

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 12, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called \* \* \* eager to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.—Ephesians 4: 1, 3.*

O Thou who are great in goodness and good in Thy greatness, kindle in our hearts a sincere desire for goodness, a true love for peace, a genuine respect for the laws of our land and a deep reverence for Thee.

Guide those who lead our Nation in these days of destiny. Bless our President in his journeys and give success to his endeavors for cooperation among the nations and peace in our world. Grant that the Members of this body may face their problems with wisdom and have the courage to seek to solve them for the good of all.

May the flag we honor and love continue to be a symbol of freedom and hope and peace in our world and may she fly forever over this land of liberty.

In the spirit of the Master we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14592. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14592) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military

training student loads, and for other purposes," request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. GOLDWATER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

### BEEF PRICE CRISIS

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, prices of live cattle have slumped to a point where they are less than half of what they were only a few months ago.

This can lead only to disaster, not only to our beef and cattle industry and our consumers, but to the general economy as well. It could well trigger a general depression.

When beef prices to the consumer were high, the President authorized the importation of foreign beef over and above the statutory limits.

Today, exactly the reverse situation exists and I have contacted the President respectfully urging him to:

First. Reimpose the beef import quota as provided by law.

Second. Negotiate to open the door to beef sales to Canada, Japan, and the European Common Market countries.

Third. Increase Government buying for school lunch, military, and needy programs.

Fourth. Use the influence of the administration to bring retail prices down in relation to cattle prices.

The United States is the only beef-eating country in the world that allows unlimited beef imports.

As a Member who has a large number of beef raisers in my constituency, but more importantly, for the economic well-being of all America, I urged the President to immediately reimpose the beef import quota to save this country from an agricultural collapse.

### NASA AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13998) 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 4, 1974.)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman will take some time to explain the conference report.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will be glad to take some time and tell the gentleman exactly what is in the report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees have resolved their differences in the House and Senate passed versions of H.R. 13998, the fiscal year 1975 NASA authorization bill. The bill passed the House on April 25 and passed the Senate on May 9. In acting on the bill, the Senate struck all after the enacting clause and substituted new language.

The committee agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain substitute amendments and with certain other stipulations insisted upon by the managers on the part of the House. There were 10 items in disagreement involving amounts to be authorized for appropriation, and 4 of the items of legislative language were to be reconciled.

The House had authorized a total of \$3,259,084,000 and the Senate authorized \$3,267,229,000 in its bill. Thus, the amount passed by the Senate was \$8,145,000 more than the House amount.

The conference substitute would authorize \$3,266,929,000 which is \$300,000 less than the amount in the Senate version and \$7,845,000 above the amount previously passed by the House.

In resolving language differences in the respective bills, the Senate receded on two of four items and the House receded on two. A summary of the substitutes agreed upon by all members of the committee of conference are as follows:

Space Shuttle—The House had authorized an increase of \$20 million more than the National Aeronautics and Space Administration request of \$800 million. The conference compromised with an authorization of \$805 million, recognizing that funds have been utilized from the program management reserve to solve unanticipated technical difficulties in test facilities supporting main engine development.

Space Flight Operations—The House authorized \$308,300,000 for space flight operations. A \$5 million reduction was made in the Apollo/Soyuz test project and a \$10 million reduction in develop-

ment, test and mission operations area. The Senate agreed with the House position on the Apollo/Soyuz test project and a compromised reduction of \$5 million was made in the development, test, and mission operations area. Thus, the conference would authorize \$313,300,000 for space flight operations.

**Lunar and Planetary Exploration**—The House authorized \$266 million for lunar and planetary exploration, the amount of the NASA request, while the Senate authorized \$264 million. The conferees adopted the House position.

**Launch Vehicle Procurement**—The House authorized \$140,500,000 for launch vehicle procurement—the amount of the original NASA request. The Senate authorized \$143,500,000 allowing a \$3 million increase for initial procurement of the Delta launch vehicle to be used with the ERTS-C spacecraft. The conference adopted the Senate position.

**Space Applications**—NASA requested \$177,500,000 for space applications. The House authorized an increase of \$2 million and designated in the bill that \$2 million of the authorized funds were to be used for research in short-term weather phenomena, \$2 million for research on hydrogen production and utilization systems, and \$1 million for research on ground propulsion systems.

The Senate authorized \$200,500,000 for space applications, including an increase of \$13 million to initiate development of the ERT-C spacecraft, \$6 million for additional energy research, \$2 million for research on short-term weather phenomena and \$2 million for ERTS data processing.

The conference substitute authorizes \$196,300,000 for space applications with \$2 million designated for research on short-term weather phenomena and \$1 million for research on ground propulsion systems.

The conferees agreed that NASA should promptly initiate the ERTS-C space project and apply added resources to energy research and development activities, including a solar power satellite study as previously approved by the House.

**Aeronautical Research and Technology**—The House authorized \$170,655,000, an increase of \$4,255,000 above the NASA request for additional effort in selected areas of aeronautical research. The Senate authorized \$171,500,000 with similar objectives to those of the House.

The conference adopted the Senate position.

**Space and Nuclear Research and Technology**—The House authorized \$80,500,000 for space and nuclear research and technology increasing the NASA request \$5,700,000 for coal and other energy related research.

The Senate authorized \$74,800,000, the amount of the original NASA request.

The conference substitute would authorize \$79,700,000 designating \$1 million for research on hydrogen production and utilization programs. In addition, the conferees agreed that \$3,900,000 of the additional authorization is to be applied to coal-related research.

**Construction of Facilities**—In the area of construction of facilities, the conference agreed to the following:

The conference adopted the Senate position and agreed to the original NASA request of \$6,040,000 for the infrared telescope facility to be located at Mauna Kea, Hawaii.

A compromise position was adopted authorizing \$37,690,000 for modifications to launch complex 38 at the John F. Kennedy Space Center to accommodate the Space Shuttle. The amount agreed to is \$5 million less than that requested by NASA.

In the House-passed version of the bill, \$2 million was added to a project for the proposed construction of a hangar at the Flight Research Center, Edwards Air Force Base, to provide a capability for long-term aeronautical research, as well as to meet the requirements for the horizontal flight test of the Shuttle Orbiter. The conference adopted the House position.

The Senate-passed version of the bill authorized each individual Shuttle construction project by specific amount, while the House version authorized Space Shuttle programs facilities in lump sum, itemized, but without specific dollar amounts for each project.

The conference adopted the Senate position.

The House bill rescinded \$10,900,000 of the fiscal year 1974 authorization for construction or orbiter landing facilities at the Kennedy Space Center to avoid duplication of authorization. No comparable provision was included in the Senate version. The conference adopted the House position.

It is important to note that the committee of conference has also adopted the House position opposing the NASA proposal to place the Plum Brook Station in a standby status and considers that every effort should be made to maintain this facility in a minimum operating condition so as to continue to provide support for NASA and other associated research activities for at least 1 year.

The conference report contains a detailed listing of program areas and projects, and amounts to be authorized for each as recommended by the committee of conference. The joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference provides additional details and other actions taken during conference of the various differences.

Does the gentleman from Iowa have further questions?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The conference report authorizes approximately \$20 million above the budget request; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And what is it above the bill as originally approved by the House?

Mr. TEAGUE. It is \$8 million above the House request and \$300,000 below what the Senate requested.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and I wish to add only that if there is no recorded vote on the conference report I want the record to show that I am opposed to it for in view of the critical financial situation of the country we can no longer afford to spend more than \$3 billion a year on space exploration.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the conference committee considering H.R. 13993, the NASA authorization bill, has accepted my amendment to increase by \$1 million NASA's budget authorization for research into hydrogen production and utilization systems. As I outlined in my introductory remarks to this amendment on April 25, hydrogen fuel offers a tremendous potential for abundant, pollution-free energy. However, the Federal Government has shown virtually no interest in exploring the possibilities of an economy based on hydrogen fuel. In fact, the primary burden for hydrogen fuel research has fallen on the shoulders of the private sector.

Despite this success in authorizing additional funding for hydrogen fuel research by NASA, a corresponding amendment to the energy research appropriations bill was defeated. However, I have been assured by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that his committee will seriously consider bolstering the budget for hydrogen fuel research in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to eliminate our energy options for the future by simply neglecting to explore the promising technologies of today. Let us hope that the leadership exhibited by the conference committee today will initiate an aggressive new program of hydrogen research for the years ahead.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I emphasize that there was unanimous agreement in the committee of conference in support of this conference report on the NASA authorization bill.

The areas of emphasis reflected in the original House bill were largely preserved, while of course at the same time a number of excellent Senate-originated recommendations were adopted.

In broad terms, the results of the conference were these. The House authorization of \$3.259 billion was increased \$7.8 million. Thus, the total authorization reflects an increase of \$20 million above the NASA request. This represents an addition of approximately one-half of 1 percent. Although this authorization is 7 percent over that of last year, the increase will be sufficient only to permit NASA to maintain its prior year level of effort, because of inflation eroded dollars.

The two major dollar differences between the House and Senate bills were in the Space Shuttle and space applications program categories. The House voted an additional \$20 million for the Space Shuttle program with the money designed to resolve shuttle engine development problems, but the Senate limited the shuttle program to the \$800 million NASA request. The compromise reached was an increase of \$5 million, or \$15 million less than the House had sought. This compromise is a signal that



the Congress is looking to NASA to hold the Space Shuttle program to original NASA estimates; we will be very reluctant to provide supplementary funding for every minor program perturbation encountered.

The other area in which there was a major dollar difference was that of space applications. In floor action, the House added a nominal increase for research associated with the use of hydrogen as a transportation fuel. The Senate added considerably more money—\$23 million—to the NASA request, with the bulk of the funding directed to a Senate-recommended new program. The program which was suggested for initiation by NASA was the Earth Resources Technology Satellite-C.

I strongly concur with the Senate recommendation that NASA should continue in aggressive fashion with the Earth Resources program. The first ERTS satellite, launched in July of 1972, has been a great success. The enthusiasm of both the science and user communities over this program has been overwhelming. This response, in fact, led the committee last year to recommend an acceleration in the schedule for the follow-on ERTS-B satellite which is now scheduled for launch early next year. The Science Committee also included an additional view in the fiscal year 1975 authorization report, that NASA should undertake an ERTS-C mission beginning next year. The purpose of the view was to emphasize to NASA that the momentum generated in the ERTS project thus far should be continued.

By adopting the Senate position and concurring in a new start for an ERTS-C program during fiscal year 1975, the House will be offering its support to a program which potentially will have the greatest economic impact on our society of any space program yet undertaken. So, I do feel the Senate initiative in this area is excellent, and I completely support our adoption of the Senate proposal.

At the same time, the House recommendations for various energy-related research and development projects were agreed to by the Senate. As this committee pointed out in the course of debate on the House bill in April, NASA has intensified its interests and activity in a number of energy fields. In particular, I would cite advanced research related to extraction and combustion of coal and the study of a solar satellite power station concept.

These items remain in the conference bill with the Committee on Conference strongly supporting the applications of space-related research to this Nation's energy crisis.

I am pleased, and I emphasize, that the Committee of Conference adopted the House Science Committee's recommendation in opposing the proposed shutdown of a most valuable and versatile, unique research and testing facility located at Plum Brook Station, near Sandusky, Ohio. Originally, NASA had intended to place that station—which NASA char-

acterized as a "one-of-a-kind" type of facility—on a standby status. In the course of hearings held by the Science Committee, however, it was revealed that a number of departments, agencies, and organizations are interested in negotiating for the use of the various Plum Brook facilities.

The Science Committee, and in turn the House, therefore, adopted a strong stand which opposed the intended closing. It was the recommendation of the House that a minimal 50-man operating force, over and above the small planned standby force, be maintained at the station for at least 1 year. The 1 year is thought to be sufficient to determine the outcome of negotiations with the various potential users of the facility.

In recognition of the fact that Plum Brook is a unique and valuable national resource, the committee of conference directed NASA to make every effort possible to maintain this facility in a minimum operating condition so as to provide for its fuller utilization in the future.

I welcome this provision and congratulate my fellow conferees for this far-sighted recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, the conference authorization bill now before the House is the result of most careful study by the House conferees. I believe that the \$3.267 billion requested is well justified and strongly deserving of our backlog. I, therefore, urge support of the report before us today, as a commitment to maintaining the strength and leadership of this country in the field of science and space.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### NO IMPEACHMENT POLITICS IN LAND USE BILL

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment as the result of a press conference held by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) with regard to our action yesterday.

I have no doubt these gentlemen are

disappointed in the results. I can understand their desire to rationalize the results. Also, I am pleased that they are angry, because show me a good loser and I will show you a loser; but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that they have invoked an argument that is simply so far afield that even in this body it must be commented on. They have claimed that the results of yesterday's votes were a direct result of the impeachment proceedings and that the final tally was based on the desire of the White House to trade off for support.

Mr. Speaker, I know that our colleagues in the House recognize that as the sheerest nonsense that it is; but I am afraid that the public might be deluded if this were not refuted.

Mr. Speaker, there is no possibility of impeachment politics pervading the issue yesterday. I would simply advise my colleagues that those who have mentioned it know that is so.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 876, ADMISSION OF A LAOTIAN CITIZEN TO WEST POINT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1168

*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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 876) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.J. Res. 876, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 206) and to consider said Senate joint resolution in the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1168 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on House Joint Resolution 876, which authorizes the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruc-

tion at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos.

House Resolution 1168 provides that after the passage of House Joint Resolution 876 it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the Joint Resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 206 and to consider Senate Joint Resolution 206 in the House.

House Joint Resolution 876 provides that the Laotian citizen shall not be entitled to any office or position in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy, or be subject to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1168 in order that we may discuss and debate House Joint Resolution 876.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1168, as explained, provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 876, to Authorize the Secretary of the Army to permit one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos to attend the U.S. Military Academy. This is an open rule with 1 hour of debate, and provides for the consideration of the Senate joint resolution after passage of the House joint resolution.

The purpose of this bill is to permit one student from the Kingdom of Laos to attend the U.S. Military Academy.

At the present time students from Laos are not included in the law covering admission of foreign students to West Point and the other academies.

Enactment of this joint resolution would not be at the expense of the United States.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 202, OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1169

*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 joint resolution (S.J. Res. 202) designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chair-

man and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against section 4 of said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the joint resolution or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the minority Member, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1169 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on Senate Joint Resolution 202, which designates the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations.

House Resolution 1169 provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule.

House Resolution 1169 provides that all points of order against section 4 of the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI—prohibiting appropriations in a legislative measure—are waived.

Senate Joint Resolution 202 places responsibility for the care and maintenance of the residence of the Vice President in the General Services Administration. The grounds of the residence consist of approximately 12 acres.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1169 in order that we may discuss and debate Senate Joint Resolution 202.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1169 provides for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 202, the official residence for the Vice President. This rule, as previously explained, is an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. In addition, the rule makes the committee substitute in order as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment, and waives points of order against section 4 for failure to comply with clause 4,

rule XXI. Clause 4 of rule XXI deals with appropriations on a legislative bill.

The primary purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 202 is to provide that the residence of the Chief of Naval Operations on Massachusetts Avenue be made the temporary official residence of the Vice President.

This change would become effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations. The bill authorizes the General Services Administration to maintain the residence. The intent of the Armed Services Committee is that this residence for the Vice President be temporary pending construction of a new residence on the grounds. This bill, unlike the Senate bill, does not repeal the existing statute which authorizes the construction of a permanent residence for the Vice President.

Enactment of this legislation will provide an immediate residence for the Vice President at a cost of approximately \$48,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule in order that this legislation might be debated.

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Is there any statement or other evidence that the Vice President will occupy this House on the Naval Observatory grounds if it is made available to him?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that he will occupy it if it is made available, because of some of the security problems existing now in his present residence in Alexandria.

Mr. GROSS. However, there is nothing to compel him to move into this residence?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. There is nothing in this legislation and there is no other compulsory legislation I know of that would require the Vice President to move into this residence.

Mr. GROSS. But there is evidence that he will move into the proposed residence?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I understand there is, yes, sir.

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised whether the Vice President is aware of this plan, and is there reason to believe he definitely would move in? The answer is the Vice President is aware of the plan and he would move in if the home is made available.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is evidence to that effect.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Yes, I will yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the procedure we are going to follow today is this: Rather than go into the Committee of the Whole, we are going to operate in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

This makes a difference in the time that will be allotted to the Members; in other words, it will be under the 5-minute rule.

I think my good friend, the gentleman from California, realizes that there has to be further explanation of the costs, other than what we have here. This is entirely different from the testimony which was received in the committee. There was an indication that the security costs for the Secret Service would involve about a quarter of a million dollars. There was testimony that further refurbishing of the home would take another quarter of a million dollars, and it wound up as an amount approaching almost \$750,000, which is considerably different from the figure which the gentleman mentioned.

I think we should have a full explanation of these matters somewhere along the line, as to just what the costs will be, and I hope we will have the opportunity during regular debate to get that information, unless the gentleman can answer these questions now.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me to answer, I took the figure from the report, and on page 3 of the report we find this language:

This legislation, as amended, offers several distinct advantages over earlier proposals. Foremost, it will provide an immediate residence for the Vice President at a minimum cost estimated to be \$10 to \$15 thousand.

Mr. Speaker, I took this information from the report. And then on page 4 of the report, we find this language:

The enactment of this legislation will provide an immediate residence for the Vice President with a minimum expenditure of funds, as indicated earlier in this report, of approximately \$48,000.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that down the road there are other plans to be considered.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand now that this bill will be considered in the Committee of the Whole and that we will have an opportunity to get a further explanation?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. The gentleman is correct. We will have an opportunity to get further explanations at that time.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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. BAKER. 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 388, nays 4, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]  
YEAS—388

Abdnor	Daniel, Robert	Heinz
Abzug	W., Jr.	Helstoski
Adams	Daniels	Hicks
Addabbo	Dominick V.	Hillis
Alexander	Danielson	Hinschaw
Anderson,	Davis, S.C.	Hogan
Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Holt
Anderson, Ill.	de la Garza	Holtzman
Andrews, N.C.	Delaney	Horton
Andrews,	Dellenback	Hosmer
N. Dak.	Dellums	Huber
Annuizio	Denholm	Hudnut
Archer	Dennis	Hungate
Arends	Dent	Hunt
Armstrong	Devine	Hutchinson
Ashbrook	Dickinson	Ichord
Ashley	Dingell	Jarman
Aspin	Donohue	Johnson, Calif.
Badillo	Downing	Johnson, Colo.
Bafalis	Drinan	Johnson, Pa.
Baker	Dulski	Jones, Ala.
Barrett	Duncan	Jones, N.C.
Bauman	du Pont	Jones, Okla.
Beard	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Tenn.
Bell	Ellberg	Jordan
Bennett	Erlenborn	Karth
Bergland	Esch	Kastenmeier
Bevill	Eshleman	Kazen
Blester	Evins, Tenn.	Kemp
Bingham	Fascell	Ketchum
Blackburn	Findley	King
Boggs	Fish	Kluczynski
Bolling	Fisher	Koch
Bray	Flood	Kuykendall
Breckinridge	Flowers	Kyros
Brinkley	Foley	Lagomarsino
Brooks	Ford	Landgrebe
Broomfield	Forsythe	Landrum
Brotzman	Fountain	Latta
Brown, Calif.	Fraser	Leggett
Brown, Mich.	Frelinghuysen	Lehman
Brown, Ohio	Frenzel	Lent
Broyhill, N.C.	Frey	Litton
Broyhill, Va.	Freohlich	Long, La.
Buchanan	Fulton	Long, Md.
Burgener	Fuqua	Lott
Burke, Calif.	Gaydos	Lujan
Burke, Fla.	Gettys	Lukens
Burke, Mass.	Gialmo	McClary
Burleson, Tex.	Gibbons	McCloskey
Burlison, Mo.	Gilman	McCollister
Burton	Ginn	McCormack
Butler	Goldwater	McDade
Byron	Gonzalez	McEwen
Camp	Goodling	McFall
Carney, Ohio	Grasso	McKay
Carter	Green, Oreg.	McKinney
Casey, Tex.	Green, Pa.	McSpadden
Chamberlain	Griffiths	Macdonald
Chappell	Gross	Madden
Chisholm	Grover	Madigan
Clancy	Gubser	Mahon
Clausen,	Gude	Mallory
Don H.	Gunter	Mann
Clawson, Del	Guyer	Martin, N.C.
Clay	Haley	Mathias, Calif.
Cleveland	Hamilton	Mathis, Ga.
Cochran	Hammer	Mayne
Cohen	schmidt	Mazzoli
Collins, Ill.	Hanley	Melcher
Collins, Tex.	Hanna	Metcalfe
Conable	Hanrahan	Mezvisinsky
Conlan	Hansen, Idaho	Michel
Conte	Hansen, Wash.	Milford
Conyers	Harrington	Miller
Cotter	Harsha	Mills
Coughlin	Hastings	Minish
Crane	Hawkins	Mink
Cronin	Hays	Mitchell, Md.
Culver	Hechler, W. Va.	Mitchell, N.Y.
Daniel, Dan	Heckler, Mass.	Mizell
		Moakley

Mollohan	Rogers	Talcott
Montgomery	Roncallo, Wyo.	Taylor, Mo.
Moorhead,	Roncallo, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.
Calif.	Rooney, Pa.	Teague
Moorhead, Pa.	Rose	Thomson, Wis.
Morgan	Rosenthal	Thone
Mosher	Rostenkowski	Thornton
Murphy, Ill.	Roush	Tiernan
Murtha	Rousselot	Towell, Nev.
Myers	Roy	Traxler
Natcher	Roybal	Treen
Nedzi	Runnels	Udall
Nelsen	Ruppe	Ullman
Nichols	Ruth	Van Deerlin
Nix	Ryan	Vander Jagt
Obey	St Germain	Vander Veen
O'Brien	Sandman	Vanik
O'Hara	Sarasin	Veysey
O'Neill	Sarbanes	Vigorito
Owens	Satterfield	Waggonner
Parris	Scherle	Waldie
Fassman	Schneebeli	Walsh
Fatman	Sebelius	Wampler
Fatten	Selberling	Ware
Perkins	Shibley	Whalen
Pettis	Shoup	White
Peyser	Shriver	Whitehurst
Pickle	Shuster	Whitten
Pike	Sikes	Widnall
Poage	Sisk	Wiggins
Podell	Skubitz	Williams
Powell, Ohio	Slack	Wilson, Bob
Preyer	Smith, Iowa	Wilson,
Price, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.	Charles H.,
Price, Tex.	Snyder	Calif.
Pritchard	Spence	Winn
Quie	Stanton,	Wolff
Rallsback	J. William	Wright
Randall	Stanton,	Wyder
Rangel	James V.	Wylie
Rarick	Stark	Wyman
Rees	Steed	Yates
Regula	Steele	Yatron
Reuss	Steelman	Young, Alaska
Rhodes	Steiger, Ariz.	Young, Fla.
Riegle	Steiger, Wis.	Young, Ga.
Rinaldo	Stokes	Young, Ill.
Roberts	Stubblefield	Young, S.C.
Robinson, Va.	Studds	Young, Tex.
Rodino	Sullivan	Zablocki
Roe	Symington	Zion
	Symms	Zwach

NAYS—4

Eckhardt	Schroeder	Wilson,
Edwards, Calif.		Charles, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Murphy, N.Y.

NOT VOTING—40

Biaggi	Diggs	Moss
Blatnik	Dorn	Pepper
Boland	Evans, Colo.	Quillen
Bowen	Flynt	Reid
Brademas	Gray	Robison, N.Y.
Brasco	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Henderson	Staggers
Carey, N.Y.	Holifield	Stephens
Cederberg	Howard	Stratton
Clark	Maraziti	Stuckey
Collier	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, N.J.
Corman	Matsunaga	Wyatt
Davis, Ga.	Meeds	
Derwinski	Minshall, Ohio	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Corman.  
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Breaux.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Stratton.  
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Stuckey.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Blatnik.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Dorn.  
Mr. Howard with Mr. Bowen.  
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Collier.  
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Cederberg.  
Mr. Boland with Mr. Evans of Colorado.  
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Gray.  
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Holifield.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Maraziti.  
Mr. Reid with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Robison of New York.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Quillen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14592 TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14592) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HEBERT, PRICE of Illinois, FISHER, BENNETT, STRATTON, BRAY, ARENDS, BOB WILSON, and GUBSER.

#### AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF ARMY TO PERMIT ONE CITIZEN OF LAOS TO ATTEND U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 876) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 876

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit within*

eighteen months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, one person, who is a citizen of the Kingdom of Laos, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy, but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

Sec. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army, the said person shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, but he shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of his graduation from the United States Military Academy, or subject to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 876, which would permit one person on a one-time basis who is a citizen of the Kingdom of Laos to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy without expense to the United States. The nominee would be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission and attendance at West Point as those cadets appointed from the United States, but he would not be entitled to any office or position in the Armed Forces or be subject to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

As I am sure you know, Mr. Speaker, such legislation is not unique. Over the years Congress has authorized the attendance of foreign students from friendly nations to attend our service academies on an individual one-time basis, and in other instances on a year-to-year basis. Under various provisions of law the President has been authorized to designate up to four persons at any one time from the Republic of the Philippines to attend the service academies. Similarly, the President is authorized to designate not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics for attendance at the academies.

Most recently, in 1973 by virtue of Public Law 93-164 the Congress authorized two citizens of the Empire of Iran to receive instruction at the Naval Academy on a one-time basis.

On May 14, 1974, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, of which I am chairman, held hearings on this resolution and heard testimony from the Department of the Army on behalf of the Department of Defense urging that the resolution be favorably considered. Since the appointment of such a cadet would form a favorable basis for professional training among military officers of Laos and certainly would enhance the relationship between the United States and that country, the subcommittee favorably reported the resolution and, in turn, the House Armed Services Committee on May 23, 1974, recommended enactment without amendment.

An outstanding candidate has been selected by the Kingdom of Laos in the

event this resolution is enacted and we understand the young man is qualified in all respects for appointment to the Military Academy.

Therefore, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution will be overwhelmingly approved.

I might add at this point that a similar measure has already been unanimously approved by the other body.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Since this young foreign citizen would not be required to take the oath of allegiance to this country, is it to be assumed that he would not be required under any circumstance to fight in any war, if this country should become involved?

Mr. FISHER. I think the gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of House Joint Resolution 876 and I join Congressman FISHER, our subcommittee chairman, in his request for favorable action for this measure, which would provide for the attendance of a citizen of Laos on a one-time basis at the U.S. Military Academy. I certainly recommend this resolution for passage, not only because I believe it would have positive results for the Laotian Army but also because I believe the Kingdom of Laos have selected an outstanding candidate to fill the appointment if this legislation is enacted into law.

As our subcommittee chairman has indicated, the young man selected by the Kingdom of Laos, Mr. Vang Chong, has all of the attributes which would indicate his success as a cadet at West Point. His father, Maj. Gen. Vang Pao, has established an enviable record as a professional soldier in the Laotian Army and has received high tribute from members of the House Armed Services Committee who visited with him in Laos.

Vang Chong graduated with honors from Staunton Military Academy in Staunton, Va., and has been recommended by the headmaster in the strongest of terms. The headmaster has informed us that Vang Chong's attendance at the Academy has been marked with notable scholastic achievement and that he rose to the rank of cadet major during his matriculation there. He has been indorsed by his school with the strongest possible recommendation for admission to the Military Academy.

Mr. Speaker, over the years since 1816 foreign students from some 29 countries have been authorized to attend the Military Academy at West Point and I believe the results have been generally beneficial for those students, their countries and the United States. Of the 210 cadets admitted over that span 144 graduated and presently there are 22 in attendance. As noted, this authorization would be at no expense to the United States and certainly the facts we have presented here today would indicate that considerable mutual benefit could flow



from enactment of House Joint Resolution 876. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WALDIE. Do I understand this is the son of Gen. Vang Pao?

Mr. DICKINSON. That is right.

Mr. WALDIE. He was a general in the Meo army?

Mr. DICKINSON. I do not have any knowledge of that.

Mr. WALDIE. It has been alleged he is a general of the Laotian Army and it is my understanding the Meo army was the army employed by the CIA and he was not a member of the Royal Laotian Army; is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON. I do not have any knowledge whether it is correct or not.

Mr. WALDIE. I wonder if there is a member of the committee that could respond to this question?

Mr. FISHER. I will be pleased to inform the gentleman from California that the general he refers to is now attached to the Royal Laotian Army in the capacity of a general and in charge of Laos Military Region II in that country.

Mr. WALDIE. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. WALDIE. Has that been a recent development? As I recall, Gen. Vang Pao was a general in the Meo army under the employ of the Central Intelligence Agency and not with the Laotian Army.

Mr. FISHER. That was some time ago when the Laotian irregulars fought so well against the North Vietnamese. He is now one of the principal officers in the Royal Laotian Army.

Mr. WALDIE. Does the Royal Laotian Government approve of this nominee?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, indeed, and this nominee has been chosen by the Royal Government of Laos.

Mr. WALDIE. Is that the new Government of Laos?

Mr. FISHER. That is the present government.

Mr. WALDIE. Is that a coalition government?

Mr. FISHER. A coalition government; that is correct.

Mr. WALDIE. Is that reflected in the hearings before the committee?

Mr. FISHER. I am sure it is reflected in the hearings and committee records.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I think that this is an appropriate manner of giving due recognition to the Kingdom of Laos and also to affirm our support for the loyal services rendered to this Nation by Laotian Gen. Vang Pao.

The prospective candidate, Vang Chong, is the son of Gen. Vang Pao and is an outstanding young man, who has accredited himself very well in the

Staunton Military Academy which he is presently attending. The adoption of this resolution should help to bring both of our nations closer together. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House today to oppose House Joint Resolution 876 on several grounds. Those who would support this legislation argue that it is a good will gesture in keeping with our past policy of training selected foreign nationals at our service academies. Yet, in truth, such an action is at odds with our present foreign policy which pledges our withdrawal from involvement in the military affairs of other nations. Since President Nixon has articulated this position, sending a foreign national to our service academies would only perpetuate the kind of foreign commitment we are anxious to avoid. It certainly would intensify, rather than reduce, our involvement in Indochina.

Little opposition was encountered last year when the House passed a bill allowing two Iranian nationals to attend the Naval Academy. At that time, even a ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee such as I was unaware that the legislation was contrived because of a commitment that Admiral Zumwalt made to the Iranian Government. A similar situation exists today when Gen. Vang Pao, the commanding general of military region II in Laos, has elicited a promise from either the State or Defense Department that the necessary legislation would be passed to allow his son to attend the Academy.

Furthermore, the Government of Laos is not democratic, including as it does Communist Party members in leadership positions. I find it unconscionable to train persons who would serve such a government especially since U.S. military academies have in the past educated young people from Chile and Greece. These young men graduated only to return to their home countries where they joined armies which overthrew their own governments. I think it folly for the United States to be associated with training persons who would use this training for such illegal ends. A present situation points up this real problem: With 25 foreign cadets enrolled in our Naval Academy, a number of whom are Latin American, it is ironic to realize that these young men will join those same South American naval forces which are raiding our tuna boats.

If we deny allowing this one Laotian to attend the Military Academy, this will not mean that he—or other foreign nationals—is unable to receive military training in the United States. Various NROTC colleges and universities accept foreign nationals in their programs—at a cost to the students, of course. And, whatever the merits of allowing this young man to enter our Military Academy in order to improve the defense capability of an allied nation, the method of selection is obviously arbitrary and

should be thoroughly reviewed by Congress.

Should precious slots in the academies be taken by foreign nationals at the expense of members of America's minority communities? I think not, especially at a time when minority representation in the officer corps lags behind minority presence in the enlisted ranks. It is deplorable that Congress would even consider special legislation to assist a foreign national to attend the very military academies which have barred admission to American women.

Since the academies have stated, in a form letter, that the acceptance of a female nominee is "contrary to the national interest," I find it inconsistent that foreign nationals from totalitarian countries would be accepted. The House Armed Services Committee is now holding hearings on allowing women to attend our service academies, a policy change which I believe is greatly desired if we hope to upgrade the capacity of our all-volunteer Army, until women and other minority groups are given appointments to our service academies, I see no justification whatsoever for admitting any foreign nationals.

For the above reasons, I urge your vote against House Joint Resolution 876. If you vote for this legislation, you are voting to continue military involvement in Southeast Asia as well as discrimination against women and minorities in our armed services.

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. I will be pleased to yield to my colleague.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and urge defeat of this bill.

When I in my own district and I am sure many Members in their districts have valid and worthy young men and young women who would like to attend the service academies and there is not room for them, I cannot countenance our going along with a deal made by the CIA or the Army in a clandestine fashion to sneak through a foreign national who would replace a constituent of mine.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's vision and foresight in calling this to our attention.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, to respond to the gentleman, I am sorry I did not have the vision the gentleman had a year ago when he opposed the entrance of two Iranians. He was a voice in the dark at that time. There were only 24 votes against that legislation, and I hope there will be a much larger number in opposition today.

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Did I understand my colleague to say that he is going to oppose the entrance of any national of any country to a U.S. academy, which will afford them entrance so they might go back

with American ideas to their country and create a better atmosphere in their country?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Very likely I will. I am very disappointed in what happened in South America. We have had this problem with the navies of Chile, Ecuador, and Peru raiding our fishing vessels in South and Central American waters and on many occasions graduates of our Naval Academy have participated in these illegal acts as members of their naval forces.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in opposition to this resolution that would allow a citizen of the Kingdom of Laos to attend the U.S. Military Academy.

Given the Department of Defense's position against admitting women to our academies, I find this resolution flying in the face of DOD's own stated policies. I have witnessed on occasion the Pentagon's ingeniousness in twisting official policies to fit political convenience, but this must rank among the top.

I will quote from two official Pentagon documents. The first is from the Department of Defense's unfavorable report on bills that would allow women admission to the academies. It says, in part:

There is a great demand for the services of graduates of the three service academies. For example, at the Naval Academy, the academic program is designed to train men for duty at sea by developing in them a solid foundation for seagoing skills. Similarly, the Military and Air Force academies mission is to produce male officers to fill combat billets. It is imperative that the maximum enrollment of males who may acquire this training be maintained. The current facilities at the academies are such that to admit females would be to reduce, by the number admitted, the number of critically needed males who receive this education.

The second document is the Army's letter endorsing this resolution which appears in the committee report. It says, in part:

This person shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of his graduation from the United States Military Academy, or subject to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, if it is so critical and imperative to deny admission of women (when the Army admits they can now fill at least 85 percent of its officer positions) because we must produce male officers to fill combat billets, then how can we allow admission of this young Laotian when clearly he will never even serve with U.S. forces? Certainly this is sexual discrimination in its most blatant form.

While I am on the subject of admitting women to our service academies, I would like to share with my colleagues a small item that appeared in the latest issue of Newsweek:

The politics of impeachment may have forced President Nixon to do an about-face in a cause he has long championed: the admission of women to the military academies. Any such move is stoutly opposed by con-

servatives on Congress's armed-services committees—whom the President is counting on to defend him against impeachment. Mr. Nixon told his civil-rights advisers that although he favored the admission of cadettes, he would not fight the conservatives over the issue.

As this item represents, I suppose, a backdoor Presidential endorsement of the idea of allowing women into the academies, I certainly welcome it. I will only note in passing that the Senate led by Senator HATHAWAY and with the specific endorsement of Senators STENNIS, THURMOND and DOMINICK, chairman and ranking members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has already gone on record as favoring the admission of women to the academies.

Beyond the issue of discrimination, affecting members of our minority communities as well as women, there are other serious matters to be addressed in considering this resolution. On April 5, 1974, Prince Souphanouvong head of the Pathet Lao, and Prince Souvanna Phouma, head of the Royal Laotian Government, signed an accord creating a coalition government in Laos. This accord ends almost a decade of fighting between the two forces, which has left one-half of the 3 million population as refugees. Contrary to the Army's opinion, I do not see how the West Point training of this young Royal Laotian General's son would enhance the relationship between the United States and the emerging coalition government of Laos.

Finally, we are currently having some good hearings on bills that would allow women into the military academies, but in good conscience I simply cannot support a resolution that would allow any foreign national to attend our academies when the majority of our own population is denied admission.

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

The United States has, through many administrations, taken students from abroad into its military academies. This is customary in countries throughout the world. Whether the admission of foreign students is a good idea or not is not at issue. Perhaps legislation could be introduced and discussed and studied as to whether our country could continue this policy. But at this time to practically insult a country that is friendly to the United States by repudiation of a policy that has been in existence for many years is unthinkable and would do insult in a manner that I do not believe this body would want to do.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of foreign students in our academies has been before us many times without being objected to. Maybe it should, and maybe we should adopt a policy not to accept cadets from other countries, but that is something that we should not try to go into at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a rank insult to another country if we vote this matter down.

Let us proceed with this in an orderly manner.

I can say that as ranking member of

the Committee on Armed Services, if any member wants to introduce such legislation, I am sure we could get a hearing on this matter.

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

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I just wish to make this observation: Every time something comes up on this floor that is designed to benefit the military of this country or to enhance our relationship with a friendly nation, we get this unmitigated attack upon the CIA. Some Members must have a distinct fetish. Perhaps some day they will understand what the CIA has done for this Nation. They get up on the floor of the House and make allegations that there has been a deal with the CIA, and yet they do not have one scintilla of evidence to support it. It is merely a mouthing off and a release of intemperate remarks by some Members who want to attack the CIA and the military in order to feather their own nests. One can always be sure of the onslaught during an election year.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that we have accepted foreign students in the Military Academy since 1916. If we want to stop that practice, we should do so in the orderly way. Let us not insult a friendly country.

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

Mr. Speaker, most of the objections that have been raised here are not valid and are probably the result of a lack of understanding as to how the system works.

The admission of a foreign student from Laos will not deprive any student in America of admission to any of the academies. It cannot, and it would not. Those who are laboring under that misapprehension have unfortunately simply not done their homework.

It was said here that this particular selection was objectionable, because, as the gentleman from California said, Gen. Vang Pao of Laos has received a commitment from either the State Department or the Defense Department that this legislation would be enacted. For that reason, the gentleman from California opposes legislation to make the son of General Pao admissible.

Let us see for a moment who General Pao is. It is true that the general's son 19 years old and an honor student, has been nominated by the Royal Laotian Government for this cadetship if this legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, General Pao is one of the strongest anti-Communist military leaders in Laos. Let us talk a little bit further about this fellow, General Pao, the father of the young man who would be admitted, the young man who is an honor student from Staunton Military Academy. Some Members seem to be very disturbed about General Pao.

I will ask the Members to listen to this: The general's military career began at the age of 13 as an interpreter to the Free French officers and the men who



parachuted onto the Plain of Jars during World War II. There he was very helpful in fighting and deceiving the Japanese, who were our enemies, even though he was then in his early teens.

After World War II General Pao performed brilliantly with the French against the Communist guerrillas. He was trained and commissioned by the French and thereafter served with great courage and valor against Communist aggressors in defense of his own country.

Listen to this: The general is credited with saving a number of American lives during the invasion by Communists of South Vietnam, and in rescue work.

It is well known that Pao is very pro-American and very anti-Communist. We cannot repay the General or his confederates for what they did for Americans, but we can today extend to him and to his government a common courtesy by admitting his son to the U.S. Military Academy, with no cost to our Government.

I remind the Members again, Mr. Speaker, that an identical bill has already been approved unanimously by the other body.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman did not feel by my remarks I was being derogatory toward the General. I just think that this is a poor way to appoint someone to the Military Academy. I have no question about the heroic acts of General Pao; I have no question about his friendship toward our country.

Yet I suppose if we looked at all of the countries we have been alined with in various wars—and there are probably thousands and thousands of people with similar backgrounds—we would see that this is not a proper way to appoint someone to a military academy, by rewarding a general who has been friendly with us by appointing his son to the academy.

As I said before, let us give him a medal if you want to.

Mr. FISHER. Well, I think everyone is entitled to his view.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues indicated he felt it would be an insult to the Laotians or to this particular Laotian general and his son if we did not permit him into our military academy. I merely ask a rhetorical question: What about the insult to our own American women who are still denied admission to all of our military academies?

I feel there is a great deal of hypocrisy about this issue as to whether or not our military academies are available to those who have served in other places when we do not even provide ways in which citizens of this country—53 percent of them, having a vote, by the way—will be admitted. They still are denied normal access.

I find it quite reprehensible, I must say, in the sense that this is strictly a special-interest bill which is totally unjustified with regard to our own land. Even though there may have been a practice of admitting foreign nationals, I think this has been an incorrect practice. Why should we admit a foreign national to West Point when the Pentagon continually insists that women will waste space in the academies because, unlike men, they will not be trained for combat duty in the defense of the United States?

Neither will the applicant in question. At least, I hope you will not try to train him for combat duty in our forces.

I submit this legislation adds insult to injury. I suggest that we cannot be asked in this House to pass over those American women who, although I may not be, are ready, willing, and able to serve in the academy at West Point. I am too old and I do not think I am trainable in that direction at this point. In any case, if my country needed me in case of attack, I would be there just like the rest of you. Nevertheless I say to you that to admit a young Laotian to West Point is unconscionable, and I strongly urge the defeat of this joint resolution.

I do not understand why you want to give military training to this young man whose father happens to be—and I only allege this on the basis of hearsay—a general of a tribe which is currently engaged in hostilities in northern Laos. Admitting his son to West Point might be construed as yet another instance of American intervention in the affairs of these countries in Southeast Asia, particularly since a coalition government now exists in Laos.

We have important business to conduct, gentlemen. Why not vote this bill down and get on to the business of taking care of the needs of the American people, the men and women of our country, who are in need of attention, instead of playing these ridiculous war games that are an insult to our intelligence?

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 876. I will be brief in my remarks.

I might say to my colleagues that I, too, serve on this subcommittee. We had extensive hearings on this bill. Those who have opposed the bill, not on the committee, did not appear before the committee to testify against the bill.

As to the statements of the gentleman from New York, in this same subcommittee we are holding extensive hearings on admitting women into the academies, and we should have some type of report on this bill in the very near future.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker—and this has been touched on before—that there will be no additional cost to the taxpayers of this country to admit this Laotian into the academy. This young man will have to be mentally and physically qualified just like any other

cadet or any other applicant to the academy.

I would like to say that the Kingdom of Laos is a friendly nation. And they have been very helpful to us during our trying times in the Far East.

This is a one-time-basis resolution. It cannot occur again unless we pass other legislation.

In closing, on this last point, Mr. Speaker, I think it is good that we have talked about Gen. Vang Pao, because I think the general is entitled to some recognition in this country because of the way that he has helped Americans. For instance, we had many Americans who were shot down over Laos, and if it had not been for Gen. Vang Pao some of these Americans would not have survived, and they would probably be dead or listed as MIA in Laos.

So I am glad that this has been pointed out by our colleagues concerning this great Laotian man.

I certainly hope the Members will support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi and associate myself with his remarks. Laos is indeed our friend and deserves better treatment from the Congress of the United States than some of those remarks seem to indicate.

It was said a bit earlier in the debate that Gen. Vang Pao was engaged in hostilities in Laos. Of course, he was defending his country from the Communist insurgency. What was not said was, that those hostilities were precipitated by the Pathet Lao, the Communist rebels of Laos, a revolution supported and exported by the North Vietnamese. Gen. Vang Pao and the Meo tribesmen, whom I met on my trip to Laos in 1971, have attempted to protect their own country from the same type of Communist insurgency being carried on in other Southeast Asian countries through the support of Hanoi. It seems to me rather than chastising Gen. Vang Pao, he should be applauded for his contributions to the cause of free Laos which shows that he is on the side of freedom, not totalitarianism and that he hardly deserves the type of remarks that have been made in the Chamber here today. These people have bravely defended their peaceful country for years against the Communists who used their children for carrying North Vietnamese supplies down the Ho Chi Minh trail. No wonder there were hostilities, at least they were defensive in nature.

Again I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me this is an act of international good will and will not prevent any U.S. appointees from attending our academies.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his very strong remarks.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, Vang Chong, the 19-year-old son of Maj. Gen. Vang Pao, commander of Laos Military

Region Two, is applying for admission in the U.S. Military Academy class of 1978.

I have met Gen. Vang Pao in the presence of the Ambassador and consider the general to be an excellent citizen in every way. Gen. Vang Pao's long years of determined and often successful struggle against some of the best regiments of the North Vietnamese Army are well known. His combat against communism and the Communists in northern Laos began from the early age of 13 years, and endured through decades of warfare. Since 1960, at a crucial point in the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, he has assisted in the pursuance of U.S. Southeast Asian policy. Military analysts recognize that Vang Pao's skillful organization and tactical use of the Meo irregulars forced the North Vietnamese to assign most of two infantry divisions to North Laos—units which would otherwise have been free to oppose American soldiers in South Vietnam. He also developed a search-and-rescue capability in northern Laos which resulted in the successful pickup of numerous American airmen downed behind enemy lines.

Vang Chong has exemplified his father's traits during his years at the Staunton Military Academy, Staunton, Va., where he has been for the past 4 years. He is a cadet captain, a member of the honor society, and is also the S-2 officer of the corps of cadets. His grades are generally high and he has the enthusiastic respect of his instructors.

I heartily commend this young man for his academic achievements. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 876.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution. The previous question was ordered.

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

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. 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 294, nays 101, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—294

Abdnor	Ashley	Blackburn
Addabbo	Bafalis	Boggs
Alexander	Baker	Bolling
Anderson, Ill.	Barrett	Bray
Andrews,	Bauman	Breckinridge
N. Dak.	Beard	Brinkley
Annunzio	Bell	Broomfield
Archer	Bennett	Brotzman
Arends	Bergland	Brown, Mich.
Armstrong	Blester	Brown, Ohio
Ashbrook	Bingham	Broyhill, N.C.

Broyhill, Va.	Heinz	Quile
Buchanan	Henderson	Rallsback
Burgener	Hicks	Randall
Burke, Mass.	Hillis	Regula
Burleson, Tex.	Hinshaw	Rhodes
Burlison, Mo.	Hogan	Rinaldo
Butler	Holt	Roberts
Byron	Horton	Robinson, Va.
Camp	Hosmer	Rodino
Carter	Huber	Roe
Casey, Tex.	Hudnut	Rogers
Chamberlain	Hunt	Roncalio, Wyo.
Chappell	Hutchinson	Roncalio, N.Y.
Clancy	Ichord	Rooney, Pa.
Clausen,	Jarman	Rose
Don H.	Johnson, Calif.	Rousselot
Clawson, Del.	Johnson, Pa.	Roy
Cleveland	Jones, Ala.	Runnels
Cochran	Jones, N.C.	Ruth
Cohen	Jones, Okla.	Sandman
Collins, Tex.	Kazen	Sarasin
Conable	Kemp	Satterfield
Conlan	Ketchum	Scherle
Conte	King	Schneebeli
Cotter	Kluczynski	Sebellus
Coughlin	Kuykendall	Shoup
Crane	Lagomarsino	Shriver
Cronin	Latta	Shuster
Culver	Leggett	Sikes
Daniel, Dan	Lehman	Sisk
Daniel, Robert	Lent	Skubitz
W., Jr.	Long, La.	Slack
Daniels,	Lott	Smith, Iowa
Dominick V.	Lujan	Smith, N.Y.
Davis, S.C.	McClary	Snyder
Davis, Wis.	McCollister	Spence
de la Garza	McCormack	Stanton,
Delaney	McDade	J. William
Dellenback	McEwen	Stanton,
Dennis	McFall	James V.
Dent	McKay	Steed
Devine	McSpadden	Steele
Dickinson	Macdonald	Steiger, Ariz.
Dingell	Madden	Steiger, Wis.
Donohue	Madigan	Stratton
Downing	Mahon	Stubblefield
Duncan	Mallory	Symington
Edwards, Ala.	Mann	Symms
Erlenborn	Maraziti	Talcott
Esch	Martin, N.C.	Taylor, Mo.
Eshleman	Mathias, Calif.	Taylor, N.C.
Evans, Colo.	Mayne	Teague
Fascell	Melcher	Thomson, Wis.
Findley	Michel	Thone
Fish	Milford	Towell, Nev.
Fisher	Mills	Traxler
Flood	Minish	Treen
Flowers	Mitchell, N.Y.	Udall
Foley	Mizell	Ullman
Ford	Mollohan	Vander Jagt
Forsythe	Montgomery	Vanik
Fountain	Moorhead,	Veysey
Frelinghuysen	Calif.	Vigorito
Frenzel	Moorhead, Pa.	Waggonner
Frey	Morgan	Walsh
Fulton	Murphy, Ill.	Wampler
Fuqua	Murphy, N.Y.	Ware
Gaydos	Murtha	White
Gilman	Myers	Whitehurst
Goldwater	Natcher	Whitten
Gonzalez	Nedzi	Widnall
Goodling	Nelsen	Williams
Grasso	Nichols	Wilson, Bob
Green, Oreg.	Nix	Winn
Griffiths	O'Brien	Wolf
Gross	O'Hara	Wright
Grover	O'Neill	Wyder
Gubser	Passman	Wyllie
Gunter	Patten	Wyman
Guyer	Perkins	Yatron
Haley	Pettis	Young, Alaska
Hamilton	Peyser	Young, Fla.
Hammer-	Pickle	Young, Ga.
schmidt	Pike	Young, Ill.
Hanley	Poage	Young, S.C.
Hanna	Podell	Young, Tex.
Hansen, Idaho	Powell, Ohio	Zablocki
Harsha	Preyer	Zion
Hastings	Price, Ill.	Zwach
Hays	Price, Tex.	

NAYS—101

Abzug	Burke, Calif.	Dellums
Adams	Burke, Fla.	Denholm
Anderson,	Burton	Drinan
Calif.	Carney, Ohio	Dulski
Andrews, N.C.	Chisholm	du Pont
Aspin	Clay	Eckhardt
Badillo	Collins, Ill.	Edwards, Calif.
Bevill	Conyers	Eilberg
Brooks	Corman	Evins, Tenn.
Brown, Calif.	Danielson	Fraser

Gettys	McCloskey	St Germain
Giammo	Mathis, Ga.	Sarbanes
Gibbons	Mazzoli	Schroeder
Ginn	Metcalfe	Seiberling
Green, Pa.	Mezyvinsky	Shipley
Gude	Miller	Stark
Hanrahan	Mink	Steelman
Harrington	Mitchell, Md.	Stevens
Hawkins	Moakley	Stokes
Hechler, W. Va.	Mosher	Stuckey
Heckler, Mass.	Obey	Studds
Helstoski	Owens	Sullivan
Holifield	Parris	Thompson, N.J.
Holtzman	Patman	Thornton
Johnson, Colo.	Pritchard	Tiernan
Jones, Tenn.	Rangel	Van Derlin
Jordan	Rarick	Vander Veen
Karsh	Reuss	Waldie
Kastenmeier	Riegle	Whalen
Koch	Rosenthal	Wilson,
Kyros	Rostenkowski	Charles H.,
Landrum	Roush	Calif.
Litton	Roybal	Wilson,
Long, Md.	Ruppe	Charles, Tex.
Luken	Ryan	Yates

NOT VOTING—38

Biaggi	Diggs	Meeds
Blatnik	Dorn	Minshall, Ohio
Boland	Flynt	Moss
Bowen	Fruehlich	Pepper
Brademas	Gray	Quillen
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Rees
Breaux	Hébert	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Howard	Robison, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hungate	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Landgrebe	Staggers
Collier	McKinney	Wiggins
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Wyatt
Derwinski	Matsunaga	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boland with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Fruehlich.

Mr. Howard with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Robison of New York.

Mr. Bowen with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Wyatt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1168, I call up for immediate consideration the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 206) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 876) was laid on the table.



## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to make two announcements.

Tomorrow, we will have the annual Flag Day celebration and ceremony. Our honored guest will be Hank Aaron, who is a great American and a legendary baseball star. The leaders on both sides of the aisle would appreciate a full attendance by the Members for the ceremony which we have scheduled.

Mr. Speaker, may I also say with regard to my second announcement, that we had reported earlier during the year that we would adjourn for the 4th of July weekend from Wednesday until noon on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intent of the leadership on both sides to ask that on the 4th of July weekend we adjourn from July 3 until noon on Tuesday, July 9, instead of Monday, July 8. That will be one extra day.

## OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 202) designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations.

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

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 Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 202) with Mr. ROBERTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the Senate joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the committee today is Senate Joint Resolution No. 202, to provide an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. The Armed Services Committee by a vote of 26 ayes to 5 nays recommended enactment of Senate Joint Resolution No. 202 as amended.

The purpose of this legislation is to designate the premises presently occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as a "temporary" official residence for the Vice President of the United States. It authorizes the Administrator of the General Services Administration to provide for the care, maintenance, repair, improvement, and furnishing of the official residence and grounds. It further authorizes such appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing purposes and requires that, during the interim period before such funds are appropriated, the Department of the Navy shall make provision for staffing and other appropriate purposes.

Over 100 Members of the House co-sponsored similar resolutions, so there is obviously very little, if any, controversy over the objectives of this legislation.

Under current circumstances, the Vice President must provide his own residence at such location he deems desirable and is within his means. Such a residence must be properly secured by the Secret Service to assure the proper protection of the Vice President and his family. This is often difficult to do, and can only be accomplished at reoccurring expense to the taxpayers. During the past 6 years there have been three Vice Presidents. There will be another in 2½ years. These security expenditures will continue to be necessary in the future unless an official residence is provided.

The amendment adopted by the committee, in the form of a substitute for the language passed by the Senate, differed from the Senate proposal in three major aspects:

First. It places responsibility for the care and maintenance of the residence in the General Services Administration;

Second. It clearly contemplates that the residence for the Vice President be "temporary" pending construction of a new residence on the grounds; and

Third. It, unlike the Senate bill, does not repeal Public Law 89-386 which authorizes the construction of a permanent residence for the Vice President in the District of Columbia.

The resolution, as passed by the Senate, would place the responsibility for the custody, control, and maintenance of the residence and grounds to be occupied by the Vice President under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy. Despite the fact that the responsibility for the staffing, maintenance, and operation of these premises is now, and has been for many years, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy, the

committee believes that these responsibilities should be transferred to the Administrator of the General Services Administration during the period that this residence is occupied by the Vice President.

Further, the committee felt that the provision in the Senate-passed resolution repealing Public Law 89-386, which authorizes construction of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States in the District of Columbia, which was section 6 in the original House resolution and section 7 in the Senate-passed resolution, should not be included in the final version of this legislation. Our committee does not see the wisdom in repealing existing legislation which should be utilized in the next few years to construct a permanent residence on the grounds of the Naval Observatory for the Vice President. That is the reason the committee included in the language of the resolution a qualification that the present residence of the Chief of Naval Operations would be the official "temporary" residence of the Vice President. The committee believes that when the Vice President moves into a permanent residence and vacates the temporary official residence, that it should revert to the Navy Department for its further use as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

As set forth in the committee report this bill will provide for an immediate residence for the Vice President at a cost of approximately \$15,000 for minimal renovations and redecorations and approximately \$33,000 for security equipment and installation. Thus, the legislation contemplates an estimated cost of approximately \$48,000 to provide an immediate residence for the Vice President on a temporary basis.

In summary, I recommend enactment of this legislation to provide an official residence on a temporary basis for the Vice President until the Congress sees fit to appropriate funds for the construction of a permanent residence as authorized in Public Law 89-386. I urge unanimous support for this legislation.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that I certainly am not opposed to a home for the Vice President. I think it is long overdue, and we should have one. Yet I do have some concerns about the possible costs we are going to get involved in here to provide for something on a temporary basis. It is my understanding there has already been \$73,000 spent on the Vice President's home in Alexandria, and that another \$8,300 has been spent for security in his home on top of that.

Now, what is "temporary," and what is "permanent?" Will the gentleman tell me, when does something become permanent?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the reference to "temporary" here denotes that the present facilities comprising the residence of the Chief of Naval Operations would be a temporary home for the Vice President. The home itself is the key to the reference of "temporary."

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the thing that concerns me and other Members of the Committee is that we were given a set of figures as to what it would cost in the event this were to be a permanent residence.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman is correct. We were given a set of figures as to what the actual cost would be if the Vice President moved in, as quickly as possible, to the existing facilities, and that cost would be \$15,000 for the minimal renovations that would be required, including the redecorations, and so forth, and approximately \$33,000 for security equipment and installation, and that makes a total of about \$48,000.

Now, we were given other figures. We received other figures, and we were told these were in the event the Vice President should make this a permanent residence, and then it would come to a figure that could perhaps go up to about \$762,000.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the representative of the General Services Administration gave us those figures. They are here in another report.

Those figures would be as follows: \$276,000 for improvements to the Capitol area; \$359,000 for permanent installations for protective purposes, the command post, lights, alarms, and so forth; and \$127,000 for protective equipment, making a total of about \$762,000.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman is correct. That is \$762,000 that we would have to expend if we were to make it a permanent residence for all Vice Presidents.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. The gentleman is assuring the House today that the expenses of this type are definitely not to be considered as expenses for the temporary residence of the Vice President?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is what this legislation calls for. This is the thinking of everyone who has studied this matter, and the feeling is that it would be a very unwise thing to make the present home of the Chief of Naval Operations the permanent residence for the Vice President. We do look forward to the day when we will comply with the provisions of Public Law 89-386, authorizing the construction of an official residence for the Vice President. This is what we think provides a permanent solution.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell us what the plans are for the Chief of Naval Operations now? Is he going to

move back into this residence when the Vice President's permanent home is built?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. This is something which is to be decided in the future. For the present, he is going to move to a home on the naval base here.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman will recall that the testimony by the Navy was that if that were done, it is going to take about \$125,000 to renovate the home of the Chief of Naval Operations which he is moving into on the naval base.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I think that is right. I have no quarrel with the figure the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Again I would just like to say that I wish we could get started on the permanent home of the Vice President. I think we need one; I think it is long overdue.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. It was four Congresses ago that the House made that determination, but there have never been any funds allocated for it.

Mr. ICHORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. I strongly support the concept of a Vice-Presidential home. However, I am one of the five who voted against this legislation in the committee. The reason why I did was because of the talk that I heard about the Navy using this bill to come back to lay the groundwork for building another expensive mansion for the Naval Chief of Staff. That was the reason for my vote, as a protest.

I understand from the staff now that the Navy has abandoned any ideas at this time of asking the committee and the Congress in the public works construction bill for a new mansion for the Naval Chief of Staff. Is that correct?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman is correct. The Navy at no time was the one that fostered this idea or even suggested the use of the home of the Chief of Naval Operations. I think perhaps the Navy might be a little reluctant even because of the possibility of somebody just staying there, and the Navy would then be losing the property entirely.

Mr. ICHORD. I just want to serve notice that if the Navy does come in here asking for a new mansion for the Chief of Staff of the Navy, they will have considerable opposition. I think we should spend that money on hardware and many other things to fight a possible war with, rather than building a new mansion for the Naval Chief of Staff. We have plenty of homes available that could be rehabilitated for the Naval Chief of Staff.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Let me quote a few figures that show the wisdom of finally putting into effect the provisions of Public Law 98-386. Since 1964 here are some expenditures on maintenance of homes for the Vice President.

The Government spent \$123,193 for various security matters and work on the residence of the Vice President in Minne-

sota and his apartment here. These are all involved in the area of security. In the Agnew administration there was \$175,000 spent by the GSA for renovation and other things connected in some way with the installation of security measures. The GSA spent \$175,000 and the Secret Service spent \$70,000, so there is a total of \$245,000 in the Agnew administration.

So far for Vice President Ford the GSA spent \$73,400 and the Secret Service spent \$8,465, for a total of \$81,000. This is all related to renovations necessary for the installation of security and protection devices.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I merely want to point out that the gentleman referred to the GSA's architectural plans. A few years, in the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee which I head, the GSA recommended \$1 million or \$1.5 million for architectural plans for the building of a mansion at the same site for the Vice President, at that time Vice President Agnew. It was debated in the committee and there was a very close vote, and we went to the full committee with it and debated it again. The gentleman from Ohio rose and said that we love our Vice President Agnew, but we love economy more.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this because it will be very costly in the long run.

So the matter was deleted, it was taken out in the committee at that time. The GSA had plans for an elaborate mansion for the Vice President. We did not do this for Vice President Johnson, or for Vice President HUMPHREY, and while I have the highest regard for the present Vice President, I do not believe we should do this.

As a matter of fact, when President Nixon nominated the now Vice President I was the first to publicly announce my support for him in my State, and I of course did vote for him. So my vote in opposition to this legislation means no reflection of my high regard for the present Vice President. I simply object to this because this would open the door to a very costly and elaborate mansion building for the Vice Presidency.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a somewhat unaccustomed role here today because the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) who voted against this in the committee, and was one of the five members to do so, that on this particular legislation, although I usually am one of those five, on this occasion I do want to say that I am not one of the five who voted against this in committee. I think we do owe the Vice President of our Nation a home. I think this



is a reasonable manner in which to achieve a home for the Vice President, and a fine home for the Vice President. I support this legislation.

I want to commend the gentleman in the well, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman for the comments he has made. The committee has studied this legislation carefully and the amendments they have added are most appropriate. There is a definite immediate need for this temporary residence for the Vice President. This legislation fills that need; it also takes into account the need for an adequate permanent residence to insure that Vice Presidents will be able to fulfill the obligation and responsibilities of their office.

The CNO's residence was originally commissioned as the Observatory Superintendent's home in 1893 and has become known as the Admiral's House when Congress approved Public Law 630 in 1928 which authorized the Secretary of the Navy to assign the quarters to the Chief of Naval Operations. In light of the Naval Observatory Circle's long history and tradition, there is no appropriate reason why the Admiral's House should permanently change hands and I commend the committee for making this a temporary move.

The bill as amended takes this into account and in addition, its temporary thrust clears the way for approval of a supplemental appropriation to construct a permanent home on an adjacent 10-acre site on the Observatory grounds. To this end, it is very important that the present and former Vice Presidents be consulted in order to determine the needs of the Vice President in developing a plan for a permanent residence. The planning of the permanent residence should be carefully carried out so the residence meets the needs of the Vice President's obligations but is not lavish beyond the democratic tradition of the second highest office of our country.

The present path which the committee is following in designating the Admiral's House as a temporary move is clearly a permanent savings to the taxpayers of the United States. Security costs involved with each change of private residence for the Vice President are a recurring item with which the taxpayer should not be saddled.

In this the 198th year of our Republic, it is fitting to resolve the matter of a home for the Vice President in time to celebrate our Nation's Bicentennial and I commend the committee for its prompt action on this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for his presentation to the Committee and the detailed explanation of the legislation now before us.

There does not seem to be any disagreement with the fact that the Vice President of the United States should be provided with an official residence. I say this because of the passage in the 89th Congress of Public Law 89-386 authorizing the construction of a permanent residence for the Vice President. However, no funds have been requested so far by the executive branch.

As mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois, during the past 6 years there have been three Vice Presidents. There will be another in 2½ years. Security expenditures made necessary because of so many different residences will continue to be necessary in the future unless an official residence is provided. Even though some of the equipment which the Secret Service requires to be installed is eventually recoverable, much of it is not. There are many man-hours of labor involved in each individual installation as well as the permanent structural changes. These are nonrecoverable expense factors. I believe the choice of the residence now occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as a temporary official residence for the Vice President is a good one. The legislation now on the books authorizing construction of a permanent residence calls for it to be on the grounds of the Naval Observatory. Therefore, the expenditures to be made for security purposes when the Vice President moves into the temporary residence will not be wasted and can be used when the permanent residence is constructed.

For these and other good and sufficient reasons, I urge all my colleagues to unanimously support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the members of this committee for bringing this legislation to the floor, and I rise in support of this resolution. As a matter of fact, it is my opinion that we should have acted on such legislation many years ago.

The bill before us, if enacted, would provide a temporary official residence for the Vice President of the United States and will, in part, follow up on the commitment made by Congress back in 1966 when we authorized the construction of an official residence.

While the recommendations of the Armed Services Committee view this as a temporary solution, it seems to me entirely satisfactory as it provides an immediate residence for our country's second highest officeholder, and at a physical site that is both attractive and which lends itself to the security protection necessary for Vice Presidents and their families for years to come.

It is my understanding that more than 174 of our colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, have joined in cosponsoring this or similar legislation, which indicates the broad support for some form of legislation to provide an official residence for our Vice Presidents.

This is a good bill. It is my hope that it will pass, for it takes care of a serious problem of many years' standing and in-

sures that our Vice Presidents in the future will have a suitable residence. This not only means that they will not have to be concerned with the difficult task of finding adequate housing, but it will be helpful to the Secret Service in alleviating the responsibility and expense of revising their activities in protecting our Vice Presidents every time there is a change in this high office.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this resolution.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

I cannot see how this legislation is designed to do anything more than shuffle people around at the taxpayers expense. There is, already, a law which authorizes the construction of a residence for the Vice President, and this legislation would only move the present Vice President into the Chief of Naval Operations' residence until the permanent facility, for which funds have yet to be appropriated, has been completed. In addition, it will cost the taxpayers more money, because there will have to be funds for a new residence for the CNO somewhere in Washington, possibly at the Navy Yard or Fort Meyer. Since the legislation does not solve the problem of providing a permanent residence for the Vice President, I am compelled to vote against it.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is high time that Congress move to establish a permanent national residence for the Office of the Vice President of the United States.

I believe it is time we cease to view the Vice Presidency as an appendix of Government without responsibility or function. It has been obvious over the past two decades that the Vice President has become an active participant in national policy—with important duties and assignments.

It is improper that we do not grace the office of the second highest rank in our land with a residence. We now have an opportunity to do so.

The site selected by Senate Joint Resolution 202 is ideally suited, both in location and facilities.

There are pure and simple economic reasons for making this move. It is much more economical for the taxpayers to utilize an already federally owned site than to go into the real estate market in an attempt to procure property with the necessary size and suitable location.

In addition, recent circumstances have revealed that it is costly to attempt to install makeshift security equipment in the home residences of the Vice President. It creates public misunderstanding and discomfort, both for the Vice President's family, and those assigned to guard them.

A permanent home for the Nation's Vice Presidents would seem to me to be an idea whose time is long overdue. I urge that the Committee take favorable action in that direction by approving Senate Joint Resolution 202.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 202. This resolution would make the residence of the Chief of Naval Operations

the official residence of the Vice President. It is a measure that is long overdue. Not only will it add dignity to the office of Vice President, it will save the American taxpayer a considerable amount of money.

In 1966 Congress authorized the construction of a permanent home for the Vice President on the grounds of the Naval Observatory. However, that home has never received an appropriation for the needed funds. Since that time the average costs of security adaptations on the private homes of Vice Presidents HUMPHREY, AGNEW, and FORD have been almost \$120,000 each. The bill we are debating today, similar to one that I have cosponsored in the House, will end this needless waste of the taxpayer's money. It will enable the Government to make one final set of security adaptations. The continued spending of funds for each new Vice President will come to an end. The Vice President of the United States will have a home that can serve as an appropriate permanent residence—or a suitable temporary residence until such time as a permanent one may be constructed.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 202, a measure to establish an official Vice President's residence.

This is consistent with the position I have taken on similar proposals under previous administrations, though I concede that this one at least has the merit of using an existing facility. Thus, it should in no way be interpreted as any desire to detract from the office or to withhold any expression of respect or affection for the incumbent Vice President—see my remarks in connection with his confirmation, in the RECORD, volume 119, part 30, page 39886.

At this of all times, Government must—in ways large and small—be a lot more sparing in its generosity with public funds. The people of this country are suffering unmercifully from the ravages of inflation, partly induced by profligate Government spending. I, for one, have no wish to be party to an action which appears, at least, to disregard the need for fiscal restraint.

Again, without reference to our friend and former colleague JERRY FORD, I would suggest as a general proposition that we have already gone too far in the way of bestowing perquisites and prerogatives on our public officeholders. Over the years, the trappings of power and the emoluments of office have turned the heads of too many in public service.

My plea is really for a return to the realities, and that our public servants, regardless of rank, should to the extent reasonable, live in the manner of those whom they serve. Some of the reasons given for providing the Vice President with special quarters could be invoked with equal persuasiveness for providing similar facilities for a rather long list of high-ranking public servants.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 202. As a cosponsor of a very similar House measure, I am convinced of the compelling need to

create a publicly owned residence for the Vice President of the United States.

The present situation requires that each Vice President's home receive extensive and costly security modifications. This necessity repeatedly places a drain on the public's pocketbook which would be eliminated by creating a permanent residence.

It is also clear that a publicly owned residence would lend itself more effectively to the diplomatic and other official duties of the Vice President.

A law is already on the books for construction of a new Vice-Presidential home on the grounds of the Naval Observatory, and I am hopeful Congress will provide the necessary appropriations to complete this project.

In the interim, the joint resolution before us will allow use of the present structure at the Observatory as a temporary residence, and at a cost which is very reasonable.

It is true that the Navy Department will have to secure a new residence for its chief of operations, and I can understand the reticence of the Department in leaving a structure which has housed its chief for 40 years.

In the balance of things, however, I believe Congress is fully justified and correct in designating this structure as a temporary Vice-Presidential home.

From both an economic and a practical perspective, a publicly owned Vice-Presidential residence makes excellent sense. I urge my colleagues to support the joint resolution now before us.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there does not seem to be any disagreement with the fact that the Vice President of the United States has great responsibilities and should be provided with an official residence. Nor does there seem to be any disagreement with the fact that the Vice President needs facilities in which to entertain visiting heads of state. And there certainly can be no opposition to saving money by providing security improvements for one residence rather than individual residences of future Vice Presidents.

I support the choice of the house now occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as a temporary residence for several reasons. Such an attractive house and grounds are worthy of being the residence of such a high official as the Vice President. Since the house is already Government owned, expenditures would be for security improvements and furnishings alone. The grounds and entranceway seem to be custom made for security purposes.

It would be most advantageous to act now in this matter. The present Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, will be completing his term of office this June, and it would be nice to have the Vice-Presidential residence in time for our Nation's Bicentennial. As a cosponsor of similar legislation, I urge my fellow Members to vote in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 202.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to provide a temporary official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been urging for some time the establishment of a permanent residence for the Vice President, and passage of this temporary measure would represent a giant step toward that ultimate goal.

Two years ago, I introduced legislation to designate Oxon Hill Manor, the historic and beautiful landmark residence in Prince Georges County, Md., as the permanent official residence for the Vice President.

Its classical Georgian architecture, its scenic and convenient location, its grand dimensions, and its long and distinguished history make Oxon Hill Manor a most appropriate choice for the permanent residence of the Nation's second highest public official.

While the U.S. Naval Observatory property should be suitable as a temporary residence, it cannot compare with Oxon Hill Manor in terms of historical, cultural and architectural values.

The manor land was acquired by a prominent Maryland family in 1685. John Hanson, the first President of the United States under the Articles of Confederation, died there and is said to be buried on the manor grounds. Later, the property belonged to Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State during Franklin Roosevelt's administration.

The stately mansion is surrounded by 95 acres of beautiful land, providing both scenic and security values; it commands a beautiful view of the Potomac River; its elegance and spaciousness makes it ideal for the many ceremonial functions the Vice President is called upon to host; and it is only about 10 minutes from Capitol Hill.

All of these characteristics make Oxon Hill Manor a compelling choice for designation as the permanent home of the Vice President, and when we are ready to make a decision on establishing a permanent residence—and the sooner the better—then Oxon Hill Manor should be at the top of the list for consideration.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported Senate joint resolution as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That effective upon termination of service by the incumbent in the office of Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, the Government-owned house together with furnishings, associated grounds and related facilities which are and have been used as the residence of the Chief of Naval Operations, shall thenceforth be available for, and shall be designated as, the official temporary residence of the Vice President of the United States.*

SEC. 2. As in the case of the White House, the official residence of the Vice President shall be adequately staffed and provided with such appropriate equipment, furnish-



ings, dining facilities, services, and other provisions as may be required, under the supervision and direction of the Vice President, to enable him to perform and discharge appropriately the duties, functions, and obligations associated with his high office.

Sec. 3. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to provide for the care, maintenance, repair, improvement, alteration, and furnishing of the official residence and grounds, including heating, lighting, and air conditioning, which services shall be provided at the expense of the United States.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the foregoing purposes. During any interim period until and before such funds are so appropriated, the Department of the Navy shall make provision for staffing and other appropriate services in connection with the official residence of the Vice President, subject to reimbursement therefor out of any contingency funds available to the Executive.

Sec. 5. It is the sense of Congress that living accommodations, generally equivalent to those available to the highest ranking officer on active duty in each of the other military services, should be provided for the Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. GROSS:

On page 4, line 1, immediately after the word "official" add the word "temporary"; and

on page 4, line 11, immediately after the word "official" add the word "temporary"; and

on page 4, line 20, immediately after the word "official" add the word "temporary".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered in bloc.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, page 3 of the Senate joint resolution contains this language: "shall thenceforth be available for, and shall be designated as, the official temporary residence of the Vice President of the United States."

Turning to page 4, there are three references to the "official residence" in which the word "temporary" is omitted.

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

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

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

Since it is the intent of the committee that this should be a temporary residence, I would consider the gentleman's amendment merely technical, and I would be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I think it is a needed clarifying amendment to state in all references that it is either an official tem-

porary residence or an official residence. It ought to be one way or the other—I do not care which.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have no objection to the suggested amendment.

The amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute were agreed to.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE), Chairman EDDIE HÉBERT, and members of the Committee on Armed Services, for reporting out this resolution. For the benefit of those Members who may not have been here 8 years ago, I should like to say that our Committee on Public Works reported out a bill that I had the honor of authorizing that was signed into law providing for a permanent home for all Vice Presidents on a 10-acre site adjacent to the home of Chief of Naval Operations at 34th and Massachusetts Avenue, and because of the Vietnam war, the project has never been funded.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) for offering the amendment, and commend the committee for accepting it, designating the Chief of Naval Operations' home only as a temporary home for the Vice President, because next door on this 10-acre tract which is a beautiful site, we should construct a permanent home for all future Vice Presidents. The home should have at least three floors so the bottom floor could be used for ceremonial functions.

Many of the obligations of the President could be relegated to the Vice President, particularly official entertaining. We could have the second floor for the permanent residence of the Vice President, and the third floor for guests or for housekeepers and the Secret Service.

The present Chief of Naval Operations quarters is not suitable for official entertainment. Only 20 people can sit in the dining room. It has only four bedrooms, and it is a very old structure. I think we should go ahead and house the Vice President in the Chief's home, but I think we should ask the Congress now to go ahead and provide the \$750,000 that is authorized by public law.

If I could digress for just a moment, I would point out that almost at this hour the President of the United States is in the country of Egypt, and over 2 million people turned out to see his motorcade, which I think points out the great need for people-to-people diplomacy.

If the future Vice President had a permanent home where he could entertain foreign people coming here, that could do more good to solidify our friendship with other nations than millions and millions of dollars spent overseas, in radio and other propaganda.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we need a permanent home for the Vice President.

Since I have been in Congress, we have had five different Vice Presidents. We have spent more money on security to secure the homes of those Vice Presidents than it would have cost to build a brand-new structure. We have more than paid for a new home but do not have it.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, would we not have the same problem with respect to the new home, that we would still have to hire security officers, as we do at the White House?

Mr. GRAY. I am glad my friend raised that question. It is a very important question. At the site of the present home of the Chief of Naval Operations we already have security protection. The area is all fenced in and it is very well policed and it is in the middle of the Embassy Row area where we have the Executive Protective Service which was created by our committee and this Congress, a force of 750 men who are really in control of that particular area, and whatever security we put in for the home of the Chief of Naval Operations will be suitable for the new permanent home for the Vice President which will be built next door on the 10-acre site already authorized by law.

We already have built-in security at the Chief's home and with a guardhouse at the entrance to the home, very little additional security will be required. I think it was testified that only \$48,000 would be required as additional security devices and equipment which will be needed to secure the home of the Chief of Naval Operations as the Vice President's home. That is very infinitesimal compared to the one-quarter million dollars which was spent on the former Vice President's home, which was bought for \$180,000 and sold for \$325,000 a few months later due in part to the improvements attached to his home. So a much too long answer is, no, it will not require much to secure this temporary home.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman for his answer. Of course, I suppose we would deprive the Vice President of a good real estate investment by this action.

How much would the bill cost?

Mr. GRAY. This bill only \$48,000. The bill I offered in 1966 calls for \$750,000 for the new permanent Vice President's home. We already own the 10-acre site, so there would be no land acquisition.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GRAY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, the \$750,000 would build a very comfortable home with a bottom level, similar to the White House, which can be used for ceremonial purposes. The home of the Chief of Naval Operations as I pointed out is not suitable for entertainment. The dining room will accommodate only 20 people. It will make a nice home for the Vice President to live in but will not serve the very important function I pointed out of people-to-people diplomacy.

There are untold numbers of foreign diplomats and foreign citizens who come to this country who never see the White House and never have the hand of fellowship extended to them. I think in dollars and cents it would mean a great deal more for this Nation to have our Vice President extend that personal diplomacy than it does for us to spend the money overseas on information services and so on. Those people come to this country and they see our backs instead of our faces. This would be a great thing for our people to practice personal diplomacy. It also would provide a much better and much more secure home for the second family.

I hope we can unanimously support the resolution before us and I further hope that we can fund the \$750,000 and get on with construction of a new permanent home for the Vice President. We can design and build a facility in 24 months, and allow the Vice President to live in the Chief's Home in the interim. This will bring dignity to the office and show progress for our Nation. The need is great and the hour is late for this action. Thank you.

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

Mr. Chairman, simply because I offered an amendment and it was adopted does not mean I support this bill. The cost of what is here proposed temporarily and, looking down the road, the cost of a new and permanent home for the Vice President are seemingly impossible to obtain. I have heard all manner of figures dished out this afternoon, but none of them seem to add up to any kind of intelligible total. I wish someone would tell us what this is going to cost in all its ramifications. We now get a figure of \$750,000 from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) for the construction of a super-duper Vice Presidential palace somewhere, I guess on the Naval Observatory grounds. This thing is fast running into money, especially when there is no cost for land acquisition on which to locate a \$750,000 residence for the Vice President. That is a lot of house.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. This estimate was given by the GSA of the cost and the Secret Service protection would cost \$48,000 under this present plan.

Mr. GROSS. I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois, but somehow I just cannot believe that figure. The resolution is completely open-ended. It provides for whatever the Committee on Appropriations wants to appropriate.

I am talking now about the whole train of expense, the \$48,000 plus the security, plus the refurbishing of a home for the Chief of Naval Operations, the whole ball of wax.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The figure that I quoted, according to GSA, contains the necessary renovation for occupancy and the security.

Mr. GROSS. Are we going to renovate the present structure?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman will recall that I did mention if we did

nothing in the future about a new permanent plan and we suddenly decide he can stay in this home, then to make that a permanent home would reach around \$762,000.

Mr. GROSS. This is what I am talking about. This is the foot in the door and we are on the way, with the passage of this resolution, to something I do not know what or where it will end.

I am not one of those who thinks that we should at this time, especially with the critical financial situation that confronts us, inflation and all that, ought to start building a \$750,000 home for the Vice President and creating a kind of political aristocracy. I do not believe we should do that.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Actually if we adopt this bill and we do not go into a permanent home or anything else, but just stay there, we might have to have other renovations; but actually by this present rule we are saving money.

For the last 8 years to provide security at the homes of Vice Presidents has cost the Government \$450,000.

Mr. GROSS. There is talk in this report of renovation of the residence with facilities for state functions. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is not in this bill. That is for a permanent residence.

Mr. GROSS. Why, under any circumstances, should we provide a home for the Vice President sufficient to accommodate state functions? I take it that "state functions" means large dinners and all that sort of thing, wining and dining. We now have the State Department's "Top of the Mark," a pretty lavish dining room, and there are several others the Vice President could use. He might even borrow the White House dining room on occasion, if he had to.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. This temporary housing for the Vice President would have no relation to that thing at all, building something for state functions, because this bill does not go into that at all.

Mr. GROSS. I opposed similar legislation in the past and I am sure I do not begin to have the actual cost figures for this home and the relocation of the Chief of Naval Operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA. I want the gentleman from Iowa to know I share many of his reservations. I think we will be committed irrevocably to a course of action that is going to lead to much unnecessary expense, and to the construction of yet another Imperial Palace here.

I do not think it is really necessary or appropriate to our democratic institutions.

As far as official entertainment goes, the gentleman from Iowa could have

mentioned the availability of the Blair House, which is used at the present time for official functions by the Vice President. I do not know why it could not continue to be used for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Let me make one other observation before my time again expires.

We had a man, who became Vice President of the United States, who bought a property out in Maryland and lived in it, which had a racial covenant. We had a man, who ran for the Presidency of the United States, who bought a residence out in Maryland with a racial covenant on it, and lived in that property.

I hope the gentleman can tell me whether there are any racial covenants on the property in the Naval Observatory grounds.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would not assume so because it is Government property.

Mr. GROSS. I would not assume so either, but I just wondered if the present Vice President would be living in a property on which there was such a covenant.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ROBERTS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 202) designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations, pursuant to House Resolution 1169, he reported the Senate Joint Resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate Joint Resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 380, nays 23, not voting 30, as follows:



[Roll No. 292]

## YEAS—380

Abdnor	Esch	Luke
Adams	Eshleman	McClary
Addabbo	Evans, Colo.	McCloskey
Alexander	Fascell	McCollister
Anderson,	Findley	McCormack
Calif.	Fish	McDade
Anderson, Ill.	Fisher	McEwen
Andrews, N.C.	Flood	McFall
Andrews,	Flowers	McKay
N. Dak.	Foley	McSpadden
Annunzio	Ford	Macdonald
Archer	Forsythe	Madden
Arends	Fountain	Madigan
Armstrong	Fraser	Mahon
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Mallory
Ashley	Frenzel	Mann
Aspin	Frey	Maraziti
Badillo	Fröhlich	Martin, N.C.
Bafalis	Fulton	Mathias, Calif.
Baker	Fuqua	Mathis, Ga.
Barrett	Gaydos	Matsunaga
Beard	Gettys	Mayne
Bell	Gialmo	Mazzoli
Bennett	Gibbons	Melcher
Bergland	Gilman	Metcalfe
Bevill	Ginn	Mezvisinsky
Blaggi	Goldwater	Michel
Blester	Gonzalez	Millford
Bingham	Goodling	Miller
Blackburn	Grasso	Mills
Boggs	Gray	Minish
Bolling	Green, Oreg.	Minshall, Ohio
Bray	Green, Pa.	Mitchell, Md.
Breckinridge	Griffiths	Mitchell, N.Y.
Brinkley	Grover	Mizell
Brooks	Gubser	Moakley
Broomfield	Gude	Molloy
Brotzman	Gunter	Montgomery
Brown, Calif.	Guyer	Moorhead,
Brown, Mich.	Haley	Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Hamilton	Moorhead, Pa.
Bryhill, N.C.	Hammer-	Morgan
Bryhill, Va.	schmidt	Mosher
Buchanan	Hanley	Murphy, Ill.
Burgener	Hanna	Murphy, N.Y.
Burke, Calif.	Hanrahan	Murtha
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Idaho	Myers
Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Wash.	Natcher
Burleson, Tex.	Harrington	Nedzi
Burlison, Mo.	Harsha	Nelsen
Burton	Hastings	Nichols
Butler	Hawkins	Nix
Byron	Hays	Obey
Camp	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Brien
Carney, Ohio	Heckler, Mass.	O'Neill
Carter	Heinz	Owens
Casey, Tex.	Helstoski	Parris
Chamberlain	Henderson	Passman
Chisholm	Hicks	Patman
Clark	Hillis	Patten
Clausen,	Hinshaw	Perkins
Don H.	Hogan	Pettis
Clawson, Del	Holifield	Peyster
Clay	Holt	Pickle
Cochran	Holtzman	Pike
Cohen	Horton	Poage
Collins, Tex.	Hosmer	Podell
Conable	Huber	Powell, Ohio
Conlan	Hudnut	Preyer
Conte	Hungate	Price, Ill.
Conyers	Hunt	Price, Tex.
Corman	Hutchinson	Pritchard
Cotter	Ichord	Quile
Coughlin	Jarman	Rallsback
Crane	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
Cronin	Johnson, Colo.	Rangel
Culver	Johnson, Pa.	Rarick
Daniel, Dan.	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Daniel, Robert	Jones, N.C.	Regula
W. Jr.	Jones, Okla.	Rhodes
Daniels,	Jones, Tenn.	Riegle
Dominick V.	Jordan	Rinaldo
Danielson	Karth	Roberts
Davis, S.C.	Kastenmeier	Robinson, Va.
Davis, Wis.	Kazen	Rodino
de la Garza	Kemp	Roe
Delaney	Ketchum	Roncallo, Wyo.
Dellenback	Kluczynski	Roncallo, N.Y.
Dellums	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Denholm	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Dennis	Kyros	Rostenkowski
Dent	Lagomarsino	Roush
Dickinson	Landgrebe	Rousselot
Dingell	Landrum	Roy
Donohue	Latta	Roybal
Downing	Leggett	Runnels
Dulski	Lehman	Ruppe
Duncan	Lent	Ruth
du Pont	Litton	Ryan
Edwards, Ala.	Long, La.	St Germain
Edwards, Calif.	Long, Md.	Sandman
Ellberg	Lott	Sarasin
Erlenborn	Lujan	Sarbanes

Scherie	Stuckey	Walsh
Schneebell	Studds	Wampler
Sebelius	Sullivan	Ware
Seiberling	Symington	Whalen
Symms	Talcott	White
Shoup	Taylor, Mo.	Whitehurst
Shriver	Taylor, N.C.	Whitten
Shuster	Teague	Widnall
Slack	Thompson, N.J.	Wiggins
Skubitz	Thomson, Wis.	Williams
Slack	Thone	Wilson, Bob
Smith, Iowa	Thornton	Winn
Smith, N.Y.	Tiernan	Wolff
Snyder	Towell, Nev.	Wright
Spence	Traxler	Wyder
Stanton,	Treen	Wyman
J. William	Udall	Yatron
Stanton,	Ullman	Young, Alaska
James V.	Van Deerlin	Young, Fla.
Steed	Vander Jagt	Young, Ga.
Steele	Vander Veen	Young, Ill.
Steelman	Vanik	Young, S.C.
Steiger, Ariz.	Veysey	Young, Tex.
Steiger, Wis.	Vigorito	Zablocki
Stephens	Waggonner	Zion
Stokes	Waldie	Zwack
Stratton		

## NAYS—23

Baumgardner	Gross	Stark
Chappell	King	Wilson,
Clancy	Mink	Charles H.,
Cleveland	O'Hara	Calif.
Collins, Ill.	Reuss	Wilson,
Devine	Rogers	Charles, Tex.
Drinan	Rose	Wylie
Eckhardt	Satterfield	Yates
Evins, Tenn.	Schroeder	

## NOT VOTING—30

Abzug	Davis, Ga.	Moss
Blatnik	Derwinski	Pepper
Boland	Diggs	Quillen
Bowen	Dorn	Reid
Brademas	Flynt	Robison, N.Y.
Brasco	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Howard	Sisk
Carey, N.Y.	McKinney	Staggers
Cederberg	Martin, Nebr.	Stubblefield
Collier	Meeds	Wyatt

So the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Moss.  
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Stubblefield.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Flynt.  
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Dorn.  
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Blatnik.  
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Cederberg.  
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Collier.  
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Derwinski.  
 Mr. Meeds with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.  
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. McKinney.  
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Quillen.  
 Ms. Abzug with Mr. Robison of New York.  
 Mr. Bowen with Mr. Wyatt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## A WAY TO HALT INFLATION: THE TREASURY SECRETARY'S BLUEPRINT

(Mr. SCHNEEBELI asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the June 17 issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an impressive interview which their editors held recently with the new Secretary of the Treasury, William E. Simon. In view of the high respect and great credibility which both branches of Congress have placed in the new Secretary, his basic position of a balanced Federal budget and reduced Federal spending to help control inflation, puts into proper perspective this important influence on our economy.

I hope that many people will read the fine statement of our new Secretary of the Treasury—it is an auspicious beginning of his administration in this position of great impact on our future economy:

## A WAY TO HALT INFLATION: THE TREASURY SECRETARY'S BLUEPRINT

Q. Mr. Secretary, is this country going to be able to bring inflation under control?

A. We can do it. But it is going to require a curb on Government spending, and the key to that is better co-operation between the Congress and the White House. It also requires a will on the part of the American people to stop demanding or accepting the largesse of the Federal Government without paying for it. It's just as fundamental as that. We must work toward balance in fiscal and monetary policy in this Government.

I won't buy for one minute the idea that 75 per cent of the budget is uncontrollable. That is a cop-out. We've got to quit saying there's nothing we can do about it—that "Congress has passed the laws, and here they are, even if we don't like some of them."

I'm suggesting that we—both the Congress and the executive branch—had better take a brand-new look at this and begin to get some fiscal sanity back into the picture.

Q. Can you cite some examples of what you consider bloated federal spending?

A. I'm not going to be specific on recommendations right now because we're doing a budget study on the controllable side—as well as on the uncontrollable side, which is our big problem.

Q. Just what do you mean by "controllable" and "uncontrollable" items in the budget?

A. Essentially, "uncontrollable" refers to budget items provided for by laws passed in previous years. In other words, laws already on the books spell out some obligations for more than one fiscal year. For instance, Social Security payments are spelled out by law. As the number of persons receiving Social Security increases, the amount of money goes up, too, in almost uncontrollable fashion.

Q. Who is to blame for the expansion of the uncontrollable side of the budget?

A. You can't just point the finger at Congress—or at the White House. It has come from both sides. Anyway, what's the difference whether it was an Administration plan or a congressional action that locked in new spending on an ever-escalating basis? The fact of the matter is that it's there.

Congress is about to pass—I hope—a budget-reform bill which is a step in the right direction, but only a first step. Congressmen are now hearing from their constituents that something has to be done about the budget and about inflation. That's why we're seeing action. I met with the Republican side of the House Ways and Means Committee just the other day, and to a man they are hearing this from back home. It's a genuine ground swell.

Q. Do you mean that people are urging a cut in Government spending to deal with inflation?

A. Yes, sir—and these Congressmen say that this will be the most popular thing that they can do to get re-elected this year. They tell me that their people are simply fed up with the way the Government's budget shoots up year after year. It took this country 185 years to get to 100 billion dollars of annual spending in the budget. But it took only nine more years to get to 200 billion, and only four more after that to get to the third hundred billion.

Q. In the past when people talked about cutting federal spending they were for it as long as it didn't affect them—

A. Yes, in the past that's been correct. But in the past we've never had double-digit inflation. It's always been well under 10 per cent. But now that we're above that into two digits, people are scared. And if we wait another year or two to meet this head on, we'll be back in the same mess we are right now, only at a higher rate of inflation, because it's going to start from a higher base than the one we started at two years ago, which was 3 per cent.

It's the same with interest rates. Interest rates this time started up from 8 or 8½ per cent. During the credit crunch in '66, they started at 6 per cent.

Each year we're grinding more and more inflationary expectation and actual inflation into our economy, and if we don't begin to turn it around, not only on the fiscal side—on the spending side—but on the financing side of it, this country is headed for disaster.

The financing side is little understood. But it is staggering when you realize that borrowing by the Federal Government and its agencies today takes about 60 per cent of the funds raised in the securities markets.

Q. Do you believe that in an election year Congressmen are going to vote to cut Government spending?

A. I certainly do. For the first time we have a chance of doing something because of the double-digit inflation. If we ever had a chance to cut back, now is the time. I'm not saying we can balance the fiscal '75 budget [for the year starting July 1, 1974]. I don't think it's advisable to slam on the fiscal brakes that quickly. But we must make a step in that direction and then move toward balance in '76.

Q. How much of a budget cut would be a step in the right direction? Roy Ash, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, has said you couldn't find as much as 5 billions—

A. It all depends whether one wants to take a look at the uncontrollables. You probably couldn't find 5 or 6 billions if you just wanted to look at the controllable portion of it. I'm talking about the uncontrollable side.

You're going to say, "Well, how do you get that done?" The answer is that you identify programs that are overfunded—whether it's food stamps or the many programs of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—or wherever it is that the budget has grown tremendously.

Q. Don't you have to go to Congress, though, and get a change in the law?

A. That's right—you do.

Q. Isn't it a fact that every time the President has done that—one school lunches, milk programs, almost anything—he's been beaten down?

A. That's been true. But I'm not going to take the attitude: "Ah, hell, we've tried that before; it doesn't work." I suggest that it's never really been tried before with everybody's heart behind it.

Q. Are you suggesting a fundamental change in attitude toward things like the full-employment budget?

A. I am not a full-employment-budget man. I don't think 1 per cent of the people in this country understand the full-employment concept. It's a good concept, useful to those who fully understand it, but there are

problems with how it is interpreted and how it is calculated.

For example, almost everybody agrees that a goal of no more than 4 per cent unemployment is unreasonable in view of the change in the labor force over the last 20 years. But what I am talking about is actually heading toward balance in the unified budget as we know it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, has the Administration's ability to deal with this in Congress been damaged by the Watergate mess?

A. I can honestly say—and I don't know anybody in this Administration who spends more time on the Hill and on the telephone talking to Congressmen than I do—that it hasn't bothered me one iota.

Q. You don't think the authority of the President has been eroded with Congress?

A. I certainly do not.

I'm suggesting that things have changed, and events are going to make Congress want to go in the budget-cutting direction because at this point in time it's the right thing to do politically. They're getting the ground swell from home. Double-digit inflation is a tax that's being levied on the American people, and they don't like it.

Let me tell you something: I think there's such a change in sentiment that we should put what you might call a "full-court press" on this whole subject and really fight to co-operate and get together. And I've talked to Democrats and Republicans alike on the Hill, and that is the attitude I find.

Q. Historically, hasn't inflation of the sort we have now been solved only by the country going into a recession?

A. I don't know that we can go back and say that every single time it's gone that way. I agree that the danger is there when you're relying solely on monetary policy to control inflation. But if we use fiscal policy to restrain federal spending and give monetary policy a chance to work, which Arthur Burns [Chairman, Federal Reserve Board] would certainly like to do, then we can lick this problem.

I'm a realist. I don't know that over the long run this great country will do all these things, but I'm only here once, and so shouldn't I try to get done what's right?

Q. Mr. Simon, how much is this out of your control in the sense that inflation is being imported through high prices for oil and other basic commodities?

A. Our energy policy will correct the oil problem over time. Until that time, obviously, we're going to be paying these high prices for foreign oil. But they're not going to triple again—we certainly know that. If anything, they're going to be lower a year from now, or even sooner, than they are right now. I'd bet on it, if I were a betting man.

Now, we haven't had a complete pass-through, yet, of this big run-up in oil prices. We won't see that until the end of the year. For example, in petrochemicals we have yet to see the full impact. And there isn't much that you touch during the course of the day that isn't made in one form or another in the petrochemical industry. The high cost of oil is going to come out in the form of higher prices for toothbrushes, plastic cups, and so on down the line.

Q. What about wages? Now that controls are ended, will they leap upward and add to inflation?

A. My judgment is that while wage increases aren't going to be in the 15 to 20 per cent bracket, they are going to be significantly above the 5.5 per cent guideline that we had in effect the past couple of years.

Q. Does that mean you need a new incomes policy?

A. No, it most certainly does not, because if we learned anything from wage and price controls it is that they produce distortions and compound and postpone your problems.

What we must have is restraint on federal spending so that the Government won't be

putting all this pressure on the economy and the money markets, forcing interest rates higher than they should be and keeping the inflation fires burning. This is what has to be reversed. This is fundamental. Then you can deal with shortages and other inflationary problems by acting rather than reacting.

Q. Are you worried that present interest rates—as high as 12 per cent or more—will restrain business borrowing enough to prevent recovery from the current slump?

A. There's a lot of talk about the slump, but actually it is isolated to energy-related activities. Automobiles are the prime case in point.

It's true that high interest rates are postponing borrowing. There's no question about that. But I'm not worried about too little capital investment. The McGraw-Hill survey shows an increase of 19 percent in outlays for plant and equipment this year. The Commerce Department figure is 12.2 percent. But whether it's 12.2 percent or 19 percent, the evidence is compelling that this is a source of great strength in our business outlook right through 1975.

Another point that we must stress as far as this inflation problem is concerned is that we have to give incentives to business to expand production of fuel, paper, steel and other commodities so that the U.S. doesn't have to rely on foreign nations for these key items.

Q. Do you have a plan that would do this?

A. One thing we're talking about is accelerated depreciation. It works, and it works quickly. This was proven back in the Korean War. In the Treasury Department, we are taking a look at the various plans to expand production of these vital products. We're discussing whether it should be done on an over-all basis or whether it should be done by specific industries.

Q. What is your position on an income-tax cut for individuals?

A. It would be highly inflationary.

All it would do is fuel a demand that's already excessive. People would just go out and buy the small-ticket items that are already in short supply.

Q. Do you think Congress will vote against a tax cut for individuals, but approve reductions for business?

A. We're not talking about cutting taxes for business. We're talking about accelerated depreciation and other incentives for some of our basic industries to assure the consumer that he can get commodities at a reasonable price, rather than forcing him to rely on foreign sources at a much higher price.

Don't misunderstand me. I'm not saying it will be easy to get this through Congress. But we're hopeful, and we're talking with the leaders on the Hill. We're going into this study with the encouragement of Mike Mansfield, the Senate Majority Leader, and Speaker Carl Albert in the House. Senator Hugh Scott and Representative John Rhodes, the Republican leaders in Congress, are taking part in these discussions.

Q. Mr. Simon, economists seem to be in disarray. Many are confessing they're baffled by this double-digit inflation—that many of the old rules don't seem to apply. How can anybody speak with much confidence of what the cure is?

A. I'm sorry, but I don't buy the first part of your comment—that those in the economic profession are in such disarray that they can't find agreement. The economists whose opinions I respect, whether it's Paul McCracken [a former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers] or many others, are in fundamental agreement that, leaving the politics of the situation aside, for a sustained period of time there is one fundamental thing that's needed, and that's prudent fiscal and monetary policies.

Let me tell you something to make my point: Go back and trace America's prosperity. At the end of World War II it was the



only country in the world with any real power, economically and otherwise. As the rest of the world recovered its economic strength, however, the dollar became overvalued. We should have changed that somewhere around the mid-50s or late '50s, but we continued with a fixed exchange rate and an overvalued dollar. And as we were creating all of those deficits and sending the IOUs around the world, you could find a lot of economists who were predicting—some almost to the year—that a fundamental change would have to be made in our international monetary system. And they were correct; some economists, at least, understood what was going on. A lot of them talked about it, but it wasn't very popular to print what they said.

I can give you a score of statements I made before I came to Washington. I haven't changed my tune one iota.

Q. Some well-known economists are saying that the 1975 federal budget, which you say must be cut, is too tight—

A. Sure. There's a group who believe that the American people have grown to expect each year that all of their needs are going to be met by Washington, and "let's just ignore the inflationary consequences."

It isn't going to be easy to turn this thing around. But, at this particular point in time, I believe sincerely we have an opportunity to do it, due to the unprecedented inflation rate and interest rates. Now that we've got people's attention, damn it, let's do what's right.

Q. But what is right? President Nixon's proposed national health program would add 5 or 6 billion dollars to the budget. Are you going to drop the program and say, "Well, we're at a point where we can't take on anything that costly?"

A. I think you're going to see some of that, but I wouldn't pinpoint a particular program, because these things are being worked out right now. I don't know what the President will come down on. But he'll make the individual decisions—that I'll promise you.

We've got to slow the growth of the budget to a pace that will provide normal expansion of the economy, rather than the inflationary growth rate that started with the "guns and butter" policy in 1964 during the Vietnam War. Some say this will entail itself sacrifice on the part of the American people. My answer is that when you're dealing with a budget as massive as 305 billion dollars, there is enough latitude to get back to fiscal responsibility without sacrifice.

Q. Is your attitude toward the budget accepted within the Administration generally?

A. I'll put it this way: I'm making significant progress compared to where I started a month ago when I became Secretary of the Treasury. At that time, the whole idea was considered ridiculous. And I'm picking up a lot of support in Congress.

#### INDIA'S NUCLEAR POWER

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

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, India has recently become the world's sixth nuclear power. A country that once denounced nuclear ambition and admonished those participating in the development and testing of nuclear weapons is now a member of that group. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi maintains that India's motives are for purely peaceful purposes—mining, prospecting for oil and gas, the discovery of underground sources of water, and the diversion of rivers for scientific and technological knowledge.

However, if this is indeed the case, why then has India refused thus far to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968?

As most of my colleagues are undoubtedly aware, that treaty provides for the supply of nuclear materials to both nuclear weapon and nonnuclear weapon states for peaceful purposes to all parties of the treaty at cost, when nuclear materials are safe and an economic credit. In addition, the treaty further urges the cooperation of all states in the attainment of this objective.

Let me briefly describe the current deplorable situation which exists in India today. The population of 580 million faces famine—with 80 percent of the Indian people suffering from malnutrition—and that population is increasing dramatically each year by 13 million. Seventy-five percent of those 580 million are illiterate, 75 percent of India's university graduates are unemployed, and one-half the population lives on 10 cents a day.

Given these facts, there can be no justification whatsoever for the \$173 million which the Government of India spent from 1968 to 1973 for nuclear weapon development, or the \$315 million which they intend to spend for this purpose over the next 5 years.

One-third of all Indians live below the poverty level of \$30 per year. Housing is badly needed, yet the Indian Government only allocated \$200 million for housing during the same period in which it spent \$173 million for nuclear development. India's nuclear program will not provide more jobs, will not increase production, or solve the deficit balance-of-payments crisis.

Ever more important, the suspicion and fear that surrounds the Indian motives for the recent nuclear detonation could set off a wave of nuclear proliferation around the world if left unchecked.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the United States, which between 1950 and 1971 contributed over \$10 billion in foreign assistance to India—and in 1972 and 1973 an additional \$400 million—to cut off all economic assistance of any sort to that country until it becomes a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. If not, we have no way of guaranteeing that the money we so eagerly hand out to India each year will not be used for further nuclear weapon development, rather than to deter a famine which appears imminent.

Accordingly, I am today joining my distinguished colleague—Senator MARLOWE Cook—in introducing legislation to accomplish this objective. Under the terms of this bill, which the senior Senator from Kentucky is introducing in the other Chamber, all military and economic assistance, all sales of agricultural commodities, and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war to the Government of India would be suspended until such time as India becomes a state party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. I would hope that this body will proceed expeditiously to secure the enactment of this legislation.

#### CONGRESSIONAL SENIOR INTERN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues a few observations on the third year of the senior intern program—a congressional internship designed specifically for constituents over age 60.

Back in April of 1972 I initiated an experimental program in my Washington office for the purpose of helping improve communication and understanding between the older residents of my district and their Representative and Government in Washington. Two constituents spent 2 weeks here familiarizing themselves with Federal activities relating to the elderly—study legislation, attending hearings, participating in briefings with authorities from the Government and private groups involved with the concerns of the older American.

Last May several other House and Senate colleagues jointly sponsored the program with me. Senator WILLIAM ROTH and Congressman BUD HILLIS and ROGER ZION each had two senior constituents here to participate in the internship.

This past month the program expanded further with Senator JOSEPH BIDEN and Congressmen BERT PODELL, RALPH REGULA, and JOHN WYDLER joining our original group.

Pauline and Joe Seborowski of Trevo, Pa., were my senior interns this year, selected by senior citizens groups in my district on the basis of their involvement in senior citizens activities and their interest in the program. The Seborowskis did a commendable job as senior interns, and I hope they profited from their stay as much as I benefited from their contributions to my thinking on the problems of the older American.

The program this year provided a broad overview of the Federal response to the needs of the elderly. The senior interns were briefed on the legislative process, pending senior citizen legislation and the programs of the Administration on Aging. From the perspective of the older American, discussions were held with experts in the fields of housing, transportation, national health insurance and volunteer service programs. Briefings also were conducted on social security, supplemental security income, social services and Medicare. In addition, tours of the Capitol, State Department, two embassies and a special tour and meeting at the White House were arranged.

Although the 16 participants ranged in age up to 83, they did not fit any common stereotypes of older Americans. They were an energetic and diverse group with differing backgrounds and life experiences. Large cities and rural areas were represented. Each senior intern had his or her own special concerns, and they did not hesitate in the least to express themselves and press for answers to questions which troubled them. They were eager to

learn as much as they could about programs and policies of the Government toward older Americans, and they were anxious to take this information back to their homes where it could be shared with others and put to practical use.

I do not believe we, as Members of Congress, can emphasize enough the importance of two-way communication and sharing of ideas with our constituents. Certain segments of the population require greater opportunities to communicate their special needs, and it has been my experience that the elderly represent such a group. The internship program offers a unique educational and communicative mechanism for a few constituents which can have, through them, a wider impact on a much more extensive audience. Invariably, when I mention the senior intern program to others, the reaction is, "That's a great idea." After 3 years of working with this idea, I am firmly convinced it is more than a good idea—it has become a very workable and integral part of my office operation.

Forty-three colleagues have joined me as cosponsors of or have introduced similar resolutions making the senior intern program available to all House Members as are the summer college intern and the L.B.J. teacher intern programs. Very briefly, the resolution sets aside time during the month of May each year for the internship program and allows a Member to hire for this period two additional employees over age 65. I might add at this point that since there is no real magic in 65 as the qualifying age for becoming a senior citizen, the age requirement probably should be reduced to 60 years to include many of those individuals who are retiring at earlier ages.

In the very near future several of us who have been involved with this legislation will be circulating a dear colleague to recruit additional cosponsors. I am encouraged by and wish to thank those Members who have had the interest and initiative to conduct senior intern programs in their own offices in the absence of a formal legislative authorization, and I trust even more will become involved in this ad hoc program in the future.

I commend senior internships to your consideration, and I yield at this time to my colleagues who may wish to discuss their impressions of the program.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to participate in this Special Order today. For the second year in a row my office has sponsored a Senior Citizen Intern program. My staff and I have benefited greatly from the experience and it has given me the opportunity to communicate more effectively with the elderly in my district.

For 2 weeks this spring, Mr. and Mrs. Chester Edwards of Anderson, Ind., served as congressional interns in my Washington office. In addition to attending briefings and meetings with committee and individuals involved with matters relating to the elderly, the Edwardses became acquainted with the everyday happenings in a congressional office. They became a part of my staff and reported each morning to their desk and proceeded to work on their assignments.

Upon their return to Indiana, my interns wrote a report on their thoughts and experiences while in Washington. (It was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 22, 1974.) This report is now being mailed to senior citizens in my district and distributed by the Edwardses when they meet with senior citizen organizations.

We need to involve ourselves with the elderly and allow them to involve themselves with us. Parceling them out to old age and retirement homes is not the answer. All over this great land of ours, citizens are complaining about the lack of community, the lack of caring in our towns and cities. Maybe one reason is because we are not utilizing the experience and wisdom of all our human resources, particularly our elderly. A community where the elderly do not play an important and central role is not really a community. Our elderly have lived where we have not, have lived when we have not—they can teach us much and we should begin to listen.

The elderly in this country are assuming a new importance that they have never known. Nationwide, those 65 and older make up 10 percent of our population. This amounts to well over 20 million people and this figure has grown seven times since the beginning of the century.

This Nation is finally beginning to realize that our senior citizens are the firm foundation—the backbone—of our society. And, no matter how superficially youth-oriented our culture becomes, we should never forget this.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, recently I shared my congressional duties for 2 weeks with three hard-working interns. They were not college students, more eager than experienced. They were senior citizens—genuine, qualified students of the world—both eager and experienced. Though brief, the association was rewarding for me. I learned a great deal and was reminded of things one tends to forget.

Those interns, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Gershowitz and Mrs. Celia Zeidman, all residents of the 13th Congressional District, represented for 2 weeks in Congress all our senior citizens. Though beyond retirement age, they are young and vibrant—ready for the second time around.

Mrs. Zeidman is associated with the Blanche Schuldiner League Day Center of the Brooklyn Hebrew Home and Hospital for the Aged. Mrs. Nettie Gershowitz is president of the Friendship Club of the Shorefront YM-YWHA in Brooklyn. Both these ladies, and Mr. Gershowitz as well, alive with energy and endurance, greeted each Washington morning as an opportunity to learn something new.

They enjoyed learning the detailed business of a congressional office and contributed to the excellent program of seminars that comprised the senior intern program.

I take this opportunity to thank these friends for another chance to learn from my elders. I was reminded of the contributions they have made and are making now to the world we live in. It is a better place because of them. The future

will be bright for me and my children if we bring to the task what I saw in them—pride, integrity, ability, a willingness to work and an indomitable sense of humor.

It was particularly fitting that Mr. and Mrs. Gershowitz and Mrs. Zeidman were here on the day the House of Representatives passed H.R. 6175 by a vote of 379 to 1, establishing the National Institute of Aging as part of the National Institutes of Health. It was a giant step for senior citizens, who are all too often neglected by the Government to which they paid taxes for so many years.

Governmental indifference to the needs of senior citizens is changing, and the Gershowitzes' and Mrs. Zeidman's work in Congress is the beginning of that change. Passing the National Institute of Aging Act is a part of the progress. If we are to construct Government services responsive to the needs of senior citizens, then senior citizens must take an active part in the political process. Their participation must extend beyond simply voting every 2 or 4 years.

We will continue the congressional senior intern program until the elderly are sharing in the benefits of the Government. There should be no less concern for the welfare of senior citizens than for the welfare of oil cartels and industrial conglomerates whose needs are traditionally favored over the needs of the elderly.

It reminds those charged with administering programs for the elderly that the people they serve are real human beings, not statistics to be manipulated for private purposes.

And so, thanks to Harold and Nettie Gershowitz and Celia Zeidman for working with me. It was my pleasure, and to my benefit. I hope their experience in Washington will be useful to them as they work with me to improve the condition of all the senior citizens who live in our 13th Congressional District.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity of this special order to officially thank the two fine people who served as senior citizen interns in my office, Harry and Mary Jane Rankin, for their efforts in behalf of older Americans in Ohio's 16th Congressional District.

The Rankins came to Washington to study legislation of interest to senior citizens and to learn about programs and policies affecting the elderly. But they accomplished much more than that.

Through the efforts of the Rankins and the other senior citizen interns the Members of this body have a greater insight into the problems of aging. This internship program has proven itself as a valuable way to focus the attention of Congress on the problems of older Americans.

Mr. and Mrs. Rankin learned a great deal about the Government's program for older citizens, their perspective and observations have been helpful to me in seeking better ways to deal with these problems. I intend to continue to draw on their views with regard to senior citizens.

Improving the awareness of Congress by itself makes the senior citizen internship worthwhile, but there are other advantages. The interns themselves gain governmental experience and knowledge



of Federal programs affecting the elderly. In addition to these largely personal gains the senior citizen interns share their Washington experience with their peers. They go to meetings, talk with their friends, work with local leaders, and in a variety of ways disseminate the fruits of their internship to those who are most interested.

One tangible result of this internship program was the introduction of a bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize senior citizen subsidies to mass transportation systems for reduced fares for the elderly.

From my conversations with the Rankins I learned that the Urban Mass Transit Administration (UMTA) cannot now fund reduced fare programs for the elderly. This UMTA bill would authorize reimbursement of communities or transportation companies for their losses on fares reduced by up to two-thirds of the normal rate.

Transportation Department studies show that where local communities have lowered fares for senior citizens, ridership by the elderly has increased anywhere from 20 to 50 percent. It has been shown that the cost of the transportation fare is a major restraint against the widespread use of mass transit facilities by the elderly. This bill will help reduce that barrier.

In other words, the benefits of this program include the focusing of attention on the problems of the elderly, the free exchange of ideas to meet those problems, the communication of existing policies and programs to local citizens, and with luck some productive legislation. This list of benefits makes a strong case for expanding this excellent program.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the congressional senior citizen intern program was introduced in my Fifth Congressional District of New York this year. I was genuinely impressed by the enthusiasm it stimulated in senior citizen circles and, more importantly, by the effectiveness of the program, which was designed to include local participation in the formulation of legislation and programs affecting senior citizens.

Mrs. Hazel Sandy, 394 Hawthorne Street, Uniondale, N.Y., and Col. Emanuel Singer, 1094 Fulton Street, Woodmere, N.Y., were selected to represent the senior citizens in my district.

I believe the sentiments expressed in the reports which they submitted to me upon completion of their 2 weeks' assignment in the Nation's Capitol bespeak their better understanding of the legislative process and their enthusiastic approval of the program. I would like to read them into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. The reports follow:

#### REPORT OF HAZEL SANDY

This report pertains to the Senior Citizens Intern Program conducted from April 29 to May 10, 1974, in Washington, D.C. This program relating to legislation of all the bills pertaining to Senior Citizens is the basis of my letter.

In my opinion, it is going to take many years to obtain all the objectives in these bills.

Having this Senior Citizen Intern Program, to me, is a very good idea as I have gotten

a different perspective of what the government is doing and planning to do for the aged. It is a tremendous undertaking and it certainly will take time and money to give to the aged all the benefits they plan to give. By attending these meetings I have gotten a good idea how the legislation works and will try and convey these findings to the Senior Citizens.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

In talking with Senior Citizens one of their great concerns is Social Security. They feel that every time it is raised they have deductions taken out, which means they do not receive a sizable increase or as much as they thought they would receive. With the supplementary program they are receiving a little more but not enough to insure better living. I know that the context of Social Security is changing all the time so there are different phases in the workings of the bill which have to be ironed out.

I understand that in Sen. Church's bill he advocates making Social Security independent and to be taken out of HEW I think this would be a good idea.

#### THE MEDICAL PROGRAM

This is one program I have heard a lot of comments on. With the deductible amount being raised to \$60.00 and the increase in cost of medicine and doctors' fees continually rising, it has another bad effect on the Senior Citizen. One way to alleviate this would be to have the cost of medical coverage lowered. Also give deductions for medical needs covered by Medicare.

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Insurance is another important factor of income spending. The cost of financing and administering full National Health Insurance would be very high and the Government could not maintain the cost.

On the three major proposals for National Health Insurance, is there a possibility that they might take different portions of these bills and consolidate them? In learning of the contents of these bills, I think the Administration bill is the best, wherein the private insurance companies carry the insurance and the government subsidizes same.

#### SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

I heard a program on T.V. regarding Socialized Medicine in England. They discussed the program and stated that they were having problems pertaining to same. Each person has to pay \$2.00 per week for this service. The doctors in the program receive approximately \$13,000 per year. They went on to say that it is a very expensive program and that if the American Government (we have many more people to take care of than they have) went into socialized medicine it would be a very expensive undertaking and cost billions of dollars.

#### TAXES ON PROPERTY

People who own their own homes have a hard time paying taxes. Those persons having an income up to \$5,000 have a tax deduction. It would be a help if they would raise the income on this program so that more people could benefit thereby.

#### ACTION PROGRAM

Here are a few of the services on Action. This program was set up by President Nixon. These are very worthy programs.

1. Foster Grandparents: Serve in a variety of settings: pediatric wards of hospitals, institutions for mentally retarded, the physically handicapped correctional facilities, etc. Each grandparent is assigned two children and devotes two hours each day. The grandparent receives small benefits for this service.

2. RSVP: The Retired Senior Volunteer Program is a part of Action. You can contribute your time, experience, knowledge and interest to others in your community who need you.

3. Senior Companions: Congress passed a bill authorizing older people working for older people. They receive \$1.60 per hour, tax free.

Would it be possible or feasible to put all programs pertaining to the aged in one package or under one department?

This report covers some of my thoughts and opinions on these Federal activities.

#### REPORT OF COL. EMMANUEL SINGER

This report pertains to the reference title conducted in Washington, D.C., during early May 1974.

The observations, statements and questions of other participants in this symposium, the government designees assigned to render certain facts relating to legislation pertaining to senior citizens, is the basis for my opinion.

(1) It is my opinion that legislation related to the subject title cannot be put into active legislation for several years to come.

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

(2) National Health Insurance is the most important thought of senior citizens. Costs and care are the prime thought of our group, based upon discussions.

(3) If the three (3) bills now in discussion can be consolidated, that is, the workable good points of each bill incorporated into one bill, some headway will result.

(3) (a) The cost of financing and administering full maintenance of the requirements of senior citizens would be astronomical and possibly cannot be a function of government.

(3) (b) All persons eligible to participate in the overall benefits derived from legislation of the nature involved should be subject to pay amounts of money at regular periods, depending upon their respective age and earned income. Also included in payments to the government must be monies received from investments, regardless of the fact that the income results from tax exempt sources.

(3) (c) In England, and Sweden, government-financed socialized medicine, as it is termed, is not entirely successful. People are taking unnecessary advantage of the service by visiting doctors and medical facilities for the most minor or imaginary ailments. I feel that this condition would not occur if the public participated in the costs and that certain precautions be taken to prevent unwarranted visits.

(3) (d) I believe that the best way of handling a National Health Insurance program is by a legislative bill which would provide for the government to subsidize private insurance companies.

(3) (e) At the present time, the sole source of reimbursement for medical services is Medicare. The sixty dollars which must be paid by the individual before he or she is eligible for collecting monies is rather high. This amount should be reduced.

(3) (f) Some attempt should be made to reduce the cost of medical services. This I feel will be very difficult because of the effect it will have on the doctor's income. I know that the average doctor in England only earns approximately \$13,000 per year. This amount certainly is not adequate for physicians in this country.

(3) (g) I have reviewed, carefully, Publication RA413U.S.B., 74-87 ED entitled "National Health Insurance."

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

Regardless of the terminology, social security is an insurance policy in the form of annuity.

It provides a rather poor income for the low income individual, whereas the high income individual does not need its benefits. The middle strata, unless they have pension benefits are greatly affected.

I would recommend that those individuals who have large incomes, particularly those individuals with tax exempt incomes, be made to pay some amount towards increas-

ing the source of monies for use in the lower echelon of income.

#### TAXATION—SENIOR CITIZENS

I believe that this area could be the most advantageous help for the senior citizen. It would be more acceptable to the general public in that it would eliminate or reduce payments to senior citizens.

- (1) Give a greater tax allowance to those over 65 years of age.
- (2) Reduce the allowance on Medicare.
- (3) Eliminate through some means School taxes for those over 65 years of age.
- (4) Reduce property taxes for those over 65 years of age.
- (5) Give added deductions for medical needs not covered by Medicare.
- (6) Reduce by a ticket arrangement the cost of transportation and tax charges.
- (7) Reduce by a ticket the sales taxes.

I believe that if the area of taxes were reviewed that a considerable amount would be saved for use in other areas by the senior citizen.

#### LAISON OFFICE IN WASHINGTON

I believe that if a Liaison Office was formed here in Washington to coordinate the activities of all branches of the government the cost and the efficiency of legislation pertaining to senior citizens would be more productive.

This report covers my thoughts pertaining to Federal activities. There are many points that can be taken on a lower level, such as transportation, etc.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the special order taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER) today.

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

There was no objection.

#### BEEF INDUSTRY TROUBLES DESERVE IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the cattle industry in this country is facing a major crisis. Our Nation has long led the world in beef production and quality. The livestock industry of Kansas is the No. 1 industry insofar as my State's economy is concerned. Cattlemen from my congressional district and from over the State have sounded the alarm. At present, dire circumstances threaten this industry, and prompt action is imperative to prevent complete financial disaster.

There is little question that the price freeze last year was ill advised, and the resulting buyer boycott had serious impact on the cattle industry.

In response to the shortages of beef last summer, cattlemen increased production. At the same time, production costs to the industry rose dramatically—the result of inflationary conditions, the energy crisis, and increased transportation costs. Consumer purchase of beef, in this a land of many beef eaters, has

dropped off, and the industry is left with an oversupply of beef.

Fed cattle prices have declined severely since February. In February, the wholesale price of choice beef in the Midwest was a record 91 cents per pound. It is now about 65 cents a pound. Only yesterday, the price dropped 3½ cents a pound. While retail prices of beef have apparently started a slow decline, the decrease at the retail level is not as dramatic. The drop in retail prices from February to May has been less than 10 cents per pound.

The loss to the feeders is mounting daily, and is in excess of \$125 a head. The Agriculture Department's index of prices received by farmers fell 8 percent during the month ended May 15, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, the cattle industry is on the brink of financial disaster, through no fault of its own, and is sustaining losses which amount to over a quarter of a billion dollars per month. It is time to act now to protect this industry which is so vital to Kansas and the Nation.

On May 30, I joined with two of my colleagues in the Kansas delegation, Mr. SEBELIUS and Mr. SKUBITZ, in sponsoring legislation which would prohibit, for 180 days, the importation of beef into the United States.

Last December, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that meat import quotas, which the President suspended in 1973, would continue to be lifted for 1974. As required by law, the Secretary will review the situation every 3 months, at which time the suspension could be reconsidered.

I believe the situation is so serious now that Congress should insist that meat imports be stopped immediately, and that the halt be imposed for a long enough period to allow domestic supplies to come more in line with demand. Our bill calls for the embargo to continue for 180 days, or about 6 months.

Other colleagues in the House have introduced other legislation to help the cattle industry—to prevent importation of contaminated meat, and of meat slaughtered under inhumane conditions.

Legislation also has been introduced to provide for an insured loan fund to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration, to enable cattlemen to secure Government guaranteed or insured loans. Such a fund may well be necessary because many of these livestock people are confronted with disaster as great as any flood or tornado. I seriously doubt if concessionary interest subsidies would be in order, nor desired by cattlemen, but additional capital is the desirable goal of this bill.

It is essential that urban and rural interests alike unite to bolster this vital segment of the Nation's food industry.

While needed legislation should be moved on a priority basis through the appropriate committees, the Nation's food retailers can assume an important role.

The declining prices on the wholesale level must be reflected more dramatically and speedily at the retail level. As I previously stated, lower prices are not showing up as quickly as they should at the meat counter in many parts of the coun-

try. The housewife should be given a break in her family budget, and be encouraged to again include more beef on the family menu.

In this regard I have written to Clarence G. Adamy, president of the National Association of Food Chains, urging that all possible action be taken by the association to encourage its members to promote beef sales, and to pass on promptly wholesale price decreases. The association has cooperated fully in the past and its efforts can be a factor in bringing an upturn once again.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me reemphasize how vital this industry is to our Nation—how grave the current situation is—and how important it is that the Congress and the administration, as well as others in the food industry, act to provide relief to the beef industry.

#### STATES SHOW CONGRESS THE WAY TO CAMPAIGN REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, once again, the States are showing the way for the Federal Government in an important area of public policy, in this case the area of campaign reform.

On few issues in recent history has the Congress expended more time studying and investigating than on the proliferation of abuses and violations in political campaign practices, especially those dealing with campaign finances. A broad consensus exists, in and out of Congress, that major reforms are necessary, and a variety of such reforms are pending in legislative form. Yet, the Congress is strangely reluctant to act.

This preoccupation with symptoms at the expense of remedies stands in sharp contrast to the impressive record of constructive activity in most State capitals. According to the June 11 Wall Street Journal, no less than 67 campaign reform measures have been enacted by 40 State legislatures in the past 18 months. Those same 18 months have produced exactly nothing from the national legislature.

Despite the persistent myth that the Nation's talent and brains and concern are headquartered in Washington, this record once again illustrates the contrary fact: that the States have more than their share of these qualities and, more importantly, possess the indispensable commitment to respond positively to the well-founded concerns of their citizens.

Lest the Congress become forgetful of the fact, Mr. Speaker, those same citizens are also citizens of the United States and constituents of those who represent them in the Congress. If 40 State legislatures and 40 Governors have responded to citizen demands for cleaner elections, how long can we in Washington afford to ignore them?

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of the article from the Wall Street Journal written by that newspaper's Washington bureau chief, Norman C. Miller:



# CAMPAIGN CLEAN-UP IN THE STATES (By Norman C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The Watergate-inspired reform effort to reduce the influence of money and secrecy in government is making significant progress in some strange quarters.

With little national notice, state legislatures, long known as breeding grounds of corruption, have passed a remarkable array of reform laws during the last 18 months. As many as 67 reform measures—dealing with campaign finance, ethical standards for officeholders and requirements for open meetings by governmental units—have been enacted by 40 legislatures, according to Common Cause, the self-styled citizens' lobby.

While the quality of the reforms obviously is uneven, the record of the legislatures is impressive as a whole. In the key area of campaign finance, for example, 25 states have enacted new laws requiring disclosure of, or limits on, campaign contributions, while also imposing some curbs on spending by candidates. Eight of these states have further authorized experiments with public financing of campaigns. Perhaps most importantly, many of the states have established independent commissions to enforce the reform laws; it was lack of effective police power that made a practical nullity of many earlier efforts to clear up political financing.

## ACTION IN SEATTLE

The reform movement got a further lift last week when the nation's governors, at their annual conference in Seattle, called on "all levels of government" to enact comprehensive "clean government" measures. Among other things, the governors endorsed: broad campaign finance reforms, including experiments with public financing; ethical codes for public officials, including disclosure of their personal finances; open meetings of all public bodies; registration of lobbyists, coupled with "full disclosure" of their activities.

The governors passed their resolution just a day after voters in California overwhelmingly approved a proposition on the primary ballot, putting into effect the toughest set of campaign and lobbying restrictions yet enacted. In addition to strict contribution, spending and disclosure rules for campaign financing, the new California law hits hard at traditionally powerful lobbying groups. The measure sharply limits direct spending for lobbying and requires disclosure of those outlays that are permitted. And its most controversial section flatly forbids registered lobbyists from making campaign contributions.

The upsurge of activity at the state level is in striking contrast to the inaction in Congress. There is no serious consideration there of reform of loophole-ridden lobbying regulations that now allow the most powerful interests, both business and labor-oriented, to escape detailed public scrutiny of their efforts to influence legislation. And while the Senate has passed bills to reform campaign financing on three separate occasions, key members of the House seem determined to stall the legislation to death if they can get away with it.

Campaign-finance legislation has been languishing in the House Administration Committee for fully 18 months. Chairman Wayne Hays, an Ohio Democrat who scorns reform, waited until last October to even begin public hearings. It took the committee another eight weeks to conduct just six hearings. Almost four more months passed before the panel started bill-drafting sessions in late March.

Only nine working sessions of about two hours each have been held since March. The last four sessions scheduled by the committee were abandoned for lack of a quorum. After all this time, the committee has "worked" its way through less than 10 pages of a 30-page draft bill. Now, with the impeachment crisis

threatening to block all legislation that hasn't cleared committees within a month or six weeks, the campaign-finance legislation is in increasing danger of dying.

That would be no accident. The Senate-passed legislation contains a number of proposals that Rep. Hays and many other House members dislike intensely. One is a provision allowing public financing of congressional primary and general election campaigns; House members fear this would guarantee that they would face strong opponents, while also diminishing other advantages incumbents enjoy. Another is a plan for an independent commission to enforce campaign rules; House members like the existing cozy set-up that gives police power to employees of Congress—who are hardly of a mind to be tough on their bosses. And there is fierce resistance in the House to proposals for disclosure of members' personal finances.

While the House undoubtedly can stall campaign reforms to death if it wishes, the experience at the state level suggests that Congressmen may be underrating the public demand for thorough-going reform in the wake of the Watergate scandals. The reform proposition in California passed last week by better than 2 to 1; so did similar plans approved earlier by voters in Colorado and Washington state. Many of the legislatures that enacted reform bills did not do so because their members were extra-virtuous, but simply because they were prodded into action by Common Cause and similar public-interest lobbies.

Indeed, it was ironic that at the Seattle conference several governors grumbled about the very reform measures that do-good outfits like Common Cause have applauded the states for enacting. Republican Governor Jack Williams of Arizona complained that too many reforms were based on a "presumption of guilt instead of innocence" of politicians. Democrat William Waller of Mississippi denounced the resolution endorsing a reform package as a "demeaning and debilitating" idea.

But most of the governors have found it impolitic to resist the reform movement. Several of the most widely respected governors, like Democrats Reubin Askew of Florida and Patrick Lucey of Wisconsin and Republicans William Milliken of Michigan and Dan Evans of Washington, have identified themselves strongly with the reform movement and reaped political benefits as a consequence.

Many members of Congress, on the other hand, appear willing to take the risk that the public doesn't care much about legislation aimed at cleaning up the political process. That is a high-risk bet, especially since Common Cause and other public-interest groups are gearing up to focus attention on reform issues in the fall campaign. "In effect, we are going to become a campaign organization in September and October" and "take incumbents to task on the reform issues," says Thomas Belden, director of state activities for Common Cause.

## GOVERNOR NOEL'S WARNING

It is probable that public pressure ultimately will persuade Congress to enact campaign-finance reforms and perhaps others as well. A deeper question is whether new laws will make much difference. Philip Noel, the Democratic governor of Rhode Island, properly warns that people shouldn't be "de-luded" that enactment of reform laws will "insure integrity in government."

Strict laws certainly won't do that, but there is reason to expect that they will establish a framework in which it will be harder for shady politics to flourish.

Thus, open meetings do not rule out dirty political deals, but they do make it tougher to bring them off. Campaign contribution limits, disclosure rules and candidate-spending curbs don't guarantee election of honest men, but they do tend to curb undue influ-

ence of moneyed groups. Changing to public financing of elections isn't a panacea either, but it would further diminish the power of money to corrupt politics. Strict regulation of lobbyists wouldn't prevent big interests from wielding a lot of clout, but it would tend to restrain questionable uses of power.

Fred Wertheimer, the legislative director of Common Cause, sums up the potential of the reform bills well: "This is not an attempt to legislate morality," he says. "It is an attempt to set ground rules for the way people conduct public affairs," and those ground rules alone can result in a "fundamental and profound difference" in political behavior.

## FAIR PLAY

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, not long ago, one of my colleagues accused the Justice Department of not being diligent in the investigation and prosecution of persons suspected of being Nazi war criminals. The Justice Department responded in part by releasing a list of 37 persons who were under investigation.

Among these individuals was a man I have known for a long time, Dr. Hubertus Strughold. This man is a distinguished scientist of international reputation. He has not spent his life skulking about odd corners of the world, or dwelling in the shadows of our society; far from hiding, he has been an active and highly visible person for years. More than that, he has been an active and highly visible person for years. More than that, he has been a citizen for 18 years, and he has been through not only the investigations required to become a citizen, but also through all the processes needed to obtain high Government security clearances. This is hardly the kind of life a man would choose to lead if he had anything to hide.

Yet this man stands accused. I don't know what he is accused of. I have no indication that the Government is prepared to take any action against him. And therefore this man, like every other citizen, has the right to have his name and reputation protected until and unless the Government is prepared to charge him and take the case to court.

Not one of us here would say that investigating agencies have a right to reveal the names of people that are being investigated, unless those agencies have a case. If they have a case, they can take it to court. Otherwise, citizens have the right to have their privacy protected and respected.

Dr. Strughold has the right to have his name protected, unless he is charged with some crime. If he is not so charged, and he may never be, the Government has no right to release his name and damage his reputation.

We have seen too much violation of due process and respect for individual rights by zealots in this administration. It is not excusable or forgivable, and ought not to be tolerated.

Surely the Government has an obligation to seek out people suspected of crimes, and especially war crimes. But in its zeal it also has an obligation to protect individual rights and liberty, for

otherwise it is no better than the oppressors we all abhor.

Dr. Strughold has earned the respect of a wide circle of scientists and laymen. He has performed services of profound importance. Such a man surely deserves fair play.

I include the following article:

**THE STRUGHOLD INQUIRY A FOOLISH TIME WASTER**

Dr. Hubertus Strughold said this week that an investigation to see whether he was a Nazi war criminal is "idiotic."

Upon long and sober reflection, we have concluded that his word is as good as there is.

We have been associated on numerous occasions with the physician-teacher-researcher since he became "our German space scientist" just after World War II. We have read many of his essays and articles on space medicine and space flight. We have heard him many times, making speeches, making conversation and thinking out loud.

He is a scholar and a gentleman and has been an outstanding American citizen since he was naturalized 18 years ago. We have heard him express his concern for the fate of East Germans under Soviet domination. We have heard him recall his teaching days in Germany. He has an interesting theory, he is fond of recalling, about the evils of "civilization" that regiments people (a very anti-Nazi notion, to be sure). He has said "civilization" has suppressed the siesta, a natural sleep cycle at mid-day that corresponds to a natural wake cycle shortly before dawn.

He declined to be regimented, even to the point of accepting the rigors of Daylight Saving Time! He became President Eisenhower's consultant on the biological clock—the workings of jet lag on world diplomacy.

He took up space medicine as a research interest when he wondered what useful purposes might be found in treating bodily ills absent pressure—in a weightless circumstance. That led him to a natural alliance with rocket pioneers, to high-altitude flight and—eventually—to the U.S. Air Force's School of Aviation Medicine at Randolph AFB and later at Aerospace Medical Division, USAF, at Brooks AFB prior to his retirement three years ago.

Dr. Strughold was cleared through rigorous inquiry when he took an Air Force job after the war. He has handled his responsibilities well. He is honored among his colleagues and those who know him well.

The Nazi war crimes charge was resurrected by Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman, D-N.Y., who said investigation of some 37 persons in the U.S. alleged to have been involved with Nazis prior to 1945, had been lax. When a member of Congress raises enough sand, from somewhere within the bureaucracy must come a response.

The response is that Dr. Strughold has no war crimes record, that he passed the required screening, and that proving any thing at this late date would be a "monumental" task, anyway.

"Idiotic" seems accurate enough way to dismiss the unfortunate affair.

**LAND-USE SETBACK**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed by the action taken by the House yesterday when it voted 211 to 204 to defeat the rule to allow the House to consider H.R. 10294, the Land Use Plan-

ning Act of 1974. The opponents of this measure were well organized and deliberately distorted the purposes of the land use planning legislation. In this respect, they were aided and abetted by the President and his Secretary of the Interior. Although we previously were told that land use planning ranked as the administration's No. 1 environmental proposal for the last 2 years, Mr. Nixon switched sides, and one can only speculate about his devious motives for selling out to the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the use of our land not only affects the natural environment but shapes the pattern of our daily lives. Yet, land use is the single most important element affecting the quality of our environment which remains substantially unaddressed as a matter of national policy. As a cosponsor of H.R. 10294, I believed that the Land Use Planning Act was a reasonable proposal designed to cope with the burgeoning growth for land and natural resources.

In the beginning of our Nation, the land and all its vast resources seemed to be endless. But we have come to realize that the land is finite, and an increasing population and the expanding demand for the land and its resources have created a desperate need to determine the best purpose for which the land should be utilized. There is an obvious necessity to plan for the more rational use of land to meet our present and future growth and development in a manner more orderly and timely than the approach we followed, for example, with the explosive post World War II expansion. For many areas of our country, however, this awareness that land planning may be required has come too late. Ill planned and unwise development has resulted in urban sprawl and degradation of the countryside.

As land use increasingly becomes the focus for conflicts over National, State, regional and local goals, we can only view with dismay the chaotic, short-term, crisis-by-crisis, case-by-case approach characterizing much of the present day land use decisionmaking which further fails to relate one development to another or to the larger environment. Unless our land use decisionmaking processes are vastly improved at all levels of government, the United States will be unable to meet the rapidly emerging land use crisis.

A quiet revolution in land use controls already is taking place in many of our local and State governments and there is an urgency to enact Federal legislation, notwithstanding yesterday's setback, to assist State and local governments to improve their land use planning and management capability as well as providing policy guidelines for the management of Federal lands that equal one-third of the area of our Nation. H.R. 10294 would have authorized the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to guidelines issued by the Council on Environmental Quality, to make grants to assist the States to develop and implement comprehensive land use planning processes as well as to provide land use planning directives for the public lands. It was not the purpose of this measure, as

opponents would have had us believe, to impose land use decisions on the States and local governments from Washington. Rather, H.R. 10294 was intended to be a legislative device to establish a mechanism whereby and through which balanced and relevant land use decisions may be made and reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, many Members, particularly those who serve on the Interior Committee, worked long and hard for the Land Use Planning Act. Particular recognition, however, must be paid to our distinguished colleague from Arizona and chairman of the House Interior Subcommittee on the Environment, Mr. UDALL, who steadfastly and tenaciously guided the land use legislation through the Interior Committee. I share his deep disappointment regarding the House's failure to act on H.R. 10294.

Mr. Speaker, while opponents of land use cheer the defeat of this legislation, it is, for them, a hollow victory. Rather than support legislation which is responsive to our various social and economic needs and which will preserve and enhance the most valuable assets of our natural environment, they have chosen to support the present chaotic land use conditions which continue to abuse the American land.

**THE ECONOMY: A TIME FOR CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP**

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, the malignancy of inflation eats away at all of us. Decent, hard-working, and self-sufficient citizens are finding it increasingly difficult to secure basic necessities—food, fuel, and housing—in the face of inflation in excess of 13 percent per annum. No tax program we could devise would be as regressive and cruel in application as inflation itself.

Utah's Gov. Calvin Rampton recently remarked at the National Governor's Conference:

Inflation leads all the other concerns of the people by so far that there is really no other problem in the same league.

But when Americans desperately search for solutions to cope with rising prices, they find a supply shortage which is even more critical in its effect than shortages in food and fuel. We are confronted with a severe shortage of economic leadership. Five years of Nixonomics have produced catastrophic results.

Inflation was increasing at a 4.7 percent annual rate in 1968. Today it is rising by 13.2 percent. The average worker's real spendable income has fallen more than 7 percent since October 1972, and it is actually lower today than it was when Mr. Nixon took office.

Unemployment registered 3.6 percent in 1968. Now it is 5.2 percent. The number of persons unemployed has almost doubled, from 2.8 million to 4.5 million.

Real annual growth in gross national product was 4.7 percent in 1968. In 1974



it is 0.5 percent. The productivity increase rate was 3.5 percent in 1968. Today it is minus 5.5 percent.

Wealth at the rate of \$10 billion annually is now being transferred from the lowest three-fifths of our income groups to the richest one-fifth. Fewer than 1 percent of the American people own half of all the corporate stock, and corporate profits increased 36 percent from 1971 to 1973. Meanwhile, the family trying to make ends meet on \$12,600 a year had to pay an additional \$1,200 in 1973 just to maintain the living standards of 1972. That family had to spend \$402 more on fuel, \$165 more for housing, and \$57 more for clothing.

Americans do not face this problem alone. Inflation is a worldwide phenomenon, complicated by real and manufactured shortages of raw materials and the dangerous prospect of a worldwide food shortage. The immediate cause of the most recent inflationary surge is principally a matter of excess demand coupled with shortages in food, fuel, and other raw materials. While inflationary pressures from food and fuel prices appear to be abating somewhat, new upward pressure on prices due to higher labor costs must be expected as workers attempt to regain the income they had last year. In addition, nonfood and non-energy prices have recently been rising at an annual rate of more than 10 percent, indicating that inflation has spread throughout almost all sectors of the economy.

At the same time economic indicators continue to suggest a deteriorating situation. Mr. Nixon informed us in a recent radio message that the worst is behind us in terms of inflation. But on the very next day, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Dr. Arthur Burns, said that the inflation at the present rate could threaten the very foundations of our economy. Mr. Nixon continues to depend on forecasts, expectations, hopes, studies, and voluntarism to justify his optimism that the worst is behind us.

We are faced with the frightening condition that in the highest levels of Government there is no agreement on where inflation is going or how it can be controlled. It is conspicuous that within the administration, the most optimistic views belong to those people who are not economists. And since there is no agreement within the administration regarding the future course of inflation, it is hardly surprising that there is also no agreement about the remedy.

The administration is relying on the highest interest rates since the Civil War as its chief weapon against inflation. Reliance strictly on tight monetary policy reflects a paucity of ideas in the Nixon administration. This has left the Federal Reserve to carry on the battle almost singlehandedly.

We must not allow ourselves to be trapped in one-dimensional economics. President Nixon seems unable or unwilling to exercise leadership. Clearly, any leadership in the economic area must come from Congress. I have no magic formula to halt inflation dead in its tracks. But I do have some positive sug-

gestions designed to moderate inflation and restore earning power.

**First. Moderate credit expansion—**Rapid money expansion could generate more inflation, and this in the long run further raises interest rates. A moderate rate of growth must therefore be pursued. However, interest-sensitive sectors such as housing and small business must be protected by channeling credit in their direction and away from less desirable uses such as export subsidies for commodities in short domestic supply.

**Second. Increase supplies and stabilize prices—**Today's inflation is different in that it reflects to an unprecedented degree the growing world shortages of key commodities. Measures must be taken to directly increase supplies of basic commodities to stabilize or reduce prices, regardless of the pain caused to special interests. We can increase the supply of scarce materials and forestall future shortages through advance planning and sensible import, export, subsidy, and market policies.

**Third. Public service jobs to reduce unemployment—**The present unemployment rate of 5 percent is way above any definition of full employment and is not acceptable. We must fight unemployment through jobs by expanding public service employment in health, public safety, mass transportation, environment, education, and inner city problems. Such jobs are the least costly, least inflationary, and least energy consuming. Creating 500,000 public service jobs would cost about \$3.5 billion per year, which could be recouped by making cuts from excessive capital-intensive programs in the Nixon budget, such as military and foreign aid expenditures.

**Fourth. Tax relief, tax reform—**Low- and middle-income groups have been forced to bear a disproportionate burden of inflation. I support tax relief aimed specifically at low- and middle-income people by granting a partial cost-of-living adjustment to those hardest hit by rising prices and taxes. The battle against unemployment and high prices will be a long one. An unfair tax burden is clearly within our power to rectify now.

Tax relief means more money in the worker's pocket. It can help persuade the worker to moderate his demands for a large or unreasonable wage increase. Such relief could take several forms: First, reducing the employee's payroll tax; second, increasing the income tax standard deduction and low-income allowance; three, changing the personal income tax deduction to a tax credit.

To avoid excessive fiscal stimulus, the cost of tax relief should be offset—partly through increased Federal revenues due to increased economic activity, but mainly through effective tax reform. For example, Congress should immediately end the special tax favors conferred on the oil industry.

I have outlined in a speech appearing in the April 11, 1974, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10 basic revisions of our tax code which would increase Federal revenues by \$10 billion this year, help balance the budget, and permit some tax relief for lower and middle-income groups.

The effect of this tax relief-tax reform proposal is twofold. First, pressures for inflationary wage increases will be moderated, heading off serious new inflation. Second, this new spending power will start our economy toward more growth. All of this is accomplished without new Government spending, without increasing the deficit, and without unnecessary fiscal stimulus.

**Fifth. Stabilize food prices—**Food is a key cause of inflation. Food prices increased by 20 percent last year. If the weather holds up, food harvests look good for this year. For example, our harvest of grains and soybeans should be 14 percent above the 1973 level. However, food prices, even with record crops, are estimated to go up by 12 percent this year.

Increasing food prices must be halted. The Agriculture Department must continue to monitor food exports to assure adequate domestic supplies. We must stop selling our food abroad, to the Soviet Union or anyone else, if these sales create shortages which lead to unreasonable food prices for the American family. Furthermore, we must encourage increased production by intensifying programs for agriculture research and development and by providing effective production incentives.

**Sixth. Stabilize fuel prices—**The need to deal with fuel prices is even more urgent. The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee reports that price increases for petroleum products since January of 1973 are costing consumers a conservatively estimated \$35.5 billion per year. This is the wallop that is causing much of our inflation as it increases the cost of gasoline, electricity, and heating oil.

We must meet the chief cause of inflation head on by rolling back oil prices. As the devastating effect of inflation becomes more obvious, perhaps the administration will abandon its policy of protecting oil company profits and permit an oil price rollback.

The following table lists the profit increases for the major oil companies for the first quarter of 1974:

*First quarter 1974 profit increases over first quarter 1973  
(In percent)*

Exxon	39
Texaco	123
Gulf	76
Mobil	66
Shell	52
Standard (Ind.)	81
Standard (Cal.)	92
Continental	130
Occidental Petroleum	178

Such a price rollback can be large enough to take the push out of inflation caused by energy prices without decreasing the incentive to find more sources of oil. We could roll back oil prices by \$3 per barrel—to \$7.09 per barrel—and still be at a level which William Simon says will bring forth as much new production as we can reasonably expect to get.

**Seventh. Strict antitrust enforcement—**The Government must conduct a continuing review of the effect of economic concentration and anti-competitive practices on inflation. A market eco-

nomy requires competition which is free of monopoly power. We have witnessed a growth of undue concentration of economic power in several lines of the economy. Concentrated industries are insulated from traditional price competition, and many of them are so highly integrated vertically that they are even free from the threat of new entry. Firms with market power enjoy the capability of restricting output and maintaining high prices in the face of declining demand. This phenomenon is a significant factor contributing to inflation.

Government agencies charged with preventing private monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade fail to effectively enforce the antitrust laws. For 5 years the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has not fulfilled its mandate to preserve, foster, and restore competition. The division has failed to address the significant economic concentration in our society and has expended its resources in attacking relatively less significant antitrust transgressions. This emphasis cannot be allowed to continue. Competition must be restored as the basic principle governing the allocation of resources and determination of prices.

The market mechanism is the most efficient system for the production and distribution of goods and services. Restoration of free market principles must be the overriding consideration in our formulation of economic policy.

**Eighth. Revitalize small business—**Small business encompasses over 95 percent of American business, employs more than 50 million Americans, and produces 40 percent of the GNP. Small business is essential to the economic foundation of our society. The small business community is currently straining to cope with higher taxes, higher interest rates, increased wage rates, paperwork burden, tighter Federal regulations, and most important, inflation. The Federal Government must do all it can to improve the small businessman's chances for successful operation and growth.

Concern for the small business community is imperative to recognize their special problems. In a society where preoccupation with giant corporations, conglomerates, and big unions takes precedence, revitalization of the small business community is needed to maintain the viability of a historically vital sector of the American economy.

**Ninth. Reduce Government spending—**Many experts cite excessive Government spending as a principal cause of inflation. I agree. Government spending in the last 5 years has increased 50 percent. The Nixon Presidency has piled up cumulative deficits of about \$120 billion, the highest of any peacetime administration in history. Over the past 5 years, the Congress has trimmed more than \$19 billion from President Nixon's appropriations requests. I came very close to voting a balanced budget my first year in Congress. If all of my appropriations votes had prevailed last year, Congress would have cut the President's fiscal 1974 budget by \$8.6 billion.

We need to cut unnecessary government spending—especially military

spending, which is highly inflationary. For example, we now grant military foreign aid to at least 40 countries. It not only burdens the American taxpayer, it increases world tensions. This year the President has asked for \$5.2 billion in foreign aid. The request for military assistance is \$1.9 billion. This time of roaring inflation is no time to increase foreign and military aid. Congress must exercise spending restraint in these and other areas to counter inflationary trends.

#### CONCLUSION

Public leaders must recognize the enormous damage that prolonged inflation would inflict on our country. I reject the administration's passive attitude toward an economic crisis which is undermining the expectations and quality of life of millions of average income Americans—at least two-thirds of the Nation. People lose their jobs, the cruel tax of uncontrolled inflation shrinks individual buying power, many citizens remain in poverty, misallocation of wealth to the rich continues and accelerates, small businessmen are forced out of business, the tax system remains unjust and unfair, and our economy becomes less free and more regulated every day. Promises like those of the President's Council of Economic Advisors that inflation will drop from 12 to 7 percent during the coming year will be a cruel joke to people living on the edge of economic disaster.

If the Government will commit itself to provide jobs, improve purchasing power, stabilize food and fuel prices, implement fairer tax distribution, enforce the antitrust laws, cut Government spending, and channel credit where it is needed, wage earners will have a valid reason to moderate their requests for pay increases. We have a program to slow inflation, increase growth, and maintain the U.S. economy as the strongest instrument for efficient resource allocation and distribution in the world.

#### SEMINARS ON BANK SECRECY—A JUNKET TO THE EDGE OF THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a "tax haven conference" was just held in Paris. The same "seminar service" plans an identical conference to be held at the Okura Hotel in Amsterdam on October 14, 15, and 16. At present the following panel discussions are being planned for the Amsterdam Conference:

- Creating trusts and similar entities.
- Investing in real estate.
- Shipping companies and shipping registrations.
- Continental European financial centers and tax havens.
- Channel Islands.
- Caribbean tax havens.
- Pacific Basin tax havens.

I might add that if one is a tax lawyer or adviser, the cost of such a "seminar" might well be deductible—a further insult to the American public and Treasury! It is incredible that tax laws permit a tax

deductible trip for a course in tax avoidance.

A second pamphlet from this "tax service" company, invites one—for a moderate fee—to spend June 20 and 21 at Le Grand Hotel in Paris to hear experts speak on the topic of "Bank Secrecy: Switzerland and Other Countries."

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this conference is being organized for the benefit of the world's law enforcement officers. I believe that it is a seminar program to help tax lawyers and advisers discuss grey areas of the law—to help them advise their clients on how to bury money and promote a flight from taxation. I know that there are troubles with our present Bank Secrecy Act, but the type of flaunting of "Swiss numbered accounts" provided by this "seminar" pamphlet surely requires some form of international tax treaty action.

I would like to include portions of the pamphlet in the RECORD at this point. I debated on whether or not to include the name of the seminar "service" and the speakers, since I do not want to increase their business. But those who seek to bury large fortunes in Swiss accounts have enough wealth to know about this type of "service." They have enough money to hire the fancy international lawyers to handle their money.

But the vast majority of the American public and the Congress have no idea of the dimension of this problem—a dollar outflow and tax avoidance estimated to run into the billions. Therefore, I will include names, dates, and places, to put some reality around the little known world of Swiss banking gnomes and numbered accounts.

It might be wise for the Treasury and Justice Departments to send representatives! We cannot combat tax evasion and illegal bank flows unless we know what the avoiders know!

Portions of the "seminar" pamphlet follow:

#### BANK SECRECY: SWITZERLAND AND OTHER COUNTRIES

(Programme sponsored by The Institute For International Learning and Portfolio & Fund Guide International—Paris: 20, 21 June, 1974, Le Grand Hotel)

#### BANK SECRECY

##### Switzerland and other countries

The Chairman and almost all of the speakers of this Conference have previously lectured on this very important subject a number of times in the U.S.A.

This Conference will cover the background of the law of banking and economic confidentiality in Switzerland.

Special emphasis will be placed in the very recent changes in Swiss Law, Administrative Decisions and Treaties.

It will further cover banking secrecy in countries other than Switzerland, including the major European countries such as Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, etc., and smaller jurisdictions such as Liechtenstein, Panama, Singapore, New Hebrides, Lebanon and Indonesia.

It will include the specific relationship between countries with total, partial or no bank secrecy.

It will further discuss possibilities of obtaining foreign exchange in specific jurisdictions as well as the exchange of information in criminal and other matters.

Paris is very busy in June, and we have reserved only a limited number of rooms at



the Grand Hotel. Therefore, we suggest you fill in and return the registration form as soon as possible.

#### Programme

Thursday, 20th June

9:30 a.m.—12:30 p.m.

Swiss Banking and Economic Confidentiality  
Background of the law of banking and the protection of economic secrets in Switzerland.

The Bank accounts.

Limitations on disclosure of the banking secret in civil and criminal courts and in administrative proceedings.

Specific problems with respect to foreign banks doing business in Switzerland.

Controlling policies affecting Swiss Banks doing business in other countries.

Panel discussion—questions and answers.

12:30 p.m. lunch

2:30–5:30 p.m.

Banking Secrecy in Countries Other Than Switzerland

Private versus official inquiries.

In depth study of different groups of countries.

1. Germany, Austria, Netherlands.
2. Belgium, France, Luxemburg.
3. Italy.
4. Liechtenstein, Panama, Bahamas, Singapore, New Hebrides, Lebanon, Indonesia.

Panel discussion—questions and answers.

Friday, 21st June

9:30 a.m.—12:30 p.m.

Specific Application of American Law to Bank Secrecy in Other Countries

Conflicts of law generally with respect to secrecy of foreign accounts.

United States Regulation of its nationals abroad in violation of laws of host countries.

Powers to compel production of records in the United States from foreign branch.

Use of secret foreign bank accounts to violate United States laws and efforts at its inhibition.

1. Electronic data processing and retrieval.
  2. Statute and regulation requiring record keeping and reporting.
  3. Resident Revenue representatives.
  4. Exchange of information among sovereigns pursuant to treaty and understandings.
- Jurisdictional and procedural questions with respect to inquiry by another country into a Swiss bank secret.

1. In criminal matters.

2. In administration of estates.

Panel discussion—questions and answers.

12:30 p.m. Lunch

2:30–5:30 p.m.

Secrecy, Blocked Funds and International Transactions

Some practical aspects of bank secrecy and confidential accounts.

Various categories of blocked accounts, their use and marketability.

Significance of clearing and bilateral accounts.

Movements of "flight capital" and its effect on balance of payments.

Panel discussion—questions and answers.

#### FACULTY

Chairman

Boris Kostelanetz—Law firm of Kostelanetz & Ritholz, New York City; Formerly Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the U.S.; Co-Author of Criminal Aspects of Tax Fraud Cases.

#### Speakers

Maurice Aubert—Member of the Geneva Bar; Manager of the legal department, Hentsch & Co., Geneva; Partner of Messrs. Hentsch & Co., 1968; Author of a number of articles on Bank Secrecy.

Nicholas L. Deak—Doctor of Philosophy, University of Neuchatel, Switzerland; Founder and President of Deak and Co., Inc. which includes Perera Company, Inc.; Member of the faculty of the American Bankers Association.

Jules Ritholz—Law firm of Kostelanetz & Ritholz, New York City; Former Chairman, Committee on Civil and Criminal Tax Penalties, Tax Section, ABA.

Ernest C. Stiefel—Past Chairman: Committee on Foreign and International Law, New York County Lawyers' Association; Committee on European Law of the American Bar Association; Adviser: Journal of International Law and Policies (N.Y.U.).

Stephan Trechsel—Public Prosecutor, Bern; Lecturer at the University of Bern Law School.

#### JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1974

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to announce that on June 6, 1974, the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities favorably reported to the House Committee on Education and Labor, H.R. 15276, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

This bill reflects the deep and growing commitment of the subcommittee membership to improve the quality of life for all youth of our Nation. It is a strengthened version of H.R. 6265, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

We are particularly pleased that H.R. 15276 carries the cosponsorship of eight of our distinguished colleagues, Ms. CHISHOLM, Ms. MINK, Messrs. PERKINS, BELL, STEIGER of Wisconsin, Esch, CLAY, and BENITEZ.

A companion bill, S. 821, which was introduced under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH M. BAYH, was recently favorably reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. It is now awaiting action by the Senate. The intensity, discipline, and compassionate commitment of Senator BAYH to this area is too well-known for me to adequately describe at this time.

Mr. Speaker, while the most valuable resource of this great Nation is its youth, juveniles commit almost half the crimes committed in this Nation. Existing Federal programs for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency are fragmented and uncoordinated. Only about 15 percent of the law enforcement administration's moneys and only about \$10 million of HEW's delinquency prevention efforts are expended for this purpose.

With broad bipartisan support, H.R. 15276 seeks to provide strong Federal leadership in dealing with this important national problem which is siphoning off the future leaders of this Nation.

A major feature of this bill, over and above providing the beginnings of adequate resources to meet this problem, is its attempt to coordinate Federal efforts in the field of juvenile delinquency. It requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to report to the Presi-

dent and the Congress on how existing Federal juvenile delinquency programs could be strengthened and for the President to report to the Congress on the implementation of these recommendations.

Second, through a juvenile delinquency development statement, each Federal agency is required to report to the Secretary and then to the Congress on the extent to which the programs of the concerned agency further the goals and policies of Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

Third, a Coordinating Council on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, with Cabinet-level officers' participation as well as public membership, is established with broadened responsibility, authority, and resources to replace the Interdepartmental Council for the Coordination of all Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs. The Interdepartmental Council has failed to meet its legislative mandate because of minimal support on the highest levels of our Nation and inadequate authority and responsibility.

Fourth, an Institute for the Continuing Studies of the Prevention of Juvenile Justice, developed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) would provide the necessary training, evaluation, research, demonstration, and technical and informational services which have been sadly lacking in this area.

Fifth, a Federal assistance program to deal with the problems of runaway youth and their families, a concern of many of our distinguished colleagues, has been incorporated into the act. This title authorizes the Secretary to make grants to localities and private agencies for the development of programs and services for youth and their families outside the law enforcement and juvenile justice system. It also directs the Secretary to conduct a statistical survey on the characteristics of runaway youth and their relationship to antisocial behavior.

This bill authorizes an annual appropriation of \$75 million for fiscal years 1975 and 1976; \$125 million for fiscal year 1977; and \$175 million for fiscal year 1978. Of these amounts, not more than 5 percent may be appropriated for the Administration and not more than 10 percent may be appropriated for the Institute. In addition, \$10 million is authorized for the grant program and \$500,000 is authorized for the survey and reporting program of the Runaway Youth Act for each of the fiscal years 1975, 1976, and 1977. Such sums as may be necessary are authorized for the purposes of the Coordinating Council.

Mr. Speaker, I insert H.R. 15276, as favorably reported by the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities, in the RECORD:

H.R. 15276

A bill to provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974".

## FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) juveniles account for almost half the arrests for serious crimes in the United States today;

(2) understaffed, overcrowded juvenile courts, probation services, and correctional facilities are not able to provide individualized justice or effective help;

(3) present juvenile courts, foster and protective care programs, and shelter facilities are inadequate to meet the needs of the countless neglected, abandoned, and dependent children, who, because of this failure to provide effective services, may become delinquents;

(4) existing programs have not adequately responded to the particular problems of the increasing numbers of young people who are addicted to or who abuse drugs, particularly nonopiate or polydrug abusers;

(5) juvenile delinquency can be prevented through programs designed to keep students in elementary and secondary schools through the prevention of unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

(6) States and local communities which experience directly the devastating failures of the juvenile justice system do not presently have sufficient technical expertise or adequate resources to deal comprehensively with the problems of juvenile delinquency;

(7) the adverse impact of juvenile delinquency results in enormous annual cost and immeasurable loss in human life, personal security, and wasted human resources;

(8) existing Federal programs have not provided the direction, coordination, resources, and leadership required to meet the crisis of delinquency; and

(9) juvenile delinquency constitutes a growing threat to the national welfare requiring immediate, comprehensive, and effective action by the Federal Government.

## PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to provide the necessary resources, leadership, and coordination to develop and implement effective methods of preventing and treating juvenile delinquency;

(2) to increase the capacity of State and local governments and public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations to conduct innovative, effective delinquency prevention and treatment programs and to provide useful research, evaluation, and training services in the area of juvenile delinquency;

(3) to develop and implement effective programs and services to divert juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system and to increase the capacity of State and local governments to provide critically needed alternatives to institutionalization;

(4) to develop and encourage the implementation of national standards for the administration of juvenile justice, including recommendations for administrative, budgetary, and legislative action at the Federal, State, and local level to facilitate the adoption of such standards;

(5) to establish a centralized research effort on the problems of juvenile delinquency, including an information clearinghouse to disseminate the findings of such research and all data related to juvenile delinquency;

(6) to provide for the thorough and prompt evaluation of all federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs;

(7) to provide technical assistance to public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals in developing and implementing juvenile delinquency programs;

(8) to assist States and local communities with resources to develop and implement programs to keep students in elementary and secondary schools and to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

(9) to establish training programs for persons, including professionals, paraprofessionals, and volunteers, who work with delinquents or potential delinquents or whose work or activities relate to juvenile delinquency programs;

(10) to establish a new Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide direction, coordination, and review of all federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs;

(11) to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, to further the purposes of this Act; and

(12) to establish a Federal assistance program to deal with the problems of runaway youth.

## DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "community-based" means a small, open group home or other suitable place located near the juvenile's home or family and programs of community supervision and service which maintain community and consumer participation in the planning, operation, and evaluation of their programs which may include medical, educational, vocational, social, and psychological guidance, training, counseling, drug treatment, and other rehabilitative services;

(2) the term "construction" means acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings, or any combination of such activities (including architects' fees but not the cost of acquisition of land for buildings);

(3) the term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house such machinery, utilities, or equipment;

(4) the term "juvenile delinquency program" means any program or activity related to juvenile delinquency prevention, control, diversion, treatment, rehabilitation, planning, education, training, and research, including drug abuse programs, the improvement of the juvenile justice system, and any program or activity for neglected, abandoned, or dependent youth and other youth who are in danger of becoming delinquent;

(5) the term "local government" means any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State, and an Indian tribe and any combination of two or more of such units acting jointly;

(6) the term "public agency" means any State, unit of local government, combination of such States or units, or any department, agency, or instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

(7) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(8) the term "State" means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(9) the term "Federal agency" means any agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government;

(10) the term "drug dependent" has the meaning given it by section 2(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 (g));

(11) the term "Administration" means the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Administration established by section 101(a);

(12) the term "Director" means the Director of the Administration;

(13) the term "State agency" means an agency designated under section 214(a)(1);

(14) the term "State Supervisory Board" means the board provided for under section 214(a)(3);

(15) the term "local agency" means any local agency which is assigned responsibility under section 214(a)(6);

(16) the term "Institute" means the Institute for Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency established by section 301(a);

(17) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Institute; and

(18) the term "Council" means the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention established by section 501.

## TITLE I—JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ADMINISTRATION

## ESTABLISHMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 101. (a) There hereby is established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Administration.

(b) There shall be at the head of the Administration a Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary. The salary of the Director shall be fixed by the Secretary.

(c) The Director shall be the chief executive of the Administration and shall exercise all necessary powers.

(d) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary. The salary of the Deputy Director shall be fixed by the Secretary. The Deputy Director shall perform such functions as the Director from time to time assigns or delegates, and shall act as Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director.

## OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 102. The Secretary may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as are necessary to perform the functions vested in him and to prescribe their functions.

## VOLUNTARY SERVICES

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b)), the Secretary may accept and employ voluntary and uncompensated services in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

## CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORTS

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary shall establish overall policy and develop objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities relating to prevention, diversion, training, treatment, rehabilitation, evaluation, research, and improvement of the juvenile justice system in the United States. In carrying out his functions, the Secretary shall consult with the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) advise the President as to all matters relating to federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs and Federal policies regarding juvenile delinquency;

(2) assist operating agencies which have direct responsibilities for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency in the development and promulgation of rules, guidelines, requirements, criteria, standards, procedures, and budget requests in accordance with the policies, priorities, and objectives he establishes;

(3) review and, to the extent he considers necessary, modify the implementation plans for any Federal program and the budget request of any Federal agency, to the extent such plans or requests pertain to Federal juvenile delinquency programs;

(4) conduct and support, in cooperation with the Institute for Continuing Studies of the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, evaluations and studies of the performance and results achieved by Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities and of the prospective performance and results that



might be achieved by alternative programs and activities supplementary to or in lieu of those currently being administered;

(5) coordinate Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities among Federal agencies and between Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities and other Federal programs and activities which he determines may have an important bearing on the success of the entire Federal juvenile delinquency effort;

(6) develop annually, submit to the Council for review, and thereafter submit to the President and the Congress, no later than September 30, a report which shall include an analysis and evaluation of Federal juvenile delinquency programs conducted and assisted by Federal agencies, the expenditures made, the results achieved, the plans developed, and problems in the operations and coordination of such programs, and recommendations for modifications in organization, management, personnel, standards, budget requests, and implementation plans necessary to increase the effectiveness of such programs;

(7) develop annually, submit to the Council for review, and thereafter submit to the President and the Congress, no later than March 1, a comprehensive plan for juvenile delinquency programs administered by any Federal agency, with particular emphasis on the prevention of juvenile delinquency and the development of programs and services which will encourage increased diversion of juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system; and

(8) provide technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments, courts, public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals, in the planning, establishment, funding, operation, or evaluation of juvenile delinquency programs.

(c) The President shall, no later than 90 days after receiving each annual report under subsection (b) (6), submit a report to the Congress and to the Council containing a detailed statement of any action taken or anticipated with respect to recommendations made by each such annual report.

(d) (1) The first report submitted to the President and the Congress by the Secretary under subsection (b) (6) shall contain, in addition to information required by subsection (b) (6), a detailed statement of criteria developed by the Secretary for identifying the characteristics of juvenile delinquency, prevention, diversion of youths from the juvenile justice system, and the training, treatment, and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents.

(2) The second such report shall contain, in addition to information required by subsection (b) (6), an identification of Federal programs which are related to juvenile delinquency prevention or treatment, together with a statement of the moneys expended for each such program during the most recent complete fiscal year. Such identification shall be made by the Secretary through the use of criteria developed under paragraph (1).

(e) The third report submitted to the President and the Congress by the Secretary under subsection (b) (7) shall contain, in addition to the comprehensive plan required by subsection (b) (7), a detailed statement of procedures to be used with respect to the submission of juvenile delinquency development statements to the Secretary by Federal agencies under section 105. Such statement submitted by the Secretary shall include a description of information, data, and analyses which shall be contained in each such impact statement.

(f) The Secretary may require Federal agencies engaged in any activity involving any Federal juvenile delinquency program

to provide him with such information and reports, and to conduct such studies and surveys, as he may deem to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(g) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions under this title, except the making of rules, to any officer or employee of the Administration.

(h) The Secretary may utilize the services and facilities of any Federal agency and of any other public agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be agreed upon.

(i) The Secretary may transfer funds appropriated under this Act to any Federal agency to develop or demonstrate new methods in juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment and to supplement existing delinquency prevention and treatment programs which the Director finds to be exceptionally effective or for which he finds there exists exceptional need.

(j) The Secretary may make grants to, or enter into contracts with, any public or private agency, institution, or individual to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(k) All functions of the Secretary under this Act shall be administered through the Administration.

#### JUVENILE DELINQUENCY DEVELOPMENT STATEMENTS

SEC. 105. (a) The Secretary shall require each Federal agency which administers a Federal juvenile delinquency program which meets any criterion developed by the Secretary under section 104(d) (1) to submit to the Secretary a juvenile delinquency development statement. Such statement shall be in addition to any information, report, study, or survey which the Secretary may require under section 104(f).

(b) Each juvenile delinquency development statement submitted to the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be submitted in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary under section 104(e) and shall contain such information, data, and analyses as the Secretary may require under section 104(e). Such analyses shall include an analysis of the extent to which the juvenile delinquency program of the Federal agency submitting such development statement conforms with and furthers Federal juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment goals and policies.

(c) The Secretary shall review and comment upon each juvenile delinquency development statement transmitted to him under subsection (a). Such development statement, together with the comments of the agency involved in every recommendation or request made by such agency for Federal legislation which significantly affects juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment.

#### JOINT FUNDING

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, where funds are made available by more than one Federal agency to be used by any agency, organization, institution, or individual to carry out a Federal juvenile delinquency program or activity, any one of the Federal agencies providing funds may be designated by the Secretary to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and the Secretary may order any such agency to waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined in rules prescribed by the Secretary) which is inconsistent with the similar requirement of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

## TITLE II—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

### PART A—GRANT PROGRAMS

#### AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 211. The Secretary may make grants to States and local governments to assist them in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating projects directly or through contracts with public and private agencies for the development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in the area of juvenile delinquency and programs to improve the juvenile justice system.

#### ALLOCATION

SEC. 212. (a) In accordance with rules prescribed under this title, funds shall be allocated annually among the States on the basis of relative population of people under 18 years of age. No such allotment to any State shall be less than \$150,000, except that for the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, no allotment shall be less than \$50,000.

(b) Except for funds appropriated for fiscal year 1975, if any amount so allotted remains unobligated at the end of the fiscal year, such funds shall be reallocated in a manner equitable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Funds appropriated for fiscal year 1975 may be obligated in accordance with subsection (a) until June 30, 1976, after which time they may be reallocated. Any amount so reallocated shall be in addition to the amounts already allotted and available to the States, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the same period.

(c) In accordance with rules prescribed under this title, a portion of any allotment to any State under this part shall be available to develop a State plan and to pay that portion of the expenditures which are necessary for efficient administration. Not more than 15 percent of the total annual allotment of such State shall be available for such purposes. The State shall make available needed funds for planning and administration to local governments within the State on an equitable basis.

(d) Financial assistance extended under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 90 percent of the approved costs of any assisted programs or activities. The non-Federal share shall be made only through the use of cash or other monetary instruments.

#### SPECIAL EMPHASIS PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS; AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 213. (a) Not less than 25 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to this title shall be available only for special emphasis prevention and treatment grants and contracts made pursuant to this section and section 215.

(b) Among applicants for grants and contracts under this part, priority shall be given to private nonprofit organizations or institutions which have had experience in dealing with youth. Not less than 20 percent of the funds available for grants and contracts made pursuant to this part shall be available for grants and contracts to such private nonprofit organizations or institutions.

(c) The Secretary may make grants to and enter into contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, or individuals to—

(1) develop and implement new approaches, techniques, and methods with respect to juvenile delinquency programs;

(2) develop and maintain community-based alternatives to traditional forms of institutionalization;

(3) develop and implement programs to keep students in elementary and secondary

schools and to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

(4) develop and implement effective means of diverting juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice and correctional system;

(5) improve the capability of public and private agencies and organizations to provide services for delinquents and youths in danger of becoming delinquent; and

(6) facilitate the adoption of the recommendations of the Institute as set forth pursuant to section 309.

#### STATE PLANS

SEC. 214. (a) In order to receive formula grants under this part, a State shall submit a plan for carrying out its purposes. In accordance with rules prescribed under this title, such plan shall—

(1) establish or designate a single State agency, or designate any other agency, as the sole agency responsible for the preparation and administration of the plan;

(2) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency has or will have authority, by legislation if necessary, to implement such plan in conformity with this part;

(3) provide for supervision of the programs funded under this Act by the State agency by a State supervisory board appointed by the chief executive officer of the State (A) which shall consist of not less than 15 persons who have training, experience, or special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of juvenile justice; (B) which shall include representation of units of local government, law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies such as law enforcement, correction or probation personnel, and juvenile or family court judges, and public agencies concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment such as welfare, social services, mental health, education, youth service departments, or alternative youth systems; (C) which shall include representatives of private organizations concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment; concerned with neglected or dependent children; concerned with the quality of juvenile justice, education, or social services for children; which utilize volunteers to work with delinquents or potential delinquents; community-based delinquency prevention or treatment programs; and organizations which represent employees affected by this Act; (D) a majority of whose members (including the Chairman) shall not be full-time employees of the Federal Government, the State, or any local government; (E) at least one-third of whose members shall be under the age of 26 at the time of appointment and of whom at least two shall have been under the jurisdiction of the justice system; and (F) which shall have the authority to approve, after consultation with private agencies and alternative youth systems, any proposed modification of a State plan before such proposed modification is submitted to the Secretary;

(4) provide for the active consultation with and participation of local governments in the development of a State plan which adequately takes into account the needs and requests of local governments;

(5) provide that at least 75 percent of the funds received by the State under section 212 shall be expended through programs of local government insofar as they are consistent with the State plan, except that this provision may be waived at the discretion of the Secretary for any State if the services for delinquent or potentially delinquent youth are organized primarily on a statewide basis;

(6) provided that the chief executive officer of the local government shall assign responsibility for the preparation and administration of the local government's part of the State plan, or for the supervision of the preparation and administration of the local

government's part of the State plan, to that agency within the local government's structure which can most effectively carry out the purposes of this Act and shall provide for supervision of the programs funded under this Act by the local agency by a board which meets the appropriate requirements of paragraph (3);

(7) provide, to the maximum extent feasible, for an equitable distribution of the assistance received under section 212 within the State;

(8) set forth a detailed study of the State needs for an effective, comprehensive, coordinated approach to juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment and the improvement of the juvenile justice system, including an itemized estimated cost for the development and implementation of such programs;

(9) provide that not less than 75 percent of the funds available to such State or to any local government of such State under this part, whether expended directly by the State or by the local government or through contracts with public or private agencies, shall be used for advanced techniques in conjunction with the development, maintenance, and expansion of programs and services designed to prevent juvenile delinquency, to divert juveniles from the juvenile justice system, and to provide community-based alternatives to juvenile detention and correctional facilities; such advanced techniques shall include community-based programs and services relating to various aspects of juvenile delinquency, youth service bureaus to assist delinquent and other youth, drug abuse education and prevention programs, programs to encourage youth to remain in school, improvement of probation programs and services, statewide programs designed to increase the use of nonsecure community-based facilities for the commitment of juveniles, and youth-initiated programs and outreach programs designed to assist youth who otherwise would not be reached by assistance programs;

(10) encourage the development of an adequate research, training, and evaluation capacity within the State;

(11) encourage the placement of juveniles in shelter facilities, rather than juvenile detention or correctional facilities, if such juveniles are charged with or have committed offenses which would not be criminal if committed by an adult; discourage the incarceration of juveniles with adults; and encourage the establishment of monitoring systems designed to augment the commitment policies described in this paragraph;

(12) provide assurances that assistance will be available on an equitable basis to deal with all disadvantaged youth, including females, minority youth, and mentally, emotionally, or physically handicapped youth;

(13) provide for procedures which will be established for protecting under Federal, State, and local law the right of recipients of services and which will assure appropriate privacy with regard to records relating to such services provided to any individual under the State plan;

(14) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures necessary to assure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title;

(15) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds made available under this part for any period will not be so used as to supplement and increase (but not supplant), to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the programs described in this part, and will in no event replace such State, local, and other non-Federal funds;

(16) provide that the State agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its plan and submit to the

Secretary an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs and activities carried out under the plan, and any modifications in the plan, including the survey of State and local needs, which it considers necessary; and

(17) contain such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may reasonably prescribe to assure the effectiveness of the programs assisted under this title.

(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof that meets the requirements of subsection (a).

(c) In the event that any State fails to submit a plan, or submits a plan, or any modification thereof which the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, determines does not meet the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary shall make the allotment of such State under the provisions of section 212 available to the public and private agencies in such State for programs under sections 213 and 215.

#### APPLICATIONS

SEC. 215. (a) Any agency, institution, or individual desiring to receive a grant, or enter into any contract under this section or section 213, shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information, as the Secretary may prescribe.

(b) In accordance with guidelines established by the Secretary, each such application shall—

(1) provide that the program for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) set forth a program for carrying out one or more of the purposes set forth in section 214;

(3) provide for the proper and efficient administration of such program;

(4) provide for regular evaluation of the program;

(5) indicate that the applicant has requested the review of the application from the State agency or local agency designated under section 214, when appropriate;

(6) indicate the response of the State agency or the local agency to the request for review and comment on the application;

(7) provide that regular reports on the program shall be sent to the Secretary and to the State agency and local agency, when appropriate; and

(8) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title.

(c) In determining whether or not to approve applications for grants under this title, the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the relative cost and effectiveness of the proposed program in effectuating the purposes of this Act;

(2) the extent to which the proposed program will incorporate new or innovative techniques;

(3) the extent to which the proposed program meets the objectives and priorities of the State plan, when a State plan has been approved by the Secretary under section 214 (b) and when the location and scope of the program make such consideration appropriate;

(4) the increase in capacity of the public and private agency, institution, or individual to provide services to delinquents or youths in danger of becoming delinquent;

(5) the extent to which the proposed project serves communities which have high rates of youth unemployment, school dropout, and delinquency; and

(6) the extent to which the proposed program facilitates the implementation of the recommendations of the Institute as set forth pursuant to section 309.



**PART B—GENERAL PROVISIONS**  
**WITHHOLDING**

SEC. 221. Whenever the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a recipient of a grant under this title, finds—

(1) that the program or activity for which such grant was made has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this title, or

(2) that in the operation of the program or activity there is failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Secretary shall notify such recipient of his findings and no further payments may be made to such recipient under this title (or in his discretion that the State agency shall not make further payments to specified programs affected by the failure) by the Secretary until he is satisfied that such non-compliance has been, or will promptly be, corrected.

**USE OF FUNDS**

SEC. 222. (a) Funds paid to any State public or private agency, institution, or individual (whether directly or through a State agency or local agency) may be used for—

(1) securing, developing, or operating the program designed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and

(2) not more than 50 percent of the cost of the construction of innovative community-based facilities for less than 20 persons which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Except as provided by subsection (a), no funds paid to any public or private agency, institution, or individual under this title (whether directly or through a State agency or local agency) may be used for construction.

**PAYMENTS**

SEC. 223. (a) In accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, it is the policy of the Congress that programs funded under this title shall continue to receive financial assistance, except that such assistance shall not continue if the yearly evaluation of such programs is not satisfactory.

(b) At the discretion of the Secretary, when there is no other way to fund an essential juvenile delinquency program, the State may utilize 25 percent of the funds available to it under this Act to meet the non-Federal matching share requirement for any other Federal juvenile delinquency program grant.

(c) Whenever the Secretary determines that it will contribute to the purposes of this Act, he may require the recipient of any grant or contract to contribute money, facilities, or services up to 25 percent of the cost of the project involved.

(d) Payments made under this title, pursuant to a grant or contract, may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursements, in such installments and on such conditions as the Secretary may determine.

**TITLE III—INSTITUTE FOR CONTINUING STUDIES OF THE PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY**

**ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE**

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby established an institute to be known as the Institute for Continuing Studies of the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. The Institute shall be administered by the Secretary through the Administration.

(b) It shall be the purpose of the Institute to provide a coordinating center for the collection, preparation, and dissemination of useful data regarding the treatment and control of juvenile offenders, and it shall also be the purpose of the Institute to provide training for representatives of Federal, State, and local law enforcement

officers, teachers and other educational personnel, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, probation personnel, correctional personnel, and other persons, including lay personnel, connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

**FUNCTIONS**

SEC. 302. The Institute shall—

(1) serve as an information bank by collecting systematically and synthesizing the data and knowledge obtained from studies and research by public and private agencies, institutions, or individuals concerning all aspects of juvenile delinquency, including the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(2) serve as a clearinghouse and information center for the preparation, publication, and dissemination of all information regarding juvenile delinquency, including State and local juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment programs and plans, availability of resources, training and educational programs, statistics, and other pertinent data and information;

(3) disseminate pertinent data and studies (including a periodic journal) to individuals, agencies, and organizations concerned with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(4) prepare, in cooperation with educational institutions, Federal, State, and local agencies, and appropriate individuals and private agencies, such studies as it considers to be necessary with respect to the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and related matters, including recommendations designed to promote effective prevention and treatment;

(5) devise and conduct in various geographical locations, seminars and workshops providing continuing studies for persons engaged in working directly with juveniles and juvenile offenders;

(6) devise and conduct a training program, in accordance with the provisions of sections 305, 306, and 307, of short-term instruction in the latest proven-effective methods of prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency for correctional and law enforcement personnel, teachers and other educational personnel, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, probation officers, and other persons (including lay personnel) connected with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(7) develop technical training teams to aid in the development of training programs in the States and to assist State and local agencies which work with juveniles and juvenile offenders;

(8) conduct, encourage, and coordinate research and evaluation into any aspect of juvenile delinquency, particularly with respect to new programs and methods which show promise of making a contribution toward the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(9) encourage the development of demonstration projects in new and innovative techniques and methods to prevent and treat juvenile delinquency;

(10) provide for the evaluation of all programs assisted under this Act in order to determine the results and the effectiveness of such programs;

(11) provide for the evaluation of any other Federal, State, or local juvenile delinquency program, as deemed necessary by the Secretary; and

(12) disseminate the results of such evaluations and research and demonstration activities, particularly to persons actively working in the field of juvenile delinquency.

**POWERS**

SEC. 303. (a) The functions, powers, and duties specified in this Act to be carried out by the Institute shall not be transferred

elsewhere or within any Federal agency unless specifically hereafter authorized by the Congress. In addition to the other powers, express and implied, the Institute may—

(1) request any Federal agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other material as the Institute deems necessary to carry out its functions;

(2) arrange with and reimburse the heads of Federal agencies for the use of personnel or facilities or equipment of such agencies;

(3) confer with and avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of State, municipal, or other public or private local agencies;

(4) enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals, for the partial performance of any of the functions of the Institute; and

(5) compensate consultants and members of technical advisory councils who are not in the regular fulltime employ of the United States, at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator of the Institute but not exceeding \$75 per diem and while away from home, or regular place of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(b) Any Federal agency which receives a request from the Institute under subsection (a) (1) may cooperate with the Institute and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and furnish information and advice to the Institute.

**ADMINISTRATOR AND STAFF**

SEC. 304. (a) The Institute shall have an Administrator who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary.

(b) The Administrator shall have responsibility for the administration of the organization, employees, enrollees, financial affairs, and other operations of the Institute. He may employ such staff, faculty, and administrative personnel as are necessary for the functioning of the Institute.

(c) The Administrator shall have the power to—

(1) acquire and hold real and personal property for the Institute;

(2) receive gifts, donations, and trusts on behalf of the Institute; and

(3) appoint such technical or other advisory councils comprised of consultants to guide and advise the Secretary.

(d) The Administrator may delegate his powers under this Act to such employees of the Institute as he deems appropriate.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF TRAINING PROGRAM**

SEC. 305. (a) The Secretary shall establish within the Institute a training program designed to train enrollees with respect to methods and techniques for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

(b) Enrollees in the training program established under this section shall be drawn from correctional and law enforcement personnel, teachers and other educational personnel, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, probation officers, and other persons (including lay personnel) connected with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

**CURRICULUM FOR TRAINING PROGRAM**

SEC. 306. The Secretary shall design and supervise a curriculum for the training program established by section 305 which shall utilize an interdisciplinary approach with respect to the prevention of juvenile delinquency, the treatment of juvenile delinquents, and the diversion of youths from the juvenile justice system. Such curriculum shall be appropriate to the needs of the enrollees of the training program.

**ENROLLMENT FOR TRAINING PROGRAM**

SEC. 307. (a) Any person seeking to enroll in the training program established under

section 305 shall transmit an application to the Administrator, in such form and according to such procedures as the Administrator may prescribe.

(b) The Administrator shall make the final determination with respect to the admittance of any person to the training program. The Administrator, in making such determination, shall seek to assure that persons admitted to the training program are broadly representative of the categories described in section 305(b).

(c) While studying at the Institute and while traveling in connection with his study (including authorized field trips), each person enrolled in the Institute shall be allowed travel expenses and a per diem allowance in the same manner as prescribed for persons employed intermittently in the Government service under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

#### ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 308. The Administrator shall develop annually and submit to the President and each House of the Congress, prior to June 30, a report on the activities of the Institute and on research, demonstration, training, and evaluation programs funded under this title, including a review of the results of such programs, an assessment of the application of such results to existing and new juvenile delinquency programs, and detailed recommendations for future research, demonstration, training, and evaluation programs.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE

Sec. 309. The Institute, under the supervision of the Secretary, shall conduct a study for the development of standards for juvenile justice. The Institute shall, no later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the President and to each House of the Congress a report based upon such study. Such report shall contain a detailed statement of recommended standards for the administration of juvenile justice at the Federal, State, and local level, and shall recommend—

- (1) Federal action, including administrative, budgetary, and legislative action, required to facilitate the adoption of such standards throughout the United States; and
- (2) State and local action to facilitate the adoption of such standards for juvenile justice at the State and local level.

#### INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

Sec. 310. Each Federal agency shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

#### RECORDS

Sec. 311. Records containing the identity of any juvenile gathered for purposes pursuant to this title may under no circumstances be disclosed or transferred to any individual or to any public or private agency.

#### TITLE IV—RUNAWAY YOUTH ACT

##### SHORT TITLE

Sec. 401. This title may be cited as the "Runaway Youth Act".

##### FINDINGS

Sec. 402. The Congress hereby finds that—

- (1) the number of juveniles who leave and remain away from home without parental permission has increased to alarming proportions, creating a substantial law enforcement problem for the communities inundated, and significantly endangering the young people who are without resources and live on the street;

- (2) the exact nature of the problem is not well defined because national statistics on the size and profile of the runaway youth population are not tabulated;

- (3) many such young people, because of

their age and situation, are urgently in need of temporary shelter and counseling services;

- (4) the problem of locating, detaining, and returning runaway children should not be the responsibility of already overburdened police departments and juvenile justice authorities; and

- (5) in view of the interstate nature of the problem, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to develop accurate reporting of the problem nationally and to develop an effective system of temporary care outside the law enforcement structure.

#### RULES

Sec. 403. The Secretary may prescribe such rules as he considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

#### PART A—GRANT PROGRAM

##### PURPOSES OF GRANT PROGRAM

Sec. 411. The Secretary is authorized to make grants and to provide technical assistance to localities and nonprofit private agencies in accordance with the provisions of this part. Grants under this part shall be made for the purpose of developing local facilities to deal primarily with the immediate needs of runaway youth in a manner which is outside the law enforcement structure and juvenile justice system. The size of such grants shall be determined by the number of runaway youth in the community and the existing availability of services. Among applicants priority shall be given to private organizations or institutions which have had past experience in dealing with runaway youth.

##### ELIGIBILITY

Sec. 412. (a) To be eligible for assistance under this part, an applicant shall propose to establish, strengthen, or fund an existing or proposed runaway house, a locally controlled facility providing temporary shelter, and counseling services to juveniles who have left home without the permission of their parents or guardians.

(b) In order to qualify for assistance under this part, an applicant shall submit a plan to the Secretary meeting the following requirements and including the following information. Each house—

- (1) shall be located in an area which is demonstrably frequented by or easily reachable by runaway youth;

- (2) shall have a maximum capacity of no more than 20 children, with a ratio of staff to children of sufficient proportion to assure adequate supervision and treatment;

- (3) shall develop adequate plans for contacting the child's parents or relatives (if such action is required by State law) and assuring the safe return of the child according to the best interests of the child, for contacting local government officials pursuant to informal arrangements established with such officials by the runaway house, and for providing for other appropriate alternative living arrangements;

- (4) shall develop an adequate plan for assuring proper relations with law enforcement personnel, and the return of runaway youths from correctional institutions;

- (5) shall develop an adequate plan for aftercare counseling involving runaway youth and their parents within the State in which the runaway house is located and for assuring, as possible, that aftercare services will be provided to those children who are returned beyond the State in which the runaway house is located;

- (6) shall keep adequate statistical records profiling the children and parents which it serves, except that records maintained on individual runaway youths shall not be disclosed without parental consent to anyone other than another agency compiling statistical records or a government agency involved in the disposition of criminal charges against an individual runaway youth, and

reports or other documents based on such statistical records shall not disclose the identity of individual runaway youths;

- (7) shall submit annual reports to the Secretary detailing how the house has been able to meet the goals of its plans and reporting the statistical summaries required by paragraph (6);

- (8) shall demonstrate its ability to operate under accounting procedures and fiscal control devices as required by the Secretary;

- (9) shall submit a budget estimate with respect to the plan submitted by such house under this subsection; and

- (10) shall supply such other information as the Secretary reasonably deems necessary.

#### APPROVAL BY SECRETARY

Sec. 413. An application by a State, locality, or nonprofit private agency for a grant under this part may be approved by the Secretary only if it is consistent with the applicable provisions of this part and meets the requirements set forth in section 412. Priority shall be given to grants smaller than \$75,000. In considering grant applications under this part, priority shall be given to any applicant whose program budget is smaller than \$100,000.

#### GRANTS TO PRIVATE AGENCIES; STAFFING

Sec. 414. Nothing in this part shall be construed to deny grants to nonprofit private agencies which are fully controlled by private boards or persons but which in other respects meet the requirements of this part and agree to be legally responsible for the operation of the runaway house. Nothing in this part shall give the Federal Government control over the staffing and personnel decisions of facilities receiving Federal funds.

#### REPORTS

Sec. 415. The Secretary shall annually report to the Congress on the status and accomplishments of the runaway houses which are funded under this part, with particular attention to—

- (1) their effectiveness in alleviating the problems of runaway youth;

- (2) their ability to reunite children with their families and to encourage the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services;

- (3) their effectiveness in strengthening family relationships and encouraging stable living conditions for children; and

- (4) their effectiveness in helping youth decide upon a future course of action.

#### FEDERAL SHARE

Sec. 416. (a) The Federal share for construction under this part shall be no more than 50 percent. The Federal share for the acquisition and renovation of existing structures, the provision of counseling services, staff training, and the general costs of operations of such facility's budget for any fiscal year shall be 90 percent. The non-Federal share may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated by the Secretary, including plant, equipment, or services.

(b) Payments under this section may be made in installments, in advance, or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

#### PART B—STATISTICAL SURVEY

##### SURVEY; REPORT

Sec. 421. The Secretary shall gather information and carry out a comprehensive statistical survey defining the major characteristics of the runaway youth population and determining the areas of the Nation most affected. Such survey shall include the age, sex, and socioeconomic background of runaway youth, the places from which and to which children run, and the relationship between running away and other illegal behavior. The Secretary shall report the results



of such information gathering and survey to the Congress not later than June 30, 1975.

#### RECORDS

SEC. 422. Records containing the identity of individual runaway youths gathered for statistical purposes pursuant to section 421 may under no circumstances be disclosed or transferred to any individual or to any public or private agency.

### TITLE V—COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

#### ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 501. There is hereby established, as an independent organization in the executive branch of the Federal Government, a council to be known as the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention.

#### MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 502. (a) The Council shall consist of six regular members appointed under subsection (c) and an additional number of ex officio members designated by subsection (b).

(b) (1) The following individuals shall be ex officio members of the Council:

(A) the Secretary (or the Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, if so designated by the Secretary);

(B) the Director of the Administration;

(C) the Attorney General or his designee;

(D) the Secretary of Labor (or the Under Secretary of Labor, if so designated by such Secretary);

(E) the Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention or his designee;

(F) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (or the Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, if so designated by such Secretary); and

(G) the Administrator of the Institute.

(2) Any individual designated under paragraph (1)(C) or paragraph (1)(E) shall be selected from individuals who exercise significant decisionmaking authority in the Federal agency involved.

(c) The regular members of the Council shall be appointed by the President from persons who by virtue of their training or experience have special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of juvenile justice. At least three members shall not have attained 26 years of age on the date of their appointment.

(d) (1) Except as provided by paragraphs (2) and (3), members of the Council appointed by the President under subsection (c) shall be appointed for terms of four years.

(2) Of the members first appointed to the Council under subsection (c)—

(A) two shall be appointed for terms of one year,

(B) two shall be appointed for terms of two years, and

(C) two shall be appointed for terms of three years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. Such members shall be appointed within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this title.

(3) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of his term until a successor has taken office.

(e) Members of the Council shall be eligible for reappointment to the Council.

(f) The Secretary shall serve as Chairman of the Council. The Director shall serve as Vice Chairman of the Council. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman.

(g) The Council shall meet at least six times per year to receive reports and recommendations and to take such actions as may be considered appropriate by members of the Council. A description of the activities of the Council shall be included in the annual report required by section 104(b)(6).

#### FUNCTIONS

SEC. 503. (a) The Council shall make recommendations to the Secretary at least annually with respect to coordination of the planning, policy, priorities, operations, and management of all Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

(b) The Council shall, through a subcommittee designated by the Chairman, review the activities and administration of the Institute and shall make recommendations with respect to such activities and administration.

#### EXECUTIVE SECRETARY; STAFF

SEC. 504. (a) The Chairman shall, with the approval of the Council, appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council.

(b) The Executive Secretary shall be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the Council.

(c) The Executive Secretary may, with the approval of the Council, appoint and fix the salary of such personnel as he considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

#### COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

SEC. 505. (a) Members of the Council who are full-time employees of the Federal Government shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the functions of the Council.

(b) Members of the Council who are not full-time employees of the Federal Government shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$100 per day, including travel-time for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Council. Members shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the functions of the Council.

### TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 601. (a) To carry out the purposes of titles I, II, and III there is authorized to be appropriated \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, and \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978.

(b) Not more than 5 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this Act may be used for the purposes authorized under title I.

(c) Not more than 10 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this Act may be used for purposes authorized under title III.

(d) (1) To carry out the purposes of part A of title IV there is authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, 1976, and 1977, the sum of \$10,000,000.

(2) To carry out the purposes of part B of title IV there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$500,000.

(e) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of title V.

#### NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) No financial assistance for any program under this Act shall be provided unless the grant, contract, or agreement with respect to such program specifically provides

that no person with responsibilities in the operation of such program will discriminate with respect to any such program because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation, or beliefs.

(b) No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be subjected to discrimination under, or be denied employment in connection with any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act. The provisions of the preceding sentence shall be enforced in accordance with section 603 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Section 603 of such Act shall apply with respect to any action taken to enforce such sentence. This section shall not be construed as affecting any other legal remedy that a person may have if such person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, subjected to discrimination under, or denied employment in connection with any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act.

#### EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 603. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), the foregoing provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 104(b)(6), section 104(b)(7), and section 310 shall take effect at the close of December 31, 1974. Section 105 shall take effect at the close of August 31, 1977.

### RUSSIAN FERTILIZER LOAN—A GOOD DEAL FOR THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said and written recently with regard to a \$180 million financing commitment given by the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a proposed fertilizer complex in the Soviet Union.

Because of the many misunderstandings that have arisen concerning the loan, I want to take a few minutes to describe exactly how beneficial this loan will be to our country. The Export-Import Bank loan of \$180 million will produce a sale of \$400 million of U.S. equipment and services to be used in the construction of an ammonia plant, storage facilities, tank cars, and a pipeline in the Soviet Union. The additional \$220 million will come from the Soviet Union in a syndicate of private U.S. banks.

Additionally, oceangoing tankers carrying superphosphoric acid from the United States and bringing back ammonia, urea, and potash from the Soviet Union are to be built in the United States. The loan to establish the fertilizer plant will also benefit the United States because the U.S. exports a phosphate fertilizer, which we have in relative abundance, and in return will receive two nitrogen fertilizers, ammonia and urea, which are in scarce supply, plus the potash.

#### FERTILIZER LOAN WILL HELP SAVE ENERGY

The nitrogen fertilizer that the United States will receive will be made from Soviet natural gas. To manufacture the fertilizer would require a drain on our own natural gas reserves, enough to heat

1.12 million homes. The ammonia and urea imported to the United States will have an energy content equivalent to 25.5 million barrels of crude oil per year.

The Export-Import Bank project will create thousands of jobs in the United States. More than half a billion dollars will be invested in the United States for ships and expanded production facilities in mine phosphate rock in Florida. It is estimated that this will create 2,000 to 3,000 construction jobs and 2,900 permanent jobs. In addition to the sale of at least \$400 million in equipment, there will be substantial balance-of-trade advantages. The United States will acquire a much needed fertilizer from abroad in return for exporting a fertilizer in ample supply in the United States, thus avoiding a net drain on our trade balance.

The Export-Import Bank has issued a preliminary commitment on the fertilizer complex. On the basis of this, fees are being paid against financing commitments from private banks and contracts have been made to suppliers. These arrangements carry expiration dates at which time costs will increase. On the basis of its contract with the Soviet Union and the Export-Import Bank's commitment, upward of \$2 million has been spent in designing and planning the project.

Not only will the fertilizer project be a profitable one for the United States but it will substantially contribute to world food needs. If the Export-Import Bank fails to provide financing, the United States will lose all of the monetary benefits. This project is in the Soviet's 5-year plan and will go forward with or without the Export-Import Bank. If we do not follow through on our preliminary commitment, the contracts and benefits will go to French, Italian, British, or Japanese suppliers.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the Export-Import Bank complete its loan commitment on the Soviet fertilizer deal and because of the many advantages it will bring to the United States I urge all Members of the House to support this project.

#### TECHNOLOGICAL ASPECT OF DÉTENTE

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Dr. Fred Schulman, testified today before the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe on the subject, "Technological Aspects of Détente." Formerly chief of nuclear power programs for NASA, Dr. Schulman is presently a research professor at George Washington University.

In his testimony Dr. Schulman raised some important questions about differing American and Soviet approaches to détente and listed a number of areas where he stated that the Soviet Union has not responded to American initiatives of trade or technology exchange in a like manner.

Dr. Schulman mentioned in particular the role of the Soviet Union in backing the Arab oil embargo and in supplying the Arabs with military equipment for use against Israel, some of which may have involved the use of American exports such as ball bearings. Dr. Schulman also listed some of the high-technology export agreements we have made:

Agreements with:  
Occidental Petroleum Corp. for oil and gas exploration and specialized pipeline facilities.

Various American companies for offshore deep-well rigs and equipment, including installation of submersible pumps. There is at present no capability within the Soviet bloc for these items, and this has been a priority goal for years. The unusual recent appointment of a high Communist Party official, Boris Y. Sherbina, as Minister of Oil and Gas Construction instead of the usual expert technician for this post, signifies the importance the Russians attach to this goal.

General Dynamics Corp. covering scientific and technological cooperation for a period of 5 years in the fields of shipbuilding, telecommunication equipment, commercial and special purpose aircraft, and computer-operated industrial processing and navigation equipment.

Bryant Chucking Grinding Co. (Excello Corp.) for precision military ball-bearing machines.

Lummus Co. & Monsanto Corp. for building chemical and polymer plants.

Poland and Fairchild Corporation for sale of U.S. integrated-circuit technology of a type extensively used in modern weapons, guidance systems and in third-generation computers.

Negotiations are underway with Boeing, Lockheed and McDonnell-Douglas Corp. for the sale to the Soviets of aircraft under terms in which the Soviets would acquire the manufacturing technology, plants and managerial techniques needed to build wide-bodied U.S. commercial jets.

Sperry Rand for cooperative projects in computers, navigation, guidance and control systems, office machines, pneumatic and hydraulic equipment.

This testimony, as well as that of others today, strongly indicates that the United States could well be trying to "buy" détente with trade concessions; that the Soviet Union is not responding with anything more than lip service to the cause of better relations; and that our Government continues its policy in spite of that.

I have raised this issue in correspondence with the Department of State, and they have responded in a way that does not adequately deal with the specifics Dr. Schulman mentioned and which does not get to the basic policy questions I asked. I intend to continue this correspondence and hope that others will join me in raising the issue with the State Department.

In addition to his testimony before the subcommittee, Dr. Schulman has recently published an article concerning economic aspects of the energy crisis which I would like to insert in the Record at this point:

#### LESSONS FOR US IN EUROPE'S DEEPENING ECONOMIC CRISIS (By Fred Schulman)

It will be interesting to see how Europe manages its deepening energy-caused economic crisis later this year.

The Europeans, who, with the notable ex-

ception of the Dutch, surrendered so meekly to Arab political demands, will be facing an oil import bill of \$55 billion to \$80 billion during 1974. Western Europe will be importing 15.2 million barrels of oil per day. This is 98.7 per cent of its oil supply, of which 69 per cent is derived from Arab sources.

When all of the finance ministers and all of the defense ministers of Europe return home from their tours of the Arab world and count all the arms and industrial plants they have sold, they will find themselves on the short end of a trade deficit amounting to more than \$30 billion. This economic squeeze was brought upon themselves by their failure to counter the Arab oil weapon and to recognize the interest of the USSR in promoting the ensuing difficulties in the NATO nations. Remembering that the United States was forced to devalue its currency twice in one year largely after experiencing a trade deficit in 1972 of only \$6.4 billion, it is not hard to see that the impact of the enormous 1974 trade deficit on the economies of Western Europe will be very severe. The inflation, misery and chaos that will be caused will be unsettling to the stability and friendly democratic governments. The possibility of radical upheavals, now seen by only a few people, will be of increasing concern before 1975 is history.

In an interesting coincidence, the United States in 1985 will need to import approximately the same volume of oil as will Western Europe in 1974. So we are in the fortunate position of being able to watch European events this year to see how they handle the problem.

The energy crisis facing the world today involves complex technical, financial, diplomatic, political, environmental and tax aspects.

The energy crisis is typical of a number of growing shortages involving material resources. Abuse of détente, as in the actions of the USSR during and after the October War can intensify these shortages. The shortages of material resources are a paradox among plenty. There are more oil, wheat, copper, newsprint, steel, etc. produced in the world than ever before. Yet the world, and even the United States, suffers shortages in many of these materials. Why?

The answers are clear.

They relate to the greatly increased worldwide consumption of resources within the last few years which has been brought about by instant worldwide communications, rapid transfer of technology and the higher living-standard aspirations of the rapidly rising population, now 3.6 billion, inhabiting the earth.

Commenting on the energy explosion, the Joint Committee of Atomic Energy wrote that the world as a whole, will consume in the 30 years from 1970 through the year 2000, as much energy as it did from the time of creation until 1970.

This illustrates vividly the magnitude of the problem. Yet it can be solved, particularly with ingenuity to create what we need from plentiful materials at hand, increased efficiency in production and use, and developing renewable energy sources.

According to a study conducted in 1971 for the Secretary of the Interior, the United States in 1985 will need to import a minimum of 14.8 million barrels of oil each day. If the current war on poverty is successful and if we clean up the environment as planned, more energy is required and the import figure jumps to about 25 million barrels of oil each day. If nuclear energy is unable to do its job of providing an important part of our electricity needs, it must be replaced by another 9 million barrels of oil per day making a total need for imported oil in 1985 amounting to 34 million barrels per day.



It is simply not feasible to import such a massive amount of oil, either physically or financially. A trade deficit of \$40 billion a year will be caused by the importation of only the minimum 14.8 million barrels of oil expected to be imported daily in 1985. Even if the Arabs provided the oil, we could not afford it.

Nor do we have the supertankers, superports or refineries to handle this volume of petroleum. We are far behind schedule even if it is decided to build all the facilities needed. Of the 35 world ports which can handle the mammoth supertankers of today, none are in the United States.

The energy facilities needed to maintain our historical rate of growth amount to \$400 billion of new construction. This is equivalent to investing capital amounting to \$750 million each week from now until 1985.

In the short term, there are many things that can be done to improve the situation. Existing oil wells yield, on the average, only 36 per cent of their oil. With the price of oil now exceeding \$7.00 per barrel, it now becomes economical to use secondary and even tertiary methods of oil recovery to increase yields above 36 per cent. Each 1 per cent increase in oil yield is equivalent to adding 3 billion barrels to our proved reserves. A 5 per cent increase in engine energy conversion, which could result from research, adds the equivalent of 1 million barrels per day to our supply in the case of stationary power plants and 2 million barrels per day in the case of automobile engines. There is ample incentive to do this and there are many promising technical approaches toward this goal.

For the longer term, solar, geothermal, nuclear fission, nuclear fusion and new liquid fuels from plant products are quite reasonable objectives. Research programs are underway in most of these approaches. Oil recovery from plentiful shale as well as conversion of plentiful coal to oil can ultimately support production of about 12 million barrels of oil per day. Success in these programs will be a boon to mankind of the first magnitude.

The United States is not a sleeping giant. It does have considerable resources. Its strength can readily nullify Arab and Soviet threats to oil supplies in the immediate future by symbiotic use of trade, energy and food, while its ingenuity can develop new energy resources.

If this is done, the energy crisis need not become, as in Europe, a force for weakness and distress, but a challenge that unites the country and provides the assurance of a hopeful future through better use of available energy resources.

#### 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. HUDNUT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BIESTER, for 30 minutes, today.  
Mr. SHRIVER, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. CLEVELAND, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. BRADENAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 30 minutes, today.  
Mr. VANIK, for 60 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HAWKINS and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,291.75.

Mr. ROUSH and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUDNUT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYLIE in two instances.  
Mr. BELL.  
Mr. McCLOSKEY.  
Mr. FISH.  
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.  
Mr. SHOUP.  
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. HOSMER in four instances.  
Mr. NELSEN.  
Mr. HUDNUT.  
Mr. WALSH.  
Mr. CLEVELAND.  
Mr. RHODES.  
Mr. BROOMFIELD.  
Mr. ABDNOR.  
Mr. BRAY in three instances.  
Mr. YOUNG of Illinois in two instances.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DRINAN in 10 instances.  
Mr. COTTER.  
Ms. ABZUG in 10 instances.  
Mr. MAZZOLI in 10 instances.  
Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.  
Mr. CAREY of New York.  
Mr. EDWARDS of California.  
Mr. RARICK in three instances.  
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
Mr. FOLEY.  
Mr. KASTENMEIER.  
Mr. DULSKI in five instances.  
Mr. RYAN in two instances.  
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.  
Mr. BRECKINRIDGE in 10 instances.  
Mr. PATTEN.  
Mr. LONG of Louisiana in five instances.  
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 13, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2449. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that improvements are needed in U.S. contractor training of the Republic of Vietnam armed forces, was taken from the speaker's table; referred 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. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1170. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 411. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to certain rates of postage, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1102). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1171. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the conference report on H.R. 7130. An act to improve congressional control over budgetary outlay and receipt totals, to provide for a Legislative Budget Office, to establish a procedure providing congressional control over impoundment of funds by the executive branch, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1103). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABDNOR:

H.R. 15332. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a loan insurance program for livestock producers and feeders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15333. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of any fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat during a 180-day period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 15334. 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. BARRETT:

H.R. 15335. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide individuals a tax credit for the purchase of home garden tools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.R. 15337. A bill to provide that income from entertainment activities held in conjunction with a public fair conducted by an organization described in section 501(c) shall not be unrelated trade or business income and shall not affect the tax exemption of the organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DU PONT (for himself and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 15338. A bill to insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 15339. A bill to prohibit the military departments from using dogs in connection with any research or other activities relating to biological or chemical warfare agents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15340. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 15341. A bill to abolish the U.S. Postal Service, to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act, to reenact the former provisions of title 39, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LITTON (for himself and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 15342. A bill to establish a Department of Social, Economic, and Natural Resources Planning in the executive branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 15343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow for a temporary period a deduction equal to the increase in residential electricity expenses occurring after January 1, 1973; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15344. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow for a temporary period a tax credit equal to one-half of the increase in residential electricity expenses occurring after January 1, 1973; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 15345. A bill to prohibit the importation of fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat for a 6-month period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself, Mr. RHODES, Mr. McFALL, and Mr. ARENDS):

H.R. 15346. A bill to establish a National Commission on Supplies and Shortages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.R. 15347. A bill to prohibit foreign assistance to India until India becomes a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 15348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax rules now applicable to savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and so forth, shall also be applicable to the comparable mortgage programs now undertaken by national mortgage associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. McSPADEN, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. LOTT, Mr. THONE, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mr. RANDALL):

H.R. 15349. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a loan insurance program for cattlemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 15350. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a loan insurance program for producers of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15351. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the amount of certain cancellations of indebtedness under student loan programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTH:

H.R. 15352. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide an exemption from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of that act for full-time babysitters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 15353. A bill to provide for emergency financing for livestock producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 15354. A bill to provide for the Federal collection of certain State and local income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 15355. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to certain officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 15356. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a loan insurance program for livestock producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. SKUBBTZ):

H.R. 15357. A bill to amend the act of October 15, 1966, establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 15358. A bill to declare a portion of the Delaware River in Burlington County, N.J., nonnavigable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. BELL, and Mr. ROE):

H.J. Res. 1055. Joint resolution to prohibit the Bureau of Labor Statistics from instituting any revision in the method of calculating the Consumer Price Index until such revision has been approved by resolution by either the Senate or the House of Representatives of the United States of America; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 1056. Joint resolution to extend by 30 days the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.J. Res. 1057. Joint resolution to extend by 30 days the expiration date of the Export Administration Act of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.J. Res. 1058. Joint resolution to extend by 30 days the expiration date of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; 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. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15359. A bill for the relief of Cedimir Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 15360. A bill to temporarily terminate the entitlement of Gwendolyn Artie and Wanda Lou Smithee to child's insurance benefits under section 202(d) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE—Wednesday, June 12, 1974

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

### PRAYER

The Right Reverend Zoltan Beky, D.D., bishop emeritus, the Hungarian Reformed Church in America, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Heavenly Father.

We give Thee thanks for Thy creation, providence, and guidance. But especially for revealing Thyself to us in Thy word which has always been the foundation and strength of our Nation.

We pray today for Thy blessing upon all those who were called to lead this great Nation and to be guardians of the great heritage which is ours. May this great Nation always remain faithful to the basic principles upon which these United States were founded.

Save us from internal discord, moral decay, individual and corporal selfishness. Thou hast created this Nation out

of the multitude of cultures, races, and religions. Thou hast led millions to these shores to build a land of hope, freedom, and opportunity.

We pray for the deliberation of today in this noble body. Bless the thoughts, the words, and the work of all here present.

We pray in Thy name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 11, 1974, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Allen, one of its read-

ing clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 12165. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of certain works in the Colorado River Basin to control the salinity of water delivered to users in the United States and Mexico; and

H.R. 12281. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1975, the suspension of duties on certain forms of copper.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12281) to continue until the close of June 30, 1975, the suspension of duties on certain forms of copper, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees