?

Unbalanced budgets, annual deficits, increases in debt, and ever-increasing tax loads are negative influences that do great harm to our people, while balanced budgets, annual surpluses, systematic debt retirement and tax relief would be positive influences that would greatly benefit our fellow citizens.

The reason we cannot balance the budget, create surpluses, reduce the debt, and cut taxes is that we have permitted spending outlays to get out of control. If we do not bring irresponsible spending under control, there will be more and more regimentation by more and more bureaucrats, an ever-increasing concentration of political and economic power as more and more new governmental activities are superimposed on existing programs, and of course an ever-lengthening string of budgetary deficits that will create inflation even worse than that which already plagues us.

Future budgets can be balanced if we simply hold the line on spending. Why continue to fritter away the annual increases in revenue that our amazing system of free enterprise generates? Instead of passing more and more spending proposals, let us use the extra revenue for debt reduction and an eventual easing of the tax burden.

The following table demonstrates that receipts are behind outlays by 1 year. Why not make it the other way around?

[In millions of dollars]

	Receipts	Outlays
Fiscal year—		
1972	208,649	231,876
1973	232,225	246,526
1974 estimate	270,000	274,660
1975 estimate	295,000	304,445

Our economic health would improve and more people would be able to meet their own needs from their own incomes if we would only let our growing economy's fiscal fruits go toward reducing the debt rather than let them be wasted by more riotous spending.

In the list below are some more of the spending proposals that my colleague mentioned during his remarks. Each of them would cost at least half a billion dollars but less than a billion dollars during the period from fiscal 1974 through fiscal 1977. The total for the 4 years would be $22,703,875,000, considerably less than the totals mentioned by the two gentlemen who preceded me in the well, but still a tidy sum of money.

BILLS THAT WOULD COST AT LEAST HALF A BILLION DOLLARS BUT UNDER $1,000,000,000 EACH DURING 4 YEARS

[Costs in thousands of dollars]

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Total
Juvenile and Adult Correctional Facilities Improvement Act	100,000	200,000	300,000	300,000	900,000
Automotive Transport Research and Development Act	300,000	300,000	300,000	----------	900,000
Emergency Urban Crime Reduction Act	300,000	[1] 300,000	[1] 300,000	----------	900,000
National Reading Improvement Act	207,500	312,500	367,500	----------	887,500
Rural Drinking Water Assistance Act	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	880,000
Senior Citizens Community Centers and Services Act	170,000	280,000	390,000	----------	840,000
Narcotics Addict Treatment and Rehabilitation Act	200,000	[1] 200,000	[1] 200,000	[1] 200,000	800,000
Urban Transportation Emergency Relief Act	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	800,000
Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act	400,000	400,000	----------	----------	800,000
Rural Development Act Amendments	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	800,000
Energy Emergency Act	633,500	150,000	----------	----------	783,500
Neighborhood Conservation Act	150,000	250,000	370,000	----------	770,000
National Health Planning and Development Act	18,000	198,000	268,000	268,000	752,000
Correctional Manpower and Employment Act	150,000	200,000	[1] 200,000	[1] 200,000	750,000
Middle and Low Income Housing Act	750,000	----------	----------	----------	750,000
Pollution Control Facility Loan Act	750,000	----------	----------	----------	750,000
Establish State automobile emission control systems inspection programs	300,000	400,000	----------	----------	700,000
Physicians' community service program	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	700,000
Housing for the Elderly Act	230,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	695,000
Indian Health Care Improvement Act	----------	189,250	252,050	234,075	675,375
Amend Federal Water Pollution Control Act	225,000	225,000	225,000	----------	675,000
Community Child Care Act	----------	150,000	250,000	250,000	650,000
National Health Research Fellowship and Traineeship Act	204,000	214,500	225,000	----------	643,500
Programs for unemployed scientists and engineers	300,000	300,000	----------	----------	600,000
Indian Economic Development and Employment Act	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	600,000
Federal Energy Administration Act	116,000	277,000	179,000	4,000	576,000
Omnibus Correctional Reform Act	93,000	145,000	145,000	190,000	573,000
Land Use Policy and Planning Assistance Act	137,000	137,000	137,000	137,000	548,000
National Fuels and Energy Conservation Act	281,000	104,000	116,000	4,000	505,000
National Environmental Financing Act	500,000	----------	----------	----------	500,000
Community Economic Adjustment Assistance Act	500,000	----------	----------	----------	500,000
Congressional Election Finance Act	500,000	----------	----------	----------	500,000
Total	8,460,000	6,032,250	5,324,550	2,887,075	22,703,870

[1] Projections.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at some statistics.

Personal consumption expenditures during 1971 totaled $664,900 million, including the following items:

	Billions
Food	$117.3
Housing	99.2
Transportation	90.1
Clothing, shoes, etc	57.3
Medical care expenses	51.4
Household furniture, equipment, and supplies	47.3
Recreation	42.5
Personal business	37.1
Electricity, gas, telephone, and telegraph	27.4
Alcoholic beverages	19.1
Tobacco	11.7
Private education and research	11.1
Personal care	10.6
Religious and welfare activities	9.1
Foreign travel and other, net	5.2
Domestic service	5.0
Jewelry and watches	4.3
Miscellaneous	19.2
Total consumption	664.9

The above figures represent the market value of goods and services purchased by individuals and nonprofit institutions, and the value of food, clothing, housing, and financial services received by them as income in kind. They include the rental value of owner-occupied houses, but not purchases of dwellings.

That is a lot of money—$664,900,000,000, but if all of the bills that the gentleman from Illinois mentioned in his remarks were enacted into law, a great deal more than that, $871,363,307,000, would have to be produced by the taxpayers during the next 4 years. Of that huge sum, $680,567,812,000 would have to be paid out during fiscals 1974, 1975, and 1976. That 3-year total exceeds what is being spent in a single year for food, housing, clothing, medical care, and a good many other things.

The preceding speakers have listed a good many of the bills that we have been discussing, but the list is by no means complete. The tabulation that I will insert at the conclusion of my remarks includes those that would cost at least $25 million but under $50 million each during the next 4 years, or a total of $1,870,203,000 for the period 1974 through 1977—fiscal years. That sounds like peanuts, but added to the other tables it helps to make a truly frightening figure.

The tabulation follows:

BILLS THAT WOULD COST AT LEAST $25,000,000 BUT UNDER $50,000,000 EACH DURING 4 YEARS

[Costs in thousands of dollars]

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Totals
Construct, operate, and maintain Nueces River project (Texas)	49,600	----------	----------	----------	49,600
Earthquake Prediction Act	12,200	12,200	12,200	12,200	48,800
Construct, operate, and maintain Santa Margarita project (California)	48,700	----------	----------	----------	48,700
National Agency for Transportation Safety Act	14,000	16,000	18,000	----------	48,000
Federal Animal Damage Control Act	9,600	13,000	13,000	12,000	47,600
Mobile Health Unit Act	10,000	15,000	20,000	----------	45,000
National Workers' Compensation Standards Act	15,000	15,000	15,000	----------	45,000
Construct Fourmile Run project (Virginia)	42,800	----------	----------	----------	42,800
Establish Big Thicket National Biological Reserve (Texas)	16,119	11,484	12,845	2,312	42,760
Federal Fisheries Environmental Disaster and Assistance Act	33,000	9,000	----------	----------	42,000
Drug Abuse Education Act	7,000	10,000	12,000	12,000	41,000
Construct, operate, and maintain Cibolo project (Texas)	40,151	----------	----------	----------	40,151
Secondary schools' interscholastic athletic programs	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
Prisoner Treatment Act	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
Control streambank erosion	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
Develop community facilities on Guam	40,000	----------	----------	----------	40,000
Elderly and Handicapped Americans Transportation Services Act	15,000	25,000	----------	----------	40,000
Shoreline Erosion Control Demonstration Act	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
Rolling stock scheduling and control systems	40,000	----------	----------	----------	40,000
Nutritional Medical Education Act	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
Establish New Energy Source Corporation	10,000	10,000	[1] 10,000	[1] 10,000	40,000
Train physicians' assistants	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
National Summer Youth Sports Program Act	7,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	37,000
Runaway Youth Act	13,000	12,000	12,000	----------	37,000
Resettle Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel	36,500	----------	----------	----------	36,500
Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act	4,500	8,000	11,500	12,500	36,500

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Totals
High Seas Oil Port Act	500	10,500	13,000	12,500	36,500
Children with Specific Learning Disabilities Act	6,000	12,000	18,000		36,000
Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Act	10,000	12,000	14,000		36,000
Grants to Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University (California)	8,750	8,750	8,750	8,750	35,000
National Professions Foundation Act	5,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	35,000
Rehabilitate aged inpatients of long-term health care facilities	5,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	35,000
Authorize emergency erosion control projects	35,000				35,000
Create position of ombudsman for Congress	8,025	8,025	8,025	8,025	32,100
Urban Transport Data Act	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	32,000
Japan-United States Friendship Act	32,000				32,000
Establish National Institute of Building Sciences	10,000	10,000	6,000	6,000	32,000
Toxic Substances Control Act	9,240	11,100	10,100		30,440
National Blood Bank Act	10,000	10,000	10,000		30,000
Designate marine sanctuaries in areas of ocean, coastal, and other waters	10,000	10,000	10,000		30,000
Authorize research and develop ground propulsion systems	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	30,000
Respiratory Disease Benefits Act	10,000	10,000	10,000		30,000
Youth Programs Act	10,000	10,000	10,000		30,000
Waterway transportation to Gateway National Recreation Area (New Jersey–New York)	30,000				30,000
Employees Comprehensive Respiratory Disease Compensation and Registration Act	10,000	10,000	10,000		30,000
Construct, operate, and maintain replacement dam for American Falls Dam of Upper Snake River Basin project (Idaho)	29,000				29,000
Establish California Desert National Conservation Area	28,600				28,600
Weather Modification and Precipitation Management Act	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	28,000
Acquire Vermejo Ranch (New Mexico–Colorado) lands for forests	26,788	288	288	288	27,652
Institute for the Social Sciences Act	10,000	5,500	5,500	5,500	26,500
Establish Nantucket Sound Islands Trust	8,334	8,333	8,333		25,000
Total	858,907	405,680	391,041	214,575	1,870,203

[1] Projections.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if all of the 450-plus bills that my able colleague has referred to became law, the taxpayers, bond purchasers, and money lenders would have to produce almost $875 billion during the next 4 years for Uncle Sam's pockets. Such a sum is almost too much for the human mind to comprehend.

This vast sum is only a part of the fiscal picture. If even a few of the more costly bills, such as the Health Security Act, were passed, inflation would be accelerated to dangerous heights. Inflation is the most vicious of all taxes—there are no escapes from it. Young, old, and middle-aged alike pay the costs of inflation by the erosion of their purchasing power.

To make matters even worse, the increases in tax burdens and inflation loads will be accompanied by vast increases in the number of bureaucrats who would be hired to administer the many new programs created by the bills. The vastly larger bureaucracy would wield more and more power as the executive monstrosity grew and grew, but its individual members would become more powerful politically as their numbers increased.

Eight States have approximately 1,260,000 Federal civilian employees, each of them having at least 100,000, except Ohio, which has had 100,000 but now has just over 95,000. These States, California, Illinois, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia, also have 212 of the 538 votes in the electoral college, thus constituting a powerful force that could be a determining factor in a close Presidential election.

The table below includes some more of the bills that my colleague mentioned. Each of them would cost at least $1 billion but less than $10 billion during the 4-year period, or $208,729,058,000 for all of them for fiscal years 1974 through 1977.

The table follows:

BILLS THAT WOULD COST AT LEAST $1,000,000,000 EACH BUT UNDER $10,000,000,000 EACH DURING 4 YEARS

[Costs in thousands of dollars]

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Totals
Adequate Nutrition Act	2,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000		9,500,000
Comprehensive Child Development Act	2,050,000	3,050,000	4,050,000	50,000	9,200,000
Public and Private Education Assistance Act	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	9,000,000
Regional Development Act	3,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000		8,500,000
Public Works Development Act	2,278,334	2,803,833	3,328,333		8,410,500
Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation Act	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	8,000,000
Police Manpower Act	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	8,000,000
Create National Zoological and Aquarium Corporation	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	8,000,000
Energy sources and technologies research	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	8,000,000
Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Administration Act	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	8,000,000
Comprehensive Manpower Act	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000		7,500,000
Community Development Assistance Act	4,200,000	3,200,000			7,400,000
Emergency Rural Housing Act	2,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	7,000,000
State Education Finance Assistance Act		2,000,000	[1] 2,000,000	[1] 2,000,000	6,000,000
Economic Disaster Area Assistance Act	1,252,500	1,252,500	1,252,500	1,252,500	5,010,000
Community Land Grant Act	5,007,500				5,007,500
Full Employment and Job Development Act	1,003,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	4,012,000
		[1] 1,000,000	[1] 1,000,000	[1] 1,000,000	
Small Business Pollution Abatement Loan Assistance and Workers' Readjustment Assistance Act	4,000,000				4,000,000
Establish Urban Parkland Heritage Corporation	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
Emergency Energy Employment Assistance Act	2,000,000	2,000,000			4,000,000
National Refinery Facilities Expansion Act	3,000,000				3,000,000
Domestic Enterprise Bank Act	3,000,000				3,000,000
Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	2,800,000
National Energy Research and Development Policy Act	847,000	855,000	55,000		2,557,000
			800,000		
Family planning and population research	429,000	516,000	623,000	629,000	2,197,000
Manpower Training and Employment Act	[1] 75,000	[1] 75,000	942,000	[1] 1,017,000	2,184,000
			[1] 75,000		
Comprehensive Child Nutrition Act	543,088	543,088	543,088	543,088	2,172,352
Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments	757,000	677,150	18,700	5,000	2,116,300
			[1] 658,450		
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act	320,000	475,000	630,000	[1] 630,000	2,055,000
Surface Transportation Act	2,035,000				2,035,000
Equal Educational Opportunities Act	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000
Police Assistance Act	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000
Urban Employment Act	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000
Elementary and Secondary Drug Abuse Eradication Act	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000
National Landlord-Tenant Act	500,000	500,000	[1] 500,000	[1] 500,000	2,000,000
National Credit Union Bank Act	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000
Public Employment Act	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000
Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act (new programs)			937,125	983,981	1,921,106
Federal-Aid Railroad Act	455,000	455,000	455,000	455,000	1,820,000
National Science Policy and Priorities Act	362,000	618,000	830,000		1,810,000

BILLS THAT WOULD COST AT LEAST $1,000,000,000 EACH BUT UNDER $10,000,000,000 EACH DURING 4 YEARS—Continued

[Costs in thousands of dollars]

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Totals
Rail Services Act	1,658,500	100,000			1,758,500
Solar, Hydrogen, and Geothermal Energy Act	110,050	545,000	545,000	545,000	1,745,050
Emergency Mass Transit Passenger Act	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	1,600,000
Comprehensive Child Care and Child Development Act	100,000	1,500,000			1,600,000
National Domestic Development Bank Act	610,500	300,000	300,000	300,000	1,510,500
Establish special employment assistance program	1,000,000	[1] 500,000			1,500,000
Energy Conservation Research and Development Act	200,000	300,000	500,000	500,000	1,500,000
Increased participation in International Development Association	1,500,000				1,500,000
Community Services Act	329,000	[1] 329,000	[1] 329,000	[1] 329,000	1,316,000
Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1973	700,000	[1] 600,000			1,300,000
National Educational Opportunities Act		100,000	500,000	500,000	1,100,000
Urban Hospitals Emergency Assistance Act		200,000	335,000	525,000	1,060,000
Rolling Stock Utilization and Financing Act	1,020,000				1,020,000
Essential Rail Services Act	471,250	420,000	120,000		1,011,250
National Cooperative Housing Act	1,000,000				1,000,000
Federal Disaster Insurance Act	1,000,000				1,000,000
National Energy Development Bank Act	1,000,000				1,000,000
National Coal Gasification and Liquefaction Act	1,000,000				1,000,000
Natural and Human Resources Restoration and Conservation Act	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,000,000
National Catastrophic Disaster Insurance Act	1,000,000				1,000,000
National Growth Policy Employment Act	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,000,000
Total	75,163,722	52,767,571	49,680,196	31,117,569	208,729,058

[1] Projections.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, before we require constituents to assume new financial burdens, we ought to determine whether the new programs with expensive price tags are necessary. If they are necessary, we should determine whether such new activities are constitutional. If they are both necessary and constitutional, we should determine whether we can afford them.

We cannot take comfort with a moratorium on new programs that we can do without. We cannot be content with elimination of waste, ending of duplication, and consolidation of similar activities. Outdated programs that have outlived their public purpose and usefulness should be terminated. Programs should be shifted from the national to State and local levels, especially where such activities are not constitutional responsibilities of the Federal Government. A switch to the private sector of programs that are not proper functions of any Government, local, State, or national, is urgently needed.

The wholehearted cooperation of the Congress, the President, State and local officials, and private individuals, businesses, and organizations will be required if we are to accomplish these goals.

The following data, which is inserted to supplement that provided by the previous participants in this special order, includes bills that would cost at least $50 million but less than $100 million during the fiscal years 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977. The total cost of these bills for 4 years would be $2,988,843,000.

The data follows:

BILLS THAT WOULD COST AT LEAST $50,000,000 BUT UNDER $100,000,000 EACH DURING 4 YEARS

[Costs in thousands of dollars]

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Total
Criminal Justice Professions Development Act	35,250	40,250	[1] 22,650		98,150
Senior Citizens Job Corps Act	35,000	60,000			95,000
Military reservation conservation and rehabilitation programs	23,500	23,500	23,500	23,500	94,000
Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act	12,947	[1] 26,884	[1] 27,000	[1] 27,000	93,831
Bill of rights for the mentally retarded	30,000	30,000	30,000		90,000
Federal Drug Abuse Enforcement Reorganization Act	30,000	30,000	30,000		90,000
Construct, operate, and maintain Marias-Milk unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri basin program (Montana)	89,530				89,530
Mining and Mineral Resources Research Act	17,500	19,500	21,500	23,500	82,000
Establish Hells Canyon National Recreation Area (Idaho, Oregon, Washington)	81,500				81,500
Public and Allied Health Personnel Act	80,500				80,500
Women's Educational Equity Act		15,000	25,000	40,000	80,000
Child Advocacy Act	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
New England Regional Development Act	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
Earthquake Prevention and Prediction Research Act	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
Neighborhood Service Centers Act	20,000	25,000	35,000		80,000
Offender Employment and Training Act	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
District of Columbia Urban Development Corporation Act	77,000				77,000
National Arthritis Act	500	15,500	25,000	35,000	76,000
Export Expansion Act	37,700	37,700			75,400
Establish Asian Studies Institute	15,000	15,000	20,000	25,000	75,000
Property Tax Relief and Reform Act	20,000	25,000	30,000		75,000
Federal Child Support Security Act	75,000				75,000
Establish Big Thicket National Preserve (Texas)	70,812				70,812
Construct, operate, and maintain certain divisions of Central Valley project (California)		1,000	19,000	47,000	67,000
Federal Election Campaign Act amendments	20,500	20,500	20,500	5,500	67,000
Make Washington metropolitan area rail system available to handicapped	65,000				65,000
National Diabetes Research and Education Act	500	12,500	20,000	30,000	63,000
Establish Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area (Georgia)	62,000				62,000
International Commerce Service Act	31,000	31,000			62,000
Campuses for the Elderly Act	15,070	15,000	15,000	15,000	60,070
Develop national scenic and recreational highway program	30,000	30,000			60,000
Natural Game Fish Stream Preservation Act	30,000	30,000			60,000
Establish Santa Monica Mountain and Seashore National Urban Park (California)	30,000	30,000			60,000
Hemophilia Act	10,000	20,000	30,000		60,000
Amateur Athletic Act	51,850	1,100	1,100		54,050
Heroin addiction treatment and prevention	50,000				50,000
Ethnic Heritage Studies Act	20,000	30,000			50,000
Regional Seed-Money Corporation Act	18,800	31,200			50,000
Establish Trust Fund for the Supervision of Private Foundations	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	50,000
Home Preservation Act	50,000				50,000
Demonstration program to provide direct financing of housing for elderly	50,000				50,000
Increased contributions to Special Funds of Asian Development Bank	50,000				50,000
Total	1,428,959	708,134	487,750	364,000	2,988,843

[1] Projections.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, we who are participating in this special order hope that the data about spending measures will be of benefit to our colleagues in this body as well as the one at the other end of the Capitol. There are also two other groups—actually they are one, because they have the same membership—taxpayers and voters, who will be interested in such information.

Sooner or later there will be a day of fiscal reckoning, when the taxpayers will have to put up the money to pay for such extravagant new programs as become law. Sooner or later there will be a day of political reckoning, when the voters will replace irresponsible spenders with men who will show a greater concern for the fiscal well-being of their constituents.

Fortunately, most of the expensive bills that we have been discussing this afternoon will expire in committee pigeonholes as far as the present Congress is concerned, but many of them, as well as some newcomers, will be deposited in the hoppers when the next Congress enters upon its labors. All too many of them will be put on the statute books and the taxpayers will find their burdens heavier than ever.

At this point in my remarks I would like to insert another listing of the spending proposals that have been mentioned. Each of the measures in the list would cost at least $100 million but less than $500 million during the next 4 fiscal years, 1974 through 1977. The total cost would be $23,345,755,000 for that period.

The listing follows:

BILLS THAT WOULD COST A LEAST $100,000,000 BUT UNDER $500,000,000 EACH DURING 4 YEARS

[Costs in thousands of dollars]

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Totals
Correctional Services Improvement Act	340,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	460,000
Amend Public Works and Economic Development Act (new programs)	150,000	150,000	[1] 150,000		450,000
Conversion Research and Education Act		100,000	150,000	200,000	450,000
Urban Recreational Opportunities Act	150,000	200,000	[1] 100,000		450,000
Establish Fire Protection Assistance Administration	100,000	150,000	200,000		450,000
Opportunities Industrialization Assistance Act	100,000	150,000	200,000		450,000
Fare-Free Mass Transportation Demonstration Act	150,000	150,000	150,000		450,000
Public Broadcasting Financing Act	80,000	100,000	120,000	140,000	440,000
National Environmental Center Act	148,750	72,500	72,500	22,500	406,250
		[1] 40,000		[1] 50,000	
Police Compensation Act	100,000	[1] 100,000	[1] 100,000	[1] 100,000	400,000
Make Martin L. King, Jr.'s, birthday legal public holiday	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000
Department of Education Act	200,000	200,000			400,000
Teachers' Sabbatical Leave Act	100,000	[1] 100,000	[1] 100,000	[1] 100,000	400,000
Make John F. Kennedy's birthday legal holiday	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000
Make United States Flag Day legal public holiday	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000
Spirit of '76 High Speed Rail Act	400,000				400,000
National Institute of Health Care Delivery Act	115,000	130,000	145,000		390,000
Eliminate railway-highway crossing hazards	150,000	225,000			375,000
Food Distribution Act	75,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	375,000
National Multiple Sclerosis and Epilepsy Act	100,000	125,000	150,000		375,000
Middle-Aged and Older Workers Employment and Community Service Act	140,000	210,000			350,000
Basic Commodities and Energy Resources Mass Transportation Assistance Act	100,000	125,000	125,000		350,000
State Court Assistance Act	50,500	73,500	93,500	132,000	349,500
Panama Canal Modernization Act	45,000	[1] 100,556	[1] 100,556	[1] 100,556	346,668
Low rent housing projects crime prevention	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	320,000
Develop training in family medicine	110,000	160,000	[1] 50,000		320,000
Surface Mining Reclamation Act	130,100	78,650	61,200	43,750	313,700
Smogless Vehicle Development Act	100,000	100,000	100,000		300,000
Loans to small businesses to help them comply with certain laws	75,000	100,000	125,000		300,000
Rural Health Care Delivery Improvement Act	75,000	100,000	125,000		300,000
Federal Election Campaign Financing Act	120,000		170,000		290,000
Child Development Personnel Training Act	60,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	285,000
Gifted and Talented Children's Educational Assistance Act	80,000	97,000	104,000		281,000
Trade Improvement Act	280,000				280,000
Olders Workers Conservation Corps Act	130,000	150,000			280,000
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act	274,700				274,700
Automobile Driver Education and Highway Safety Act	85,000	85,000	85,000		255,000
Senior Citizens Skill and Talent Utilization Act	75,000	125,000	[1] 50,000		250,000
Older Americans Community Service Employment Act	100,000	150,000			250,000
American Forestry Act	100,000	150,000			250,000
Rail Passenger Service Development Act	50,000	100,000	100,000		250,000
Federal Election Campaign Fund Act			150,000	100,000	250,000
Light on crime program	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	240,000
Accelerated Indian reservation road program	75,000	75,000	75,000		225,000
Technology Resources Survey and Applications Act	10,000	210,000			220,000
National Research Service Award Act	215,947	3,000			218,947
Emergency Rail Services Act Amendments	210,000				210,000
Air Transportation Security Act	55,500	50,000	50,000	50,000	205,500
Resource Conservation and Recycling Incentives Act	76,500	50,000	75,000		201,500
National Resource and Energy Conservation Act	51,500	25,000	50,000	75,000	201,500
Coal Mine Surface Area Protection Act	125,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	200,000
Federal Oil and Gas Corporation Act	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	200,000
Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendment of 1973	200,000				200,000
Make Election Day legal public holiday	100,000		100,000		200,000
Minority Business Assistance and Community Economic Development Act	95,000	[1] 95,000			190,000
Animal Health Research Act	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	180,000
Indian Self-Determination and Educational Reform Act	40,000	62,750	133,000	128,000	363,750
Elementary School Reading Emphasis Act	61,010	55,010	60,010	10	176,040
Public Health Act	80,000	90,000			170,000
Safe Drinking Water Act	33,000	56,000	76,300		165,300
Tutorial services for homebound children	55,000	[1] 55,000	[1] 55,000		165,000
Kidney Disease Treatment and Prevention Act	27,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	162,000
National Oil Recycling Act	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	160,000
Federal Election Finance Act	40,000	[1] 40,000	[1] 40,000	[1] 40,000	160,000
Establish abandoned automobile removal programs	38,000	38,000	38,000	[1] 38,000	152,000
Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act	75,000	[1] 75,000			150,000
Pacific South-West Water Yield Improvement Act	150,000				150,000
Financial Institutions Act	150,000				150,000
National Islands Conservation and Recreation Act			75,000	75,000	150,000
Service, Employment, and Redevelopment Assistance Act	30,000	35,000	40,000	40,000	145,000
Hospital services for domestic agricultural migrant workers (new program)	25,000	35,000	40,000	45,000	145,000
Children's Dental Health Act	48,000	69,000	[1] 25,000		142,000
Voter Registration Assistance Act	45,000	45,000	45,000		135,000
Fire Prevention and Control Act	42,500	40,000	45,000		127,500
Consumer Protection Organization Act	36,500	61,500	25,000		123,000
Museum Services Act	40,000	40,000	40,000		120,000
Speedy Trial Act	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	120,000
Federal Grain Insurance Act	105,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	120,000
Bilingual Job Training Act	20,000	40,000	60,000		120,000
Petroleum Reserves and Import Policy Act	20,000	50,000	50,000		120,000
Establish Big Cypress National Preserve (Florida)	116,900				116,900
Establish Congressional Center for the Study of Domestic and International Policy	115,000				115,000
National Chronicare Demonstration Center Act	45,500	37,500	32,000		115,000
Supplementary Education Services for the Handicapped Act	30,000	37,500	45,000		112,500

Footnote at end of table.

BILLS THAT WOULD COST AT LEAST $100,000,000 BUT UNDER $500,000,000 EACH DURING 4 YEARS—Continued

[Costs in thousands of dollars]

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Totals
Noise Abatement and Control Act	17,000	25,000	32,000	37,000	111,000
Indian Financing Act	70,000	20,000	20,000		110,000
Gold Mines Assistance Act	15,000	15,000	25,000	50,000	105,000
Retirement Income Security for Employees Act	35,000	35,000	35,000		105,000
Fisheries Development Act	27,000	33,500	41,000		103,500
		[1] 1,000	[1] 1,000		
Advance transportation technology	101,000				101,000
National Centers for Spinal Cord Injuries	15,000	25,000	30,000	[1] 30,000	100,000
International Health Agency Act	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	100,000
Small Business Crime Insurance Act	100,000				100,000
Great Lakes Basin Conservation Act	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	100,000
Disaster Preparedness and Assistance Act	100,000				100,000
Community Anticrime Assistance Act	50,000	50,000			100,000
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act	100,000				100,000
Forestry Incentives Act	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	100,000
Motor Vehicle Disposal Assistance Act	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	100,000
Total	8,656,907	6,566,966	5,530,066	2,591,816	23,345,755

[1] Projections.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the ability of some of my colleagues in both Houses of the Congress to keep thinking up new spending programs never ceases to astonish me. Such measures overflow the hopper year after year. The hard-earned money of our fellow Americans would be showered from coast to coast, from border to border—and even throughout the world—if but a few of these massive spending bills become law.

No matter how much money taxpayers must send to the Nation's Capital, the spenders will dream up new and more ways of getting rid of it. Not only will they add to current authorizations and appropriations, but they will also mortgage the future by creating new programs that will become built-in guarantees for increases in future budgets. Federal tax payments must be supplemented by other payments to statehouses and city halls because of matching requirements imposed on State and local governments by Washington.

A study that has been prepared at my request demonstrates convincingly that balanced budgets in the foreseeable future are a fiscal mirage. Deficit will follow deficit, there will be more and greater borrowing at presumably higher and higher interest rates, more and worse inflation, and ever escalating prices. When and where will it all end?

The study, which is necessarily incomplete because the flow of bills never ceases, covers more than 450 measures which would, if all became law, necessitate spending a grand total of $871,363,307,000 during fiscal years 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977.

Considerable restraint was exercised during the compilation, or the total would have become even more frightening—close to the trillion-dollar mark. Where measures set up programs for less than 4 years, no projections were made for the balance of the period unless it was self-evident that, once established, such activities would continue indefinitely.

For instance, a program may require an authorization of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1974 and "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal years 1975 and 1976. If the bill creates a 3-year program, $50,000,000 has been projected for each of the second and third years.

Another example of what justifies a projection would be a bill calling for the establishment of a program for assisting victims of a crippling disease. The bill may call for authorizations of $25 million for each of the next 3 years. Inasmuch as there will probably be victims of such a disease during the fourth year, an additional $25 million has been projected.

While a good many measures use the phrase "such sums as may be necessary" or similar expressions, little attempt has been made to ascertain how much such bills would cost during the years covered by such language. A good many billions could probably be added to the already astronomical total.

A researcher encounters many difficulties when he attempts to attach price-tags to pending legislation. While some bills authorize definite amounts for definite fiscal years, others that authorize definite appropriations fail to mention fiscal year periods. Yet other measures include only an authorization for "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act."

To make matters even more complicated, some authorizations are for 2 or 3 fiscal years, while others are for 9 or 10 years, and still others authorize the appropriation of specific amounts to continue year after year, ad infinitum. It would obviously be rather difficult to come up with a single meaningful cost total.

The study necessitated a review of more than 17,000 bills and joint resolutions, but new ones are being offered every day that one or both bodies are in session. In order to make the resulting data usable, certain guidelines were drawn up. Dollar totals were developed for each of the fiscal years 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977 as well as a grand total. These totals take account of the projections that I mentioned earlier.

Where the same or similar bills have been introduced in both bodies, or more than once in the same body, the authorization figures were included only once, using, in most instances, the highest funding level where variations in cost occurred. Because the study covers only newly established programs or legislation that vastly expands or changes the direction of existing ones, it excludes—I repeat, excludes—such important categories as the following:

First. Bills authorizing appropriations for the simple extension of existing programs.

Second. Bills relating to defense and military spending.

Third. Bills authorizing appropriations for established public works programs.

Fourth. Bills establishing repayable loan operations similar to the rural telephone bank.

Fifth. Bills providing income tax deductions, exclusions, credits, or incentives.

Sixth. Bills increasing benefits or modifying coverage under social security, veterans, civil service, and railroad retirement pension programs.

Seventh. Bills costing less than $1 million for at least one of the 4 years.

Eighth. Bills where no specific dollar figures were included in the authorizing language and no cost estimates are available.

Let us now proceed to analyze a few of the study's results and implications.

The more than 450 measures included in the study represent proposed expenditures for fiscals 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977 of $228,606,895,000, $214,163,678,000, $237,797,239,000, and $190,795,495,000, respectively. The grand total for 4 years—fasten your seatbelts—is $871,363,307,000.

The proposed expenditures for fiscal 1975 of $214,163,678,000 amount to 70.35 percent of the $304,445,000,000 outlays proposed by the President for that year.

The budget outlook to 1979, which appears in the President's budget for fiscal 1975, estimates that outlays for fiscal 1976 will total $329,000,000,000. This is the figure that would result if restraint is exercised. If all the bills included in the study were enacted into law, they would add $237,797,239,000 to the fiscal 1976 total, an addition of 72.28 percent.

The following tabulation contains just a few of the more than 450 bills that I have been discussing. Each of the bills in the tabulation would cost at least $10 billion during the 4-year period, or $610,374,000,000 for the entire package for fiscals 1974 through 1977.

The tabulation follows:

BILLS THAT WOULD COST AT LEAST $10,000,000,000 EACH DURING 4 YEARS

[Costs in thousands of dollars]

Title or description	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Totals
Health Security Act		50,100,000	100,200,000	100,200,000	250,500,000
Children's Allowances Act	6,600,000	9,350,000	12,100,000	14,850,000	42,900,000
Public Service Employment Act	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	40,000,000
Housing and Community Development Act	14,043,000	7,944,000	7,945,000		29,932,000
National Growth Policy Planning Act	8,086,000	8,585,000	9,065,000	565,000	26,301,000
National Education Investment Act	12,500,000	12,500,000			25,000,000
Small Communities Planning, Development, and Training Act	8,001,000	8,500,000	[1] 7,500,000		24,001,000
Energy Conservation and Development Trust Fund Act	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	23,600,000
Multifamily Housing Rehabilitation Act	20,000,000				20,000,000
Public School Improvement and Desegregation Act	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	20,000,000
Community Preschool Opportunity Act	2,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	7,000,000	16,000,000
Water Pollution Control Trust Fund Act	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	16,000,000
National Energy Resources Improvement Act	15,250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	16,000,000
Employment Opportunities Act	7,000,000	7,000,000			14,000,000
Elementary and Secondary Education Assistance Act	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000		13,500,000
Highways and Related Transportation Systems Improvement Act	2,750,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	12,500,000
Schoolchildren's Assistance Act	5,070,000	[1] 5,070,000			10,140,000
General Education Assistance Act	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	10,000,000
Total	133,200,000	147,449,000	176,210,000	153,515,000	610,374,000

[1] Projections.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in connection with a special order taken today by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

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

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL PAPERWORK BURDEN: TWO ADDITIONAL WORTHWHILE PIECES OF LEGISLATION

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

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, Senator THOMAS MCINTYRE is the sponsor of two pieces of legislation in the other body, relating to the Federal paperwork burden, which have been the objects of hearings before the Senate Government Operations Committee. Each represents a desirable and sensible proposal.

Unfortunately, these measures have not been introduced in the House and I feel that their inclusion in the overall consideration of the paperwork problem here in the House is vital and imperative. I am, therefore, sponsoring these bills today, as part of my legislative program relating to the matter and in conjunction with the Federal Paperwork Burden Relief Act, H.R. 12181.

One of the pieces of legislation seeks to lessen, to the greatest possible extent, the onerous reporting requirements from the very beginning—at the development and reporting of legislation by the various congressional committees. This strikes at one of the seed causes of the establishment of reporting requirements.

The second measure I am introducing would bring the Internal Revenue Service under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reports Act and would transfer authority for administration of the law from the OMB to the Comptroller General of the United States. This is where I feel such authority belongs.

Excellent testimony in behalf of the two proposals has been presented by the National Federation of Independent Business, before the Senate committee. I submit the statement of Mr. Frederick L. Williford, NFIB Director of Government Affairs, for the consideration of my House colleagues. I fully support and endorse the objectives of the two bills in question which I today submit.

They relate to further avenues we might explore in dealing with the very serious and increasingly difficult paperwork problem.

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK L. WILLIFORD

Before: Committee on Government Operations.

Subject: S. 1812 and S. 200.

Date: September 12, 1973.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the Committee, I am Frederick L. Williford, Director of Government Affairs, for the National Federation of Independent Business.

The National Federation of Independent Business is the largest single member business organization in the United States. And, on behalf of its more than 350,000 member firms, I wish to thank you for this opportunity to testify on these two worthwhile pieces of legislation—S. 1812 and S. 200.

NFIB's member firms range across a broad spectrum of the Nation's economy and represent a true and accurate cross-section of the American small business community. The majority of them are proprietorships and partnerships. More than 85% of these firms employ less than twenty people and over 35% have gross sales under $200,000 per year.

Because so many of these firms are relatively small, their total economic impact is often overlooked. This is distressing to the small businessman. The following analysis demonstrates the important role played by the Federation's members in the everyday economic life of the States represented by the Members of this Committee.

In your fifteen States, NFIB has 115,251 member firms. They employ almost 851,000 of your constituents and have gross annual sales of approximately $15.9 billion.

Because of NFIB's diverse composition and its unique practices of regularly polling its membership on important legislative issues, we are convinced that NFIB accurately portrays the beliefs and attitudes of the vast majority of the small, independent businessmen of America.

GOVERNMENT PAPERWORK: ITS IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS

Earlier this year in a speech before the Senate, Senator Alan Bible of Nevada, the Chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, stated quite bluntly that, "the cold, hard fact is that the Federal Government is burying the small businessman under an avalanche of paper." Unfortunately, a sampling of the attitudes of Federation members on this subject shows the accuracy of the Senator's assessment.

The burdensome and suffocating impact of bureaucratic red tape and paperwork is one of the most common and continuous complaints voiced by NFIB's member firms. Government inspired paperwork, whether it be for data collection, legislative enforcement or other purposes, seems to openly clash with their beliefs about the nature of small business and the free enterprise system. It tends to contradict their image of the aggressive and independent spirit of the Nation's small entrepreneurs.

Most small businessmen complain that Government paperwork is both time-consuming and costly. And, according to recent studies, their statements are accurate. *The Federal Paperwork Burden*, a 1973 Report of the Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Government Regulation stated that the Office of Management and Budget estimated that the Federal Government requires about 130.5 million man-hours of work per year from those who fill out and file its forms. The reporting burden for small business alone, between the end of 1966 and the end of 1971, increased by over 10 million man hours. This "Federal Forms Pollution," as Senator McIntyre aptly describes this appalling phenomenon, costs the small business community over $18 billion dollars per year.

The familiar adage that time is money in business can be applied even more aptly to small business. Most small businessmen are deeply involved in the day to day operations of their firms. Their time is a valuable commodity and the researching of the accounting and statistical records needed to fill out Government forms is non-productive work. This time must be taken from normal income-producing activities and can have a critical impact upon a small, struggling enterprise.

Some time ago NFIB tried to gauge the degree of involvement of its members in this time-consuming activity. It was startled to discover that in almost a quarter of the firms examined (24%), the owner completed the required Federal forms. Only 6% of the small businesses surveyed contracted this work out to accountants, while in the remaining 70% both the owner and his staff were involved. In other words, in 94% of the firms examined, both the owner and his staff were engaged in considerable non-productive work.

As previously noted, non-productive work can have a critical impact upon a struggling small business. It is extremely difficult for small firms to absorb these non-essential costs. They simply do not have the resources to support non-productive employees. Nor do they have a labor force large enough to spread out the per unit cost of this paper-

work. This places them at an immediate competitive disadvantage. Big business does have the sales volume to distribute these costs, plus the resources to seek out and employ the experts capable of cutting or offsetting them entirely.

Congress has long recognized the adverse impact of Federal paperwork requirements upon small, independent business. In 1942 it passed the Federal Reports Act, which declared it "the policy of the Congress that information which may be needed by various Federal agencies should be obtained with a minimum burden upon business enterprises (especially small business enterprises) and other persons required to furnish such information."

In a recent speech before his colleagues, Senator McIntyre, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Regulation and the author of S. 200 and S. 1812, detailed his opinion of how the Reports Act was intended to redress this competitive disadvantage. He said that:

"It recognized the disparity of resources between small businesses and large firms which have staffs of accountants and lawyers to undertand and fill out extensive paperwork forms. It sought to protect small business from the competitive disadvantages of having to spend precious resources just to comply with Federal paperwork demands."

In addition to this early interest, several Committees in both Houses of Congress have studied the inordinate burden Federal paperwork places upon small business. Chief among these is the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, which has conducted a very valuable and comprehensive study of this problem. Its 1968 and 1973 Reports are just the first fruits of its continuing probe, but they provide the foundation for the legislation that you are considering today.

Despite this Congressional interest and the vigilance of the Select Committee, "Federal Forms Pollution" continues unchecked. In fact, Federal forms are proliferating faster today than ever before.

The total paperwork burden of a typical small business has more than doubled over the past ten years. A small firm with about fifty employees is required to complete and file between 75 and 80 forms a year. During a recent three year period, from 1965 to 1968, approximately 1,200 new Federal forms were approved by OMB, while the reporting burden for small business alone increased by over 10 million man-hours between the end of 1966 and 1971.

A depressing and somewhat frightening example of this proliferation was recently provided to Congressman Tom Railsback of Illinois by one of his small business constituents—the Moline Tool Company. Its President supplied the Congressman with a list of the Government reports and forms that it filled out between January 1st and April 30th, 1972. The list contained a total of 49 entries—23 Federal and 26 State forms. (See Appendix A.)

Tax forms are the largest single source of small business paperwork. It is estimated that the Internal Revenue Service, which is not subject to the Federal Reports Act of 1942, is responsible for about 35% of all the Federal forms in use today. Over the past four years, the number of tax forms listed in the IRS's *Tax Guide for Small Business* has more than paperwork to eliminate unnecessary duplication and to simplify required forms. According to Senator McIntyre, the 1942 law "contained the potential for holding in check the tendency of the executive bureaucracy to demand even more data from small business."

From the small business viewpoint, this well-intentioned law has failed miserably.

Judging solely upon the facts presented previously, the National Federation of Independent Business concurs completely and wholeheartedly with the conclusions reached by Senator McIntyre's Subcommittee on Government Regulation. It found that "the Office of Management and Budget is not adequately administering the Federal Reports Act of 1942," and that "OMB has also shown a consistent lack of initiative in rigorously pursuing the directives" of the Act. The Subcommittee also noted that the 1942 law had been "ineffective in controlling the proliferation of Federal paperwork due to lack of authority over IRS and the ineffective administration of the Act by OMB." It concluded further that "if the paperwork burden is to be brought under control, Congress must look elsewhere than to OMB for any real and effective improvement."

Based upon these findings, the Subcommittee recommended the consideration and adoption of legislation to bring the Internal Revenue Service under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reports Act and to transfer authority for administration of the law from OMB to the Comptroller General of the United States. These recommendations are embodied in Senator McIntyre's bill—S. 1812—which you are considering today.

The Federation feels this legislation is long overdue and urges you to report it as soon as possible. OMB has had 32 years to make the Federal Reports Act work and it has failed. NFIB feels that it is time to let someone else carry the ball before it is too late for small business.

S. 200—AN INTERESTING SUGGESTION

During its detailed explanation of the small business paperwork burden the Subcommittee stated that many small businessmen "feel that Government seems geared to the needs of big business." Upon reading further it becomes clear that the Subcommittee is referring to the Agencies and Departments of the Executive Branch. Yet, these sentiments could be just as easily applied to the Congress, and especially to those Committees that must deal with politically powerful interest groups.

Hearings and debates on legislation that is vital to the future of small business are often conducted with absolutely no interest in their impact upon this sector of the economy. Big government, big labor and big business are all consulted and listened to attentively, while small business is either not taken seriously or intentionally ignored. This is what happened with tax reform in 1969 and with OSHA a year later.

Often, Congressional enactments will have an unintentional but devastating impact upon small business. This is especially true of the bureaucratic red tape and paperwork connected with their implementation and enforcement.

The Federation realizes that the collection of information and the posting of complicated regulations is absolutely necessary in some instances. But, it is also very much aware that these forms and regulations can have a critical impact upon small business. Consequently, NFIB feels that everything humanly possible should be done to make the Members of Congress cognizant of any additional burden their actions may place upon the Nation's small business community.

Senator McIntyre's Subcommittee, in addition to S. 1812, recommends the adoption of S. 200—a bill that would, in effect, require each Senate Committee to issue a small business paperwork impact statement along with any legislation it reported for Senate action. This would be accomplished by amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

The Federation realizes that adoption of this legislation would place an added burden upon an already overworked Senate staff. It can accept this as a valid reason for inaction in this area, yet, at the same time, it must stress that S. 200 is a unique and interesting solution to a very real problem and, as such, merits your sincere attention. Awareness that the problem exists is the key—it is also the solution.

The National Federation of Independent Business considers it a privilege to have had this opportunity to testify before this distinguished Committee. We hope our testimony is useful to you in your deliberations and we stand ready to be of assistance at any time in our mutual efforts in behalf of small and independent business.

Mr. Chairman, should the Members of the Committee have any questions regarding my testimony, I shall be happy to try and answer them.

Thank you.

APPENDIX A: GOVERNMENT REPORTS AND FORMS FILED BY MOLINE TOOL CO. FROM JANUARY 1, 1972 THROUGH APRIL 30, 1972

FEDERAL FORMS

Federal Unemployment Fourth Quarter 1971.
F.I.C.A. Wages Paid Fourth Quarter 1971.
Withholding Taxes 12–31–71.
Withholding Taxes 1–15–72.
Withholding Taxes 1–31–72.
Withholding Taxes 2–15–72.
Bureau of Commerce Annual Report Form MA100.
O.S.H.A. Report.
W–2's for 1971.
1099's for Dividend.
1096—Summary of 1099's.
Federal Income Tax Extension.
Federal Trade Commission Form MG–3 (P&L).
F.I.C.A. 3–15–72.
F.I.C.A. 3–31–72.
First Quarter F.I.C.A.
First Quarter Federal Unemployment.
MQ35–W Survey of Business on Hand and Shipments.
MQ35–W Supplement.
F.I.C.A. 4–15–72.
F.I.C.A. 4–30–72.

STATE FORMS

State Unemployment Fourth Quarter 1971.
State Unemployment Report Form DL 1219.
State Income Taxes Withheld 1–15–72.
State W–3 Report of Wages.
State Income Taxes Withheld 2–15–72.
State Income Tax Extension.
Illinois Sales Tax Report 1–31–72.
Illinois Sales Tax Report 2–28–72.
Illinois Local Unemployment Office Report—Expected Employment.
Illinois Form DL 1219—State Unemployment.
State—Statement of Products BLS 790 Illinois Department of Labor.
State of Illinois Annual Report.
Illinois Local Unemployment Office Report—Expected Employment.
State DL 1219 Job Openings and Labor Turnover.
Illinois Unemployment Investigation.
State Income Taxes Withheld 3–15–72.
State DL 1219.
State Annual Sales Tax Report.
State Annual Income Tax Payment.
Illinois First Quarter State Unemployment.
4/21 Illinois Form 1219.
4/28 Illinois Sales Tax.
3/31 Illinois Sales Tax.
4/28 Illinois ISES–8/1—Department of Labor.
DL 1219 for May.
4/15 State Income Taxes Withheld.

APPENDIX B: TAX FORMS FILED BY MR. VOSEN FOR HIS SMALL BUSINESS CLIENTS

FEDERAL FORMS

940: Federal Unemployment Tax Return, January 31st.

941: Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return, January 31st.

W–2: Wage and Tax Statement (one for each employee), January 31st.

W–3: Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statements, January 31st.

1099: U.S. Information Return on Commissions, Dividends, and Interests, January 31st.

1096: Transmittal Return for Form 1099, February 28th.

1120, 1120S: Corporation Income Tax Return, March 15th.

1165: Partnership Income Tax Return, April 15th.

1040: Individual Income Tax Return, April 15th.

STATE FORMS

IT-941: State Return of Income Tax Withheld, January 31st.

IT-3: Reconciliation of Ohio Income Tax; Withheld and Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statement, January 31st.

UCO2: Employer's Contribution Report (State Unemployment Tax Report), January 31st.

DP21: State Workmen's Compensation Report, January 31st.

FT-1120: Corporation Franchise Tax Report ,January 31st.

IT-1040: Ohio Individual Income Tax Return, April 15th.

938-939: Security Valuation and Investor's List, March 31st.

ST-10: Semi-Annual Sales Tax Return, February 28th.

COUNTY FORMS

Tangible and Intangible Personal Property Tax Returns for Individuals; Proprietorships, and Corporations, April 30th.

CITY FORMS

Employer's Quarterly Withheld Municipal Tax Return, January 31st.

Reconciliation of Municipal Income Tax Withheld and Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statement, January 31st.

City Business Returns and City Individual Income Tax Returns, April 30th.

THE SKY IS THE LIMIT

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 House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, voted last week to table a bill to extend the Economic Stabilization Act. Unfortunately, at the same time the committee also tabled bills that would have created new standby authority to deal with our chronic and growing inflation problem.

I opposed the Economic Stabilization Act from the beginning, because it handed the President unprecedented powers over the national economy—powers such as no other President had ever held before, in time of peace or war. Moreover, these dictatorial powers were granted without requiring any accountability for their use. Congress did not require detailed reports from the President on his administration of the Stabilization Act. The Congress, let alone the people of this country, have never been told who violated the wage and price regulations, let alone the penalties, if any, that were exacted from major violators. I have a feeling that if the President had been required to explain and justify his actions, as I advocated, the wage and price control program could certainly have been administered more fairly than it was, and it probably would have been more effective.

Congress was mistaken in granting the President excessive powers in the first place. Last year the error was compounded when Congress extended the Economic Stabilization Act in the face of clear evidence that its vast powers were being abused, and that the wage and price control program was largely ineffective. The people were disappointed, and growing disillusioned, but Congress decided to give the President another chance.

This year, with the wage and price control program in a shambles, and with the public clearly disillusioned, Congress is not offering any leadership, as it should. The action of the Banking and Currency Committee was in effect a joint throwing up of hands, giving up on any effort at all to control inflation.

Yet inflation is about the most serious problem confronting our country today. The majority of people can no longer afford to buy, or even rent, decent housing. The cost of food has gone up by astounding amounts, and there is no end in sight. People are literally unable to afford decent food for themselves. Utility bills, clothing, gasoline and every other essential of life is being priced out of the reach of all but the luckiest among us. In the face of this, Congress can hardly afford to throw up its hands and do nothing.

I believed last year, and still believe, that Congress should create an economic controls program that is effective, just, and responsive to the needs and desires of the American people. Obviously, making the President into an economic dictator did not work last year, and it will not work now.

I recommended to my colleagues that the Committee vote down an extension of the Economic Stabilization Act, which clearly has not worked. But I also called for creation of a standby authority that would monitor events, find out what the real causes of inflation are, and recommend a program to deal with it. In this way, Congress could act on a positive program, rather than merely sign another blank check of Presidential authority. Moreover, such an approach would, as I pointed out last year, enable Congress to keep its eye and hand on the economic reins, so that we could be sure that whatever program is created works and responds to the real needs of the American people.

It will be a while before the results of the failure of Congress to act are felt. The existing controls program will last until April 30. After that there will be no wage and price control of any kind. I expect that very large price increases will soon follow, and of course many wage demands will increase likewise. But it is unlikely that wages will ever catch up to the price spiral.

AFRICAN SAFARI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, last December I visited Africa to participate as Cochairman at the Fourth African-American Dialogue Conference. Accompanying me to the conference and throughout my subsequent tour of several African countries, was Mr. W. O. Walker, editor and publisher of the Call and Post of Cleveland.

Mr. Walker has written a series of illuminating articles, full of his notes and observations as a black American. He has entitled the series, "African Safari: An Odyssey into an Awakening Continent." I take the liberty of reprinting the entire series here.

AFRICAN SAFARI: AN ODYSSEY INTO AN AWAKENING CONTINENT

(By William O. Walker)

Safari is a Swahali word from the mother tongue meaning journey.

When you travel almost half way around the world, meeting old, staid European (Paris) culture and dialoguing with awakening and challenging Africans you can truthfully say you have been on a safari.

Modern travel with its fast flying planes, is hard on your physical body. When, within six hours you ask your body to move that far ahead in time and adjust to the change, don't be surprised at what happens.

The six hour flight from New York to Paris via Air France was nothing unusual. The service and cuisine was mediocre.

The first shock of the trip was arriving in Paris and finding out that your baggage didn't make it. Imagine how it feels to contemplate three weeks in strange places without your clothes that you so meticulously packed lost somewhere between Paris and New York. When several hours later your baggage catches up with you, what a relief. This is one of the hazards of modern, fast traveling.

Paris, with its eternal buildings and seemingly indestructible Eiffel Tower, is the same in appearance as I last saw it 28 years ago. Hustlers and sharpies are the same the world over. There are plenty of them in Paris.

The war, one, two and all the other skirmishes, have introduced Negroes to many places. Paris is no different. Former war correspondent Ollie Ollie Steward of the Afro-American newspapers, who refused to return to jim-crow America, is a landmark here and a welcome sight for those of us who can't speak French.

Another American, has traded his United States uniform for French citizenship. Attired in his chef's outfit, he welcomes you to his Paris soul food cafe. It's jampacked and we regret that we had eaten dinner before getting to his place.

Hayes is a Morehouse College graduate where he played football. He takes time out from his many hungry customers to reminisce about old times in the states.

The brother is seen in many places in Paris but not in the meaningful jobs. We are still the marginal worker. Perhaps the fact that we don't have to endure public segregation, has dulled our sensitiveness to economic ostracism.

Paris with its thousand year history, the depredations of its ruthless kings, the avariciousness of Napoleon and, now the loss of its fabled colonial empire, is a city with a doubtful future. It lives in its memories that rattle the granite buildings and trod its memorable streets. It seems that all of this past grandeur is locked up in the stone walls and cobblestone patios of Versailles. We thought about this as we trudged through the many rooms and halls of this historic palace.

The Paris airport LeBourget is where our flight to Africa begins. Once in the airport concourse, Africa shows.

Our flight is on Air Afrique. The service crew is mixed. African men, a colored hostess and two French hostesses. The pilots are French.

This crew took us as far as Dakar, Senegal. From here, the service crew is all African, mixed between men and women. The pilots are still French.

At Dakar, an American joined us. A brother. He is in charge of administering programs covering five countries, including all of those in the African drought area. He is an expert who has spent many years in African countries. I realized that he could

give us lots of the kind of information we wanted. So we talked. I asked him many questions and got some real background information. He went to Conakry, Guinea with us and then on to Bamaco, Mali.

GUINEA

We were met at the Conakry, Guinea airport by American Ambassador Todeman and several of his staff and officials of the Guinean government. Our processing through customs was handled by Mrs. Camara Sans, chief of protocol of the Guinea Foreign ministry.

We are now in the hot weather belt. Temperatures are in the eighties. When we left Paris that morning it was cold. This leg of the trip with stops at Marsielles and Dakar, has taken eight hours.

In the VIP lounge, where we waited for baggage and clearance, there was a delegation of Japanese. They are here we were told, to work out with the Guinean government, the building of a railroad to the bauxite and iron ore deposits in the mountains adjacent to the Liberian border.

Another delegation leaving, was officials from Zaire (formerly the Congo) who were in Conakry for official ceremonies.

The Ambassador and his staff, escorted us to Camayenne Guest House where we were to spend the two nights in Guinea.

Guinea is not as yet a rich country. However, the hospitality is most generous. We are guests of the Guinean government. Everything for our comfort was arranged. Our guest cottage faces the Atlantic ocean. We have a full two-day schedule.

"Guinea," Sekou Toure said to French general Charles DeGaul: "Would rather be poor and free than happy as a slave." The French thereupon pulled up stakes, taking everything they could, damaging valuable machinery and destroyed important records. Merchants closed up shops and most of them are still closed.

The people of Guinea are poor but proud. There is no begging or any effort to harass visitors for money or to buy something. In fact, we had trouble getting the men who served us at the guest cottage to accept any gratuity.

Why does a country rich in soil, minerals, climate and water, have to be poor. With all its natural resources, Guinea should have a much higher standard of living. Isolated by the French, it is having a difficult time getting capital to develop its resources.

We had about an hour and a half conference with President Sekou Toure in his office. He is more idealistic than practical. He wants the basis of his economy to be socialism. On his reception wall, is a large picture of Fidel Castro and another one of some Russians. When he gets his railroad built, he can start selling his minerals on the world market. At the present time, American firms are the developers.

Ambassador and Mrs. Todman gave an official reception for us. Among the many guests attending, was Stokley Carmichael. As you know he is making Guinea his home. His wife did not accompany him. There is some mystery as to why he selected Guinea and what he is doing to make a living.

MALI

We left Conakry early in the morning for Bamaka, Mali. This is the beginning of the drought area. Arriving we were surprised to see everything so green and plenty of water. At 7:00 A.M., the temperature was 74 degrees. This city is at the beginning of the navigable part of the Niger river. Since this was just the beginning of the dry season, the river was still navigable.

Bamako has its outlet to the sea via a railroad that runs to Dakar. Over this line comes much of the relief supplies the world is contributing to African family relief.

We were met by the American charge de affairs and went to his home for breakfast.

There is a world of difference between Conakry and Bamako. The streets are bustling with people and traffic is going in every direction. With so many people in the streets, you wonder who is working. However, there are many small shops tended mostly by Africans.

We called upon Captain Doukara, member of the ruling Supreme Council of the Government of Mali and in addition, is Minister of Defense in the cabinet.

He is responsible for the coordination of all emergency drought relief. We talked about drought conditions and the help he was getting from the United States. He had just visited America and was promised considerable help. In fiscal 1973–74, the U.S. has contributed a total of $11,872,900.

Our next stop was at the so-called gold market. This is part of a local market where there are many small shops that make jewelry. The market place was very colorful and crowded.

We are back on Air Afrique for the trip to Lagos via Abidjan in Ivory Coast. We make a much too short 2½ hour stop over the Abidjan. Met by an American Embassy official, we make a quick tour of the city, and then back on the plane for Lagos, Nigeria.

In Abidjan there seems to be more white at the economic core than African. The French are helping those who cowtow and fighting those who show independence.

NIGERIA

We made a brief stop in Accra, Ghana. Here we saw plans of the Ghanaian Air Line. This was the first African owned line. Kawame Nkruma started it. Now several African countries have their own airlines.

Arriving in Lagos, we are now in the largest and richest of Black African ruled nations. The key ingredient is oil. Americans have more invested in Nigeria than in any other African nation. In fact, South Africa is third in investments by U.S. firms.

The drive from the airport to our hotel took us through the main part of the city. Teeming with people and traffic, the streets are a drivers' nigthmare. Since there are no sidewalks, all traffic is in the streets.

The white man is where the money is in all of these African countries. Our hotel is white owned. The hotel restaurant is Chinese.

When we got to Lagos on Wednesday, we found ourselves in the middle of census taking. The government had decided that everybody had to be counted. Therefore, a three day holiday was declared. Government buildings and all stores and offices were closed. Nobody was supposed to leave home until they had been counted by the census taker. Evidence that you had been counted, was an indelible ink that was put on your thumb. You could be arrested if you had not been counted. So everybody was practically under house arrest.

The people as well as the government took this census taking serious.

We were guests of the Nigerian government and they spared no effort to make our stay enjoyable. Our schedule was so crowded that we had to cancel some of the appointments.

Our visit was capped off with an interview with the Head of State, General Yakubu Gowon. Ambassador J. T. F. Iyalla, Permanent Secretary set the interview up for us. We also talked with most of the top cabinet officials.

Lagos is a messed up city so far as planning is concerned. It has evidently grown so fast that no thought was given as to how and where it grew. The business district is crowded into an area too small. The streets are narrow and cannot accommodate the traffic.

Most of the clubs and houses formerly occupied by the English, are now in the hands of the Nigerians.

In West Africa, the women are subordinated. The men do all the work women do in other countries: maid work, laundry, cleaning, etc. In the hotels, all the waiters are men. Women in this part of Africa are shy and backward. Even when you encounter those who are wives of top officials, they are reticent and less talkative.

Nigeria is anxious to have Black Americans come over and invest in businesses. Officials told me that there are many opportunities for those with experience.

We met Lloyd LaBeach, former Olympic champion from California. He is head of Krimo Dairy Products. They control most of the distribution of milk in Lagos. Milk is imported in powdered form and reconverted. He has a very successful business. He has been here for 12 years. His wife is from Canton, Ohio.

William R. Ford, director of the United States Aid Mission to Nigeria, who is from a Detroit suburb, is one of the most dynamic and informed officials we met in all of Africa. He was the key man in making our stay in Lagos so profitable and enjoyable.

We were entertained on our last day in Lagos by Mr. & Mrs. Robert Fleming. They are white. He operates a flour mill and has good connections with Nigerian and American officials.

Other people we met in Lagos were: Dr. K. O. Mbadiwe, who is chairman of African Insurance Co. He received his education in America. J. J. Simmons, III of Muskogee, Okla., and New York City. He is a black who has made it good in the oil business. I first met Simmons in Columbus, Ohio when he was speculating in oil in the Mt. Gilead area. He now works for Amerada Hess Corp. of New York. The company is interested in Nigerian oil.

We met Thelma Robuck Aller. She is a Clevelander. A relative of the late Rev. Aller of Zion Baptist Church. Met Thomas A. Jonson, West African bureau chief of The New York Times.

Another American we met was Edgar Van Blake. He is an Agricultural specialist. The American government sent him to Nigeria to help develop a good strain of milk cattle. His sister is Mrs. Thomas Rush, who lives on E. 123 St. in Cleveland.

G. A. Adefioye & Sons are Nigerian importers and exporters. Mr. Adefioye is anxious to make connections with American Blacks who are interested in business. His firm deals in iron, cement and other commodities.

I visited the plant of The Daily Times in Lagos. I met the chairman and managing director Alhaji Babatunde Jose. This newspaper plant was formerly owned by Englishmen. Nigerians have bought all but 10% and Mr. Jose told me they would purchase all of this in March. The plant is modern and is operated entirely now by Nigerians. It is a daily paper.

Although some kind of a bug hit me during the last hours of our stay in Lagos, after treatment at the hospital I was able to board the Ethiopian Airlines plane Saturday night for Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Our first week visiting the West coast countries had been interesting. When we landed in Addis Ababa Sunday morning, we were in a different climate. It was cold. Addis Ababa is eight thousand feet above sea level, and this makes a big difference in climate.

Upon landing, we met several members of the American delegation to the Dialogue conference, who had just arrived from New York. I must say that the Ethiopian Airline is as good as any in America. The service was excellent. All the crew, pilots, etc., are Ethiopians.

Our week in Addis Ababa was one to remember. We stayed at the Hilton Hotel. The Dialogue meetings were held in the

New African Hall which is part of a new convention complex which is not yet fully finished.

We are now in the oldest black governed nation in the world. They date their history back to before Christ. The people here look different from those in West Africa. The women are more beautiful.

The streets of Addis Ababa are wide. The traffic moves smoothly. And, the streets are clean. There seemed to be less Asian and European involvement in retail business. This means that the profits from the retail trade are going largely into the pockets of Ethiopians. This is one of the big problems in most of the African countries we visited.

Sunday was an open day. I rested and tried to overcome the attack I had in Lagos. Monday and Tuesday were meetings of the Dialogue. On Wednesday, we took a bus and went some 60 miles into the hinterland. Here we got to see the country and how the people outside the cities live. We saw living and farming conditions that haven't changed much in the last century.

Most of Ethiopia is semi-arid. Water, therefore, is the great need. We visited Wonji Sugar Estates. Here some 6000 acres have been irrigated and sugar cane is grown. It is a veritable oasis in contrast to the surrounding land.

About 30,000 people live and work here. The cane is grown, harvested, processed into sugar right here. In addition, there is a candy manufacturing plant, as modern as anything in the USA and, all the production is done by Ethiopians. The management is under the direction of Belgians.

On this trip, we visited the National Malaria Eradication Training Centre at Nazareth. Malaria is a big health problem. This center, with U.S. government help, trains field workers, fumigates homes; sprays water holes and does research work.

Automobile traffic must share the roads with herds of cattle and scores of people walking. At one point, we shared the road with a camel caravan.

FOURTH DIALOGUE

The African-American Dialogue is sponsored by the African American Institute of New York. This was the fourth conference. All held in Africa.

Delegates are limited to Africans and Americans; biracial. The purpose is to promote better and closer social and commercial relations between Africa and America.

The meetings were held in the beautiful African Hall, set in the center of a new convention complex. His Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie delivered the opening address. Cong. Louis Stokes, a co-chairman, was on the committee to escort the Emperor.

The sessions of the Dialogue are not open to the public. This is to enable a much freer discussion of problems by the delegates, many of whom do not always express the views of their governments. Many of these delegates from Africa have been participants in the political revolutions that have and are changing the form and shape of many governments.

The main subjects on the agenda were: Economic Issues in African-American Relations; Southern African Issues in African-American Relations.

The discussions were frank, open and exploratory. The U.S. came in for much criticism for its policies with Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia. Aid to Israel vs aid to Africa came in for much discussion.

The caliber of delegates insured a high degree of factual information and sound views on the related problems. These were the heart of the Dialogue because it enabled each delegate to take back to his country information that could be most helpful in formulating programs and policies. The Dialogue closed on a strong note for a more active role of America in African development.

African countries represented were: Ethiopia, Nigeria, Ghana, KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, South Africa, Liberia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Lesotho, Simbabwe, Kenya, Zambia, Tunisia, Botswana.

Americans attending: Samuel C. Adams, Jr., Assistant Administrator Bureau of Africa; Julian Bond, Atlanta; Ronald H. Brown, National Urban League; Mrs. Goler T. Butcher, House Comm. on Foreign Affairs; Carter, U.S. Ambassador to Tanzania; William R. Cotter, president African-American Institute; Cong. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.; Robert H. Edwards, Ford Foundation; Louis B. Fleming, Los Angeles; J. Wayne Fredericks, Chase Manhattan Bank; Walter H. Gussenhoven, General Motors African Area; Dr. Vivian M. Henderson, Clark Univ., Atlanta; John Lewis, Voter Education Project, Atlanta; William Lucy, AFL–CIO, Memphis; Edward N. Ney, Young & Rubicam International, Inc., New York; Rev. Randolph Nugent, United Methodist Church, New York; William Reid, Riegal Textile Corp., South Carolina; Cong. Louis Stokes, Cleveland, and myself.

At the closing session, I was delegated to give the American summary. Dr. Vivian Henderson requested that the next session of the Dialogue be held in the United States, with Atlanta as the first choice. This will be taken into consideration.

There were many social affairs given for us in Addis Ababa. L. M. Marshall, U.S. Dept. of State was very helpful to us. He is stationed in Ethiopia. Topping them was a reception at the Imperial Palace as guests of Emperor Haile Selassie.

Another one was the invitation to have dinner in the home of an Ethiopian businessman. Here we enjoyed the hospitality of a middle upper class Ethiopian family. My hosts were Mr. and Mrs. Ato Dereje Deressa. He is general manager of Alem Public Relations. Also invited to share dinner with us, were two other Ethiopian businessmen and their wives.

Since these Ethiopians spoke English, conversation was easy. One of the Ethiopian guests, a businessman, owned a glass manufacturing plant. He purchases much equipment in America. The other guest was the Singer Sewing Machine agent for all of Ethiopia. He too does a big business.

The service was buffet. The table was laden with many Ethiopian foods. They were all very tasty. Some were not unlike many of our American foods. After all, chicken, beef and lamb are still the same no matter how it is fixed. This was a most delightful evening for it was our opportunity to get really close to a typical Ethiopian businessman's family and home. While the home was not as elaborately furnished as a similar American home, it was approximate with the same general style furniture.

The shops, stores and markets that sell food to the masses, are very interesting. They line the streets and roads. They are small with most of the wares openly displayed. Here as in most other African cities we visited, meats are not refrigerated. They are openly displayed and the meat is cut up as customers request certain pieces. Fruits are sold everywhere, even from small stands along the country roads.

Addis Ababa is exceptional for its many fine municipal and governmental buildings. Its city hall would put Cleveland's to shame. There are three exceptionally large and modern hospitals. Again, I must emphasize that Addis Ababa is the cleanest African city we visited.

MAU MAU LAND

After a week in Ethiopia, it was time to take off for Mau Mau land. We left Addis Ababa and flew over miles and miles of desolate, semi-arid land. Few houses or settlements were seen. The whole week we were in Addis Ababa, we didn't see a cloud. Now as we head South, as we near Nairobi, Kenya we see clouds.

Nairobi is about five thousand feet above sea level so the climate here is not sultry. In fact, the evenings are cool enough for sweaters and topcoats. Although only fifteen percent of the land in Kenya is tillable, the area around Nairobi is green and beautiful.

Arriving at the modern Nairobi airport, we were met by top Kenyan and American officials. Some of the Dialogue delegates came on to Nairobi for the country was celebrating its tenth anniversary. Although you don't see or hear now anything about the Mau Mau, I remember that it was this movement that finally brought independence to Kenya.

Nairobi is bedecked for the anniversary. As the Special Ambassador of President Richard Nixon for the tenth celebration, I am joined here by my two associates: Dr. Michael P. Balzano, Jr., Director of Action, and Wendell B. Coote, Country Director for East African Affairs, Department of State.

We arrived in Nairobi Saturday afternoon. That night we attended the "Miss Tenth Anniversary Beauty Competition." This was the first big event of the Tenth Anniversary celebration. It was cocktails, dinner and entertainment. The contestants were all very attractive.

Sunday, we had lunch at the country home of Mr. & Mrs. Jaffe. He is the African correspondent of Newsweek. Most of Dialogue's delegates who came on to Kenya, were there, plus several top Kenyan officials. The beautiful flowers and the country surroundings, plus the lovely people, made this a most enjoyable affair.

From the luncheon, Cong. Stokes and I were guests of an American embassy official on a tour of one of several game parks. In a Land Rover, we spent three hours seeing the wild animals as they roamed the land. We got some good photographs. Over 70,000 tourists visit Kenya every year to see its natural beauty and attractions.

Everything in Nairobi was Tenth Anniversary and, everything about the anniversary was Mzee Jomo Kenyatta. Mzee is a Swahili term for Elder. Educated at London University and London School of Economics, Kenyatta returned to Kenya in 1946 and became active in the Mau Mau struggle. He was sent to jail in 1952. Released in 1961, he was named president of Kenya African National Union. When Kenya became a Republic, he was president. His daughter, Margaret, is mayor of Nairobi.

Every day and night were crowded with official and semi-official events. However, Cong. Stokes and I did take enough time out to make a motor tour of the Masai country in the Rift Valley.

One of the gifts of the American government to the Tenth Anniversary program, was the appearance of Dizzie Gillespie and his quartette. In Nairobi, I ran into Rev. and Mrs. Sandy Ray. He formerly pastored Shiloh Baptist Church in Columbus, and was a member of the Ohio Legislature. He now lives in Brooklyn.

Nairobi was a hectic place because of the many functions. Our delegation finally gave up trying to attend everything. There were many top African officials paying their respect to Jomo Kenyatta. The most popular from the masses response was General Amin, head of Uganda. His popularity is due to the fact that he expelled all Asians from his country. Every time he left or returned to the Hilton Hotel, he was greeted by big crowds and given the clenched fist salute. We were supposed to visit Uganda but General Amin's coming to Kenya for the celebration, forced us to change our itinerary.

Kenya has come a long ways from the Mau

Mau days. The whites and Asians still figure large in the economy. However, most of the Kenyan masses arehopeful that the influence of both will be greatly reduced. Until this is accomplished, as I see it, the Kenyans will not have full possession of their country or its economy.

BEAUTIFUL TANZANIA

We decided that we had seen and done all we could in Nairobi so, on Wednesday, we left for Dar es Salaam, the capital of Tanzania. Here, we were the guests of the government headed by Julius Nyerre and, of the American Ambassador Beverly Carter, the former editor of The Pittsburgh Courier.

We are now in real tropical climate as Dar es Salaam is near the equator on the Indian Ocean. This is a beautiful city with a profusion of flowers, and the most beautiful red flowering fire trees which seem to be everywhere.

Here we rejoined Counciliman Charles V. Carr and Virgil Ogletree and the Dialogue members. We are staying in Hotel Kilimanjaro overlooking the Indian Ocean. While the mid-day sun is hot, the nights are pleasant.

We had lunch at Ambassador Carter's lovely home. That evening top Tanzanian government officials tendered us a reception. President Julius K. Nyerere was busy convening the legislature to get passage of a tax bill that had previously been defeated.

We were now at the furthermost distance from home. The weather was so good and the people so hospitable, it made you want to stay on. However, it was time to plan for returning.

The visit to the railroad the Chinese are building, was enjoyable. I did not go, but Cong. Stokes did. He was greatly impressed. When finished, it will be a commercial link between the central African nations and the seaport of Dar es Salaam.

I was always intrigued by the exotic name of Zanzibar, the spice island. As Zanzibar was only 20 minutes air flying time from Dar es Salaam, we asked our host to set up a trip for us.

Friday morning we got the word go. A private plane carried us over to Zanzibar. The floral beauty of the island is great. Coconut tres cover it. We visited many of the old ruins and remains of the Old Arab, Sultan regimes. Zanzibar is now a part of Tanzania. This island has been a prize since the Portuguese came here in the 1500's.

The narrow streets and the architecture are the remains of the old Arab-slave days. Cloves and other spices provide a big export market. The local island government provided us with guides and treated us royally. Some of the buildings we saw, were three and four hundred years old. The market place with all kinds of foods and vegetables, was colorful. The theater was showing an American film.

Our tour carried us by some imposing apartment buildings. Our guide stated that these were built by the government to house low-income people. The buildings were three and four stories with balconies. They looked as good as any we have in America.

The unusual part of this story is that the residents pay $6.00 a month for utilities. The rent is free and they can live there for life under these conditions. The money for the construction of these apartments comes from the profits on the sale of cloves and other spices that grow on the island and are sold through the government monopoly.

The Tanzanian government has built several lovely resort facilities on the Indian Ocean about 12 miles out from Dar es Salaam. Saturday we motored out to Bahari Beach Hotel. The main building and the some 22 individual cabanas are all in African motif; thatched roofs and round buildings. Most of the cabanas are two stories, beautifully furnished with baths and water. The main building houses the bar, dance floor and dining areas. There is dancing and entertainment. There is a private pool as well as a fine sandy ocean beach. Fishing is excellent. The cabanas rent for $50 a day, including three meals.

Friday night we had dinner with the leaders of the freedom fighters in Mozambique. Saturday morning, we had a conference with Foreign Minister John Macela. He delineated the policy of the Tanzanian government on the colonial rule of Portugal over Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau. This interesting story I will tell about next week.

COLONIALISM'S CHALLENGER

There are millions of Africans still living under colonial rule. Portugal controls the largest colonial territory. Guinea-Bissau on the West Coast and Mozambique on the East Coast are the two main centers of opposition to Portugal's rule.

In Dar es Salaam, we visited with the heads of FRELIMO. (Front for the Liberation of Mozambique). They have their main headquarters here. On our first day here, we made contact with FRELIMO officials and a conference was set up at their headquarters in downtown near the waterfront. Most of the delegates from the Dialogue who came here, attended. We were briefed on the problems these freedom fighters face in their revolution against Portugal.

On Friday night, Cong. Louis Stokes and I had dinner with Marcelius Dos Santos and another official. We talked rather intimately about the problems they face.

On Saturday, our last day in Dar es Salaam, FRELIMO officials had Cong. Stokes and me to lunch at the home of one of their members. Here we met many of the field workers, some who had just returned from the fighting front in Mozambique.

We had a most delicious meal which included mangos and cashews. To my surprise, I found out that cashews are a delicious fruit as well as a nut.

These people are serious for they are about a serious business. Much of their operation must be secret for the Portuguese have a price on the heads of many of them. Two American white women were part of the luncheon guests. One was the wife of one of the officials and the other (a graduate of Miami Univ. Ohio) was one of the workers.

A growing number of African states have established bilateral relations with FRELIMO, in line with their recognition of the movement as the sole representative of the Mozambican people.

In a talk with Foreign Minister John Malecela of Tanzania Saturday morning before our luncheon, he told us that his country permitted FRELIMO to have headquarters here and, that Tanzania will continue to aid all freedom fighters even more aggressively until Africa has become free.

He told us that the freedom fighters were now receiving new and modern weapons from Russia and China. He said they will accept weapons and aid from any source opened to them. He said this did not make them communist.

The FRELIMO people were bitter over the United States support of Portugal. Napalm bombs and other destructive weapons have been supplied to the Portuguese fighters in Mozambique.

The position of the government of Tanzania was expressed in a statement in 1971, "Africans," the statement said, "do not and cannot disagree on the need to eradicate racialism and colonialism from Africa. While some of us may wish to adopt, and others to reject, the cultural, social, political or economic patterns of Europe, and while there may thus be disagreement on the domestic purpose of social and political activity, there is one fundamental purpose that we share. We are all resolved to work against the racialism and colonialism which still oppress Africa, and to do this until these evils have been eradicated from the face of our continent."

The FRELIMO officials are anxious to establish relations with Negroes in America. They feel that we should help them like the American Jews are helping Israel.

We agreed that there should be closer relations between the Africa people and American Blacks. We are going to try to bring one or two FRELIMO officials to the United States this year for a tour.

Another interesting fighter against racial oppression is Chief Gatsna Buthelezi, leader of the Zulu nation in South Africa. There is some disagreement between Buthelezi and other Africans over his effort to work with the South Africans for some degree of freedom for the Zulu people.

We first met Buthelezi in Ethiopia. He addressed the Dialogue. We next saw him in Nairobi and, then in Dar es Salaam. He is a very sensitive man and dedicated. His life is constantly in danger (1) from the whites who hate him, and (2) the Africans who disagree with him. He is the only Black leader that the South African government will permit to leave to attend conferences.

Saturday was our last day and our busiest. The more we talked with the Africans the more interested we became in their problems. Racially, topographically and geographically Africa is a vast and complex country. The so-called African movement in America by Blacks, is so far from reality that it is tragic. We have hold of the wrong handle completely.

Next week I will reproduce a letter from an African woman which I think will be most interesting.

AFRICAN WOMEN

In a previous installment, I referred to the position of African women in these emerging countries. Here and there you find African women holding high government positions.

In Guinea, we were greeted by a very attractive woman who was a member of the Senegal. In Nairobi, the daughter of Mzee, Caroline Diop, of Dakar, was a delegate. She is a member of the National Assembly of Senegal. In Nairobi, the daughter of Mzee Jomo Kenyatta is mayor of that capital city.

In traveling through Africa, you don't see many women driving automobiles, clerking in stores. Housework and hotel cleaning is largely done by men. We did have a woman driver of our car while in Zanzibar.

Generally the women do the hard work. They tend the many roadside stands; carry what seems like tremendous burdens on their backs and heads. The African society does not as yet accord women full rights.

While in Nairobi I came across evidence that African women are not completely satisfied with their role. In the Sunday issue of the daily paper under the caption: "We Women Won't Accept It," in a letter to the editor, a Mrs. Beldina A. Owuor gave full vent to her feelings about the treatment of African women.

Here is her letter:

WE WOMEN WON'T ACCEPT IT

As Kenya celebrates its 10th anniversary, I would like, as a woman, to inform those men (Kenyans) who still subject their wives to oppression, dictatorship and human indignity that such thing has no place in the independent Kenya.

Kenya women were liberated years back and a man who thinks that women are to be beaten, dictated, kicked around and be answerable to every member of the husband's family should know that it won't work that way in the present Kenya.

Our attention as a nation should be drawn to the fact that though we sent away "wabeberu," we still have some under our roofs. Though we are a nation free from colonialism,

depression and human injustice, we still have private oppressions and human injustices under our roofs.

Kenya Police should join hands in ensuring the security and the safety of women in some homes in Kenya. We still have men in this independent country who beat, cut and strangle their wives. Some even break the limbs of their wives. A man tired of his wife should divorce her rather than committing the crime of breaking her limbs.

Several women who have had their arms broken say that they are tired of telling lies to their bosses when they go back to office that they fell from stair-cases or baths.

Another reason why some women stay is because of the children. The fact is that children brought up in a fighting family will never make decent people in the society and therefore it is no point staying with a fighting husband for the sake of the children.

We should, as a nation, be ashamed of such things as are happening to some women in this country yet we got our independence years back. We should not only sympathise with those people who are oppressed in Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia and South Africa but we should also sympathise with the women who suffer this kind of thing in this very independent country. And they suffer these oppressions in the hands of their black husbands.

Anybody who wants to argue it out that these are traditions should know that there is no tradition which allows a man to kick, cut, strangle, break his wife's bones or even kill her. These are unlawful and if that was the case then our grandmothers would not have lived. On the other hand, if some people maintain that it is a tradition then I would say that such traditions have no place in the present society.

We are not going to have deformed limping women in our Independent Kenya and therefore such traditions should be buried deep and be forgotten for ever.

Mrs. Beldina A. Owuor, Nairobi.

AFRICA IS MANY COUNTRIES

In this series on my visit to the six African countries, I have summarized much of what I saw and learned about this mother country.

Africa is many countries. Its people are varied, alike and unlike. Some places are as modern as Cleveland and far more beautiful. Others are still in the primitive area.

However, in the past ten years, which is about the average age of Black Africa's independence, with little experience, these African countries have made remarkable progress.

In the technical and intricate processes of government, our African brothers have outdistanced us. They are rapidly learning how to govern themselves and adjust to the world of the atom and the computer. It is out of these countries and people that real Black pride and power are going to be implemented.

In checking back on some random notes, here are some concluding opinions.

TOO MANY COUNTRIES

Present day Africa is too fragmented. On the West Coast, there are 17 independent countries. This is far too many for the resources these countries have. Some are far too small to be able to support their independence. Each has its own currency, postal-telecommunications and, all the other accoutrements of government. The nuisance of currency exchange is exasperating to travelers. In most African countries, it is a crime to take currency outside their borders.

Two languages dominate these West Coast countries, French and English. These are the commercial languages. The tribal language differs almost from tribe to tribe. Language then should not be a barrier to a federation like the European Common Market Countries or the United States of America.

This would cut the cost of government, improve currency values and, make international trade easier. This would also help in opening up for development, vast natural resources found in many of these countries.

On the East Coast, the countries are much larger in area, Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda being the smallest.

The East Coast nations of Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania have initiated some form of federation. While it is not as yet fully functional, it is a beginning. In these countries, English is the commercial language. Tanzania and Zanzibar have united into one common country.

Coalition governments, if not outright merger, must be in the future of African countries if they are to overcome the problems of industrial development, education and poverty.

Ethiopia is taking the leadership in developing African airlines. Their school in Addis Ababa is training Africans from many countries. This is the kind of mutual cooperation African countries need if they are to become self-sufficient.

THE MASAI

One of the least developed tribes in Africa, especially on the East Coast, is the Masai. These people range over parts of Kenya and Tanzania, grazing their cattle, which to them represents their wealth. Since this part of Africa has two wet and two dry seasons, these people are more or less constantly on the move. I visited one of their outposts in the Rift Valley. They are rather aloof. The Kenyan government recently issued an order for the Masai men to wear pants under their flowing blankets.

Two American farm specialists told me that these Masai have hypnotic power over cattle. They told me two amazing stories of their prowess in subduing cattle from Texas.

NEGRO AMBASSADORS

African nationalism is opening the doors for Negro Ambassadors from the United States. Terence A. Todman in Guinea and Beverly Carter in Tanzania, both of whom I talked with, are doing a good job. Both Nigeria and Kenya are ripe for Black ambassadors from the U.S. The American Negro is acceptable to top African officials, most of whom were themselves trained in American colleges.

VISIT AFRICA

Black Americans should visit Africa. Tourism is Kenya's biggest foreign exchange producer. Over 70,000 tourists visit Kenya every year. Other African countries are now bidding for their share of this tourist trade. The hotels in most of the cities are from good to excellent. The beach facilities at Dar es Salaam on the Indian Ocean are as fine as anyone could desire.

There is much to see and enjoy in Africa. The winter months are the best time to visit. There are two wet and two dry seasons in many of the countries. Bus and private car and plane tours are obtainable at reasonable cost. The people are friendly if you are. English speaking guides are available.

PRIORITIES

The first priority in Africa as I see it, is stable, responsible government. The second is education. African secondary schools are way behind the needs of the masses. Third is agriculture. There are enough natural fruits and fertile land for the people of Africa not to be hungry. They must raise enough food for their needs and, some to export. This cannot be done by the present outmoded methods of farming and cattle raising. We were told by top Nigerian officials that they were determined to improve their agriculture. Other countries must also do this.

MISCONCEPTIONS

The American Negro has some misconceptions about Africa. This goes for style of clothes, hair styles, dancing, etc. What we think and what is, is more than often miles from the truth.

The Africans feel that the Black brothers across the sea, are not interested in them. There is a great need for closing this gap. Both the American Negro and the Africans can profit from such a move.

HEARINGS ON WIRETAPPING AND ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, Congress enacted the first comprehensive statute governing wiretapping and electronic surveillance. That statute, a part of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, specifically outlawed such eavesdropping unless it fell within certain specified exceptions. In the 6 years since the passage of the act, alleged abuses of its wiretapping exceptions have caused many Members of Congress and private citizens to wonder whether the act provides sufficient safeguards to assure that the privacy of individual Americans is not invaded.

That Americans are concerned is apparent from a recent national survey in which three out of four persons interviewed indicated that "wiretapping and spying under the excuse of national security are a serious threat to people's privacy." This public concern over privacy of communications has been reflected in Congress by the fact that over 30 Members have sponsored legislation which would restrict currently authorized eavesdropping.

The Supreme Court, as well, has recognized the dangers inherent in governmental abuse of wiretapping and electronic surveillance. Justice Powell, in expressing the unanimous view of the Court, wrote in 1971:

"The price of lawful public dissent must not be a dread of subjection to an unchecked surveillance power. Nor must the fear of unauthorized official eavesdropping deter vigorous citizen dissent and discussion of Government action in private conversation. For private dissent, no less than open public discourse, is essential to our free society." *U.S.* v. *U.S. District Court,* 407 U.S. 297 (1972).

In view of the concern on the part of the people, the Court, and Members of Congress, the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice of the House Judiciary Committee has scheduled hearings on April 24, 26, and 29 on wiretapping and electronic surveillance. These hearings will not focus on specific legislation but will elicit testimony regarding past and present practices in eavesdropping with a view to developing legislation which will prevent future threats to individual privacy from wiretapping and electronic surveillance.

THE 76TH MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from an area of the country where there are several military bases and where there is outstanding pride in the community in the accomplishments of our military forces. I take special notice today of the achievement recently of the 76th Military Airlift Squadron at Charleston Air Force Base in Charleston, S.C.

The 76th Military Airlift Squadron was selected as the outstanding airlift squadron for the Military Airlift Command for 1973. The officers and men of the 76th MAS won this high accolade in competition between 17 squadrons in the Military Airlift Command.

Criteria used to determine the winner included safety records, current safety programs, mission accomplishment, training programs, operational readiness inspection results, civic activities, resource management, and athletic competition.

The 76th MAS was the nominee of the 437th Military Airlift Wing, which is stationed at Charleston Air Force Base under the command of Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Sadler. It was then selected as the best squadron in the 21st Air Force before winning the commandwide honor.

This award is certainly a fine tribute to everyone associated with the 76th Military Airlift Squadron, to the 437th Military Airlift Wing, and to the entire Air Force.

So that my colleagues may appreciate the accomplishments of my hometown squadron, I am inserting in the RECORD the citation which accompanied the award to the 76th Airlift Squadron.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE OUTSTANDING AIRLIFT SQUADRON OF THE YEAR TO THE 76TH MILITARY AIRLIFT SQUADRON

The 76th Military Airlift Squadron, 437 Military Airlift Wing, Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, has distinguished itself as the outstanding airlift squadron in the Military Airlift Command for the year 1973. During this period, the 76th Military Airlift Squadron has made positive and significant efforts to conduct its operations in an efficient and professional manner, and has realized tangible benefits as a direct result of these efforts.

In addition to adding another accident-free year to the 21 year, 592,000 hour safety record, the 76th Military Airlift Squadron has been the Charleston Air Force Base leader in making substantial and significant improvements to the living and working quarters of the assigned personnel. These efforts were recognized by General Carlton, Commander, Military Airlift Command, when he recognized Charleston Air Force Base as having the best facilities in the Military Airlift Command.

But more importantly, the 76th Military Airlift Squadron has continued its proud tradition of successfully performing every type of mission flown by the Military Airlift Command, ranging from Presidential Support, joint Army-Air Force paratrooper training and deployments, overseas cargo and passenger support, to the flights to Israel to support our ally during the Middle East Crisis of 1973. Professionalism, "esprit de corps", and a personal individual commitment to a high degree of sustained performance, combined with the 76th motto of "Safety, Spirit, Service" have been the guiding principles which have made the 76th Military Airlift Squadron the Outstanding Airlift Squadron in the Military Airlift Command for the year 1973.

CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS URGES FREEDOM FOR KURDISTAN—INTRODUCES A RESOLUTION CALLING FOR SELF-DETERMINATION FOR KURDS

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

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly taken the House floor to speak for freedom for nationality groups which have been denied the right of self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, more than 50 years ago Woodrow Wilson, a great New Jerseyan, put the United States publicly on record in support of the principle of self-determination.

I rise in support of a people with a history of 4,000 years, the people of Kurdistan who have been denied the right to exist as a nation despite their ancient heritage.

Today, I have introduced a concurrent resolution urging this Nation to use all its good offices in behalf of independence for the people of Kurdistan.

For the benefit of all Members, I would like to outline some of the background to the present sticky situation in the Middle East.

When the Allies Conference at San Remo in 1920 placed Iraq under British mandate, the boundaries of Iraq were not yet defined. Turkey still laid claims to Iraqi Kurdistan, on the grounds that it was in full control of that region when the cease-fire became effective at the end of the First World War. Kurds refused to have their land become a part of either Turkey or Iraq on the grounds that the Sevres Treaty had entitled them to full independence. However, Britain, being aware of the rich oilfields in Kurdistan—Kirkuk and Ayn Zala—did its utmost to retain the region as a part of Iraq, in order to come under its mandate.

Shaykh Mahmood Barzanji, a Kurdish leader, took advantage of the situation by leading a Kurdish revolt against the government of Iraq and the British Mandate, and in 1920 declared himself "King of Kurdistan." Both British and Iraqi forces joined in fighting against the Kurds. To pacify Kurdish demands Britain and Iraq jointly declared their recognition of the "rights of Kurds living within the boundaries of Iraq to form a Kurdish government within its borders." Furthermore, the League of Nations in the mandate document for Iraq specifically recommended that Kurds should administer their own area, speak their own language and have Kurdish taught in schools.

However, hardly any part of the joint British-Iraqi declaration, or the League's recommendations were ever implemented and as a result Kurdish uprisings continued under the leadership of Mahmood Barzanji, and Ahmad Barzani. Since 1940 and to the present day leadership of the Kurdish liberation movement has been under Mustafa Barzani.

In 1959, the Kurdish Democratic Party—KDP—was granted a license to openly function as a political party. The party's program called upon Kurds to "struggle peacefully for the right of the Kurdish nation to self-determination." The Iraqi Government soon stamped Barzani and the KDP as recessionists and agents of "imperialism." Consequently, members of the KDP Central Committee in Baghdad were arrested, the party's newspaper was closed and the Kurdish revolt against the Iraqi Government started again in 1961. Kurds insisted on autonomy for Iraqi Kurdistan and fighting lasted for 10 years, contributing significantly to the downfall of three successive Iraqi regimes.

During 1963 negotiations started between Iraq, Syria and Egypt, aiming at a union between the three countries. Meanwhile, negotiations began between the Government of Iraq and the Kurds for a peaceful settlement of Kurdish problems.

The following were the main Kurdish demands:

First, Kurds would be satisfied with autonomy if Iraq remains an independent state.

Second, if Iraq joins any other Arab country in federation, Kurds will seek wider autonomy.

Third, if Iraq is fused in union with any Arab country, Kurds will accept joining the union as a regional Kurdish entity.

However, neither union between Iraq and any Arab country, nor peace between the Iraqi Government and the Kurds was accomplished.

In 1966 the Government of Iraq, in a 12-point program, declared recognition of Kurdish nationality, and promised a decentralized administration for Iraqi Kurdistan. However, such programs had already been rejected by the Kurds in 1963, 1965 and early 1966.

THE MARCH 11, 1970, AGREEMENT

After 10 years of bitter fighting between the Iraqi Kurds and various Iraqi regimes, the present Iraqi Baath rulers reiterated, at the beginning of 1970, that "the question of Kurdish national ambitions in Iraq is one of the foremost issues facing the Arab revolution," and that in order to put an end to the exploitation of this question by "the forces of imperialism and reaction" the Iraqi Government has decided to take the "initiative in restoring peace to all parts of Northern Iraq."

Barzani was asked to send a Kurdish delegation to Baghdad to negotiate a peace agreement with the Government An agreement between the two sides was reached. Kurds were to be granted autonomy; but prior to that, the boundaries of Kurdistan were to be determined and a general census of Iraq was to be conducted in order to determine the percentage of Kurds, upon which basis the Kurdish share of Iraqi revenues will be determined. Kurds insisted that the agreement be guaranteed by a

foreign government. As a compromise, reached during a visit to Barzani by the Iraqi Vice President Saddam Hussein, it was agreed that Kurds would be satisfied by registering the agreement with the United Nations; publishing said agreement in the Iraqi Government's official Gazette—Register—and broadcasting the agreement on Government radio and television stations.

Three years have passed since this agreement was signed; yet the boundaries of Kurdistan have not yet been defined, and a census in Iraq has not been conducted. There has been instead several Government-sponsored attempts against the life of Barzani. Major Iraqi oilfields are in the Kurdish area of Kirkuk and Ain Zala, and the present Iraqi regime is not willing to officially recognize that. Instead it is trying to force Kurds out of the oilfield areas and replace them with Arabs. Consequently, clashes have already begun between Kurdish and Iraqi Government forces. Kurds have sufficient fighting manpower, but, in order to maintain their control over cities and oilfields, they need antiaircraft and antitank equipment. As recently as 2 months ago, Barzani called for U.S. assistance in arms, in return for an oil deal—statement published in Washington Post, August 1973.

One can hardly disagree with the conclusions reached by the Rand Corp., that Iraqi might ultimately cease to exist as a state; that is, Kurds controlling their land in the northern part, Iran, a Shia Muslim country, taking over the overwhelming Shia majority in the southeastern area, and Kuwait, an arid state, enjoying the abundance of water in the southern part of Iraq.

REPEAL OF THE TRADE EMBARGO ON CUBA

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1974, in an attempt to bring U.S. policy toward Cuba into alinement with the realities of today, I introduced H.R. 13821, a bill to repeal the various acts of Congress which have imposed economic sanctions against the government of Cuba. The series of legislative and executive branch decrees and directives, based on previous congressional authority and decisions taken in the Organization of American States—OAS—comprise the legal framework for the longstanding policy of the U.S. embargo on Cuba.

The embargo on trade with Cuba was officially declared as a Presidential proclamation by President Kennedy on February 3, 1962, after the OAS foreign minister, in a January 1962 meeting, declared the government of Cuba incompatible with the principles of the Inter-American system, and, taking note of Cuba's subversion of Latin America, urged member states to take steps for their self-defense. The President cited section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as authorization to establish and maintain an embargo on all trade between the United States and Cuba. In 1964, the OAS directed all member states to sever diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba. In this period of the first part of the 1960's, the U.S. Government attempted to strengthen its isolation of Cuba by various provisions in legislation along with directives from the Departments of Treasury, Commerce, and State.

The United States and OAS embargo of Cuba was a reaction to the revolutionary tactics of Fidel Castro, characterized by his attempts to subvert Latin American governments, especially those in the Caribbean. Officially, United States policy has been directed toward the isolation of Cuba in order to cause economic and eventual political chaos. This attempt to isolate Cuba through the tactic of the economic embargo has failed miserably and has even proven to be counterproductive.

The United States embargo on Cuba has contributed to the strengthening of the Russian economic yoke around the island-nation. The Russians adequately filled the gap left by the United States and now support Cuba to the tune of $1.5 to $2 million per day. The Russians and the other Socialist countries of Eastern Europe provide Cuba with industrial machinery and a multitude of technical advisors.

Ironically, the United States embargo of Cuba has helped improve the balance of payments of our friends at our expense. In 1972, the last year for which official figures have been tabulated, countries that are considered our closest friends and allies were doing vigorous business with "isolated" Cuba. For example, Great Britain exported almost $43 million in goods to Cuba; France exported just under $26 million; Germany exported just under $20 million; and Spain over $18 million. In 1971, Canada exported $56 million in goods to Cuba. These nations are providing Cuba with such goods as trucks, buses, railroad cars, heavy machinery, and agricultural machinery, commodities which should be coming from this country but cannot because it has been against the law to trade with Cuba.

Consternation over this particular aspect of our embargo policy has been expressed by some prominent Americans in the past few weeks. Cyrus Eaton, well-known industrialist, said that the only accomplishment of the trade embargo has been to deprive the American farmers and industry of business. Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers, vented his frustration over the embargo when news was published that Cuba had contracted to purchase millions of dollars worth of automobiles and trucks from Argentine subsidiaries of the U.S.-based multinational firms of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler. Reuther urged that the U.S. Government lift the trade embargo so that Cuba can deal directly with U.S. automobile manufacturers rather than the Argentine subsidiaries. He pointed out that this would help restore some of the 100,000 jobs lost in the U.S. automobile industry because of the depressed job market. Similarly, many Americans are upset over the recently announced deal whereby a Canadian subsidiary of a U.S. firm is going to sell $12 to $18 million in locomotives to Cuba. People are beginning to wonder who is being isolated, Cuba or the United States?

In the context of U.S.-Latin American relations, the embargo on Cuba, as well as this country's overall policy toward that nation, is beginning to place the United States in a position of isolation. Aside from the 7 Latin American nations that now maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba, in spite of the OAS ban, 3 more, thus a total of 10, have a trade relationship. Ironically, one of these is Venezuela, the nation that brought charges against Cuba at the 1964 OAS meeting which created the final pillar of the institutionalized U.S.-OAS isolation of Cuba. There are indications that other Latin American states want to change their policy toward Cuba.

The United States embargo has not isolated Cuba. It has not destroyed the Cuban economy, although it has created some hardship for the Cuban people. It has served to unite Cubans behind Fidel Castro, and has enabled the Cuban leader to use the United States as a scapegoat for which he can blame all his nation's ills.

The trade embargo on Cuba is outdated, unrealistic, and not in concert with today's trend toward normalization of relationships with former foes. If for no other reason than our own self-interest, the embargo on Cuba must be replaced.

THE MODEL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Model Criminal Justice System Act.

Crime in America continues to threaten the stability and security of our citizens. No amount of rhetoric—and no single piece of legislation—will eliminate crime. But the measure I am introducing today, if enacted, will be a major step toward reducing crime.

The purpose of this legislation is to create model criminal justice systems in several States. Those States voluntarily choosing to participate in the program would undertake comprehensive reform of their entire criminal justice system—reform aimed at producing stronger and more efficient law enforcement, fairer and faster court systems, and a more modern and flexible corrections program. The Federal Government would pay most of the costs of such reform, but the principle of local control over criminal justice administration would be maintained.

Reducing crime is still the primary responsibility of State and local governments. I believe it should stay that way. However, the Federal Government can play a significant role in encouraging and financing the type of reforms needed to combat crime effectively.

In 1968, the Republican candidate for President of the United States told us that by changing the Attorney General he would dramatically reduce the rate of crime. Five men have held that office since that promise was made, and crime still continues to threaten every section of our country.

Indeed, the situation is no better today than it was in 1967, when the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice observed that—

> There is much crime in America, more than ever is reported, far more than ever is solved, far too much for the health of the Nation. Every American knows that. Every American is, in a sense, a victim of crime. Violence and theft have not only injured often irreparably, hundreds of thousands of citizens, but have directly affected everyone. Some people have been impelled to uproot themselves and find new homes. Some have been made afraid to use public streets and parks. Some have come to doubt the worth of a society in which so many people behave so badly. Some have become distrustful of the Government's ability, or even desire, to protect them.

In my own State, the statistics tell an equally alarming story. Since 1968, the rate of violent crime has increased by over 50 percent in Utah. And over 2 out of 100 Utah citizens were victims of some type of crime in 1972.

In Salt Lake and Tooele Counties, seriout felonies such as homicide, rape, aggravated assault, burglary and robbery, increased 74 percent in just a few short years between 1967 and 1971.

There are a litany of reasons underlying these grim statistics. But, unlike other difficult problems which face our country we know how to reduce crime.

We know that more professional and better paid law enforcement personnel, an efficient and well-run judicial system, and corrections programs which rehabilitate, rather than breed more crime, are the keys to reducing crime substantially.

The failures and inadequacies of the criminal justice system in our States have been well documented. The 1967 finding of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice still holds true today:

> The increasing volume of crime in America establishes conclusively that many of the old ways are not good enough. Innovation and experimentation in all parts of the criminal justice system are clearly imperative. They are imperative with respect both to entire agencies and to specific procedures. Court systems need reorganization and case-docketing methods need improvement; police-community relations programs are needed and so are ways of relieving detectives from the duty of typing their own reports; community-based correctional programs must be organized and the pay of prison guards must be raised. Recruitment and training, organization and management, research and development all require re-examination and reform.

We also know that simply pouring money into one part of a criminal justice system—while neglecting or ignoring other parts of that system—will, in the long run, prove ineffective in reducing crime.

The world's best police force will be hamstrung in reducing crime if there are indefinite delays in bringing a defendant to trial; and a judicial system operating at maximum efficiency will be meaningless if those convicted in the courts are placed in prisons which produce only hardened criminals.

As the Utah State Law Enforcement Planning Agency—ULEPA—pointed out in its 1973 report, "A Case Against Crime"—

> The concept of curtailing crime has become synonymous with the concept of funding bigger, better, and more expensive police forces and police-related items. ULEPA's past and current budget allocations appear to be aimed at decreasing unemployment rather than attacking specific aspects of crime. There is little question that an effective and efficiently alert police force aids in both preventing crime and apprehending individuals engaged in crime, but as the output of one segment of the criminal justice system increases, the work load in other segments of that system increases proportionately. The more arrests made, the more complaints issued, which yields more cases for prosecution through the courts, increased caseloads develop and backlogs enlarge. The net result is the defeat of the essence of a fair and speedy trial, which is an integral part of our criminal justice system.

In 1969, a staff report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence presented this gloomy description of the criminal justice process in most States:

> A system implies some unity of purpose and organized interrelationship among component parts. In the typical American city and state, and under federal jurisdiction as well, no such relationship exists. There is, instead, a reasonably well-defined criminal process, a continuum through which each accused offender may pass: from the hands of the police, to the jurisdiction of the courts, behind the walls of a prison, then back into the street. The inefficiency, fallout, and failure of purpose during this process is notorious . . .

In 1973, the ULEPA report reached the same conclusion about Utah's criminal justice system:

> There is a constant plethora of disgrumblings from both the police and the general public about our "system," which is really a non-system, but the impediments to the efficient coordination and operation of the criminal justice system are still ignored. Police are only a part of the system, through an indispensable and integral part; however, the police alone cannot insure that justice is served. The total system has to equate that justice.

The ULEPA report concluded that we can no longer afford "to plan and fund token projects that affect only part of the criminal justice system."

But Utah—and almost every other State—cannot alone accomplish comprehensive reform of an entire criminal justice system. Our States and local government, which are faced with a variety of difficult problems, need substantial financial assistance to achieve this reform, and the Federal Government can provide such assistance.

The passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 recognized this principle. But under that legislation, funds have been distributed on a piecemeal basis; and there has been a failure to encourage the type of comprehensive reform of a State's criminal justice system which those who originally proposed this legislation anticipated.

I believe that we need a new program of Federal financial assistance to combat crime—a program which offers substantial assistance as an incentive for sweeping and comprehensive reform of a State's entire criminal justice system. That is the basic purpose of the legislation I am introducing today. It is designed to establish model and experimental programs in several States.

It should be emphasized that this is a completely voluntary program, which will not replace the existing authority under the Safe Streets Act. Those States which do not enter this program will continue to be eligible for funding under that act. It offers a bonus of Federal help for those States willing to reform their entire criminal justice systems.

The bill I am introducing establishes flexible standards for reform of each part of a State's criminal justice system. States interested in participating under this program will submit plans designed to meet the standards contained in the bill. And those States whose plans are selected can immediately begin to implement their plans.

Senators MONDALE, BROOKE, EAGLETON, and former Senator, now Attorney General Saxbe have introduced essentially the same bill in the Senate. Unfortunately, this measure has languished there, and a similar proposal has never been considered in the House. The bill consists of two major titles. Title I contains a comprehensive program for reform with emphasis on law enforcement, the criminal courts and corrections. States desiring to participate in the program will, with Federal financial assistance, develop and submit a State agenda for the specific implementation of these reforms within their States.

Reforms which a State can implement without new legislative authority are classified as phase I, and those requiring new legislation are classified as phase II. A State will be given more time to implement phase II reforms, but in no event will a State be given more than 4 years to implement its total plan. The Federal Government will pay 75 percent of the costs of implementing phase I and 90 percent of the cost of implementing phase II.

The State plans will be administered by the chief executive of each State, or by a public agency designated or created for that purpose. At the discretion of participating States, State advisory councils may be appointed to advise the chief executive on the preparation and administration of the State plans, and to

evaluate programs assisted under this legislation.

Title II establishes an independent agency within the executive branch—the Criminal Justice Reform Administration—to be headed by a single administrator. This agency will provide technical assistance as needed to the States and localities regarding all aspects of the program. It will also provide for the wisest possible dissemination of information obtained under the program—including an annual report to the President on the activities of the Criminal Justice Reform Act. I am not committed to creation of a new agency. In fact, I believe this program can be effectively integrated into the LEAA framework.

The most crucial part of this bill are the standards it establishes for measuring the acceptability of a State's plan for reform. These standards are derived from the recommendations of various commissions and other groups which have carefully examined the problem of crime in America, such as the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and various State crime commissions and planning agencies. For example, many of the recommendations of the Utah State Law Enforcement Planning Agency's most recent State plan are embodied in these standards.

Obviously, some of these standards may need revision before this legislation is ever enacted. But for the most part, I think these standards reflect the best thinking of most of those who are involved in the criminal justice system on a day-to-day basis.

These standards can be classified into three basic parts: law enforcement, improving the fairness and efficiency of the criminal court system, and corrections. Since these standards are the heart of this bill, it would be useful to discuss each basic category of standards and the problems they are designed to solve.

First, under the broad category of law enforcement, the bill would require the following:

Standards for recruitment of law enforcement officers which are uniform throughout the States;

Appropriate educational requirements for advancement of policies which are uniform throughout the State;

Beginning compensation and increases in compensation which are appropriate for a professional, considering the size of the community and the cost of living in the community in which such personnel serve;

A retirement system that is uniform throughout the State, and a statewide pension plan for such personnel;

To the extent possible, uniform promotional policies for such pesonnel throughout the State;

To the extent appropriate, standard operational procedures for such personnel throughout the State;

Lateral entry between law enforcement agencies of each locality within the State and between Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies located within the State, with appropriate conditions on the period of initial service for such personnel; and

Facilities offering short-term mandatory training for all such personnel within the State.

I want to stress that uniform standards will be consistent with the principle of community control of law enforcement agencies in States which prefer to follow that pattern.

The second category of standards under this bill is aimed at improving the fairness and efficiency of the criminal court system. To accomplish the expeditious disposition of criminal cases in those States participating under this program, the bill requires that a State and its localities implement whatever reforms necessary to insure that the trial of all criminal cases will be commenced no later than 60 days from the date of a defendant's arrest or the initiation of prosecution—whichever occurs first. Failure to meet this standard will result in dismissal with prejudice of the charges against the defendant.

Administrator of this program shall, by regulation, specify those periods of delay to be excluded from this 60-day period for commencing a trial. For example, delay because a defendant has fled the jurisdiction would obviously be excluded from the 60-day limitation period.

This 60-day standard allows States and their localities great flexibility in overhauling their criminal judicial system. The bill specified that such reforms may include, without limitation—

Increasing the number of judges trying criminal offenses;

Improving the efficiency of criminal court procedures;

Appointing professional court administrators; and

Increasing personnel engaged in prosecuting and defending criminal cases.

The Federal Government would not dictate a particular scheme for reform. Rather, the determination would be made as to whether a State's reform proposals were adequate to meet the 60-day limitation in the bill, thereby insuring a speedy trial. I must point out that I am not committed at this point to the remedy of dismissal with prejudice now provided in 102(2)B of the bill.

In Utah, as in almost every other State, many of the reforms called for under this section of the bill are needed. As the ULEPA's recent report pointed out—

> The gross number of police officers available, their training, educational achievements, and salary levels are generally cited as recurring problems to be solved.

In particular, this report noted that the wide variance in salary levels for law enforcement personnel throughout the State creates manpower and recruitment problems. According to the report, "there is little incentive for the college-educated to seek a law enforcement career" given the pay scales for most police officers in Utah.

That is why an important standard in this bill would require beginning compensation and increases in compensation which are appropriate or a professional—considering the size of the community for law enforcement personnel and the cost of living in the community in which such individuals serve.

In 1967, the President's Crime Commission revealed statistics which showed that the median annual salary for a patrolman in a large city was $5,300. Typically, the maximum salary was less than $1,000 more than the starting salary. This was contrasted with the starting salary for nonsupervisory FBI agents of $8,421, with a high of $16,905.

While salaries of the Nation's police have increased since 1967, they are still inadequate.

Because of their present inadequate level of pay, many policemen in Utah and throughout the country are forced to "moonlight" with other jobs in order to support their families. If we want full-time policemen who can concentrate on their law enforcement duties, we must pay a decent wage for such demanding work.

I believe that the speedy disposition of criminal cases is one of the most vital reforms called for in this bill.

Several years ago, a survey by the U.S. Census Bureau revealed that more than one-half of 160,000 inmates in city and county jails throughout the country were being held for reasons other than conviction of a crime. Almost all of the inmates in this category were awaiting trial.

But far more than unfairness to individual defendants results from long delays in disposing of criminal cases. It is clear that such delays are a major cause of our increasing crime rate.

Such delays in bringing a defendant to trial often make it more difficult for the Government to obtain a conviction. Witnesses tend to be less reliable, and some witnesses are no longer available. Unfortunately, it is the repeat criminal offender who is usually aware of the advantages of a long delay between arrest and trial.

Studies have shown that the longer it takes to bring to trial a defendant out on bail, the more likely it is he will commit a crime while awaiting trial.

Finally, the surest deterrent to crime is the knowledge that its commission will be followed by swift and appropriate punishment. The delays in most judicial systems have obviously negated the impact of this important type of deterrence.

Chief Justice Burger, recognizing the link between increasing crime and court delays, has also recommended a 60-day limit for the commencement of all criminal trials. In an interview, the Chief Justice was asked whether delay has been a major factor underlying the rise of crime over the last decade; he responded as follows:

> I cannot think of any judicial factor more important than delay and uncertainty. It's always difficult to assign priorities in this sort of thing, but I know of none I can think of more important than the absence of the sure knowledge that a criminal act will be followed by a speedy trial and punishment.

And that's why I have said that if we

could have every criminal trial ready to be presented within 60 days after the arrest or the charge, I think you'd see a very, very sharp drop in the crime rate. It would surely put an end to the large number of crimes committed by men out on bail waiting six months to 18 months to be brought to trial.

As the Chief Justice pointed out—

We cannot blindly cling to methods and forms designed for the 17th and 18th centuries.

In Utah, unlike other States, we are not yet faced with the extreme delay in bringing criminal defendants to trial. But given the increasing workload which is inevitable in the face of a rising crime rate, there is a real potential for excessive delay unless we reform our system.

The handwriting is on the wall. In its 1973 report, the ULEPA concluded that—

Our current court system is a non-system, without unified scope or direction. The caseload is increasing at a faster rate than manpower training and new personnel positions.

In addition to the urgent need for improving judicial administration, the ULEPA report also called for increasing the personnel involved in both the prosecution and defense of criminal cases and for reforms in the manner in which cases are now prosecuted and defended.

The final category of standards under this legislation deals with the critical problem of corrections.

Almost all the authorities agree that the weakest link in the criminal justice system is what passes for a program of corrections in most States. As the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice observed—

For a great many offenders . . . corrections does not correct. Indeed, experts are increasingly coming to feel that the conditions under which many offenders are handled, particularly in institutions are often a positive detriment to rehabilitation.

There are a variety of reforms which are needed. To begin with, most corrections programs do not have the capacity for dealing flexibly with a broad range of offenders.

The President's Crime Commission and other authorities have called for the development of a far broader range of alternatives for dealing with offenders. As the Commission pointed out:

While there are some who must be completely segregated from society, there are many instances in which segregation does more harm than good.

For the incorrigible offender who poses a clear danger to society, maximum security prisons are necessary. But it makes no sense to build an entire prison system designed to serve only the most hardened criminals—thereby forcing all other classes of inmates to adapt to such an institution. Petty offenders are often forced to live and to learn with major felons.

The importance of properly classifying offenders was underlined by the disturbing finding of the President's Crime Commission that—

Approximately one-fourth of the 400,000 children detailed in 1965—for a variety of causes but including truancy, smoking, and running away from home—were held in adult jails and lockups, often with hardened criminals.

Utah, like other States, lacks proper facilities for dealing with juvenile offenders. According to the ULEPA report—

Adequate juvenile detention facilities are inaccessible on a statewide geographical basis. There are only six approved detention facilities in the State. The majority of counties in the State do not have adequate facilities, and children are often placed in jails. Detention practices and standards are not uniformly or consistently followed nor very frequently enforced. Intake services at detention centers outside of Salt Lake City are not available on a 24-hour basis. The result is that children are placed in detention inappropriately.

As the President's Commission and others have emphasized, a variety of penal institutions and programs are required to meet the special needs of various types of offenders. In particular, the development of community-based correctional facilities—designed to avoid the use of far-removed and isolated institutions—is considered an extremely valuable rehabilitation tool.

Another serious problem is the fact that many jails, prisons, and other corrections facilities are woefully overcrowded, understaffed and badly equipped—and they are thus unable to offer even the most minimal rehabilitation programs such as job training or schooling. Several years ago, a study of over 3,000 jails by the U.S. Census Bureau found that about 85 percent had no recreational or educational facilities of any kind; about 50 percent had no medical facilities; and about 25 percent had no visiting facilities.

The condition of Utah's jails mirrors the national situation. The ULEPA reached the following conclusion about jails in Utah in its 1973 report:

In 1972, 34 jails in Utah were visited as a part of the updating of a Utah jail study performed in 1968. The findings and conclusions are consistent with many of the conclusions of the President's Task Force on Corrections.

Utah has a total of 49 jails in operation that hold individuals for 48 hours or more. Only 11 of these jails have 24-hour coverage by personnel. Matrons are not available when females are detained. In most of the jails, prisoners are served only two meals a day; three meals are served only when prisoners are assigned to work details. In 21 of the 48 jails, there are no facilities for the preparation of meals. Where these facilities are lacking, food is either brought in or prisoners are taken to local restaurants. The feeding of prisoners is definitely a problem in most Utah jails. In many jails, plumbing facilities required for sanitation and personal hygiene are generally old, in poor condition, and not adequate. It is felt that improvements could be made by issuing jail uniforms, providing clean bedding, laundry facilities and more supervision . . .

It has already been noted that the physical conditions of many of the jails in the State of Utah are unacceptable by LEAA standards. Many of the physical plants are in need of repair and remodeling. Many of the county and local jails have been condemned by one of several agencies . . .

Another serious deficiency in most corrections programs is the inadequacy of existing parole and probation services—particularly for juveniles and misdemeanants. These services perform the most fundamental needs: to provide a man a job, a house, keep him out of trouble and away from crime. The President's Crime Commission found that to meet the requirements of both correctional agencies and the courts, there was an immediate need to double the Nation's pool of juvenile probation officers, triple the number of probation officers working with adult felons, and increase sevenfold the number of officers working with misdemeanants.

According to the Commission—

These inadequacies can have serious consequences. Lack of community treatment facilities for misdemeanants and juveniles means the neglect of one of the most important lines of defense against serious crimes, since many persons with juvenile or misdemeanant records graduate to graver offenses. Lack of probation facilities also may mean that many minor and first-time offenders, who would be more suitably and economically dealt with within the community, are instead institutionalized. And lack of supervision, particularly through parole, means that the community is being exposed to unnecessary risks and that offenders are going without assistance in reestablishing themsleves in jobs and schools.

This is also a serious problem in Utah. In its 1973 report, the ULEPA found that—

Correctional agencies in Utah face acute shortages of qualified manpower, especially in positions charged with responsibility for treatment and rehabilitation;

Rehabilitation is nonexistent in Utah's jails;

Probation services away from Salt Lake, Weber, and Utah Counties are "nonexistent";

Parole services are limited, comprised of not much more than limited supervision.

Finally, related to the issue of corrections reform is the need to find effective methods for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics and drug addicts.

In 1965, according to the President's Crime Commission, public drunkenness accounted for one out of every three arrests in America. Since these arrests burden the police, clog the lower courts, and crowd penal institutions, the Commission recommended that communities develop civil detoxification units and comprehensive aftercare programs.

In regard to drug addiction, the President's Crime Commission found that—

Drug addicts, to support their habits, were stealing millions of dollars worth of property every year and contributing to the public's fear of robbery and burglary. The police, the courts, the jails and prisons and social-service agencies of all kinds were devoting great amounts of time, money and manpower to attempt to control drug abuse. Worst of all thousands of human lives were being wasted.

The old methods for dealing with narcotics addicts simply do not work. Whether an addict is assigned to a prison or to a special treatment facility, he will more often than not return to addic-

tion—and crime to support it—after release.

Some programs—such as methadone maintenance—have proved relatively successful in treating drug addicts. However, a great deal of research must be done before we will know the best methods of eliminating this terrible problem.

It is clear that States and local governments—with Federal assistance—must put more emphasis on programs for treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts and alcoholics. Such programs should be available both to inmates in institutions and as alternatives to incarceration.

In the final analysis, excellent law enforcement and an efficient court system will do little to reduce the crime rate so long as the prevailing problems in the area of corrections remain unsolved. If a State wants to achieve the comprehensive criminal justice reform called for under this legislation, it must therefore establish or provide:

A system for classifying persons charged with, or convicted of, criminal offenses so as to permit individualized treatment and security standards appropriate to the individual;

A range of correctional facilities that are adequately equipped and staffed to treat the particular classifications of inmates assigned there, including small-unit, community-based correctional institutions;

Comprehensive vocational and educational programs designed for the special needs of rehabilitating each class of persons charged with or convicted of criminal offenses;

Separate detention facilities for juveniles, including shelter facilities outside the correctional system for abandoned, neglected, or runaway children;

Standards applicable throughout the State for local jails and misdemeanants institutions to be enforced by the appropriate State corrections agency;

Parole and probation services for felons, for juveniles, for adult misdemeanants who need or can profit from community treatment and supervisory services for offenders who are released from correctional institutions without parole;

Caseload standards for parole and probation officers that vary in size and in type and intensity of treatment according to the needs and problems of the offender;

Statewide job qualifications and compensation schedules for correctional officers, including probation and parole officers, along with a mandatory system of inservice training; and

Programs of treatment and rehabilitation for persons suffering from alcoholism and drug abuse, available both to inmates and as an alternative to incarceration.

These standards—and the other standards in the bill concerned with law enforcement and the criminal court system—are not novel ideas. They represent the consensus of the best thinking of those who have worked in and studied the system of criminal justice as it exists in this country today.

Indeed, it is depressing that 7 years after the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, so many of that Commission's recommendations have either been ignored or only partially implemented.

That Commssion—and the commissions and studies that came before it—told us a very simple truth: Crime can be reduced, but only if we are willing to invest in excellent law enforcement, an efficient court system, and a flexible corrections program with the skilled people necessary to offer meaningful treatment and rehabilitation.

Unfortunately, it is very difficult to dramatize the importance of such reforms and to mobilize opinion on this issue. When an Attica or some other prison riots, there is a temporary call for prison reform. But once the riot is over and forgotten, the demands for reform cease.

I do not think we can continue to ignore the relationship between a rising crime rate and an outmoded, inefficient criminal justice system.

And I do not think we can continue to act as if a rising crime rate is a fact of life in the years ahead.

With the type of comprehensive reform outlined in the bill I am introducing today, I am convinced we can turn that crime rate around—and make our society a more decent and safer place for us and our children.

DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS OF GREEK PEOPLE SUPPRESSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill that declares it to be the policy of the U.S. Government to provide no military assistance, or military sales, credit sales, and guaranties to or for the Government of Greece until that Government lives up to its political obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty to observe the principles of democracy and provide individual liberty within Greece and its military obligations to perform common defense functions assigned under the current NATO plans.

The bill, which would also require the President to make a comprehensive review of U.S. relations with Greece and report his findings to Congress, is similar to one that was passed by the Senate in January.

Its text follows:

A bill to prohibit all military assistance to Greece until it is determined that Greece is fulfilling its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States Government to provide military assistance and military sales, credit sales, and guaranties to or for the Government of Greece only when that Government fulfills its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, including both adherence to the political principles stated in the preamble to the treaty and the maintenance of its capability to perform common defense functions assigned under the current North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense plans. Therefore, no military assistance and no sales, credit sales, or guarantees shall be provided to or for the Government of Greece under this or any other Act after the date of enactment of this Act until the President (1) undertakes a comprehensive review, after such date, of United States policy toward Greece, (2) has made a full report with respect to such review to Congress, and (3) finds and reports to Congress that, as a result of such review, the Government of Greece is in full compliance with its political and military obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty.

Recent events in Greece and the instability of the military regime there underscore the need for a review of American policy toward that nation, particularly in view of alarming reports of an almost total suppression of democratic rights, mass arrests, and the reopening of concentration camps there.

I call attention to the findings of a House Foreign Affairs Committee study mission to Greece, headed by Rep. DONALD M. FRASER, which said in its report, February 22, 1974, that American policy toward Greece is wrong. Among its findings were these significant points:

The unity of NATO is seriously disrupted when the United States insists that NATO continue to support a dictatorial regime in Greece when the original purpose of NATO membership for Greece was to preserve its democratic government. The United States stands alone in NATO in insisting on this close relationship with a military Greek Government.

American self-interest in projecting abroad its commitment to a democratic society as part of its foreign policy is seriously damaged when we continue to support a government which has been under military rule for 7 years.

Whether or not there is justice in the charge that the United States condoned the execution of the 1967 military (coup), there is a widespread perception in Greece today that our continued support of the military government contributed to its continuation. The United States has become, in the eyes of an increasing number of Greek democrats, an instrument of their repression.

A report prepared for me by the American Committee for Democracy and Freedom in Greece points out that the American record of collaboration with the Greek juntas is so bad that—

Among the Greek people our name has become synonymous with the poverty and oppression of the past seven years. Every act of resistance to the despots in Greece has been linked to the demands to "get the CIA out of Greece" and to "stop U.S. intervention and support" of the fascists.

The 200 years of our own American history should teach us that people will resist injustice, and yet we continue to support regimes that repress the democratic rights of their own people. The growing discontent in Greece against the dictatorial government of Col. George Papadopoulos did not slow our official support for his regime. Not until that discontent rose to such a pitch that the people threatened to oust the junta did Papadopoulos offer even the pre-

tense of an election. He excluded any opposition parties from his "democratic elections" and the Greek people were not fooled. In fact, his fraudulent promises precipitated the strongest, most organized opposition in the 7 years of the colonels' rule. This led to mass arrests, jailings and bloodshed and replacement of the Papadopoulos government by an even more reactionary military-led regime that continues to repress democratic rights and has reopened hated concentration camps.

While the press was full of stories about the uprising of the students demanding academic and political freedom at the Athens Polytechnic Institute on November 15, 1973, most newspapers failed to report the depth and extent of that uprising and the fact that it was not limited to students, but included the participation of people from all walks of life. Of the 866 arrests to which the government admitted, more than half were workers. The New York Times on Nov. 19, 1973, in a dispatch from Athens reported:

Knowledgeable Greeks said that up to 2,000 people had been detained during the clashes or picked up by the police at their homes.

In a later report that appeared in its December 28, 1973, edition, the New York Times said:

What began as student protests erupted into an anti-Government explosion encompassing such usually disparate elements of Greek society as trade unionists, businessmen, professionals and artists. The clear message was that a broad cross-section of Greeks—not just a few "anarchists" as the Government contended—is demanding more, not less freedom than President Papadopoulos had grudgingly begun to yield.

According to the junta, only 13 students were killed in the antigovernment protests, but other accounts report much larger casualties. The International Committee of Human Rights, after three of its lawyers spent 15 days in Greece, reported on December 20, 1973, that the number of dead greatly exceeds 50. The Committee for Solidarity with Greece, based in London, reported the following deaths: two women died of wounds in Evangelismos hospital; one child in a children's hospital, 20 in the reformatory center; 9 in KAT hospital; 43 in the streets of Athens; 30 in private hospitals; 29 in first aid stations. Letters from Greece, published in Greek language papers in Europe, placed the number of dead at more than 200, often giving the names of the dead and wounded.

The inability of the colonels to contain the growing opposition made it necessary to substitute a more repressive military dictatorship. Necessary to whom? What part did the United States play in the November 25 coup? In little more than a week after the Papadopoulos regime was ousted, our Government rushed to resume full diplomatic contacts with the new army-backed Government of Greece. Ambassador Henry J. Tasca called on the new foreign minister and planned meetings with other top officials in the regime.

The New York Times reported December 4, 1973, that Brig. Gen. Dimitrios Ioannidis, chief of the Greek military police, played a key role in the November 25 coup and was regarded by Western embassies "as the regime's No. 1 strongman. He is known as a staunch anti-Communist and a fiery nationalist."

The same article noted that the state-controlled media was giving prominence to a warning that—

Greece had been too often and too sharply criticized in NATO for failing to restore democracy, and that Greeks wanted no more of such interference in their internal affairs. . . .

The Times report continued:

The United States opened diplomatic dealings with the new Government at a time when local disillusion with it was growing after early hopes that the downfall of Mr. Papadopoulos would be a step toward democratic normality.

The changed mood was fed by the arbitrary closing of an Athens rightist daily, Vradyni, last Saturday for disobeying military police guidance of what it should not print.

The full text of the December 4 New York Times report follows:

ATHENS CONTACTS RENEWED BY U.S.—BUT NEW RULERS INSTALLED BY COUP WARN ON PRESSURE

ATHENS, Dec. 4.—The United States today resumed full diplomatic contacts with Greece's new army-backed Government, which took power in a bloodless coup Nov. 25.

Ambassador Henry J. Tasca called on Spyros Tetenes, a career diplomat who was given the post of Foreign Minister in the Cabinet of Premier Adamantios Androutsopoulos. Applications for meetings with other Greek leaders, presumably including the new President, Gen. Phaidon Gizikis, are pending.

Mr. Tasca's meeting with the Foreign Minister followed assurances by members of the new Cabinet to Embassy officials that the new Government would remain in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and adhere to its links with the United States and respect the agreement with the United States Sixth Fleet on a home port.

There is no evidence yet here that these pledges reflect the consensus in the Government's entire power structure, whose composition and outlook are unknown.

What seems certain is the Brig. Gen. Dimitrios Ioannidis, chief of the Greek military police, who played a key role in the Nov. 25 coup, is regarded by Western embassies here as the regime's No. 1 strongman. He is known as a stanch anti-Communist and a fiery nationalist.

MISGIVINGS PRODUCED

The broad publicity given by the state-controlled news media to a warning to the West that Greece's new leaders might be less tolerant to Western efforts to encourage democracy here has increased misgivings in Western embassies.

The warning was made Sunday in a front-page article in the Athens daily Eleftheros Kosmos and signed by Christian Xanthopoulos-Palamas, Foreign Minister of the Papadopoulos Government under the headline: "The Political Change in Greece and the Atlantic Alliance."

The article asserted that Greece had been too often and too sharply criticized in NATO for failing to restore democracy, and that Greeks wanted no more of such interference in their internal affairs, adding that such interference caused "a pointless and absurd cold war within the NATO Council" and undermined Western unity.

The United States opened diplomatic dealings with the new Government at a time when local disillusion with it was growing after early hopes that the downfall of Mr. Papadopoulos would be a step toward democratic normality.

The changed mood was fed by the arbitrary closing of an Athens rightist daily, Vradyni, last Saturday for disobeying military police guidance on what it should not print.

PROTEST TO GOVERNMENT

Unions of journalists, printers and other newspaper employes, in a joint protest to the Government, called the action "unjustified and inexplicable" and "contrary to official assurance that there is no censorship."

Thirty-four students and one journalist in Salonika, in northern Greece, are to appear before a court-martial magistrate tomorrow on charges related to a sit-in at Salonika University three weeks ago.

Between 200 and 300 persons are still being held here after the mid-November student revolt in Athens Polytechnic University that ended in riots and at least 12 civilian deaths.

Today, security forces rearrested Prof. Dionysios Karageorgas, who was given amnesty last August from a life sentence for sedition imposed on him in 1970 by an Athens court-martial.

The law professor, who had lost half a hand and one ear in an accidental bomb blast that betrayed apparent underground activities, was reported to have been under medical treatment for head injuries since his release.

General Ioannidis, the new "strong man" in the military regime, operates the military police, the ESA, like Hitler's Gestapo, according to reports gathered by the American Committee for Democracy and Freedom in Greece. It quotes the Greek News Agency in London as saying that—

ESA men in plain clothes when they are on special missions, enter where they will without warning, without warrants of arrest, or the approval of the government authorities. They arrest those whom the "Chief" orders them to. The police vans come and go ceaselessly.

A communique issued by the ESA on December 12, 1973, in its role as a supergovernment, attempted to justify its ruthless activities by leveling charges against the police for "unsuccessful confrontation of the mob in the demonstrations" of November; against the judicial authorities for their "lukewarm and lenient behavior during the trial of those charged as being responsible for the demonstrations;" against the professors and senate of the Polytechnic for "having talked about the sanctity of the institute's premises and promising to send medicines and clothing to the students;" and against the university authorities for "their inexplicable conception of the asylum of education foundations," et cetera.

On January 3, 1974, the junta prevented a threatened strike by the printers union of Athens by arresting 12 of its leaders. The next day the British Committee for Democracy in Greece issued a list of names of trade unionists and former members of Parliament arrested in the previous days. The Manchester Guardian reported on January 4, 1974, that—

The extent of the Government's reaction to the proposed strike reflects its concern at the spread of labor unrest. The Greek

Confederation of Labor has called for increases of 25 to 40% in rates of pay to meet recent inflation here (Athens), the highest in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and Development, and the Government is disturbed lest unrest over wages, combined with the wide anger at the bloodshed after the occupation of the Athens Polytechnic and the demand for an alternative to military rule might manifest itself in a general strike.

On January 18, 47 of those arrested during the November uprising were brought to court in Athens where, without written accusations, briefs or attorneys, without the right of appeal, they all received jail sentences of 1 to 6 years. The students were all between the ages of 16 and 18. Meanwhile, accounts of tortures in the jails are filtering out more and more frequently.

The New York Times reported December 31, 1973:

Officials refused to discuss the question of political prisoners. No one knows who they are, how many there are, or where they are held. A delegation from the (West Europe) Socialist International that came to look into this question was turned back at Athens airport last week.

The December 31 New York Times article follows:

GREECE REPORTEDLY REOPENING A PRISON

ATHENS, Dec. 30.—Families of Greek political prisoners contended today that the new Government had reopened the concentration camp on Gyaros, a waterless, uninhabited island of seven square miles in the Aegean Sea.

Officials refused to confirm the report. Nor would they confirm reports that a first group of 25 or 30 Greeks was sent to the camp yesterday, and 25 more today.

But the family of Ioannis Haralambopoulous, a former Liberal member of Parliament, said it had been told by the Athens security police that he had been shipped to the camp with other political prisoners.

RED CROSS PROTESTED

The mother of Nikolaos Klaos, a journalist and former student leader, appealed to the Greek President, Lieut. Gen. Phaidon Gizikis, to find out where her son was kept. The family was allowed to visit him and learned from him that he expected to be shipped to Gyaros.

Gyaros, 65 miles southeast of Athens, was used as a prison camp immediately after the military coup in 1967, when 6,500 Greeks were rounded up in one night.

The prison population of the camp diminished as a result of releases as well as transfers to other camps. It was shut down in 1969 after repeated protests by the International Red Cross that the camp was unfit for human occupation.

The present Government, which five weeks ago toppled the dictatorship of President George Papadopoulos, had promised to free all those arrested by the deposed Government after the Athens student revolt was crushed in November. Panayotis Kanellopoulos, a former conservative Premier, said in a statement distributed to the press that he did not know how many were still detained despite the pledge. He said he was particularly grieved by the case of Mr. Haralambopoulos, who was arrested 45 days ago and "disappeared from the eyes of his family."

Mr. Kanellopoulos called on the Government "to end the inhuman isolation to which he has been subjected for so long in defiance of all moral law."

Reports from relatives of other prisoners said a 68-year-old left-wing former deputy named George Stergiou had also been sent to the camp. The relatives said they had been asked to furnish warm clothes.

Officials refuse to discuss the question of political prisoners. No one knows who they are, how many there are or where they are held. A delegation from the Socialist International that came to look into this question was turned back at Athens airport last week.

This uncertainty has encouraged rumors that more people died in the street riots last month than the 13 officially listed. Security forces opened fire on the demonstrators in Athens during the riots Nov. 16 and 19, and the bloodshed acted as a catalyst for the overthrow of the Papadopoulos Government by another military junta one week later.

The new Government, which is said to be controlled behind the scenes by Brig. Gen. Demetrios Ioannidis, chief of the military police, has issued few statements. It refuses to commit itself to any plans.

One substantial reform in favor of democracy came 12 days ago. A constitutional decree stripped Greek presidents, of the vast executive and legislative powers with which Mr. Papadopoulos had tried to insure a trouble-free tenure until 1981. However, at the same time, the new Government upheld martial law, which was brought back after the student revolt, and called off Mr. Papadopoulos's plans for elections in 1974.

On January 2, 1974, the Christian Science Monitor commented that "the last vestiges of an opposition press have disappeared" with the closing down of the Greek Orthodox Church paper, Christianiki, for expressing disapproval of the past and present juntas and with the shutdown of the Athens rightwing daily, Vradyni.

Immediately after the coup, the New York Times had reported November 26, 1974, that General Ioannidis had called in newspaper editors and told them that they should henceforth work in behalf of the new government. He said that they could criticize life under the old government but that the new leaders would not tolerate criticism, either in news columns or cartoons.

The most ominous indication of the new junta's plans to stifle resistance is the reopening of the concentration camp island of Gyaros which had been shut down since 1969 under the pressure of outraged public opinion and repeated protests from the International Red Cross. Gyaros is a barren, waterless rock in the Aegean Sea that had been used by emperors of ancient Rome to rid themselves of their adversaries. No one is certain of the numbers of prisoners on the island now.

The Christian Science Monitor on January 2, 1974, said 25 political prisoners had been reported by their families to have been shipped to the prison island. On December 31, 1973, the London Daily Telegraph reported:

It is understood students involved in the incidents at Athens Polytechnic University in November are among the deportees to Yioura (Gyaros). Two former MPs are also said to have been included in the first group in the convoy. One is Mr. Haralambopoulos of Patras, South Greece, who was arrested three weeks ago. His son, a 26-year-old lawyer, is also said to be detained in Yioura.

Earlier this month, on April 1, the Times reported that the new government in Greece "has made it clear that dissenters will not be tolerated." Reporting directly from Athens, correspondent Steven V. Roberts said:

The Government is nominally headed by Gen. Phaidon Gizikis, but the real power lies with Brig. Gen. Demetrios Ionnidis, the head of the military police. Rumors abound concerning factionalism and rivalry within the ruling group, and some diplomats think the Government is still acting out of "weakness" and "insecurity," but in recent weeks the "no nonsense" attitude has shown itself in a variety of ways.

The full article said:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1974]

"NO NONSENSE" IN GREECE—NEW GOVERNMENT HAS MADE IT CLEAR THAT DISSENTERS WILL NOT BE TOLERATED

(By Steven V. Roberts)

ATHENS, March 31.—Greece celebrated her national day last week with dozens of tanks rumbling through Athens, showing off the nation's military might. But the sizable crowds lining the sunlit parade route stared in silence as the olive drab armor clanked past. To some Greeks, the guns seemed pointed as much at them as at any foreign enemy.

Four months after a military coup deposed the Government of George Papadopoulos, a former Army colonel who seized power in 1967, the direction Greece is taking remains murky and uncertain. Readers gave a knowing laugh last week when The Athens News published a picture of Chinese characters and labeled it "The Greek Political Situation."

But at least one point is now clear: The new Government will not tolerate dissent. The Athens daily newspaper Eleftheros Cosmos seemed to be taking an official view when it editiorialized on the national day, March 25, the anniversary of the rebellion against the Turks in 1821, that "Greece is perhaps menaced more internally and less externally."

"A NO-NONSENSE GROUP"

"The only trend I can observe," said a foreign diplomat, "is the effort to drum in the idea that this Government is a no-nonsense group. They won't permit a level of opposition to get started."

The Government is nominally headed by Gen. Phaidon Gizikis, but the real power lies with Brig. Gen. Demetrios Ioannides, the head of the military police. Rumors abound concerning factionalism and rivalry within the ruling group, and some diplomats think the Government is still acting out of "weakness" and "insecurity," but in recent weeks the "no-nonsense" attitude has shown itself in a variety of ways.

Two newspapers were closed in December and several reporters arrested. By now the press is printing almost no political news, and, as one fearful publisher put it last week, "self-censorship" by the papers is almost complete.

George Mavros, the acting head of the Center Union Party, was arrested for endorsing a British decision to cancel a Navy visit here as a sign of Britain's displeasure with the Athens Government. Mr. Mavros, 65 years old, has apparently been exiled to Gyaros, a harsh island in the Aegean, where about 100 political prisoners have been reported sent.

Several former associates of Mr. Papadopoulos have also been rounded up. Michael Balopoulos, former secretary general of the national tourist organization, was arrested and released last week, but Ioannis Agathangelou, once the No. 2 man in the previous administration, remains on Gyaros after his arrest for "creating unrest among citizens."

Dissident film makers, actors and singers have also been sent to Gyaros. About 10 small night clubs in the Plaka district were closed

by the police, apparently because they presented songs composed by Mikis Treodorakis, an avowed leftist now living in exile.

Diplomats and professors say that students are routinely arrested and released as a form of "intimidation". Student demonstrations helped bring about the coup last November, and it is still uncertain how many youths were killed after tanks stormed the campus of the Athens Polytechnic University. The official figure for civilian casualties is 13, but most well-informed sources put the number at about 50. Some student leaders are also said to be on Gyaros.

FEAR OF COMMUNISM

Dozens of Communists—the party is official outlawed—have also been rounded up, and the Government contends that it has smashed a leftist plot to cause its overthrow.

In defense of Government actions, some Greeks point out that this country suffered severely from Communist attacks during the Civil War of 1946 to 1949, that three Communist countries are on her northern border and that fear of renewed trouble runs deep. As Eleftheros Cosmos put it, "Greece will never enjoy quiet sleep if Communism is not put out of action."

The army and its supporters fear the tumult of democratic politics and place the highest priority on order. As an example of this view, the newspaper Estia carried an editorial last week against "unrestrained freedom."

Behind these outward signs, no one really knows what is happening inside the Government. Greece is still in a period of waiting.

Whose interest is served by keeping the lid on the demands for democracy in Greece? Who has profited from the millions of U.S. dollars poured into Greece? Certainly not the majority of Greek people who have become impoverished by runaway inflation, with living costs rising by 35 to 40 percent in 1973 alone. Certainly not the hundreds of thousands of workers who have left Greece since 1968 to seek jobs in other countries because there were none in their own land. How much of our American tax dollars have been poured over the years into these Greek military regimes and used to enrich the Greek generals and other Army leaders? Colonel Papadopoulos reportedly built himself a palace, with its own heliport. Kryix, a Greek language newspaper in New York, reported evidence of corruption has been released by the Gizikis junta to discredit the previous regime. How necessary to our security is the maintenance of a military dictatorship in Greece?

When the colonels took power in 1967 there were bitter accusations about the role of the CIA in that coup. Andreas Papandreou, the deposed premier, stated then:

> . . . the Greek intelligence service is literally a part of the CIA, administratively and fiscally. . . . Papadopoulos was liaison between the two intelligence services, U.S. and Greek. In fact, he was the one trusted person, the one superagent, in Greece of the CIA. And as I like to put it, the first known agent of the CIA to become prime minister in Europe is Papadopoulos.

Today, when so much is known about the CIA's role in manipulating and arranging events in other countries for the convenience of American foreign policy, we have a responsibility in the Congress to look into the role of the CIA in the latest coup. Charges have been made that Adamandios Androutsopoulos, the new premier, was in the pay of the CIA during his years in this country. According to the Christian Science Monitor, January 2, 1974, the deposed Papadopoulos and his prime minister, Markezinis, are "telling all visitors that the U.S. CIA engineered their overthrow." The Monitor also reported that—

> There is a general impression among all walks of the (Greek) population that the U.S., finding Mr. Papadopoulos had "outlived his usefulness," decided to discard him.

Charges such as these warrant an investigation by the appropriate congressional committee. I hope that this will be undertaken, and I also hope that the House will join the Senate in calling for the suspension of military aid and loans to the Greek junta pending a full review of American policy toward Greece.

At this point, I would like to include in the RECORD various news reports on the situation in Greece.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1974]

GREECE'S WORST CRISIS

A study mission for the House Foreign Affairs Committee believes Greece is facing its worst crisis since the civil war of 1946–49. "Indeed, a renewal of large-scale civil conflict is one of the real possibilities in Greece today," says the mission's report, presented by Representative Donald Fraser of Minnesota after an on-the-scene investigation.

This somber conclusion, fraught with grim implications not only for the long-suffering Greeks but for Greece's partners in Western defense, seems to be supported by every new action of the obviously insecure military junta that overthrew Colonel Papadopoulos last November. The brutal arrest of George Mavros, a former Government minister and leader of the Center Union party, is only the most recent exhibition of the junta's instability.

Military police in civilian clothes smashed in the door of his Athens home with a crowbar at 6 A.M. and hauled Mr. Mavros off to jail after he had defended the cancellation by Britain's Labor Government of a visit to Greece by two Royal Navy ships. To the junta, Britain's action was intolerable intervention in Greek affairs; to Mr. Mavros, it was "completely justified" as a move aimed at helping restore democracy to Greece.

Foreign Secretary James Callaghan said he ordered the British ships to turn back because "we have to differentiate ourselves from the dictatorships." Congressman Fraser's mission fears that the Nixon Administration's reluctance to make the same differentiation has already badly damaged the United States with the Greek people and could turn them decisively against the whole NATO relationship when political change comes to Greece.

For whatever reasons, the United States Navy has partially carried out one of the House mission recommendations. It will delay, perhaps for a year or more, a final decision in basing an aircraft carrier with its air wing at Megara Bay, west of Athens. The Navy attributes the postponement to difficulties in negotiating the necessary details with the junta; but Greek democrats hope it signals a change of attitude by the Administration.

Two things seem clear in Greece's situation. The obscure, second-rate civilians drafted for the Cabinet by the military rulers cannot even come to grips with Greece's burgeoning problems, including Europe's most rampant inflation. And the top military leaders remain divided about Greece's political future, with one faction of respected officers still favoring formation of a government of national unity, charged with preparing early elections and a return to civilian democratic rule.

Is it too much to hope that the United States will find discreet ways to support this democratic solution, thus diminishing the risks of civil war and vindicating the ideals for which President Truman came to Greece's aid 27 years ago this month?

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1974]

U.S. DEFERS BASING CARRIER IN GREECE—NEW ATHENS REGIME SEEKING ARMS FOR USE OF PORT

ATHENS, March 15.—Diplomatic sources said today that a final decision on basing a United States carrier near Athens had been postponed for a year or more because of delays in working out the arrangements with the new Greek Government.

The military rulers who ousted the Government of President George Papadopoulos last November told the United States Navy in January that Greece expected modern arms and equipment in exchange for granting home-port facilities.

The United States Ambassador to Greece, Henry J. Tasca, flew to Washington yesterday for consultations.

6 DESTROYERS ARE THERE

Ambassador Tasca is scheduled to testify on March 27 before the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Europe and probably before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The subcommittee, headed by Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat of Long Island, has been highly critical of the United States Navy's plan to base a carrier task force near Athens.

The first phase of the Navy's plan was completed in September 1972, when six American destroyers anchored at Eleusis, an industrial port 15 miles west of Athens. They are now based there at a specially built pier and are to be joined soon by a Navy hospital ship.

It was while the second phase of the agreement was under negotiation that the Papadopoulos Government was overthrown by another military group on Nov. 25, after a student-worker revolt that was quelled by tanks and martial law. At least 13 civilians were killed.

When the Navy resumed the negotiations, the new Greek leaders, unlike the deposed ones, pressed for modernization of Greek weaponry in exchange, reportedly producing a list of demands for planes, ships and tanks worth several hundred million dollars.

AIRFIELDS ALSO SOUGHT

Qualified sources said that the talks would be resumed at the Greek Foreign Ministry soon.

The American side is seeking agreements for the use of Megara Bay and a land support area for the carrier. It also wants airfield facilities, first at Eleusis air base for aircraft maintenance, but chiefly at Souda Bay airfield, on the island of Crete, for proficiency flying by pilots of the carrier task force.

Home-port facilities for the carrier would add 1,150 American naval dependents to some 1,500 already settled in the greater Athens area.

If the diplomatic negotiations succeed and the "agreed amendments" to the 1973 arrangement with the ousted Government are signed, American experts here say, the Defense Department will then ask the State Department for its decision on the home-port agreement.

According to State Department officials, the political situation in Greece would then be reviewed before the department decided whether to endorse the arrangement.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1974]

U.S. DEFERS TALKS ON BASE IN GREECE—PAUSE IS LINKED TO CONCERN OVER REGIME'S DURABILITY

(By David Binder)

WASHINGTON, Jan. 15.—Worry about the durability of the new military leadership in Athens and its foreign policy has caused the Nixon Administration to defer discussions on basing a navy carrier task force in Greece, American officials reported today.

The officials said the pause was ordered last month by Secretary of State Kissinger after the coup d'état in which a group of rightists Greek army officers overthrew President George Papadopoulos Nov. 25.

An agreement for establishment of a home port for a carrier task force—a squadron of six destroyers, an aircraft carrier, its air wing and a hospital ship—was signed by Greek and American military officials one year ago.

The initial phase—the anchoring of the destroyer squadron at Eleusis, 15 miles west of Athens and the lodging of about 1,500 navy dependents in the Athens metropolitan area—had already been completed by then on the basis of an earlier agreement in principle.

It is the second and more controversial phase, the stationing of a Sixth Fleet carrier in Megara Bay, beyond Eleusis, that is being held up mainly for political reasons, the officials said.

MORE UNREST FEARED

While technical discussions with Greek military authorities continue on unresolved details of the plan, the decision on whether to go ahead with the stationing of the carrier has been postponed until the political situation in Greece becomes clear, the officials said.

Mr. Kissinger has met twice with American officials concerned with Greece since the November take-over by the Government of Lieut. Gen. Phaidon Gizikis. After the first meeting, Mr. Kissinger said he was disposed to go ahead with the Rome port arrangement for the carrier. The second time he recommended a pause.

The officials said Mr. Kissinger had become disturbed over reports that the new Greek leadership was likely to raise the kind of unrest that precipitated the November coup.

In addition, the Nixon Administration was described as being wary of an increasingly nationalist note struck by the Greek military leaders.

An official cited as evidence a declaration Jan. 6 by the new Foreign Minister, Spyros Tetenes, relating to Greece's membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. Tetenes said that while Greece remained devoted to her international obligations and alliances she was "at the same time demanding fulfillment of obligations stemming from our alliance by others." The American official commented: "They have become a shade more nationalistic."

POSITION ON MIDEAST NOTED

The administration officials also noted that during the Arab-Israel war in October Athens forbade United States Air Force planes to fly in and out of the Greek base to help resupply Israel while permitting Soviet supply planes to fly over Greece's Cyclades Islands on the way to Syria and Egypt.

At the State Department, an officer concerned with the homeport issue said: "We are being closemouthed about it because it is time to decide and we haven't decided yet."

There is strong opposition in the State Department to the home-port plan on the ground that it would needlessly complicate already difficult political relations between Athens and Washington. But according to military sources, there is also opposition within the United States navy to the project, which is viewed as a pet of the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Elmo Zumwalt.

The admirals who oppose the home-port policy described as carrier-oriented "traditionalists" who believe the navy should avoid foreign bases.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1974]

SENATE VOTES TO BAR AID TO GREEK REGIME

The Senate voted yesterday to bar military aid to Greece until the Athens regime restores a democratic government and agrees to fulfill its obligations to NATO.

The bill was passed and sent to the House on a voice vote. Its fate was uncertain there, and it would almost certainly be vetoed by President Nixon if it was approved.

The measure bars all military assistance, sales, credit sales or guaranties for arms to the Greek government until the President finds and reports to Congress that "the government of Greece is in full compliance with its political and military obligations under the North Atlantic treaty."

The bill does allow the President to give aid if he notifies Congress 30 days in advance that the "overriding national interest" requires it.

Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), the bill's main sponsor, said he did not have much hope for enactment when the bill was voted out of the Foreign Relations Committee in December. He called it largely a "symbolic" gesture "to show the Greek people they still have some friends" in the United States. But an aide to Pell said yesterday the bill was cleared for a voice vote by the Republican leadership because "apparently they just decided not to fight it."

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I support the special order of my colleague from New York, Ms. ABZUG, on the continued supression of democracy in Greece.

After a recent fact-finding mission to Greece, the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported in February of this year:

The present government cannot long endure. Marked by inexperience, its members appear without the requisite talents or skills for extricating the country from its political and economic chaos.

Mr. Speaker, after the coup under which the Ionnades regime took power last November, the Greek government reopened prison camps for political opponents, first created by the Papadopoulos government. Papadopoulos, though still repressive, had ended the camps, promised to allow free elections, and granted political amnesty to many, all because of the pressure of world and public opinion. It was at this point that the military coup took place.

The current Greek Government has arbitrarily arrested and imprisoned opponents and has reopened the detention camps on the country's islands and in downtown Athens. The 30 percent inflation rate—the highest in Europe—continues. Since Ionnades took over, there has only been a movement back to greater repression. There is no longer even the promise of allowing elections. Demonstrations by workers and students are occurring once again.

Mr. Speaker, a democratic government would not imprison its political opponents in camps. A democratic government would not fear to hold elections.

Because of congressional pressure, the U.S. Government decided not to build a home port in Greece as previously planned by the Defense Department. This would have been needless support of the corrupt and repressive Greek Government. Yet the Defense Department has never publicly stated its reasons for this reversal in policy. I agree with the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the facts surrounding our policy in this area should be made public.

Mr. Speaker, for the fiscal year 1973, the U.S. Government provided $102.6 million in military loans and grants to the Greek Government, a government which has shown that it wants not democracy, but dictatorship. I am as opposed to providing such assistance to Greece now as I was and am opposed to our military assistance to South Vietnam.

I agree with Senator PELL, Congresswoman ABZUG and other distinguished colleagues here today that the United States should suspend military assistance or sales to the Greek Government until a review of Greek policy assures the Congress that the Greek Government is in compliance with its political and military obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, to which it subscribes.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, although we have long been considered the leader of the democratic free world, we continue to support repressive states which are unpopular even in their homelands. It is time to live up to our own democratic ideals and to end such support.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the subject of the special order today of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, CENTER FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, MARCH 22, 1974

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished public servants of our time is the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of an outstanding address delivered by Mr. Justice Goldberg at the Center for Civil Rights at the University of Notre Dame, March 22, 1974, on the occasion both of the dedication of the reading room of the Center for Civil Rights at the Notre Dame Law School and the 20th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Brown against the Board of Education.

The text of Mr. Justice Goldberg's address follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG

It is a great honor and privilege to address this dinner celebrating the dedication of the Reading Room of the Center for Civil Rights

at the Law School of Notre Dame University and commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Brown v. Board of Education*.[1]

It is most appropriate that the Center for Civil Rights and its Reading Room be established at Notre Dame and that this commemoration be held at this University. Its President, the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh is one of the nation's outstanding leaders in the cause of equal rights and equal justice. Father Hesburgh has been for many years and continues to be a great spiritual warrior in the continuing struggle for freedom and equality. As we all should he acknowledges equal rights for all as the will of God in whose image all persons are created; yet he recognizes by both deed and word that it remains true, as President Kennedy once said, "that here on earth God's will must truly be our own."

A TIME OF PROFOUND CYNICISM

We meet at a time of profound cynicism and disillusionment about our government, its leaders and the political process. This cynicism is understandable. Watergate has shocked this Nation and rightly so. Watergate involves allegations and evidence before Congressional committees and before courts that high officials of our government authorized and participated in illegal bugging, illegal disruption of the political process, perjury, political favoritism influencing governmental decisionmaking, violation of the election laws, cover-up and obstruction of justice and misprision of felony.

Two former cabinet officers are now standing trial for certain of these offenses. Several former White House officials have already pleaded guilty to various Watergate crimes. Other former high-ranking government officials are under indictment.

Those charged, but not convicted, are entitled to the presumption of innocence, but it cannot be gainsaid that the ever-mounting disclosures have eroded public confidence in the leadership of our country. This is evident from the public opinion polls and from the fact that the process of impeaching the President himself is under way by a virtually unanimous vote of the House of Representatives.

IMPEACHMENT A DRASTIC SANCTION

The same public opinion polls, however, show that the American public is uneasy about the prospect of impeaching a President. This, too, is most understandable. Impeachment has occurred only once before in our history, at the time of Andrew Johnson. Impeachment is the most drastic political sanction our constitutional system provides.

The men who framed our Constitution were aware of the enormity of the impeachment sanction and recognized the potentially disruptive effects of an impeachment proceeding. But they also recognized that it would be far more dangerous for the country to have no remedy against the betrayal of the public trust than to sustain the burden of impeachment and conviction.

We must not, in fidelity to the Constitution and to restore public confidence in government, abjure the use of the sanction the Framers provided.

IMPEACHMENT PROCESS—WHATEVER THE OUTCOME—WILL ALLAY CYNICISM

Impeachment cannot solve all of our Watergate woes, but if impeachment proceedings are properly and fairly conducted, the result—whatever it may be—will stand as legitimate in this country and serve to allay much of the cynicism which exists in our people's minds about our political institutions.

The Constitution provides the tools. Our reluctance to use tools so finely honed is understandable, but they are in use; the impeachment process is under way. It is the duty of Congress to proceed to a conclusion; it is the duty of the President fully to cooperate with Congress; it is the duty of the people to abide by the result. This is the constitutional way. It will not fail us; we must not fail it.

CYNICISM ALSO PERMEATES CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Cynicism and discouragement likewise permeate the civil rights movement. It is only honest to admit this.

There are adherents of civil rights who say that the great promise of *Brown* has not been fully realized. In this, they are right; but they are not right in "copping out;" the struggle to overcome centuries of racial discrimination in so many aspects of Aremican life is bound to be arduous and frustrating. Thomas Paine aptly warned that: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must . . . undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

HISTORIC BROWN DECISION MERITS CONTINUED SUPPORT

There are adherents of civil rights who say that *Brown* was initially right in holding that separate can never be equal but that since equality is still denied, let us return to separatism, for at least by so doing we can preserve our pride and safeguard our identity. I understand this reaction and am a firm believer in a pluralistic society rather than a homogenized one. But the goal of an integrated and desegregated public education decreed by *Brown*, is worthy of our continuing efforts and must not be abandoned because of fatigue and discouragement.

There are those who despair that the struggle for human rights seems to be ever enduring and even never ending; that it is too much to expect continuing pursuit of Martin Luther King's dream when the dream appears to be merely such and far from reality. To these, I would say, to paraphrase Tennyson, more things are wrought by dreams than this world conceives of.

ELIMINATING VESTIGE OF SLAVERY: A TRANSCENDENT OBLIGATION

There are those, formerly part of the great coalition that forged *Brown*,[2] who now fear that, carried to its logical conclusion, *Brown*, in seeking to eliminate racial discrimination against Blacks in education, will do so at the expense of other racial and ethnic minorities which, too, have suffered grievous discrimination. To these adherents of civil rights who have expressed these fears and concerns, most recently in briefs filed in the *Defunis* case,[3] I would say, you are misguided in your fears and are wrong, simply wrong. To eliminate the vestiges of slavery, as promised by the thirteenth amendment—to seek to correct an injustice existing since the very foundation of this country—is a moral and constitutional obligation of transcendent importance.

BUT NO RESPONSIBLE CIVIL RIGHTS ADVOCATE PROPOSES QUOTAS

It is understandable that victims of past discrimination in educational opportunity react against the specter of the imposition of quotas. The fact is, however, that no responsible adherent of civil rights is proposing the restoration of a quota system—the infamous numerous clauses.[4] The affirmative action program of seeking to admit a moderate—indeed, a modest—number of Black students to law schools and other institutions of higher learning is an essential element in a program to correct an historic inequity; it is not a program to establish a quota system for admission of students to institutions of higher education.

ACTUAL ADMISSION, NOT PREPARATION, THE KEY TO EQUALITY

All agree that some form of affirmative action is required, but some overlook the teaching of *Brown* that the most effective type of affirmative action program to overcome past injustices is for Black students to share an educational experience with other students by admission to their ranks.[5] Preparatory courses are useful but actual admission to an integrated classroom provides real educational benefits to white and Black students alike.

There is a clear and present danger that the fissure in the civil rights coalition evident in the *DeFunis* case will widen to the busing and other difficult cases which are coming to the courts for adjudication.[6] This would be a matter of very great regret.

DANGER THAT GREAT COALITION IN SUPREME COURT WILL FALL

There is perhaps an even greater danger, division in the great coalition in the Supreme Court of the United States established in *Brown* and persisting in Brown's progeny. *Brown* itself was a unanimous decision[7] and, during the Warren era[8] all school desegregation cases were also unanimous.[9]

But the Court Court, as presently constituted, for the first time since *Brown*, has begun to divide on certain issues involving desegregation of public education.[10]

If this greatest of coalitions disintegrates, this would be most tragic. A civil rights coalition may urge; the Supreme Court decides. And, equally important, the Supreme Court is often the moral conscience of the nation. It was in *Brown*; it should remain so with the authority which unanimity provides.

AS THE HIGH COURT GOES, SO GO THE HIGH AIMS OF BROWN

Brown, as all historians of the Supreme Court agree, is one of its most significant decisions. One of the reasons is that *Brown* transcended the momentous issue of integrating public education. *Brown* had a profound impact as a constutitional signpost pointing towards the elimination of all kinds of legal barriers based on race and as a landmark from which broader changes in Black-white relations can be dated. It reflected a subtle trend of constitutional adjudication, an indication of an attitude by the Supreme Court to focus on issues before it in a different way than prior Courts.[11]

SEPARATE BUT EQUAL A FICTION

In deciding *Brown*, the Court cut through the fiction surrounding the old "separate but equal" doctrine to the realities which had always been patently obvious to all who were willing to see: that "separate" could never be "equal," because its very genesis and its only purpose for being was to be invidiously discriminatory, to keep the Black man in an inferior status.[12] But self-evident as this has always been, it was not until 1954—just twenty years ago and almost one hundred years after the adoption of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments—that the Court was willing to accord a full constitutional recognition and significance to this unmistakable reality.

THE GREAT GOOD: EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW

The willingness to look at the real impact of governmental action, to search for truth amid the fictions of legal doctrine, brought a new freshness to constitutional adjudication, a recognition that the basic law must be willing to grapple with everyday reality. This is why the Warren Court became a place of particular promise and hope for Black people, who were thereby encouraged to believe that racial justice is actually attainable, that the law could understand their own reality in a way which would allow it to frame mean-

Footnotes at end of article.

ingful relief from the everyday denials of constitutional principle and right.[13] The stifling of this new realism by division in the Supreme Court or by cutting back on *Brown* would set back the great goal of equal justice under law.

I conclude by making this appeal:

PERSEVERE FOR FREEDOM

To adherents of civil rights who have become discouraged and cynical, I say that this is not the time for the summer soldier or the sunshine patriot. The road ahead in the march for equality, in law and in fact, is filled with great obstacles difficult to surmount. But we must perservere if we are to bring the full blessings of freedom and equality to us and to our posterity.

Therefore, it is imperative that those who genuinely believe in civil rights persist in their efforts with courage and fortitude. Racial segregation and discrimination continue, but it is lesser in degree than when *Brown* was decided. This no one can deny.

True, the pace for total elimination of racial discrimination has been with all too deliberate speed.[14] But the Supreme Court itself has abandoned this concept. Today the constitutional mandate for equality is for the here and now and not a mere promise for the indefinite future.[15]

CIVIL RIGHTS FOR THE HERE AND NOW

Furthermore, the areas of denial of civil rights encompass important areas in addition to education, such as jobs, housing, voting, criminal and civil justice and accommodations that are public in fact although private in form. The elimination of racial barriers against equality in these aspects of American life simply is too important to permit cynicism, discouragement or half-hearted dedication to rectifying injustice.

I also appeal to the coalition of civil rights adherents, splintered in the *DeFunis* case, not to engage in acrimony, but to seek to restore the prior unity which existed, not by compromise—because compromise of constitutional principles is impermissible—but by returning to a common program of seeking to eliminate racial discrimination by supporting realistic remedies rather than submitting to ill-founded fears.

It would be presumptuous for me to appeal to the Supreme Court. Thus, I can only express the hope that the Court will unite as it did during the Warren era in support of that concept nobly expressed on the great edifice which houses the Court: Equal Justice for all.

APPEAL TO THE FRACTURED CIVIL RIGHTS ADHERENTS

And, finally, I also express the hope that the people of this country will abjure prejudice, fear and hate and will apply and practice the teachings of our common Judaic-Christian tradition, that all men are God's children, created in His image.

In *Brown*, the Court did its duty, under circumstances reminiscent of an earlier decision of the Supreme Court, *Worcester v. Georgia*,[16] decided in 1832. In that case, the Supreme Court upheld the claim of the Cherokee Indians to treaty land against annexation by the State of Georgia. This ruling aroused great anger on the part of President Jackson and Georgia. There were rumors and even threats that both the President and Georgia would decline to follow the Court's decision. Referring to these reports, Justice Story, in a letter to a friend, said this:

"Georgia is full of anger and violence. What she will do, it is difficult to say. Probably she will resist the execution of our judgment, and if she does, I do not believe the President will interfere. . . . The rumor is, that he has told the Georgians he will do nothing. I, for one, feel quite easy on this subject, be the event what it may. The Court has done its duty. Let the Nation now do theirs."[17]

In May of 1954, the Court in *Brown* did its duty. Now, in 1974 and in the years to come, let both the present Court and the Nation do theirs by fulfilling the still-unrealized American creed that all men are created free and equal.

FOOTNOTES

[1] 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[2] Twenty years ago, many groups united with the N.A.A.C.P. in urging the Court to take this "great civilizing step" of overturning the "separate but equal" principle of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. This coalition included the federal government, represented by the Justice Department; Jewish organizations, such as the American Jewish Congress; labor groups such as the American Federation of Teachers and the Congress of Industrial Organizations; defenders of civil rights such as the American Civil Liberties Union and the American Council on Human Rights, and other interested groups such as the American Veterans Committee. *See* Bolling v. Sharp, 347 U.S. 497, 498 (1954); Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 485–86 (1954).

[3] The fallout from the coalition that helped bring *Brown* about is evidenced by the briefs in the pending Supreme Court case of *DeFunis v. Odegaard*. No. 73–235. The American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League, the AFL–CIO and other groups generally supportive of civil rights filed amici briefs in support of DeFunis. On the other hand, Jewish organizations, such as the National Council of Jewish Women and the Union of Hebrew Congregations; union groups such as the United Farm Workers, United Auto Workers, United Mine Workers, and State, County and Municipal Employees; The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; the National Education Association; the Children's Fund; the ACLU; the N.A.A.C.P.; the Legal Defense Fund and other important organizations have filed briefs in support of the disputed program of the Law School of Washington. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission filed a motion supported by a brief amicus curiae in support of the program, but Solicitor General Bork disavowed this brief for the government and upon his application the Supreme Court rejected it.

[4] It is in these terms that the issue has been phrased in some of the briefs filed in *DeFunis*. See Brief of the Anti-Defamation League at 2 (question is: Whether a state may establish a racial quota).

[5] *See* Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 485, (1954). The importance of the admission of the minority student to an integrated legal classroom was recognized even before *Brown*. In 1950, the Court in *Sweatt v. Painter* held that the education that a Black student could receive at a law school established for Blacks could never be equal to the legal education at the University of Texas Law School. 339 U.S. 629 (1950). To the Court, the fact that the ostensibly objective facilities were equivalent was not controlling. As Chief Justice Vinson stated:

"What is more important, the University of Texas Law School possesses to a far greater degree those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school. Such qualities include reputation of the faculty, experience of the administration, position and influence of the alumni, standing in the community, traditions, and prestige." *Id.* at 634.

[6] *See* Milliken v. Bradley, cert. granted Nov. 19, 1973, 42 U.S.L.W. 3306 (U.S. Nov. 20, 1973) Nos. 73–434, 73–435, 73–436 (geographic boundaries); Gonzales v. Fairfax-Brewster Schools, Inc., 363 F. Supp. 1200 (E.D. Va. 1973), *appeal docketed*, No. 73–2351 (4th Cir. Nov. 13, 1973) (desegregation of private school under 42 U.S.C. section 1981).

[7] 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[8] I use this term to designate the chronological period during which Earl Warren was Chief Justice of the United States and the term "the Burger Court" to designate the present Court.

[9] *See, e.g.*, Green v. County School Board, 391 U.S. 430 (1968); Griffin v. Board of Education, 377 U.S. 218 (1964); Goss v. Board of Education, 373 U.S. 683 (1963); Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958). The Burger Court has been able to remain unanimous on certain issues. *See* Swann v. Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1 (1970); Alexander v. Board of Education, 396 U.S. 19 (1969).

[10] In *Wright v. Council of City of Emporia*, the Court split 5–4 on whether a municipality can break off from an existing school district which has not yet completed the process of dismantling a system of enforced racial segregation. 407 U.S. 451 (1972). The Court in *Carter v. West Feliciana Parish School Board*, while concurring in result, disagreed as to the proper timetable for the implementation of a court-ordered pupil transfer plan. 396 U.S. 290 (1970). And in two important desegregation cases last term, the Court also divided. In *Keyes v. School District No. 1*, Justice Rehnquist dissented, while Justices Douglas and Powell wrote concurring opinions. 413 U.S. 189 (1973). In *Bradley v. School Board*, the Court affirmed by an equally divided vote, with Justice Powell not participating, a lower court holding disallowing a desegregation plan which crossed county lines. 412 U.S. 92 (1973).

[11] A. Goldberg, Equal Justice 22 (1971).

[12] *Id.* at 21.

[13] *Id.* at 23.

[14] Brown v. Board of Education, 349 U.S. 294, 301 (1955).

[15] Watson v. City of Memphis, 373 U.S. 526, 533 (1963).

[16] 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832).

[17] 1 C. Warren, The Supreme Court in United States History.

EAST–WEST CENTER — CATALYST FOR IMPROVING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THROUGH CREATIVE TENSION

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the House today passed H.R. 14013, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974. Included in the bill is a small amount of money, $200,000, to cover the costs of a labor-management negotiated pay increase for employees of the Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange Between East and West, commonly known as the East-West Center, located at the University of Hawaii in Honolulu. While this amount is less than what was requested, because the difference is likely to be resolved in conference with the Senate, and the exact additional amount absolutely required is in dispute, I did not seek an amendment to raise it.

Many of the Members of the House are well acquainted with the activities of the East-West Center, which Congress created and charged with the mandate of promoting "better relations and understanding between the United States and nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training and research."

The task assigned the institution is

not a simple one. But it is being pursued assiduously and vigorously by the people of the East-West Center, under the direction of its able and dedicated Chancellor, Dr. Everett Kleinjans. In time the East-West Center, in my judgment, will prove to be America's wisest investment in peace.

In his convocation address last fall, a copy of which has just come into my possession, Chancellor Kleinjans discussed the central goals and problems facing the East-West Center. In the belief that his remarks will contribute to a better understanding and consequent stronger support of a unique and most remarkable institution, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point the text of Chancellor Kleinjans' convocation address:

CREATIVE TENSION

(By Chancellor Kleinjans)

I would like to share with you a few thoughts about the East-West Center as we begin this academic year together here in the Manoa Valley. You most likely had images of the Center before you came. Since coming, your images have no doubt changed. By the time you leave, they may change still more. In a sense, this changing image is one factor in making life interesting for you—I hope.

In the May 21, 1973 issue of *Contact* there appeared an editorial cartoon depicting conflicting images of the Center. At the top the Chancellor of the East-West Center was pictured saying:

The East-West Center—formally known as "The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West"—[The Center's] mandated goal is "to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training and research."

A fundamental aim of all East-West Center programs is to foster understanding and mutual respect among people from differing cultures working together in seeking solutions to common problems.

At the middle of the page was a big YET, and below that some sketches showing grantee fighting grantee, administration and grantee fighting each other, and U.S. foreign policy trampling on East-West Center goals.

LOYAL, BRAVE, HONEST AND TRUE

I studied the cartoon with a great deal of interest, not just because I was part of the subject of the cartoon, but basically because I generally agreed with the graphic description. The East-West Center has very high ideals but the gap separating these ideals from realization is rather large. These ideals are the goals toward which we strive. They certainly are not statements of accomplishment. It is like the Boy Scouts in the United States. The Boy Scout manual says in effect that a boy scout is loyal, brave, honest and true. This is not a statement of fact since I know boy scouts who are not loyal, brave, honest and true. It is a statement of goals or commitments, of directions and strivings. The same is true of the Center. Our goals set our directions and provide us with guides for our behavior.

It is true that many people think of internationalism in utopian terms. Somehow, they feel, everyone in the international community must be sweet and loving, rational in thinking, and always emotionally rich in personal relationships. To attempt to give credence to this image they and we smile and laugh a great deal. However, I fear that the smiling and the laughter often serve to cover up the real tensions that exist at the Center.

In reality the East-West Center is a tense place and tense by design. First of all, tensions exist between countries East and West, as well as countries East and East, West and West, and North and South. Each country represents its own culture, its own values and design for living. Who can deny that we are a divided world, separated by ideological, national, ethnic, and tribal differences, and torn by civil strife and factionalism? The history of internationalism is rife with tension. People from different cultures have been divided from each other because they act differently, believe differently. The rise of nationalism since World War II demands patriotism and creates a heightened sense of ethnocentricity.

Most educational institutions in the countries from which we come are built upon a philosophy which is dedicated to passing on the culture of the society in which they exist. In such monocultural institutions both teacher and learner are expected to have similar experiences and ways of thinking upon which the program of the school can be built. This means that people look to the past for their common culture and traditions. However, in an educational institution which is attempting to be intercultural, there is no such common cultural core to build upon. It is necessary for such international institutions to be teleological in their thinking, to look to their ends or goals rather than a common past for guidance and direction. International institutions must orient themselves to the future.

A GLOBAL FEDERATION

Three problems/difficulties are immediately faced, which bring concomitantly three challenges. First, internationalism has no cultural base. There is only a very thin psychological or social base upon which to build a world consciousness, a global federation, an international community. There is no real international language. English, which is the most commonly used language, has many cultural assumptions in it.

Because you students will be using English here at the Center, studying in an American curriculum with textbooks basically written by Americans, the Center is often accused of being too American. But the same would be true if we were in China and used Chinese texts and the Chinese language. Men don't speak languages, but a particular language. The same is true of religion. There are many religions and different men adhere to the tenets of one religion or another. There is no one international religion. Although Buddhism or Christianity may claim to be international, internationalism tends to be secular. The *challenge* is to see if we can build a solid cultural base for internationalism for the emerging world community.

MEN DIFFER DEEPLY

Second, although we can take a stance toward the future in an international institution, men differ deeply about what the future will be or should be. Some want more technology to enhance the quality of life of their people. Others are demanding less technology and a return to nature. Some feel we are moving inexorably toward a classless society. Others believe that some form of capitalism is better. We are divided on what we might call the quality of life, or even happiness. The *challenge* is to find commonalities, especially as human beings.

There is little doubt that our different cultures tend to shape us in different ways. The self, or even groups of selves, must be distinguished from other selves and groups. Differences in culture and ways of thinking are wonderful for those differences can enrich the lives of all. They must be fostered. But I have come to believe that they must be given importance only *after* the commonalities are recognized and given importance. Probably the most important part of every individual is that which unites him with all other individuals—that which makes him human. The most important feature of the world is our common humanity. We must not come to feel that because of differences other men are a nuisance. We have a common future if we can work together to create it.

The third problem about looking to the future for our inspiration is that we are such slaves of the past. Modern depth psychology has shown in a very convincing way how deeply adults are influenced by childhood experience. The child *is* the father of the adult. However, the *challenge* to education and the requirement of the present age is for men and women to gain the courage to rise above their past, above their own experience. What is needed is a new height psychology which will raise our hands to new creativity, our eyes to new potentialities and our hearts to new hope.

It is my hope that the members of the East-West Center community will stretch out thus into the future, in real international cooperation, to build a better world. It is extremely difficult, and takes a great deal of patience, to develop programs that are positive and building, and which help us only to inch toward the goals we hold.

There are other tensions built into the Center. We have attempted/are attempting to build programs into the Center that are interdisciplinary. The tension described by C.P. Snow in *Two Cultures* is a simplification of the tension that exists in academia between people in sociology and economics, to say nothing of people in engineering and economics or philosophy. Of course, there are different schools of thoughts in linguistics, in psychology, in fact, in all disciplines. Getting people to work together across disciplinary boundaries can be fraught with tension.

We are also trying to be interprofessional, bringing together theorists and practitioners, scholars and businessmen or government officials. All the tensions that exist between town and gown, between economic practicality and scholarly theory are therefore inherent in the Center.

You will find that there is tension in the fact that the East-West Center is a national educational institution on the campus of, in cooperation with, and under the umbrella of a state university. Given the basic antipathy of the American people toward their national government, deepened by recent national events, you will find further cause for tensions.

LEARNING TO COPE

Learning to cope with the tensions that are part of our East-West Center existence is one large step toward reaching our goals. Tension can be coped with in at least two ways: it can be either reduced, or it can be used creatively. We could reduce the number of tensions we have in the East-West Center by eliminating the internationalism, or the interdisciplinary work or the interprofessional nature of our programs, or creating an institution completely separate from the University of Hawaii. Each of these would reduce the tension but also reduce the richness of our educational endeavor. Therefore, it seems to me that we should accept the challenge to learn to *cope* with the tensions and use them creatively. The analogy is the violin string. A man cannot make music on the violin unless the strings are tense. There is a point beyond which the tension would break the string. There is also a point of looseness below which the string would fail to make the music. However, with the proper amount of tension music is produced which makes harmony with other musical instruments. In families, among people of homogeneous cultures, there are deep disagreements, fights and even occasional killings. Can the East-West Center remain part of this dynamically changing 20th century and avoid these tensions? Of course not. However, we should struggle mightily to use the tensions to create harmony with men of all cultures

and bring our lives a little closer in line with our goals.

AMENDING U.S. HOUSING ACT OF 1937

(Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me I include the following material on amending the U.S. Housing Act of 1937:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

The bill would amend the United States Housing Act of 1937.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. Would provide that the Act may be cited as the "United States Housing Act of 1937."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Would provide that it is the policy of the United States to assist the States and their political subdivision to remedy unsafe and unsanitary housing conditions and the acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income. It would also vest in local housing agencies the maximum amount of responsibility in the administration of their housing programs. It would also state that no low-income housing project tenant should be barred from serving on the board of a public housing agency because of his tenancy. The section is substantially the same as the present declaration of policy except for the deletion of obsolete or unnecessary language. In this section and elsewhere, the term "low-income housing" is used in lieu of "low-rent housing."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3(1). Would define "low-income housing" to mean decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings within the financial reach of families of low income. Income limits for occupancy and rents would be fixed by public housing agencies and approved by the Secretary. The maximum rental would be one-fourth of family income. At least 20 percent of the dwelling units in any project placed under annual contributions contracts in any fiscal year after the effective date of this section would have to be occupied by very low-income families. At least an additional 30 percent would have to be occupied by families whose incomes do not exceed 50 percent of the median family income for the area as determined by the Secretary. Family income would be defined to exclude: the income of a family member (other than the head of the household) who is under 18 or a full-time student; an amount equal to $300 for each member of the family residing in the household (other than the head of the household) who is a wage earner or who is under 18 or who is disabled or handicapped or a full-time student; nonrecurring income; 5 percent of the family's gross income (10 percent in the case of an elderly family); extraordinary medical or other expenses; and an amount equal to sums received by the household head or his spouse for certain foster child care. Would continue to prohibit public agency reduction of welfare assistance payments to a tenant or group of tenants as result of application of the 25% of income maximum rent limitation.

3(2). Would define "low-income families" to mean families who cannot afford to pay enough to cause private enterprise in their locality or metropolitan areas to build an adequate supply of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for their use. The term "very low-income families" would be defined to mean families whose income does not exceed 20 percent of the median family income for the area.

"Families" would include single persons in the case of persons at least fifty years of age or displaced persons, as well as the remaining member of a tenant family. "Elderly families" would mean those whose heads (or their spouses), or whose sole members, are at least 62 years of age, under a disability, or handicapped. "Displaced families" would mean families displaced by governmental action or families whose homes have been extensively damaged or destroyed by a disaster declared or otherwise formally recognized pursuant to Federal disaster relief laws.

3(3). Would define "development" and "development cost" as under present law, except for minor changes to facilitate project financing and the deletion of an unnecessary provision concerning the cost of shared facilities.

3(4). Would substitute "operation" for the present term "administration" in order to conform to current usage in the public housing program. It would otherwise substantially restate the present definition, including the provision which makes it clear that the cost of tenant programs and services are includable in operation of a project and eligible for subsidy assistance.

3(5). Would define "acquisition cost" to mean the amount prudently required to be expended by a public housing agency in acquiring a low-income housing project.

3(6). Would define "public housing agency" to mean any State, county, municipality or other governmental entity or public body (or agency or instrumentality thereof) which is authorized to engage in or assist in the development or operation of low-income housing. This would amend the present provision so as to include public agencies which are authorized to assist in the development or operation of such housing.

3(7). Would define "State" to include the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the territories and possessions of the United States, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Indian tribes, bands, groups, and nations (including Alaska Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos) of the United States.

3(8). Would define "Secretary to mean the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

3(9). Would define "low-income housing project or "project" to mean any project developed, acquired, or assisted under the Act and the improvement of any such housing.

LOANS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 4(a). Would authorize the Secretary to make loans to public housing agencies to help finance or refinance the development, acquisition, or operation of low-income housing projects by such agencies. Such loans would provide for an interest rate specified by the Secretary which is not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, plus one-eighth of one percent.

(b). Would authorize the Secretary to issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount which would not, unless authorized by the President, exceed $1.5 billion.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 5(a). Would authorize the Secretary to make annual contributions to public housing agencies to assist in achieving and maintaining the low-income character of their projects and would direct the Secretary to embody provisions for such contributions in a contract guaranteeing their payment. It would provide that the annual contribution payable under the section may not exceed the debt service payable on obligations issued by the public housing agency to finance the development or acquisition cost of the low-income project involved. The present requirement that annual contributions be fixed in uniform amounts and paid in such amounts over a fixed period of years would be deleted in order to afford greater flexibility in the financing of public housing projects. Under the revised Act there would be a new subsidy structure which would provide for a separation between the authority to make annual contributions based on debt service requirements and the authority to make operating subsidy payments. This subsection also would delete the present authorization to pay an additional annual subsidy of up to $120 per dwelling unit occupied by an elderly family, a large family, a family of unusually low income, or a displaced family as the purpose of these subsidies would be included under the broad operating subsidy authorization contained in Section 9 of the revised Act.

(b). Would authorize the Secretary to prescribe regulations fixing the maximum contributions to be provided under different circumstances, giving consideration to cost, location, size, rent-paying ability of prospective tenants or other factors bearing upon the need to achieve and maintain low rentals. Such regulations could provide for rates of contribution based on development, acquisition, or operation costs, number of dwelling units, number of persons housed, interest charges, or other appropriate factors.

(c). Would authorize the Secretary to enter into contracts for annual contributions aggregating not more than $1,199,250,000 per year, which would be increased by $225,000,000 on July 1, 1971, by $150,000,000 on July 1, 1972, by $140,000,000 on July 1, 1973, by $810,000,000 on July 1, 1974, and by $735,000,000 on July 1, 1975. Of the aggregate amount of annual contributions contracts authorized under this section, (other than units in private accommodations under Section 8), would make available not less than $15,000,000 on July 1, 1974, and an additional $15,000,000 on July 1, 1975, for low-income housing for persons who are members of any Indian tribe, band, pueblo, group, or community of Indians or Alaska natives which is recognized by the Federal government or any state government. Not more than 30 percent of the dwelling units placed under annual contributions in any fiscal year after the effective date of this section would be units of low income housing in private accommodations under Section 8. Annual contribution contracts shall be equal to the difference between the sum of the total debt service payment plus operating costs, and the rental payments that tenants are required to make under section 3(1). At least 20 percent of the dwelling units placed under annual contributions in any fiscal year after the effective date of this section would be required to have at least three bedrooms and the Secretary would be required to include information on such units in his annual report. Of the aggregate amount authorized, the Secretary would be authorized to use an amount not to exceed $100 million per year for modernization. The Secretary could enter into only such new contracts for preliminary loans as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered into. The faith of the United States would be solemnly pledged to payment of all annual contributions contracted for pursuant to this section, and there would be authorized to be appropriated each year the amounts necessary for payments of all annual contributions contracted for.

This subsection also would require pay-

ments when due of annual contributions (out of available funds other than funds obtained through the issuance of obligations pursuant to section 4(b)).

(d). Would provide that any contract for loans or annual contributions may cover one or more than one low-income project owned by a public housing agency, and that if the contract covers two or more projects, they may be treated collectively as one project.

(e). Would authorize the Secretary to consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, amount of annual contribution, or any other term, of any contract or agreement to which the Secretary is a party, subject to specific limitations contained in the Act. It also would authorize the Secretary with the consent of a public housing agency to amend contributions contracts when it would promote economy or be in the financial interest of the Government, or would be necessary to maintain the low-income character of the project involved. However, contracts could not be amended in a manner which would impair the rights of low-income tenants or of the holders of any outstanding obligations for which annual contributions have been pledged.

(f). Would give the Secretary additional authority to pledge annual contributions as a guarantee of payments by a public housing agency of debt service on obligations issued by it to assist the development or acquisition of the project to which the contributions relate, except that such additional authority would not be available if the income thereon is exempt from Federal taxation.

(g). Would authorize a public housing agency to sell a low-income housing project to its tenants on such terms and conditions as the agency may determine, without affecting the Secretary's commitment to pay annual contributions with respect to that project, but such contributions could not exceed the maximum contributions authorized under subsection 5(a).

CONTRACT PROVISIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 6(a) Would authorize the Secretary to include in any contract for loans, annual contributions, sale, lease, mortgage, or any other agreement or instrument made pursuant to the Act, such covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to insure the low-income character of the project involved, and that no otherwise eligible applicant shall be excluded from any project because of race, religion, nationality, age, sex, marital status, or amount or source of income. Would also require an open space or playground in connection with a housing project. Contracts would also require that, except in the case of housing predominantly for the elderly, high-rise elevator projects should not be provided for families with children unless the Secretary determines that there is no practical alternative.

(b) Would provide a limitation on the cost of project construction and equipment (excluding land, demolition, and non-dwelling facilities) on the basis of which the amount of annual contributions would be calculated. This cost could not exceed by more than 20 percent the appropriate prototype cost for the area, required to be determined at least annually by the Secretary on the basis of estimated construction costs of various new units in the area suitable for occupancy by persons assisted under the Act. In making his determination, the Secretary would be required to take into consideration the extra durability necessary for safety and security and economical maintenance, the provision of suitable amenities, the application of good design and maintenance of architectural standards, the effectiveness of existing cost limits, and the advice and recommendations of local housing producers.

(c) Would require every contract for annual contributions to include provisions (1) allowing the Secretary to require the public housing agency to review and revise its maximum income limits if the Secretary determines changed conditions in the locality make such revisions necessary: (2) requiring a public housing agency to determine and certify to the Secretary that occupants of projects were admitted in accordance with approved income limits and to review family incomes at intervals of two years (or after shorter period, if Secretary deems it desirable); and (3) requiring prompt notification to applicants determined to be ineligible for admission of the basis for the determination and an opportunity for an informal hearing and, to those determined eligible, of the approximate date of occupancy insofar as it can be reasonably determined. This subsection would delete the present provision concerning the establishment of maximum income limits for continued occupancy in low-income housing.

(d) Would provide that whenever the receipts of a public housing agency exceeds its expenditures, the excess shall be applied to reduce subsequent annual contributions.

(e) Would require annual contributions contracts to provide that when a public housing agency and the Secretary mutually agree that a project is obsolete, making it unusable for housing purposes, a program of modifications or closeout shall be prepared. It would authorize the Secretary to use such annual contributions as are necessary to enable the public housing agency to undertake an agreed-upon program of modifications. It also would authorize the Secretary to prepare a closeout program, utilizing such annual contributions as are necessary to accommodate outstanding indebtedness, the cost of demolition (if physical improvements are not to be sold) and the cost of relocation. The net closeout cost to the Federal Government would take into account receipts from the sale of assets, pursuant to the annual contributions contract.

(f) Would authorize the Secretary to provide in any annual contributions contract that upon substantial default by the public housing agency with respect to the covenants and conditions to which the agency is subject, as defined in the contract, the agency shall be required, at the Secretary's option, to convey title or possession of the project to the Secretary. The Secretary would be required to reconvey or redeliver the project to the public housing agency when the Secretary was satisfied that all defaults with respect to the project had been cured or the obligation to make annual contributions had ended and there were no obligations or covenants by the public housing agency to the Secretary then in default. This subsection also would provide that, with respect to contracts for annual contributions containing the provisions set forth above, the Secretary's obligation to pay annual contributions to cover debt service on the local agency's obligations would continue notwithstanding any other provision of the Act.

CONGREGATE HOUSING

SEC. 7. Would require the Secretary to encourage public housing agencies, in providing housing predominately for displaced, elderly, or handicapped families, to develop housing to meet the special needs of the occupants and, wherever practicable, for use in whole or in part as congregate housing. It would limit the amount of annual contributions for congregate housing to ten percent of the total amount of contracts for annual contributions entered into pursuant to the new authority granted under section 202 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 or any subsequent law. It would define "congregate housing" to mean low-income housing in which some or all of the dwelling units do not have kitchen facilities, and connected with which there is a central dining facility.

LOW-INCOME HOUSING IN PRIVATE ACCOMMODATIONS

SEC. 8(a)(1). Would authorize public housing agencies, or the Secretary, for the purpose of providing a form of low-income housing which will aid in assuring a decent place to live for every citizen, which will take full advantage of vacancies in the private housing market, and which will provide economically mixed housing, to provide housing for low-income families in the form of low-income housing in private accommodations in accordance with section 8.

(a)(2) Would define, for purposes of section 8, the term "low-income housing in private accommodations" to mean dwelling units, leased from an owner, which provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling accommodations and which may include related facilities, and would define the term "owner" to mean any person or entity having the legal right to lease or sublease property containing one or more dwelling units as described in this section.

(b) Would direct each public housing agency to conduct a continuing survey and listing of available dwelling units within the communities under its jurisdiction which provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling accommodations and related facilities and are, or may be made, suitable for use as low-income housing in private accommodations under this section.

(c) Would direct each public housing agency, by notification to the owners of housing listed under subsection or by publication or advertisement, or otherwise, to make known from time to time to the public in the community or communities under its jurisdiction the anticipated need for dwelling units in such community or communities to be used as low-income housing in private accommodations under this section, inviting the owners of such dwelling units to make available for purposes of this section one or more of such units.

This subsection also would direct public housing agencies to conduct appropriate inspections of offered units and if it finds that such units are, or may be made suitable for use as low-income housing in private accommodations within the meaning of section 8(a)(2), and the rentals to be charged for such units, as agreed to by the agency and the owner consistent with section 8(d)(2), are within the financial range of families of low income, the agency could approve such units in accordance with (and subject to the applicable limitations contained in) this section. Also, each public housing agency would be required to maintain a current list of units approved by it including related information it considers necessary or appropriate.

(d) Would provide that, to the extent of contracts entered into by the Secretary with a public housing agency under section 5(c) of the Act, such agency in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary could enter into contracts to make assistance payments for the use of dwelling units in accordance with Section 8. Each such contract would provide (with respect to any unit) that (1) the selection of tenants for such unit shall be the function of the public housing agency, but no otherwise eligible tenant shall be excluded from participation in the program because of race, religion, nationality, age, sex, marital status, or amount or source of income; (2) the rental and other charges to be received by the owner shall be negotiated and agreed to by the agency and the owners, and the rental and other charges to be paid by the tenant shall be determined in accordance with the standards applicable to units in low-income housing projects assisted under other provisions of this Act; (3) the contract shall provide tenants with the same rights and protections as would be provided if they were residents of housing owned by the agency; (4) the agency shall

have the sole right to give notice to vacate, with the owner having the right to make representations to the agency for termination of a tenancy, but no notice to vacate shall be issued without just cause and any tenant receiving such notice shall be entitled to a fair and impartial hearing; (5) maintenance and replacements shall be in accordance with the standard practice for the building concerned, as established by the owner and agreed to by the agency; and (6) the agency and the owner shall carry out such other appropriate terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed to by them.

Finally, the subsection would provide that each contract between a public housing agency and an owner entered into under this subsection shall be for a term not less than twelve months nor more than one hundred and twenty months, and shall be renewable by such agency and owner at the expiration of such term.

(e) Would provide that the annual contribution for a project of a public housing agency for low-income housing in private accommodations under this section in lieu of any other guaranteed contribution authorized by section 5 shall not exceed the amount of the fixed annual contribution which would be established under this Act for a newly constructed project by such public housing agency designed to accommodate the comparable number, sizes, and kinds of families. Would also provide that the period over which payments will be made to a public housing agency for a project of low-income housing in private accommodations under section 8, and the aggregate amount of such payments, under a contract for annual contributions, shall be determined on the basis of the number of units in the community or communities under the jurisdiction of such agency which are in use (or can reasonably be expected to be placed in use) as low-income housing in private accommodations under this section, taking into account the terms of the leases under which such units are (or will be) so used. Also, this subsection would state that contracts between the Secretary and a public housing agency pursuant to this section shall provide for the payment of reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such agency in conducting surveys, listings, inspections, and tenant selection and assignment.

(f) Would authorize a public housing agency to purchase any structure containing one or more dwelling units leased to provide low-rent housing in private accommodations under this section for the purpose of reselling the structure to the tenant or tenants occupying units aggregating in value at least 80 percent of the structure's total value. Would also require that any such resale be made subject to such terms and conditions (including provision for deferment of the required downpayment and for elimination of or adjustments in the required interest payments during a temporary period) as may be necessary to enable the tenants involved to make the purchase without undue financial hardship.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 9(a). Would require the Secretary to make separate annual contributions to public housing agencies for the operation of low-income housing projects. The contribution would be payable in the amounts required (1) to assure the low-income character of the projects involved and (2) to achieve and maintain adequate operating services and reserves. The Secretary would be required to embody the provisions for annual contributions for operating subsidy in a contract guaranteeing their payment.

Public housing agencies would determine, with the approval of the Secretary, appropriate and required operating services and reserve funds, including tenant services, which would constitute the base level of operating services of the agency. If project income in any year was insufficient to meet the established base level for that year, the Secretary would be required to make annual contributions to meet the residual cost. The Federal commitment to maintain such base level of operating services would be required to be incorporated in an annual contributions contract. Base levels would be signified by a public housing agency at the beginning of its operating year when it prepares its annual budget. Reexaminations of the base level would be required when the agency makes its reexamination of tenant income (at least every two years).

(b) Would authorize the Secretary, in addition to the amounts authorized in section 5(c) of the Act, to enter into contracts for operating subsidy annual contributions in an amount aggregating no more than $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and $660,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10(a).—Would require the Secretary to prepare annual budget programs as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act and to maintain an integral set of amounts to be audited annually by the General Accounting Office.

(b) Would provide that all receipts and assets of the Secretary under the Act shall be available until expended.

(c) Would authorize the Federal Reserve Banks to act as depositories, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Secretary.

FINANCING LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 11(a). Would provide that where obligations of a public housing agency are secured by a pledge of loans, annual contributions, or both, and the Secretary has so certified, the full faith and credit of the United States would back the guarantee, which would be incontestable in the hands of a bearer.

(b) Would provide that, except as provided in section 5(g) (which would grant additional authority for annual contributions in cases of non-tax exempt obligations), public housing agency obligations issued in connection with low-income housing projects and the income from such projects shall be exempt from Federal taxes. It would modify the present provision so as to make it clear that this exemption applies whether the obligations are paid by the public housing agency or by the Secretary.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 12. Would require contracts entered into pursuant to this Act to include a provision requiring (1) all architects, technical engineers, draftsmen, and technicians employed in the development of a low-income housing project, and (2) laborers and mechanics employed in the operation of projects to be paid not less than the wages prevailing in the locality, as determined or adopted by the Secretary subsequent to a determination under applicable State or local law. It also would require such contracts to include a provision that laborers and mechanics employed in the development of a low-income housing project (including a project for the use of privately built housing) shall be paid not less than the wages prevailing in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to the Davis-Bacon Act.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PROJECTS FROM RENTAL FORMULA

SEC. 13. Would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in lieu of the rental or income contribution provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended by this Act, to approve the use of special schedules of required payments for participants in mutual help housing projects who contribute labor, land, or materials to the development of such projects.

ASSISTANCE TO NOT-FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 14. Would provide that in areas where no public housing agency exists or where a public housing agency is unable or unwilling to provide low-income housing under this act, the Secretary, upon application of a private, not-for-profit organization located in such area, is authorized to extend to such organization, to the extent feasible, all of the benefits of this Act. Organizations receiving such benefits shall be bound by the provisions of this Act as if they were public housing agencies. Such not-for-profit organizations shall be organized for the purposes of engaging in or assisting in the development or operation of low-income housing and shall be governed by a board of directors which is representative of the population living in the area. In addition to the purposes specified for annual contributions in Section 5 of this Act, such annual contributions may be used to retire the principal and interest on any debt incurred by the not-for-profit organization for the purchase, construction, repair or lease of low-income housing regardless of whether or not such debt is insured, guaranteed or subsidized under any federal, state or local government housing program.

EQUITY FOR THE SINGLE TAXPAYER

(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, I would like at this time to urge the distinguished chairman, WILBUR MILLS, and his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, to move expeditiously in executive session with the markup of H.R. 2701. I testified before that committee last year supporting the passage of H.R. 2701; again I call the House's attention to the necessity of passing this legislation without waiting another year.

As we all know, millions of Americans are now in the process of filing their 1973 tax returns. Unfortunately, approximately 38 million people, namely, those who are not married, will be discriminated against when they pay their taxes. H.R. 2701 would remove this discriminatory inequity faced by single people by establishing a uniform rate structure for all taxpayers, whether they be married, widowed, divorced, or single. This means that after the allowable deductions and exemptions are taken, the same graduated tax rate would be applied to an individual's taxable income, regardless of one's marital status, thus allowing persons to compute their taxes by using the same tax table currently reserved for use by married couples filing jointly. H.R. 2701 has 163 cosponsors, and has been introduced in the Senate as S. 650 by Senator PACKWOOD.

The single taxpayer pays up to 20 percent more in taxes than a taxpayer filing a joint return. The actual cost can best be illustrated by a few examples. A single taxpayer whose taxable income is $12,000 pays $2,630 in taxes; if he or she were married and filing a joint return, he or she would pay $2,260—a difference of $370. And the rate on any in-

come in excess of $12,000—up to $14,000—increases; for example, 20 percent for the single return and 25 percent for the joint return. The tax penalty for being single at $16,000 is $570; at $20,000, $850; at $50,000, $3,130.

I believe that taxes should reflect differences in a taxpayer's responsibilities for dependent support, but the way to do this is through exemptions for dependents, not through different tax schedules for the same incomes. To that end, I have proposed legislation to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to $1,200. Requiring as we do today that single persons pay at a higher rate is simply arbitrary. The joint tax return rate for married taxpayers does not reflect the different financial responsibilities in supporting six dependents as opposed to say, one dependent. Furthermore, under the present rate structure a divorcee or widow with three dependents, using the head of household schedule, pays taxes at a higher rate than a married couple with no children. In fact, widows and divorcees who are heads of households on the average are required to pay 10 percent more taxes than they would had their marriages continued or their spouses lived.

The failure by Congress to act on this legislation would be unconscionable. Only six other countries tax their unmarried people more heavily than their married couples. Five of these six, Russia, three of her satellites and Spain, are dictatorships. We all realize that our tax code contains a number of tax preferences. What H.R. 2701 calls for is not another preference, but simple equity for the unmarried taxpayer. Moreover, this equity is not for the benefit of a few, but rather for the benefit of most, for almost everyone must face the prospect of one day being single and, unless this bill is passed, being confronted with discriminatory taxation.

ONE PICTURE WORTH A THOUSAND WORDS

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that one picture is worth a thousand words, and I believe it. I think that this is one of the reasons I get so fed up with slanted political cartoons and their artists. Primarily, I am talking about the nationally syndicated cartoonists like Herblock and Oliphant. You know the ones, I mean.

Mr. Charles C. Phillips, who is the associate editor of the Shreveport Journal located in my district, and I might add, an excellent daily newspaper, recently devoted a column to the subject of political cartoons and the fact that most of the nationally syndicated ones are blatantly anti-Nixon and are limited to several subjects—Watergate, the energy crisis, and ecology.

Mr. Phillips says that his paper subscribes to several cartoonists, but adds:

It's a cold day in August when one of the nationally syndicated cartoonists draws something favorable toward the President or even mildly objective toward him. Some depict Mr. Nixon as a common criminal, convicting him long before he has been impeached or tried.

What amazes Mr. Phillips is that the President still has the support that he does have. He said:

Many of these cartoons, if not all, and others like them are being printed daily in newspapers in some, maybe most, parts of the United States. What amazes me is that the President still has as much popular support as he does.

Finally, Mr. Phillips concedes that cartoonists are entitled to their views:

But these days they don't seem to be able to deal with any except four subjects: Watergate, in which they've already convicted Nixon; the energy crisis which they blame on the President or the big oil companies; the Middle east, and ecology (oh brother, ecology). If one of our columnists writes about education, law enforcement or some other topical matter it takes half the morning to find a cartoon dealing with the subject.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the entire column by Mr. Phillips above mentioned:

CAPS AND LOWER CASE

(By Charles Phillips)

One of my duties around the office is to pick out cartoons to go on the editorial page and the opposite-editorial page. It's a hard job when you work on a newspaper which isn't at all convinced that Richard M. Nixon should be impeached and when you feel the same way yourself.

The paper subscribes to several cartoonists, some of which are the best in the nation. But it's a cold day in August when one of the nationally-syndicated cartoonists draws something favorable toward the President or even mildly objective toward him. Some of the cartoonists depict Mr. Nixon as a common criminal, convicting him long before he has been impeached or tried. I read in the British publication Punch recently that most news writers and cartoonists are anarchists at heart, and I believe it!

So let's take a verbal look (that phrase is almost grammatical anarchy) at some of the cartoons we are getting these days.

As I look under our cartoon file titled "administration" the first one I come to is by Ranan Lurie who uses an over-sized and usually grotesque style. The cartoon shows the President cringing and walking away from a man in clerical robes who is holding up a cross which has printed on it the word "quit." The caption of the cartoon reads: "The Exorcist."

Farther down the stack there is one by Herblock which shows a man in pinstriped suit with dark glasses a la Mafia. He is labeled "The Nixon Gang" and he is telling the Senate about refusal to testify on grounds of executive privilege. Another Herblock cartoon shows the President about to sink in murky water and holding a sign saying "Papers on the ITT case and the milk funds." The caption has the President saying "The allegations are utterly false—I've only been involved up to here."

This cartoon, appearing in many newspapers across the nation, was drawn before any sort of charges had been made against the President concerning ITT or the milk fund contributors. In fact, no charges have been brought at all, except by Mssrs. Herblock and Co.

Still another Herblock cartoon shows the President in front of a podium with microphones on it. In the rear is an American flag. The cartoon is captioned "State of the Union." Nixon is shown holding a sign saying "I am not a crook." Of course, the inference is that he is a crook.

Cartoonist Lane uses ridicule in attacking the President. One of his panels shows Nixon standing shamefacedly in front of a man dressed as Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam is saying, "If you were to resign, think of the future you'd have as a tax consultant." Clever, yes. Fair, no.

Then there is one by Oliphant which shows the President and another person standing near a door labeled "GOP Department of Sabotage." The unidentified man is saying to the President: "Want to know where else you could cut expenditures?" Then for the real knife, the cartoonist has two small figures in a corner and one is saying, "The next caper is to steal the Constitution." What's he talking about when he says "steal the Constitution?" Nothing, I fear. Just bias.

Another Lurie gem shows Mr. Nixon precariously trying to balance himself on a rope. Below it is a revolving barrel of oil, then a ball labeled "Personal scandals" and another marked "ITT," and two other spheres tagged "etc"—all on top of a tight rope. Mr. Nixon is portrayed as a perspiring figure with a hole in his shoe. Lurie's imagination is boundless when it comes to despising the President. Another cartoon depicts Nixon in the robes of an emperor with a crown topped by a runic cross. He is pulling a toy. The "toy" is a guillotine and the caption says: "Some heads are going to roll."

Back to Herblock. He has a cartoon with no caption which shows the President in the upper half of an hour glass. Obviously, the sands of time are Vice President Ford entering a room in which Nixon is surrounded by a cow named "milk deal," an alligator named "fuel crisis" and a goose, I guess, labeled "bugs." Nixon is saying "Welcome to the zoo."

Back to Herblock. One of his cartoons shows the President at his desk. Bolts of lightning are coming through the window and floodwaters are several feet deep inside the room. There is no caption. The inference is that President Nixon is about to drown in his troubles. We already know what Mr. Herblock believes those troubles to be.

These are just a few. There are dozens more just about as bad. There was one showing the legs of a man who obviously had been lynched on a tree on the White House lawn. The legs, of course, are unmistakably those of the President. I thought it was in such bad taste that I threw it away. Probably be worth something 50 years from now.

We must remember that many of these cartoons, if not all, and others like them are being printed daily in newspapers in some, maybe most, parts of the United States. What amazes me is that the President still has as much popular support as he does. The recent off-year congressional elections in Pennsylvania, Michigan and Ohio show that Republican candidates lost by small majorities. If the country agreed with our distinguished cartoonists the GOP candidates would have polled only their own vote and maybe their wives', if they were allowed to go unhung to election day.

The cartoonists, of course, are entitled to their opinions. But these days they don't seem to be able to deal with any except four subjects: Watergate, in which they've already convicted Nixon; the energy crisis which they blame on the President or the big oil companies; the Middle east, and ecology (oh brother, ecology). If one of our columnists writes about education, law enforcement or some other topical matter it takes half the morning to find a cartoon dealing with the subject.

Why, they've even quit drawing cartoons

about civil rights and integration. Frankly, I think the millenium is at hand.

TESTIMONY BEFORE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, Congresswoman SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, and myself, I wish to submit for the RECORD the testimony given before the General Subcommittee on Education on March 19 in hearings on the Bilingual Education Act. Sister Vicente speaks from both the heart and the head—from her background as a Spanish-speaking child growing up in New York and her adult experience in working for better educational opportunities for similar children growing up today in Massachusetts.

We felt this testimony presented such an eloquent statement of the problems faced by the child in need of bilingual education in our society that it would be worthwhile giving it a wider audience.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF SISTER FRANCES GEORGIA VICENTE, ADVOCATE FOR LINGUISTIC MINORITIES, BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Sister Vicente. Thank you, Madam Chairman and honorable members of the committee.

I have to in conscience add something to that kind of ponderous introduction because I am another person also.

[Spanish.]

It is significant when we get résumés from abroad it always includes home languages people speak. It was like a homecoming when I met Mr. Cruz this morning. I found out I taught all his sisters and brothers, so I would like to inject a little of the human element. I know you have been deluged with statistics and all the reasons why bilingual education should exist. Having been involved in law, I assure you statistics are important, but please, the cultural part.

When I spoke in Spanish, I became another person causing in me to feel the roots of my ancestors in Spain. I can go through Madrid and feel at home, yet I can speak as an American where I was born in New York and feel comfortable in this culture. We can only become more of what we really are when we understand and feel the roots of what we were. Then we can become better Americans. And what is to be an American really?

If all of us look back into the history of our ancestry, we don't have to go too far back before we touch the immigrant part of our family. And yet what do we have to show for the glorious kaleidoscope of diversity with which we could have enriched the history of our nation instead of having adhered to the melting pot theory; that we all go into a pot and we are all going to come out somehow American. What does that mean?

I am so glad my parents escaped the melting pot. When I walked into our home, it was the most wonderful thing in the world to be a little Spanish girl even if on the streets of New York they called me a spick. But I could withstand that pressure from the outside because I did not speak English and, therefore, it was implicit I was different from and less than they.

If a professor in a university speaks with an accent, that is something awesome. But if a poor little Puerto Rican child on the street says, "Me no Puerto Rican, me American,"—that is right, boys get rid of what you think is not American and get assimilated.

Yet you know when Americans go abroad they expect every cab driver and waiter to help him in his need by speaking English.

We have 500 million people in our Western Hemisphere, of whom 198 million speak Spanish as their primary language. But we look south of the border and we say, "You people get educated, learn English," and we sit back here as a mono-lingual nation and don't feel we need to extend ourselves just in the human relationships of acknowledging and respecting their background. Of these hundreds of millions in our own country, more than 10 million are Spanish-speaking.

It is closing in the Southwest. We know the history. Puerto Ricans are moving into all the Eastern cities as far West as Chicago. It is closing in on us. We can't miss it. We are the fifth largest Spanish-speaking nation in the world, exceeded only by Mexico, Spain, Argentina. So it is time this whole idea that we are "catering" to non-English-speaking children or peoples and we are giving them some crumbs of our benefits here should turn the other way and say what great resources have we wasted?

We are a great people for natural resources in the United States. What about our human resources that we failed to elaborate.

So I would like to put two things forth: The human element, which I will go to in just a moment, and the great human resources that we have lost by putting our immigrants historically into the melting pot.

What about the human element? We feel that the understanding among nations is going to bring peace, but nations are made up of people. And people come down to personal relationships and the persons of multi-lingual groups we have in our nation are the first we have to address ourselves to before we want Kissinger to run around the world trying to solve its problems. We have our own.

[Spanish.]

Now why do they come up? That is another whole socioeconomic and political thing and I cannot take your time for that.

I was in Puerto Rico 25 years ago when country people raised their chickens and vegetables and brought them into town. I went back two or three years ago after over 20 years and those country people were practically starving because they cannot compete in selling their live native chickens with the supermarkets that have moved into Puerto Rico, taxfree, because of Operation Bootstrap and all the wonderful things industrialization was to do to the Island. This has helped in a middle-class area. But your dear children are poorer today than they were then and therefore they have to sell a few little pigs to come to Boston on a cold snowy day with [Spanish].

The concept of cold to them is 60 degrees on a winter day. In an airport in San Juan it is interesting—there is a florist there and he watched this family of ten children with their parents getting ready to get on a flight, and he invited them into the florist shop and said, "Come see this." He put them into a walk-in refrigerator and closed the door for one minute. They came out blue.

He said, "That is what you are going to meet." They had no conception of what this means.

So they lived in Boston and if they are very lucky our social worker ferrets them out in a little cold water flat with all the other socio-economic conditions. You say, "Your child has to go to school," which of course the mother and father always expected him to do, but inundated with all the problems of their survival, all of a sudden school on a hill somewhere becomes kind of a far-off idea. So we bring them in and bring them into the office and there sits the principal and she is very proper and she knows her business.

She says to me, "What is their name?" I said [Spanish].

She hears this long strange name. She doesn't know what was said. I explain we have three surnames. She says, "We don't need all those last names," so she starts. She cuts off the last name. It is the mother's surname and the mother dies. She lost her maternity. If she cuts off the next surname, that is the father's and all of a sudden the child becomes illegitimate because they do not belong to her.

One last name in Puerto Rico means—so this kind of cultural thing.

Then, "Produce the birth certificate." Then she says to me, "Forget it. Why does she need a piece of paper to prove she was born when she is standing there?"

Then we start with shots. Polio, is she vaccinated? If she knows one English word, it is "bang, bang." She watches Westerns. Hide them under a bed and you don't see those children in school.

Now if we get through all that and I can coax her—she loves the sisters and she trusts me and hands me the children, I put them in school. What do we have, up to a short time ago? Children sitting in a classroom vegetating, frightened with all kinds of hostile pressures, racially—and I have to bring this in—they are too light for the Blacks, they are too dark for the whites. All of a sudden they have to identify whether white or non-white and they go home and ask their mother.

So please, these are the things in a human way that we are to become sensitive with. He is not going to learn to speak English or learn to read, Spanish or anything else, if he is so scared, if he is so uncomfortable, if he does not know why he is there. If nobody understands him as a person, let alone linguistically, he is going to be a school dropout.

So if I can inject this part, don't forget the human element please and this is why we need Puerto Rican teachers to relate to them. This is why we need our Anglo professionals to become sensitized—you are smiling because you know the Blacks speak English after a fashion, or more or less.

Now the other thing is where does the responsibility lie, and here I have very strong feelings of shared responsibility. And this brings me to our Massachusetts situation. We were the first state, as you know, in 1971 to pass the first mandated bilingual law. That word "mandated" is so important. I am sure you all had the experience of sitting at school committee meetings to beg some compensatory—"Please may I have the crumbs" for a marginal purpose like, for example, non-English-speaking children.

Who votes now? We have 8 percent voting power, the Puerto Ricans in Boston. Do you think Kerrigan or McDonald or O'Leary are interested in that part of the world? This is just reality. I am not a politcal being, but I have been around out of the cloister a few years and I suddenly found out the truth is not the only thing that is important.

But I said they have been very good to me, Mr. Kerrigan. But where does the responsibility lie? The local district has the obligation to educate every child in that district up to the limit of his resources. Boston in round numbers has $800 per-capita expenditure, whether that child is sitting there frightened to death, vegetating or drops out, that expenditure is supposed to be spent. So

what made the Massachusetts law palatable was it had a realistic cost factor.

We expect the district to pay that much, $800 in Boston, and the excess per-capita that is spent in the more specialized bilingual, because of the lower pupil-teacher ratio, 15 to 1; without aid, 20 to 1. The specialized materials and other ancillary things that are needed—it may cost $1100, maybe at a maximum. The state reimburses the difference so Boston puts in the $800. The state reimburses the city $300 and everybody has done its share.

Now where does the Federal come in? I would not dare tell you what I need. This is symbolically speaking—classroom, a teacher, a book. In other words, the limit to the budgets of the states could not bring in all the help we need, let's say, for the teacher training program, which is tremendous.

I heard the figures of 80,500 bilingual teachers needed in the United States today.

Mr. MEEDS. That is just Spanish-speaking.

Sister VICENTE. But they are the big lump sum, you know. It is maybe 10.5 million Spanish-speaking; 3 or 4 million with all the others included. Altthough in Boston or in Massachusetts we have six linguistic minorities—Spanish, Portuguese—you know that 85 percent of the Portuguese in the United States reside in Southern Massachusetts. From the whaling days—there have been five generations. 58 percent of New Bedford is Portuguese. 2 percent are in professional jobs. Results? All the Portuguese are stupid.

Look back in history and they were the great sailors and great map-makers. What happened? Melting pot theory. They got lost. They were the fishermen and millhands, and still are. They never got the education which is the only self-help that makes people grow to the stature that they are able because they have the depth of their culture behind them. They are not wounded people, different from, less than.

So with the Italians. I was glad to see Mario and Romano and Alphonzo on this committee. We do not all have to be Helen Smith, do we?

So we are back to the responsibility. So all the ancillary things, those 85,000 teachers—if we have 10 percent or more Spanish-speaking in the United States of the whole total population—85,000 teachers is not even 1 percent of that Spanish-speaking population. So why should teachers unions get so upset?

Here there is a surplus of teachers. Massachusetts has 5,000 certified teachers without a job, so when I go around asking for extra slots for Puerto Rico—it is a wonder we are alive. But are we trying to continue and perpetuate the jobs for teachers—and I respect their need of a job—or are we going to meet the need of children standing there being lost and then filling the welfare ranks in the future, the drug addiction, all the things that go with school dropouts, with people who cannot read or write, who are functionally illiterate in two languages. They speak Spanish, but cannot read and write it. Their English is poor and they are never up to par and there they are.

So to get back to the practical part. The district should give the basic cost of education. The state can add the excess per capita. Then we need the higher funds from the Federal Government for massive teacher preparation. For the extra preparation for bilingual, that is very expensive. But if we don't give these children even in a bilingual program a marketable skill, that piece of paper that says they came with a general diploma from a high school—we sell them down the line if they only have bilingual four years and no marketable skill.

We need help from our administration on the state level. The last time I was in Albany—they have a heroic director, and a sister helping them and a secretary. Three people in a state that has one-third the population of Puerto Rico residing in it with 250,000 Puerto Rican children alone. In Massachusetts we have a secretary and three supervisors for the whole state. We need extra help. We need specialists in curriculum and teacher assessment in testing at state level who can give technical assistance throughout the state for emerging programs.

We need all kinds of research. We are all running around trying to get resources while we are busy at a million things because we cannot stop. We have 5 million children needing to be helped now.

So in my written account, which is nothing of what I have said now, you will read the individual needs and I am sure they have been reiterated because everybody knows. I know that Senators Kennedy, Cranston and Montoya have presented legislation already to the Senate that speaks in terms of $250 million, which sounds like a mint. We are only spending $35 million, but I heard someone say a billion and my heart soared because we have 5 million children who need bilingual in order to survive educationally.

When Mr. Cruz was saying about $85,000 for 815—like $100 per capita for his little program annually—it is nothing. So by all means the skeleton which the district provides—and it should assume its responsibility—I don't believe in Title VII taking over total education of the child and taking the district and the state off the hook. It is nice, but they should do their part, the ordinary per-capita at district level. Excess per-capita for basic bilingual program—then if a state and local is doing that much to help those children, I think the Federal Government can afford to be generous to them. For states like New Mexico or Arizona where they are already putting 80 percent of their budget in education, they need more massive help than Massachusetts.

We have 15,000 non-English-speaking children in the whole state. We can afford to be generous with 4 million dollars. We can take care of it.

Now I open it for any questions of specifics.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Sister Vicente, your testimony is just almost overwhelming in terms of the warmth and the deep feelings and convictions you have over the fact that basically this is a human problem. I wish that you were in the position of being able to make appearances before the bureaucrats, the curricula planners and all of those persons who have overwhelming overriding problems that they have to deal with in their specific capacities.

I am so glad that you appeared before this committee this morning because the thread that kept running through your remarks was the fact that indeed we have tried to assimilate everybody into the so-called melting pot when in reality we are nothing but a wonderful salad bowl, a mix, a coming-together of all kinds making their contribution to the so-called melting pot.

I was wondering if you really felt basically that we cannot in any way leave the bilingual programs up to the decisions of state or city governments, because those programs might receive very low priorities because of the fact that many of these persons coming from these groups are not powerful people. In other words, for example, we are talking about revenue-sharing right now.

If you just talk about revenue-sharing generally and do not speak about stipulated grants, the people that need the help would get lost completely. I was wondering if you felt now that any kind of legislation pertaining to bilingual education that comes before city councils or state legislatures or Federal Government—we can no longer put in the legislative "may." We must have a mandate.

Sister VICENTE. I feel strongly so.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Is that what you recommend?

Sister VICENTE. Strongly so. A number of states have discretionary bilingual laws, but they just touch on the problem. We are just asking a favor. When it is compensatory, it puts these children in the position of their problems instead of assets.

By all means we know there are priorities of all kinds and that bilingual education is never going to be the total priority everywhere where it is needed. We expect them to respond when we just ask them for a favor. It is not ordinarily going to happen. Even in Massachusetts I spend my time trying to educate the educated, running around to committee meetings and budget hearings and when all else fails, then we take out the statistics and say, "We have the power to withhold all your state funds. Are you going to do it or not, or do you want to go to jail?"

There has to be a point of accounting. And that must help very much.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Second, do you really feel that—before we would really talk about meaningful—and that is the key word, meaningful—bilingual programs—that it would be most important that those persons who have the responsibility of chartering these programs, drawing up these programs and also have the responsibility of being bogged down by statistics and how much money—do you feel they forget the human element completely? Do you really feel that it is almost of urgent necessity that persons such as yourself and others who have had actual experience in the field should be the advisers to all these different committees and attempt to draw up a program based on human relations?

Sister VICENTE. I feel sensitizing legislators was the thing that won us the Massachusetts law.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much. Mr. Meeds.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Sister Vicente, one of the rewards of this job is to have the opportunity to see fine people like you in action. Every once in a while we get a person who seems to say it all in a very succinct and unemotional way. I just thought as I listened to you how I wish that I could have put you inside my suit and sat you on the floor of the House about three weeks ago to have replied to one of my colleagues who was questioning the validity of any bilingual education since he had come from the old country and he was proud to say he was an American. He could not understand why other people wanted to retain some of their own native background.

As I listened to you, I wished you were there to reply to him. I was incapable of doing it as you would have.

I am going to take your spoken statement and insert in the record as a reply to that statement. Also the written statement will be made part of the record.

I was not being facetious when I mentioned a billion dollars. Perhaps I was being unrealistic in terms of getting that much, but in terms of the enormity of the problem, not at all. San Francisco educators were here indicating they are spending approximately $300 per student for bilingual programs in the City of San Francisco. We are spending at the Federal level about $350 per student on bilingual programs.

If you take that and multiply it times the 5 million, as you point out and as other experts indicate—5 million students that are in need of bilingual education—you get some idea of the enormity of the cost of this program, about $1.5 billion per year. So I don't think $250 million is at all unrealistic because I would say, particularly as we pointed out through the witness before you, initially at least that much is required. I assume you are a strong supporter of the Senate bill.

Sister VICENTE. Very much so, yes.

Mr. MEEDS. I assume also you are very much in favor of the teacher education aspects of it.

Sister VICENTE. So important. May I add one thing about this billion dollars? At present federally we spend $1 billion force-feeding

foreign language students on a secondary and college level to give them their academic status they need to go to the college of their choice and they cannot order a cup of coffee when they go abroad. It is misspent and we are sandpapering out of this linguistic minorities.

When I went to school I was not allowed to take Spanish because I know it. I learned to read and write it fluently in graduate school. It is such a misplaced thing. In Massachusetts we are introducing a new law for language maintenance, that when children come out of their bilingual education program which is, I am sad to say, for three years, they will be able to maintain their language, at the level of their proficiency. Then we will have a real cadre of truly bilingual people that we need.

Every doctor and nurse and lawyer in Boston is asking me for conversational Spanish so he can make it economically with his patients or clients because they are being overrun. The Portuguese children are learning French as their second language. They can hardly speak English. It is a confusing need.

So we should put our money where the true need is.

Mr. MEEDS. I agree. Again I much appreciate your testimony.

Sister VICENTE. Thank you very much.

Mr. BENITEZ. I would like to make one observation. First I think that those of us who have been privileged to be here today are most grateful to you. This has been one of the best testimonies in my year and one-half we have heard. And I am saying this—the punch line comes in a minute. But the point I wish to emphasize is that we have seen this, a display of charm and of grace and this is what the sister and I when we used to study Greek identified under the word "charisma," which means the Grace of God.

And my sense of drama and of propriety makes me say this—because when all of a sudden I saw these two charismatic ladies—my colleague, Shirley Chisholm, and my former compatriot in Puerto Rico get together, I must say to my other colleagues that if these two sisters join efforts, the walls of bureaucrats will crumble down.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you.

I would just like to say once again that we certainly do appreciate your efforts and one of the things that came home so clearly to me as you were speaking was the fact that I have many, many friends from different countries who are part of the United Nations and whenever I go to the United Nations and listen to these women from Asian countries, European and African countries, not only speak their own language so fluently and beautifully, but also handle the English language so beautifully, and then I look around at the Americans who will be there, women and/or men, who are not able to converse or understand, I almost feel in a way by the attitudes of some of them that "You all should be speaking English"—I think we are going to have to learn something about this kind of patronizing attitude that many of us have with respect to other peoples who are fluent in both languages or two or three languages and realize that this is a world community.

Sister Vicente, I am not ashamed to say that one of my assets in the political arena today in America is my fluency in written and spoken Spanish, and this is one of the things I use constantly. I think many of us have to recognize that, whether we want to face the fact or not, the world community is narrowing and that we have thousands of persons of Spanish-speaking origin in this country and in some cities in this nation and very soon in the near future this is going to be the dominant ethnic group in these cities, so I think it behooves us to get off our paternalistic attitudes and realize we are a salad bowl and not a melting pot.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT WEISMAN

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, one of Chicago's most beloved citizens has passed away. My good friend, Al Weisman, well known and well respected by all who knew him died on March 23, 1974, a sudden victim of a massive heart attack.

Al was the personification of the famous line from the poem by Sam Walter Foss:

Let me live in my house by the side of the road, and be a friend to man.

Al was truly a friend to man—every man. He loved people; he overlooked their weaknesses and their foibles. He stressed their attributes. He had a capacity for great compassion.

People liked to talk to Al because he would share their problems and their anguish. He helped them in their time of need and sparkled with them in their time of happiness. He was warm and encouraging. People came away from talking to him with a good feeling.

Al loved politics. Perhaps it was his natural bent for show business that gave him his intense interest in politics and current affairs. He knew everybody in political activity, from the mayor to the precinct captain. He was a pragmatist with ideals. His pragmatism never stooped to mean ends.

He always looked for ways to make politics better by supporting good civic causes and those who advanced them.

It was fun to be with Al. He was bright, perceptive, witty, and he loved to laugh. A gathering took life whenever he was there. A community cause gained impetus because he participated.

He was the organizer and general of the Wellington-Oakdale Marching Society. On every national holiday, the flag would be raised in front of his home at 11 a.m. and his friends in the immediate neighborhood gathered with their children to march behind the flag down Wellington Avenue, Sheridan Road, and Oakdale to St. Joseph's Hospital where the sisters distributed lollipops and candy to the kids. His marching society started with only a few friends, but over the years it grew to a force of almost a thousand, augmented by marching bands and recorded by television cameras and newspaper photographers. Al walked in front wearing his tricornered hat, giving the occasion color, fun, and an all-embracing sense of belonging.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss Al very much. When I think of him, I shall recall how appropriate for him, too, was the line by Abraham Lincoln:

Die when I may, I want it said of me by those who know me best that I always plucked a thistle and planted a flower where I thought a flower would grow.

To Annie, his good wife, and to his beloved family, Addie and I extend our most profound sympathy and our love.

Mr. Speaker, I attach eulogies given at his funeral by Irv Kupcinet, Jon Anderson, Fairfax Cone, together with press notices:

AL WEISMAN EULOGY

(By Kup)

Friends of Al and Annie, of Sydney and Tony and Kim: I sense the feeling that pervades this gathering. It is one of shock and disbelief. All of us were stunned. Al Weisman, so vibrant, so vital, so vigorous one day: a victim of a heart attack the next.

Al Weisman gone? To those of us assembled here, that is incredible and impossible.

This gathering is the greatest eulogy of Al Weisman. Persons of all walks of life, from the high and mighty to just "ordinary people" have come together to pay respect to a beloved friend who left his imprint on all with whom he came in contact . . . because Al Weisman cared. He genuinely cared about his fellow being. A unique attribute in this impersonal, computerized society.

And all of us have something in common, in addition to our love for Al Weisman. Each of us, in his own way, could write a story on the most unforgettable character I've ever met.

And each of us would be writing about the same person.

Al Weisman is unforgettable . . . and will remain so in our hearts and in our thoughts.

The medical report states he died of heart failure. But I reject that explanation. Al's heart never failed anybody, himself or his friends. It was steady as the stars . . . ask the many he befriended. It was as faithful as the tides . . . ask the members of his bereaved family.

There was room in his heart for all.

Many of you gathered here today know so much about our most unforgettable character . . .

Of his days as a newspaperman in St. Louis:

Of his work with the Community Fund, which brought him to the attention of the Chicago newspaper fraternity:

Of his 18 years as an advertising executive with Foote, Cone & Belding, which he served as its good will ambassador:

Of his involvement in politics, including the campaigns of Adlai Stevenson and Joseph Lohman:

Of his efforts, in conjunction with Bill Hartmann, to assure an appreciative reception of Pablo Piccaso's prodigious contribution to Chicago:

Of his last role as Assistant Vice President for Public Affairs at the University of Chicago.

These, and many other of his interests, are well known to this gathering.

May I add a few personal memories that make Al so unforgettable.

We were friends for more than 25 years—without a single angry interlude. And throughout this period, my office phone would ring every morning at approximately 9:30. Al would be on the other end—asking some penetrating question about the state of our nation or our city, commenting on the day's news, or offering some stimulating suggestion for the column or TV show . . . many times to be pursued later over our frequent lunches.

He was as stimulating as he is unforgettable.

I loved and admired him for his concern for others. Like his students at Columbia College, each of whom practically became his private ward. And his delight over one of his students, a part-time vendor at the ball park, who invariably greeted him in the stands with, "Hi, Professor Weisman!" for all to hear. Or the bank teller on Michigan Avenue who saved souvenir Kennedy half dollars for him—and whose personal problems Al helped solve. And the time he mobilized so many to memorialize his friend, producer Marshall Migatz, a victim of an auto acident. Al felt Marshall's contribution to the theatre should be fully recognized and he put in motion the campaign to keep the academy playhouse operating in memory of Marshall Migatz.

And the joy he realized in turning actor briefly for a role in *The Front Page* at the Academy Playhouse, then located at Loyola U., a joy that stemmed from his association with a play about the newspaper profession, which was his first love.

This desire to share with others was typified when he started driving from his north side home to the south side campus of the University, a daily chore that ran the risk of life and limb for him. But Al, so characteristic of him, wouldn't waste all that car space driving alone. He arranged to pick up friends so he could drive them to the loop or beyond. It was perhaps a small thing, but it was an indication of how he forever was thinking of helping others.

And then there were those Sundays during the fall when I drove him home from the football games, first from Wrigley Field and then Soldier Field. And his invariable needle on entering the car, "Well, expert, explain why they lost this time."

And his many hats that reflected his mood. Al wore many hats in life, both figuratively and literally. Nobody knows how many he owned. There was the tam he affected for a spell. Then the baseball cap, then the stocking cap, then the fur piece, then the C-monogram cap for the University of Chicago, and then there was the tri-corner. I suspect he loved the tri-corner best because it identified him with the Wellington-Oakdale Old Glory Marching Society, which he founded and nurtured after his friend, Sherman Wolf, presented him with a flag.

What to do with a flag? Why a flag is for a parade, reasoned Al. And who better to parade to the beat of the drummer than youngsters? Thus did he come upon the idea of the neighborhood marching society . . . for fun, of course, but also for the more serious purpose of instilling love of country into the youngsters.

And thru his efforts, the Wellington Oakdale Old Glory Marching Society attracted attention in the press, then on television and finally, across the country as a model for other cities.

You can measure a man by his respect for his elders and his dedication of youth. Al's devotion to his parents was a joy to behold. And at the other end of the age spectrum was his unbounded elation over the pint-size patriots of the Old Glory Marching Society.

A Jewish theologian and poet who lived in the middle ages once wrote, "Man should be both master and slave—master of his will and slave to his conscience."

No better words can describe Al Weisman . . . for certainly he was master of his will, as much as any of us can be, and he definitely was a slave to his conscience, which constantly called on him to help his fellow man.

He was a man of love and devotion, as his wife Ann and daughters Syndey and Kim, and son Tony know so well.

The Talmud teaches us that "the righteous need no tombstones, their words are their monuments."

Al knew how to use words . . . he knew how to communicate . . . even tho, as many of us know, he often spoke in half-finished sentences. But he never failed to get the message across—professionally or personally.

Yes, we all have known a most unforgettable character.

And may I end this eulogy by quoting a line from the poets that has so much meaning for all of us:

"They are not dead who live in the hearts they leave behind."

FOR UNCLE AL

(By Jon Anderson)

Someone from out of town once asked me, "What does your friend Al Weisman do?"

Well, I explained, he wears a pirate hat and he marches around the block on holidays. He can get you a job or tickets to anything. You can call him up from anywhere in the world and he'll give you the latest news. He knows most of the Andy Frain ushers at Wrigley Field and he can get you into the sunny seats when yours are in the shade. And when you get there chances are that the hot dog man will be one of Al's students from Columbia College and Al will get the guy to tell you a lot of things you never knew about the selling of hot dogs.

The remarkable thing about Al was that he knew so many people so well. Or rather, that he *understood* so many people so well. He was a man of endless energy and endless patience, talking about problems, encouraging, advising, organizing. The Picasso statue dedication. The Marshall Migatz theatre fund. We all know of hundreds of ventures Al was involved in beyond his formal jobs with Foote, Cone & Belding and the University of Chicago.

But the essence of Al came out best during his parades. There was a wonderful, warm humor to those days, and it is worth noting that in a decade it hardly ever rained on Al's parades. What each parade did was to pull together a whole community of peripheral friends, those people you don't see every day, but you wonder how they're getting on. The parades centered on Al, and what he did for the community was to keep us all together.

It was fitting that his retirement gift from Foote, Cone & Belding was a specially-designed telephone and that it sits in the den of the Weisman home where most of us have sat and talked with Al on numberless occasions.

Al kept us together, by taking the time to be a close friend, a listener, an encourager, an adviser to many, many people.

That's what Al Weisman did, and he did it better than anyone I know.

AL WEISMAN

(By Fairfax M. Cone)

Al Weisman never knew a helping hand to be too much trouble.

Indeed, he never looked upon it as anything but sharing an experience, which he did without stint, taking his share from the vast reservoir of an open heart.

Al's friends can be numbered in many hundreds.

He made these wherever he paused in a moving, exciting life.

In St. Louis, as a very young man in newspaperdom.

In Alaska, in World War II.

In Chicago, in the Community Fund; at Ebony magazine, and his annual neighborhood children's parade.

At Foote, Cone & Belding, and Columbia College and, finally, at the University of Chicago.

In each of these he left his mark. And from them and from their people, large and small, he took the sustenance that was given him, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say the sustenance that was repaid to him—in friends.

Of all the things Al Weisman understood, and there were many, this was the one by which he lived with his warm helping hand, giving much, asking little.

FROM THE JOHN CALLAWAY TELECAST ON CBS, CHICAGO, SUNDAY, MARCH 24, 1974, AT 6 P.M.

The obituaries will tell you that Albert P. Weisman was a reporter with the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch before launching a public relations career. The wire services remind us that Al Weisman worked for presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson in 1952, that he helped organize public television station WTTW, that he ran public relations for the big advertising firm of Foote, Cone & Belding for 18 years . . . and then finished his career at the University of Chicago.

And many of you viewers will be familiar with the Wellington-Oakdale Old Glory Marching Society, which Al Weisman founded in 1963. This holiday parade effort reflected Al Weisman's unabashed patriotism at a time when flag waving wasn't very fashionable. And it really is not surprising that Al is not to be seen in our film of the parade. Because Al Weisman was foremost among that very small behind-the-scenes club that makes things work in this town.

Nobody was better with a telephone. He would call a reporter and speak with a soft, conspiritorial voice: "John, do you know what's going on at City Hall today."

Some misinformed people didn't take Al Weisman seriously because he walked like his feet hurt, in those baggy pants, and he talked out of the side of his mouth. They didn't realize how he got things done in this town like his incomparable promotion of the Civic Center Picasso sculpture.

He was a one man employment agency. He was a floating city editor with a dozen story tips a day for writers and reporters. He had the power and good humor to gently remind politicians and TV people not to take themselves too seriously. He brought together powerful people on opposite sides of issues. He was an enabler, a go-between; he provided the social lubricant so badly needed in the ambition-ridden world of politics and media.

The last letter he wrote to this reporter—and he must have written a hundred notes a week to people—was signed with the word most men fear to use and the word that best represents Al Weisman. It was signed, "love."

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Mar. 25, 1974]

LAUGHTER HIS LEGACY: AL WEISMAN'S STORIES ALL TOLD NOW

(By Tom Fitzpatrick)

We were sitting upstairs in Hobson's one day and Al Weisman reminisced about one of the many zany things that happened while he was handling political candidates.

"I managed Joe Lohman's campaign for sheriff one year," Al said. A tiny smile began forming around Al's eyes as he talked, so I knew this would be a good one.

"We were doing just fine. The press was great and we could sense we were ahead.

"Well, about two weeks before the election, Gov. Stratton comes up with a tape on which Lohman is saying that policemen have a tendency to marry prostitutes."

Al interrupted his story until all those around the table could control their laughter.

"Well, you can imagine the wives of all the policemen were ready to lynch all of us who have anything to do with Lohman's campaign. For days, I have to deal with them, trying to calm them down.

"So we decide to hold a press conference to straighten everything out. It turns out the Lohman quote was lifted out of context from a lecture he delivered about the quality of mercy.

"Lohman managed to explain this to everyone's satisfaction but he couldn't stop at that. Right at the end of the press conference he added: 'You know, clergymen have the same tendencies.' "

Al's face took on a look of mock horror.

"I stopped breathing," Al said. "I couldn't believe it was happening. But we were lucky. The only one who picked up on this angle was a guy from Time magazine and his story didn't appear until the day after we had won the election."

There will be no more long lunches with Al in Hobson's. No more chances to hear Al expound about his days as a police reporter, either. Sadder still, there will be no more opportunities to be with him and watch and listen to Al serve as a conscience for the newspapermen of this town.

Al died Saturday night in Billings hospital at 59.

He suffered a heart attack Friday afternoon while walking across the quadrangle at the University of Chicago where he was the assistant vice president for public affairs.

Al had a full life. He had been a newspaperman and then a public relations man who became a vice president at Foote, Cone and Belding. He had worked in both presidential campaigns for Adlai Stevenson.

But there were so many sides to him. For example, he used to dress up as the Easter Bunny for the kids' party at the Lincoln Park Zoo.

And one day, back in 1963, Al founded the Wellington-Oakdale Old Glory Marching Society.

How did it start? For Al it was simple. His friend, Sherman Wolf, had given him a parade size flag as a joke. Al got a handful of kids together and started an annual parade.

Through the years, the parade has become a community fixture with politicians vying to take part. Al was happy to have them all on one condition. They could march but they could not give a speech.

Al was always proud that his daughter Sydney had turned out to be a reporter for WLS radio.

Many times during long conversations, Al would suddenly ask:

"How's she doing?"

"She's doing fine, Al," I'd say. "She's good."

Then Al would ask: "Do you think she's happy?"

"I think so, Al. I think she is."

Then Al would smile and shake his head slowly.

"That's really the most important thing," he said. "I want her to be happy."

Sydney remembers another day when she and her dad were driving somewhere in a car.

All at once the conversation turned from high comedy to seriousness (this is the way it always was with Al), and Al said to Sydney:

"You know, if I had any legacy to leave my children it would be the ability to laugh at themselves and to always have a sense of humor."

There was so much about Al Weisman that people didn't know.

Once, I remember him saying he wanted to write a book some day about his life.

"I've really had a good life," Al said, "and I'd like to sit down and tell it all so that my kids could read it. I think they'd like it."

[From the Lincoln Park-Lake View Booster, Mar. 27, 1974]

WELLINGTON-OAKDALE'S WEISMAN DIES; PARADES TO CONTINUE AS MEMORIAL?

The Wellington-Oakdale Old Glory Marching Society, a ragtag crew of fledgling patriots who toted an unwieldy flag through the streets of Lake View to celebrate major holidays, will no longer be able to follow the leader.

Al Weisman, a man who used to rival the Pied Piper as he strutted ahead of his pint-sized marchers of the Society he founded in 1963, died last week at age 59.

In more sedate circles, the North Side resident was identified as the assistant for publice affairs and director of public information at the University of Chicago.

During a lifetime of involvement with the media Weisman worked for both presidential campaigns of Adlai Stevenson and for 18 years with the advertising firm of Foote, Cone and Belding, many as vice president in charge of public relations there.

But, as one neighbor observed, no job was important enough to confine him and he was always looking for "other hats to wear."

The most colorful hat he donned was undoubtedly the three-cornered, Napoleon-like topper that made the 5-foot-7 dynamo stand out in the crowd of youngsters he led in parades.

With a parade-size flag donated by a friend, Weisman started an annual event about a decade ago. Leading a ragamuffin gang of East Lake View kids, he would direct a parade that begin at his home at 513 Wellington, snaked along Sheridan to Surf and stopped at St. Joseph's Hospital when the nuns there offered candy to the tired troopers.

As the fame and fun of the parade captured attention, politicians and local community leaders joined the fanfare on Memorial Day, the Fourth of July, Labor Day and Halloween, but Weisman insisted that no speeches interrupt the hilarity.

"He seemed to know everyone in this community," mused one friend of the newspaperman and public relations director. "He truly gave a sense of community to this area."

Other community leaders hoped that the paraders would continue the street play that he began as an appropriate memorial to his leadership.

Mr. Weisman died Saturday night, March 23, at Billings Hospital after suffering a heart attack Friday afternoon as he crossed the central quadrangle at the University of Chicago campus.

Born in St. Louis, he joined the Globe-Democrat there in 1932 where he wrote features and served as night city editor before entering the army in 1942. Weisman spent most of World War II as a war correspondent for Yank, a magazine for enlisted men.

Survivors include his widow, Ann; a son, Tony; two daughters, Kim and Sydney, and a brother, Paul. Services were held March 26 at Sinai Temple, 5350 S. South Shore. Interment was in Rosehill cemetery.

The family requested that, in lieu of flowers, contributions be made to the University of Chicago to establish a fellowship for working journalists.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 26. 1974]

AL WAS A MAN WHO LEFT A SMILE IN HIS WAKE

(By Joe Cappo)

If I thought Al Weisman would have wanted me to write his obit, I would wax poetic about his accomplishments. But I'll leave that to the chroniclers.

While the memory is still fresh, the least I can do is share some of it with you. Those who didn't know Al are probably wondering why so many of us in the press have made such a fuss over his death.

Well, Al was a puckish man who could saunter through the city room of a newspaper, gabbing here and there with reporters and editors. He had that magic ability to maintain three unrelated conversations at one time, and he always walked away leaving smiles in his wake.

Considering the less-than-cordial nature of most newsmen at work, this ability was unique. I don't know of another PR person who was so welcome at the Chicago newspapers. But Al could even carry off the same ritual at the New York Times.

This wasn't public relations, though, It was more the mark of a man who was a joy to know.

I can tell right now that I will never be able to capture his spirit in these empty words. Suffice it to say that he was a warm, compassionate man, the kind whom many sought for advice and understanding.

He had a bounce in his step and a gleam in his eye, most evident when he led the holiday marches through his neighborhood. And the Wellington-Oakdale Old Glory Marching Society that he stated was an important part of his life.

Before moving to the University of Chicago a few months ago, Al handled public relations for 18 years at Foote, Cone & Belding. It was during this time that I came to know and love Al Weisman. I don't mean to imply that I was his best friend . . . but only that he had the ability to make me and hundreds of others feel that they had a best friend.

In five years of conducting this column, I have written only one other piece about a person who died. He was Leo Burnett, a giant in the advertising business. Al Weisman was his own kind of giant.

No more than a week ago, he was deskhopping through the city room of The Daily News. He stopped by and sat in a chair that I'm staring at right now.

In the middle of one of those disjointed, half-sentence-studded conversations that we always seemed to have, he mused: "In the 18 years I was in the advertising business, I never got an ulcer. But lately, I don't know. Maybe I'm getting old . . ."

A few days later, at age 59, he died, felled by a heart attack.

But before he left the office that day, he talked about leaving the advertising business that I cover, and asked: "Tell me, Joe, do you miss me?"

We all miss you, Al.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 25, 1974]

A. P. WEISMAN RITES TUESDAY; UC OFFICIAL

Services for Albert P. Weisman, assistant vice president of public affairs and director of public relations for the University of Chicago, will be held at 11 a.m Tuesday in the Sinai Temple, 5350 South Shore Dr.

Mr. Weisman, 59, of 513 W. Wellington, had a heart attack Friday and died Saturday in Billings Hospital.

Mr. Weisman's career as a Chicago public relations specialist began in 1947 when he served as the representative for the Chicago Community Fund.

He then was a Chicago correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. He previously served as feature writer and night city editor for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and was a combat correspondent during World War II for "Yank," the enlisted men's magazine.

After a brief stint as public relations director for the Los Angeles Community Chest, Mr. Weisman returned to Chicago as public relations director for Ebony Magazine.

He next handled public relations for the 1952 presidential campaign of the late Adlai E. Stevenson and then opened his own public relations firm, which focused on political candidates and welfare organizations.

In 1955 Mr. Weisman joined the advertising firm of Foote, Cone & Belding. He supervised 5 U.S. and 14 international offices for the firm before being appointed to his university posts last August.

Mr. Weisman was best known outside his public relations work for having launched the "Wellington-Oakdale Old Glory Marching Society." The society consists of area residents who parade through the North Side neighborhood on major holidays.

Mr. Weisman also was instrumental in establishing Chicago's public television station, WTTW (Channel 11). And he served as a director of the Lincoln Park Zoological Society and a trustee of Columbia College where he taught urban politics. He also taught at the University of Chicago's Metropolitan Institute.

Memorial contributions may be made to establish an Al Weisman fellowship for working journalists.

Survivors include his wife, Ann; a son, Tony; two daughters, Kim and Sydney, and a brother, Paul.

ARTICLE ON TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Mr. Ibrohim Clark. The article is based upon a discussion paper first presented at the One Asia

Assembly in Manila, Philippines, in 1971. It contains information concerning technology transfer in Southeast Asia which relates directly to a bill I introduced today to establish an "International Science and Technology Transfer Institute."

PATTERNS FOR EFFECTIVE USE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Ibrohim Clark)

This paper is an effort to suggest means of using science and technology in Southeast Asia so that rapid benefits can be achieved without disturbing the balance between peoples' inner needs and their worldly activities. It is a discussion concerned with the patterns of development of science and technology in Southeast Asia, and will suggest means for implementing these patterns, with specific examples of scientific and technological areas important to the full development of the potential of the people and resources of Southeast Asia.

An opening question: What is the function that science and technology should play in the nations of Southeast Asia in order to accelerate their achievement of full domestic capacity as well as a greater role among the nations of the world?

Advanced planning for the use of science and technology can preclude some of the hazards of unbridled, unplanned growth we have experienced in the west. Science and technology need not lead the peoples of Southeast Asia down the road of environmental abuse and destruction, machine domination, and weapons brinksmanship. But these very excesses of technology unfortunately experienced all too often in the west may yield certain insights as to the appropriate patterns of scientific and economic development in Southeast Asia. If we look for a balance between social and spiritual development on the one side and economic, scientific and technological development on the other, than the infusion of science and technology may accrue lasting benefits. Thus it is essential to consider patterns of scientific and technological development concommitantly with the social and spiritual climate of the individual and collective nations of Southeast Asia.

In order to maintain this balance in practical, realistic, and specific planning for intensified use of science and technology in the nations of Southeast Asia it seems necessary to plan structures which will protect such balance. Some examples already exist in Southeast Asia, some are just evolving and unfortunately, some negative effects have already been felt where too little attention has been paid to such a balance.

It seems that the key word for success may be cooperation. That is, sharing of the initial and even continuing responsibility for the development of both basic and applied scientific research.

An excellent example of such sharing has occurred at the Applied Scientific Research Corporation of Thailand. This organization was established in Thailand on May 20, 1963 by Royal Assent. This Thai National Research Organization, now in its 9th year, is chartered to "initiate and carry out applied scientific research and investigations concerned with natural resources, industries and administrative services of Thailand, including the health and welfare of the Thai people, and to promote and support such research." The organization is also supposed to, "promote the application of the results of applied research for the benefit of the nation, train scientific research workers, and provide a central service for making scientific tests, and measurements of all kinds."

This research organization, started with the cooperation of foreign scientists and the financial assistance of UNDP, is now engaged in many research projects important to the development of Thailand and Southeast Asia. For the first five years after its foundation the research posts were shared by foreign scientists and Thai scientists. This arrangement even included the Australian Research Director and his Thai counterpart.

Within the Applied Scientific Research Organization there is a Technological Research Institute, an Agricultural Research Institute, a Nutrition and Food Sciences Research Institute, and a Center for Environmental and Ecological Research. The latter has conducted detailed studies in humid tropical forests of Thailand, including forest regeneration, watershed management, wildlife conservation, etc. These studies have contributed to the International Biological Programme. This Research Institute is presented as an excellent example of how a first rate scientific research organization can be established with foreign scientists participating for an extended period, but governed by the national government, and now, Thai scientists. It is noteworthy that this organization required the passing of a special act to establish it which provided exception of salaries from the Civil Service Act (thus allowing the scientists to participate and exchange positions on an international scale) and funding earmarked for a 5-year period, giving it ample time to become established and demonstrate its value.

Such research institutions could be established in other countries, throughout Southeast Asia following a similar legislative, implementation, and operation pattern.

Another national research organization with somewhat more limited range of research activities is the Bogor Botanical Gardens in Indonesia. This research center is now becoming the center for a new regional development research organization called BIOTROP which should become a model for regional cooperation in tropical biology studies in Southeast Asia. The development of BIOTROP has taken some 4 years. The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Council (SEAMEC) first considered BIOTROP in 1966 at the 2nd SEAMEC Conference in Manila, and Indonesia was honored to be the host country for a SEAMEC Regional Center for Tropical Biology at Bogor Botanical Gardens. The basic funding for various SEAMEC projects was established at the Manila Conference. The United States pledged 50% of the operational and capital costs and the remainder comes from non-U.S. government sources. Member countries and the Ford Foundation have provided the major portion of this 50% support.

Other projects fostered by SEAMEC include:

1. Six national Tropical Medicine Centers located in Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, the Republic of Vietnam, with a Central Coordinating Board located in Bangkok.

2. The Regional Centre for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture, located in Los Banos in the Philippines.

3. The Regional Centre for Education in Science and Mathematics, located in Penang, Malaysia.

4. The Regional English Language Centre in Singapore.

5. The Regional Centre for Training, Research and Post Graduate Study in Tropical Biology in Bogor, Indonesia.

6. The Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology, located in Saigon.

It is easy to see how this regional organization can spawn centers for science and technology that benefit all the nations of Southeast Asia.

A somewhat different approach to the introduction of scientific research into Southeast Asia is presented by the Rice Research Institute in the Philippines. It also represents a cooperative effort of international scientists, but has been established financially through private foundations. Its effect on food development has become well known throughout the world. It is the kind of research activity which I believe a United States International Development Institute would encourage and support.

Another new approach for development is now being initiated in Indonesia in East Kalimantan, where a research project, although national in scope, may have regional and even international significance. The purpose of this Indonesian project is to develop tropical forest, agricultural and wildlife research areas to: 1) test and verify methods of increased productivity and multiple use, 2) determine the most effective methods of management and administration, 3) provide and area for tropical forestry and forest product studies, 4) study all ecological aspects of the research, and 5) to provide educational exchange in all aspects of tropical land ecology.

Planning for an entire research and development community is being considered by landscape architects, community planners, and social scientists so as to provide maximum compatibility with the local people, community structure and social life patterns. It is anticipated that tropical forest management techniques would provide a basis for governmental planning in multiple forest uses in Indonesia and Southeast Asia.

Financing for these studies would come largely from the wood and agricultural products of the research land.

In relation to planning for this project Professor Garrett Eckbo has said: "The world is filled with mistakes resulting from carelessly planned or haphazard development. These mistakes cannot be corrected, once made. Nor are simple quantitative controls enough—both natural ecosystems and human experience must be studied with maximum subtlety and sophistication."

Such a project, carefully planned and executed, can become a seed for total community development and a model for national and regional development and wise land use practices. And it can accomplish all of this while simultaneously improving the economic and social welfare of the people in the immediate area.

The tropical areas of Southeast Asia have been, and are, most vulnerable to haphazardly planned projects and area development and to outright exploitation of natural resources. The almost fanatical surge of public interest in the "quality of environment" now being expressed in the United States should serve as a flashing red light to the peoples of Southeast Asia—a warning for careful planning that will include preservation of the purity and beauty of land, water, and air for many decades hence!

I believe the leaders and peoples of Southeast Asia can now begin to see the dangers and damage to the environment from rapid, unplanned and poorly regulated natural resources exploitation. Surely it is understandable that such things could have occurred in the past, but today global concern for the quality of our environment has provided almost everyone with knowledge of this danger of unbridled economic exploitation and blind technology utilization. The high school and college students in America today are forming "action" groups on environment and ecology!

Yet concern for the environment should not hamper the development of natural resources through the use of science and technology in Southeast Asia. It need not. What is essential is that immediate planning includes a full consideration of the effects of new technology on both the environment and the peoples' social, cultural and spiritual values.

Just two examples of poor planning for technology will be cited here; the rest I leave up to you. Perhaps the most apparent exploitation of natural resources in Southeast Asia is that of timber. When tropical soils

are left bare after timber cutting the microorganisms and soil structure often deteriorate so as to make the land areas almost worthless. With wise planning, however, cut forests could be replaced with a new, faster growing species of tree or converted to citrus fruit. Such forest management yields a much greater economic return in the long run. Experience and know-how are available for wise multiple forest use planning.

Perhaps the problem of off-shore oil drilling leaks has not yet been serious in Southeast Asia—I am not certain. I am certain that it could be in the future. When one looks at the off-shore oil concessions in Indonesian waters it seems almost a certainty that oil will leak from some of these drillings. And such leakage on the shores of Bali and other tropical islands will have an economic impact on tourism which can only be dimly realized. Often some simple geological, engineering or scientific planning will prevent such future mishaps. Recently in the Gulf of Mexico where a large oil leak occurred it was said that the damage could have been cut dramatically by the installation of storm chokes that close wells when the oil flows get out of control. The cost of these devices is $800 per well!

Exploitation of land areas for minerals in the United States has been, and is, a serious problem, both esthetically and economically.

With such warnings and knowledge of means of prevention, perhaps Southeast Asia can circumvent this negative impact of science and technology and haphazard natural resource exploitation.

Probably one of the best—and most dramatic—new scientific tools for recognizing and controlling such potential environmental abuses is the resource survey satellite. The United States satellite, technically known by the acronym ERTS (Environmental Resource and Technological Satellite), the first such U.S. satellite, was launched in 1972.

It has been made clear by President Nixon in the past year that Earth Resource satellite data would be made available to the developing nations (United Nations, September, 1969). Robert Packard, of the U.S. State Department, said in March, 1970: "We must move promptly and openly to develop this capability (earth resource satellites), seeking maximum foreign participation from the outset and making sure that these arrangements are consistent with the particular characteristics of this new technology as it unfolds." Packard further states in the same speech: "There seems little doubt as to the technical feasibility of surveying earth resources by remote sensors from satellites."

This fact is dramatically shown to be true by Phil Langley of the U.S. Forest Survey, who completed the first U.S. forest inventory utilizing satellite photography in 1969. Langley conducted a forest inventory on some 5 million acres of the Mississippi River Valley. The U.S. Forest Service said: "It is the first practical use of space photographs in forestry, and the first time a forest has been inventoried, using space photos." Although this method required photography from aircraft as well, it is only the first crude use of space photography for practical operational land and vegetation inventories. As the early weather satellite photos gave only crude data on cloud and weather patterns, so will the earth satellite data and its processing become much more sophisticated as user requirements are met.

Now we see that crop surveys can be made from a satellite and computer-processed by taking several photos of the same areas at different times. This is the great value of satellites—repeated pictures at regular intervals (orbits) of changing natural events, i.e., floods, rivers, vegetation, etc. Keith Arnold, Deputy Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, stated in a March, 1970 speech: "The Earth Resource and Technology Satellite's greatest significance is the fact that it will develop repetitive, synoptic space data for analysis and applications."

The nations of Southeast Asia, with support from international agencies, should already have begun the training of a small number of specialists in the most promising use of such satellite data. The data handling, data processing, and data analysis will be major parts of the implementation and practical use of such satellite photography. Only by establishing priorities of data use and data processing can the earth resource satellite data be brought to bear on some of the pressing cartography, land and oceans surveys of Southeast Asia.

PLANNING FOR ACCELERATED AND BALANCED DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

With the preceding examples of good planning in a few projects, poor planning in others, and a dramatic new tool for natural resource development and environmental monitoring, we are now in a better position to look at a pattern of science and technology use in Southeast Asia which is practical and has some promise of success.

The most important theme that can be drawn is that specialists should *work with* the scientists and engineers of Southeast Asia until projects and programs are underway. This period of mutual effort between foreign experts and national experts has been shown to significantly benefit both parties. The foreign scientist or engineer goes away with a deeper understanding of the cultural, social and spiritual values of the peoples of the developing countries, while at the same time leaving behind some of his own skill and know-how. In the course of this working experience, bridges of understanding are built. Without a doubt, this is the real key to international relations!

A RECAPITULATION: ABUSES OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Science and technology, when pursued without due regard for their impact on man's social and spiritual life and cultural values, is often destructive. More and more machines are built, more and more weapons are built; the very pressure of their existence drives man to finding more and more uses for them. This escalation of technology creates many new gadgets and activities for man but often makes his life more hectic, more complicated, and less meaningful.

Environmental abuse; enhanced by the more powerful technological tools, and exploitation to satisfy growth in materials needed for machines and products, are primarily due to lack of understanding of the long-term boomerang effect, i.e., an abused environment ultimately comes back full circle to abuse man. Men may then suffer this abuse through a shortage of the very resources they have depleted through wasteful initial exploitation. (The philosophy here is usually the greatest profit for the least expenditure.) But more often the abuse to man comes back through his further use of, or interaction with, a contaminated environment, i.e., water, and soil pollution, and adverse visual aesthetic effects.

AN APPROACH TO MINIMIZE ABUSES AND MAXIMIZE BENEFITS FOR SOCIAL GROWTH AND HUMAN WELFARE

Working on the premise that new approaches are needed in planning the transfer and infusion of science and technology into Southeast Asia then, we propose the following: Taking examples from those successful and effective science and technology projects already existing in the area—of both regional and national character—we suggest that centers of research and development be established in each nation of Southeast Asia on at least four levels:

I. Fundamental Scientific Research Centers associated with one or more existing Universities

II. Applied Research and Development Centers, working in coordination with the appropriate government ministries

III. Pilot Research and Engineering Projects, either at a fixed site or in the field, as required

IV. Full scale implementation projects which in many instances will require coordinated planning with landscape architects, community developers, and environmental specialists

Many such centers of scientific research already exist in the nations of Southeast Asia and these would provide focal points for expanded growth and development. Each of these national centers should be affiliated, where possible, in a regional network, with exchange of information, data facilities, and personnel. It may be an advantage to consider one center in each category as the coordinating center for that group, thus providing a means for central data storage, data arrangement and acquisition.

Some of these research centers, particularly those in categories II, III, and IV, could be set up on a self-sustaining basis and actually become examples of improved productivity and effective management.

These seeds for the planning of modern technology, set into the social and cultural patterns of the area, would hopefully grow and spread through regional cooperation toward the achievement of a dynamic and vital unity of development. This unity could then become the focal point for a new age—an age characterized by balance between science and technology and man's social and spiritual needs.

SILENCE ON INFLATION IS ECONOMIC FOOL'S GOLD

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the distinguished Committee on Banking and Currency voted to table any consideration of various proposals to amend and extend the Economic Stabilization Act. Insofar as that vote reflected a desire on the part of the committee members to bring a halt to direct wage and price controls, I am in agreement with it. But insofar as that vote indicated an unwillingness to even discuss where we go from here in the inflation fight, and indicated an inability on the part of the Congress to actively rethink economic policy, I opposed it. To be sure, Mr. Speaker, those who read the headlines will salute the Banking and Currency Committee for bringing to an end an ineffective and unsettling income policy. But those historians who read the fine print will record that at a time of unprecedented inflation, of threatened unemployment, of shortages of basic commodities, of a general economic slowdown, and of a Presidency weakened by scandal, the Banking and Currency Committee took the "forceful" action of deciding not even to talk about what to do or to explain why we should not do what some have suggested.

Mr. Speaker, it is this failure to even candidly confront the issue before the committee that upsets me. To be sure, the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee decided to speak no evil last Friday. But the American people, it is predicted, will see and hear and—what is more important—will feel economic evil this coming year. Is our

response to them truly that Congress is not even able to rationally discuss what to do about it? It is rare that Members of this august body have been so afraid of their own words. Let us not pretend, Mr. Speaker, that nondecision is a triumph even when it replaces ill-conceived action; our economic woes will continue, they will not solve themselves, and there is no triumph in being afraid to face them. There is a distinct difference between being put in a posture of retracing one's steps and appearing to give up.

This is not to say that the committee should have agreed to inequitable selective controls, as the administration first proposed, or to standby controls subject to legislative veto, as proposed by some of my colleagues on the committee. Even if the questions of equity are set aside, it is difficult to see how selective controls at this date could be any more effective than generalized controls have been. Similarly, standby controls would only contribute to the general uncertainty which exists as to what our economic policy is and what steps will predictably be taken to bring inflation back to acceptable levels without causing a recession in the process.

But I do submit, Mr. Speaker, that we should have taken the occasion provided by last Friday to begin the long and hard process of candidly admitting where past policies have failed and seriously consider what new approaches might be tried in the future. In point of fact, neither the selective controls nor the standby controls proposals were still seriously before the committee. The Cost of Living Council had effectively given up on the idea of selective controls in favor of a monitoring agency proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON). While some of the specifics of this new proposal needed amending, it at least deserved our attention and discussion.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that much of the reason for the failure of our efforts at controlling inflation is that we and those put in charge of the program did not have a sufficient understanding of what its cases were. Both in terms of legislation and administration, our anti-inflation effort has been conceived in terms of developing an arsenal of weapons which could be used to attack temporary upsurges in prices brought about by rising demand and increasing costs—particularly labor costs.

From the perspective of hindsight, Mr. Speaker, I believe we can now see two fundamental errors in this entire approach. First, the emphasis has been placed upon developing short-term weapons when what confronts us is a long-term problem. What we need is to develop long-term strategy; what we have created is a catalog of short-term tactics. Second, price and wage controls have hit heaviest at the manufacturing stage of our commercial processes when the greatest inflationary pressures have been at the basic materials stage: metals, chemicals, fuels, and agricultural products. This is a whole new phenomena with which we have not been too acquainted.

The consequences of our approaching inflation with a short-term perspective have been all too clear: rather than discouraging inflationary behavior, the on-again, off-again way in which we have used anti-inflation tools has encouraged expectations that higher prices are the norm and inflation-fighting the exception. Thus, during the period that wage-price controls have been imposed, anticipation of a quick "return to normalcy" helped fan the flames of inflationary expectations. And when the controls have been lifted, there has been a quick rush to raise prices before the administration's economic blunderbuss was primed for the next barrage. This push to raise prices then becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy—the price rises give rise to new pressures for controls which, when reimposed, increase pressures for a new round of price increases, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this kind of scatter-shot approach to dealing with a changing economy provides no solution at all. The kinds of changes which are occurring in our economic system—and the world economic system—are long-term changes.

To deal with them, it is necessary to develop long-term economic policies rather than tools for mere crisis management. Only through the development of long-term economic policy which is realistic, workable, and politically acceptable can we encourage healthy expectations in our economic system. If we do not work hard now to help develop that policy, we are sure to face the continuing cycle of inflation, response, inflation, response, and so on.

The necessity for developing long-term policy ties in to the need to focus more of our attention on basic materials industries relative to our manufacturing sector. When anti-inflation policy must extend its long arm down to basic industries, the interdependence of that policy with other policies becomes more intricate. In the area of agricultural production, for example, our anti-inflation policy should relate to what our farm policy is and should be; it should relate to what our export policy is and should be; it should relate to changes in diet and new developments in technology for improving diet; and it should relate to improvements in our processing and distribution system.

Similarly, our anti-inflation tools in the energy area must be coordinated with long-term developments in fuel supply rather than merely short-term allocation needs; they must be coordinated with technological development as well as overseas production; and they must be joined with movements in conservation efforts, such as reduction of automobile size and construction of mass transit systems. In short, Mr. Speaker, basic industries are just that—basic. They interrelate with all sectors of the economy. To control prices in a vacuum within these industries is bound to create severe dislocations elsewhere.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, are basic materials industries policies—developed by labor, management, and government—which guide the use of tools such as price and wage controls. To say merely that you are against inflation is like saying that you are for free enterprise: It is more like an expression of philosophy that it is of policy. To say merely that you are for wage and price controls is like saying you are for regulatory commissions. There is a critical intermediary step that is missing. That step is the articulation of policy which makes philosophy specific and which guides the tools which are available for implementation.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be satisfied with sitting on our hands while inflation continues to rob the American consumer and threaten the American worker. Let us resolve to begin now to develop those policies which have been so sorely lacking from the avalanche of freezes, plans and excuses.

First, let us at least call upon the Council of Economic Advisers to provide the basic data-gathering and reporting services proposed in the Stanton bill. But let us not talk about simple data-gathering in a vacuum. What is imperative is information-gathering and reporting which has reference to well-defined policies and which proves useful in the implementation of those policies.

Second, let us, in the firmest voice possible, call upon the Federal Reserve Board to end its policy of short-swing changes in the money supply in favor of a policy which reduces uncertainty in the economy and, therefore, encourages moderation. As our colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) has so well documented, at least some of the blame for record inflation must be borne by those monetary policy leaders who have so sternly advised others to put their houses in order.

Third, let us call upon the President to develop and submit to the Congress legislation which would facilitate the creation and ongoing updating of basic materials industries policies as I suggested before. Such a proposal would be a great deal more farsighted than what has been proposed before.

Fourth, let us call upon the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to not let our final action be a resounding silence. Rather, let us call upon him to schedule hearings on what appropriate legislative contribution can be made at this point, in light of past experience and future realities.

Fifth, and finally, Mr. Speaker, let us call upon our colleagues on the House-Senate conference committee to move expeditiously on reporting back to us the budget control legislation so that we may better meet our responsibilities in the fiscal area.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying only that no one should be fooled by the events of last Friday. Obviously, the decision not to decide cannot be a final expression of policy. It can only postpone that final expression.

REPEAL SECTION 409, TRANS-ALASKAN PIPELINE

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to reduce the constant growth of paperwork generated by agencies of the Federal Government. Last year, in a report on the "Federal Paperwork Burden," the Senate Select Committee on Small Business noted that the "paperwork problem has been described as reaching crisis proportions." It added that "The small businessman carries the heaviest portion of this burden" and concluded that "a firm employing not more than 50 people, for example, is required to fill out as many as 75 to 80 different types of forms in the course of 1 year."—Senate Report No. 93-125.

At 1972 hearings leading to the report, Senator MCINTYRE, who chaired the hearings, said that it is costing small business about $18 billion a year to fill out the different forms. It is also costing an equal amount at all levels of Government to print, shuffle, and sort all of these forms—according to the report. As a member of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I have been following these hearings with a great deal of interest.

In spite of this problem, the Congress enacted legislation last fall that will have the effect of increasing the flow of Federal paperwork. I am talking about section 409 of the Trans-Alaskan Pipeline Act, which effectively removed one of the few deterrents to an ever-increasing demand for information by the Government agencies. That section amended the Federal Reports Act of 1942, and practically nullified its deterrent effect on the independent regulatory agencies to independently require response to reports and questionnaires by the business community.

Under the Federal Reports Act, agencies of the Federal Government may not collect information from more than 9 persons without advance approval from the Office of Management and Budget. The purpose is to coordinate the collection of data by the Government, eliminate unnecessary reports, reduce the reporting burden and minimize the reporting cost. In the review process, the OMB is empowered to solicit comment from the public, hold hearings, and reject unnecessary report and questionnaire forms.

Section 409 of the Pipeline Act transferred authority for reviewing questionnaires and report forms proposed by the independent regulatory agencies from the OMB to the General Accounting Office. The transfer, however, diminished the review authority by eliminating power of the review agency to reject unnecessary forms; by limiting the review period to 45 days; and by removing the right of respondents to request hearings on proposed forms. As a result, the independent agencies can now decide for themselves what information they want to collect—without any effective review by an objective outside source. GAO review of the necessity of the report or questionnaire is advisory only, and the agencies can ignore its advice.

Section 409 was not germane to the pipeline proposal, and it was not in the bill originally passed by this body on August 2, 1973. In fact, it was not considered by either House at the committee hearing level. It was added to the Senate version on the Senate floor and was later included in the bill reported by the conference committee.

Many of us who supported construction of the pipeline favored deletion of section 409 when the bill came back from conference. Under pressures of the energy crisis, however, a majority felt that any attempt to delete this provision would jeopardize the Pipeline Act itself. Consequently, we accepted section 409 in agreeing to the conference report on November 12, 1973.

Since the Pipeline Act is now law, the Congress can act to relieve the paperwork crisis without threatening efforts to relieve the energy crisis. My bill will give you that opportunity. It would repeal section 409 of the Pipeline Act, and return authority for reviewing regulatory agency forms to the OMB. More importantly, it would restore the power of an objective source to reject the circulation of unnecessary forms by the independent regulatory agencies. As it is now, the GAO has responsibility for reviewing proposed forms but no power to enforce its decision.

I understand that the GAO is taking its new responsibilities very seriously. It is working conscientiously under limited powers to minimize the reporting burden and eliminate the duplication. It would be in order to ask, then: "Why not simply amend section 409? Why not give GAO power to reject forms that are not necessary for the performance of statutory functions assigned to the independent agencies?" That would be the power now exercised by OMB as to the other agencies—and the same power formerly exercised by OMB over the regulatory agencies.

There are two reasons why my bill favors a simple repeal of section 409. First, it is illogical and uneconomical to split the review function. With GAO reviewing forms circulated by the independent regulatory agencies and OMB exercising review over the other agencies, we have unnecessary duplication of staff and other resources.

Second, review of agency operating functions involves the GAO routinely in those functions. This could weaken the objectivity of GAO's principal auditing responsibilities. At least, Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats expressed that apprehension in a letter of September 18, 1973, to Congressman JOHNSON of California. He said:

> I am frankly disturbed about the provision because it would establish an executive function in the General Accounting Office. In the past the Congress has avoided placing operating responsibilities of this type in GAO because of our responsibility for advising the Congress as to how the executive agencies carry out their responsibilities. We cannot carry out an operating function and, at the same time, provide the Congress with an evaluation of it which would be considered as objective and unbiased. I believe that is the situation we face in connection with this amendment. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 7, 1973, page 36312, for full text of letter.)

My bill would repeal the legislative mandate which establishes an executive function in the General Accounting Office—a function over which Mr. Staats properly expressed misgivings. I would like to emphasize, however, that it would in no way diminish the traditional authority of the GAO to evaluate and advise the Congress as to how the executive agencies, including the Office of Management and Budget, carry out their responsibilities.

Under the provisions of sections 53 and 54 of title 31 of the United States Code, the GAO will still have the authority to review, evaluate, and report on the manner in which the Office of Management and Budget is fulfilling its responsibilities under the pertinent provisions of the Federal Reports Act. The OMB will still have the responsibility to eliminate unnecessary reports and reduce reporting burdens, and its efforts in this regard will still be subject to the scrutiny of the GAO.

I know that many others are equally concerned about the paperwork problem, and I invite all of you to join me in this corrective legislation.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1974, I was absent during two votes on H.R. 12565. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 146 and "no" on rollcall No. 147.

NATO: 1974 IS NOT 1949

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Armed Services Committee, on which I have the honor of serving, released a report on the future of the U.S. military commitment to Europe. This report was prepared by the ad hoc Subcommittee on U.S. Military Commitments to Europe, on which to my regret neither I nor any of the other members of the full committee who share my general views have had the honor of serving. The report stemmed from the Peyser amendment to the fiscal year 1974 military procurement bill, which instructed the Armed Services Committee to conduct "a detailed and independent study on the advisability of maintaining our present military commitment in Europe in view of the current economic and military situation in Europe."

I believe the ad hoc subcommittee has performed a valuable service in its detailed and independent study of one aspect of the NATO problem. The ad hoc subcommittee has carefully considered the question of whether our future NATO expenses should be increased by repeal of the Jackson-Nunn amendment,

which requires our European partners to eventually offset balance-of-payments deficits incurred by our stationing of forces in Europe. The ad hoc subcommittee has concluded, quite rightly in my view, that our cost should not be increased and Jackson-Nunn should be allowed to stand.

However, there is considerable popular and congressional interest in the other side of the question, namely, whether our future NATO expenses should be reduced further than provided by Jackson-Nunn. I suggest that, as we consider this side of the coin, the following points should be kept in mind:

First. With the notable exception of Greece, where freedom has been destroyed by U.S.-supported military dictatorship, NATO has batted 1,000 in preserving the democracy and independence of its members. This should give us great satisfaction, since America has a political, economic, moral, and emotional interest in the freedom of Western Europe. This area, with a combined economic strength comparable to our own, is by culture and tradition the closest to us, and it contains most of the true democracies in the world.

Second. At the same time, we must understand that the military significance of Western Europe has decreased radically. When NATO was founded in 1949, we had reason to fear the Soviet Union would sweep over Western Europe and then consider invading the United States. But time and technology have erased all reason for that fear. Both sides have developed and deployed massive thermonuclear arsenals and intercontinental delivery systems; if the war ever comes between the United States and the Soviet Union, it will be fought with long-range missiles and bombers homeland to homeland; intermediate nations in Western Europe and elsewhere will be of little importance to either side.

As far as limited nonnuclear conflicts are concerned, the most probable trouble spot is the Near East. As we saw in last fall's conflict with the exception of Portugal none of our NATO allies was willing to help us in this area in any way whatsoever, and it now appears Portugal's cooperation will not be repeated.

This reluctance to risk an oil boycott is understandable, but it nevertheless dramatizes the fact that our selfish interest in the independence of Europe is economic rather than military.

Third. The cost of our military commitment to Europe is very substantial. Our troops in Europe plus those based at home but dedicated to NATO cost us about $17 billion annually. If we add to this one-half of the $9.5 billion we spend on troops available to NATO but also available for other conflicts, we have about $22 billion. And this does not include the research and development costs of such very expensive weapons systems as F–15, SAM–D, AWACS, and A–10, all of which owe their primary rationale to NATO.

The magnitude of this sum is best placed in perspective by considering that the fiscal year 1975 budget includes only $7.6 billion for the nuclear strategic forces which are the only forces that actually protect the United States. Thus, we are spending 3 times as much for Europe's security as for our own.

Fourth. It is one thing to say it is in our interest to keep Europe free, but another thing entirely to conclude that therefore we ought to pay the bills. Atlantic security is a two-way street: The Europeans need us even more than we need them. Therefore, does it follow that Europe should pay the cost of the forces which protect American security—our strategic nuclear deterrent?

Of course not. But why is this proposition any more preposterous than that which has us paying for doing the Europeans the favor of defending them?

It made sense for us to pick up the tab in 1949. Europe was in rubble and we were the greatest economic and military power in history. But our military aid has served its original purpose; it has protected Europe during the recovery. Now the recovery has been made and Western Europe's economic strength rivals our own. Why can they not pay their own bills? Times have changed, but our policy has not.

Let there be no doubt about it: Europe is not bearing its share of the load. The tables prepared by the ad hoc subcommittee demonstrate that our per capita defense expenditures are an astounding 232 percent above the average of the other NATO members, and 94 percent above the highest member, West Germany. As a percentage of GNP, our defense expenditures are a less monumental but still conclusive 69 percent above the NATO average. We spend a higher proportion of our GNP for defense than does any other NATO member except Portugal, and Portugal's military money goes not to stop aggression in Europe but to perpetrate aggression against its African colonies: a purpose of which we can hardly approve.

It seems clear to me the Europeans should pay the entire cost of their defense, not simply offset the relatively minor balance-of-payments deficit. Let us not talk of "burden sharing," but of "burden bearing."

Fifth. The ad hoc subcommittee specified a number of categories it felt should not be included as U.S. expenditures to be offset under Jackson-Nunn, and a number of categories of European expenditures the subcommittee felt should be considered as counting toward the offset.

I find this disturbing, and typical of the way we have handled the entire troops-in-Europe question. Here we have the Europeans of course writing their side of the contract, but we also have the Americans arguing the case for the Europeans. Who is representing the interests of the United States? Apparently nobody is.

At the risk of appearing uncouth, I would like to suggest an item to be written into the contract that would benefit my own country: No European expenditure should be counted as offsetting balance of payments under Jackson-Nunn if, on the basis of recent history or reasonable prediction, it appears that the expenditure would have occurred in the absence of Jackson-Nunn. In other words, let us not bail out the Europeans by giving them credit for what they would have done anyway. If this formula should prove unworkably complex in terms of purchases of American goods, the only solution would be to require payment in gold or hard currency.

And to reiterate: We should be talking not about the $2 billion or so involved in the balance-of-payments deficit, but about the full $22 billion cost of our European commitment.

Sixth. True, the Europeans would rather not raise their defense budgets; everyone likes a free ride if he can get it. But while a free and independent Europe is in our interest, it is even more in the interest of the Europeans. It is not credible to say Europe will not spend what is necessary for their defense if we did not do it for them.

Seventh. The prevailing assumption that a reduction in our expenditures or numbers of troops in Europe would reduce our military strength there seems to me entirely unwarranted.

As I have indicated, I prefer to deal with this problem by requiring those who benefit from our forces to pay for them; they can then tell us what our force levels in Europe should be. But since the prevailing interest in Congress appears to center on the unilateral reduction route, I shall now discuss it.

Our force in Europe is tail-heavy, top-heavy, and fat. A smaller, lean force would be far more effective militarily. The ad hoc subcommittee's report says:

> Laughter would ring loud in the Kremlin if unilateral reductions were announced at this crucial point.

If I were a Soviet general, I would be laughing right now at the enormous drain the Americans are imposing upon themselves by maintenance of "The Big PX."

We have, according to the ad hoc subcommittee report, 198,000 ground forces in Europe. I include in this figure the 15,000 non-NATO forces, since they too serve the mission of European security. The report cites an Army claim of a 61–39 combat support ratio. I suspect laughter would ring loud in our own barracks if this figure were suggested to our own combat troops. I believe it must be derived from the ratio of "combat units" to "support units." But a "combat unit" includes many individuals who do not fight. If we deal with individual personnel rather than with units, as we must to get a clear picture, the figure becomes about 30–70, according to Lt. Col. Edward King, who has studied the question intensively and written widely on it. If we than figure in the 225,000 dependents, who must properly be counted as "support forces," we have an abysmal teeth-to-tail ratio of about 13–87.

If we accept the Army's claimed 61–39 ratio as desirable, it is thus evident that we could reduce our total support forces from 359,000 down to 41,000. Thus, we could send 318,000 of our people in Europe home and back to civilian life without losing one of our 64,000 combat soldiers, and in the process creating the

teeth-to-tail ratio the Army claims it has today.

In particular, I say those dependents must go. Our forces must be prepared to engage the Russians on a moment's notice; this is impossible if they will have to spend their first week or two protecting and evacuating their wives and children. It is true this will make it more difficult to get personnel to go to Europe, but the reduction in uniformed support forces will mean we will need to attract only about half of those presently stationed there. We may want to employ additional hardship-easing tactics such as a 6-month "Blue-Gold" rotation between the United States and Europe.

In addition to being tail-heavy, our forces are top-heavy. At last count, we had more generals and admirals in Europe than we had in Vietnam in 1968 at the peak of the fighting. This is understandable: Europe is a heck of a fun place to be, especially on a senior officer's salary. Generals like to go there. Admirals like to go there. Congressmen like to go there. I myself like to go there. But the purpose of an army is to fight, not to provide comfortable billets.

I have received countless communications from concerned military men in Europe, telling me of the surplus of senior officers and of the overriding concern on the part of the senior officers and of the overriding concern on the part of the senior officers that even more senior officer slots be created. The destructive effect on morale of this attitude cannot be overestimated. This is not the American way.

The headquarters reduction steps reported by the ad hoc subcommittee are commendable. But the situation calls for the spade, not the tweezers.

The subcommittee talked with a number of American generals in Europe who were unanimous in their view that they could afford no unilateral reductions. This is not surprising. On the contrary, it would be astounding if the subcommittee had found one general anywhere—or one civilian bureaucrat—who would advocate that his operation be reduced. And it is impossible to imagine a general who would deviate from the policy of his Secretary of Defense and his President.

I suggest that interviewing generals in the field on this kind of issue is a circular exercise. And I regret that the subcommittee did not consider it worthwhile to take testimony from the many distinguished retired military and civilian experts—such as Gen. James Gavin, Gen. David Shoup, and Adm. Gene La Rocque—who are highly qualified to present the other side of the argument.

Eighth. This year has brought a major new proposal with far-reaching implications for Europe and for the survival of civilization in general: The Pentagon plans to deploy a new generation of small clean tactical nuclear warheads.

This is the rationale: The 7,000 nuclear bombs and tactical missiles we have scattered around Europe are so powerful and dirty that they would destroy not only their target but a substantial piece of countryside around the target. Since this would be unacceptable to the friendly nations on whose soil we should engage the Soviets, it would be nearly impossible to use these weapons. On the other hand, smaller cleaner weapons would cause less collateral damage and would thus be more useable.

In short, the purpose of this program is to lower the nuclear threshold. In my view, this disadvantage far overwhelms any advantages to be gained by the program.

Suppose, as the scenario goes, we find our conventional forces not doing well and we try to bail them out with the small nukes. Surely the Soviets will not swallow their machismo and fail to retaliate with their nukes. Thus, our troops will be wiped out at an even faster rate. Moreover, not being equipped with small clean nukes and not fighting in friendly territory, the Soviets will respond with old-fashioned large dirty nukes, laying waste the countryside of our allies just as if we had done it. At this point, we of course will not swallow our machismo; we will feel compelled to counterrespond with nukes one step larger still, and so the cycle will go until we are in all-out nuclear war.

It is argued that, while this might well happen if the nukes were actually used, the threat of using them adds to our deterrent. This is a specious argument. A threat is meaningful only to the extent that it can be carried out. If we will not use our large nukes because of collateral damage, neither will we use small nukes because of collateral damage that would be caused by the certain Soviet response. Our European allies recognize this, and have displayed a total lack of enthusiasm for small nukes. Their justified fear of nuclear escalation is so great they have even refused us permission to install nuclear mines under their soil.

We should also consider that the inadequacy of NATO vis-a-vis the Warsaw Pact is not as clear as many military men believe it to be. It is true that adding up the order of battle puts us in an unfavorable position. But let us look behind the number of tanks, aircraft, and men to the question of who would do what is an actual conflict.

NATO with all its problems, is a true alliance of independent nations against a common adversary. In contrast, the Warsaw Pact consists of the Soviet Union plus a number of smaller nations it has subjugated by force or threat of force. The satellites tolerate subjugation because they have no choice, but this does not mean they would not break away if they could.

As the ad hoc subcommittee points out, nearly half of the Warsaw Pact forces are satellite units. It is probably accurate to regard these forces as liabilities rather than assets from the Soviet point of view. Suppose war were to break out between the Soviet Union and Western Europe. What Soviet general could trust the Hungarians, the Czechoslovakians, or the Poles not to sieze the opportunity to rebel? It is more likely that the satellite forces will be guarded than used.

Similarly, what Soviet planner could assume the Chinese would not seize the opportunity and attack the distracted bear from the rear?

War in Europe is already prohibitively risky for the Soviets. Small nukes make it suicidal for us as well. It is imperative that we leave the United States-U.S.S.R. nuclear threshold where it is and where it has never been crossed. Our efforts should be directed toward raising the threshold rather than lowering it.

Finally, we come to the mutual balanced force reduction—MBFR—talks. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee strongly recommends against unilateral reductions, fearing they would cut the ground out from under our negotiators.

General, I tend to favor any negotiations anywhere at any time on any issue. But in this case, I have reluctantly concluded I cannot. These negotiations appear to be designed to set not a ceiling on but a floor under our European commitment.

For years, we have been told we should not unilaterally reduce because the MBFR talks were on the way. Now we are told we should not reduce because the talks are in progress. We can expect the talks to drag on for several years and to finally produce a token reduction of perhaps 10 percent. We will then be told we should not reduce further because to do so would be to give away ground won in years of hard negotiations

This may be a cynical interpretation, but I believe it is well founded on experience. We have seen the present administration produce the SALT I treaty and promptly announce its intention to spend every cent it could and develop every weapon possible right up to the limit of the treaty. As a result, our military budgets have gone up, the Soviets have responded in kind, the risk of nuclear war appears to have increased, prospects for SALT II are uncertain, and if SALT II fails we may expect the administration to ask us to abrogate SALT I. We would have been better off if Congress had simply killed Safeguard and MIRV.

The Vietnam experience also encourages a cynical attitude toward Nixonian negotiations. For 4 years, the administration stalled around in Paris, telling us not to disturb the delicate negotiations underway. Finally, even the gullibility of Congress was overloaded, and it was clear we were going to cut off funds for the war. Only then did our negotiators finally agree to terms the other side had offered several years previously.

I suggest we are now in a similar situation. The troop reduction ball is in our laps. We should pick it up and run with it, because if we do not, nobody else will.

FURTHER CHANGES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill identical to Senate bill S. 411 reported out of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The purpose of this bill is to increase phasing from 5 to 8 years for regular rate second-class publications and the fourth-class special book rate; and to increase

phasing from 10 to 16 years for second-class nonprofit publications, third-class nonprofit publications, and the special fourth-class library rates. This bill would also provide for specific deletion of the Postal Service from the Budget and Accounting Act and would require that the President not alter the Postal Service's request for appropriations.

On July 23, 1973, I submitted a similar bill, H.R. 8929, which was defeated on the rule. We felt at that time that we needed to reach a compromise on that bill. As a result, the Senate worked on this legislation and reported out S. 411 with the amendments included above. This is more modest than the original bill designed to give a short time of extra breathing space to help mailers absorb the increased rates imposed after passage of the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970. It also provides relatively greater relief for nonprofit mailers. The new bill does not provide any permanent subsidies, as did H.R. 8929.

Since the rule on H.R. 8929 was defeated, we have received many calls and correspondence from smaller newspapers and periodicals, both profit and nonprofit, and from congressional offices expressing interest in this issue and concern for its defeat. We have come to believe that many Members voted against this bill primarily because they had insufficient data and background on the question. On July 23, when the rule on H.R. 8929 was defeated on the floor, some Members expressed distress that this bill would help the special interests, made publishers of magazines that have made substantial profits despite rising postal rates. This was certainly not the intent of that bill or of the bill I am introducing today. We should never lose sight of the fact that the major beneficiaries of this bill will be the American people who depend on the mail to bring them the printed word and the charitable and religious institutions which use the mail to disseminate information and raise funds.

There are innumerable smaller newspapers, magazines, and nonprofit publications who have severely felt the squeeze of rising postal rates. Some have been forced to cease publication, and many have found it necessary to increase their mail subscription prices because of the ever-increasing rise in these rates.

One daily newspaper in Michigan, "The Evening News," lost 5 percent of their mail subscriptions after the rate hike in 1972. It is most significant to note that all of these subscribers were in rural communities and many subscribers who were forced to cancel their subscriptions were older Americans on fixed incomes. These are the people who are continually being asked to suffer the burden of higher postal rates. This particular paper did not go out of business because of the rate increase, but it is truly distressing to think that many people who depended on this paper for news of their community suffered a loss. Many magazines of medium or small circulation are in an equally difficult position because of postage costs. The Progressive Farmer, a magazine of medium circulation, and certainly a publication that is serving a need of many Americans, has experienced an increased postal bill of $220,000 in the last 3 years. And publications of nonprofit institution have been hit even harder.

Also in grave danger are the nonprofit charitable and religious organizations. These groups must rely upon the mail for the raising of funds and the dissemination of ideas. Publications of this kind have fewer possibilities for adding to their revenues to cover additional postage costs.

For example, one of these newspapers with a circulation of 38,000 has an annual postage bill of $17,800. With the annual increases scheduled by the Postal Service, the postage will be $65,000 in 1981—the annual postage bill in 1971 was $10,000—thus in 10 years, the postage charges will go from $10,000 to $65,000 a year, a 550-percent increase in rates. We cannot expect religious and nonprofit publications to continue to operate under these conditions. They perform a vital educational and cultural service to our country. We should not have to explain to their readers that because of the rising cost of postage, they have gone out of business or have been forced into a price bracket that only the affluent can afford.

We must insure that the free flow of information and ideas will continue uninterrupted. We must insure that Americans who depend upon the mail for this service will not be ignored.

Certainly the Congress did not anticipate postal rate increases of the magnitude we have witnessed, nor did we intend that additional postage costs would silence the small independent opinion journals that have played a truly significant role in keeping our Government and private institutions honest.

We must make it clear that we still believe, as we have in the past, that these journals of news and opinion, newspapers, and nonprofit publications continue to serve a broad spectrum of the American public. They provide an essential service to all our citizens. They represent one of the strengths of our democracy and an essential foundation of the freedom we have always enjoyed. We cannot cut off countless Americans to whom an increase in subscriptions might be a few cents more than they can afford.

I feel certain that a detailed debate would answer many of the questions and allay the fears the Members have about who will benefit and best be served by the passage of this bill. We need a thorough discussion of all of the issues involved so that we will understand that the average citizen is the chief benefactor of a bill which proposes to provide continued public support to assure the widespread dissemination of ideas, information, opinions, and educational and cultural materials through the mail.

BOLLING REORGANIZATION A STEP BACKWARD

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, as all the Members now know, the Committee on Committees has recommended that the Post Office and Civil Service Commission be abolished and transfer most of its jurisdiction to a new Labor Committee. I am very disappointed in this proposal, and I feel that it reflects a basic misunderstanding of the important role of the committee in monitoring the activities of the Postal Service.

As you know, in 1970, Congress adopted the Postal Reorganization Act which established the Postal Service as a quasi-independent establishment within the executive branch. While Congress did delegate authority in areas such as postal rates and the setting of pay for postal employees, it in no way removed the Postal Service's vast operations from congressional oversight. In fact, I would submit that our oversight responsibilities in this crucially important area have been greatly increased.

In the past year, my Subcommittee on Postal Service has conducted an extensive series of hearings on many aspects of the operations and policies of the Postal Service. The Subcommittee on Postal Facilities, Mail, and Labor Management has conducted similarly intense investigations of the areas under its jurisdiction. I do not believe that these important activities could be matched should the jurisdiction pass to another committee where the Postal Service would be a relatively minor part of a much larger area of interest.

As a new and somewhat controversial entity, and as one which touches the lives of every citizen as no other Government function does, it is important to retain strong congressional oversight of the Postal Service. The current Post Office and Civil Service Committee has developed unmatched expertise in this area, expertise which would be severely diluted should the proposed reorganization take place.

The major thrust of the committee's report appears to be that it is more efficient to consolidate major legislative issue areas under a single committee in order to allow Congress to develop more coherent national policies in critical areas such as energy, transportation, and control of the environment. The proposal to disband the Post Office and Civil Service Committee would, however, seem to run counter to this intent. The net effect would be to submerge a major program of almost incalculable importance to our economy into the structure of another committee which will not be able to devote more than a fraction of its time to the Postal Service.

Finally, any legislative program designed to correct some of the deficiencies of the Postal Reorganization Act will probably require deliberations which will span two or more Congresses. I plan to introduce legislation in the near future to correct many of the deficiencies uncovered to date. But our work will not end with the passage of this bill. In short, I feel that the long-term interest of the American public in an efficient postal service require a committee devoted primarily to this end.

Similar comments can be made about the important civil service jurisdiction

of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

My colleague, CHARLES H. WILSON, chairman of the Postal Facilities, Mail, and Labor Management Subcommittee, has written the following article which appeared in the April 17 edition of the Federal Times. It is an excellent article and I commend it to your attention.

FORUM: "BOLLING REORGANIZATION A STEP BACKWARD"

(By Representative Charles H. Wilson)

Last year, a ten-member Select Committee on Committees appointed by Speaker Albert set about the task of developing a proposed reorganization of the committee system within the House of Representatives to improve its responsiveness to the needs of the American people.

Through a series of 37 hearings and 17 mark-up sessions, the Select Committee, chaired by Richard Bolling, D-Mo., considered literally hundreds of "reform" proposals, and on March 19, 1974, reported its recommendations in the form of a House resolution.

Unfortunately, these recommendations do not represent true reform and, although I have long been a proponent of progressive change in all aspects of government, I must vigorously oppose the Bolling committee package because in a very real sense it represents a step backwards for the interests of the American people.

Indeed, it is strewn with inconsistencies and misjudgments which, if implemented, would be seriously detrimental to the efficient and thorough operations of the House.

One clear example of ill-conceived "reform" is the proposed abolition of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This is, of course, a legislative area in which I have considerable expertise, since I have served on the committee for almost a dozen years, and currently chair its subcommittee on postal facilities, mail, and labor management.

Because of its importance in assuring prompt, dependable and reasonably priced postal service, as well as fair labor-management conditions for postal and civil service employees, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee must, in my opinion, be maintained in its present form, and I take this opportunity to elaborate on my reasoning.

First, however, it is important to recognize that the Select Committee did face an enormous task in attempting to give in-depth consideration to every jurisdictional segment within the House committee system, given their limited amount of time.

Therefore, during the deliberations, the Bolling committee often tended to rely heavily on the individual expertise of a member who had served on the particular standing committee being discussed.

In some areas they had very little working knowledge, however, and postal service and federal employee jurisdiction was certainly one of these. In fact, despite a combined total of well over 100 years of congressional service, the ten congressmen on the Select Committee had a cumulative experience on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of less than 12 months.

Probably as a result of this deficiency, their discussions at open mark-up sessions revealed an obvious lack of expertise on postal and civil service matters.

During their very brief consideration of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for example, several members asserted their belief that the Congress really has very little or nothing to do with postal operations since the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970.

Well, this certainly comes as a surprise to me, and I'm sure that my good friend Jim Hanley, who chairs the postal service subcommittee, and our full committee chairman, Thad Dulski, would be equally amazed.

The fact is, Congress, and I can say with pride especially our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, has played an extremely important role in postal operations in the difficult times since the new United States Postal Service was initiated in 1971.

The Postal Reorganization Act did give the new USPS substantial autonomy, and supposedly this new semi-independent organization would lead the way to a more efficient postal system by replacing the old "bureaucratic" Post Office Department with an agency which could react like a business in the private sector.

What resulted, however, was a hybrid which reflected the worst of both worlds, and the first two and one-half years of the Postal Service's operation produced a stunning array of boondoggles.

It has been the responsibility of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, with its appropriate subcommittees and adequate number of staff to expose and resolve the many problems which often led to a serious deterioration of mail service throughout the country.

Through our investigations in recent years of scandals such as the Westinghouse job evaluation contract, the waste in sundry mechanization and centralization schemes, and severe service delays in many locales as a result of the imposition of inflexible programs on a nationwide scale, we have played an essential role in turning top postal management around from their initial belief that cost-saving rather than service to the American public was the primary objective of mail service.

Just this past week our subcommittee, in conjunction with the Hanley postal service subcommittee, has issued a summary of our observations and recommendations on the United States Postal Service during the first session of this Congress. I would commend this report to those reorganizers who believe that we have no role in postal affairs.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee also has responsibility for the employees of the federal government, who now number 2.8 million with an annual payroll of $25.3 billion. Related compensation benefits for insurance and retirement amount to approximately $4.6 billion annually.

In addition, the retirement system covers 2.5 million government employees, and currently disperses over $300 million monthly to annuitants. The life insurance and health benefits programs each cover approximately three million employees, and for fiscal year 1972, over $317 million was paid out for death claims, and over $1 billion for health insurance claims.

The postal service alone encompasses over 700,000 employees with a budget of over $10 billion annually.

Somehow, the Bolling committee believes that all of these postal and civil service matters can be handled by a single subcommittee within the proposed newly created labor committee. I believe this is simply nonsense.

The plain truth is that the Select Committee on Committees has no understanding of what the Post Office and Civil Service Committee does and nowhere is this more apparent than in their printed report.

As proof of the need to abolish the committee, they quote a statistic that fewer bills have been referred in recent years. Needless to say, anyone who has any Capitol Hill background knows that it would be difficult to imagine a more irrelevant yardstick. Even so, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee compares favorably with the other House Committees in this regard.

To justify the moving of postal service jurisdiction to the labor committee, the report states that the postal service "will always be dependent upon an efficient labor force; in other words, the best of personnel practices and labor management relations are essential to a successful postal service."

The fact is, however, that the postal and federal employee unions vigorously oppose the disbandment of the Post Office and Civil Service, since in the new labor committee other topics would probably be given priority consideration.

Nowhere in their report is the Postal Rate Commission, which under the Postal Reorganization Act is empowered to fix postal rates and determine mail classification, mentioned. I wonder if they know it exists?

Further, in one chart they assign railway and ocean mail service to the Government Operations Committee. No explanation for this is given, and on several other charts which should correspond, these two items are not listed.

Early in the report they state that one of the foremost goals of reorganization would be to "intensify" review of government programs. Again, how can the disbandment of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee possibly lead to intensified review of its areas of jurisdiction.

In summary, what the Bolling committee has presented is a package characterized by a mish-mash of political expediencies and rash judgments.

Although ostensibly the disbanding of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee was predicated on the Bolling committee's desire to reduce the number of standing committees in the House, the fact is that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which was initially slated for oblivion, was "reinstated" by the Select Committee for reasons, as Chairman Bolling himself admitted, which were other than philosophical. In addition, the Select Committee on Small Business has been recommended for standing committee status.

Despite their contention that "members are to have only one committee assignment to a committee concerned with broad, pressing national problems," committees on the District of Columbia, House Administration, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Budget, Small Business, Standards of Official Conduct, and Veterans would exist under the reorganization proposal, however, and members of these committees would also be allowed to remain on one of the 15 "major" committees.

This is possible because the Bolling committee has cleverly titled these seven as "other committees." I suppose that designation removes the conflict from their original goal of one committee per member in order to "eliminate the problems members frequently face when they are scheduled to be in several different meetings at the same time."

I firmly believe that the quality of postal service is a vital national concern, it is a highly visible issue among the American people and, indeed, to many citizens it is their only contact with their government.

The overwhelming majority of House members agree with this assessment, and will not favor the relegation of congressional responsibility for postal service to one legislative subcommittee.

My distinguished colleague, B. F. Sisk of California, has amply demonstrated this fact by recently introducing legislation to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act and thereby increase our role in postal matters, not decrease it,

The status of our federal work force is equally important. Obviously, the Bolling committee does not recognize these basic facts and after looking in-depth into one area jurisdiction, I am forced to wonder what other grave deficiencies exist in the proposal.

At any rate, I can assure you that I will do everything in my power to defeat the reorganization proposals of the Select Committee on Committees.

HELP FOR RIVERTON, WYO.

(Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to provide authority and a means for confinement and control of uranium mill tailings piles which have plagued several western States. A similar bill has already been introduced by Senator DOMENICI, of New Mexico. in the Senate.

In my State of Wyoming, mill tailings remaining from the Susquehanna-Western, Inc., operations near Riverton, Wyo., have been a lingering source of concern. The milling activities at Riverton ceased in 1963, however, the AEC license which covered the milling activities is still in effect. Compliance to AEC radiation safety standards are thereby still required. The tailings were last inspected in 1970 and again on March 13, 1973, to assure such compliance.

The AEC realizes the importance of long-term stabilization and control of mill tailings at Riverton and other sites. There is a constant concern about the sites from local residents with wind and erosion distributing the radioactive tailings.

The Environmental Protection Agency has voiced concern over lack of stabilization of mill tailings, and although there is no immediate health hazard at Riverton, it has expressed concern over the future if there is no containment.

We have a problem recognized by the EPA, the AEC, and the States, but each hesitates to act due to lack of specific authority. This legislation would provide just that needed authority.

CONTROLLING INFLATION, ENERGY, CRIME TOP PRIORITIES IN 14TH DISTRICT POLL

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, residents of the 14th Congressional District responded overwhelmingly to the fourth annual questionnaire I sent to each postal patron in the district in mid-February. By March 1, some 11,500 completed questionnaires had been received in my Washington office. About 3,000 were received after that date but were not included in the count, because of the limitation of time.

The completed questionnaires contained 18,990 replies, as most were filled out by both men and women in the household. Although those who replied are not necessarily a cross-section of 14th District residents, they obviously constitute a significant sample.

For the second year in a row, controlling inflation was most frequently cited as the highest priority for action by Congress. Energy development replaced crime control as the next most urgent priority. Some 43 percent of those responding checked controlling inflation and 40 percent checked develop alternate energy sources. The third item most frequently mentioned, controlling crime, was checked by 27 percent.

On questions dealing with the energy crisis, 65 percent favored diverting part of Federal gasoline taxes from highways to mass transit, but 55 percent rejected a small extra gasoline tax to be used for energy research. A majority—55 percent—favored gasoline rationing if needed. Most—43 percent—felt the oil industry should be regulated like public utilities, and 28 percent thought the industry's excess profits should be taxed.

A large majority—78 percent—felt that the lands used for coal stripmining should be fully restored even if it adds to the electric bill. A sizable majority—63 percent—wants to continue controls on air and water pollution.

A strong majority—62 percent—favor a Federal program to provide jobs for people who cannot find work, while only 25 percent oppose such a program.

Views varied on the question of impeachment of the President. Some 28 percent felt the House should continue to investigate whether there are grounds for impeachment; another 28 percent felt the House should impeach him immediately so that he can be tried by the Senate; 20 percent said Congress should "get off his back," and 16 percent felt he should resign now.

On other issues, a majority—54 percent—felt that all guns should be registered, 18 percent favor a ban on cheap handguns, and 7 percent would like to see all private ownership of guns prohibited. That adds up to a total of 79 percent in favor of some form of gun control, while only 13 percent oppose any controls.

On the hotly debated issue of abortion, the largest number—42 percent—felt that abortion should be left entirely to each woman's conscience, with no legal restrictions. An additional 24 percent support the Supreme Court's ruling on abortion. As against the 66 percent who support a liberal position on abortion laws, 24 percent want to prohibit abortion except to save the mother's life.

An overwhelming 85 percent oppose renewal of U.S. military activity in Indochina, even if North Vietnam launches a major military offensive.

Here are the complete results of the survey, including the differences between men and women where they were significant:

Question	*Percentage totals* Yes	No
1. Do you think wage and price controls should be continued?	51	30
Men—yes: 48.		
Women—yes: 55.		
2. Would you favor diverting a substantial part of the Federal gasoline tax money from highway building to mass transit development?	65	23
Men—no: 26.		
Women—no: 19.		
3. Would you favor a small additional tax on gasoline to be used for research to find ways to make the U.S. self-sufficient in energy?	34	55
4. Do you favor a Federal program to provide jobs for people who cannot find work?	62	25
5. Would you favor a Federal law requiring that lands used for coal strip mining be fully restored—even if it will raise the average electric bill by a few cents per month?	78	12
6. Would you favor partial public financing of political campaigns in order to put stricter limits on private political contributions?	54	32
7. Do you favor the present policy of aid to Israel?	33	45
8. If North Vietnam launches a major military offensive against South Vietnam, would you favor a renewal of U.S. military activity in Indochina?	7	85
Men—no: 80.		
Women—no: 88.		

9. Which of the following statements is closest to your own view? (Please check one.)	*Percent totals*
(a) Until the energy crisis is over, we should drop controls on air and water pollution	25
(b) While working to solve the energy crisis, we must continue controls on air and water pollution	63
Men: 60.	
Women: 67.	
(c) Undecided	6

10. Which of the following statements is closest to your views about the oil industry. (Please check one.)	
(a) Place no limits on their profits so that they can develop new energy sources	7
(b) Tax their excess profits	28
(c) Regulate the oil industry like public utilities	43
(d) Nationalize (i.e. gov't. ownership of) the oil industry	11
(e) Undecided	4

11. If there is not enough gasoline to go around this spring, which one of the following policies would you support? (Please check one.)	
(a) Raise the price of gasoline to reduce the demand	10
(b) Continue cutbacks and offer gasoline on a first come, first served basis	19
(c) Initiate gasoline rationing with coupon books	55
(d) Undecided	9

12. Which of the following statements is closest to your view with respect to impeachment of President Nixon? (Please check one.)	
(a) Congress should "get off his back"	20
(b) He should resign now	16
(c) The House should continue its investigation to determine if there are grounds for impeachment	28
(d) The House should impeach him immediately so that he can be tried by the Senate	28
(e) Undecided	2

13. What is your position on the Administration's request to increase the military budget by about $6 billion in 1974–75 (to $86 billion)? (Please check one.)	
(a) The increase should be even greater	6
(b) The proposed budget is about right	20
(c) The proposed budget should be reduced	59
Men: 56.	
Women: 63.	
(d) Undecided	10

14. Which of the following statements is closest to your views on gun control legislation? (*Please check one.*)

(a) The right to own guns should not be restricted in any way ---------- 13
(b) There should be a ban on the sale of cheap handguns but no controls on other guns ---------- 18
(c) All guns should be registered by their owners, and there should be strict penalties for possession of unregistered guns ---------- 54
Men: 49.
Women: 59.
(d) All private ownership of guns should be prohibited ---------- 7
(e) Undecided ---------- 3

15. The Supreme Court has ruled that the government cannot prohibit abortions during the early months of pregnancy, but may prohibit them after the 6th month of pregnancy (except when necessary to protect the mother's health). Which of the following is closest to your views on this subject? (*Please check one.*)

(a) Abortion should be left entirely to each woman's conscience, with no legal restrictions ---------- 42
(b) The Court's decision is reasonable and should not be changed ---------- 24
(c) The Constitution should be amended to prohibit abortion except to save the mother's life ---------- 24
(d) Undecided ---------- 5

16. What do you think Congress' priorities should be? (*Please check the 3 items you believe are most urgent.*)
Control inflation—43.
Develop alternate energy sources—40.
Control crime—27.
Reform federal income tax—26.
Reduce cost of health care—21.
Reduce unemployment—19.
Aid senior citizens—16.
Reduce military spending—16.
Election & campaign reform—14.
Improve mass transit—13.
Control pollution—8.
More support for education—7.
Eliminate poverty and slums—7.
Equal rights for minorities—3.
(*Totals of percentage do not always equal 100 because of no answers or multiple answers.*)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PARRIS (at the request of Mr. RHODES), after 6:45 p.m. today, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, after 4:30 today, and for Thursday, April 11, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DERWINSKI, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCDADE, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. HOGAN, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. DENNIS, for 10 minutes, on April 11.
Mr. GOLDWATER, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. WHALEN, for 15 minutes, on April 11.
Mr. KEMP, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. SEIBERLING, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. YATRON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STOKES, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FULTON, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OWENS, for 30 minutes, today.
Ms. ABZUG, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, on April 11.
Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 20 minutes, on April 11.
Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $627.

Mr. MEEDS and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $522.50.

Mr. YATES, and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD, and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $522.50.

Mr. STOKES, and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $836.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.
Mr. ARENDS.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. SCHNEEBELI.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. ASHBROOK in five instances.
Mr. SEBELIUS.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. FORSYTHE.
Mr. RONCALLO of New York.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. SPENCE in four instances.
Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.
Mr. KEMP in three instances.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mr. COHEN.
Mr. FROEHLICH.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. HUBER in three instances.

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

Mr. VANIK in four instances.
Mr. DENT.
Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. O'NEILL.
Mr. ROSENTHAL.
Mr. DRINAN in three instances.
Mr. CULVER in six instances.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.
Ms. ABZUG in 10 instances.
Mr. STOKES in five instances.
Mr. NIX.
Mr. BRINKLEY in two instances.
Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.
Mr. GIBBONS.
Mr. CHAPPELL.
Mr. HAYS.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in four instances.
Mr. MCCORMACK.
Mr. STRATTON.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in four instances.

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. 13542. An act to abolish the position of Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1866. An act to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13542. An act to abolish the position of Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at 7 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 11, 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:

2164. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting notice of his intention to exercise his authority under sections 610(a) and 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to provide security supporting assistance to Egypt in fiscal year 1974 for clearance of the Suez

Canal, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2411, together with notice and justification of the resulting change in the previously reported country allocation of foreign assistance, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2165. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the 26th Annual Report on the national industrial reserve, covering calendar year 1973, pursuing to 50 U.S.C. 461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2166. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed transfer of the aircraft carrier ex-*Yorktown* (ex-CVS–10) to the State of South Carolina represented by the Patriots Point Development Authority (Patriots Point Naval Museum), Charleston, S.C., pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7308 (c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2167. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July-December 1973, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2168. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to crime and law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2169. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the statistical report of contributions and expenditures made during the 1972 election campaigns for the U.S. House of Representatives, prepared pursuant to the provisions of section 308(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 [2 U.S.C. 438(a)(7)] (H. Doc. No. 93–284); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2170. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on its administration of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act during fiscal year 1973, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1457; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2171. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the first interim report on the administration of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act (Public Law 88–129) and its subsequent amendments, pursuant to section 206 of Public Law 92–157 (42 U.S.C. 295h–8nt); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2172. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the first interim report on the administration of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (Nurse Training), pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 92–158 (42 U.S.C. 296 nt); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2173. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on progress in the promulgation and enforcement of motor vehicle bumper standards, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2174. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, to permit the financing of certain airport and airway system operating costs from the airport and airway trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2175. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of February 28, 1974, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2177. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1973 on the Reserve Forces, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 279; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2176. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for better use of physicians and dentists providing services in health centers funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; 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. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 271. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the missing in action in Southeast Asia; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–982). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 13998. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STRATTON: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 2770 (Rept. No. 93–984) ordered to be printed.

Mr. STRATTON: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 2771 (Rept. No. 93–985). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14110. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency assistance grants to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increases in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, to prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third-party payee) in certain cases, and to continue on a permanent basis the provision making supplemental security income recipients eligible for food stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14111. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to permit loans to be made to certain small business concerns that have suffered or will suffer substantial economic injury as a result of the diminished availability of refined petroleum products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. BOGGS:

H.R. 14112. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for certain additional persons on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 14113. A bill to provide for the orderly transition from mandatory economic controls, continued monitoring of the economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 14114. A bill to provide for the computation of pay of retired members of the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FREY, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 14115. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for Federal participation in the costs of the social security program, with a substantial increase in the contribution and benefit base and with appropriate reductions in social security taxes to reflect the Federal Government's participation in such costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS:

H.R. 14116. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide Federal assistance for interscholastic athletic programs in secondary schools associated with community improvement programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. HALEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. DANIELSON, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. HUBER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, and Mr. GUYER):

H.R. 14117. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans, and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 14118. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, to authorize the use of certain funds to purchase agricultural commodities for distribution to schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NIX, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. VANDER VEEN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 14119. A bill to extend and improve the Nation's unemployment programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. NIX, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. HICKS):

H.R. 14120. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to assist in the establishment and initial operation of agencies and expanding the services available in existing agencies to train professionals and paraprofessional personnel to provide home health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CULVER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. ROYBAL, Ms. ABZUG, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. KYROS, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. STEELE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, and Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 14121. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to assist in the establishment and initial operation of agencies and expanding the services available in existing agencies which will provide home health services, and to provide grants to public and private agencies to train professional and paraprofessional personnel to provide home health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. STEELMAN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. FORD:

H.R. 14122. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide for the making of grants to assist in the establishment and initial operation of agencies and expanding the services available in existing agencies which will provide home health services, and to provide grants to public and private agencies to train professional and paraprofessional personnel to provide home health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 14123. A bill to require, upon written request by any individual, the disclosure of materials which relate to the receipt of any money from the United States by any public agency or nonprofit institution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14124. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act to prohibit brokered deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 14125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Sode of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY) (by request):

H.R. 14126. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 14127. A bill to amend section 1951, title 18, United States Code, act of July 3, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 14128. A bill to amend section 121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gain from sale or exchange of residence of individual who has attained age 65) to lower to 60 the age at which the benefits of that section may be elected and to increase the amount of gain which may be excluded under such section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDRUM (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 14129. A bill to amend section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 14130. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make the provisions presently authorizing an increase in old age insurance benefits for individuals who delay their retirement until after they attain age 65 available also to certain individuals who retire and become entitled to benefits before attaining such age but who repay the amount of such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 14131. A bill to prescribe uniform criteria for formulating judicial remedies for the elimination of dual school systems; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14132. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide for freedom of choice in student assignment in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14133. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of certain Federal courts with respect to public schools and to confer such jurisdiction upon certain other courts; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14134. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts to issue busing orders based on race, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 14135. A bill to establish a National Resource Information System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROE (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 14136. A bill to establish a National Foreign Investment Control Commission to prohibit or restrict foreign ownership control or management control, through direct purchase, in whole or in part; from acquiring securities of certain domestic issuers of securities; from acquiring certain domestic issuers of securities, by merger, tender offer, or any other means; control of certain domestic corporations or industries, real estate, or other natural resources deemed to be vital to the economic security or national defense of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ROE (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. UDALL, and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H.R. 14137. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in, Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROE (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 14138. A bill to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Investment Control in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CAREY of New York, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 14139. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a minimum annual income (subject to subsequent increases to reflect the cost of living) of $3,850 in the case of elderly individuals and $5,200 in the case of elderly couples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. FREY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 14140. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a minimum annual income (subject to subsequent increases to reflect the cost of living) of $3,850 in the case of elderly individuals and $5,200 in the case of elderly couples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, and Mr. VANDER VEEN):

H.R. 14141. A bill to amend the act establishing the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore to provide for the expansion of the lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14142. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to furnish medical and dental treatment for non-service-connected disabilities of veterans over 70 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. BENITEZ, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FROEHLICH, Mr. FULTON, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. GUNTER):

H.R. 14143. A bill making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for research on the cause and treatment of diabetes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MINISH, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THONE, Mr. WINN, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 14144. A bill making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for research on the cause and treatment of diabetes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 14145. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period which is presently a prerequisite of eligibility for disability insurance benefits or the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 14146. A bill to provide retirement annuities for certain widows of members of the uniformed services who died before the effective date of the survivor benefit plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14147. A bill to insure that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced, or entitlement thereto discontinued, because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WINN (for himself, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. ROE, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. THONE, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. WARE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 14148. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, hurricanes, large thunderstorms, and other types of short-term weather phenomena, and to develop methods for predicting, detecting, and moni-

toring such atmospheric behavior; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. WINN (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. GUYER, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. KEMP, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 14149. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, hurricanes, large thunderstorms, and other types of short-term phenomena, and to develop methods for predicting, detecting, and monitoring atmospheric behavior; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 14150. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency assistance grants to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increases in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, to prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third party payee) in certain cases, and to repeal section 411 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972 and certain related provisions of law in order to restore to aged, blind and disabled individuals receiving supplemental security income (under title XVI of the Social Security Act) their right to participate in the food stamp and surplus commodities programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 14151. A bill to improve the coordination of Federal reporting services; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14152. A bill to require that new forms and reports, and revisions of existing forms, resulting from legislation be contained in reports of committees reporting the legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 14153. A bill to prohibit all military assistance to Greece until it is determined that Greece is fulfilling its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14154. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency assistance grants to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increases in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, to prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, and to continue on a permanent basis the provision making supplemental security income recipients eligible for food stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 14155. A bill to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act by designating certain lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, to provide for study of certain additional lands for such inclusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 14156. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself and Mr. SIKES):

H.R. 14157. A bill to establish the Mineral Conservation Research and Development Commission within the National Science Foundation; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 14158. A bill to authorize assistance for the resettlement of refugees from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 14159. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to permit the mailing of tickets and other material in connection with lotteries conducted by State agencies or by nonprofit organizations in accordance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FROEHLICH:

H.R. 14160. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize a grant program for the payment by the United States of the cost of certain chemicals used for water pollution control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 14161. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide grants, loans, and loan insurance for the purpose of planning and constructing projects designed to recover energy from solid waste; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. ABDNOR):

H.R. 14162. A bill to amend section 360, title 38 of the United States Code, to authorize disability payments to certain veteran amputees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 14163. A bill to protect the constitutional right of privacy of individuals concerning whom identifiable information is recorded by enacting principles of information practices in furtherance of articles I, III, IV, V, IX, X, and XIV of amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 14164. A bill to provide for the development of a national health policy and to assist and facilitate the development of necessary health care resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself and Mr. BERGLAND):

H.R. 14165. A bill to amend section 104 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize an improved program for research and demonstration of new techniques for the control of lake pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEINZ:

H.R. 14166. A bill to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to authorize and require the President of the United States to allocate plastic feedstocks produced from petrochemical feedstocks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself and Mr. SKUBITZ):

H.R. 14167. A bill to amend the act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92-578); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. WYATT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H.R. 14168. A bill to enable the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the operation, maintenance, and continue construction of the Federal transmission system in the Pacific Northwest by use of the revenues of the Federal Columbia River Power System and the proceeds of revenue bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 14169. A bill to discourage the use of painful devices in the trapping of animals and birds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 14170. A bill to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to authorize and require the President of the United States to allocate asphalt and asphalt derivatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 14171. A bill to authorize assistance for the resettlement of refugees from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ROE, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. THORNTON, and Mr. GUNTER):

H.R. 14172. A bill to further the conduct of research, development, and demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies, to establish a geothermal energy coordination and management project, to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to provide for the funding of activities relating to geothermal energy, to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for the carrying out of research and development in geothermal energy technology, to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for the utilization of geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 14173. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide for improved procedures for planning and environmental review of proposed nuclear powerplants, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 14174. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State or such officer as he may designate to conclude an agreement with the People's Republic of China for indemnification for any loss or damage to objects in the "Exhibition of the Archeological Finds of the People's Republic of China" while in the possession of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 14175. A bill to establish a Criminal Justice Reform Administration in order to provide assistance to encourage States and localities to undertake comprehensive criminal justice reform in order to strengthen police protection, improve the prosecution of offenders, expedite overcrowded court criminal calendars, and strengthen correctional systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SEBELIUS, and Mr. TREEN):

H.R. 14176. 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. RINALDO:

HR. 14177. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 14179. A bill to amend section 4a, the commodity distribution program of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14180. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 14181. A bill to provide for the development of a long-range plan to advance the national attack on arthritis and related musculoskeletal diseases and for arthritis training and demonstration centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.R. 14182. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission in consultation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to enter into cooperative agreements with certain States to contain and render harmless uranium mill tailings, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 14183. 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; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14184. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make the stealing of a controlled substance from a pharmacy or related establishment a Federal crime; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 14185. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide service pension to certain veterans of World War I and pension to the widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOWELL of Nevada:

H.R. 14186. A bill to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14187. A bill to expand the Boulder Canyon project to provide for the construction of a highway crossing of the Colorado River immediately downstream from Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WINN (for himself, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 14188. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, hurricanes, large thunderstorms, and other types of short-term weather phenomena, and to develop methods for predicting, detecting, and monitoring such atmospheric behavior; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. VANDER VEEN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 14189. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act, to establish objectives and standards governing imposition of controls after April 30, 1974, to create an Economic Stabilization Administration, to establish a mechanism for congressional action when the President fails to act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 14190. A bill to amend Public Law 93–153 to repeal section 409 thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 14191. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs of Federal assistance for comprehensive health resources planning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 14192. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide low-interest operating loans to small businesses seriously affected by a shortage in energy producing materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14193. A bill to promote rail-highway safety by requiring light-reflecting markings on railroad locomotives and cars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANLEY (for himself, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FORD, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NIX, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 14194. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to certain rates of postage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. MCSPADDEN, and Mr. NIX):

H.R. 14195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an increase in the amount of the personal exemptions for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1973; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 14196. A bill to establish a Health Action Corps; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WINN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REID, Mr. PREYER, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 14197. A bill to discourage the use of painful devices in the trapping of animals and birds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FREY, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. STEELMAN):

H.R. 14198. A bill to discourage the use of painful devices in the trapping of animals and birds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. MILLS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MEYERS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. REID, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. RUTH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. WARE):

H.J. Res. 976. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1974, as National Arthritis Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.J. Res. 977. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to force and effect of treaties; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS:

H. Con. Res. 476. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the autonomy of the Kurdish Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Con. Res. 477. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the 7-day period, beginning on Monday, that contains the July 20 date of each year as U.S. Space Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FROEHLICH (for himself, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DENT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. GROVER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. ROUSH):

H. Res. 1032. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court decisions on abortion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILFORD (for himself, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. DENT, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ROE, and Ms. SCHROEDER):

H. Res. 1033. Resolution advocating the use of export controls by the United States, especially with respect to natural resources and agricultural commodities, in order to increase employment opportunities for American workers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 14199. A bill for the relief of Eupert Anthony Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14200. A bill for the relief of Pedro Escobedo-Celaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.