the contributions of those who are handicapped and actively participate in the work of our Nation. Toward this end, the National Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults and the National Paraplegia Foundation are jointly sponsoring a National Handicapped Awareness Week from May 16 to May 22, 1976.

These two national organizations have been exemplary in their concern for handicapped individuals. It is fitting, then, that they join to commemorate a week in which all Americans will be called upon to take cognizance of the needs and potential of the handicapped people of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution calling upon and authorizing the President to proclaim the week of May 16, 1976, as "National Handicapped Awareness Week," and I insert the text of this resolution at this point in the RECORD:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Authorizing the President to proclaim the week of May 16, 1976, as National Handicapped Awareness Week

Whereas, the Federal Government is deeply committed to taking every step possible to guarantee that the handicapped citizens of the Nation receive equal access to employment, education, transportation, housing, recreation and to public buildings and services; and

Whereas, to further this commitment the Congress fully endorses the National Handicapped Awareness Week; and

Whereas, it is important for all citizens of the Nation to understand that our handicapped neighbors actively and productively participate in the life of our country; and

Whereas, to further this understanding, National Handicapped Awareness Week activities are designed to remove existing barriers which affect one out of every ten Americans and to work toward the full development of their economic, social, and personal potential through the use of the manmade environments;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 16, 1976, as "National Handicapped Awareness Week", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, March 16, 1976*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*I beseech you to 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.

Eternal God, whose mercies are new every morning and fresh every hour we would see the beckoning of Thy guiding hand as we launch out upon the duties of this day. Grant that we who have been called to this place of leadership in the life of our country and conscious of the heritage which is ours may now rise in greatness of mind and spirit to meet the demands made upon us to minister to the needs of our Nation.

Bless our Speaker and these Representatives of our people. Keep them physically strong, mentally awake, morally straight, and vigorously alive that they may do their work humbly and truly with due regard for the good of all.

In Thy holy name 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Roddy, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 9, 1976:

H.J. Res. 811. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

On March 15, 1976:

H.R. 7824. An act to amend section 142 of title 13, United States Code, to change the date for taking censuses of agriculture, irrigation, and drainage, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11045. An act to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to extend the authorizations of appropriations contained in such act; and

H.R. 11893. An act to increase the temporary debt limit, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4034. An act to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital in Loma Linda, Calif., as the "Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans' Hospital," and for other purposes.

The message also 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. 8507. An act to revise the per diem allowance authorized for members of the American Battle Monuments Commission when in a travel status.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1911. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain persons insured under servicemen's group life insurance (SGLI) with a choice of conversion to either an individual policy of life insurance, including term, or a veterans' group life insurance (VGLI) policy upon the expiration of their servicemen's group life insurance coverage, and for other purposes.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. There is one bill on the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the bill on the Private Calendar.

FIDEL GROSSO-PADILLA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6817) for the relief of Fidel Grosso-Padilla.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 8617, FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACT OF 1975

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint six additional conferees on the bill (H.R. 8617) to restore to Federal civilian and Postal Service employees their rights to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following additional conferees: Mrs. SPELLMAN, Messrs. SOLARZ, CHARLES H. WILSON of California, HARRIS, JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, and ROUSSELOT.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to change the social security law so that no one would be forced to retire or be limited in the income he or she may earn, in order to receive full social security benefits.

Those who have reached the age where they are entitled to receive social security benefits, for which they have already paid their taxes, should not be forced to retire in order to receive full benefits, or be penalized for having other sources of income. This is not required of those who have paid their premiums on annuity policies with private insurance companies, and it should not be required of those who have paid their premiums in the form of social security taxes.

The Government's failure to control spiraling inflation has hurt those on modest and fixed incomes. The elderly and people with disabilities, either temporary

or permanent, and those who are often without other sources of income, find that the meager increases in their social security payments have been offset by spiraling inflation.

There is no reason for those on a limited income to bear the often devastating consequences of Government policies that do nothing to control inflation. And certainly there is no reason for placing a limit on how much extra income a senior citizen receiving benefits may earn. Our society cannot afford to waste the special skills of our elderly by depriving them of their social security benefits if they choose to continue working.

It is Congress, and only Congress, which can correct this injustice. The right of those on social security to live in dignity, and not despair, is in the hands of the U.S. Congress, and I hope we will correct the present situation by passing this bill.

LAYING OF CORNERSTONE OF THE MASONIC TEMPLE, MORROW LODGE NO. 734, F. & A.M.

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon, March 14, 1976, over 750 people attended the laying of the cornerstone of the Masonic Temple of Morrow Lodge, No. 734, F. & A.M., of the Grand Lodge of Georgia. The cornerstone laying was followed immediately by the formal dedication of the temple.

An emergency communication of the Grand Lodge of Georgia was assembled and was presided over by Mr. Lonzo Pope, the most worshipful grand master of Georgia. Officers of the grand lodge and many past grand masters were present. Most worshipful grand master Pope presided over the communication, the cornerstone laying, and the dedication ceremony.

Morrow Lodge, No. 734, is one of the most recent additions to the Grand Lodge of Georgia. The lodge was granted dispensation to organize in July 1971, and the charter was granted and confirmed in October 1971. The present membership is over 300 members and attendance at regular communications is one of the highest in Georgia. The officers of the lodge are:

LIST OF OFFICERS

Worshipful Master—Donald H. Fincher.
Senior Warden—Ralph Smith.
Junior Warden—Hendry Betts.
Senior Deacon—Bob Gay.
Junior Deacon—Leroy York.
Senior Steward—Mike Terrell.
Junior Steward—Ronnie Tribble.
Treasurer—Al Hunter.
Secretary—Lamar Northcutt.
Tyler—Bob Harwell.
Chaplain—Charlie Jackson.
Trustees—C. T. Hall, D. L. Shirley, Homer Cooper, Glenn Buckner, Gordon Cavanaugh, Donald H. Fincher, Ralph Smith.

Brother Lamar Northcutt, the present secretary, was the first master of the lodge and served in that capacity for the first 18 months after the charter was granted and had previously served as the grand master of College Park Lodge No. 454.

Last Sunday was a memorable and glorious day for Morrow Lodge No. 734 and the day was an inspiration and challenge to all other lodges within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Georgia. The Grand Lodge of Georgia has been in existence since the charter was granted for Solomon Lodge No. 1, Savannah, Ga., founded by Gen. James Edward Oglethorpe.

"ORPHANS OF THE EXODUS FROM THE SOVIET UNION"

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I met Anatoly Sharansky in May last year when I was in Russia and he served as the translator when I met with Nobel Peace Prize winner, Andrei Sakharov.

I met Natalia Sharansky, his wife, later in the year when she came to the United States to meet American supporters of the fight for freedom by the Jewish people of the Soviet Union.

They have been separated since June 5, 1974. Anatoly had been jailed prior to and during former President Nixon's trip to Russia. While he was in prison Natalia was given an exit visa and 10 days to use it. Anatoly was released on June 4 and they were married under dramatic circumstances that day. Natalia had to leave for Israel the next day.

Only a cruel and inhuman policy keeps these two young people apart and it is a policy which violates the principles of the Helsinki Final Act which the Soviet Union signed and so loudly endorsed last summer.

The Sharanskys are just one example of this policy and because of it Members of Congress are conducting a vigil on behalf of the families which remain separated.

These people are the "Orphans of the Exodus from the Soviet Union" and we will continue to hold up the Soviet Government for international condemnation until they are free and reunited.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1976, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 12490

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Thursday, March 18, 1976, to file a report on H.R. 12490, a bill to provide tax treatment for exchanges under the final system plan for ConRail.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT LAWMAKER

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the Honorable Wright Patman, the people of America have lost a friend and dedicated servant.

Throughout his long 47 years in the House, a length of service exceeded by only three others, Mr. Patman hammered away repeatedly at inequities in the financial system and at progressive issues for the welfare of the common people. Noteably, high-interest rates were his target and he was determined to achieve significant change in a system he felt was contrary to the common good.

Mr. Patman did not hesitate in launching his crusades for the people upon entering the House in 1928. His immediate efforts to achieve reform brought him the resentment of his senior colleagues who then denied him membership on the Banking Committee where he wished to serve to better fight for the kind of basic changes he sought.

His achievements, both large and small, are too numerous to list, but a few exemplify this man of integrity and his dedication to purpose. Very early in his career, he moved to impeach Andrew Mellon who had been appointed Secretary of the Treasury by President Hoover. Mellon was an obvious symbol of entrenched wealth and left office rather than face conflict of interest charges. Wright Patman was a constant champion of the common man in America, the farmer, small businessman, worker, and veteran. He was, of course, instrumental in writing and passage of the Robinson-Patman Act forbidding manufacturers to discriminate against small businesses by giving special prices to chains. He will be long remembered, too, as the prime mover in establishing the credit union system we know today with its 30 million members in the United States.

Wright Patman worked tirelessly for lower interest rates and to remove conflicts of interest within the Federal Reserve System. He made long strides in his leadership against the power of big money and banking on behalf of all consumers.

He had announced his intentions of retiring after this his 47th year in the House. I only wish that he had been able to enjoy a few years of retirement in Texarkana to reflect upon his life's work and accomplishments over the years as the people's servant. His crusades should be continued as a tribute. Wright Patman will not be forgotten, but will remain as an influence in our lives as an example of integrity, dedication, kindness, and selfless service. We will miss Wright Patman.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS PRESIDENT FORD DOES A SNOW JOB ON REVENUE SHARING

(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, the weatherman called off his snow alert. President Ford should have done the same

with his little snow job on revenue sharing.

The President wrapped himself in the revenue-sharing flag. He presented himself as the champion of the cities and States. What he did not tell the mayors is that his own budget yanks the financial rug out from under State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that we have one of his campaign managers sitting in the first row, listening with intent.

The President thunders for a $6.5 billion revenue-sharing program—while his own budget quietly cuts total Federal assistance, including revenue sharing, by a net $9 billion to States and cities in fiscal 1977.

The Congressional Budget Office lays it out very well in its new report. And the Joint Economic Committee backs it up. The JEC report points out that the President's budget hikes State and local costs in such areas as social security, transportation, unemployment benefits, and public service jobs.

His budget shirks the real Federal responsibility to States and cities.

If the mayors really want to know what kind of help to expect from this President, the President does not really care.

IN DEFENSE OF PRESIDENT FORD'S REVENUE-SHARING PROGRAM

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, when I first heard the words of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), and his tirade about the President's program, I wondered whether I had the date wrong and whether today was really St. Patrick's Day, and he had just kissed the "Baloney Stone."

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) undoubtedly is trying to obfuscate the situation to the point that the mayors and the people who run our Nation's cities, and who happen to be in Washington at this time, should realize that it is really the majority leader and the majority side which are keeping revenue sharing in committee.

We understand that there are hearings being held, and we also understand that the bill, as it comes out, will probably be greatly lacking in meeting the requirements of the various cities with respect to the time in which they can budget their general revenue-sharing funds.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts knows, but did not realize, the fact that the revenue sharing undoubtedly is being put into the President's program in lieu of many of the items which the gentleman from Massachusetts said were cut from the budget. Of course, they were cut from the budget because one of the ideas in back of revenue sharing is to do just that, to give the wherewithal to the cities and towns so that they can spend money as they want rather than to have somebody from Washington telling them what to do.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if the President has been spreading snow, I think that is a cleaner commodity than that being spread by the majority leader here today.

VOTING REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, today the House will debate House Joint Resolution 280 to provide full voting representation in the Congress to the residents of the District of Columbia. I would like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his leadership in bringing this historic legislation before the House.

Our Founding Fathers' eloquent arguments against "taxation without representation" unfortunately still ring true for nearly three-quarters of a million Americans. These arguments, as stated by Thomas Jefferson in the simple declaration that "the influence over government must be shared among all the people," speak for themselves.

I support the extension of voting representation to the District because it is right and it is fair.

Our forefathers did not provide for direct election to the Senate, or women's suffrage, or suffrage for blacks and we have, one by one, advanced and improved their great vision of representational democracy. Let us do so once again, adding the life of representation to this, the heart-city of our land.

IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL TO EXTEND FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM, H.R. 12332

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, revenue sharing is a concept which has proven itself since its inception in 1972. The present Federal revenue sharing program will expire on December 31, 1976. To insure the continuation of the revenue sharing program, many bills have been filed in the first and second session.

The bill that I have authored merits your review. It is basically along the lines of the present program with two important exceptions. Present legislation imposes limitations on uses by the local communities. My bill lifts the limitations and allows the local communities to use the funds in the area of most need. Essentially, my bill will allow the localities to channel money into their educational system which they are now prevented from doing because of the limitation language.

Most important, my bill provides that funds are to be sent directly to the local communities. The present program and the administration bill provides that one-third of the funds are to be sent to the State governments. My bill insures that there will be no diversions and waste by the middleman. Revenue sharing has been successful in diverting funds from Washington, D.C. bureaucrats—now let us do the same with the State bureaucrats. Let us put the decisionmaking and funding allocation in the hands of those closest to the problems and those most immediately answerable to the taxpayer.

CONTINUATION OF GROUP ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS UNDER TITLE XX

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12455) to extend from April 1 to October 1, 1976, the maximum period during which recipients of services on September 30, 1975, under titles IV–A and VI of the Social Security Act, may continue to receive services under title XX of that act without individual determinations.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12455

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 228.61(c) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended February 9, 1976 (41 F.R. 5635), shall continue in effect prior to October 1, 1976: *Provided,* That the date "March 31, 1976", as it appears therein, shall be deemed to read "September 30, 1976".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 12455, which is emergency legislation to provide that senior citizen centers utilizing funds under title XX would not be required to impose a means test after April 1, if they were operating on a group eligibility basis prior to the implementation of title XX last October. The administration recommended legislation of this type. The bill has no budgetary impact.

Title XX was enacted as a major part of Public Law 93–647 at the end of the 93d Congress. Included as a policy in title XX was the establishment of a priority in the provision of social services for the poor under the $2.5 billion title XX program. Its effective date was October 1, 1975, when it superseded provisions for social services that had been made under part A of title IV and title VI of the Social Security Act.

Last fall, as the effective date of October 1 approached, there was substantial concern expressed by various groups, particularly those concerned with senior citizen centers that an individual means test which title XX required was demeaning, complex, and administratively costly.

At that time the Subcommittee on Public Assistance of the Ways and Means

Committee worked out an agreement with the Department of HEW so that an individual means test would not have to be applied to services that had not formerly been subject to a means test. This transition to implementation of the means test lasts until April 1. Hearings have been held by the Public Assistance Subcommittee. Many Members of Congress, individuals, and organizations representing the aged, children, and family services and the handicapped plus HEW and State officials made specific recommendations for a permanent solution for the various issues related to eligibility for social services under title XX. It is apparent that a permanent solution of the issues involved cannot be worked out by April 1. At the same time the Office of the General Counsel of HEW advises that the Department does not have statutory authority to extend the continuation of the group eligibility approach beyond March 31.

The further delay provided for in H.R. 12455 in the imposition of the means test would apply until October 1, 1976, to those social services programs that were operating on a group eligibility basis prior to the implementation of title XX last October. For other social services programs where group eligibility has not been used, HEW will be making immediate changes in regulations to provide greater flexibility for States in determining eligibilty under title XX. This can include a simple declaration by an individual that his income does not exceed the income eligibility criteria.

The Ways and Means Committee have efforts underway toward immediate resolution of this issue including a review of the administration proposal and other bills which have been introduced on this subject.

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

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, and I support the extension. I do want to commend both the chairman and the full committee, and particularly the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) for the very industrious way in which they have approached the problem. It is a problem.

Submitting seniors to a means test is degrading, unfair, and inequitable. Equally important, it is a total waste of time and money, facts which are confirmed by the results of a 4-month examination by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and exhaustive studies conducted by other agencies.

For example, a New York City agency found that in New York City, 97 percent of the seniors currently participating in senior centers would have met the requirements of the means test. Such findings indicate that from a practical point of view the simplest, most efficient cost-saving thing to do would be to eliminate entirely the means test for senior citizens. Only 3 percent of the people might be dropped from center eligibility at the cost of subjecting the other 97 percent who qualify to the indignity of the means test. From a cost benefit point of view, it would seem to me the most practical thing to do would be to eliminate the test entirely.

In view of HEW's general agreement with these facts and findings, I do not understand why the committee cannot once and for all resolve the difficulty for senior citizens prior to April 1, by passing legislation eliminating the means test, which is the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREEN) or, alternatively, accept some form of group eligibility or neighborhood or census tract eligibility, which does not require individual persons, and senior citizens, to be subject to the means test?

I commend the committee, but I still wish they would have found a way reasonably and prudently to dispose of this problem. To continue the controversy until October, when Congress will not be in session cannot resolve the problem, merely extends a problem that could have been resolved.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's sentiments. He knows much more about this problem than almost anyone in the House. Certainly he lives with it in his district.

One of our dilemmas is that there are a number of different kinds of social services for which justification could be made for an exemption from the means test. But it must be recognized that we are dealing with a limited number of dollars. The Subcommittee on Public Assistance will be looking at the various alternatives to resolve this issue but at the same time maintain a priority for the most needy.

I promise the gentleman that the committee will report back a bill well before the time needed to pass Congress before October 1. At the same time Congress will also need to resolve how many dollars we will put into social services, and how many dollars we get from other programs to aid senior citizens.

I would call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that some funds go into senior citizens centers from the Older Americans Act and some from title XX. Title XX requires a means test for each person served in a center. The Older Americans Act prohibits the means test. This apparent contradiction between two different Federal programs needs to be resolved.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand there are some inconsistencies within the laws, and especially with title XX, but that does not mean the problems are insoluble. We have been working on this for over a year and I hope with the gentleman's deep understanding and commitment the solution can be arrived at as rapidly as possible. I thought this could have been done by April 1. If it is of such enormous difficulty, then we will have to deal with it as we can, but I appreciate the gentleman's deep commitment to this problem. I know the gentleman and his colleagues on the committee realize the problem and have a sympathetic understanding of the problems of senior citizens and the total lack of wisdom of forcing them to an individual means test, which is impractical and involves indignity for the individual.

Mr. CORMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

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

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California for the leadership he has provided in coming up with this solution to what has been a very grave problem for the senior citizens of the Nation. This bill before us was sponsored by every member of the subcommittee, both the majority and the minority. I urge support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12455 has the unanimous support of the Committee on Ways and Means and its Subcommittee on Public Assistance.

Members of Congress have received substantial correspondence from senior citizens protesting the impending use of the means test to determine their eligibility for participation in senior centers supported by funds under title XX of the Social Security Act. The senior citizens, who initially gained the services of senior centers under the Older Americans Act, are especially affected by the means test approach associated with the new title XX program. Under existing law and regulations, after March 31, 1976, individuals who received services through group eligibility under the old titles IV–A and VI would have to satisfy a means test which they commonly regard as demeaning and a wasteful diversion of scarce service resources.

Two days of subcommittee hearings left no doubt as to the desirability of modifying the application of the means test. The Department of Health, Edution, and Welfare has indicated that prior to April 1 it will publish new regulations permitting States to design their own systems of eligibility determination for title XX services. However, the Department has advised us that legislation is required to permit use beyond March 31 of group eligbility where it has been employed.

The bill before us would hold in place until October 1, 1976, the group eligibility concept as presently used. In the coming months the Subcommittee on Public Assistance is expected to study the President's proposal for converting title XX into a block grant program for social services. In the course of that review, I anticipate the Subcommittee will focus specifically upon the issues of eligibility determination.

I urge the passage of this measure, confident that it will be welcomed by thousands of senior citizens and others who have received social services through group eligibility.

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

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I also support this legislation.

Today I introduced legislation which would repeal the means test, but after the explanation of the gentleman from California, and the assurances that this matter will be given consideration by the

Ways and Means Committee, I think the wise thing for us to do is overwhelmingly pass this bill and let the Ways and Means Committee get the job done.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his remarks, as always so filled with commonsense.

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

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

I, too, add my compliments to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) for bringing this to our attention.

There really is a very big mix-up between title XX and the Older Americans Act. We have to solve it. It is a dilemma facing our senior citizens.

I certainly hope we pass this bill by an overwhelming majority.

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

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) for bringing up this bill which suspends, until October 1, 1976, the imposition of a means test on the use of the senior citizens centers around the country.

I am also pleased by the gentleman's assurance that before the October deadline in this bill is reached, we will get another bill to resolve the problem of the means test.

But I share the concern of my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL), that this problem could have been solved once and for all at this time. An analysis in New York City shows that 97 percent of all the people using senior citizen centers, which may be the only place where they can find companionship, a nutritious meal, and information and referral services, meet the eligibility standards.

Imposing a means test would not only require the State of New York to take away money from activities, meals, and recreational programs in order to administer the test, but experience in other programs has shown that administering means tests may exclude eligible people, as well as those few who may be ineligible.

I would say to the gentleman from California that in order to deal with senior centers, it is not necessary to resolve the problem with respect to day care or other such services. What distinguishes senior citizen center services from a number of other social services that the committee is concerned with is that senior services are relatively cheap for the States to provide and cover a population which is almost entirely poor.

If a means test is imposed, it should be imposed only where there are substantial expenditures per person and that is not something we find with respect to senior citizens centers. For example, in New York it costs an estimated $128 per person, per year, to operate a senior citizens center. Day care, on the other hand, can cost up to $100 per person, per week.

So I would say that I am disappointed that the bill that the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) has introduced, and which I sponsored, was not passed by the committee. I believe that is the proper solution to the problem.

Finally, a means test will discourage persons from using senior citizens centers. Many elderly persons are too proud to undergo the humiliation of pleading and documenting their poverty. They will, instead, simply stay away. The senior center program is one of the best and most appreciated programs devised by the Federal Government. We ought to encourage rather than discourage their use. I believe, therefore, we should have permanently removed rather than simply delayed the means test for senior citizens centers.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in commending the chairman of the subcommittee for reporting out this legislation to extend until October 1, 1976, the period during which senior citizen centers may continue to operate without an individual means test. I understand this extension period is to give the subcommittee time to develop permanent legislation to deal with the difficult problems raised by the proposed means test. In my opinion it is vital that these senior citizen centers continue to operate without an individual means test. Such a test is demeaning and unfair to our senior citizens and administratively more costly than any purpose it could serve. It ought not to be imposed and I welcome this additional period to work out such a solution.

Recently, participants in the senior citizen center project of the Greater Homewood Community Corp. in Baltimore were asked their view of the proposed individual means test. Their responses reflect keenly the demeaning impact of such a test and I want to share with my colleagues a few of their remarks:

The very purpose of the project would be spoiled. A person can hardly feel enriched and fulfilled by programs that make them feel like a beggar.

It is mean and small. It is a very undignified way to treat older people, who do not deserve such shabby treatment from their government.

A gross insult to my intelligence and infringement on what I hold dear, my dignity and privacy. I don't like anyone looking into my pocket-book not even my grandchildren.

In addition to the demeaning aspect of the means test and the needless cost associated therewith, such a requirement would categorize senior citizens and cause the centers to lose many people who contribute significantly to their operation. I therefore thank the chairman for his commitment to consider a permanent solution of this pressing problem.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12455 that will simply extend from April 1, to October 1, 1976, the maximum period during which recipients of services on September 30, 1975, under titles IV–A and VI of the Social Security Act, may continue to receive services under title XX of that Act without individual determinations. We are referring to services provided in homemaker programs, foster care and adoption, special services for the handicapped, day care programs, protective services for children, meals on wheels, general counseling services for employment. All of these programs relate to programs that are designed to help make people lead independent lives. Many times these services will prevent people from having to resort to dependence on the welfare rolls.

However the new strict eligibility requirements in many cases are defeating the purpose of the programs. In many cases the administrative burden of determining eligibility results in additional costs to agencies that have already stretched their budgets as far as they will go. Many times the eligibility tests are inappropriate, for example in providing good family planning provider services. The result is that social services can be given to more people for the same money if costly eligibility procedures and reporting requirements are reduced.

This bill will merely extend for 6 months present eligibility procedures. This will allow time to study the best way to provide the services for those that need them.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H.R. 12455, legislation to extend the prohibition against the implementation of individual means tests for senior citizens under title XX, for an additional 6 months. As one who has led the fight against the means test, I consider the passage of this legislation to be vital while Congress continues to work on a permanent solution to this volatile issue.

Thanks to my efforts, and those of other members of the New York congressional delegation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare postponed the implementation date for individual means tests for senior citizens, from October 1, 1975, to April 1, 1976. During the past 5½ months, HEW has been studying the feasibility of such a means test. In addition, the Subcommittee on Public Assistance has been conducting extensive hearings on the various bills which have been introduced to resolve the means test controversy. It became apparent by the end of last week, that no final solution would be agreed to in time for the April 1 deadline, thus this bill has emerged.

I have long been opposed to senior citizens being subjected to the demeaning process of means tests in order to prove their eligibility to receive senior center services under title XX. Individual means tests administered on a quarterly basis, as prescribed in the title XX law, are both unnecessary and expensive. Only 13 percent of all senior citizens in this Nation have incomes which would

disqualify them from participating in senior center programs. In New York City where there is a high concentration of elderly, the percentage is even smaller.

In addition, these means tests would result in astronomical new administrative costs for States to absorb. Estimates for New York State alone, indicate that the costs of administering means tests would far exceed the costs of operating senior centers. These centers serve more than 100,000 elderly citizens in New York State. The means test would represent an extraordinary waste of Government money to prove what we already generally know.

I am hopeful that the language of my bill H.R. 8456, which repeals the means test provision of title XX, will eventually prevail. I consider this to be the most direct and equitable way to settle this controversy.

In these severe economic times, it seems unnecessarily cruel to even suggest a curtailment of the important services which senior centers provide to our elderly. Many programs for older Americans have been founded on senior centers where our senior citizens gather for companionship, meals, recreation, and societal activities. They have given new meaning and new life to many of our elderly. These centers have brought together people of all social and economic backgrounds.

We must fight, and not perpetuate, the problems of elderly isolation and loneliness. Requiring individual means tests for senior citizens, will have the adverse effect of driving many senior citizens away from senior centers and back into their homes to live their remaining years as prisoners of loneliness, fear, and despair. Further, if enough senior citizens take this route, it may result in the closing of senior centers across the Nation.

I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Public Assistance Subcommittee, Hon. JAMES CORMAN, as well as my distinguished colleague from New York, Hon. CHARLES RANGEL, for their tireless efforts on behalf of resolving this issue. I urge the swift passage of this legislation today to demonstrate to the senior citizens of this Nation that we are committed to helping them enjoy lives of dignity and meaning.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12455, a bill that would extend the moratorium on the use of means tests for older persons who use senior citizens centers. I support this bill because imposition of this means test would be a senseless waste of the taxpayers money, given the high proportion of participants in these centers who are already eligible. Incidentally, the city of New York's Bureau of Purchased Social Services for Adults found that 97 percent of those currently participating would remain eligible; the figure is roughly 80 percent nationally. This high percentage of eligible participants is due to the fact that most of these centers are located in previous OEO target areas and a high percentage rely on social security for their sole source of income.

The diversion of service funds to administrative overhead could amount to $361 million nationally in the first year alone. At an estimated $40 to $45 to administer each test, this would represent a 37-percent loss of program funds in the first year and 25 percent for each succeeding year in the city of New York. While the financial cost can be documented, the human loss of implementing a means test is inestimable. It is predicted that the means test would drive people away from these centers who depend on them for recreation, companionship, referral services, and, for some, the only hot meal of the day.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 9280 introduced by my colleague, Congressman BEN ROSENTHAL, I am disappointed that we do not have the opportunity to vote on a more comprehensive reform bill today. I would prefer to vote on such a bill that would specifically exempt senior centers from a means test. H.R. 9280 would also allow States to waive individual means tests for predominantly low-income groups on a geographical basis. I believe that this exemption should be expanded to include the blind and the disabled in addition to the elderly on the grounds that they all tend to live on fixed incomes and would have inordinant difficulty in complying with procedures such as means tests.

I know that the Subcommitte on Public Assistance of the Committee on Ways and Means has held hearings on this issue and does not feel that it can develop legislation before the current moratorium expires April 1. I urge that the subcommittee and committee expedite their consideration of a more comprehensive approach to this issue.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in vigorous support of H.R. 12455 which extends for an additional 6 months the period recipients under the old title IV–A and VI social services program can continue to receive services in a group setting without individual eligibility determinations. With the April 1 expiration date of the first 6-months' extension Congress requested close at hand, I commend the Public Assistance Subcommittee and the full House Ways and Means Committee for recognizing the need for additional time to consider and resolve the group eligibility controversy under the new title XX social services program. Their quick action on H.R. 12455 clearly reflects their justified concern about the serious unanticipated human and financial consequences of fully implementing the individual means test which have been brought to their attention through various hearings on the new title XX program. As a representative of thousands of older Americans who consider group services provided in title XX supported senior centers essential to their survival and well-being, but who also value their privacy, I have been made fully aware of what havoc will occur if we allow the present suspension of the individual means test for group services to expire. I urge my colleagues in the House to concur in the House Ways and Means Committee's judgment on the extension and vote to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 12455.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the bill (H.R. 12455) now under discussion.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12455).

The question was taken.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. 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 383, nays 0, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—383

Abdnor	Carney	Flowers
Adams	Carr	Flynt
Addabbo	Carter	Foley
Alexander	Cederberg	Ford, Mich.
Allen	Chappell	Forsythe
Ambro	Chisholm	Fountain
Anderson, Calif.	Clancy	Fraser
	Clausen, Don H.	Frenzel
Andrews, N.C.		Frey
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clawson, Del	Fuqua
	Clay	Gaydos
Archer	Cleveland	Giaimo
Armstrong	Cochran	Gibbons
Ashbrook	Cohen	Gilman
Ashley	Collins, Tex.	Ginn
Aspin	Conable	Goldwater
AuCoin	Conlan	Gonzalez
Badillo	Conte	Goodling
Bafalis	Corman	Gradison
Baldus	Cornell	Grassley
Baucus	Coughlin	Green
Bauman	D'Amours	Gude
Beard, R.I.	Daniel, Dan	Hagedorn
Beard, Tenn.	Daniel, R. W.	Haley
Bedell	Daniels, N.J.	Hall
Bennett	Danielson	Hamilton
Bevill	Davis	Hammer-schmidt
Biaggi	de la Garza	
Biester	Delaney	Hanley
Bingham	Dent	Hannaford
Blanchard	Derrick	Harkin
Blouin	Derwinski	Harrington
Boland	Devine	Harris
Bolling	Dickinson	Harsha
Bonker	Dodd	Hawkins
Bowen	Downey, N.Y.	Hays, Ohio
Brademas	Downing, Va.	Hébert
Breaux	Drinan	Hechler, W. Va.
Breckinridge	Duncan, Oreg.	Heckler, Mass.
Brinkley	Duncan, Tenn.	Hefner
Brodhead	du Pont	Helstoski
Brooks	Early	Henderson
Broomfield	Eckhardt	Hicks
Brown, Calif.	Edgar	Hightower
Brown, Mich.	Edwards, Ala.	Hillis
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Calif.	Holland
Broyhill	Eilberg	Holt
Buchanan	Emery	Holtzman
Burgener	English	Horton
Burke, Calif.	Evans, Ind.	Howard
Burke, Fla.	Evins, Tenn.	Howe
Burke, Mass.	Fenwick	Hubbard
Burleson, Tex.	Findley	Hughes
Burlison, Mo.	Fish	Hungate
Burton, John	Fisher	Hutchinson
Burton, Phillip	Fithian	Hyde
Butler	Flood	Ichord
Byron	Florio	Jacobs

Jarman	Moorhead, Pa.	Schulze
Jeffords	Morgan	Sebelius
Jenrette	Mosher	Seiberling
Johnson, Calif.	Moss	Sharp
Johnson, Colo.	Mottl	Shipley
Johnson, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Shriver
Jones, Ala.	Murtha	Shuster
Jones, N.C.	Myers, Ind.	Sikes
Jones, Okla.	Myers, Pa.	Sisk
Jones, Tenn.	Natcher	Skubitz
Jordan	Neal	Slack
Kasten	Nedzi	Smith, Iowa
Kastenmeier	Nichols	Smith, Nebr.
Kazen	Nix	Snyder
Kelly	Nolan	Solarz
Kemp	Nowak	Spellman
Ketchum	Oberstar	Spence
Keys	O'Brien	Staggers
Kindness	O'Hara	Stanton,
Koch	O'Neill	J. William
Krebs	Ottinger	Stark
Krueger	Passman	Steed
LaFalce	Patten, N.J.	Steelman
Lagomarsino	Patterson,	Steiger, Ariz.
Landrum	Calif.	Steiger, Wis.
Latta	Pattison, N.Y.	Stephens
Leggett	Pepper	Stratton
Lehman	Perkins	Stuckey
Lent	Pettis	Studds
Levitas	Peyser	Sullivan
Litton	Pickle	Symington
Lloyd, Calif.	Pike	Symms
Lloyd, Tenn.	Poage	Talcott
Long, La.	Pressler	Taylor, Mo.
Long, Md.	Preyer	Taylor, N.C.
Lott	Price	Teague
Lujan	Pritchard	Thompson
Lundine	Quie	Thone
McCollister	Quillen	Thornton
McCormack	Railsback	Traxler
McDade	Randall	Treen
McEwen	Rangel	Tsongas
McFall	Rees	Ullman
McHugh	Regula	Van Deerlin
McKay	Reuss	Vander Jagt
Madden	Rhodes	Vanik
Madigan	Richmond	Vigorito
Maguire	Rinaldo	Waggonner
Mahon	Risenhoover	Walsh
Mann	Roberts	Wampler
Martin	Robinson	Weaver
Mathis	Rodino	Whalen
Matsunaga	Rogers	White
Mazzoli	Roncalio	Whitehurst
Meeds	Rooney	Whitten
Melcher	Rose	Wiggins
Mezvinsky	Rosenthal	Wilson, Bob
Michel	Roush	Wilson, C. H.
Milford	Rousselot	Winn
Miller, Ohio	Roybal	Wirth
Mills	Runnels	Wolff
Mineta	Ruppe	Wright
Minish	Russo	Wydler
Mink	Ryan	Wylie
Mitchell, Md.	St Germain	Yates
Mitchell, N.Y.	Santini	Yatron
Moakley	Sarasin	Young, Alaska
Mollohan	Sarbanes	Young, Fla.
Montgomery	Satterfield	Young, Ga.
Moore	Scheuer	Young, Tex.
Moorhead,	Schneebeli	Zablocki
Calif.	Schroeder	Zeferetti

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—49

Abzug	Evans, Colo.	Mikva
Anderson, Ill.	Fary	Miller, Calif.
Annunzio	Fascell	Moffett
Barrett	Ford, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.
Bell	Guyer	Obey
Bergland	Hansen	Riegle
Boggs	Hayes, Ind.	Roe
Collins, Ill.	Heinz	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Hinshaw	Simon
Cotter	Karth	Stanton,
Crane	McClory	James V.
Dellums	McCloskey	Stokes
Diggs	McDonald	Udall
Dingell	McKinney	Vander Veen
Erlenborn	Macdonald	Waxman
Esch	Metcalfe	Wilson, Tex.
Eshleman	Meyner	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Roe.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Bergland.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Mikva.
Mr. Dingell with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Bell.
Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Guyer.
Ms. Abzug with Mr. McDonald of Georgia.
Mr. Hayes of Indiana with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Hansen.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Obey with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Moffett with Mr. James V. Stanton.
Mr. Waxman with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Ford of Tennessee.
Mr. Fary with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Riegle.
Mrs. Meyner with Mr. Simon.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Vander Veen.

Mr. FORSYTHE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIFTH QUARTERLY REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON WAGE AND PRICE STABILITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 5 of the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act, as amended, I hereby transmit to the Congress the fifth quarterly report of the Council on Wage and Price Stability. This report contains a description of the Council activities during the last quarter of 1975 in monitoring both prices and wages in the private sector and various Federal Government activities that lead to higher costs and prices without creating commensurate benefits. It discusses in some detail the Council's studies in steel, automobiles, and industrial chemicals, as well as its filings before various Federal regulatory agencies.

During 1976, the Council on Wage and Phice Stability will continue to play an important role in supplementing fiscal and monetary policies by calling public attention to wage and price developments or actions by the Government that could be of concern to American consumers.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 16, 1976.*

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1976

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request agreement of March 11, 1976, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 857) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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. 857

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of June 27, 1975 (Public Law 94–41, as amended by Public Law 94–159), is hereby further amended by striking out "March 31, 1976" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1976".

SEC. 2. The first section of the tenth un-numbered clause of section 101(b) of such joint resolution is amended by inserting after "VII", the following "(except sections 792, 793, and 794(a))".

SEC. 3. The first un-numbered clause of section 101(e) of such joint resolution is amended by striking out "section 314(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sections 312, 313, 792, 793, and 794".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, after "794" insert "(a)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a resolution making further continuing appropriations. The present continuing resolution expires on March 31, and it is necessary to have a further continuing resolution.

Most of the appropriation bills, of course, have been processed and enacted into law; but there are three problems that bring about the necessity for this continuing resolution.

It is necessary because all of the appropriation bills for the current fiscal year have not yet been enacted into law. Basically, the resolution is applicable to three areas—the District of Columbia, foreign aid, and certain Labor-HEW appropriations.

The original continuing resolution was passed last June and was extended in December until March 31, 2 weeks from tomorrow.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

With respect to the District of Columbia, the D.C. budget was not submitted to Congress until last November 5. Although the committee concluded hearings before adjournment of the last session of Congress on December 19, 1975, reporting of the District of Columbia bill has been delayed since that time pending receipt of amendments to the budget and enactment of revenue measures by the city government necessary to produce a balanced budget as required by law. It is evident that the appropriation bill will not clear Congress and be sent to the President before the expiration of the existing continuing resolution on March 31.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

With respect to the foreign aid bill, the committee concluded the bulk of the hearings for fiscal year 1976 last June

but applicable authorizations were long delayed.

On March 3, the House passed the international security assistance bill. Although the House passed the foreign assistance appropriation bill the following day, there is no certainty that Senate and conference actions can be accomplished and the bill sent to the White House before the existing continuing resolution expires on the last day of this month. Consequently, an extension of the existing continuing resolution is necessary for these purposes.

LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS

Further continuing authority is also required for certain programs normally funded under the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. This is necessary because of the absence or lateness of some authorizing legislation.

Appropriations for some of these activities including those under the Older Americans Act amendments and the public broadcasting program will be included in the second supplemental appropriation bill which the committee plans to report and pass through the House before the Easter recess which begins at close of business, Wednesday, April 14.

A number of ongoing health programs still lack basic authorization and the outlook for such legislation before the beginning of the new fiscal year is uncertain. With respect to the training programs for allied health and public health professions, the committee has included in sections 2 and 3 of the resolution language to permit the continuation of these activities which would otherwise expire. Moreover, extension of the existing resolution is required to further provide for programs and activities presently covered until midnight March 31.

Mr. Speaker, the September 30 date contained in the pending resolution represents the last day of the so-called transition period—the special fiscal period designed to achieve the change of the fiscal year as required by the Congressional Budget Act passed in July 2 years ago.

I know of no difficulty involved here. The matter was not controversial before the Committee on Appropriations. It should be considered as a routine operation that is required because of the factors which I have related to the House.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the continuing resolution. If we are going to continue these programs, as provided here, then I see no other option other than to pass the continuing resolution. So I support the continuing resolution.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), yielding to me.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that this continuing resolution provides funding of roughly $4.1 billion of ongoing programs but that most of the funding is for foreign assistance. So that basically this resolution provides for continuing appropriations of slightly over $3.1 billion in foreign assistance. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from California is correct. The exact figure is $3,043,000,000.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. $3.1 billion in foreign assistance for the foreign aid giveaway?

Mr. MAHON. This represents a continuation of last year's program levels. That is what the continuing resolution would provide for.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. My point is that roughly three-fourths of the money provided in this continuing resolution is for the giveaway programs overseas. Is that right?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate that comment. Therefore those Members that feel that the overwhelming proportion of the funds contained in this continuing resolution are for massive giveaway programs overseas would surely ask that we have a recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker, let me review for my fellow Members just where all this taxpayers' money is proposed to go:

House Joint Resolution 857 for consideration of House Appropriations Committee, March 11, 1976, summary of activities included

[In millions]

Foreign assistance	$3,043
District of Columbia	385
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, selected activities	645
Center for Disease Control	
National Institutes of Health	
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, Mental Health Administration	
Health Resources Administration:	
Health Manpower	
Special Education Programs	
Public Health	
Allied Health	
Health Facilities Construction	
Office of Human Development, Aging Programs	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	62
Total	4,136
Added by change in level of funding	49
Total	4,185

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT), that we had votes in the House on March 3 and 4 on the military assistance authorization bill and on the appropriations bill for all of the foreign aid programs. Of course, these bills have not been enacted into law and that is one of the reasons we have a further continuing resolution.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Of course, that particular bill that this body passed is still in conference and we do not know really what the final outcome of that will be, but, in any regard, if there are any individuals who have substantial doubts about continuing this massive foreign aid giveaway program overseas, then this would be the place to indicate that doubt.

Mr. MAHON. There are many Members who opposed the legislation approved by the House earlier this month. I was among those voting against both the authorization and the appropriation.

I would say to the gentleman that the time to vote against foreign aid or for lower foreign aid spending levels was earlier this month, not on the measure before us at this time.

The resolution we are considering now provides a level for foreign aid of about $3 billion. It is the same rate as has prevailed since July 1 of this fiscal year.

The appropriations bill which passed the House on March 4 provided $5 billion, about $2 billion more than today's resolution.

So, I would say that Members should have voted against the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills or against the conference reports when they come back to the House, if this is what they wish to do. I would not think Members would want to vote against this measure which is $2 billion lower than what the House approved 2 weeks ago and some $2.7 billion less than the President requested for the current fiscal year.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional amount of $175,000 for the National Commission on Water Quality, authorized by section 315 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended to complete the work of the Commission."

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this amendment will provide $175,000 to permit the National Commission on Water Quality to complete its work. Its work will be completed by a report which will be filed next month. The $175,000 appropriation follows an authorization which was passed by the House on March 9 and by the Senate on March 10.

The Commission, in my opinion, is completing a vital study that should be assembled and printed to get the maximum benefit from this effort.

Members of both the House and Senate are participants in the important study group which has been under the capable guidance of Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, a former chief of the Corps of Engineers.

The chairman of the distinguished Committee on Public Works and the Vice President, who are both Members of this Commission, have asked that these funds be made available promptly as the small staff of the Commission of necessity will be placed on leave without pay this week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to

adopt this amendment to this resolution so that these funds can be made available immediately. This is the only vehicle now before the Congress where this small but critical amount of funds can be provided.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary that the amendment be agreed to, and I trust that it will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the continuing resolution before us supports a number of ongoing programs normally funded in the Labor-HEW appropriations bill which at this late point in the fiscal year, still lack appropriations.

The resolution provides a total of $757,232,000 for these programs. Specifically, the bill provides continued funding at the annual rate of $28,300,000 for preventive health programs; $123,646,000 for the research training program of the National Institutes of Health; $160,287,000 for the research training and drug abuse programs of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration; $111,500,00 for the older Americans programs of the Office of Human Development; and $62,000,000 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The legislative authority for these programs expired on June 30, 1975. We shall be able to include appropriations for the older Americans programs and for public broadcasting, and possibly for drug abuse and research training in the second supplemental appropriation bill which will be reported by the committee quite soon.

In addition, the continuing resolution provides $271,499,000 for the health manpower programs. This is the second full year that we have had to provide for the health manpower programs in the continuing resolution. The legislative authority for the health manpower programs expired on June 30, 1974. Let me point out that we have modified the existing resolution to permit the continuation of the training programs for allied health and public health professions. This change was necessary in order to prevent termination of support to these programs.

None of these activities could be included in the 1976 Labor-HEW appropriation bill, or the first 1976 supplemental appropriation bill, due to lack of authorizing legislation.

I wish I could say that this is the last time that this House will have to deal with a continuing resolution. Unfortunately, the outlook for the future is not that bright. Our subcommittee is currently considering 1977 budget estimates totaling over $58 billion, of which $3.3 billion requires additional authorizing legislation. Our schedule calls for completion of subcommittee markup of the 1977 appropriation bills by May 6, completion of full committee consideration by June 4, and completion of House action by July 2.

If the necessary authorizing legislation is not enacted soon, we will have to leave the unauthorized programs out of our 1977 appropriation bill—and that means more continuing resolutions.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. 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 309, nays 75, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—309

Adams	Burton, Phillip	Eilberg
Addabbo	Butler	Esch
Alexander	Carney	Evins, Tenn.
Allen	Carr	Fascell
Ambro	Carter	Fenwick
Anderson, Calif.	Cederberg	Findley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Chappell	Fish
Armstrong	Chisholm	Fisher
Ashley	Clay	Fithian
Aspin	Cleveland	Flood
AuCoin	Cohen	Florio
Badillo	Conable	Flowers
Baldus	Conte	Flynt
Baucus	Corman	Foley
Beard, R.I.	Cornell	Ford, Mich.
Bedell	Coughlin	Forsythe
Biaggi	D'Amours	Fountain
Biester	Daniel, Dan	Fraser
Bingham	Daniel, R. W.	Frenzel
Blanchard	Daniels, N.J.	Fuqua
Blouin	Danielson	Gaydos
Boland	Davis	Giaimo
Bolling	de la Garza	Gilman
Bonker	Delaney	Goldwater
Bowen	Dent	Gonzalez
Brademas	Derwinski	Goodling
Breaux	Devine	Gradison
Breckinridge	Dickinson	Grassley
Brodhead	Diggs	Green
Brooks	Dingell	Gude
Broomfield	Dodd	Hall
Brown, Calif.	Downey, N.Y.	Hamilton
Brown, Mich.	Downing, Va.	Hammer-schmidt
Buchanan	Drinan	Hanley
Burgener	Duncan, Oreg.	Hannaford
Burke, Calif.	Duncan, Tenn.	Harkin
Burke, Mass.	du Pont	Harrington
Burleson, Tex.	Early	Harris
Burlison, Mo.	Eckhardt	Hawkins
Burton, John	Edgar	Hayes, Ind.
	Edwards, Ala.	Hays, Ohio
	Edwards, Calif.	

Hébert	Mink	Sarasin
Hechler, W. Va.	Mitchell, Md.	Sarbanes
Heckler, Mass.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Scheuer
Helstoski	Moakley	Schroeder
Henderson	Moffett	Sebelius
Hicks	Mollohan	Selberling
Hillis	Moorhead, Pa.	Sharp
Holland	Morgan	Shipley
Holtzman	Mosher	Shriver
Horton	Moss	Sikes
Howard	Murphy, N.Y.	Sisk
Howe	Murtha	Slack
Hughes	Myers, Pa.	Smith, Iowa
Hungate	Natcher	Solarz
Hyde	Neal	Spellman
Jacobs	Nedzi	Staggers
Jarman	Nix	Stanton, J. William
Jeffords	Nolan	Stark
Johnson, Calif.	Nowak	Steed
Johnson, Colo.	Oberstar	Steelman
Johnson, Pa.	O'Brien	Steiger, Wis.
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara	Stratton
Jones, N.C.	O'Neill	Stuckey
Jordan	Ottinger	Studds
Kasten	Passman	Sullivan
Kastenmeier	Patten, N.J.	Symington
Kazen	Patterson, Calif.	Talcott
Kemp	Pattison, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.
Keys	Pepper	Teague
Kindness	Perkins	Thompson
Koch	Pettis	Thone
Krebs	Peyser	Tsongas
Krueger	Pickle	Ullman
LaFalce	Pike	Van Deerlin
Lagomarsino	Poage	Vander Jagt
Lehman	Preyer	Vanik
Lent	Price	Vigorito
Litton	Pritchard	Waggonner
Lloyd, Calif.	Quie	Walsh
Long, La.	Railsback	Wampler
Long, Md.	Randall	Waxman
Lujan	Rangel	Weaver
McCormack	Rees	Whalen
McDade	Regula	White
McEwen	Reuss	Whitehurst
McFall	Rhodes	Whitten
McHugh	Richmond	Wiggins
McKay	Rinaldo	Wilson, Bob
Madden	Risenhoover	Wilson, C. H.
Maguire	Roberts	Winn
Mahon	Robinson	Wirth
Mann	Rodino	Wolff
Mathis	Roncalio	Wright
Matsunaga	Rooney	Wydler
Mazzoli	Rose	Wylie
Meeds	Rosenthal	Yates
Melcher	Roush	Yatron
Mezvinsky	Roybal	Young, Ga.
Milford	Russo	Young, Tex.
Miller, Calif.	Ryan	Zablocki
Mills	St Germain	Zeferetti
Mineta	Santini	
Minish		

NAYS—75

Abdnor	Hagedorn	Myers, Ind.
Andrews, N.C.	Haley	Nichols
Archer	Hefner	Pressler
Ashbrook	Hightower	Quillen
Bafalis	Holt	Rogers
Bauman	Hubbard	Rousselot
Bennett	Hutchinson	Runnels
Bevill	Ichord	Ruppe
Brinkley	Jenrette	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Jones, Okla.	Schneebeli
Broyhill	Jones, Tenn.	Schulze
Burke, Fla.	Kelly	Shuster
Byron	Ketchum	Skubitz
Clancy	Landrum	Smith, Nebr.
Clausen, Don H.	Latta	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Levitas	Spence
Cochran	Lloyd, Tenn.	Steiger, Ariz.
Collins, Tex.	Lott	Stephens
Conlan	McCollister	Symms
Derrick	McDonald	Taylor, Mo.
Emery	Martin	Traxler
English	Miller, Ohio	Treen
Evans, Ind.	Montgomery	Young, Fla.
Frey	Moore	
Gibbons	Moorhead, Calif.	
Ginn	Mottl	

NOT VOTING—48

Abzug	Cotter	Harsha
Anderson, Ill.	Crane	Heinz
Annunzio	Dellums	Hinshaw
Barrett	Erlenborn	Karth
Beard, Tenn.	Eshleman	Leggett
Bell	Evans, Colo.	Lundine
Bergland	Fary	McClory
Boggs	Ford, Tenn.	McCloskey
Collins, Ill.	Guyer	McKinney
Conyers	Hansen	Macdonald

Madigan	Riegle	Thornton
Metcalfe	Roe	Udall
Meyner	Rostenkowski	Vander Veen
Michel	Simon	Wilson, Tex.
Mikva	Stanton, James V.	Young, Alaska
Murphy, Ill.	Stokes	
Obey		

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Vander Veen.
Mr. Obey with Mr. Lundine.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
Ms. Abzug with Mr. Beard of Tennessee.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. McClory.
Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Bergland with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Roe.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Ford of Tennessee.
Mr. Fary with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Riegle.
Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Bell.
Mrs. Meyner with Mr. Madigan.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Hansen.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Simon with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Mikva.
Mr. Thornton with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. LEVITAS and Mr. SATTERFIELD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed, and that I be permitted to include certain tables and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 280, PROVIDING REPRESENTATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CONGRESS

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1040 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1040

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. 280) to amend the Constitution to provide for the representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes for the minority to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1040 provides for an open rule with 3 hours of general debate on House Joint Resolution 280, a resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress.

The rule further provides that the 3 hours of debate be divided equally and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the joint resolution shall be read under the 5-minute rule.

Also, House Resolution 1040 provides that 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.

House Joint Resolution 280 would amend the Constitution to provide the District of Columbia voting representation in the House of Representatives on the basis of its population, and two voting Members of the Senate. Each Senator and Representative would possess the same qualifications as to age and citizenship and would have the same rights, privileges and obligations as other Senators and Representatives. As written, the amendment would have no effect on the provision in the 23d amendment for determining the number of Presidential elections to which the District is now entitled. Finally, the proposed new article confers power upon Congress to make provisions for filling vacancies in the representation in Congress for the District, but by election only.

It is unconscionable that in the year 1976—the two hundredth anniversary of this great Nation—that the citizens of the District of Columbia are subject to "taxation without representation." Basic to true democratic representation, the foundation of American Government, is the power to participate in the decision-making process which effects our lives. Our Nation was founded on this premise and through the years political participation has been strengthened by such acts as the 15th amendment, which prohibited the denial of the vote on the basis of race, the 19th amendment, which eliminated sex as the basis for denying the vote, the 26th amendment, which extended the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and over, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The greatest Bicentennial gift this Bicentennial Congress could give to the District of Columbia is full representation in the American political system. The 23d amendment, passed in 1960, granted District residents the right to vote in the selection of the President. Moreover, this amendment, enacted after decades of debating the constitutional and political issues related to the question of providing full voting representation in Congress to the people of the District of Columbia, set a precedent for subsequent Congress, that the District residents should not be denied the right to vote for the President because of their place of residence.

It is time, in this Bicentennial Year, for the Congress to employ the opportunity and its responsibility to recognize the right of the same citizens to full representation in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1040 in order that we may discuss, debate, and pass House Joint Resolution 280.

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

Mr. Speaker, while I feel certain this rule will be adopted, the joint resolution should be defeated on final passage.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary describes this bill as follows, and I quote:

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

As already noted, the proposed new article would not make the District of Columbia a State or invest it with the sovereign powers of a State. Nor would it constitute a foundation for statehood or change the constitutional powers and responsibility of the Congress to legislate with respect to the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I think most Members of the House are asking themselves why the proponents are attempting this approach to this particular problem. I hope to give the Members a little more information than was provided in this committee report as to why this approach is being taken.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG) has already indicated that residents of the District of Columbia can now vote for President and Vice President. They now elect their city government; they now elect their school board, even though they have a difficult time keeping a superintendent. But they do all these things, and they also elect a nonvoting Member of this House.

Now, one would think they would be here seeking to make the District of Columbia a State, and then they would accept all the responsibilities of a State. But, no, they are not doing that. They want all the benefits of being a State, but they do not want to accept all of the responsibilities of statehood.

The question is, why? Why are they taking this particular approach? To go the precedent-shattering constitutional route as here proposed, it will take a two-thirds vote in this House; to go the statehood route, it will only take a majority vote.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to be against this approach, but I did tell the gentleman from the District of Columbia, Reverend FAUNTROY, that if he could give me in writing a guarantee that Councilman Douglas Moore, who has been in the papers lately, would be one of the two U.S. Senators, I might be persuaded to vote for it. I think the Senate needs somebody like him, and I am not sure but what that would be an improvement all the way around. In that way we could get him out of the City Council and over there.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, to continue on the question of why the proponents are going this route when it would be much easier to go the statehood route and not have to submit the matter to the States for ratification.

This is a very unique and precedent-setting procedure. Why are they doing it?

Well, they want to eat their cake and have it too. It is just as simple as that. They want to be dipping into all these Federal funds they presently have access to as a non-State while still enjoying the benefits of statehood. That is what it is all about.

The issue is not this question of taxation without representation. That is not the question at all, because citizens do vote in this Federal city. And I still consider it a Federal city; it is the Capital of all the people of these United States, and it is not just for the people who happen to reside here in the District of Columbia.

It is a Federal city. They want to dip into all these funds that are now provided to the District as a Federal city by our constituents, yours and mine, the taxpayers of this Nation, and these are funds to which the States are not now entitled to receive.

Does your State get a Federal payment? It does not. What does the District of Columbia get, and how much does the District of Columbia want to keep by going this route?

Mr. Speaker, I went to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Appropriations to get the expenditures for the District as they apply today, and I find they are very enlightening. In fiscal year 1976 the Federal payment to the District of Columbia was $254 million. In Federal grants the District of Columbia received $340,614,000. From revenue sharing—and we heard a little bit about that from our majority leader earlier this afternoon—the District of Columbia received $30 million. That all comes to a subtotal of $624,614,000.

In Federal loans for fiscal year 1976 the District of Columbia received $248,153,000. After the addition of that figure, the District of Columbia received a total in Federal funds for fiscal year 1976 of $872,767,000. But I am not finished yet.

How many major cities in this country are getting a $6 billion subway system built primarily by the taxpayers of this country? If they are doing anything remotely similar to this subway construction, are their bonds being sold backed by the U.S. Government?

Mr. Speaker, these bonds are so backed in the District of Columbia. I might say, since I have mentioned the subway system, that I have these figures for the benefit of the Members.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee—and he keeps pretty close tab on what is going on—says that $6 billion will be cost of this most expensive subway system in America.

The revised estimated cost, even if we use the present figures, would be $4,730,600,000. The amount authorized by the Congress and by the people of this country so far is $2,980,200,000.

Mr. Speaker, they have even come into the Congress and said, "We want a change in the ratio of payments." The Federal Government is already paying two-thirds of the cost.

They just recently came in and said, "We want 80 percent."

Mr. Speaker, I went to the Library of Congress, and I do not very often do this, to get some figures on the amount of the tax burden versus Federal outlays. If the Members would like to see this little document as to their States and compare the figures for the District of Columbia, it will be back there on the committee table. You can take a look at it. However, since we are talking about the District of Columbia, I might point out this includes outlays for Federal employees and all of the outlays from the Federal tax treasury in the District of Columbia. It does not, naturally, all go to the District of Columbia. I am talking about outlays of all Federal dollars in the District of Columbia, according to the Library of Congress. Under the tax burden, the figure is $1,141,347,000. The amount of the outlays is $8,500,803,000.

Mr. Speaker, let us not talk about taxation without representation when we have figures like these staring us in the face. As we listen to the discussion here this afternoon and we hear all about taxation without representation, let us keep in mind this fact: Why are the proponents of this legislation not going the State route rather than via this hybrid route?

I have given the Members the answer to this question. The answer is dollars, dollars that would not otherwise go into the District of Columbia and they do not want to have to give them up by accepting statehood. Could it be that the proponents value dollars more than statehood? I would hope not.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 280 which would amend the Constitution to provide for the representation of the District of Columbia in Congress. The constitutional amendment which this resolution would propose provides that the District of Columbia elect two U.S. Senators and the number of U.S. Representatives to which it would be entitled if it were a State—the current population of the District would result in two Representatives. Senators and Representatives which elected would have to be inhabitants of the District and meet the same age and citizenship requirements as if they were elected from a State. All vacancies would be filled by election only.

The people of the District of Columbia, like all other citizens of the United States are entitled to their full representation in the U.S. Congress. This constitutional amendment is needed because the framers of our Constitution could not have foreseen that 700,000 persons have been deprived of their voting franchise.

I urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 280 in order that the most fundamental principle of our democracy can be extended to all the citizens of the District of Columbia—the right to representation of one's views in Government.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will my chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), yield for just one short question?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when we had this in the Committee on Rules, I think we answered most of the gentleman's questions.

Mr. LATTA. The committee did not answer my question.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) a question.

Mr. Speaker, the question I would like to ask my good chairman, which he apparently does not wish to answer, is why are the proponents not going the State route and willing to accept the responsibility of statehood as well as all the benefits?

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows the answer and this is apparently why he did not choose to answer.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, this will be covered in full detail when the general debate starts. I can assure the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that there are many solid and good reasons why going the route of statehood would be inappropriate. A particular, special and good reason, and just one of the number of reasons, is that our founders wanted to have a Federal enclave that we operated ourselves as Members of the Congress. That is a very important principle that we would lose by having a State. Does the gentleman from California want the State of Maryland or the State of Virginia or the State of California to control the business of the Federal enclave?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute and again yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr.

Speaker, I have completed my statement, and that is that one of the reasons is to preserve the important principle of the Federal Government controlling its own buildings and its own property.

Mr. LATTA. I might say in my humble view that there is not very much to preserve as far as the Federal city idea is concerned. We attempted to carve out a Federal enclave, and many Members realize that that was a fluke.

I just want to say that I look forward with anxious anticipation to getting an answer to my question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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 appear to have it.

Mr. HILLIS. 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 313, nays 72, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—313

Abdnor	Clay	Gilman
Adams	Cochran	Ginn
Addabbo	Cohen	Goldwater
Alexander	Conable	Gonzalez
Allen	Conte	Goodling
Ambro	Corman	Gradison
Andrews, N.C.	Cornell	Grassley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cotter	Green
	Coughlin	Gude
Armstrong	D'Amours	Hagedorn
Ashley	Daniel, Dan	Hall
Aspin	Daniels, N.J.	Hamilton
AuCoin	Danielson	Hanley
Badillo	Davis	Hannaford
Baldus	de la Garza	Harkin
Baucus	Delaney	Harrington
Beard, R.I.	Dent	Harris
Beard, Tenn.	Derrick	Hawkins
Bedell	Derwinski	Hayes, Ind.
Bennett	Dickinson	Hays, Ohio
Bevill	Diggs	Hechler, W. Va.
Biaggi	Dodd	Heckler, Mass.
Biester	Downey, N.Y.	Hefner
Bingham	Downing, Va.	Helstoski
Blanchard	Drinan	Henderson
Blouin	Duncan, Oreg.	Hicks
Boland	du Pont	Holland
Bolling	Early	Holtzman
Bonker	Eckhardt	Horton
Brademas	Edgar	Howard
Breaux	Edwards, Ala.	Howe
Breckinridge	Edwards, Calif.	Hughes
Brinkley	Eilberg	Hungate
Brodhead	Emery	Hyde
Brown, Calif.	Esch	Ichord
Brown, Mich.	Evans, Ind.	Jacobs
Brown, Ohio	Fascell	Jeffords
Broyhill	Fenwick	Jenrette
Buchanan	Findley	Johnson, Colo.
Burgener	Fish	Jones, N.C.
Burke, Calif.	Fisher	Jones, Tenn.
Burke, Fla.	Fithian	Jordan
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Kasten
Burlison, Mo.	Florio	Kastenmeier
Burton, John	Flowers	Kazen
Burton, Phillip	Ford, Mich.	Kelly
Byron	Forsythe	Kemp
Carney	Fountain	Ketchum
Carr	Fraser	Keys
Cederberg	Frenzel	Koch
Chappell	Frey	Krebs
Chisholm	Fuqua	LaFalce
Clausen, Don H.	Gaydos	Lagomarsino
	Giaimo	Leggett
Seiberling	Nolan	Slack
Sharp	Nowak	Smith, Iowa
Shipley	Oberstar	Smith, Nebr.
Lehman	O'Brien	Solarz
Lent	O'Hara	Spellman
Levitas	O'Neill	Spence
Litton	Ottinger	Staggers
Lloyd, Calif.	Patten, N.J.	Stanton,
Lloyd, Tenn.	Patterson, Calif.	J. William
Long, La.		Stark
Lundine	Pattison, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
McCollister	Pepper	Stephens
McCormack	Perkins	Stuckey
McDade	Pettis	Studds
McFall	Peyser	Sullivan
McHugh	Pickle	Symington
McKay	Pike	Talcott
McKinney	Pressler	Taylor, Mo.
Madden	Preyer	Taylor, N.C.
Maguire	Price	Thone
Mahon	Quie	Thornton
Mann	Railsback	Traxler
Martin	Randall	Treen
Matsunaga	Rangel	Tsongas
Mazzoli	Rees	Ullman
Meeds	Regula	Van Deerlin
Melcher	Reuss	Vander Jagt
Mezvinsky	Rhodes	Vander Veen
Miller, Calif.	Richmond	Vanik
Mills	Rinaldo	Vigorito
Mineta	Risenhoover	Walsh
Minish	Rodino	Wampler
Mink	Roe	Waxman
Mitchell, Md.	Rogers	Weaver
Mitchell, N.Y.	Roncalio	Whalen
Moakley	Rooney	White
Moffett	Rose	Whitehurst
Mollohan	Rosenthal	Wiggins
Moorhead, Pa.	Roush	Wilson, Bob
Morgan	Roybal	Wilson, C. H.
Mosher	Russo	Winn
Moss	St Germain	Wirth
Mottl	Santini	Wolff
Murphy, N.Y.	Sarasin	Wright
Murtha	Sarbanes	Wydler
Myers, Ind.	Scheuer	Yates
Myers, Pa.	Schneebeli	Yatron
Natcher	Schroeder	Young, Fla.
Neal	Schulze	Young, Ga.
Nedzi	Shriver	Zablocki
Nichols	Sisk	Zeferetti
Nix	Skubitz	

NAYS—72

Anderson, Calif.	Hammer-schmidt	Poage
		Pritchard
Archer	Hébert	Quillen
Ashbrook	Hightower	Roberts
Bafalis	Hillis	Robinson
Bauman	Holt	Rousselot
Bowen	Hubbard	Runnels
Brooks	Hutchinson	Ruppe
Broomfield	Jarman	Ryan
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Pa.	Satterfield
Butler	Jones, Okla.	Sebelius
Carter	Kindness	Shuster
Clancy	Landrum	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Latta	Steed
Cleveland	Long, Md.	Steiger, Ariz.
Collins, Tex.	Lott	Stratton
Conlan	Lujan	Symms
Daniel, R. W.	McDonald	Waggonner
Devine	McEwen	Whitten
Dingell	Milford	Wilson, Tex.
Duncan, Tenn.	Miller, Ohio	Wylie
English	Montgomery	Young, Alaska
Evins, Tenn.	Moore	Young, Tex.
Flynt	Moorhead, Calif.	
Gibbons		
Haley	Pasman	

NOT VOTING—47

Abzug	Ford, Tenn.	Meyner
Anderson, Ill.	Guyer	Michel
Annunzio	Hansen	Mikva
Barrett	Harsha	Murphy, Ill.
Bell	Heinz	Obey
Bergland	Hinshaw	Riegle
Boggs	Johnson, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Collins, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Conyers	Karth	Simon
Crane	Krueger	Stanton, James V.
Dellums	McClory	
Erlenborn	McCloskey	Steelman
Eshleman	Macdonald	Stokes
Evans, Colo.	Madigan	Teague
Fary	Mathis	Thompson
Foley	Metcalfe	Udall

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Meyner for, with Mr. Annunzio against.

Mr. Thompson for, with Mr. Teague against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Krueger.
Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Mathis.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
Mr. Bergland with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Ms. Abzug with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Fary with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Madigan.
Mr. Ford of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Riegle.
Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Foley with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Hansen.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Obey with Mr. Steelman.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Simon with Mr. Michel.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Udall.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that tomorrow when the Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by the Prime Minister of Ireland only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor and the cooperation of all the Members is requested.

PROVIDING REPRESENTATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CONGRESS

Mr. EDWARDS of California. 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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 280) to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 280), with Mr. SMITH of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BUTLER) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation which is being brought to the House by the able and distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS). I want to commend him and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BUTLER), for having labored over this legislation which has had the attention of the Congress for a number of years now, and has been before the various committees of the Congress and finally reaches the floor of the House of Representatives, and, hopefully, will obtain the support of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am in strong support of House Joint Resolution 280, which proposes to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment which would grant the people of the District of Columbia the seat of the government, their long overdue right to elect two Senators and the number of Representatives to which they would be entitled if the District were a State. Unlike the nonvoting delegate position now filled by our able and distinguished colleague, WALTER FAUNTROY, the Senators and Representatives granted under this resolution would have full voting powers, and all the rights and responsibilities of Congressmen from the States.

In this, our Bicentennial Year, this resolution takes on special significance. Over 200 years, this Nation has always strived for universal suffrage. Shortly after the adoption of the Constitution, the States began removing the qualification of property ownership, and increased the franchise. After the Civil War, the 15th amendment prohibited denial of the vote based on race or national origin. In the 20th century, we adopted the 19th amendment, giving the right to vote to women, and in 1961, the States ratified the 23d amendment, giving the people of the District the right to select electors for the offices of President and Vice President. Three years later, the 24th amendment prohibited poll taxes, increasing the franchise further. In 1972, just 4 years ago, the 24th amendment passed the States in record time, granting the vote to all of our citizens over the age of 18. Finally, in the first session of this Congress, we passed, and the President signed, a bill that grants to all American citizens residing abroad the right to vote in elections at home.

There remains, however, one group of our citizens who are still denied the right to vote—the people of the District of Columbia. They may not govern their own affairs—they are governed by the people of the 50 States. It is this same sort of denial of self-government that caused the American colonists in 1776 to raise the cry of "No taxation without representation." The citizens of the District pay all Federal taxes. They are subject to service in the Armed Forces, and have served courageously and admirably since the founding of the Republic. And they are subject to all Federal laws. Yet they may not participate in the formation of those laws. This is not government "of the people, and by the people."

The joint resolution you have before you today provides the means for correcting this historic injustice to the citizens of Washington.

It is time to act now, and not let the people of this great city be denied the full rights of American citizenship any longer. I strongly urge the passage of this resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, in form, our Nation is a Federal Republic, a Union of States. The Constitution provides that Members of this House shall be chosen every second year by the people of the several States. The other body is composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof. When we vote in congressional elections, you and I act in our capacity as citizens of our States, not as citizens of the United States, because it is the people of the several States, not the people of the United States, who choose the Congress.

The joint resolution we are now considering would change all that. It would effect a fundamental change in the character of our Federal Union of States. For the first time, American citizens who are not citizens of the several States would participate in the election of voting Members in Congress.

All during the 19th century and into the 20th, American citizens left their States of residence and migrated into new lands which were subject to the jurisdiction of the United States but were not in any State. As migration into those areas increased they were organized into territories, but at no time did those Americans elect voting Members of Congress. Not until their territory was admitted as a State did they have that representation. As residents of the territories the most representation they enjoyed was the voice of a single territorial delegate who had no vote.

There was no widespread belief that the people of the territories were discriminated against because they had no direct voting representation in Congress. In large part they had left the States where they enjoyed direct voting representation, willingly surrendering the right of direct voting representation here for other advantages they sought in the West. By analogy, the large majority of the residents of the District of Columbia are not native here but willingly left their States in order to live at the seat of government, surrendering the advantages of direct voting representation for other advantages thought important by them.

There is no law compelling any citizen to live in the District of Columbia. All who deem direct representation in Congress to be of sufficient importance can establish residence in one of the States and participate there in the election of Senators and Representatives. In fact, large numbers who live in the District have retained their State citizenship and regularly vote in congressional elections in the States. I believe the policy of Congress should be to encourage people to live in the States, not in the District of Columbia. The District was created as a haven for Congress, outside the States, and the predominant concerns in the District should be the Government of the United States. Those who do live in the District should be connected with the Government and those who minister to its needs. Those whose careers are in the Government need no direct representation in this House or in the other, because they are themselves directly participating in the governmental process.

It is argued that the people of the District of Columbia are being taxed without representation, resorting to that great American Revolutionary slogan, "no taxation without representation." But the comparison is inappropriate. The British Colonies in North America were a distant land, weeks away from London in communication. They had no voice in Parliament. There was no way in which they could make their wants known or in which they could express their views. The District of Columbia is right here. Its local government is heard every day. It has a Delegate accorded full rights of speech and debate in this House. He serves on our committees. He is recognized as one of us. He is not an outsider, as was Benjamin Franklin and other colonial agents before the British Government 200 years ago. The District of Columbia participates in all of the Federal aid programs available to the States.

And in addition, the District receives hundreds of millions of dollars each year from the Federal Government as a payment in lieu of taxes. Now that is a special benefit to the District, because we make no like payments to the States as payments in lieu of taxes on Government land and buildings in the States, and there are a lot of Government-owned facilities throughout the country. The British wanted to tax the Colonies, to take from them and to give little or nothing in return. The District of Columbia, on the other hand, receives much more in aid from the Federal Government than the people of the District pay to the Government in taxes. It is not a case of taxation without representation. It is a case of net benefits received without voting representation, just the reverse of the situation two centuries ago.

It is argued that the Founding Fathers sought to broaden the franchise to all citizens and could not have intended to deprive the people who resided in the seat of government direct voting representa-

tion in Congress. I suggest that the Founding Fathers intended to leave voting qualifications to the States. They clearly prescribed that the electors in each State for Members of this House shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. What those qualifications are were left to State law. They intended to broaden the franchise only so far as the States extended it.

I suggest, too, that the Founding Fathers envisioned that only those connected with the general government would live in the Federal District, and then only for so long as they were part of the Government. They would need no representation in Congress since they would be directly participating in the Government. They created the District as a haven for Congress, beyond the reach of any State legislature or local interest. Had they contemplated a large resident population in the District unconnected with the Government, demanding voting representation in Congress in the same manner as if they were a State, our Founders would have likely rejected that demand, fearing that such recognition might seed the very sort of local influence and control they sought to avoid. They would not have left the local influences of New York and Philadelphia to embrace the local influences of the Federal District. They left those cities to avoid local influences. I am inclined to believe it was no historic accident that the people who choose to live in the congressional haven are without direct voting representation in Congress.

My position is that this joint resolution ought not pass in any form. But if the House determines to enact it, once it be postulated that the District is entitled to voting represenation here, no less than full membership in both Houses can be justified. The people of each of the 50 States are represented in this House according to their numbers and they choose two Senators to represent their State. To accord the people of the District of Columbia voting representation in this House and to deny them their equal suffrage in the Senate, would leave them only half represented, with voting strength in one House of a bicameral Legislature but none in the other. The people of the District would not long be content with such an arrangement and they would come again to Congress, asking that the Constitution be further amended to give them full suffrage. As one who believes that the Constitution should be sparingly amended, I contend that if the District is to be accorded voting representation at all, it should be given that representation to which it would be entitled if it were a State. The people will not be content with less.

It is argued that since no State may be deprived without its consent of its equal suffrage in the Senate, an amendment providing for Senators from the District of Columbia could not be made effective without ratification by all 50 States. The contention is that the admission of two Senators from the District would dilute the power of the States. But this dilution would affect all of the States equally, so that none would be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. Admission of Senators from the District would no more deprive a State of its equal voting power in the Senate than would the admission of the District as a State, or the admission of any new State.

It is also argued that if Washington, the federal city, can obtain voting representation in the Senate, other large metropolitan cities might seek a like voice. Such fears may be allayed by the clear provisions of the Constitution. Every city other than Washington is within a State and already represented in the Senate. And since no State may be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate without its consent, an amendment which would grant Senators to any city other than Washington would enlarge the senatorial representation of a State and could not be accomplished with less than ratification by all of the States.

I think, too, that if this joint resolution is to be adopted, the 23d amendment of the Constitution should be repealed.

House Joint Resolution 280 would provide the District the same representation in Congress it would have if it were a State. Senators and Representatives from the District would have all of the rights of other Members, including the power vested in Congress under the 25th amendment. Representatives from the District would also participate in the election of a President when that right devolves upon the House under the 12th amendment, where the District would be treated as the 51st State. Senators from the District would participate in the election of a Vice President when that duty devolves upon the State under the 12th amendment.

But inconsistently the proposal specifically preserevs the 23d amendment limiting the District in the electoral process to the electoral vote of the least populous State.

If the District is to be accorded two Senators and its population entitles it to two Representatives, it ought to be given its full complement of electoral votes, four. It is certainly not fair to treat the District as though it were a State when the choice of a President is thrown into the House of Representatives because no Presidential candidate received a majority of the electoral votes, and to deny the District its full strength within the electoral college to ward off that event. The proposal should be amended to grant the District its full complement in the electoral college and repeal the 23d amendment.

There are other problems with the proposed constitutional amendment which I have dealt with in my minority views. I invite Members to read them, as well as the dissenting views of my colleagues before voting upon what I consider to be an unfortunate proposal to amend the Constitution in a way which very clearly would remove some of the last vestiges of a true federal system of States.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I do intend to respond to many of the points made in the minority views of the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON) later on in this debate; but for the moment, I would like to know if I am right in interpreting the gentleman's statement, that Federal employees in the District of Columbia deserve no representation in the legislative branch of Government, to mean that those 60,000 Federal employees who live in suburban Maryland and the 61,000 Federal employees in suburban Virginia, should likewise be denied the privilege of voting for Members of the House and Members of the Senate. Do you wish to deprive these citizens also in the legislative branch of Government? Is that a fair interpretation of the gentleman's statement?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. No, I made no such statement.

My point is that any citizen of any one of the 50 States should be directly represented here by voting representatives in the House. Those citizens of the United States who choose not to live in one of those 50 States never have been entitled to direct representation, and I do not think that they should be.

Any citizen who feels so strongly about that can establish residence in one of the 50 States. If any citizen who lives in the District of Columbia feels strongly enough about it he could move either to Virginia or Maryland.

Mr. FAUNTROY. If the gentleman would yield further, that was the view, if the gentleman recalls, of King George's Parliament, that the people in the 13 Colonies, if they wanted representation in return for the taxes they paid, could move to England.

The gentleman also mentioned the fact that residents of the territories have never had the privilege of voting representation in the House and the Senate.

But the gentleman does not mention the fact that residents of the District of Columbia, unlike the residents of the territories, assume all of the responsibilities of citizenship including the payment of Federal taxes, service in the military, and the other obligations of citizenship.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that the people who lived in the territories in the 19th and 20th centuries also paid Federal taxes and served in the military and carried out all of the responsibilities of citizenship.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I think the gentleman from Michigan will find that the fact is that District residents, unlike the residents of the territories to which the gentleman has referred, pay Federal taxes and, as a matter of fact, we pay a higher per capita Federal tax in the District than do the citizens of all but four States of the Union. It troubles me that the gentleman from Michigan would deny the residents of this Federal City what the gentleman would demand for the residents of the district who have elected him to represent them in the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I simply say that anybody who chooses not to live in one of the 50 States is not entitled to direct representation in a federal system, a union of states.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the arguments of my colleagues, both in the subcommittee, in the full committee and on the floor in opposition to this joint resolution and I must admit that I find it very hard to understand them. I do not think that any of the arguments, although ably presented by distinguished lawyers and constitutional scholars, are really substantive in nature.

I was thinking as I was sitting over there that if the State of California decided that the residents of Sacramento, the capital city of California, or if the State of Virginia decided that the people in the city of Richmond, Va., the capital of that State, could not vote for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the aggrieved could go right into Federal court, charge unconstitutionality as a denial of equal protection under the laws, and obtain a court order correcting the situation within a few weeks.

Yet here we have 700,000 people or more who are not able to have their own representation in the House of Representatives or in the Senate, and somehow they make a big thing out of granting it to them. We should really be outraged, and this legislation should pass by a nearly unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, when the Federal Government was established in 1787, the people of what is now the District voted in Maryland for Representatives, Senators, Vice Presidents, and Presidents. They voted in Maryland until the election of November 1800. Then, in December 1800, the Federal Government took jurisdiction over the District, and its residents have not voted in a congressional election since.

Some have suggested that this was the result of an oversight of the Constitutional Convention. The delegates to that convention simply did not consider the consequences of establishing a new Federal city for the seat of the new Government. Shortly after 1800, when it became clear that District residents could not vote for those who would govern them, there was an attempt in Congress to correct this gross inequity, and to restore the right to vote to the residents of the District. The attempt failed, however, and Washington's citizens have been without the vote ever since. Numerous attempts since then have also failed, but this Bicentennial Congress should act to fulfill the goals of equal representation and participation in the Government by all citizens set by the Founders 200 years ago.

The best way to correct this fundamental inequity is by constitutional amendment. Some have suggested that because the Constitution speaks only in terms of representation of States and of people of the States, the District, a non-State, should not be given representation in Congress. That is precisely why a constitutional amendment is necessary. The Constitution does speak of representation in Congress only in terms of States, and of course, the District is not a State. Thus, without an amendment such as the one proposed by the resolution, it would be impossible to grant the people of the District the full voting representation to which they are entitled as citizens of this great Republic.

House Joint Resolution 280 is the best proposed constitutional amendment to accomplish this goal. The resolution allows the people of the District to elect two Senators and the number of Representatives to which they would be entitled if they were a State, which, with their current population of over 700,000 would be two. The resolution gives the Senators and Representatives from the District the full rights, duties, and obligations as Congressmen from the States, and subjects them to the same qualifications requirements that are prescribed for other Congressmen. The resolution also provides that vacancies in either office shall be filled by election by the people of the District, rather than by appointment, as is the case for Senators of the States. The resolution does not, however, affect the 23d amendment, which gives the District electors for President equal to the number from the least populous State. But it does grant the Representatives and Senators a vote the same as if the District were a State in the election of the President and Vice President respectively, when that duty falls upon the House or upon the Senate. Finally, the resolution grants Congress the power to enforce the proposed amendment by appropriate legislation. Thus, the proposed amendment maintains the flexibility required by our constitutional system by granting Congress the power to enforce this amendment. The unique status of the District, and the power the Constitution gives to Congress over the District's affairs make this imperative.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend our distinguished colleague in the well, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for his enormous leadership in this very important unfinished business in terms of providing meaningful representation in the House and in the Senate, and even more particularly, if I may, I would like to commend our colleague, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) for his tireless and dogged determination to pursue this matter and to see that our fellow citizens here in the District of Columbia are accorded the same and equivalent representation that our fellow citizens in the balance of the United States are accorded.

This step is long overdue, and I certainly hope our colleagues will adopt the committee proposal.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the gentleman from California very much for his contribution.

The proposed amendment also leaves intact the delicate compromise that was formed in the 23d amendment limiting the number of Presidential electors the District may appoint, and we will welcome the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and look forward to a debate on this particular point.

The need, Mr. Chairman, for this amendment is clear, and the issue is of vital importance not only to three-quarters of a million of our citizens but to all the rest of us as well. It is really most fitting that we have the opportunity to right this historic wrong in this year when we are celebrating our 200th anniversary. I urge all of the Members to vote for this resolution and let the people of the States grant the District of Columbia the full status of American citizenship.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 280 proposes to amend the Constitution to provide voting representation for the residents of the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I oppose House Joint Resolution 280 for a number of reasons, the principal one of which is that there is not the remotest possibility that this constitutional amendment will receive the blessing of the requisite number of States in its present form. Our energies could more properly be directed toward solving the many legislative problems now before the Congress. If the resolution must be considered, I urge its rejection, both as a matter of policy and as a matter of law.

The policy reasons which compelled our Founding Fathers to create a politically neutral Federal City likewise remain today. It is well known that the failure of the city of Philadelphia to protect delegates to the Continental Congree from 80 mutinous soldiers[1] prompted the framers to adopt a clause retaining exclusive Federal jurisdiction at the Seat of Government.[2] Consistent with the exclusive jurisdiction clause was the notion that District residents would receive adequate informal representation by Congressmen residing in the District.[3] This premise prompted the Seventh Congress to remove the franchise that residents of the District held in Maryland and Virginia subsequent to cession in 1791 until December 1800.[4] Representative John Dennis of Maryland noted that such action was acceptable to residents of the District because "from their nearness to, and residence among the members of the General Government, they knew that though they might not be represented in the national body, their voice would be heard."[5] As every Member knows, the voice of the people of the District is heard in Congress; that fact is so well acknowledged that it has been judicially noticed.[6]

---

[1] 5 Elliott's Debates in the Congress of the Confederacy 92-93 (1901).

[2] 8 J. of Continental Congress 295 (G.P.O. ed. 1922); Report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal Areas Within the States, pt. II, at 17 (1957).

[3] The Federalist No. 43, at 280 (Earle ed. 1937) (J. Madison).

[4] Act of Feb. 27, 1801, ch. 15, 2 Stat. 103.

[5] 10 Annals of Congress, 998-99 (1801).

[6] *District of Columbia Fed'n of Civil Ass'n Inc.* v. *Volpe*, 434 F.2d 436.

Testimony established during the course of the hearings just exactly who the people of the District of Columbia are. The Bureau of the Census testified at the hearings that the population of the District numbers about 723,000 persons, 500,000 of whom are of voting age.[7] Other testimony indicated the overwhelming Federal impact on the District by showing the high rate of District residents who work for the Federal Government or collect survivors or retirement benefits.[8] Also, an admittedly large number of residents of the District retain domicile in other States and tend to leave the District a short time after they arrive there.[9]

The available data indicates to me that the character of the District has not changed substantially from that contemplatedw hen article I, sec. 8, cl. 17. was written into the Constitution, giving exclusive jurisdiction over the District to the Congress. At that time, the District was visualized as a sparsely populated city composed of transient Federal employees to a great extent. Today, eligible voters domiciled in the District probably constitute as little as one-tenth of 1 percent of the population of this country. The composition of the District as originally contemplated is the composition of the District today.

A. APPORTIONMENT

Moreover, since many people residing in the District retain domicile and vote in a State, the District will be over represented in the House of Representatives. This preferential treatment results because the Department of Census implements the apportionment clause of the 14th amendment by focusing on residence rather than domicile. Nowhere else in this country are a higher percentage of nondomicilaries residing in one place. The honorable delegate from the District of Columbia is on record indicating that over 200,000 residents of the District are eligible to vote under the absentee voter laws of 35 States. (See *Carliner* v. *Board of Commissioners*, 265 F. Supp. 736, 738 (D.D.C. 1967), *aff'd per curiam*, 412 F. 2d 1091 (D.C. Cir. 1969).) This figure is approximately 40 percent of all eligible voters in the District.

This amazing conclusion is bolstered by a report entitled "State of Birth" published by the Bureau of Census in 1970. That report reveals that of 720,942 people residing in the District, only 321,402 were born there. About 60 percent of those born there and still living there are under the age of 20. Thus only 142,159 persons over the age of 20 residing in the District were born there; this represents only 30 percent of eligible voters. This implies that the number of persons likely to be eligible for domiciles in other States may be as high as 70 percent of all eligible voters. This amazing statistic is surpassed in no State of this Nation except in those few States to which a disproportionately high number of senior citizens migrate to retire—Florida, Arizona, Nevada, Alaska.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

Supporters of House Joint Resolution 280 raises the cry of "no taxation without representation" to bolster the argument in favor of voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia. Using that historical rhetoric in the present context oversimplifies the issue and is seriously misleading. On its face the slogan is true; residents of the District do pay Federal taxes and, of course, do not have voting representation in Congress. However, the residents of the District are situated in a much different position vis-a-vis the Federal Government than were the American colonists vis-a-vis Britain.

Historically, the colonists were situated far from the seat of government. Beginning in 1763, Great Britain began imposing burdensome taxes on the colonists which were not placed on any other citizens of the British Empire. In 1764, the Sugar Act taxed molasses, sugar, non-British textiles, coffee, indigo, and some types of wine. In 1765 the infamous Stamp Act levied a direct tax on newspapers, almanacs, pamphlets and broadsides, legal documents of all kinds, insurance policies, ships' papers, licenses, and even dice and playing cards. Severe protests in America caused the repeal of this act in 1766. In 1767 the Townshend Acts imposed duties on glass, red and white lead, painters' colors, tea and paper imported into the colonies. Protests was so severe that all of these taxes were repealed in 1770 except the tax on tea. Finally in 1773, the Tea Act gave the East India Co., a tax preference to undercut colonial merchants selling tea and paying a tea tax. In short, the colonists were oppressed; they were receiving far less in benefits from Great Britain than they were contributing in taxes. The situation was intolerable.

By contrast, there is no suggestion that any Federal tax discriminates unfairly or arbitrarily against residents of the District. The only Federal taxes imposed on residents of the District of Columbia are customs duties and social insurance, excise, income and estate taxes which are borne equally by all Americans. The duly elected City Council of the District of Columbia imposes on its own citizens the corporate tax, property tax, financial institution tax, gasoline tax, motor vehicle registration tax, cigarette tax, real estate deed recordation tax, sales tax, use tax, public utilities tax, insurance companies tax, parking tax, inheritance and real estate tax, unemployment, compensation tax, and general local income tax.

Moreover, in analyzing the incidence of the Federal tax burden for fiscal 1974, the Library of Congress published a study which reveals that residents of the District paid only $1.1 billion in taxes while receiving nearly $8.5 billion in benefits from the Federal Government. The 1/7.45 burden/benefit ratio is miniscule when considered alone, and infinitesimal when compared with the ratio of the 50 States, Alaska is next with 1/2.56.

One reason the ratio is high is that the District is the seat of government. The overwhelming impact of the Federal presence is demonstrated by the fact that over one-third of all employed persons—109,000—residing in the District work for the Federal Government. An additional 56,000 persons residing in the District are either military survivors or civil service or military retirees. People move to the District, and those born in the District remain there, to take advantage of the Federal presence. They are willing to do so notwithstanding the fact that they will have no voting representation in Congress.

The law on the issue is clear. The Supreme Court has held that it is not unconstitutional for Congress to tax residents of the District of Columbia despite the fact that they are unrepresented in Congress. *Heald* v. *District of Columbia*, 259 U.S. 114 (1922); *See Hobson* v. *Tobriner*, 255 F. Supp. 295, 298–299 (D.D.C. 1966).

I am not prepared to extend voting representation to a non-State merely on the basis that its residents pay taxes. The Constitution does not require it and it is unsound as a matter of policy. Throughout our history, residents of the territories have applied for statehood to gain the right to be represented in Congress.

The previous analysis of policy issues indicates that House Joint Resolution 280 should be rejected. In addition, there are a number of unresolved constitutional issues accompanying the amendment:

First. Article V of the Constitution limits the amendatory power by providing that no State, without its consent, may be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. The District is not a State, and this amendment does not confer statehood upon it. Does the admission of a non-State fall within the bounds of the proviso of article V? If so, this amendment would require ratification by all 50 States.

The purpose of this proviso was to insure that States with smaller populations would be able to exert influence in the Congress. The intent of the proviso, and of the Great Compromise which underlies it, is as effectively undermined by providing Senatorial representation to a non-State as by providing additional representation to a larger State. Moreover, if the District is to assume the benefits of statehood without actually becoming a State, there is no logical reason why the residents of Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other territories should not be given equal treatment.

Second. The proposed amendment goes to great length to attempt to eliminate the constitutional conflict between the exclusive jurisdiction over the affairs of the District conferred upon the Congress by article I, section 8, clause 17, and the restrictions imposed upon the powers of the Congress to control the selection of its Members, but it does not entirely succeed. For example, article I, section 2, clause 1 of the Constitution provides that the electors of each State shall have the

[7] Hearings on H.J. Res. 280, Representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress, before the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Ser. no. 15, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. 60 (1975) [hereinafter referred to as "Hearings"].

[8] Id. at 62–63.

[9] *Carliner* v. *Board of Commissioners*, 265 F. Supp. 736, 738 (D.C.C. 1967).

qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Even if the City Council of the District were assumed to be the legislature for the purposes of this clause, we are still faced with the fact that all elections in the District are held under power delegated, but not relinquished by the Congress, and that a conflict exists between the two sections.

Third. Similarly, the proposed amendment attempts to avoid conflict between the requirement for the chief executive of a State to issue writs of election and make appointments for vacancies in the Senate, and the fact that the chief executive of the District is ultimately responsible to the Congress by stating that the people of the District of Columbia shall fill such vacancies by election. Again, however, the elections must be called by persons acting under authority delegated by the Congress and the qualifications of the electors are the ultimate responsibility of Congress.

Fourth. The proposed amendment also fails to resolve the dilemma concerning determination of the place of choosing Senators for the District. Article I, section 4, specifically forbids Congress from prescribing the place of "chusing" Senators. Yet this amendment would compel Congress to do so by "appropriate legislation" in compliance with the exclusive jurisdiction clause.

Fifth. We are also faced by the illogical situation of the District's being treated as a State in its representation in the Congress, with two Representatives and two Senators, while treating it under the 23d amendment as something less in the electoral college with three electoral votes, and then treating it under the 12th amendment as a State again in the event that the election of the President and Vice President shall fall upon the Congress.

Sixth. Finally, in striving to give the residents of the District full rights, this amendment fails to allow residents of the District the right to ratify constitutional amendments pursuant to article V of the Constitution. Since the proviso of article V is likewise unaffected, any Senators given to the District by this amendment could be taken away without the District's consent.

The wording of portions of section 1 of the amendment is also open to serious question. The amendment provides that each Senator or Representative elected pursuant to the amendment "shall have the same rights, privileges, and obligations" as one from a State. Does this mean that in some aspects these Members would not be the same as Members from a State? Why was the term "powers" excluded? Under a well settled maxim of interpretation, if specific items are listed, all others are presumed to be excluded. If full equality of status was intended, this choice of words may not be adequate.

These legal issues demonstrate the danger in disturbing the Great Compromise upon which our country was founded. The "State" is the fundamental component of our federal system and it must remain so. Once non-States are permitted to have voting representation in Congress, our entire federal system will crumble. I am not prepared to contribute to that result.

It is apparent to me that House Joint Resolution 280 is deficient as a matter of policy as well as a matter of law. I ask all other Members to join me in defeating this resolution.

Some Members have expressed the view that House Joint Resolution 280 should be amended to allow representation of the District only in the House of Representatives. I agree with their views opposing representation of the District in the Senate, but feel the same reasoning process leads to an identical conclusion with respect to representation of the District in the House of Representatives.

Our entire federal system is founded on the Great Compromise leading to representation of the States in the Senate and the people of the States in the House.

While it is inappropriate to represent the District in the Senate because the District is not a State, it is equally inappropriate to represent the people of the District in the House because they are not people of the several States as required by article I, section 2, clause 1, of the Constitution.

The same violence that is done to our federal system by permitting a non-State to be represented in the Senate is done by permitting the people of non-States to be represented in the House. The precedent would be set to allow voting representatives from any territory of the United States such as Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

The proper route to representation in either House of Congress is enumerated in article IV, section 3, clause 1, of the Constitution: A majority vote of each House results in the admission of a new State into the Union. This was the course followed by the territories of Alaska and Hawaii, whose residents shared a similar status with residents of the District in being taxed and in serving in the Armed Forces. Any measure that allows a non-State to have any form of voting representation discourages statehood.

The intricate machinery of our Constitution should not be trifled with lightly. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on House Joint Resolution 280.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Delegate from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia pointed out that the high rate of Government employment in the District of Columbia suggests that the citizens are not entitled to voting representation in the Congress of the United States. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that only about 25 percent of the people employed in the District of Columbia are employed by the Federal Government; that there are, for example, 37 percent of the people of Arlington County who are employed by the Federal Government?

Is the gentleman proposing that because they have more people working for the Federal Government in Arlington County, that the distinguished gentleman who represents the 10th Congressional District of Virginia should not be privileged to vote here? The same is true of Montgomery County. I find it difficult to follow the gentleman's argument that because we have a modest number of one-fourth of the people who work in the District of Columbia employed by the Federal Government, that this should be reason to deny us what every other American has, and that is the privilege of voting representation in both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman. With all due respect, perhaps he did not have the benefit of attending all 3 days of the hearings of the subcommitee, as I did, but the gentleman who testified from the Bureau of the Census indicated on page 129 of our hearing record that in 1970 there were 52,000 men, or 30 percent, of all employed males living in the District who were employed by the Federal Government.

In addition to these men who are employed by the Federal Government and their dependents who would be supported by their earnings, there were 57,000 women, or 35 percent of employed females living in the District, who are also employed by the Federal Government.

Of course, these people were also supported by funds received from the Federal Government.

In 1973, according to the Civil Service figures, there were about 50,000 civilian annuitants in the District, and about 12,000 of these were survivors.

I mention this because the Delegate's percentage is perhaps low. The point I was endeavoring to make is that, as far as the District of Columbia is concerned, it remains today as it was contemplated by the people who wrote the Constitution; now, as then, there is no real compelling reason why those people residing in the District should have the franchise to vote within the District. They are privileged to vote from whence they come. And, of course, if they choose to have their residence here, they do it knowingly, just as the people who go to the territories and just as the people who go elsewhere. That is the reason, I suggest, that we cannot create this kind of a non-State without doing true violence to the concept of the people who wrote our Constitution. The people were aware of this when they moved to the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. With all due respect, I would hope the gentleman would update his figures. The gentleman quoted a figure cited in 1972. The Washington Council of Governments has released figures in 1974, which show 25.33 percent of the people employed in the District of Columbia in fact work for the Federal Government.

I would suggest also that the gentleman put in perspective the fact that only one-tenth of 1 percent of the people who live in the Nation happen to reside in the District of Columbia; the implication being that that is too small a number to merit representation in the House and the Senate.

I would call to the attention of the gentleman that there are 10 States of the Union who have less citizens than those

of us who live in the District of Columbia. The citizens of all of those States are represented by two voting Members of the Senate. And even though I represent more people than one-fifth of the Members of the Senate, 20 Members of the Senate are elected to represent States that have less people than reside here in the District of Columbia.

Even though I represent more people than any single Member of the House, I cannot vote.

Does the gentleman want to justify that on the basis of the fact that in the District of Columbia there resides only one-tenth of 1 percent of the people of the Nation?

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to say to the gentleman that his reference to the States is correct.

I might suggest that the representation the gentleman is giving them is indeed superior to many of these people the gentleman mentioned, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to confirm that.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. But I do feel the gentleman must also be aware that there are a number of cities in the United States that are larger than the District of Columbia. Is the gentleman suggesting that we give them two Members of the Senate, in addition?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I certainly am not. I suggest that we acknowledge the fact that there are 50 States, and a Federal District set aside by the Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. It was established by the Constitution.

Mr. FAUNTROY. It was established by the Constitution. I stand corrected. The sole purpose of this amendment is to correct a situation whereby only these citizens of the Nation on this continent who assume all of the responsibilities of citizenship, including the payment of Federal taxes be afforded the opportunity of voting in both the House and the Senate.

The gentleman made another reference to the fact that we have some 200,000 citizens in the District of Columbia who are eligible to vote elsewhere.

Mr. BUTLER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I made reference to the testimony of the gentleman on an earlier occasion. Does the gentleman now retract that position?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I certainly do not, but I do want to confirm for the gentleman that of those 200,000 only 50,000 have elected to become registered voters in the District of Columbia, and of the 350,000 who are eligible in the District of Columbia, more than 271,000 have registered. Over 75 percent of the people who reside in the District of Columbia have in fact registered to vote for a nonvoting delegate, and that percentage is actually 13 percent above the national average. I would call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that only 62 percent of the people of this Nation who are eligible bother to register to vote.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if he is saying that the people in the District of Columbia, who have demonstrated an interest in voting and representative government, should be denied that privilege with respect to the national legislature while people who vote in a less percentage in the rest of the Nation are not denied that privilege?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, before we get into that and while we are on this subject, I will ask the gentleman if he has the figures. The gentleman will recall that during the course of his testimony before our subcommittee—and I refer to page 10 of the hearings—I asked him for certain figures and he promised to provide them for me. Perhaps he is prepared to provide them now, but up to this point we have not received them.

Does the gentleman have any figures as to the percentage of turnout of voters in the District of Columbia?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I do, Mr. Chairman. In the elections of 1972 we had a 44-percent turnout.

Mr. BUTLER. That is a percentage of what? How many people voted in 1972?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I can provide that information. The figure was 44 percent.

Mr. BUTLER. Forty-four percent of what?

Mr. FAUNTROY. Forty-four percent of those eligible to vote in fact voted.

In fact, a large number of those who had the option of voting in the District of Columbia, where they could not vote for representation in return for the taxes they pay, elected to vote elsewhere and claimed residence elsewhere. That was the situation because alone among Americans we in the District of Columbia are denied the privilege that every other taxpaying American on this continent has, and that is the privilege of representation in the House and Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's confirming once more that there are 200,000 people in the District of Columbia who are domiciled here and eligible to vote elsewhere. I hope the gentleman will be able to get a little time so that he can develop some figures on voter turnout in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I point out once more that three-fourths of the people who are eligible to vote elect to vote outside the District because they cannot vote in the District of Columbia under the same circumstances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, the question that is before the House today has been brought up on at least 21 occasions in the history of Congress since the year 1800. One hopes today that on the 22d occasion when this matter is before either body something is going to happen to rectify this basic injustice.

In 1967 and again in 1971 the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported resolutions which would have given voting representation to the District. In both cases the Committee on Rules failed to report the measure to the full House for its consideration.

Today is an historic day in the campaign to give District residents the right to elect congressional Members. The chief argument, Mr. Chairman, in favor of this joint resolution is very simple. All persons in the United States should have the right to elect their representatives in Congress. The call to battle in our war of independence is as compelling today as it was 200 years ago.

It is argued, however, rather speciously, I believe, that District residents do not really need elected representatives because they are already adequately represented by all of the Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. Chairman, putting aside for a moment the philosophical indefensibility of that contention, it is a well-known and sordid part of our history that the Congress has been enormously derelict in the way in which it has treated the residents of the District of Columbia. However, even if these people did have some representation here in Congress, the real answer to the contention advanced by some that this vicarious representation is adequate is simply that such representation is not good enough.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard and we shall continue to hear opposition to this resolution. It is said, for example, that many of the residents of the District maintain voting residences in other jurisdictions. Whatever accurate data might show, this would still not be grounds for disenfranchising all of the residents of the District. That some District residents vote in other districts, maintain their loyalties to those jurisdictions, and identify with that other location is not an arrangement we should promote. To the contrary, it is politically unhealthful and inconsistent with the sound view that citizens should participate fully and effectively in the affairs of their local government.

It has also been argued here that this resolution would improperly reduce equal representation in the Senate, which the Constitution gives to each State. The proponents of this contention rely on the provision of article V of the Constitution.

Let us read this very carefully, Mr. Chairman, because their contention is, in my judgment, erroneous. Article V of the Constitution states "that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Mr. Chairman, the limitation in article V is intended to prevent a conspiracy of three-fourths of the States, using the amendment process, to deprive another State of its equal representation in the Senate. Thus, the provision requires only that each State have two Senators unless it consents to some lesser number.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, the quoted words in article V that we have already heard here today at some length are to forbid deprivation of Senate voting strength, not the dilution of that strength.

Obviously, dilution of voting strength in the Senate was clearly contemplated by the provision in article IV for the admission of new States.

To that rejoinder, the proponents may simply state that the restrictions in article V forbidding deprivation of equal Senate suffrage without consent do not apply to the admission of new States.

Under article IV, in short, they contend that by a simple majority vote, Congress can dilute a State's voting strength in the Senate, but that Congress cannot,

by a two-thirds vote, make an equal diminution under article V.

With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, that argument is fallacious and totally erroneous. However, some say that even if this amendment is adopted and ratified, it will not place the District on the same footing of equality as every other State. In that contention there is some truth. When a vacancy occurs in the Senate, for example, it is filled temporarily by the Governor of the State in question. But in the District of Columbia such vacancies will be filled by the voters themselves pursuant to act of Congress in a popular election.

But these deviations are minor at best and are attributable to the unique and special character of the District; and as such, we can allow some insignificant unevenness in the representational arrangement. However, these slight deviations with voting representation in Congress constitute an arrangement which is vastly superior to the continued disenfranchisement of District residents.

Mr. Chairman, we had overwhelming testimony at our hearings indicating that in the capitals of the other nations of the Earth nothing like this has ever happened. It is not happening now in capitals like Bonn, Paris, Vienna, Rome, London, and Ottawa, and yes, in Moscow. All of them have the right to be represented in their legislatures as do other citizens in their own particular nations.

President Nixon at the beginning of the 92d Congress urged the enactment of the resolution before us today.

Those who are opposed to the enactment of House Joint Resolution 280 must provide an alternative. If they have no viable alternative to correct the great injustice that will be corrected by House Joint Resolution 280 they must confess that, even in our Bicentennial Year, they want to perpetuate America's last colony.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole has not appeared.

The Chair announces that a regular quorum call will now commence.

Members who have not already responded under the noticed quorum call will have a minimum of 15 minutes to record their presence. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 109]

Abzug	Bell	Chisholm
Adams	Biaggi	Clay
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Cochran
Andrews, N.C.	Boland	Collins, Ill.
Annunzio	Bolling	Conable
Ashley	Brademas	Conlan
Badillo	Brown, Mich.	Conyers
Barrett	Cederberg	Crane
D'Amours	Horton	O'Neill
Danielson	Jarman	Pepper
Dellums	Jones, Ala.	Pike
Derwinski	Jones, Okla.	Quie
Diggs	Karth	Riegle
Dingell	Krueger	Rostenkowski
Dodd	LaFalce	Scheuer
Early	Landrum	Schneebeli
Eckhardt	Levitas	Shuster
Erlenborn	Lott	Sikes
Esch	McCloskey	Simon
Eshleman	McCollister	Slack
Evans, Colo.	McDade	Solarz
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Stanton, James V.
Fary	Macdonald	Steed
Foley	Metcalfe	Steelman
Ford, Tenn.	Meyner	Stokes
Gibbons	Michel	Teague
Guyer	Mikva	Tsongas
Harsha	Miller, Ohio	Udall
Hayes, Ind.	Mills	Ullman
Hébert	Moakley	Vigorito
Heckler, Mass.	Morgan	Waxman
Heinz	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, C. H.
Henderson	Murphy, N.Y.	Wright
Hillis	Myers, Ind.	Young, Alaska
Hinshaw	Obey	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 280, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 328 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Roddy, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 15, 1976 the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5727. An act to establish an independent and regionalized United States Parole Commission, to provide fair and equitable parole procedures, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

PROVIDING REPRESENTATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CONGRESS

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BUTLER).

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH).

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 280. It is my view that this proposed constitutional amendment completes a process that began early in the history of our Nation—the process of insuring that all adult Americans will have the right to participate directly in electing the Government that rules their lives.

The road to universal suffrage has not been easy. During the infancy of our Republic, it took State legislatures over 50 years to abolish property requirements limiting the right to vote. It was little more than 100 years ago when the 15th amendment to the Constitution precluded denial of the right to vote on grounds of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Direct election of Senators was achieved by passage of the 17th amendment to the Constitution, just prior to the First World War. Shortly thereafter, women were guaranteed the right to vote upon ratification of the 19th amendment. In 1964, the right of poor people to vote was protected by abolition of the poll tax in Federal elections with the addition of the 24th amendment to the Constitution. Five years ago, the passage of the 26th amendment lowered the voting age to 18 to guarantee voting rights to young Americans. Finally, last year, this Congress passed, and the President signed, a bill to allow American citizens residing overseas to vote in their State of last domicile.

And now, this Congress has the opportunity to take the final step in guaranteeing universal rights of suffrage to all adult American citizens residing in the continental United States, be they black or white, male or female, poor or rich. The residents of the District of Columbia are the only citizens who bear all the burdens of citizenship, but are deprived of the most precious right of citizenship—the right to vote for representatives to Congress.

Indeed, it was only in 1961 upon ratification of the 23d amendment that residents of the District were given any voice in government. That amendment gave the District the number of presidential and vice presidential electors held by the least populous State. It is significant that this amendment was ratified in less than 1 year after passing both Houses of Congress. The legislatures of our States could see the equity in allowing citizens of the District to participate in the selection of electors, and I am confident that they will see the equity of allowing the District representation in Congress when we give them the opportunity to ratify the proposed artice of amendment embodied in House Joint Resolution 280.

Supporters of House Joint Resolution 280 have stated their case well. The District is larger than 10 of our States. Its people do pay all Federal taxes and have fought and died in every war engaged in by this Nation since the birth of the District.

On the other hand, opponents of House Joint Resolution 280 have raised a legion of arguments to obfuscate the issue. I will not engage in their diversion, except to note, that the people retain the ultimate right to amend their Constitution without limitation; it is not possible to have an unconstitutional constitutional amendment. The very phrase is a contradiction in terms.

Tomorrow each of you will be granted your constitutional right to vote on House Joint Resolution 280. As you cast your vote, think about the three quarters

of a million Americans who reside in the Capital of the greatest democracy in the world. Ask yourself as a matter of fundamental fairness if you can deny these people the right to vote. Our predecessors in 93 Congresses before us had the same decision to make in deciding whether to permit racial minorities, women, poor people, and young people the right to participate in the elective process. In each instance, they voted to open our democracy to a deserving segment of society. I ask every Member to vote, as I will, to support House Joint Resolution 280, because no group of citizens deserves the right to vote more than the residents of the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, the arguments for voting representation for the 720,000 American citizens living in the District of Columbia are, to my mind, painfully obvious and irrefutable. This is a measure whose time came 200 years ago. That we could deny such a basic right to a city full of people who are, in various capacities, serving their Nation is so incredible, as to be ludicrous. Just what is it we are afraid of—government of, for, and by the people?

Opponents of House Joint Resolution 280 have constitutional qualms about voting representation for the District. But it seems to me that we provide a proper response to their concerns in the form of a constitutional amendment. The Founding Fathers meant the Constitution to be a living flexible document, not a set of stone tablets. Historians tell us that the problem of disenfranchisement of District residents never came up in the Philadelphia deliberations of 1783. James Madison wrote his belief that—

> The inhabitants (of the District) * * * will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them.

So no less than the "Father of the Constitution" had no hint that residents of the Federal city would ever be denied suffrage. I think this resolution provides a proper and constitutional vehicle for correcting a 200-year-old oversight.

The argument is also made that District residents "voluntarily" gave up their constitutional rights for the privilege of working and living in the Nation's Capital. A simple poll of citizens in any office or on any street corner in this city will provide ample rebuttal to this point.

As the following arguments have not yet sunk in—despite 22 congressional hearings on the subject—I will recite them once again. District residents pay Federal taxes passed by a Congress in which they have no voice. District residents are subject to Federal law passed by a Congress in which they have no vote. District residents fight in wars which are declared in a Congress which does not bother to consult with their views. The anguished cries of "taxation without representation" waft across the Potomac every time nonresident income taxes are mentioned; yet no District representative voted on the day Congress prohibited the City Council from enacting the same nonresident income tax 51 other municipalities have. With this, I will end an endless list.

Opponents to this legislation offer a unique brand of "Catch-22" to District citizens. If the District wants voting rights, it should become a State—an obvious political impossibility. Or it should be ceded back to Maryland—another incredibly constructive suggestion. However, it seems to me that those with "constitutional queasiness" would jump at the opportunity to support a measure like House Joint Resolution 280, which affords an opportunity to give the District the vote while at the same time preserving the unique status of the Federal City, a status which in being unique is also highly discriminatory.

I urge my colleagues to take another step toward representative government—and into the 18th century—by supporting House Joint Resolution 280.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KINDNESS).

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Chairman, as is usual in the functioning of the work of the subcommittee, the honorable gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) has dealt in an exemplary manner through the legislative process with the Members in bringing House Joint Resolution 280 to the floor of the House.

The chairman stated earlier in the debate on this matter that there is a lack of understanding of the arguments against House Joint Resolution 280. I have noticed that lack of understanding, and in trying to examine it closely have assumed that the problem is that some people approach the Constitution with greater emphasis on the States as the component bodies, while others look to the Federal Government established by the States in that Constitution as being dominant and thus overlook the States.

Why should not the area now known as the District of Columbia become a State. No satisfactory answer to that question has been offered in the hearings in the subcommittee or in the debate in the full Committee on the Judiciary, and really, up to now, no satisfactory answer to that question has been offered in the debate today. No satisfactory answer to that question has even been whispered; but there is a problem in understanding this resolution unless one looks at the importance of the States in the foundation of our Constitution and of our Union.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 280. This resolution is without doubt ill-considered, in my view. Indeed, this resolution threatens the very fiber on which this country was founded by proposing to accord voting representation in the House of Representatives and in the Senate to people who are not domiciled in a State of the United States.

Many matters will be tossed back and forth in the course of our debate on this issue, but none of them should divert our attention from the question of paramount importance: Should representation in Congress be limited to States and the people of the States?

To me, this question is easy to answer. Our entire federal system is contingent on acknowledging that the State is the fundamental component of our Union.

Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to vote for a resolution that alters the delicate balance of our system of government. If representation in either House of Congress is accorded to residents of the District of Columbia, then nothing is to prevent future attempts to represent the territories, as has been brought out in the debate heretofore, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the other territories. Indeed, our territories will have no incentive to become States if they maintain the primary benefits of statehood without incurring the obligations of statehood.

Article IV, section 3, clause 1, of the Constitution empowers both Houses of Congress, by a majority vote, to admit new States into the Union. The voting requirement for statehood is much less stringent than the two-thirds vote of each House of Congress and the ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures needed to take affirmative action on House Joint Resolution 280.

Mr. Chairman, while the proponents of House Joint Resolution 280 avoid the direct path to voting representation so thoughtfully provided by the framers of our Constitution, no good answer, I repeat, has been given to this question. Indeed, none could be given.

Supporters of House Joint Resolution 280 speak to the difficulty of separating the Federal enclave from the State of Columbia; but every State has Federal property within its boundaries. The only difference is that in no other case does the Federal Government pay the State for using the land.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the Federal payment is the factor which forces proponents of House Joint Resolution 280 to resort to this attempt at perverting the constitutional system. They fear that the state of Columbia could not be viable fiscally without the Federal subsidy of nearly $190 million. Nothing could be more misleading. Analysis of the revenues of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1974 reveals that the Federal payment comprised only 15 percent of the total revenues.

It must be kept in mind that the Federal payment is made in addition to separate payments for water consumed of $2.5 million and for sewer service of $1.5 million. These payments for services would continue even if the District became a State, as would a token payment for police and fire service. But the Federal payment in lieu of property tax would be eliminated just as it is for the other States.

The notion that the Federal Government should pay District residents for using Federal land has always seemed to me to be anomalous, in my thinking. The land was ceded to the Federal Government by the State of Maryland; it presently belongs to the Federal Government and not to the people of the District of Columbia. The national city belongs to all of the people of this country, people who should not have to subsidize those

few who have chosen to live here, as has been pointed out.

Mr. Chairman, I leave to my colleagues the task of debating the legal infirmities of House Joint Resolution 280. A bipartisan group of six committee members, of which I was one, discussed them fully at page 29 of the report.

While the resolution does seem to me to be poorly drafted and is replete with constitutional inconsistencies, I need not attack it on those grounds. The amendment fails to pass the very threshold test that should be applied to all constitutional amendments. That test is whether a less restructive alternative exists to accomplish the ends that are sought. Our Constitution is not a shopping list. It should not be lightly amended or on the spur of the moment. In this instance the District can gain representation by statehood or by simple statutory retrocession to Maryland. Until these alternative solutions are convincingly demonstrated to be unfeasible, I am not prepared even to begin the solemn task of evaluating House Joint Resolution 280 on its merits.

Our subcommittee held only 3 days of hearings on this legislation in the 94th Congress. The resolution failed to pass the committee by the two-thirds vote it will need to pass this House.

Some who support House Joint Resolution 280 adamantly contend that statehood for the District of Columbia is undesirable. At page 3 of the committee report it is stated that the committee is of the opinion that the District should not be transformed into a State because:

> The Constitutional Convention decided that the seat of the Federal government should not be located in a state, lest the Federal government be dependent on the state government for its protection and service.

This argument, it seems to me, is an absurdity. The Constitutional Convention also decided that the seat of Federal Government would not have separate voting representation in the Congress, and quite logically so.

If there is to be no deviation from the conclusions reached by the Constitutional Convention, as is argued at page 3 of the committee report, then we should certainly suspend debate and forget about House Joint Resolution 280 or any other proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, one reason that is not articulated by those who favor House Joint Resolution 280, for their position in opposition to statehood, is that statehood stands very little chance of receiving a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

Let me assume that for now those people are content to support House Joint Resolution 280, with statehood to be taken as the next step.

Let me caution all Members who favor the option of statehood for the District that the defeat of House Joint Resolution 280 is essential to accomplish that result.

Assume that the proposed amendment passes both Houses of Congress, is ratified by the States and becomes part of the Constitution. Then the District constituting the seat of government will be given two Senators and an appropriate number of Representatives. Suppose then that 10, 50, or 100 years into the future the District purports to insure home rule by petitioning for statehood. It is likely that the proposed State of Columbia would exclude a small Federal enclave which would remain the seat of government. House Joint Resolution 280 and the resulting amendment would entitle that seat of government to two Senators and an appropriate number of representatives to that same Federal enclave. Even if there were very few persons residing in that enclave. In order to prevent such a ludicrous result, the Constitution would have to be amended to repeal the proposed article in House Joint Resolution 280. Therefore, in order to become a State, the District of Columbia would need to obtain the votes necessary to pass a constitutional amendment.

Moreover, there is a distinct possibility that the repeal of House Joint Resolution 280, or the amendment it proposes, would require the consent of the inhabitants of the Federal enclave, lest they be deprived of their equal suffrage in the Senate. Optimistically, such consent would not be required because the proviso to article V of the Constitution protects only States, and House Joint Resolution 280 is quite silent on that point.

I urge opposition on both grounds to House Joint Resolution 280.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. REES).

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the joint resolution. I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary but because of my seniority and talent, I find myself a senior member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and as such I have done a great deal of work in the area of District of Columbia finances and wrote all of the sections of the bill on home rule dealing with finances of the District.

When our Founding Fathers decided to have a Federal city, the decision was that it would not be a State, it would be a city, and the major purpose of the city would be that this would be the seat of government. They did not put the Capital in New York or Philadelphia where there were other things going on. They wanted to have a capital which would be the capital of the United States, and the major business of that capital would be the governing of the United States. That was their concept. They wanted to get away from many of those pressures that they might have found in other cities, and they put it right around the Mason-Dixon line so we could heal some of the wounds that had come up during the Continental Convention, and with that notion it should remain a Federal city because that is basically what it is.

If we look at the tax base of Washington, D.C., we will find that a good part of it is tax exempt because it represents property of the United States, or it represents embassy property of foreign governments that are here because this is the capital of the United States. That is basically what its tax base is now. It is not going to get any better. If they had statehood, they would not start taxing the embassies, and I doubt that they would tax the Federal Government.

We have home rule in the District of Columbia, but the real rulers of the District of Columbia are really the two Houses of Congress of the United States, and we reserve all of that power under article I, section 8, of the Constitution to govern the District of Columbia.

We have jurisdiction over their charter. If we wish to any day amend the charter of the District of Columbia, we can do so because this is a Federal city.

I will just give the Members some projections right now. I think that in the charter there is language that I wrote that said that the tax base of the District should more or less be about the same as the tax base of the surrounding jurisdictions so we would not have the situation where because of a narrow tax base the city would have to have a property tax or an income tax higher than Maryland or Virginia, because we want to keep them all competitive.

Even now in the City Council they are having very difficult problems because they have to raise taxes. Already we are finding that the taxes are going up in the District, and they are not going up as much in surrounding communities, and this, of course, puts more and more pressure on Federal payment.

Just last week I introduced a bill to try to fund the police and fire pension systems. They are not funded in the District of Columbia. We did not have any foresight at all in this Congress. Here we have a pension system where the down-the-line unfunded liabilities are $1.84 billion. Someone is going to have to pay for that, and I think that is probably in good part an obligation of the Federal Government because this is a Federal city.

If the District of Columbia became a State, there is no way, absolutely no way, that the District of Columbia, utilizing every single grant program of the U.S. Government could ever finance itself because it is a Federal city and its major purpose is the governing of the United States of America. That is what it is. It is a Federal city. It cannot exist as a State. The tax base is not there. This is strictly an urban tax base. They cannot even build a building over so many stories high in the District of Columbia because of Federal law, because we do not want this to be a city like New York; we want it to be a city with space, so there is a limit on building because every one wants to have a view of the Capitol and the Washington Monument and whatever other monuments we might have here.

It really is impossible, if we are talking about some municipal economics, to

consider the District a State because it is not. Our Founding Fathers considered it to be a Federal seat, the seat of the Government of the United States. I think it should remain that and I think its citizens should have the right to vote, which they do, and I think its Delegate should have the right to vote on the floor of this House just as we have the right to vote.

I support this resolution and I will certainly oppose any amendment that might be offered to grant the District statehood, because this is not what the Founding Fathers thought of as a Federal city, and statehood would be disastrous to the people of the District because they would not have the money to finance their own State.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House have an opportunity to redress an injustice that is nearly as old as the Nation itself. For over 175 years, the residents of the District of Columbia have been deprived of voting representation in Congress.

The right to vote is the most fundamental civil right to be protected in a society. Our country has progressed from a time when only white, male property holders over the age of 21 could participate in Government into an era when women, minorities, and all citizens over 18 are guaranteed the elective franchise. This very Congress has reaffirmed its dedication to protect the right to vote by extending the franchise to American citizens residing overseas. Only one group of American citizens residing within the continental United States is still denied the right to elect voting representatives; that group is the residents of the District of Columbia.

House Joint Resolution 280 accords residents of the District the full representation in Congress to which they would be entitled if the District were a State. The amendment is concisely drafted to mesh with the 23d amendment to the Constitution which currently allots three electors to the District. The resolution gives Congress the flexibility to deal with matters such as drawing District lines and filling interim vacancies in the Senate by leaving these details to be remedied by appropriate legislation. I support this approach because constitutional amendments should identify basic precepts and not endeavor to specify every possible contingency. Those who support this resolution will do so because it accords fair and equitable treatment to the Americans who reside in our Nation's Capital. Those who oppose this resolution for whatever reason cannot deny that they are depriving fellow Americans who pay taxes and serve in the Armed Forces of a voice in Government.

I am aware that some of my colleagues support an amendment designed to give the District of Columbia voting representation only in the House of Representatives. Such an amendment not only deprives residents of the District of rights to which they are entitled, but also creates an asymmetry within our system of government that is completely unacceptable. I am unprepared to cast a vote branding residents of the District as second-class citizens. If the proposed constitutional amendment is presented in final form to provide for District representation only in the House of Representatives, then I will be constrained to vote against the resolution.

This proposed constitutional amendment gives each Member a well defined choice. Either this House will remove the last vestige of colonialism by passing House Joint Resolution 280 or the world will know that as America celebrates its Bicentennial, not all Americans are treated equally. As for me, the choice is clear. I plan to vote yea on House Joint Resolution 280.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 280, which would amend the Constitution to provide the District of Columbia with voting representation in both the House and Senate. Passage of this bill would do irreparable damage to our federal system of government.

States are the basic building blocks of our Nation. Only States can be represented in the Senate and only the people of the States can be represented in the House.

The right of representation, in other words, is the sole right of the citizens of the States. This is the heart of the federal structure. It is in recognition of the fact that the United States is a federal union of individual States.

House Joint Resolution 280, however, would grant a non-State—the District of Columbia—voting representation rights that for the life of our country have been the exclusive province of the States. The District of Columbia would become entitled to two Senators and House representation based upon population.

I cannot go along with this action. It is inappropriate to represent the District of Columbia in the Senate because the District is not a State. It is inappropriate to represent the people of the District in the House because they are not people of the "several States" as is required by the Constitution.

Not only would granting non-States the same rights of representation as States violate our federal principles, it would also set a bad precedent. It would open the door for legislation to grant voting representation to territories such as Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. It would even open up the possibility of granting cities within a State the right of separate Senate and House representation.

States should remain the fundamental components of the Nation. To do otherwise would erode our federal system of government and weaken the important role of the States.

We should also keep in mind during consideration of this bill that the District of Columbia is unique. It is the Federal Capital, the Capital of all Americans. It does not represent the narrow partisan interests of approximately 725,000 city residents but rather the general interests of more than 200 million Americans.

The District of Columbia was specifically created as a separate entity under the jurisdiction of Congress so as to be free from the political pressures, narrow interests and control of any one State. A politically neutral Federal City is still a desirable goal today.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished delegate from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to express my heartfelt thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for the fine leadership the gentleman has given in championing this very worthy cause.

Mr. Chairman, in the now nearly 5 years that I have represented the people of the District of Columbia in this Chamber without a vote, I have not troubled anyone with quorum calls or lengthy speeches on subjects which were of vital and legitimate concern to the people of the United States and to the District which I represent; but I do on this occasion ask that the Members lend me their ears and listen carefully to what I have to say.

Mr. Chairman, as I returned to Washington, D.C., last month from our Lincoln/Washington birthday recess, I had an experience on the airplane that I think captures the meaning of our deliberations here today. As the pilot made the final approach into Washington National Airport, the stewardess came over the intercom in her accustomed manner saying:

> Ladies and gentlemen, the pilot has informed us that we are making our final approach into our Nation's Capital. If you will look out of the window on the left, you will see coming up the White House where the President of these great United States lives.
>
> In the distance you see the United States Capitol, where in this Bicentennial year the five hundred and thirty-five Members of the House of Representatives and Senate conduct the legislative business of our nation. Looking to the city beyond, you will see the homes and neighborhoods of nearly three-quarters of a million Americans who pay nearly a billion dollars in Federal taxes a year, but who today, like the Founding Fathers of old, still endure the tyranny of taxation without representation; for they alone among Americans who bear all of the responsibilities of citizenship, have no voting representation in the legislative branch of government.
>
> As we make our final approach, therefore, will you be kind enough to fasten your seat belts, bring your seat backs and tray tables into an upright position, extinguish all smoking materials, and turn your clocks back two hundred years.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us today is whether in this Bicentennial Year the House is prepared to right the clock of time for the only American citizens in the continental United States who still endure "the tyranny of taxation without representation," the citizens of the Capital City of our Nation. Ours is the quest for the "Spirit of '76" in the 94th Congress.

The question before us is simply this: "Is there any justification for denying

American citizens who bear all of the responsibilities of citizenship the right to voting representation in the legislative branch of our National Government?" Your Committee on the Judiciary, and I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans today, would hang you to answer that question in the "Spirit of '76" which inspired our Founding Fathers, 200 years ago. We would have you answer that there is no justification for continuing to deny the three quarters of a million Americans who live in the Federal District which we have set aside as our Nation's Capital, who pay a billion dollars a year in Federal taxes, the right to full voting representation in both chambers of our national legislature. We believe that it is time for this Bicentennial Congress to follow the 86th Congress in its acknowledgement of the right of the residents of our Nation's Capital to vote in the election of the leadership of the executive branch of our Government, by acknowledging the right of those same citizens to voting participation in the legislative branch of our Government.

What House Joint Resolution 280 proposes to do is to provide that representation, just as do all of the major nations of the free world with respect to the residents of their capital cities; whether it be Great Britain in London, or France in Paris, or West Germany in Bonn.

In the course of the debate on House Joint Resolution 280, Mr. Chairman, you will hear Members of this House, who have and will continue in this Bicentennial Year to make eloquent speeches extolling the virtues of our Founding Fathers, but who will argue to continue the denial of this fundamental right of citizens in our great democracy to the residents of our Nation's Capital. Some will argue vehemently to the citizens of this Federal District what they would demand for their own constituents, indeed, what the Founding Fathers fought and died to establish for all Americans: a voice and vote in the institutions which govern them. Tomorrow, when, like their predecessors in the English Parliament over 200 years ago, they will have made all of their feeble arguments—the fact will remain as it was 200 years ago, as it is today, and as it will always be, that there is no justification for continuing to deny the citizens of the Capital City of this great Republic full voting representation in the legislative branch government.

Some will argue that this denial of voting representation should continue because the amount of Federal benefits received by District residents exceeds the Federal taxes we pay. I intend to point out that at least 31 of our 50 States receive more in Federal benefits than their residents pay in Federal taxes. But do we deny their citizens voting representation in the House and Senate? The fact is that the District individual Federal income tax per capita is higher than the per capita tax for all but four States of the Union. There is no justification for denying us voting representation in the Congress.

Some will argue to deny District residents who bear all of the responsibilities of citizenship what they demand for their own constituents because, they will say, the District should seek statehood. I shall point out that it was the intent of the framers of the Constitution to have the Federal District, due to its uniqueness, under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress and that there is no practical way to carry out that intent while fulfilling the basic right to residents here to full voting representation in the Congress than the route which House Joint Resolution 280 offers.

Some will argue, Mr. Chairman, that this denial of basic citizenship rights to residents of our Nation's Capital should continue because to grant them to the District of Columbia would open the door for the residents of Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other territories to demand the benefits of full citizenship without assuming the obligations of full citizenship. I intend to be here, to point out that the District of Columbia is neither a territory nor a commonwealth, as in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, but the one and only Federal municipality, an integral part of the United States where its residents bear all of the responsibilities of citizenship. I intend to point out that District citizens, unlike those of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, pay Federal income taxes, are subject to military service, and all of the other responsibilities of full citizenship.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I intend to be here to rebut every 18th century argument offered to deny the residents of our Nation's Capital what the Founding Fathers of this Nation fought and died to secure for all American citizens for all time: the right to full participation in the institutions which govern them. The question is, Will more than one-third of the Members of this House vote tomorrow to deny the citizens of our Federal District what they demand for American citizens who elected them to serve in this Congress: full voting representation?

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will vote tomorrow to bring the citizens of our Nation's Capital into the 20th century. Indeed I appeal to you to vote tomorrow to move this Nation one step closer to the high ground of principles that we enunciate but so often fail to live.

In the 5 years that I have served the people of this District as their nonvoting delegate in this Chamber, I have learned that without a vote, advice is of little value. I come, therefore, not simply to advise you but to ask your help. Will you not help us in this Bicentennial Year to mend the crack in the Liberty Bell? For 200 years that bell, molded to proclaim an end to the tyranny of taxation without representation, has been a symbol of freedom and justice. But for nearly 200 years now, there has been a crack in it and through that crack have fallen the three-quarters of a million American citizens who reside in our Nation's Capital, who pay a billion dollars in Federal taxes a year but who alone among Americans in these United States are denied voting representation in the legislative branch of Government.

I ask you in this Bicentennial Year to mend that crack in the Liberty Bell.

If I had a bell, I would ring it in the morning, I would ring it in the evening all over this land. I would ring out justice, I would ring out freedom I would ring out love between my brothers and my sisters all over this land. Will you not help us in this Bicentennial Year to let freedom ring not only from the mountains, to the prairies, to the oceans white with foam, but for the first time in our long history, let the Liberty Bell ring on the streets of the Capital City of the greatest democracy in the history of mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia, (Mr. FAUNTROY).

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

Mr. FAUNTROY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BUTLER).

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I congratulate the gentleman on the very eloquent and moving presentation. I do feel compelled to remind him that the Liberty Bell was not cracked until 1835, but I think the principles the gentleman has enunciated are correct.

Mr. FAUNTROY. If I may correct the gentleman, it was molded in 1752. It was cracked in 1835.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; you claim that is 200 years?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I said that for nearly 200 years there has been a crack in the bell.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I am sorry. I had the impression that if it was 1835, that is not quite 200 years ago. But, of course, we stretch a few things in argument, and I must give the gentleman license to do that.

In the course of our earlier colloquy the gentleman mentioned the percentage of voters in the District of Columbia, and the information I now have from the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress indicates that 30.83 percent of the voting age population voted in 1972 in the District of Columbia, and the figure was 34.4 percent in 1968. I mention these figures now so that the RECORD will be accurate in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) has expired.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

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

Mr. FAUNTROY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made several other references, and I would like to discuss those for a moment.

Mr. FAUNTROY. First, Mr. Chairman, before we proceed further, may I just say that the persons eligible to vote included the 150,000 who are eligible but who have opted not to register here be-

cause they cannot vote for voting representation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. Because they are domiciled elsewhere?

Mr. FAUNTROY. And because they have exercised their option to register elsewhere. That is true.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sure that the gentleman knows whereof he speaks. In the figures that came to us we are dealing with the percentage of voting age population. The gentleman is suggesting, of course, a different reason why the 200,000 people who reside here vote elsewhere.

Mr. FAUNTROY. They vote elsewhere because they cannot vote here.

Mr. BUTLER. Perhaps that is not the only reason.

Mr. FAUNTROY. They cannot vote here for representation in the Congress. They would prefer to vote in the gentleman's district, for instance, if they are domiciled there, because they can vote for Members of Congress. I cannot vote for them here.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's point is well made. Of course, I cannot psychoanalyze the 200,000 people the gentleman mentioned, but he, of course, may have a different view of that than I.

All I know is that at this moment there are 200,000 of the 500,000 eligible voters here who elected to consider themselves domiciliaries of other areas.

Mr. FAUNTROY. The gentleman is making an eloquent argument for House Joint Resolution 280. We should correct a situation where 150,000 people who reside in the District of Columbia must opt to vote elsewhere to having voting representation in the national legislature.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if that kind of argument is going to prevail, we are in deep trouble, because my view of that indicates at this moment at least that this city is still a Federal city as contemplated by the fathers of the Constitution.

During the course of his discussion the gentleman made reference to Federal payments. I would simply like to state for the RECORD that the information we have from the District budget indicates that $226 million was a part of the Federal payment to which he referred. In addition to that, according to actual 1974 figures, there is a Federal payment of $2.5 million for water consumed, in addition to a Federal loan of $3.8 million.

There is also a Federal payment for sewer service of $1.5 million, in addition to a $13 million Federal loan.

May I ask the gentleman if he thinks these figures are not representative of the cost of the Federal Government to the city?

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell me the source of his figures?

Mr. BUTLER. This is from the revenue section of the 1976 District budget.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will read the report of the District government on the Federal payment which is required as part of the provisions of the Home Rule Act of 1973, he will find that the Federal payment to the District totaled 27 percent of the District's operating budget.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. FAUNTROY. And the record shows that 54 percent of the taxable land in the city is taken off the tax rolls by virtue of the Federal presence, and that a total of $347 million in tax revenues are lost to the city because of the Federal presence. We lose more than we gain as a result of the Federal presence, and I think that fact is well recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, is it the gentleman's feeling that the Federal payment of $226 million is not adequate to satisfy the responsibilities that have been contemplated?

Mr. FAUNTROY. It is not adequate for the services we are required to deliver to organizations which the Federal Government exempts, and I refer to embassies and to all the other people who come to our Nation's Capital to transact national business.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman thinks that $226 million is presently inadequate, what amount will the gentleman deem inadequate when he gains the power to vote?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise first in support of voting representation in the Congress for the American citizens who live in the District of Columbia.

It is, to my mind, inconceivable that in the year of our Bicentennial celebration we should do other than take action in this body and in the Congress as a whole toward the provision of such representation.

Whatever combination of arguments may be made against this or that specific proposal, the fact is that the basic situation of taxation without representation is repugnant to Americans and is inequitable and unjust just as it was when this Republic was first founded and the Declaration of Independence was written and signed.

Mr. Chairman, may I say further that in my own personal judgment there cannot be equitable representation or full representation in a bicameral legislature unless there is some kind of presence or representation in both bodies of that legislature, but I rise to point up to the members of the committee and to call to their attention that because of the reservations that exist in the other body as well as in this body, I do propose tomorrow to offer an amendment which will be a compromise. That amendment will provide that the people of the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall elect at least one Representative in Congress and, as may be provided by law, one or more additional Representatives or Senators or both, up to the number to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, and that the Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal, therefore, would provide for representation in the House and leave open the question of representation in the other body, but would establish a mechanism whereby Congress could enact or provide for full representation if it saw fit.

We do not lightly or easily amend the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me reasonable that while we are in the process of providing representation in this House, we should establish a mechanism whereby such representation may be provided in both bodies and full representation be possible, should a future Congress see fit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim full credit for and authorship of this amendment or proposal; at least one Member has already questioned what a person of my background in economics, history and theology, not a background in law, is doing in attempting to amend the Constitution of the United States and in attempting to lay out to this great Committee on the Judiciary what course of action it ought to follow.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to maintain that like Moses of old, I was led to a mountain top and there were inscribed on tablets of stone certain words of law that I now offer to become a part of the basic law of this land, as I believe did happen once and did form the basis for all legal systems over which attorneys have been arguing ever since. However, the fact is that this is a proposal of a very distinguished former Member, a chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary, the Honorable Emmanuel Celler. It is his proposal that I will tomorrow set before the House.

It is true that during a series of Congresses I have been associated with this idea and have introduced this amendment and supported it. It bears not only the stamp of authorship of Emmanuel Celler, but also it bears the recommendation and the endorsement of a former President of the United States, of Richard Nixon as President of the United States, and of a series of witnesses for the Justice Department, including the Honorable William Rehnquist, then Assistant Attorney General and now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I believe he made a very cogent argument in 1971 for the adoption of this basic proposal as a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that this idea is by no means new. As a matter of fact, the idea of voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia is about as old as the formal establishment of the District of Columbia itself.

Speaking of the District in 1803, Representative Huger of South Carolina said the following:

> I look forward to the period when the inhabitants, from their numbers and riches, will be entitled to a representative on this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I continue:

It was not until the 1880's, however, that resolutions to give District citizens voting representation were introduced

with any passion or frequency. On April 4, 1888, there was introduced in the U.S. Senate a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia.

The Senate Judiciary Committee allowed the resolution to die with the adjournment of Congress. Subsequent Congresses saw similar resolutions introduced. In 1922, 1925, and 1949, the Senate Judiciary Committee approved such resolutions only to have them fail in either the House or Senate.

Mr. Chairman, up until the present there have been repeated efforts to achieve this constitutional amendment and provide this basic equity for the American citizens who live in this city. We now have a chance and an opportunity in our Bicentennial Year to make this long dream a reality for living American citizens. History and justice cry out together that this must be done. I would urge the committee's consideration of my compromise proposal as a viable mechanism toward achieving this result and would urge that on tomorrow when it is offered it do pass.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as I heard my distinguished Baptist brother from Alabama as he visualized the words of Moses, I thought that we were having additional breadth in the hearings, and I have heard many things brought into the discussions. The distinguished theologian, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) knowing Moses can speak of the old theology. I would like to turn to history as I do know a little bit about history and I know that when we founded our Republic, we wanted to keep the District of Columbia as an individual, independent and free institution. We wanted to have a place in the District of Columbia where there would be no politics or political forces influencing our Government. And this was so clearly understood and so plain in the vision of our Founding Fathers when they established the District of Columbia, and, the years have proved it was one of the great moves that they made.

Today we are talking about providing more government. If there is one thing this country needs today it is not more government but what America needs today is less government. We have got more government than we need, more than we can afford and certainly we do not need any more government here in the District of Columbia.

We have heard many issues about the District of Columbia and why people are entitled to a vote, and why these people have been denied a vote. But there is one thing I think everyone should clearly understand about the District of Columbia and that is that no one here in the District has been denied a vote. When they moved into the District they knew that they would not have a national vote and this has been true ever since our Founding Fathers founded the District of Columbia. These people did not walk in here blind so that they can say someone has denied them a vote because they did not have the vote when they landed here. But everyone can have a vote back home. Everyone here ought to be still voting back home. In fact, they would all be better off if their homes were not in the District.

I was interested when the City Hall Committee was arguing the other day about where the city hall employees live. It was said that half of the city employees live in the suburbs. I think they would be probably better off if the other half lived in the suburbs, too.

I keep hearing about the District and the problems the District has from time to time with education. In the interest of the future of America, we all have a strong interest in education and let me say that we pay more right here from the Congress for education in the District of Columbia than for any other separate entity in America.

We need to always remember that this District is not a poor area that we have here. I think we have the highest per capita income right here in the District, higher than we have in any other section of America. We give the District more for their education than any other area of America. Yet every year when I pick up my paper to read who are the merit scholars, to see who are the achievement winners, the ones who have done an outstanding job in education, I cannot find them in these Washington public schools. They have the poorest achievement record of any major school system in America in spite of the fact that they have the most money to use in education. So it is not money. There is something wrong about the way that they run their school system. If they cannot run their schools, why should they try to run America?

The other day they came up with a new idea. City hall passed it. I will say this for the Mayor: I think he understood the facts much better than the City Council did. They passed a quota system for this city. If ever there is a backward step for any community, it is when everything in the town is set up on a quota basis. We founded this Republic on the basic premise that everybody is treated equally, that everybody has an equal opportunity, that the future, the opportunities, all work in this country is on an equal basis. But in many communities today folks have changed that philosophy. Some folks have come to the idea that we are going to run America on a quota basis.

I am glad to note that the Prime Minister of Ireland is coming here Wednesday, and I predict we are not going to hear a word about quotas when he speaks, because I never heard the Irish ever ask for any special deal or special favor at any time.

Let us review what the city hall of the District said on this quota deal, because this quota business is completely un-American. The resolution specifies to have full representation, in jobs at all salary and wage levels and scales, in accordance with the representation of all groups in the available work force of the District of Columbia, including, but not limited to, blacks, whites, Spanish-speaking Americans, native Americans, Asian Americans, females, and males—it does not mention the Irish. But everybody is supposed to get an equal shake.

When I checked on that I found that the population here is about 70 percent black, and I found that the people who work for city hall are 70 percent black. To start with, it is not a racial matter they are talking about.

Let me give my colleagues one example of the problem. Getting into this quota base, I checked on lawyers and found out that 13 percent of the staff attorneys for the city of Washington are black, and yet when we turn around, we find out that in the city of Washington only 9 percent of the attorneys in this city are black. In other words, although 9 percent of the attorneys are black, the city has 13 percent black attorneys. They are not going to get them from the colleges, because in the colleges today blacks make up only 7 percent of the enrollment in the law schools. How do we get into a quota system that says we are going to have more black lawyers when we do not have them in the city and in law schools? But they pass a quota system to legislate out an imbalance in one technical profession.

I would like to add one more thing. Down where I come from—because all of us like to talk about our own home State—we have 24 Congressmen representing the great State of Texas. If we took any kind of an evaluation of any type and prepared a cross-section report on who is the most outstanding, who is the most capable, who do folks think is the best Congressperson up here in Congress, I think the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JORDAN) would win head and shoulders over any one of the other 23. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JORDAN) is black; Ms. JORDAN is a woman. I will tell the Members something else: I have talked to people down there in Houston. I have asked, "What will she do when reelection comes up?" They have told me she will get 75 percent of the vote.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JORDAN) is not in Congress because of any quota system; she is here because she is the most capable person to do the job. She has ability. She is a hard worker. She represents her district as well as anybody in Congress.

If we are going to build a republic that is going to be greater in the future, if we are going to build a republic this is going to last another 200 years, we need to forget all of this quota nonsense. We need to continue to elect people based on ability from whatever section they come, and above all we need to go back to the principles upon which we founded this great Republic and let the District of Columbia stay out of politics completely.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was reading the original Civil Service Act a few days ago, and I find in it that the employees of the civil service are supposed to be allocated to the States

according to their population. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman in the well is aware of that.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. What is the gentleman saying now?

Mr. CARTER. That the civil service employees are supposed to be allocated according to the populations of the several States. That is, the great State of Texas, the gentleman's State, as large as it is and as popular as it is, should have quite a share of the civil service jobs.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Is the gentleman telling me every State is supposed to have the same number of civil service employees, in ratio to the State's population?

Mr. CARTER. It is in ratio to the population.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. The District has never provided State quotas in civil service. Is Texas supposed to have a percent?

Mr. CARTER. It is according to the population of the several States. That is, California, according to that law, would have more civil servants than any other State; New York State would be next as the second largest; and then the third largest State would be next in the number of civil service employees. This is something that is part of the basic law, and as far as I know it has never been changed. That applies, as I understand it, to the civil servants throughout our country. I do not believe the law has been changed. I think an effort was made to change it a few days ago but that effort failed.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. I want to thank my distinguished friend for enlightening me. I did not know we had that law. As many of our colleagues know, we have many laws we do not understand fully. But I do know one thing for sure. Let us leave the District alone.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say not too many throughout this Congress know that law.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, when all is said and done, what we are talking about is whether the citizens of the District of Columbia are going to have an opportunity to have representation in their legislative body, as do the other citizens in the 50 States of the United States. The eloquent arguments of our Founding Fathers against taxation without representation unfortunately still ring true, as it has been said here today, for nearly three-quarters of a million Americans. These arguments, as stated by Thomas Jefferson in the simple declaration that "the influence over Government must be shared among all the people," speak for themselves.

I support the extension of voting representation to the District because it is right and it is fair. It is a matter of each citizen having the opportunity to have representation regardless of his or her race, color, or creed.

Some mention has been made of the Federal payment here, and as a Congressman who represents a suburban jurisdiction, this is a matter that I am very sensitive to. I have questioned at times whether, indeed, perhaps the District gets more than its fair share of the Federal funds. I think that question should be looked at very carefully: whether the citizens of the District pay as much as the citizens of the surrounding jurisdictions in property taxes and sales taxes and other taxes for the support of their Government. It is concerns such as these which prompted me to introduce legislation to provide for a very thorough study of the Federal payment problem: whether the Federal payment is inadequate, or above what it should be, and/or whether the Federal payment actually should be cut.

However, this, to me is an irrelevant argument with respect to the question of representation. We in the Congress are the ones who control the Federal payment and the taxes which are paid here. If indeed the citizens of the city are not paying what they should toward the support of the Government here, then we have the authority in the Congress to change that.

Indeed, as has been said, we retain authority over this Federal city because it is so stated in the Constitution and under the home rule law, Congress still has complete control, absolute control over what happens in the city.

What we see evolving from the opponents of voting representations is what I consider to be a sort of "Catch 22" argument. They say on the one hand that if we want representation for the citizens of the District of Columbia, then let us make the District a State.

This is an impossible situation. I know many of the people that proposed that the District be made a State would be the very first ones to say we have to provide adequate protection for the Federal establishment here. This was the very reason that Congress wrote into the Constitution a provision for a Federal District, because it had been hounded out of the City of Philadelphia by unruly citizens and a State government unwilling to do anything about the situation. When they drafted the Constitution they made sure that was not going to happen again.

At the same time, much has been made of the profile of the city. The very architectural profile of this city is retained in order that the beauty of the monuments, the Capitol, the White House, the great Mall, and all such structures will stand out, not for the suburbanites to enjoy or the people of the inner city to enjoy, but for all American citizens to enjoy. If we make the District of Columbia into a State, then we could have glue factories, we could have high-rise buildings, we could have the entire physical structure of this city changed and Congress would not have a thing to say about it, because every State is equal.

On the other hand, there are those who say that, indeed, if we give this representation to the city, then the citizens of Guam and Puerto Rico and the other territories are going to demand the same. This is not the case at all, for these places are not discussed in the Constitution in the same manner. They are not singled out, and are not in a parallel situation.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, these other places are simply not given such importance in the Constitution. They are simply not of the same status, as in the case of Puerto Rico which a few years ago had a very active States Rights Party and decided by its own election that it did not want statehood and wanted to continue commonwealth status. We do not find the Puerto Ricans asking for State representation in either the Senate or the House, because they know this is not what is provided for in the Constitution, even though the District may be asking this.

Further, opponents have also argued that article V of the Constitution means non-State representation in the Senate would distort the States suffrage by giving the same right to a non-State. This argument was convincingly refuted at the House Judiciary Committee hearings by a constitutional scholar who argued that the phrase does not say equal to another State but simply means each entity must have equal representation. Voting representation for the District of Columbia will not change that.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution is a living, dynamic document. To amend it in this manner will in no way jeopardize the great foundations of our political system. On the contrary, this amendment gives further strength to the very principles of representative democracy of our Founding Fathers. I urge the House to approve House Joint Resolution 280 by a two-thirds vote tomorrow.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. THORNTON).

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman of the subcommittee for their diligent efforts in bringing to the House a proposal to accomplish the desirable results of allowing the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the joint resolution.

Although my committee assignment has since changed, I was a member of the Judiciary Committee when the resolution was ordered reported, and I would urge members to refer to the separate views which Congressmen HUNGATE, BUTLER, HYDE, KINDNESS, and I filed in the committee report. In those views, we urged the committee to give consideration to a statutory answer to the question of voting representation in Congress for the residents of the District of Columbia.

I agree that it would be desirable for the residents of the District to have voting representation, but I am not convinced that a constitutional amendment is the best means to accomplish that goal. Constitutional amendments should be resorted to only when the normal processes of legislative, executive, or judicial ac-

tion cannot accomplish the desired results.

The experience of many of the States—including my own State of Arkansas—has clearly shown the difficulties which arise when a Constitution is written in terms too restrictive, and often dealing with subjects which should be covered by legislation. We should be careful to make sure that this tendency does not develop at the Federal level.

I believe that normal legislative processes can be used to assure voting representation to District residents. There are at least two ways this can be done.

One alternative is to redraw the District lines to include only a Federal enclave and to retrocede the residential areas of the city to the State of Maryland. The objection to this proposal is that a total retrocession would jeopardize the unique qualities of Washington as a Federal city.

There is a second alternative, which to me seems a better solution. That is to retrocede to Maryland not all of the powers of "exclusive legislation" which the Constitution grants to Congress but to make a specific retrocession of the right of District residents to vote in Maryland Federal elections. In other words, for the purposes of voting in congressional elections, residents of the District would be considered to be residents of the State of Maryland.

It is a historical fact that District residents voted in the Maryland elections of 1800, and there is nothing in the Constitution to forbid them from doing so now. The governing provisions of the Constitution are rather complex, and I would not go further into them here. They are set out in my separate views to the committee report.

The important point is that we do not need this proposed constitutional amendment to give District residents voting representation. In my view, there is a better means of accomplishing the desirable result of allowing District residents a vote in Federal elections, and therefore I urge the defeat of the resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Arkansas, our colleague (Mr. THORNTON). I certainly agree that we ought to explore the statute approach.

I agree definitely that the citizens of the District of Columbia are American citizens who pay taxes and who have the right to vote for representation in the Congress of the United States who can in turn represent them with full voting privileges. Of course, we have the precedent of the 29th Congress which on July 8, 1846, by act of Congress ceded back to the State of Virginia that portion of Virginia which was within the District and is today the city of Alexandria and Arlington County. They are no longer a part of the District of Columbia but have been since this act a part of the State of Virginia.

Therefore, I definitely support that approach rather than the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 280 to provide representation of the District of Columbia in Congress. I have cosponsored a similar bill.

The report of the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the House Judiciary Committee, chaired by our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. EDWARDS), argues eloquently in support of the resolution, calling for the representation of the District of Columbia in Congress as another step toward the attainment of universal suffrage.

I agree with the subcommittee that an area with a population of over 750,000 residents, who pay Federal and local taxes and serve in the Armed Forces, should have the power to participate in the Nation's decisionmaking process.

The residents of the Nation's Capital have gradually achieved partial representation and participatory rights, beginning in 1961 when the District citizens were given the right to vote in Presidential elections. This was further expanded in 1970 when District of Columbia residents elected their first nonvoting Delegate to Congress. Three years later, they were granted local home rule.

But this still falls short of including the District of Columbia in full participation in the democratic process. It is only fitting, then, that the congressional representation formula be extended to the District of Columbia. In this Bicentennial Congress, it is a genuine reaffirmation of our commitment to the democratic rights of all citizens.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 280, which will enable the residents of the District of Columbia to be represented in the bodies that not only govern the fate of our country, but of their very lives as well.

For as long as I have been in public life, I have fought for the full enfranchisement of as many of our citizens as possible. Enfranchisement, not just in voting, but in the fullest possible participation in the political system. And contrary to what we learned in high school about electoral system, we have found that we must fight to enjoy that participation, that our constitutionally mandated rights have not been easy to come by.

And now we are faced with another battle—to allow the District of Columbia to help decide its own fate. We call it a Federal City, we might as well call it a colony. Each Monday, our calendars read "District Day," and yet there is not one official resident of the District who decides the issues that will be passed along as policy governing the lives of the 700,000 people who make Washington their home.

And who are those people? Many of them are poor and black, and have never had options as to how they lived their lives, and they have always been the stepchildren of our Government. And for years the people with power, the people who work for this Government, have fled this city at the end of the day, grateful that they had the option to leave what they considered an unsafe and unlovely place. But that has changed. People are returning to the city, new areas are being restored, there has been a renaissance of culture, many superb restaurants have opened, Washington is becoming a vital and cosmopolitan place to live.

But, although its citizens have been given a modicum of home rule, they still have few options about the way their lives are governed. And it is time an end was put to that. It seems absurd to think that the men who wrote the Constitution meant to disenfranchise the people living in the Nation's Capital. I doubt they were prescient enough to see that the land on which Washington was built would be ceded not by one, but two, States, and therefore would be a "stateless" city.

It has been said that this bill, as it stands, will have difficulty in the Senate, because the other House is wary of adding new Members that do not represent a "true" State. That kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, is antithetical to everything this country is supposed to stand for. The District of Columbia has not been given the power to govern itself, but it must, at least, have as full a voice in this Government as possible.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The people of the District constituting the seat government of the United States shall elect two Senators and the number of Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State. Each Senator or Representative so elected, shall be an inhabitant of the District and shall possess the same qualifications as to age and citizenship and have the same rights, privileges, and obligations as a Senator or Representative from a State.

"SEC. 2. When vacancies happen in the representation of the District in either the Senate or the House of Representatives, the people of the District shall fill such vacancies by election.

"SEC. 3. This article shall have no effect on the provision made in the twenty-third article of amendment of the Constitution for determining the number of electors for President and Vice President to be appointed for the District. Each Representative or Senator from the District shall be entitled to participate in the choosing of the President or Vice President in the House of Representatives or Senate under the twelfth article of amendment as if the District were a State.

"SEC. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.".

Mr. EDWARDS of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 280) to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT SETTING FORTH ACTION OF THE PRESIDENT ON SPECIALTY STEEL IMPORTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94-409)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 203(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, enclosed is a report to the Congress setting forth the action I am taking on specialty steel imports pursuant to section 203(a) of the Trade Act of 1974.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 16, 1976.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. In addition to the committees to which the report of the Select Committee Intelligence was referred on February 16, 1976, the Chair, pursuant to his authority under clause 5, rule X, has referred the report to the Committee on Government Operations for study of the report and recommendations of the select committee under the same restrictions and conditions as those stated in the Chair's announcement contained on page 3158 of the RECORD of February 16, 1976.

ELECTRONIC STUN GUN TERRORIZES ELDERLY COUPLE BEFORE THEY ARE MURDERED

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great alarm that I must again bring to my colleagues' attention the tragic abuse of a frightening weapon, the Taser electric stun gun, which was just used in the brutal murder of an elderly couple in suburban Philadelphia.

This torture device—ironically marketed to protect innocent citizens from criminals—is increasingly being used by criminals to terrorize their victims.

This most recent example of the Taser's contribution to crime involves the senseless murder of a 77-year-old couple who lived in Langhorne, Pa. According to law enforcement officials investigating this March 14 tragedy, the victims apparently were terrorized by the stun gun and then wantonly shot with conventional weapons. At this point, moreover, the possibility remains that the electric gun, itself, causally contributed to the couple's death.

The documented evidence of the Taser's abuse continues to mount, yet this Orwellian device still remains outside of all existing Federal sanctions.

As the sponsor of legislation to ban the public sale of Taser-like weapons, I recognize the necessity of swift, definitive Federal restrictions on this instrument. Similar efforts by several of my distinguished colleagues, in addition to investigations by various Federal agencies, attest to the urgency of the situation.

The most significant action relating to the stun gun was the Judiciary Committee's unanimous approval of Congresswoman HOLTZMAN's amendment to H.R. 11193 to classify Taser-like weapons as destructive devices. Regrettably, however, the Holtzman provision must await the further consideration of H.R. 11193 in the subcommittee.

I, therefore, appeal to my colleagues to relay their convictions to the Judiciary Committee to report out the Holtzman provision on the Taser as a separate bill.

I am inserting into the RECORD articles by Philadelphia Bulletin Reporter Thomas J. Gibbons, Jr., and the United Press International, published last night. These shocking accounts underscore the necessity of immediate congressional action to ban the Taser's public sale:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Mar. 15, 1976]

STUN GUN USED IN 2 KILLINGS—COUPLE THEN SHOT ON BUCKS FARM

(By Thomas J. Gibbons, Jr.)

An elderly couple apparently were shocked with electronic stun guns yesterday before being shot to death in their Langhorne farmhouse in Bucks County.

It was the second multiple murder this weekend in Bucks County, but authorities said there appeared to be no connection between the two incidents.

Edward and Marguerita Vogenberger, both 77, were shot in the head with bullets in an apparent robbery attempt, according to Middletown Township Police Chief Howard C. Shook.

The Vogenbergers' 14-acre truck farm at 222 N. Green st., Langhorne borough, is about five miles from the Abt family home in Trevose where six persons were found shot to death Friday night.

NO LINK FOUND

Bucks County Assistant District Attorney Dale Reichley said there was "no apparent relation whatever between the two homicide scenes."

Chief Shook said police found the bodies after receiving an anonymous phone call about 5 P.M. yesterday from a man who referred to Green St. and said: "If you're looking for something, check an old farmhouse."

Shook said police checked the Vogenberger house, which is the only farmhouse on the street, but no one answered the door.

"We thought no one was home, so we were going to leave until we looked in the window and saw the bodies," he said. "We had no idea when we went there of what we were looking for."

Chief Shook said dart gun barbs were found in the clothing of the victims. The "stun gun," is a battery-powered weapon which discharges two darts that produce a 50,000-volt shock.

Shook said Mrs. Vogenberger had a dart stuck in her clothing under the left breast and another on the left leg. Her husband had two darts stuck in the clothing on his back. Two of the fishhook-sized darts are shot into each victim to make a positive and negative electrical connection.

SHOT IN HEAD

Shook said Mrs. Vogenberger had been shot once in the top of the head with a bullet of undetermined caliber, and her husband was shot once in the side of the head above the left ear.

"We feel that the stun gun was used just to terrorize the people," Shook said. "However, due to their age and the voltage it may have had something to do with their deaths."

The stun guns went on the market last year under the brand name of "Taser Public Defender."

Shaped like a long flashlight with two darts stuck in the end, the device increasingly has been used by criminals. The gun was used in January to terrorize a Montgomery County, Pa., couple during a robbery.

Shook said no weapons were found, which ruled out the possibility of a murder-suicide.

He said the upstairs of the farmhouse had been "ransacked tremendously. The burglars were looking for something. If not money, I don't know what it was. The upstairs was turned upside down."

Shook said there was no sign of forced entry. He theorized that the couple kept the doors unlocked in the rural area.

GREW "BEST CORN"

George T. Strouse, deputy county coroner, said deaths were caused by bullet wounds of the head. The bodies were removed from the first floor of the 2½ story brick farmhouse to St. Mary's hospital last night.

The Vogenbergers grew green beans, rhubarb, squash, tomatoes, peppers, strawberries and "the best corn in all of Bucks County," said Mrs. James Hudson, 65, a neighbor who lives on N. Green St.

"We've known them for 38 years. They've farmed there over 40 years," she said.

"He was our milkman years ago," Mrs. Hudson said. "Why Marguerita could even run the plow. She'd always helped in the farming. Everybody in Langhorne knows the Vogenbergers. I'm numb. I feel sort of cold, like this couldn't be happening in Langhorne."

The couple belonged to Langhorne Methodist Church and the Langhorne Historical Society. Vogenberger was a camera fan and showed slides at historical society meetings.

Neighbors said the couple had no children and few visitors except for the summer when they operated a store on the property.

One neighbor said Vogenberger had a gun. "He used to shoot above the trees to keep the crows away from the berries. He was a tough man. If he caught anybody coming in they would have a big fight on their hands," the neighbor said.

Paul Delp, 21, also of N. Green St., said he had a party Saturday night "and we were going here until 7 in the morning and we didn't hear anything suspicious.

"I'm going to start sleeping with a shotgun," he said.

One neighbor reported a "suspicious" car parked on narrow Green St. on Saturday night.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 15, 1976]

SHOCK GUN USED BY KILLERS OF 2

LANGHORNE, PA.—A dart gun that produces electrical shock was used in the slaying and robbery of an elderly couple who were found dead in their farmhouse, police said today.

The couple, Edward and Margarita Vogenberger, both 77, were found apparently shot to death Sunday. The site is about five miles from where six persons were shot to death Friday night at a home in Trevose, Pa.

But police said they did not think the incidents were related. They said robbery appeared to be the motive in the second multiple slaying.

Middletown Township Police Chief Howard C. Shook said he was waiting for the results of an autopsy, expected late this afternoon, to determine what caliber gun was used in the shooting of the Vogenberger and also to determine the involvement of the dart gun.

Police said the victims had gunshot wounds of the head. Shook said darts from the dart gun were also found in the bodies.

The discovery came about 48 hours after the bodies of five members of the John Abt family and a family friend were found shot to death in their home in a residential section of Trevose.

Last Jan. 8 in nearby Montgomery County, Pa., a couple in Whitpain Township was bound and terrorized by four men using the electrical shocking device to force them to tell where valuables were kept in the house.

The bandits fled with a large amount of jewelry, cash and a number of guns, and also took a car of one of the victims, which was later found abandoned.

PALM OIL—A THREAT TO CONSUMER HEALTH

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, in an earlier address to my distinguished colleagues, I have pointed out the costly impact that palm oil imports are having on American agriculture and the oilseed industry of our Nation. I have also called attention to the fact that a large amount of foreign palm oil is being produced with the help of loans backed by the United States through the World Bank and the International Development Agency.

The adverse financial implications are simple and can be readily understood. However, one fact that my colleagues and the consumers of America probably do not know is that palm oil used as a vegetable oil in the human diet may be dangerous to human health. The American consumer is well aware that highly saturated fats and oils have been determined to be a cause of arteriosclerosis and, thus, should be avoided.

Consumers have come to equate animal fats as highly saturated and vegetable oils as highly unsaturated. Because of the selection of vegetable oils by housewives, the American oilseed industry has grown greatly in recent years while the use of lard has dropped to almost nil during the same period. However, I am sure that most consumers will be surprised to learn that palm oil is actually considerably more saturated than hog lard.

An analysis of the statistics on fats and oils published by the Department of Agriculture shows that palm oil contains 45 percent saturated fatty acids, while lard contains only 38 percent. Much lower levels of saturated fatty acids are present in soybean oil—15 percent, sunflower oil—12 percent, cottonseed oil—25 percent and peanut oil—18 percent.

Because of its lower price, more and more palm oil is being used for the manufacture of cooking oils and shortening. In 1970, only 1.6 percent of the oil used in the production of shortening and margarine was of palm oil origin. However, in 1975, in excess of 11.3 percent of the oil used in producing shortening and margarine was composed of the highly saturated imported oil. As a result, American consumers are buying vegetable oil under the impression that they are getting a product low in saturated fats; but if the product contains palm oil, they are actually getting a product more saturated than lard.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, that all products containing palm oil should bear a label signifying that they contain palm oil—a highly saturated dietary oil. Although such labeling will not prevent palm oil imports, it will at least allow American consumers to know what oil they are buying. It will also permit consumers the chance to purchase domestically produced vegetable oils which are more beneficial to their health.

As I pointed out earlier, the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. MATHIS) has announced that hearings will be held on the palm oil import situation on March 18, 1976, in his Subcommittee on Oilseeds and Rice. I am sure that testimony will be received which will further show that palm oil imports pose a threat to the health of consumers and to the economic stability of American agriculture. I urge my colleagues to attend these hearings and learn of the problem palm oil imports are causing in the United States. I am sure that an examination to the palm oil import situation will lead my colleagues to agree that strong health controls and food labeling requirements are needed to protect American consumers and American agriculture.

VETERANS BENEFITS

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, 3.7 million veterans will lose their entitlement to educational benefits due to the effect of the 10-year delimitating period. Many of these 3.7 million dedicated American citizens entered military service following the Korean war and preceding the Vietnam conflict. It was not until 1966 that any benefits were granted to assist these peacetime veterans.

Of the 3.7 million who will be cut from educational benefits on May 31, 1976, 480,000 are currently enrolled in full and part-time educational programs. Many of these veterans will be unable to continue with their education without GI bill assistance. They will be forced to drop out of school halfway through their program. It will be an awful waste if these veterans cannot complete that which they have started. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent letter I received from one of my constituents who expresses the feelings of thousands of American veterans.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: I am a veteran attending Junior College evenings and working days. I have completed six months of schooling with financial assistance from the Veterans Administration. I know my education would be impossible without this government aid, for I am the father of four children and have monetary responsibilities at home.

Recently I heard that the educational program for Veterans will be cancelled in May of this year. If this is true, what will happen to students like myself who are trying to better themselves? Without financial assistance, many veterans will be unable to complete their higher education.

Do you think this is fair to men who have voluntarily served in the armed forces?

Several bills pending before the Veterans' Affairs Committee would serve to remedy this situation. Bills have been introduced and cosponsored by many of my colleagues to extend educational benefits or at the very least, to allow those veterans currently enrolled to complete their educational program. I have myself introduced H.R. 11973 to repeal the 10-year delimitating period.

In establishing GI bill benefits, Congress stated that:

The educational program was for the purpose of (1) extending the benefits of higher education to qualified persons who might not otherwise be able to afford such an education, (2) providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose concerns have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty after January 1, 1955, and (3) aiding such persons in attaining the vocational and educational status which they might normally have aspired to had they not served their country.

Originally 8 years was felt to be an adequate length of time for veterans to complete educational training. The delimitating period was then extended to 10 years in 1974, as Congress and the President felt that inadequate benefit levels had prevented many veterans from taking advantage of GI bill benefits. The original GI bill granted only $100 per month educational benefits to veterans. It was not until 1974, under Public Law 93-508, that benefits rose to an adequate level of $270 per month. Yet while GI educational benefits have increased 35 percent since 1970, this has been accompanied by higher education tuition increases of 45 percent for public schools and 48 percent for private schools in the last 6 years. Thus veterans who held off getting an education hoping to save enough money to supplement an inadequate GI bill are now finding that they have run out of allotted time.

Time is of the essence in extending benefits to the 3.7 million Americans who will be deprived of their educational opportunities in just 2 short months. We can make no better investment in our

Nation than in the education of our service men and women. They have earned their education assistance by their service to this country. I urge my distinguished colleagues of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to promptly consider this important issue.

LET THE SURFACE MINING BILL DIE IN THE RULES COMMITTEE

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

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1975, this House passed H.R. 25, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1975. The following May 7 the House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 25. On May 20, President Ford vetoed this bill and on June 10, the House sustained the President's veto on that legislation.

The President cited loss of jobs; higher cost of manufactured goods and higher electric bills for consumers; increased dependency on foreign oil; and an unnecessary reduction in coal production, when increases in this vital domestic energy resource are needed more than ever, as reasons for his veto.

Mr. Speaker, despite the action of this Congress to reject this legislation in the first session, some of my colleagues are proposing that we again march up the hill and down again on this bill. This time, however, they have put new cloth on the bill to disguise it, given it a new number H.R. 9725, and a new title, a bill to provide for the cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the States with respect to the regulation of surface coal mining operations, and the acquisition and reclamation of abandoned mines.

Regardless of all the efforts of the bill's proponents to call it a new piece of legislation, it is the same old bill and it has the same old problems that the old bill possessed.

Mr. Speaker, it is time this House took stock of the fact that it has not yet developed an energy policy, and especially a national coal policy. I will agree we have struggled mightily with the problem and passed legislation that alleges to establish energy and conservation policies, but in reality we have really failed at our job.

How can we claim an energy-conservation policy when we are using more gasoline this year in our automobiles than we used last year, or when we are importing more foreign oil than we did last year, or when we are still using expensive oil and gas to develop electric power and are delaying a shift in the electric industry to our most abundant energy, coal? Coal production for all purposes has virtually stood still under this Congress. The bill H.R. 9725 will reduce coal production, when we need to double it. H.R. 9725, like its predecessor, is at odds with the requirement to increase coal production. The bill should die in the House Rules Committee and we should get on with the job of establishing a realistic national coal policy.

In order that you might get another's appreciation of our lack of an energy policy and especially a national coal policy, I invite your attention to the main editorial in Saturday's, March 13, 1976, edition of The Washington Post, a newspaper I do not often quote, but which some of my colleagues consider as their bible on many issues. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1976]

COAL, OIL AND PEPCO

In this country's slow progress toward a national fuel policy, nothing is ever as simple as it first seems. For example, one obvious way to save oil to switch the electric utilities to coal. The utilities have good reason to welcome the change, since oil now costs more than twice as much as coal. But, curiously, coal consumption has hardly risen at all since 1973, when oil prices shot up and the Arabs imposed their embargo. Coal still generates a little less than half of the nation's electricity, just as it did three years ago. Why is the turn toward coal so slow?

For an answer, consider the troubles of the Potomac Electric Power Company here in Washington. Last July the Federal Energy Administration ordered it to switch its big new Morgantown plant in southern Maryland entirely to coal. But in August it had to switch its Benning plant here in the city from coal to oil, when a judge fined it $6300 for air pollution violations. The switch at Morgantown threatened severe financial damage to another company, Steuart Petroleum, which had laid out $12.5 million for oil pipelines to serve Pepco plants. The switch at Benning killed the little 15-mile railroad that had been delivering its coal.

Pepco has managed to increase its use of coal over the past year—which, incidentally, is why the fuel adjustment charge on its customers' bills is down a little. But the fuel mixture at Morgantown is still only 60 per cent coal; the rest continues to be oil. The reason has nothing to do with the environmental laws. The only way to bring coal in to Morgantown is over a decrepit branch line of the bankrupt Penn Central Railroad. At first Pepco couldn't get adequate deliveries because the Penn Central didn't have enough cars to carry the coal. In response, Pepco spent $4 million for 160 hopper cars of its own. Now, Pepco says, the cars are being eaten up by the bad tracks. Twelve of the cars have been totally destroyed in various wrecks and derailments, and another 44 are out of service for repairs. Even when the trains stay on the track, the speed limit on much of the line is 5 miles per hour.

Pepco has notified the FEA, the U.S. Railway Association and the Penn Central that it needs expanded rail capacity to bring Morgantown up to full reliance on coal. But there does not seem to be any very imminent prospect of improvement. The rail line is, of course, part of the massive reorganization of the northeastern railroads that begins next month.

At the Benning plant, true enough, Pepco could have continued to burn coal if it had installed anti-pollution gear to clean up the smoke. But that equipment is expensive. Benning is the oldest plant in the Pepco system, and is now operated only in peak periods. Pepco is in the embarrassing position of having grossly overestimated the growth of its sales, and has built substantially more generating capacity than it needs. That leaves it with neither the money nor the inclination to make expensive changes in an obsolescent plant to keep it on coal.

From the utilities' point of view, here and throughout the country, the continuing uncertainty over environmental standards constitutes a major hazard. The standards are complex, they are controversial, and sometimes they are changed. Many utilities say that they are fearful of embarking on long and costly conversions of their oil-burning plants, only to find when the job is finished that local pollution rules have been revised in the meantime.

Present law requires power plants to burn coal when they are equipped for it. But much broader legislation is under consideration in the Senate. Sens. Jennings Randolph, Henry Jackson and Warren Magnuson, respectively the chairmen of the Public Works, Interior and Commerce Committees, have introduced for discussion a bill that would force nearly all power plants—not only the utilities, but industrial plants as well—to stop using oil or gas by 1985. The amount of oil currently consumed by the utilities and industry together is nearly equal to the volume that this country imports.

The implications of conversion on this scale are enormous. This country produced 695 million tons of coal last year. To meet the requirements of the three senators' bill, production would have to be more than tripled to 2.5 billion tons within the short period of nine years, according to calculations for the Senate's National Fuels and Energy Policy Study. There are now about 150,000 coal miners; this conversion would require more than 300,000. Figures of this magnitude make it evident that full conversion to coal is probably not possible, as a practical matter, as soon as the middle 1980s. It is also evident that any substantial shift at all is going to require enormous commitments of men and money—commitments that neither the utilities nor the mining companies will make amidst the present rudderless uncertainty over national energy policies.

This country wants to reduce its dependence on imported oil. But it has not yet made up its collective mind about the price that it is willing to pay. The danger of foreign oil embargoes and disruptions remains as clear as ever. But for the time being, at least, the oil is flowing and there is a strong temptation throughout the country to keep putting off the kind of firm decisions that the three senators' bill would require. The past several years' experience demonstrates that rising oil prices alone will not swing the utilities toward coal. Without legislation, it appears, nothing at all is going to happen—nothing, that is, but a steady rise in oil imports from the Persian Gulf.

SOVIETS SEPARATE A JEWISH FAMILY

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

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today Representative EILBERG and I inaugurate a vigil on behalf of Jewish families that have been separated by the cruel and lawless emigration policy of the Soviet Union.

On August 1, in Helsinki, the Soviet Union and the United States joined 33 other countries in signing the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. That act pledged participants to do everything possible to reunite families divided by national boundaries.

The purpose of our vigil is to demonstrate the Soviets' consistent violation of that pledge, separating family after family. This afternoon I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the plight of the Butman family.

Hillel Butman of Leningrad is a "prisoner of conscience," serving a 10-year

sentence in the Soviet Union. He has been imprisoned since 1970. His wife and two daughters live in Jerusalem, Israel. He has been denied the right to emigrate to Israel, and his wife and daughters have not been permitted to visit the Soviet Union in order to see him in prison.

In his wife's own words:

In the Soviet Union every prisoner is entitled to meetings with his wife and children. My husband has been deprived of this right. During all these years my husband has seen me only twice, and has not seen his daughters even once. My youngest daughter Giula was born when he was already in prison.

Throughout 1975, I vainly sought to obtain permission for a meeting with him for myself and my eldest daughter Lilly.

On January 25, 1975, I wrote my first application for a meeting. In April I received a reply signed by Councillor B. Savostyanov of the Ministry of the Interior saying that prisoner Butman has the right of meeting his relatives. My subsequent application addressed to B. Savostyanov, asking him to name a country in which the Soviet Embassy would issue me with a visa to the USSR for the purpose of meeting my husband went without answer. . . .

Having lost all hope for a just and positive solution of the matter, and seeing that all the actions of the leaders of the Soviet Union flagrantly contradict their official statements and the international documents they have signed, I see no other way of attaining what is guaranteed to us by law than by turning for help to the people of the free world, to statesmen and public figures and to international organisations.

THE DIFFICULTY OF EMIGREES FROM THE SOVIET UNION IN OBTAINING VISAS THROUGH THE U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I share a deep and genuine concern with the gentlewoman of New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN) with respect to the problems of Soviet Jewry. There is a particular aspect of that situation which I find extremely disturbing and would like to bring it to the attention of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we as Americans pride ourselves on our melting pot tradition and our doctrine of religious tolerance. We have been highly critical of the Soviet Union in its failure to permit unrestricted Jewish emigration to Israel. We have consistently condemned and harangued Soviet officials for their prejudicial and unconscionable emigration practices. However, we should also be internalizing our criticism and directing it toward our own myopic Department of State.

Recently, I had an opportunity to visit Israel and learn of the plight of Mrs. Rozalia Skimonovict who emigrated to Israel from the Soviet Union in 1972. She has an adult son and daughter working in Israel. She would like to visit relatives in the United States; relatives she has not seen for many years. She has been denied a visitor's visa by our compassionate State Department.

Mr. McCloskey, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations was contacted for assistance. The American Embassy in Tel Aviv responded that Mrs. Skimonovict was not a good risk because she failed to show convincing evidence of her intention to return to Israel. Obviously, the State Department fears that Mrs. Skimonovict may abandon her house with her children and stay illegally in this country. This conclusion was based on the fact that she could not produce convincing evidence of ties of property, savings, or employment.

Perhaps if she had a meager bank account, that would satisfy the State Department more than her natural desire to reunite with her children. What a shame she did not leave the Soviet Union with substantial wealth. Apparently she could then visit her loved ones in this country. What kind of warped sense of compassion is emanating from our State Department?

I have written to Secretary of State Kissinger regarding this matter but have failed to receive the courtesy of an interim reply. While I know of Dr. Kissinger's active travel schedule, I always thought someone was minding the store in his absence. Perhaps I have been under a misimpression.

Mr. Speaker, we had better take a long hard look at the injustices we are perpetuating. The Statue of Liberty is looking the other way these days and we must restore her compassionate vision.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, my office has also had an unpleasant experience with the present U.S. Ambassador to Israel with respect to the issuance of visas from that country to the United States as well as from Yugoslavia where he earlier served as Ambassador. In a number of cases he had arbitrarily withheld visas.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

FEDERAL ESTATE TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House Committee on Ways and Means began its long-awaited hearings on reform of the Federal estate tax—and reform is definitely indicated if we are to preserve our Nation's family-owned farms and businesses.

I have become increasingly concerned with this problem. Just last week, I received a letter from a constituent concerning the need for estate tax reform and I would like to share part of it with my colleagues:

I am farming near Allenton, Wisconsin, on a farm which is in our family since 1845. Therefore, you can see why I am glad to see your concern about estate tax relief. Having read articles about estate planning and talking to my attorney about it, I can see where new favorable legislation is needed. If something were to happen to me, I would like for my family to have the opportunity to continue on this farm.

Few of us would deliberately consider passing legislation to end a tradition that is more than 125 years old, but unless we move on estate tax reform during the 94th Congress, the net effect of our inaction will be a further attrition of our Nation's small farms and businesses.

Yesterday, I submitted testimony to the Committee on Ways and Means and because of the importance of the issue, I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

FEDERAL ESTATE TAX REFORM

(Testimony of ROBERT W. KASTEN, Member of Congress, before the Committee on Ways and Means, March 15, 1976)

Mr. Chairman, small businesses and family farms have constituted a strong, positive economic and social force over America's 200-year heritage as a nation. Conditions that encourage their preservation and progress should be fostered by government on the national, state and local levels.

Strongly believing this premise as axiomatic to our nation's future, I am very pleased the Ways and Means Committee is again examining the Federal estate and gift tax structure. I am a cosponsor of two bills, H.R. 10892 and H.R. 3831. I strongly urge the Committee to act favorably on legislation dealing with the following reforms, which I will discuss in detail:

Raise the $60,000 exemption;

Adjust the marital deduction;

Allow the alternative method of farmland valuation;

Provide extended payment time for small business and farm estates.

PURPOSE OF ESTATE TAX

It is appropriate here to examine the purpose of the Federal estate and gift tax. Historically, it is a combination of providing a source of Federal revenue and a means to prevent vast accumulations of wealth. The total revenue from Federal estate taxes represents approximately 2.2 percent of the total revenues collected by the Federal government. Estate tax collections are not a major revenue source for the Federal government. In addition, we must consider the adverse impact of current assessments on two of the nation's vital economic groups: small businesses and family farms.

As a means to prevent vast accumulations of wealth, the application of the law to modest estates goes considerably overboard, preventing in many cases a family's retention of its sole source of support. I do not believe Congress ever intended this; rather, it has come about through the *inaction* of Congress to keep the estate tax laws in line with economic realities.

FORCED BREAK-UP OF FAMILY-OWNED ENTERPRISES

In this connection, I think it will be helpful to look at the estate tax in terms of the actual impact under the current law on family farms and small businesses. Out of this picture emerges the clear necessity for major changes in the estate tax structure.

I would like to pass along to the Committee a statement from Mr. Paul E. Hassett, President of Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce, Inc., who puts the prospects for the future of small business in perspective:

"The estate tax has long been a sword over the head of all business but particularly small concerns. The big ones can publicly offer stock holdings of a deceased owner or big participant, or they can set up a foundation as was done by Ford at Ford Corporation, after adequate provision for family, since the amounts involved were huge. But the fellow who starts a business himself, or with two others, has a problem unless much planning is done.

"If a principal has an interested child or

two, he can begin transferring ownership ($3000 to each heir, tax free each year) or he can buy huge amounts of insurance to help meet the inheritance tax, so as not to strip the company of cash and receivables and leave it unable to compete when he dies. Others take a chance and then, when they are nearing retirement, sell out—often at a sacrifice—to a large company or to a competitor. I have been told by several that they dare not lose any money in substantial amounts or make substantially more, because it would compound estate tax problems. A few companies have moved out of the U.S. . . . where the colonial status exempts them from some taxes.

"The jist of all this is that instead of vigorously growing, these small firms usually prefer to stay small, thus limiting competition. As proof, try to name five companies in Wisconsin which have grown from small to large in the last 40 years. APCO Metal Company is the only one I can think of."

SHORTAGE OF LIQUID ASSETS

The liquidity problem has been discussed in previous Congressional hearings, and anyone familiar with small business or modest farming operations knows well the cash flow limitations. In testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business in August 1975, one witness described the potential pitfalls faced by a small businessman planning for the future of his concern:

"Absent proper planning, the small businessman who has spent a lifetime creating a business is likely to find that his business cannot survive his own death, and that he and his heirs will be forced to sell, merge or liquidate the business under terms that may not adequately reflect the fair market value of the going concern. Even with proper planning, under our present tax structure it is difficult to preserve a small business for future generations. . . .

"Typically, a small businessman will have most of his personal assets invested in the business. At his death, his estate will consist primarily of an illiquid business interest, and yet the estate taxes must be paid in cash. All too often the business will have to be sold to provide the needed liquidity . . . The problem is that the small business is usually so cash poor that it can't spare the current cash necessary to fund the future problem (via life insurance, cash reserves, etc.), despite the fact that, without the source of liquidity, the business may have to be disposed of in order to meet the estate obligations."

Consider, for example, an estate consisting solely of a business with a gross value of $500,000, as pointed out by the NFIB in testimony before the same committee a year earlier. The estate tax would be $39,000, which the heirs would have to pay in cash within a short period of time. That may not sound like a great amount in relation to the total value of the business, but it would be difficult, at best, to raise that amount, and more so if assets had to be sold under forced conditions.

NEXT GENERATION FORCED OUT OF FARMING

As is the case with the surviving family of a small business proprietor, the family farm has a severe cash shortage and would probably be forced to sell all or part of the farm to pay estate taxes.

No one knows the precise extent of the impact of estate taxes on farm sales, although a USDA study last July estimated that "one-fourth of all farm real estate transfers are for the purpose of estate settlement." A survey of 258 farmers by the Wisconsin division of the National Farmers Union revealed that half of them personally knew farm families who were forced to sell all or part of their farm to pay estate taxes.

Examples abound of cases where this happened. In one instance recently related to me by the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, a widow who inherited property consisting of 955 acres of farmland when her husband died had to sell 80 acres to pay the Federal tax. In addition, she was forced to take out a mortgage on one of the farms to pay the state inheritance tax. Her two sons would like to continue the farming operation but, because the estate is in probate, the sons would have to pay the appraised value of the property to take it over from their mother, or the property would be subject to Federal gift tax.

An attorney in Wisconsin who handles estate planning in a rural community recently told me he could cite any number of cases among his clients where a farm would have to be broken up to pay the estate and inheritance taxes if the individual died tomorrow. He cited as an example a farm worth $650,000 today, combined with $100,000 of life insurance. Using the 50% marital deduction upon the husband's death, the combined federal estate tax and state inheritance tax on his estate, then again on his wife's estate after her death, would result in a tax liability of almost $200,000 before the children could inherit the farm. He asserts there is no way the surviving children could continue to operate a farm with that kind of tax debt over them. Given this situation, he says, in another generation or two we are likely to see agricultural ownership primarily in the hands of corporate investors.

REVISIONS NEEDED

Mr. Chairman, your Committee no doubt will hear this point reiterated time and again, but I do not believe we can overemphasize the severity of the problem for modest-sized estates under today's Federal estate tax structure. There has been no major revision in estate tax provisions for nearly 30 years, and we are all painfully aware of what inflation has done to the value of the dollar in that period of time. Inflation has hit hardest at two particular aspects of the Federal estate tax: the $60,000 exemption, and the valuation of land for purposes of establishing the taxable value of an estate which includes agricultural land.

The third area of principal concern to me is the marital deduction which, as presently structured, gives little or no consideration to the contribution of a wife in building a family business or in operating a farm, and it makes it extremely difficult to provide adequate protection for the security of the surviving family.

These three basic inequities are remedied in H.R. 10892, introduced by Mr. Burleson, and which I have cosponsored. I would like to discuss the specific justifications for the three major provisions of the bill.

RAISE EXEMPTION

(1) The Burleson bill would raise the exemption from the Federal estate tax from the current $60,000 to $200,000.

Mr. Chairman, this is probably the most crucial provision if we are to equalize the burden of estate taxation and allow the owner of a small business or a family farm to provide for continuation of the enterprise after his death. The $60,000 level was set in 1942. Adjusting that figure simply on the basis of the Consumer Price Index would have raised it to approximately $199,550 as of July 1975.

Former Senator Frank Carlson testified before this committee on behalf of the National Small Business Association during the 93rd Congress, pointing out that, "when the law was passed, it was feasible to operate a small business or a farm worth only $60,000. With the competition of the marketplace progressing the way it is, the smallest efficient size of a business is necessarily becoming larger in terms of dollars invested."

Senator Carlson asserted at that time, "The tax treatment that the small businessman receives is generally unfavorable; and when he dies, the tax treatment of his estate is even more severe.

"Unfortunately, due to heavy estate taxes, small businesses are often dissolved at the death of their founder. Or the business must be liquidated to pay the estate taxes. Consideration should be given to ways of avoiding ruining a going concern by inflicting heavy transfer taxes."

Let's look at the drastic changes in farm valuations over past years in light of the $60,000 exemption. In 1942, when it was established, farms were worth considerably less than that amount. The following USDA figures for Wisconsin demonstrate the dramatic changes that have occurred:

Year	Cost per acre	Average per farm value land and buildings	Number of farms	Average size (acres)
1942	$54	$6,900	183,100	128
1967	182	32,400	109,000	178
1974 (estimate)	401	75,000	81,000	185

The Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation provided us with a more recent tabulation from the University of Wisconsin Extension Service placing the average 1974 per acre value at $465 for land and buildings, or $438 for land alone.

The University data also shows that a 185-acre dairy operation would run only 41 milking cows, which is actually not considered to be an economically efficient unit. For a person to make the capital investment to enter into a unit of that size, however, it would take $185,300. According to the University Extension Service a 50–80 cow unit would be more efficient to operate. The following table compares the University's estimates for capital investment required to establish operations of various sizes:

Herd size:	*Acres required*	*Investment*
41	185	$185,300
59	254	264,605
85	360	879,263
137	528	537,905

Three conclusions are apparent from this data: (1) the number of farms in Wisconsin has declined dramatically in past years and the trend continues, aggravated by the confiscatory Federal estate tax which makes it extremely difficult to pass a family operation to the next generation; (2) the paper value of the average farm has increased astronomically when compared to the value in 1942, and the trend continues steadily upward, which contributes to the estate tax burden; and (3) the enormous capital investment required virtually precludes a young person from entering the family industry unless he can take over a family operation.

This illustrates graphically the growing severity of the problem if Congress does not act this session, assuming we agree on the intrinsic value of the family farm in the nation's agricultural economy.

INCREASE MARITAL DEDUCTION

(2) The Burleson bill would increase the estate tax marital deduction, to a maximum of $100,000 plus 50 percent of the adjusted value of the estate.

There has been no major structural revision in Federal estate and gift taxes since the adoption of the current marital deduction provisions in 1948. Current law provides that the marital deduction shall not exceed 50 percent of the value of the adjusted gross estate. This means that where there is a moderate-sized estate and surviving minor children, the surviving spouse may suffer considerable hardship when the

burden of the estate tax is combined with loss of the deceased's earning capacity.

If the family tries to continue the family farm or business, there will probably be a loss of income if the deceased was the primary manager of the business, until the family gains the necessary managerial experience to make it succeed. In the case of a farm, unpredictable weather and market conditions compound the problem. In the meantime, the family is saddled with exorbitant inheritance and estate taxes.

An increase in the marital tax deduction also gives recognition to the husband-wife partnership in family farms and small businesses and gives needed protection for the security of the surviving family.

Federal law provides for deduction from the amount of the gross estate any financial contribution a wife has made, but she has to support such a deduction with proof of wages paid to her. I know of no farm operation where the husband "employs" his wife; yet, almost any farmer will readily tell you his wife and his children are his best, most reliable, hardest-working help. The same is true of most family businesses, yet in both cases the IRS considers the wife to have contributed not a penny to the value of the estate.

What a travesty of justice to witness someone who endured the hardships of building up a farm or a family business with her husband losing them both because of archaic estate tax laws!

CURRENT USE VALUATION

(3) The Burleson bill provides a method for valuing farms and woodland for estate tax purposes on the basis of current use rather than potential higher value uses.

I believe Congress should be committed to policies which enable continuation of the family farm as an economic entity in our nation. To carry out this commitment, the need for this change is obvious, particularly on the fringes of urban areas, where the potential for residential or commercial development escalates the value of farmland far out of proportion to its value if its use remains agricultural.

Safeguards are built into this provision to insure that it is used for agricultural land. To qualify, the property must have been used for farming, woodland, or scenic open space, for five years prior to the death of the owner and must remain in that use for five years after the heir has elected to use this method of valuation. Otherwise, additional estate taxes on a higher value would be collected.

The latest figures available for Wisconsin show that whereas the average value of land which continues to be in agricultural use was $438 per acre, agricultural land sold in 1974 with plans to divert it to other uses had an average value of $592 per acre. For just a 200-acre farm, the difference of $154 an acre would mean an increased value for the estate of $30,800. That average also does not reflect the increasing pressures on agricultural land values in the suburban fringe areas. Indicative of the broad range of land values just in Wisconsin, agricultural land which was sold in 1974 varied from $25 per acre to a high of $25,425 per acre.

Use valuation for real estate taxes is being looked to by a number of states as a means to encourage continued agricultural production rather than capitulation to pressures to sell to developers when a farmer can no longer afford the rising property taxes. States, such as Wisconsin, are also considering the alternative valuation method for determining assessment of inheritance taxes. I think it is very appropriate for Congress to take this action on the Federal level as a matter of policy to encourage agricultural land use.

EXTENDED PAYMENT TIME

A fourth reform proposal, not included in H.R. 10892, is incorporated in the other bill I am sponsoring, H.R. 3831, and would permit an extension of time for paying the taxes when the estate consists largely of small business or agricultural interests.

This particular reform was advocated by President Ford as the major thrust of his initial estate tax reform proposal, although he has now joined advocates of other revisions such as raising the exemption. His proposal would only raise the exemption to $150,000, which I do not believe is adequate.

I do support deferring payment of the tax, under qualifying limitations, for a period of five years, and allowing a long-term low-interest loan to pay off the balance. However, as the President acceded in his most recent proposals, this in itself is not enough until we equalize the unfair burden of taxation now placed on the modest-sized estates which would stand to benefit from the reforms your committee is studying.

SUMMARY

Congress has many urgent matters to decide this session, but this is one that certainly should receive a high priority. There is little disagreement that reform is needed. Therefore, I hope these hearings result in expediting the legislation, and I further hope the members of the House will quickly resolve disagreements on how the reforms should be structured.

Family farms and small businesses are a vital part of our nation's economy. I am committed to helping preserve the role of family enterprises in our economic system, and the reforms I support in Federal estate tax laws are a vital step in that effort.

MEDICAL FREEDOM OF CHOICE FOR CONSUMERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years there has been a growing controversy over the value of the 1962 amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act—the amendments that instituted the efficacy requirements. Since the amendments were passed, every new drug must be approved by the FDA as being effective, i.e., fulfilling its stated claims, before it can be sold. Admittedly, it is difficult to condemn an amendment with such honorable intentions; however, all that glitters is not gold. The 1962 amendments have been in operation long enough now to enable us to take a long, hard look at the benefits they have conferred upon the American public.

There have been a variety of excellent studies done on the value of the amendments. In my remarks today, I freely use the information of a study done by Prof. Sam Peltzman of the University of Chicago. To appraise the utility of the 1962 amendments, one must first analyze the intent of the Congress in making these laws.

The amendments undoubtedly received the impetus needed for passage as a result of the 1961–62 thalidomide episode. The congressional intent appears to have been to change the procedures surrounding the introduction of new drugs and their premarket testing in an effort to prevent another such occurrence. The basic provision of the amendments was an addition of a proof-of-efficacy requirement to the proof-of-safety requirement of the original law passed in 1938. The FDA now has the authority to specify the type of testing a manufacturer must perform and they may terminate or order modification of the investigation at any point in the testing if the drug is deemed unsafe or ineffective. Under the original law, a new drug application—NDA—received automatic approval if it had not been rejected by the FDA within 180 days; the 1962 amendments removed this time constraint on the FDA.

The "benefits" of these amendments are supposedly obvious: to prevent ineffective drugs from being marketed and to provide consumers with additional information about new drugs. These ends could naturally be accomplished by any suppression of innovation and, therefore, the amendments have undoubtedly produced, to some degree, their desired results. However, I think it is very important to investigate the total benefits of the amendments and compare that figure with the probable benefits our society has been deprived of since their passage. The evidence suggests that this may be another case of not being able to see the forest for the trees: we have zeroed in on one minute problem in the drug industry and our solutions have deprived thousands of Americans of the benefits of new, effective drugs for several years, significantly reduced drug innovation, and cost the American public millions of dollars.

The 1962 amendments had two easily identifiable results:

First, they substantially increased the development time required to market a new drug, and, second, the cost of getting a new drug to the market was increased. Even without exploring the total ramifications of these results, it should be obvious that the amendments have imposed a burden upon both drug innovation and the consumers' pocketbook. Professor Peltzman states in his book "Regulation of Pharmaceutical Innovation" that—

> Even when generous allowance is made for considerable variation in drug development time, it is difficult to attribute less than two years added development time to the operation of the 1962 amendments.

The estimate of delayed development time has generally been put at 2 to 4 years. In terms of cost, I will mention only the administrative cost now; in 1970 the FDA required nearly $15 million to carry out the requirements of the amendments.

Neither of these results appear to be too large a sacrifice to prove a new drug ineffective—if one proceeds no further. A complete examination into the full results leads to only one conclusion: the 1962 amendments have imposed a net loss on consumers.

Since the primary purpose of the amendments was to stop inefficacious drugs from entering into the marketplace, it is appropriate to ask if that result has been satisfactorily achieved. As I have mentioned before, any reduction of the flow of all new drugs will obviously reduce the sales of inefficacious drugs. Studies indicate, however, that the incidence of waste on inefficacious drugs has not been reduced. Experts, doctors, and patients have generally agreed that there has been no substantial change in the efficacy of new drugs, because of the

amendments. Naturally, this may simply be a result of administrative ineptness and, therefore, procedural change could be a possible solution. Professor Peltzman emphatically disagrees with this reasoning:

The penalties imposed by the market place on sellers of ineffective drugs before 1962 seem to have been sufficient to have left little room for improvement by a regulatory agency.

We have added another level of bureaucratic redtape to regulate an industry when the free market accomplishes the identical goals more efficiently and more effectively.

Unfortunately, from a consumer standpoint, this has not been the total loss resulting from the amendments. Drug innovation has suffered a dramatic decline since the addition of the efficacy requirement to the Food and Drug Act. Since the amendments, 16 new chemical entities—NCE have been introduced annually compared with an average 43 annual NCE's before the amendments. There was an average of 301 new drugs, combinations of previously introduced chemical entities and chemical entities marketed under a new brand name, introduced annually before the amendments; that figure dropped to an average of 92 annually from 1963 to 1971. Mr. Peultzman asserts that the "amendments have been responsible for substantially all the post-1962 decline in drug innovation."

This amendment-induced reduction in drug innovation has placed the consumer in a worse position even if the assumption is made that the amendments had prevented marketing of all ineffective drugs. This statement is valid because, even though the amendments do have the potential for reducing death and disease, they also have the potential for increasing them. This potential arises from the fact that the benefits of every new drug are not available to the consumer for an additional 2 to 4 years. Americans who could truly use the products of our advanced pharmaceutical knowledge are denied those products while the FDA investigates whether or not the product has the curative powers the manufacturer claims it has.

The reduction in innovation has also had international consequences. The United States is now experiencing an entirely new phenomena. We are in a "drug-lag" behind other developed countries in the production of new drugs. This drug-lag is a very serious problem since the United States has traditionally accounted for over a third of the world drug sales and research and development expenditures.

The evidence seems to definitely indicate, then, that, first, the amendments have not accomplished their intended results; that is, keeping inefficacious drugs off the market; second, the new drug flow has been more than halved; and third, the gestation period has more than doubled. The obvious question at this point in time is whether or not the benefit of keeping some inefficacious drugs from entering into the marketplace outweighs the losses from the reduction in drug innovation and the delay in getting drugs to the consumer. The answer to this question, in both consumer-welfare and economic terms, is an emphatic no.

As mentioned before, the amendments have the potential to prevent deaths and shorten illnesses by prohibiting inefficacious drugs. This figure can and has been calculated in dollar terms using very scientific, economic procedures. It is estimated that the American consumer has been afforded an annual gain of $100 million by reducing the waste of purchases of ineffective drugs.

However, we must look at the other side of the same coin. The amendments have also delayed the marketing to consumers of new, effective drugs. These delays have meant that deaths have resulted and illnesses have not been shortened when, in many cases, there existed a drug that could have been prescribed had it not been for the FDA's extensive testing. The loss produced by these missed benefits caused by the reduced flow of new drugs is estimated to be $300 to $400 million per year.

There is an additional cost to the consumer attributable to the 1962 amendments. The reduced flow of new drugs has meant less competition in the pharmaceutical industry. As a result, existing drugs have commanded prices higher than what would have been expected without the amendments. These higher prices have added $50 million a year to the consumers' drug expenditures.

I must, therefore, conclude that the 1962 amendments have harmed the American consumer:

(The) measurable effects add up to (an annual) net loss of $250 to $350 million, or about 6 percent of total drug sales.

In light of the existing evidence, I am now preparing legislation that will repeal the "effectiveness" clauses from the 1962 amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it very clear to you and to my colleagues that my legislation will deal only with the proof-of-efficacy requirement and not the proof-of-safety requirement. Drugs will still have to undergo the testing that has been required since 1938 to show that they are safe.

However, as Mr. Peltzman so accurately concludes his study:

If the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act was intended to benefit consumers, the inescapable conclusion to which this study points is that the intent is better served by reversion to the status quo ante 1962.

I urge my colleagues to research this important area and to support my legislation to repeal the 1962 amendments in a sincere attempt to remove their cost from our already financially overburdened American consumer.

PARENS PATRIAE: A BAD BILL

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it might seem appropriate that in this year of the Bicentennial the Congress should consider a bill bearing the auspicious title "parens patriae" or "father of the country." But like so much of what has passed through these Chambers in recent years as proconsumer legislation, the so-called "parens patriae" amendments to our antitrust laws, now before the House and Senate, carry a misleading label. Far from being a "father," the creature spawned from this legislation would more likely be yet another judicial bureaucratic monster born of good intention and poor legal conception.

To quote the gentleman from New York on the subject—and I quote from Congressman DELANEY's remarks, made when this legislation came before the Rules Committee last November:

Instead of being a consumers' bill, helping those people, it is just going to put additional costs, going to be a Roman holiday for lawyers.

As a lawyer, I have great respect for my profession, but I also realize we have a segment of the bar which profits from legislation of this type. You do not dangle accidents in front of an ambulance chasing lawyer but that is precisely what we are doing in this bad bill with the pot at the end of the rainbow running into the millions of dollars for the aggressive, and I might add, irresponsible, segment of our bar which will benefit most from this monstrous encouragement to sue.

After studying the details of H.R. 8532 and kindred bills pending in Congress, I can only agree with the gentleman from New York. Whatever the good intentions of the sponsors, this legislation is not going to benefit the consumer if enacted. Nevertheless, I will concede this difference between "parens partriae" and other vaunted consumer interest bills that have come before the Congress: most laws passed in the good name of consumerism have proven to be little else than an excuse to expand the Federal bureaucracy at taxpayer expense. But "parens patriae," which expands class action remedies in the Federal courts, will indeed benefit certain classes—two in particular.

First, it will benefit fee-hungry lawyers who have political connections in their State attorney general's office. Under provisions of the bill, the attorneys general can literally farm out choice class action law suits for alleged price-fixing to their friends and associates in the legal profession. To quote Congressman DELANEY once again:

In my opinion, you could not get into the courts with all the actions that would be brought. Then with the hungry attorneys, without too much to do, bringing an action and getting the fees, ultimately the cost would be borne by the consumer. Instead of being a consumers' bill, helping to help those people, it is just going to put additional costs, going to be a Roman holiday for lawyers. . . .

Continuing to quote the gentleman from New York in his remarks, made at the Rules Committee hearings on "parens patriae" last November:

We have ten times as many lawyers as we need right now in the courts. This will be an avenue where they can go in and get fees, untold amounts. You can bring the same action in fifty different states of the Union. Now who is going to pay for that? Ultimately the American public is going to pay for it, without any question.

What Congressman DELANEY was properly alarmed about, in my opinion, are the provisions of this proposed legislation providing for so-called "fluid damages" for alleged price-fixing in class action suits. These suits could be brought on behalf of all individual residents of a State, with enormous damage claims against defendants. The actual "injury" to individual plaintiffs might be minimal, but in the aggregate the judgments resulting could be sufficient to send small business firms into bankruptcy. In fact, even the filing of such suits against businesses, and the pendency of legal action in the Federal courts, could be enough to discourage outside capital investment in defendant companies. Nor would actual damages have to be proven in the normal legal sense of that word. Computerized, statistical estimates of damages and estimated losses would be all that the plaintiffs' lawyer needed to make his case. And then these statistically computed damages would be tripled under the bill's provisions, so as to further sweeten the "honey pot."

And what would the individual plaintiffs who made up that aggregate gain in the event of such a judgment? On a per capita basis, very little. The real beneficiary of this Roman holiday would, of course, be the lawyer who put the case together. H.R. 8532, as introduced, even permitted the hiring of private attorneys on a contingency basis. Although the Judiciary Committee did, at least, write in a ban on such arrangements, it has already been announced that an amendment will be offered on the House floor to remove such ban. The larger the computer-calculated claim, of course, the larger the contingency. It is little wonder that the strongest lobbyists on behalf of this bill have been members of the legal profession who specialize in plaintiffs' cases. Or that one critic of the bill has called it the "Great Bicentennial Money Machine for Antitrust Entrepreneurs."

But bad as this aspect of "parens patriae" might be, it is not the worst in terms of potential abuse of the Federal court system for personal benefit. For in addition to the bill's benefit to fee-hungry lawyers, it would serve the special interest of politically ambitious, headline-hunting State attorneys general—and I understand that there are a few of those around the country. Holders of the office of State attorney general in all 50 States plus the District of Columbia are in effect being handed a free pass to use our already overburdened Federal court system for their own narrow political purposes.

Now I say this with due respect for the vast majority of State attorneys general across the country, who are honest, dedicated public servants. But in considering an antitrust law amendment which places vast new authority in the State attorneys general of every State, Congress cannot and should not ignore certain unpleasant political facts of life. Specifically, there have over the years been some State attorneys general who were less than honest and dedicated to the public interest, while pursuing their own political and financial gain.

Consider what, in the name of "consumer interest," such unscrupulous public officials would be empowered to do under the provisions of H.R. 8532. In the hands of some, this legislation would be nothing less than a weapon for blackmail against businesses, large and small, that feared the threat of a treble-damage law suit and its effect on their credit line, regardless of the facts of the case. When a computer assesses theoretical damages and the procedural safeguards in Federal class action suits are blatantly overridden, as is provided by H.R. 8532, a business threatened by an unscrupulous State attorney general might well be forced to settle up, even if the settlement be blackmail, than face the alternative of highly costly litigation accompanied by unfavorable publicity and serious damage to its credit line.

But in my opinion, bad as that prospect is, there remains even a worse aspect of this bill, in terms of its potential abuse of the political and judicial process. And that is the potential for demagogic use of the Federal antitrust process by unscrupulous State attorneys general. The scenario for such abuse is there, for anyone who will take the time and effort to think this legislation through, beyond its high-sounding title.

I would urge, for example, the Washington Post, which editorially endorsed "parens patriae" on February 29, to take a closer look at what such authority in the hands of 51 State attorneys general could mean to the financial stability of the Post corporation.

In its editorial, the Post specifically referred to the impact of "parens patriae" on a hypothetical price-fixing action by milk producers. But it will certainly not escape the notice of politically ambitious State attorneys general in some parts of the country, where the liberal eastern press is less than popular, that the price of newspapers and magazines sent into the State are more often than not identical.

I am not suggesting that the Post and its competitors are engaged in price-fixing. But that thought may occur to some attorney general in the non-Eastern hinterlands, or, for that matter, to several. The same threat exists, in even greater prospect, for the Post's sister publication Newsweek. Over the years Newsweek and its competitor in the weekly newsmagazine field, Time, have regularly matched each other to the exact cent, in price hikes to the consumer. Both magazines today sell at newsstands for 75 cents. As a publisher myself, though on a much smaller scale, I understand the competitive forces at work that lead to such pricing similarities. But under the provisions of the "parens patriae" amendment that the Post endorses, that economic similarity could well be tested in Federal court in not one but all 50 States and the District of Columbia, by attorneys general who might see considerable political mileage to be gained—to say nothing of treble damages—in making a political scapegoat out of a nonresident legal entity.

I would urge the Post and other segments of the media to examine "parens patriae" in this light. And I would also urge that labor organizations, along with professional associations, do the same. Under recent Supreme Court decisions, labor arrangements affecting prices and anticompetitive agreements are subject to antitrust law. The same situation prevails for professional associations that often set minimum or scale pricing for services.

Thus, while H.R. 8532 may be viewed by its sponsors and supporters as a bill to nail the big corporate price-fixers, its actual scope is sufficient to taken in just about any economic entity that an ambitious, imaginative attorney general might consider a profitable target-for-the-day.

It was the late Senator Huey P. Long who said, "Corporations make the finest political enemies in the world." That was true 40 years ago and still remains true in large areas of the country today. Big Business scapegoating has never gone out of style for the politically ambitious. But I would remind my liberal colleagues that the popular fashion of scapegoating can vary from reigon to region, State to State. In one State, the price of milk or oil may strike an attorney general as an area for legal action. In another, the Eastern liberal press, or the AFL–CIO, or real estate brokers.

H.R. 8532 may, as I say, have been created with the finest of intentions as a consumer protection device. But let me submit that if in the name of consumer protection the Congress develops a weapon for political demagogues and get-rich-quick legal hucksters, we will avail the consumer little and do the system irreparable damage.

I agree with the gentleman from New York. This legislation is nothing more or less than a bill authorizing and subsidizing a Roman holiday in the Federal courts. And that is a holiday neither the judicial process nor our economy can afford.

HUD BLAMED AS DETROIT HOMES ROT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in Monday morning's Washington Post, Reporter Charles Krause has written a comprehensive review of the malignant terror of abandoned housing owned by HUD in Detroit. HUD, now Detroit's largest slum landlord, owns 57,000 abandoned houses in the city, and the blight is spreading daily. Whole neighborhoods have been swallowed up by the HUD mismanagement and the resultant looting, arson, and other crimes unleashed when the abandoned homes sit for up to 2 years without repair or sale.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Detroit is critical. I believe that each of my colleagues should take a moment to read the Post's article on the situation, and commend it to their attention here:

HUD BLAMED AS DETROIT HOMES ROT

(By Charles A. Krause)

DETROIT.—No federal bureaucracy is as well known or as widely despised here as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which rightly or wrongly is blamed by

many Detroiters for the abysmal decline of their city.

"We call it 'Hurricane HUD,'" City Council President Carl Levin said in a recent interview. "It's a plague."

The plague that local politicans, the city's two newspapers and scores of community groups have fought, largely unsuccessfully, for the past several years has now infected whole sections of Detroit, where thousands of mortgages have been foreclosed and thousands of houses left to rot by HUD.

These boarded-up and abandoned homes are often vandalized and set afire by arsonists before HUD can sell them, leaving some areas of Detroit looking like bombed-out German cities at the end of World War II.

In fact, Detroiters cynically refer to certain neighborhoods as "war zones," ravaged not by a foreign enemy but by discredited federal housing programs that continue to eat away at the fabric of Detroit.

Despite the fact that the programs were largely stopped in 1973, foreclosures continue unabated in every section of the city. And it still takes HUD's Detroit office 21 months to dispose of a home once it is repossessed—more than enough time for the boarded-up homes to be destroyed by vandals at tremendous cost to the city and the U.S. Treasury.

"HUD's inability to deal with the situation will mean hundreds of millions of dollars in future HUD losses in the city of Detroit," said John E. Mogk, a law professor at Wayne State University here, who teaches a course on housing problems.

Mogk called the boarded-up, often stripped and burnt-out homes in neighborhoods throughout the city "an absolute disaster. Once a home is abandoned it causes other homes to be abandoned [because] the market value on the block becomes depressed" and people who want to move are forced to abandon their homes when they cannot sell them.

HUD now has more than 8,400 homes boarded up in every section of Detroit. It owns another 1,800 vacant lots where houses that were destroyed once stood. Since 1970, 25,000 homes—or 13 per cent of all the homes in Detroit—have been taken over by HUD, after the owners defaulted on federally insured mortgages.

About 500 homes a month come into HUD's possession in Detroit. Those that are set afire or destroyed by vandals are then demolished by HUD, leaving nothing in their places.

This is why Levin calls HUD a plague. Each home that is boarded up or destroyed infects the block and the neighborhood where it is located—causing further decay in a city that is already one of the sickest in the nation.

Elmer C. Binford, director of HUD's Detroit office, conceded recently that "we have a massive problem" in attempting to dispose of the more than 10,000 abandoned homes and vacant lots which HUD owns in Detroit.

Binford said HUD has made some progress, pointing out that his office has reduced the average amount of time it takes to dispose of a house from 48 months a year ago to 21 months today.

The programs that have caused so much trouble and left HUD with 57,000 rotting, boarded-up homes in Detroit and other cities were designed in the 1960s to encourage home ownership for the nation's poorest families by subsidizing mortgage interest rates or by allowing the poor to buy homes with virtually no down payment.

Old Federal Housing Administration rules about where to insure mortgages were thrown out. The FHA was directed by Congress to approve mortgages in older, declining urban areas.

The theory was that if poor families were enabled to purchase a home, they would have a stake in their communities and take better care of the homes than absentee landlords, thereby saving declining urban areas.

When former HUD Secretary George Romney assumed office in 1969, he pushed the programs and demanded results. He wanted each local HUD office to approve as many mortgages as it possibly could. As a former governor of Michigan, Romney kept a special look-out on the results in Detroit.

HUD performed. More than 1.2 million mortgages were approved under the program, most of them between 1969 and 1973. These mortgages had a face value of $16.7 billion.

But by 1971 the roof began caving in, literally and figuratively, as thousands of poor families defaulted on their mortgages and many of the structurally unsound houses they had bought started falling apart.

More than 166,000 of the mortgages had been foreclosed by mid-1975, and the prognosis for the remaining one million, according to the Secretary, Carla A. Hills, is not good.

HUD has lost $2.1 billion on the 166,000 foreclosed mortgages. Hills recently asked Congress for $825 million to replenish two FHA mortgage insurance funds that are mired in red ink as a result of the foreclosures.

During her testimony, Hills warned that the end of the losses is not in sight. "We are going to face this problem again," she said, "namely continuing and essentially uncontrollable losses . . . arising out of dormant programs."

Besides the money that the federal government has lost on the mortgages it insured, HUD estimates that during 1975 its "holding" costs—the money spent to keep the houses vacant—amounted to more than $200 million, or $7.21 a day for each house.

Last December, the most recent month for which figures are available, HUD was spending $410,970 a day on its 57,000 houses just to keep them empty.

HUD also estimates it has paid $82 million in property taxes over the years on the 166,000 foreclosed homes.

Detroit officials say HUD is probably their city's fifth largest property taxpayer, behind General Motors, Detroit Edison, Chrysler and Burroughs.

They find the HUD taxes small comfort, however.

"This is a disaster inflicted on us by the federal government," said June Ridgway, a member of the Detroit Board of Assessors. "HUD has cost every citizen in Detroit 20 per cent on his house" because of a general decline in residential property values that Ridgway attributes at least in part to HUD's performance in Detroit.

Since she became HUD Secretary a year ago, Hills has tried to deal with the increasing foreclosures and massive inventory. She has demanded that HUD streamline its procedures to sell off as many houses as it can in as short a time as possible.

Outside of Detroit, it now takes HUD an average of 12.4 months to dispose of a house.

Hills also sent a letter to every lending institution that services mortgages insured by the FHA, warning them not to be too strict on foreclosures. To put some teeth into the warning, she recently created the Mortgage Review Board, which has threatened to suspend three mortgage companies from FHA backing and has placed a fourth on probation.

Besides the 10,000 homes and vacant lots in Detroit, HUD owns more than 3,600 in New York City, 3,800 in Philadelphia, 4,700 in Atlanta and 2,300 in Dallas, as well as smaller numbers in other major cities.

In addition, HUD has more than 277,000 federally insured apartment units in various stages of default and foreclosure. These are worth $3.4 billion. Again, Detroit has the greatest number—17,203 units—of troubled multi-family properties of any city in the nation.

One puzzling question: why Detroit? Why has HUD had more problems in Motown than in any other city?

Binford who has been director of HUD's Detroit office since 1974 and is highly regarded by HUD's most vocal critics here, says, "When you talk about HUD, you have to talk about it in the larger context."

He cited Detroit's auto-dependent economy, an extensive freeway system that opened up vast tracts of land in the suburbs for residential development and federal housing policies that relied "too heavily" on encouraging poor people to buy homes they could not afford and were unable to care for.

In addition, Binford said, "there's no question" that widespread corruption in HUD's Detroit office between 1969 and 1972 contributed to the massive number of foreclosures.

The Justice Department says more than 200 former HUD officials, FHA inspectors and real estate speculators who joined together to make illegal millions out of the federal programs, have been convicted in Detroit.

In many cases, the speculators bought structurally unsound homes cheap, bribed HUD officials to inflate their worth, and then sold the houses to poor and unsophisticated buyers whose dubious creditworthiness was approved by other HUD officials who were paid off by the speculators.

"We have had, do have and are working very hard to clean-up HUD corruption," Binford said, adding that it caused only part of the current foreclosure and resale problems.

Mogk, the Wayne Law School professor, says other factors in the high number of defaults were soaring energy prices and the layoffs by the automobile companies of hundreds of thousands of their employees in 1974.

Mogk also cited a traditionally high mobility factor in Detroit as well as a high crime rate, racial tension, a 20 per cent unemployment rate and a deteriorating school system.

City Council President Levin, who has fought HUD for five years, says that in trying to cope with the defaults HUD bureaucrats in Detroit have been "unbelievably incompetent, irresponsibly rigid and lacking in imagination."

Over the years, he notes, HUD has announced various plans to sell foreclosed houses and then cancelled the plans. It has brought in task forces from Washington and then admitted the task forces accomplished nothing. It has promised to tear down vandalized houses and then not done so within a reasonable period.

Today, Levin says that Binford is making a determined effort to improve HUD's sales performance in Detroit, but insists that "HUD couldn't market an ice cube in Florida in the summertime."

Binford denies that, arguing that things have improved and that HUD's Detroit inventory is declining. But he concedes the problems is "massive."

Certainly it seems that way to the citizens living near the 10,000 abandoned homes and vacant lots. For instance, there is Iva Malm, who owns a home in Detroit's Riverside section, which looks as if it had been bombed.

"I wish they'd get going and get this mess cleaned up," she said the other day as she surveyed a HUD-owned home on Glover Street that was recently set afire by vandals and now looks as if it is about to collapse. "Its a shame to have to live in a neighborhood like this. I don't like it one bit."

REVENUE SHARING

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, any program hailed as beginning a "new fed-

eralism" is likely to fall short of its goals, and against such a measure I think the scorecard on revenue sharing is negative.

I do believe the program has made a vital difference which Secretary of the Treasury William Simon addressed by saying revenue sharing "has contributed to a revitalization of our Federal system by shifting some resources to those governments closest to the people, where there is often a clearer perception of the needs of the citizens."

Against that measure revenue sharing has surely worked. Revenue sharing has also become extremely valuable to local governments as I found recently when I held a special seminar with county and municipal officials in the 12th Congressional District to gain their insights on this program. Meeting in Indiana, Pa., the seminar produced many worthwhile comments which I want to share with my colleagues.

I would like to begin by stating the conclusions I reached from that meeting that I believe are important in developing congressional debate.

First, there is unanimous feeling among local officials that this program should be extended. Whether planned by Congress or not, local governments have come to count strongly on this program for revenue, and its elimination would cause serious problems.

Second, if revenue sharing is not extended local governments will clearly be faced with two options: One, to discontinue present programs; two, to raise taxes through the regressive property tax or occupation taxes. Estimates were that taxes would increase 3 to 10 mills on property if the same level of services are to be provided without revenue sharing. With the economic recovery beginning, but not yet reaching many citizens' pocketbooks, we do not need to create that kind of choice.

Third, the flexibility of the present program is one of the best liked features of the plan. Several areas in central Pennsylvania have been very hard hit economically in recent years. The "no strings" approach of this program helps them to keep services despite rises in unemployment, and the loss of population and taxes.

Fourth, it is necessary for Congress to act with some speed. Local governments—like Congress—must now make their budget projections and select their priorities for the years ahead. They can only do that if they know the fate of revenue sharing and what they can expect from this program.

I would now like to add to those conclusions, Mr. Speaker, by sharing with the Members some of the comments from local officials on points we discussed.

USE OF FUNDS

While the funds have been used for a wide range of services, the most prominent use in the 12th Congressional District has been to help in the extension and completion of county homes for the aged. In fact, through revenue sharing the total bed space in the five full counties in the district will expand from 1,057 to 1,636. Revenue sharing funds are helping greatly in this expansion as well as with improvements to existing facilities.

The case of Cambria County is one example as explained by County Controller Robert McCormick:

We are in the present entitlement period receiving $1,446,850. One-hundred percent of these monies is going into the health sector, basically our Cambria County home. Cambria County roughly two years ago established priorities as far as county expenditures and they came up with the main priority as being the Cambria County home and areas for the aged to go. At the present time we have a capacity of 550 beds, at the completion of our program Cambria County will have 925 beds for the elderly.

The other major use of funds in the area is police and fire protection. In the city of Johnstown, in fact, Mayor Herbert Pfuhl noted that 100 percent of the revenue sharing moneys go to meet 50 percent of the total cost of police and fire protection for the city.

AGED

Before this hearing a prime concern of mine was whether enough of the funds were being used to help older Americans. I learned that nearly every community in our area uses some of its funds to help the elderly. I mentioned the money going to help with county homes. Beyond that Commission Chairman Jay Dilts outlined the commitment to the elderly in Indiana County:

I feel the aging programs are receiving a fair share of Federal Revenue Sharing money. The county home facility receives a large share of the action. The visiting nurses association also receives funds . . . we give to Operation Uplift, we give to the Senior Activities Center out of Revenue Sharing, and I believe we have addressed ourselves to this problem of the aged.

We must recall that revenue sharing was originally designed not simply to supplement local income but to provide the initiative for replacing and sustaining Federal Government service programs. I hope when we renew the law that congressional intent will be clear that programs for the elderly with these funds should be encouraged.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

One of the items the congressional debate seems to have focused on is insuring public participation in how revenue sharing funds are spent. After listening to our officials I have noted an important aspect of this question that Congress should consider.

It is well to remember that in rural areas such as I represent, public officials are neighbors and community citizens. They are very easily accessible. Knowing my own communication with citizens, I conclude there is ample input in rural areas through scheduled, formal and irregular, unscheduled meetings. The situation may differ in metropolitan areas.

I believe Congress will want to consider whether a set of rules and requirements will really increase public participation in rural areas. Several officials spoke to this point. Mayor Thomas Panetti of Windber addressed the lack of citizen concern by noting that—

Residents of the Borough are advised how Revenue Sharing funds are spent through the news media and comments are requested. Also, Revenue Sharing is discussed at Council meetings. There is little community involvement.

Mayor Michael G. Tsikalas of Edensburg noted that—

Although there has not been open forums for citizen participation in the program, there has been indirect participation through organizations which are large and very active in our community.

And Somerset Borough Councilman Richard Gibbs noted:

The Borough has widely advertised its revenue sharing plans and invited citizens' participation. In addition to the items required in the notice, footnotes have been inserted explaining each of the capital expenditures and maintenance items and its purpose. Citizens have been invited to submit their suggestions, however, only a few written requests have been received.

AID FORMULA

There were two reactions to changing the aid formula. Several individuals cautioned against a prolonged fight over the formula that would delay passage, saying it was more important to know the program would be extended and that some aid would be on the way.

Armstrong County Commission Chairman Harry Fox seemed to speak to general agreement, however, that recognition of need might be better covered by the law:

We would recommend that a better formula be used for computing benefits. More assistance should go to communities that have a lower per capita income among their residents, and a lower level of assistance to communities with a higher per capita income level.

Armstrong County is classified as a depressed area, with a high percentage of unemployed. Rightfully, it should receive a greater percentage of benefits than other areas and significantly more than Fox Chapel or Montgomery County in Eastern Pennsylvania.

PROGRAM OUTLINE

There was near unanimous praise of revenue sharing for its stunning lack of redtape and absence of bureaucratic decisionmaking. No one said they missed spending directives from Washington. Commission Chairman Bud Hay of Somerest County addressed this point well:

I think our problems in the rest of the programs are that they come out with your hands tied, and especially when they [Washington] say you will initiate this program, this way, at this percentage or we will come in and set the program up . . . the cities don't have the same problems rural areas do, and God only knows we don't have the same problems the cities have, and I can't see that Harrisburg and Washington can answer all the problems.

I personally have some philosophical differences with the situation where one level of government raises funds to be spent without any controls by another level of government, but I think Commissioner Hay makes the point that we have often gone overboard in Federal Government regulations to the point where local input becomes too minimal.

A SUPPLEMENT?

One point that is key in my mind to revenue sharing in rural areas and many urban areas is the misconception that revenue sharing is "supplemental" income. The fact is that for many local

governments we are talking about a lifeline revenue source. Commission Chairman Andrew Laska of Jefferson County commented to this point:

As you probably realize Jefferson County over the past years has lost its major industries, namely the deep mines and railroads. We must now depend on small industries throughout the county, and I might say, we cannot be considered an industrialized county. Our farms are getting fewer as each year passes, our unemployment rate is in line with other parts of the country, and maybe even higher . . . I wish to stress that if [Revenue Sharing] ended in the near future, the final results would result in an economic disaster.

The next step after ending revenue sharing would be higher tax rates—regressive property tax rates just when we are beginning to emerge economically and when citizens are still feeling a great tax bite—or a sharp cut back of Government services, probably in those programs for the aged and poor.

TAXES

If revenue sharing is discontinued taxes will increase at every level in the 12th Congressional District, or programs will be slashed. The officials estimated a 3- to 10-mill increases in the property tax would closely follow the end of revenue sharing. Moreover, Bernard Bowser, Secretary of the Borough of West Kittanning made a telling point with this comment on the situation in his own borough noting that—

55% of the people in our community are individuals living on fixed incomes, there are a number of widows, retired people throughout our county confines.

Bowser noted that if revenue sharing is discontinued, property taxes will increase, and it is these individuals who will be forced from their homes or forced to pay a higher share of their pensions and social security to the Government.

CONCLUSION

As someone who is concerned about Government spending and responsibility of Government officials it is tempting for me to suggest an end to a $6 billion a year program with virtually no strings attached on spending. But to be effective government must be realistic. State and local officials see revenue sharing as a necessary way to meet the burdens of fire and police protection, garbage pickup, and social service assistance that are difficult to finance even in the best of times. Our economic difficulties of recent years coupled with already high tax burdens on the middle class, plus growing percentages of unemployed, elderly, and widows makes revenue sharing in some form a necessity. I believe Congress should extend the law quickly but also refine and improve the program over the next few years and use it as a first step in assessing the relationship of national, State, and local governments to see what future directions a "new federalism" should take.

THE CEILING ON SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, since 1972, a ceiling of $2.5 billion has been imposed on the Federal funding available under the social services program. Now known as title XX, this HEW program provides grants to States for a wide range of services to children, the elderly, the mentally retarded, and other groups with special needs.

Initially, many States were not able to spend their full formula allocation. This year, however, most States will spend all of the Federal dollars they are eligible to receive under title XX.

In order to obtain a more complete picture of the fiscal status of the social services program, I wrote to State title XX administrators earlier this year, asking them to describe the impact of the Federal ceiling on their programs. The vast majority of the 42 State administrators responding to the survey indicated that, as a result of the ceiling, inflation was gradually eroding the level of their programs.

A partial summary of the State responses is provided below:

A SAMPLE OF STATE COMMENTS ON FUNDING FOR TITLE XX SOCIAL SERVICES

Alaska: Service costs have increased by 35% since 1972. Dramatic impact from permanent settlements associated with pipeline construction but no increase in funds to deal with service needs in these areas.

Arizona: State will have to cut back optional services in order to fund mandatory services if funding increase is not provided.

Connecticut: Concern that current funding does not permit expansion of community based services to prevent inappropriate institutionalization of the elderly. Seven percent funding increase could provide day care for 2,000 additional children.

Georgia: Ceiling prevents normal continuation of programs and thus ongoing programs will have to be cut back.

Idaho: State already provides $1.5 million in unmatched state dollars. Title XX frustrates the public because it proposes services that cannot be funded. Existing system is demoralizing. Each year State has had to trim services to children and adults. Overall effect has been to reduce quality as well as quantity of programs.

Kentucky: In 1974–75, State spent $1.2 million in unmatched State funds on programs. Eight percent funding increase in FY 1977 would enable State to restore programs to 1974–5 levels.

Louisiana: This year, State has received requests for $76 million in federal funds from potential providers. Only $44 million is available. Because of funding limit, State can only serve families at 48 percent of median income rather than at 120 percent as provided under federal option.

Maryland: Estimated need will exceed funding availability by $5 million in FY 1977. State will need 10.5 percent increase to cover this increased need. Failure to provide more federal support will result in cutback of State purchase of service programs.

Massachusetts: As a result of ceiling, program cutbacks are expected in 1976–77. Day care, homemaker services and group foster care centers will be forced to close. Cutbacks and closings will mean providing clients with more costly forms of service. Institutional care or foster care are two alternatives facing some of those turned out of day care or homemaker arrangements. Some recipients will be forced to apply or re-apply for cash assistance.

Minnesota: Most services have been curtailed as a result of ceiling, progress in service expansion and development has been severely retarded.

Nebraska: State is faced with program cutbacks in 1976–77. Direct client benefits may be reduced by as much as $1 million.

New York: Since 1972, inflation has eroded value of service dollars and State's share of federal allocation has been reduced as its share of the national total population has dropped.

Oklahoma: Ceiling will necessarily result in program reductions.

Oregon: State has provided its own unmatched funds for several years. Federal funding limitation means that only 11 percent of State's day care needs are being met.

Pennsylvania: State share of national total has been reduced as a result of population shifts. If ceiling is not lifted, modest cutbacks will be required this year, severe program curtainments next year, and disastrous reductions the year following.

Texas: Fourteen percent reduction in program levels in 1976 as a result of the ceiling. State experienced 10.35 percent inflation rate during 1975.

Virginia: State needs a 15.2 percent increase just to continue current programs.

Washington: Ceiling has imposed severe hardships. State is now in the process of significantly reducing the number of case workers providing services. One-third reduction of staff over the past year due to ceiling.

Wisconsin: State will spend $6 million in unmatched funds this year. Even 7 percent federal increase will not enable State to maintain existing program levels. Recession is increasing number of people needing services. AFDC for Unemployed Parents' caseload increased by 85 percent between June, 1974 and July, 1975.

The following chart indicates which States are currently spending at their full formula allocation level:

STATES CURRENTLY SPENDING AT TITLE XX CEILING ALLOCATION

Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

STATES APPROACHING CEILING

Kansas, Missouri, Mississippi, Tennessee.

STATES THAT WILL REACH CEILING IN FISCAL YEAR 1977

Alabama, Arkansas, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Virginia.

STATE NOT YET APPROACHING CEILING

Indiana.

I would also like to include with my remarks a copy of letter from Edward Weaver, executive director of the American Public Welfare Association. Mr. Weaver, writing on behalf of the Council of State Public Welfare Administrators, discusses the need for a cost-of-living increase in social services funding:

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1976.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: In its meeting of March 9, the Social Services Committee of the Council of State Public Welfare Administrators discussed needs for additional Title XX funding. They also considered this need in the context of your January 7 letter to state administrators in which you invited their comment upon how programs are affected by the $2.5 billion ceiling and how they would

be affected if a cost-of-living increase of 6% to 8% were added to each state's allocation during FY 77.

The Committee approved the following statement and requested that it be provided to you in support of your effort to secure needed funds for Title XX programs:

"The Social Services Committee of the National Council of State Public Welfare Administrators is very much concerned by the fact that Title XX program funding under the closed-end appropriation has been severely eroded by the aggregate effect of three years of double digit inflation since passage of the Revenue Sharing Act (P.L. 92-512). In combination with a fixed allotment under the ceiling, inflation at whatever percentage will continue to constrain and actually curtail programs. The Committee supports budgetary action to recoup those funds lost through inflation and mechanisms—such as the application of an indexing factor—to protect both current and future appropriation levels under Title XX. Accordingly, the Committee would recommend that the first year of indexing include a "catch-up" percentage related to inflation-based erosion of these funds in FY 73, 74 and 75."

Yours truly,

EDWARD T. WEAVER,
Executive Director.

PANAMA CANAL SURRENDER: MAJOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION ISSUE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to this House of the Congress on December 9, 1975, under the title of "Panama Canal surrender proposal: a major geopolitical Pearl Harbor," I summarized the essential facts in the historical and legal background of the canal and its indispensable protective frame of the Canal Zone; and warned about some of the perils involved in the loss of its control (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 9, 1975, p. 39492.)

Since that time, Chief of Government Omar Torrijos of Panama, with a large entourage, made a state visit to Cuba and it has been disclosed that a Cuban expeditionary force is now in Angola supporting pro-Soviet factions for taking over the African country. In addition, there have been reports by the arrival from Havana at night at the Tocumen airport in Panama of a major influx by Communists' agents and the unloading of large trunks that observers believe to contain arms.

What does all this activity mean? Does it indicate that the Cuban forces in Africa are being trained for use in Central America against the Panama Canal? Does it mean the training of troops for guerrilla warfare in the United States? Certainly, they are matters about which our Government should be alert and take necessary precautionary measures (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 18, 1976, p. 3712).

The impact of continued uncertainties over the status of the Canal Zone and a sustained program of harassment of Panama Canal employees has lowered their morale below anything that I have known and requires the direct attention of the Congress as well as of the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Speaker, I would repeat what has been frequently stated that the Caribbean is the hemispheric danger zone. The reason for this fact is that its location is strategic.

The defense triangle for its protection consists of Puerto Rico, the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, and the Panama Canal, all three of which are under propaganda assaults aimed at wresting their control from the United States.

In disregard of strong congressional and overwhelming public opposition, responsible officials of the Department of State have continued their massive propaganda campaign in support of a new canal treaty or treaties that would surrender U.S. sovereign control over the Canal Zone to Panama and the subject has become an important U.S. Presidential election issue as well as a matter of deep international concern, especially among major maritime nations that use the canal.

This giveaway propaganda has included a series of addresses by State Department officials and others in various parts of the Nation, including the Canal Zone, seminars in universities, addresses at the Army War College, a 5-day TV program over WTOP preceded by a promotional buildup, and remarks by the U.S. Secretary of State at a recent White House gathering of the Navy League, the American Legion, and like organization officials.

During the White House meeing when the need for a new canal treaty was questioned, the U.S. Secretary of State is reliably reported to have stated: "Well, what would you rather have, a Vietnam-type of guerrilla warfare and sabotage in the Canal Zone supported by Central and South American countries or a new canal treaty?"

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that that knowledgeable group was not impressed by that attempt at terroristic intimidation. I would add that Latin Americans know strength and they respect it. They are contemptuous of weakness. Surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone would invite the very attacks that the Secretary of State says he seeks to avoid.

All the propaganda on the canal question that has emanated from the State Department has been directed toward brainwashing the American people and through them influencing the Congress into accepting that agency's projected surrender of the Canal Zone, which has not been authorized by the Congress—U.S. Constitution, article IV, section 3, clause 2. As has been said before, it is difficult to conceive of a surer way to bring about another major confrontation between the Congress and the executive than by the latter's persistence in its present pusillanimous surrender course.

To grasp the significance of the current isthmian situation certain important facts in Panama Canal history must be known:

First, prior to the acquisition of the Canal Zone by the United States, Panama was the pesthole of the world;

Second, the great French effort to construct the canal, 1879–89, ended in a tragic failure, stressing that the magnitude of the project required the contributions of a powerful country with vast resources;

Third, when occupying the Canal Zone and launching construction of the Panama Canal, 1903–06, President Theodore Roosevelt did not act capriciously or illegally, as many have recently charged, but under congressional authority and in accordance with provisions of the Treaty of 1846 with New Granada—now Colombia.

Fourth, the grant to the United States of sovereign powers, rights, and authority over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal did not originate with the Panamanian Minister in Washington, as so many have erroneously stated, but with the 1902 supplementary report of the Isthmian Canal Commission headed by Adm. John G. Walker and the legal advice of Dr. John Bassett Moore of the State Department, one of the ablest constitutional and international lawyers that one country ever produced. Moreover, the "perpetuity" factor was required by the Spooner Act of 1902 authorizing the President to acquire the perpetual control of the Canal Zone by means of a treaty with the sovereign of the isthmus, which at that time was Colombia and not Panama.

Fifth, the failure of the Colombian Senate to ratify the Hay-Herran Treaty of January 22, 1903, was the specific event that precipitated the Panama revolution of November 3, 1903, and the making of the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty with Panama instead of Colombia (Panama declaration of Independence, November 4, 1903, quoted in W. F. Johnson, "Four centuries of the Panama Canal," vol. 11, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1907).

As shown by the historical record, the purpose of the grant in perpetuity of the necessary "sovereignty and jurisdiction" was to enable the United States to meet its responsibilities "effectively" (H. Doc. No. 474, 89th Cong., p. 193). The work of constructing the Panama Canal was done under the supervision of the Secretary of War—now Army—and not the Secretary of State. Many years later, a former greatly distinguished high Panama Canal official at the time of peak construction, familiar with recent interventions by the State Department in Canal Zone matters, stated that should such interferences have occurred during the construction era he could not see how the canal could have been built.

Many today contend that conditions have changed. That is true but they have changed for the worse and require a

stronger hold by the United States rather than a weaker one.

Panama is still a land of endemic revolution and endless political turmoil. In its 72 years of independence there have been 32 Presidents, some of them holding office only a few days.

One example will be cited. On October 11, 1968, after 11 days in office, the legally elected President of Panama was overthrown in a military coup d'etat, forcing the deposed President to flee to the Canal Zone for his life and then into exile. Since that time the de facto revolutionary Government of Panama has allied itself with Red Cuba and served as a Soviet puppet.

In these capacities, it has waged an organized campaign of villification among other countries of Latin America, in Europe and at the United Nations, against its greatest benefactor, the United States. The charges that it has continually made include the following:

First. That the very existence of the U.S. Canal Zone separates Panama into two parts and works a hardship on its people;

Second. That Panama is not adequately compensated; and

Third. That U.S. housing in the Canal Zone is so much better than nearby housing of Panamanians as to be hurtful of their pride.

What are the facts? As to the first, instead of separating Panama into two isolated parts, the zone connects them. At the Pacific end of the canal, the Great Thatcher Ferry Bridge, built and paid for by the United States, enables unrestricted free cross canal vehicular transportation for both Panamanians and U.S. citizens.

At the Atlantic end of the canal, there are temporarly facilities for free cross-channel transportation available at the Gatun Locks. To provide for future needs there, I have introduced a bill to authorize the construction of a major cross-canal bridge at the Atlantic end of the canal to correspond with the bridge at the Pacific end.

Mr. Speaker, I may add that were it not for the construction of the Panama Canal and its channel crossing facilities by the United States, the people of Panama would still be passing over the Rio Grande on the Pacific and the Chagres River on the Atlantic in bungos.

As to compensation, Panama has been, and still is, the greatest single beneficiary of the canal. Its total benefits from U.S. Canal Zone sources in 1974, including the annuity of $2,328,000, were $236,912,000. These total benefits, which are seldom mentioned, with other forms of aid, have given Panama the highest per capita income in all of Central America.

At this point, I wish to stress again that the annuity is not a rental for the Canal Zone, as so often misstated, but the gratuitously augmented obligation of the Panama Railroad previously paid Colombia which was assumed by the United States in the 1903 treaty, and then only for the life of the treaty. This last fact I have never seen mentioned in any State Department pronouncements (Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, article XIV).

In regard to housing, current treaty propaganda never refers to the large number of impressive homes in Panama City, largely paid for, directly or indirectly, with money from U.S. Canal Zone sources. Such publicity compares only the housing in the slum areas of Panama City close to the Canal Zone with its modest clean housing and well-kept yards that are no better than that for homes in the well-kept towns of Indiana or Pennsylvania. Certainly, the solution of the Panamanian housing problem is not opening the Canal Zone to slum dwellers, but for Panama to look out for its own less fortunates and not to seek to do so by reducing zone housing standards to slum levels.

Mr. Speaker, the questions involved in the Isthmian situation are not local ones but global in their significance for the Panama Canal is the focal target for the Communist conquest of the strategic Caribbean already far advanced.

As previously stated, the U.S.S.R. has a beachhead in Cuba and seeks control of the Guantanamo Naval Base.

Its submarines prowl in that advantageously located sea, and movements are underway for the so-called liberation of Puerto Rico. These three spots, Puerto Rico, Guantanamo, and the Panama Canal are the pivots for defending the soft underbelly of the United States.

The recent disclosure of the use of the Cuban army is support of pro-Soviet forces in Angola and the visit of Chief of Government, Omar Torrijos, of Panama to Cuba stress the current active collaboration of the Panama Government with the U.S.S.R.

Thus in a realistic sense, the decisions involved do not concern disputes between Panama and the United States but are questions bearing on the fate of the Caribbean and the survival of the United States as an effective free nation. As such, they require a major campaign of public enlightenment as well as actions by the Congress.

What are the principal canal issues now before the Congress? They are:

First. Retention by the United States of its undiluted sovereign control over the Canal Zone. For this, identical and strongly supported resolutions are now pending in both the House and Senate.

Second. Major modernization of the existing canal under current treaty provisions, for which measures have been introduced.

Third. Authorization for the election by U.S. citizens residing in the Canal Zone of a nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives.

In view of the worldwide interest in the Panama Canal problem, such actions could not be more timely. Current efforts to compromise and ultimately to surrender indispensable U.S. sovereign control over the Canal Zone would be discouraged by favorable action. In addition to a long overdue operational improvement of the Panama Canal as well as its increase of capacity, the indicated clarification and reaffirmation of the U.S. sovereign position would obviate current negotiations and relieve the State Department of its present embarrassment of negotiating with a revolutionary government while the lawfully elected government is in exile. Such positive actions by the Congress would quickly clear away present largely contrived confusions by making definite our sovereign rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone. It would serve notice on the world that the United States is determined to meet its treaty obligations as regards the canal forthrightly.

Mr. Speaker, our country now faces what may prove to be the gravest peril in its history for upon its handling may depend the freedom of the slavery of the world. Since World War II, the Soviet empire has vastly extended its domain and its power in carefully planned movements aimed at global control, especially over maritime transportation routes. Its naval forces have conducted worldwide exercises in the three great oceans obviously aimed at the United States. With Cuba equipped with short- and long-range missiles, capable of striking vital points in the United States, with Puerto Rico threatened by a revolutionary "liberation" movement, and with U.S. sovereign control of the Canal Zone under monstrous assault led by elements in our own Government regardless of the costs or consequences, the strategic Caribbean Basin is well on its way toward becoming a red lake. Certainly, the time has come not to weaken our forces there as is being so vociferously demanded, but to strengthen them.

As the first steps in that direction, I would urge the prompt reestablishment of the pre-World War II special service squadron with its primary base in the Canal Zone and the termination of the present negotiations for the surrender of U.S. control over the vital Panama Canal.

Such actions will win wide support among thoughtful Latin Americans for they understand the present dangers involved (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 29, 1975, pp. 30794–30796). They would be supported by major canal users, go far toward restoring the damaged prestige of the United States as the leader of the free world, and receive the overwhelming support of the sovereign people of the United States.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with my distinguished colleague. The Panama Canal is ours—no one else's. I have deep reservations and view with disfavor the trend of recent negotiations between the United States and the Republic of Panama over the Panama Canal.

Panama has been clamoring for the "return" of the canal. I cannot see how we can return something that did not exist prior to the United States taking an interest in the excavation of such a canal at which time permission was granted by the Panamanians and was legally bound by treaty.

But nevertheless, an eight-point agreement on principles was signed in February 1975 by Secretary of State Kissinger and Panamanian Foreign Minister Juan Tack. This agreement could provide for the eventual cession to Pan-

ama of United States jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and possibly over the operation of the canal itself.

Last June, during the first session of the 94th Congress, I introduced House Resolution 510, expressing the sense of the House that we cannot relinquish control of the Panama Canal. I still feel that way and believe that most of my colleagues are similarly inclined.

It is this trend toward complete control that concerns me. This agreement on principles could be the foot in the door toward the canal's total operation by the Panamanians. With control of the canal in Panamanian hands, its use could be denied to us at any time.

The canal is a waterway vital to the economy and national defense of this country. Almost 70 percent of canal traffic originates or terminates in U.S. ports. Its loss would shake our economy. The military implications are staggering. For these reasons, I view with apprehension any negotiations or treaties that could lead to the loss of U.S. jurisdiction over the canal.

The title and ownership of the canal territory were issued to the United States over 60 years ago. Concurrently, the United States also received all rights and responsibilities for its maintenance and operation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the consequences of the loss of our control over the Panama Canal would be grave, indeed, and therefore fully support my colleague's concern over recent negotiations that could culminate in its loss.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, with all the problems this Nation faces, at home and abroad, it would be all too easy to dismiss the Panama Canal as small potatoes, indeed, not worthy of concern in the context of all our other woes. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is ample reason to retain the canal, and virtually no reason to surrender it.

For years, efforts were made to construct a canal across the Isthmus of Panama and thereby shorten the long and dangerous sea voyage around Cape Horn. It remained for American talent—and American funds—to complete what is still acknowledged to be one of the world's engineering marvels.

Did we seize this land? Did we conquer a people or a nation? Have we exploited or subjected the Panamanians? The answer in each instance is, of course, "no." The Republic of Panama has been paid what is essentially rent for the land, the people have been provided jobs, and world commerce and trade have advanced because the canal was built.

Now we will give it away, in order to appease Panama's leftist dictator.

The canal has been closed to no nation in peacetime. It has provided easier and less expensive access for ships traveling between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

What will be gained by surrendering this vital link between our own eastern and western borders? Nothing—but a great deal will be lost, if control passes into the hands of those whose loyalties more closely resemble Cuba's than our own.

In the conduct of affairs between our own and other nations, the Senate bears the constitutional responsibility to ratify treaties. The House of Representatives is not entirely out of the picture, however, in this instance. For it has the reponsibility, and I quote from the Constitution—

> To dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United State.

I cannot believe that two-thirds of the U.S. Senate would agree to giving up the canal. In the unlikely event that I am wrong, they will at least know that many of us in the House intend to oppose it.

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, retention of the Panama Canal as an undiminished possession of the United States is essential to our own trade, not to speak of world trade in general, and it is also essential to our own defense.

Since we have last considered this matter, we have seen a blatant display of aggression by Cuban Communist troops in their takeover of Angola. Can there be any doubt that Castro respects anything other than superior force?

It appears to be State Department policy nowadays to leave power vacuums to be filled by the Communists. While we sit paralyzed by shibboleths of "liberal" dogma and Red propaganda, the Communists go about their business of world conquest. We insist upon looking and acting the part of losers, and frankly, in international relations, nobody loves a loser. Nobody respects a loser, especially when the fall guy image is self-inflicted.

The latest State Department efforts to brainwash the American people into permitting the planned surrender of the canal are, in themselves, intolerable, regardless of their shabby objective.

The honorable Member from Pennsylvania has related an incident in which Secretary of State Henry Kissinger countered a question with his own rhetorical question: Which do we prefer, a Vietnam-type guerrilla war, or surrender through his new treaty?

We do not want either of these things. And we need not choose between them. Secretary Kissinger talks like the foreign minister of some feeble island kingdom rather than a great power statesman. If there is a dilemma, it has been created by the Secretary of State and his promises to deliver what is not his to deliver; namely, the Panama Canal. As has been pointed out again and again, it is not Mr. Kissinger's to give away. The Canal Zone was purchased, and the canal built, by tax money. It is U.S. Government property—and Congress has most emphatically not declared it surplus.

General Torrijos seems to enjoy threatening us, believing that the new action army of the Americas is Cuba's, not ours. It should be the State Department's job to quietly convince him otherwise. Instead, under the surrender-now leadership of Mr. Kissinger, it sounds as though we are ready to surrender the canal because we are actually afraid of Torrijos.

I would hope that the majority of us in this House are not. It then falls to us to inform the Secretary of State that his policy has neither popular nor congressional support.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am, as always, in full and complete agreement with Mr. FLOOD on the topic of the Panama Canal, and the retention by the United States of control of the Canal Zone. He and I, and dozens of our colleagues, have detailed time and again in this Chamber the detailed, point-by-point case supporting U.S. sovereignty in the Canal Zone. Yet, as we speak here today, the present administration sits across the negotiating table speaking with the Panamanians, in a blatant attempt to give away our interests to a Communist-inspired dictatorship.

Recent statements by Panamanian Foreign Minister Juan Antonio Tack reported in the Latin American media are indicative of the propaganda game with which they hope to pressure American opinion. Briefly, Mr. Tack claims that the return of the Panama Canal by the United States to Panama is imminent, based on what he calls an unpublicized compromise formula proposed by President Ford, and in the almost-completed drafting stages by negotiators of both countries.

I recognize, of course, that no nation wishes to admit to other than positive results from years of continuous negotiations. But I wish to state that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no final treaties drawn, and none waiting to be ratified by the Congress. The conditions set down by the Panamanians are totally unacceptable to the U.S. Congress. There is no basis, under any circumstances, for relinquishing control of the canal. Mr. Tack, and the Panamanian dictator, General Torrijos, are playing an extremely dangerous game, with the fates of the Western nations hanging in the balance.

The rather obvious approach attempted by the Panamanians is to simply announce to the watching world that the United States is willing to give away everything it has said it would not for the past 75 years. Then, when the world sees that the U.S. Congress fully intends to maintain its position in the Canal Zone—as it should, according to the terms of no less than six different treaties negotiated before, during and after the opening of the canal—the United States is then fingered as the recalcitrant—the obstinate bully refusing to stand by its word.

The entire concept of returning the Canal Zone to Panamanian control is ludicrous. A nation which cannot control its own garbage collection demands full control of the most important waterway in the Western Hemisphere. A nation with a single political party—the Communist Party—a corrupt military dictator with proven drug-smuggling connections, and a history of 59 heads of state in the past 70 years, insists it is stable and responsible enough to guarantee the neutral operation of the only passageway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Perhaps the Panamanians would suggest we also renegotiate

the return of the central third of the United States to France and the Southwest States to Mexico, negating the Louisiana and Gadsden purchases.

For this is precisely the case in Panama. We have purchased the land and the rights of access to and through the Canal Zone not just once, but many times over. The United States has invested nearly $7 billion in the purchase and development of the Panama Canal. We hold deeds to the property from one ocean to the other, and we continue to pay over $2.3 million yearly, an amount which is not called for under any of the duly ratified treaties, particularly the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 which grants the United States unlimited and perpetual rights over the canal and its zone.

Panama enjoys a per capita income greater than any other central American nation, due solely and directly to the $7 billion investment of the United States. And now that General Torrijos has tasted power on the coattails of Mr. Castro, he simply insists that our interests are no longer valid in his country.

I would point out that Torrijos has, in no uncertain terms, repeatedly stated that if we do not give in, there will be war. Castro has affirmed the support of 9 million Cubans in that fight, presumably in the same fashion as he supports the Angolan crisis, as Mr. FLOOD has pointed out. Mr. Castro has been used by the Communists in Chile, a strategically located country which could help control the passage around Cape Horn. He has been used again in Angola, whose air bases and ports would be valuable in exercising control of passage around the Cape of Good Hope. And now: the Panama Canal, which is also the key to the Caribbean, and a major part of the entire Western economy.

Foreign Minister Tack's statement of an imminent treaty agreement is so ridiculous as to not require further comment here. The same old arguments are made that the United States should pull out of Panama, and I can only respond with the same facts detailed time and again unquestionably supporting the position that the United States has every reason—historically, legally, financially, governmentally, internationally, and sensibly strong reasons—for maintaining control of the Panama Canal.

The alleged document which Mr. Tack and General Torrijos so strongly pursue would call for "total neutrality, subscribed to by all nations and guaranteed by the United Nations, including transit of troops, ships, and war materials of all countries." The Commander in Chief of U.S. Forces in the Pacific—CINCPAC—told me in a recent briefing that if every railroad track and every railroad car in the United States were made available to him in a time of crisis, he might be able to meet the needs of transporting troops and material from the eastern industrial complex to the Pacific area. The same holds true, of course, in moving from west to east.

Panamanian neutrality, however, would mean that in the event of hostilities anywhere in the world, the United States would be denied the use of its own $7 billion investment. The strongest Nation in the world would be unable to defend itself or other threatened areas from the very forces which would control the canal. For it is no secret that General Torrijos has shuttled himself and his underlings constantly to Cuba for consultation and support from the Castro regime. Torrijos has threatened to "follow the Ho Chi Minh trial of blood" in regaining control of the canal.

One major impetus for my insistence that the Congress and the American people be continually appraised of continuing developments in the Panama Canal is the certain knowledge that even the slightest lack of diligence on the part of those in favor of continued American control of the Canal Zone is a retreat which will be taken advantage of by the power mongers of the Cuban-Panamanian coalition. Castro has advised Torrijos that—

> Time is on our side in the struggle against the imperialists and to the struggle of 1.2 million Panamanians we can add nine million Cubans.

Do these words leave any doubt that the hit-and-run tactics of a guerilla revolution are being threatened by the quasi-diplomatic posings of the Panamanians in a long-term effort to bring under Communist control America's single, most important waterway for our defense and economic well-being?

It is for this reason that we must all be kept aware of the facts, and aware of the attempts of the State Department and the Panamanian Government to chip away at the foundation of our southern defenses and our interocean routes of travel and transport so vital to this Nation.

VIGIL FOR FAMILIES SEPARATED BY SOVIET OPPRESSION

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is well known throughout the world that tens of thousands of Soviet Jews have been trying for years to leave Russia in order to live in Israel and other democratic countries.

At first, Soviet authorities denied that a problem even existed, but when people, young and old alike, began committing the most serious crime possible in the Soviet Union—demonstrating in public against repression and for freedom—the Government reacted by having them fired from their jobs, or expelled from school, evicted from their homes, beaten, and, finally, imprisoned on trumped-up charges and exiled to Siberia.

All of this harassment has not served to destroy the movement. If anything, it has helped to keep it alive by setting off a wave of protest throughout the world. These protests, by private citizens and governments, were responsible for the Soviet Government decision to finally allow people to leave. Unfortunately, it was not strong enough to bring about complete freedom or even a policy of humanity on the part of the Soviets.

Thousands of families have been unable to get exit permits and they continue to be subjected daily to bigotry and harassment.

And, for those who are allowed to leave, in all too many cases the suffering does not end. The Soviet Government, in what appears to be a carefully calculated policy, has been separating families by giving some members exit permits and demanding that they leave immediately or have the permits revoked, and then not permitting the others to leave.

This has resulted in parents being separated from children and husbands from wives. Thus, those who are left behind, must not only suffer the humiliations heaped upon them by the government, but must live with the thought that they may never see the people they love the most, again. When I was in the Soviet Union last year, I met with many of them and I could see in their eyes their hunger for freedom and for their wives or husbands, and children or parents.

This is a tragic situation, but it is also one which violates international agreements signed by the Soviet Union.

In the Helsinki final act signed last year the Soviet Union pledged to do everything possible to reunite families separated by political boundaries. In reality the Soviet Union has chosen to ignore completely this portion of the agreement and is actively engaged in a policy of keeping these people apart.

When I visited the Soviet Union and met with these people each and every one, without hesitation, stated that every protest and demonstration on their behalf would aid them personally and their cause in general. They said the authorities were already doing to them the worst that they dared to do and that no further excuse was needed for even harsher punishments. They said unanimously that their most powerful weapon was worldwide protest against Soviet policy and that no statement would be too strong or demonstration too large and vociferous.

For all of these reasons I and Congresswoman HOLTZMAN, with the cooperation of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, have today begun a "vigil" on behalf of these, as they are called in Hebrew, Yetomei Aliyah—Orphans of the Exodus.

Today, Ms. HOLTZMAN and I read into the RECORD statements about the situation of two families. Every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, another Member will read a similar statement about a separated family until our list of names is exhausted.

It is our hope that the Soviets will realize that these people will never be forgotten and that they will continue to be condemned as long as they deny to any individual the basic human right to live in freedom with his or her loved ones.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the vigil which Congressman EILBERG and I began earlier today will give continuing testimony to the oppression of Jews in the Soviet Union.

The more than 50 Members of the House, who will participate in this vigil and carry it through the end of July, will outline the plight of families which have

been separated by Soviet emigration policies. Each participant in a 1-minute speech on the floor of the House will describe the history of one family that is separated from its mother, father, son, or daughter, because the Soviet Government, callously and lawlessly, has denied that person the right to emigrate. In doing so, the Members will remind the Congress and the public, in very personal terms, of the human dimension of Soviet oppression.

Our focus in this vigil will be the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the so-called Helsinki Agreement. That agreement, signed with great fanfare by President Ford and Soviet Party Brezhnev last summer, pledged each participant to facilitate family visits and reunification of families across national borders.

The agreement said, in part:

In order to promote further development of contacts on the basis of family ties the participating States will favourably consider applications for travel with the purpose of allowing persons to enter or leave their territory temporarily, and on a regular basis if desired, in order to visit members of their families.

Applications for temporary visits to meet members of their families will be dealt with without distinction as to the country of origin or destination: existing requirements for travel documents and visas will be applied in this spirit. The preparation and issue of such documents and visas will be effected within reasonable time limits; cases of urgent necessity—such as serious illness or death—will be given priority treatment.

The participants in the Helsinki agreement also made the following comments:

The participating States will deal in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family, with special attention being given to requests of an urgent character—such as requests submitted by persons who are ill or old.

They will deal with applications in this field as expeditiously as possible . . .

Until members of the same family are reunited meetings and contacts between them may take place in accordance with the modalities for contacts on the basis of family ties.

The vigil will demonstrate, every day, that these pledges are being ignored by the Soviet Government.

The Soviets' violation of the Helsinki agreement should be of interest not only to the Congress and the American people. It ought to be a major item of concern to President Ford and Secretary Kissinger, for it was they who committed the support of the United States to the agreement. I hope that our vigil, and the case histories we recount, will cause the President to communicate to the Soviets our concern that the commitments made at Helsinki be kept.

When I visited the Soviet Union last May, I was told repeatedly that we in America, particularly in the U.S. Congress, who are willing to bring Soviet oppression to the attention of the world, are the best hope for easing the restrictions on fundamental human rights in that country. I hope that our vigil makes a contribution to this vital humanitarian effort.

I would like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to conclude the story of Hillel Butman, whose case I described briefly this afternoon. What follows is a description of how Mr. Butman came to be imprisoned, and an account by Mrs. Butman of her futile efforts to be united with or even to visit her husband.

HILLEL BUTMAN

Hillel Butman, a lawyer and engineer, became concerned about the isolated and vulnerable position of Soviet Jews. As a result, he developed strong feelings toward the Jewish people and heritage. He began to assemble materials on Jewish life in scrapbooks and, in 1955, began to study Hebrew. Shortly thereafter, Butman started to teach Hebrew to others, sharing with them a common desire to emigrate to Israel.

Butman was dismissed from his position as a legal investigator in 1960 when his office learned of his deep interest in Judaism.

On June 15, 1970, while vacationing with his family, Butman was arrested and sentenced to ten years in strict regime. He has been denied a number of "regularly" scheduled visits from his mother and is denied even the minimal rights given to other Jewish Prisoners. While in the camp, he started to compile a 12,000 word Hebrew dictionary. To put an end to his "Zionist activities" on September 9, 1974, Soviet authorities transferred Butman to an isolation cell for a five-month term.

LETTER FROM EVA BUTMAN

My husband, Hillel Butman, aged 43, father of 2 children, was arrested on June 15, 1970. At the Second Leningrad Trial on June 20, 1971, he was sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment in strict regime forced labour camps for participating in the revival of the national movement in the USSR. The movement pursued two aims: to fight against the assimilation of Jews in the USSR, and to fight for the right of unhindered emigration to the State of Israel.

For the sixth year now my husband is in prison, for the past year in notorious Vladimir Prison.

Now I am appealing not only for the help to free my husband, but also in connection with another important problem. In the Soviet Union every prisoner is entitled to meetings with his wife and children. My husband has been deprived of this right. During all these years my husband has seen me only twice, and has not seen his daughters (Lilly-aged 9, and Geula-aged 2) even once. My youngest daughter Giula was born when he was already in prison.

Throughout 1975, I vainly sought to obtain permission for a meeting with him for myself and my eldest daughter Lilly.

On January 25, 1975, I wrote my first application for a meeting. In April I received a reply signed by Councillor B. Savostyanov of the Ministry of the Interior of the USSR saying that prisoner Butman has the right of meeting his relatives. My subsequent application to B. Savostyanov, asking him to name a country in which the Soviet Embassy would issue me with a visa to the USSR for the purpose of meeting my husband went without answer.

My husband, Hillel Butman, also sent a statement to the Ministry of the Interior of the USSR requesting permission for a meeting with me and his eldest daughter, and the issue for that purpose to us of a visa to the Soviet Union. In his application he refers to the relevant item in the Section on Humanitarian Contacts of the Concluding Act of the Helsinki meeting (June 1975), which says that the participating countries will benevolently consider such requests, irrespective of the country of departure and entry, and also to the statement made by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU, that "No one will be given the right to violate the Helsinki commitments."

In September 1975 by husband received a note from Chudintsev, Asst. Dept. Head of GIUTU, Ministry of the Interior of the USSR, saying that I shall have to apply on the question of obtaining an entry visa to the USSR for a meeting with him on my own.

Having lost all hope for a just and positive solution of the matter, and seeing that all the actions of the leaders of the Soviet Union flagrantly contradict their official statements and the international documents they have signed, I see no other way of attaining what is guaranteed to us by law than by turning for help to the people of the free world, to statesmen and public figures and to international organizations.

Please help me in this dark hour of need!

EVA BUTMAN,
Kibbutz Naan, Israel.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG).

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE AUTHORIZATION LEVEL OF SECTION 202—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have long been disenchanted with the operation by the Department of Housing and Urban Development of the section 202 loan program for housing for the elderly. Although the program has been in existence since 1959, there have been multiple problems with its funding, problems which have caused the program to be far from effective in keeping pace with the need to provide housing for our elderly citizens. In the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, we sought to reverse this process and breathe new life into the 202 program. Unfortunately, this has not happened.

In fiscal year 1976, HUD received 1,527 requests for section 202 loans, amounting to a total demand of $6 billion. If all of these applications had been approved, 231,623 new housing units for our elderly and handicapped citizens would have received funding. The actual number of applications which will receive funding will amount to only 3.4 percent of those applications which were filed. Obviously, there is a great need to expand the 202 program and provide more available funding for the vast majority of these housing projects which have been unable to receive any funds. This has been the case in many states, including my home State of Rhode Island, which has not received funding for any 202 loans since the 1974 act was instituted.

Therefore, I am today introducing leg-

islation which would increase the authorizing level of 202 housing for the elderly and handicapped from $800 million to $3.3 billion. This increase, if implemented, would provide a sufficient basis upon which to operate the 202 program and would allow the construction of these housing units to proceed at a pace which Congress intended in the 1974 act. Further, this authorization increase would allow the creation of jobs in the housing construction industry and would, therefore, aid in the solution of the dual problems of unemployment and elderly housing. Also, because the 1974 act states that 202 loans will be made at the Treasury Department borrowing rate, there is no interest subsidy involved in this program. Finally, I am sure that my colleagues will be interested to know that this requested authorization increase is an off-budget item and does not require clearance by the House Committee on the budget.

A similar bill is being introduced in the Senate by Senators WILLIAMS, CRANSTON, and KENNEDY. I intend to seek cosponsors for this legislation in the near future and hope that my colleagues will join with me in assuring our elderly and handicapped citizens that we intend to go forward with our promises for more housing units for these people. The applications received by HUD demonstrate that there is a need and an ability to fulfill this need which is being frustrated because of a low authorization level; therefore, our obligation is clear: We must increase this authorization capability to allow for adequate development of these housing units.

SELLING MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the executive branch and the Congress are on another collision course over an issue of foreign policy.

This time it is the sale of military equipment to Egypt.

The White House has announced its intention to sell six C–130 military transports to Egypt. Moreover, the Secretary of Defense has indicated that this sale is but the first of a series of military equipment sales to the government of President Sadat.

As would be expected, the Government of Israel has registered its strong objections to such sales. Many Americans who place a high priority on this Nation's relationship with Israel also have expressed concern.

Further, a number of Members of Congress—including leading Members of both Bodies—have expressed their intentions of filing resolutions of disapproval for the C–130 sale to Egypt, under section 36(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act.

It is indeed regrettable that such a clash over policy should seem inevitable, particularly when it concerns so important and volatile a region as the Middle East.

Much of the blame for this situation must fall to the executive branch for its lack of candor. I note in the press that White House officials are speaking of a "commitment already made to Egypt" with regard to the sale of the C–130's.

When was such a commitment made, and by whom?

It seems almost certain, of course, that the commitment was made to Egypt in connection with the negotiations leading up to the signing of the Sinai accords by Egypt and Israel last September.

Members will recall that at the time Congress was called upon to approve the U.S. proposal for the early-warning system in the Sinai, a question was raised about any secret U.S. commitment to Egypt, presumably a commitment to provide or sell military equipment. The Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, denied any such commitment was made.

Nevertheless, because of my suspicions that Congress had not been fully informed about all the commitments surrounding the Sinai Accords, I cosponsored in committee an amendment to the resolution of approval which stated that the authority in the joint resolution approving the Sinai Accords did not signify congressional approval of any other agreement, understanding, or commitment made by the executive branch. An amended version of that provision was adopted by the Congress.

Despite adoption of this caveat by the Congress, I continued to be anxious about the extent of administration commitments to the countries in that area and, in the end, voted against the Sinai Accords resolution.

Now, it appears my fears of last September have been realized. The executive branch has confirmed its commitment ot sell military equipment to Egypt and apparently intends to arm all parties in the Middle East.

The result is likely to be another head-on confrontation with the Congress—such as we have recently experienced on the issue of military aid to Turkey and to pro-West forces in Angola.

It does us no good, however, to cite the errors of the past. For the present we must seek a solution to the dilemma with which our Nation is faced.

In that spirit, I submit my own line of reasoning about what course the United States should follow in the present situation:

First, the United States should not provide offensive weapons of war to Egypt.

For too long the United States has fueled an arms race in the Middle East by selling or giving away large amounts of weapons to a number of states in that region. Because I believe this course to be utter folly I recently voted against the International Security Act. The clear danger of future encounters in the Middle East, with both Israel and the Arab States using American-made and supplied weapons, should deter us from providing weapons to be used for offensive purposes to countries in that area.

Second, the United States should be willing to provide defensive and nonlethal military equipment to Egypt.

A distinction should be drawn between military equipment, which is of a lethal weapons nature, and materiel necessary for the supply and maintenance of a military force in the areas of support, logistics and communications. This type of military equipment for defensive purposes the United States should be willing to provide to Egypt. Included could be communications equipment, unarmed vehicles such as trucks, field hospitals, uniforms, and a vast array of other goods required for a modern military force. I would include C–130 transport planes as among nonlethal military equipment.

Quite clearly President Sadat of Egypt is in a difficult position. He has broken his ties with the Soviet Union which has, in the past, supplied his nation with billions of dollars in military assistance. Now, President Sadat has turned to the West for aid. Our Nation clearly has an important stake in bolstering his defensive posture. Therefore, while being unwilling to provide him with arms ourselves, our Nation should not discourage arrangements concluded by the Egyptians with our allies in Western Europe, or—even if such could be worked out—with Israel itself.

Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post editorial, entitled "Sadat's Latest Gamble," places into perspective the problem in the Middle East and the need for an evenhanded, balanced policy on the part of the United States. I include the editorial at this point in support of such a policy:

SADAT'S LATEST GAMBLE

President Sadat's call for abrogation of the 1971 Soviet-Egyptian "treaty of friendship and cooperation"—a treaty he had negotiated—all but erases a Soviet power position once thought to be a permanent fixture of the Mideast geopolitical scene. It is no less significant a turn for having been anticipated by many earlier Egyptian complaints about excessive Soviet demands on Cairo's policy and pride. Mr. Sadat complained anew on Sunday, for instance, that Moscow had withheld military spare parts, criticized his "open door" to Western investments, and demanded prompt repayment of old debts. Americans might have told the Kremlin how difficult it is for a great-power to run a smooth relationship with a nationalistic client. All the same, it is good to see Moscow in Cairo's disfavor. The spectacle provides some basis for a limited restoration of Western self-confidence. And it materially diminishes the prospects of Egyptian participation in a new Arab-Israeli war.

Can Mr. Sadat hold Egypt to his chosen American-oriented course? Some other Egyptians feel that he risks too much by turning to Israel's leading patron, leader of the capitalist system to boot, for crucial help in regaining war-lost territory and in modernizing his impoverished country. The anti-Communist oil duchies of the Persian Gulf presumably urged Mr. Sadat to take this latest step, and perhaps helped make it financially attractive to him. But he will still have to "produce" in both territorial and economic terms.

He must "produce," too, in arms, since he can expect little further help from Moscow in keeping his Soviet-supplied armed forces politically content and militarily ready. Here the American attitude will be decisive, for Mr. Sadat hopes to start acquiring American-made military equipment—six C–130 transports, first of all—to replace the flow cut off by Moscow. It now seems that he will get the C–130s, though it will be by a maneuver which makes Congress look somewhat foolish. The administration, trying to

play it above-board and confer extra status on the deal, had suggested that the transaction be made in an official government channel subject to congressional approval. But the Congress, unwilling to stand up for arms for Egypt in an election year, asked that the sale be routed through an unsupervised commercial channel. Those who indicated this detour are among the very legislators sponsoring a pending bill requiring commercial sales to be screened on the Hill!

The Israelis are torn between a desire to wean Cairo from Moscow and a fear that a weaned Cairo will weaken Israel's hold on American strategic patronage. They have apparently persuaded the administration to sell only the six planes this year. Whether Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin could survive a fully opened arms pipeline is apparently problematical. But a military-supply relationship is necessarily a long-term one. Mr. Sadat's claims on American understanding are fair and sure to persist.

The key question about Cairo's turn from Moscow, however, is whether it will facilitate movement toward an Arab-Israeli, or at least an Egyptian-Israeli, settlement. We note that even as Mr. Sadat reiterated on Sunday that "the United States holds 99 per cent of the cards," American diplomats were undertaking exploration of Arab interest in the new Israeli formula suggesting negotiation of an "end to the state of war" in the Mideast. Something of uncertain meaning and promise, this formula represents an Israeli retreat under American pressure from previous insistence that further territory would only be yielded for a state of full-pledged peace. Military supplies apart, the United States now provides major amounts of economic aid to Israel and Egypt. This gives Washington a certain diplomatic leverage on both countries. Hard as it is for a great power to wield such leverage effectively over a extended period—the Soviet rise and fall in Egypt demonstrates that truth once again—the effort must be made.

Third, I believe the United States should take steps to reduce the flow of all armaments particularly lethal material to all countries in the Middle East, consistent with the safety of the states involved.

In 1970, U.S. arms sales abroad were not quite $1 billion. In 1975 arms sales had escalated to $10.5 billion. Of that amount, $3 billion went to countries in the Middle East, particularly to Iran and Saudi Arabia.

It is clear that what we sell to the Arab States must be compensated for by what we sell or give to Israel. It is a "no-win" game. We are fueling an arms race in the Middle East.

Moreover, in a departure from past practice, the United States is selling, or contemplating selling, some of this country's most sophisticated weapons. These sales require the presence of U.S. technicians, both civilian and military, to maintain the sophisticated equipment and to teach the troops of the recipient nation how to use it.

This means further U.S. involvement in the military affairs of the purchasing states.

The time has come to take stock of just where these trends are leading us. Rather than fueling the Middle East arms race, the United States should be doing all it can to reduce the flow of arms into the region.

By our own restraint, we can perhaps stop the cycle of escalation. Certainly our stakes in preventing a future Middle East conflict makes an attempt worth the effort. I sincerely hope the Congress and the executive branch will cooperatively work to that end, thereby enhancing the lasting peace we all hope will become a reality in the Middle East.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS M. REES

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, for each of us serving in Congress there is a time to retire. My time is now.

It has been a deeply felt honor to serve my California constituents in the House of Representatives these past 10 years. It has been a privilege to serve with so many able and talented colleagues from all parts of the country. But, after 10 years, I am finding Congress to be less of a magnificent experience of deep satisfaction and more of a demanding and, at times, an irritating job.

Like so many of my colleagues retiring this year, I find I am less tolerant of the demands of public office. At a time when there is a clamoring for the lives of public figures to be more public, I find I want to be a more private person and to have more time to spend with my family. I find the post-Watergate atmosphere to be a pall on what I consider to be a very honorable profession.

I will be leaving Congress in the belief that it is now a more enlightened and responsive body than when I first arrived in 1966. Then it was an institution caught within the grip of a rigid seniority system and dominated by a cabal of powerful aging committee chairmen.

"To get along, go along" was the motto, the advice, given to all freshmen. A new Member was expected to adjust to his small spot in the congressional solar system and let time slowly, through the deaths and defeats of his seniors, push him toward the hub of power. New voices striving to be heard were hidden and suppressed.

Much has changed. My own early efforts as a Congressman were concentrated on congressional reform, both of House rules and the internal Democratic power structure. The undue centralization of power has been broken. Younger Members are now free to participate far more freely in the forming of policy in committees dealing with policy, and in a now-active Democratic caucus.

While the seniority system still reigns on Capitol Hill, it has been modified. Three chairmen were passed over last year, and this in itself has tended to make chairmen more responsive to the membership.

With the opening up of the processes of Congress, the broadening of the rules to allow for more participation, with the infusion of new and vital Members in the House, I feel I can leave Congress with the satisfaction that many of the objectives I fought for along with other of my colleagues have been accomplished. I feel satisfied that the work I have participated in to improve the Congress, to make it a more responsive body, will continue.

The 94th Congress has been both satisfying and frustrating. I have thoroughly enjoyed my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy, an area I find very fascinating. It has been extremely gratifying for me to see the emergence of the newer Members into the congressional process, both in the House itself and also in the Banking Committee.

On the other hand, I am disturbed at the growing tendency of polarization of rhetoric on the complex domestic and international issues before us. The voracious appetite of the media for sensational news, and the headlong rush by many of my brethren to satisfy that appetite, has harmed our ability to deal reasonably and in depth on the important matters before us.

I feel more strongly that the truth is not in inflexible ideology, nor in partisan rhetoric, but in the complex "greys" that define an issue.

As a combat infantryman in the 3d army in World War II, I developed an abhorrence of ideologies and their resultant simplistic solutions to mankind's problems. I hope we do not reach for this seductive security blanket to escape realities which need objective understanding rather than blind reactions.

I have served in Congress during perhaps the most traumatic period in this Nation's history since the Great Depression. The horror of the Vietnam war and the subsequent alienation in our society sorely tried the unity and the concepts we have had as a people. The recent Watergate era of political scandal and the gross misuses of government power is something we are still recovering from.

But few nations would have the inherent inner strength to survive this chaos. We do have this strength, and we are again proving that our democracy can survive stark self-examination and can purge itself of its imperfections.

It is our ability to admit faults and to rebuild on the truth that will continue to make us a great people.

In this Bicentennial Year I leave Congress proud of my country, and grateful to have served.

DÉTENTE

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the time is rapidly approaching when the Congress is going to have to confront Secretary of State Kissinger and his policy of détente. President Ford, very recently, announced that his administration is dropping the word détente, but he was quick to state that our policy vis a vis the Russians will remain the same. In my opinion a "rip-off" by any other name is still a rip-off, and in my humble opinion that is precisely what détente is: A giant, unabashed, rip-off paid for by the American people.

Mr. Kissinger has defined economic

détente as the linkage of the American and Soviet economies. It seems to me that the Russians, on the other hand, have defined it as "you—the Americans—give, and we, the peace-loving Communists, will take and take, and take and take."

Mr. Brezhnev is quoted as telling his friends in the Politburo that:

We communists have got to string along the capitalists for awhile. We need their credits, their agriculture, and their technology But we are going to continue massive military programs and by the middle 80's we will be in a position to return to a much more aggressive foreign policy designed to gain the upper hand in our relationship with the West.

The news from Africa seems to indicate that Mr. Brezhnev could not wait for the 1980's. He used, directly or indirectly, fruits of economic détente to pay for some 12,000 Cuban soldiers and millions in military equipment to invade Angola. Now Mr. Brezhnev is preparing to invade Rhodesia.

I know a little something about Rhodesia. For one thing, I know that the major source of metallurgical grade chromite ore, which is absolutely indispensable for the production of stainless steel, is Rhodesia. I also know that the other major source is Russia. It does not take a genius to conclude that if the Russians take over Rhodesia, they will have a hammerlock on the world supply of chromium. Then there will be a real linkage between the American and Russian economies. We will give them grain at cut rate prices and they will rob us blind with astronomical chromium prices.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of détente that I want to raise for the benefit of my colleagues has to do with the Russians' maritime policies. We all know that the Soviets have spent billions to build up their naval and merchant marine fleets. In addition to the obvious military and commercial uses of its fleet, the Russians have been engaged in what amounts to massive "rate dumping"—undercutting United States and other non-Communist shipping rates for the purpose of dominating the commercial sea trade. In effect the Russians are setting their rates on a political as compared to an economic basis, and using détente to steal a larger share of transporting American commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I have just read a study prepared by Mr. Miles M. Costick on some of the implications of détente which I commend to my colleagues. One section of that study provides an in-depth examination of Soviet maritime policy which I would like to place into the RECORD for the benefit of other Members interested in this subject.

SOVIET MARITIME POLICY

AN OVERVIEW

Soviet maritime policy became global under Nikita Khruschev and under current leadership promises to stay in the world arena and challenge U.S. preeminence.

Unlike fragmented U.S. maritime policy, Soviet policy unifies the many facets of ocean activities. The central unifying forces are the Soviet navy and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

By expanding all facets of its maritime capability, the Soviet Union may attain the position of overriding dominance of the oceans occupied until recently by the United States and earlier by Great Britain.

The Soviet Navy is expanding very rapidly, and its naval strategy has shifted from a basically defensive posture towards inclusion of an offensive capability, appropriate for making global political impact and challenging the United States presence in many areas not contiguous to the Soviet Union.

Within a period of two decades, the Soviet Union has emerged from a primarily coastal fishing nation to one of the most modern—if not the most modern—of fishing nations in the world and is likely to become the dominant fishing nation of the world in the near future. In contrast, with the exception of its distant-water tuna and shrimp fisheries, the development of U.S. fisheries has been largely stagnant.

The Soviet merchant marine moved from the 23rd to the 6th place on the list of the major merchant fleets of the world. In contrast, the United States moved from the first to the eighth place over the same 1946 to 1974 period.

The Soviet Union emerged from an inferior position in oceanography in the period following World War II to one of overall capabilities comparable with the United States today.

The Soviet Union has one of the most extensive continental shelves of the world. Although the country produces only about a fifth of the U.S. offshore oil production, about 70 percent of the Soviet continental shelf offers good oil and gas prospects.

The Soviet Union is behind the United States in offshore drilling and production technology but is attempting to overcome this problem by importing capital-embodied technology in the form of drilling rigs and equipment from Western countries.

The Soviet position on the Law of the Sea is consistent with that of a major ocean power with diversified interests in the seven seas. In contrast, some experts believe that during the negotiations on the Third Law of the Sea Conference, the executive branch of the U.S. Government did not at all times follow a policy consistent with the national interest of the United States as a major maritime power.

The Soviet Union presently lags behind the U.S. in manned and unmanned undersea research capabilities and technology both qualitatively and quantitatively.

The Soviet Union supports the largest fishers-oriented marine biology and aquaculture programs in the world. The counterpart U.S. program, on the other hand, is small by comparison, although qualitatively equivalent to the Soviet program.

* * * * *

SOVIET MARITIME STRATEGY

The Soviet merchant marine is an essential segment of the Soviet armed forces and in Soviet strategic plans it has two prime functions. The first function is of carrying weapons and military supplies for Soviet ventures overseas—Middle East, Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, and Angola being the most prominent of these. The second function is in its deployment for the purpose of economic warfare. This latter function will be the subject of the following analysis.

On a world comparison basis the merchant fleet of the U.S.S.R. advanced to No. 1 in liner shipping in 1974. The COMECON-countries (Soviet trade bloc and members of Warsaw Military Pact) already provided 12 percent of the world liner tonnage in 1974, while the amount of tonnage on order for the same countries was, as far as it is known, 20 percent of the total world tonnage on order for break bulk vessels.

The merchant fleets of the major COMECON partners grow significantly faster than the sea-borne foreign trade volume of these countries. While COMECON nations represent approximately one-third of the world's industrial output, the share of these countries in international trade with countries outside the COMECON amounts to only 5 percent.

* * * * *

The Europe-U.S.A. North Atlantic and Gulf shipping trade is being increasingly penetrated by Soviet lines in consequence of the U.S.-Soviet Maritime Agreement of 1973. In the North-West Europe and Eastern Mediterranean shipping trade COMECON lines have already secured more than 35 percent share of the total volume of shipping.

Dumping: While some COMECON lines have become members of some Baltic and Atlantic sea transportation freight rate conferences, the Soviet shipping companies in particular operate to the greater extent as non-members especially in the Pacific, and in world-wide cross-trades threaten the future of Western shipping. This threat manifests itself in a form of government subsidized and supported dumping. Many lesser developed countries (LDCs) were forced to protect their national flag ships against this practice by implementing countervailing measures or by passing protective laws.

In the shipping trade between Far Eastern ports (Hong Kong, Taiwan, Korea, Singapore and Japan in particular) and U.S. Pacific ports, the Soviet Far Eastern Shipping Company (FESCO) operates with modern ships and has been practicing dumping since its inception in 1970. So far the FESCO-line has caused disruption of two Trans-Pacific freight rate conferences.

Far Eastern Economic Review of Hong Kong recently reported "The Soviet Union's Far Eastern Shipping Company (FESCO) of Vladivostok, which has been deeply undercutting other lines on the route", necessitating new talks among the conference members in order "to avoid an outright rate war."

Business Week reported last September that the AFL–CIO demanded from the U.S. Government imposition of "restrictions on rate-cutting by Soviet vessels that have been moving in on the U.S. export trade within the past three years." Furthermore *Business Week* wrote that, "In the past year Soviet merchant ships have moved in strongly to tap U.S. foreign cargoes, especially those moving from the West Coast to Japan, but also to some extent those on North Atlantic and Gulf Coast routes. U.S. shipowners charge that the Soviets drastically cut freight rates to obtain cargoes, sometimes by as much as 40 percent.

Paul Hall, President of the Seafarers' International Union, declared at his union's biennial convention in Washington on September 2nd, that, "United States vessels must be assured that state-owned fleets do not undercut rates to the point where they drive our ships from the seas.

Shannon J. Hall, President of the National Maritime Union, writing in his union's magazine, *"The Pilot"*, charged that the Soviets are using the political detente with the United States to grab a large share of hauling American commerce. Mr. Hall said the Kremlin gives the Soviet merchant marine whatever it needs to be able to undercut the fleets of other nations and that its freight rates therefore can be set on a political basis without regard to economics.

Edward J. Heine, Jr., President of United States Lines, Inc., speaking for the shipowners in the established freight rate conferences, charged that the U.S.S.R. is engaged in the third-flag carrier business for political reasons with the object of driving most of the fleets of the United States and other free enterprise nations from the sea. Third-flag vessels are those ships that ply between countries other than that of the nation whose flag they fly. There are state-owned third flag ships such as those of the Soviet

Union, Poland and East Germany that enter U.S. waters hauling cargo at noncompensatory pricing policies for short-term advantage. Mr. Heine repeated Mr. Hall's accusation that the Soviets are able to charge freight rates below those of U.S. flag ships "because the communists' idea of profitable operation is political rather than economic."

For example, Mr. Heine said, that idea does not include the capital cost burden that the American shipowner and the U.S. government bear and include in establishing a rate basis. Further, Heihe stated, "communist ocean insurance costs are extremely cheap and the Soviets give their ships bunker oil at as little as one-third the world price, while crew wages actually charged to the ships in the rate base are only one-third as high as those charged against Western ships, and social fringe benefits are not charged at all."

A study published by an association of U.S. Flag shipowners in support of Senate Bill 868, introduced by Senator Daniel Inouye, to deal primarily with Soviet unfair competition, concentration on two Soviet state-owned shipping lines, Far Eastern Shipping Co. (FESCO) and Baltalantic Line, and on Polish Ocean Lines, which operates in the Atlantic. The study charges that these communist third-fleet carriers haul cargoes at a base rate 10 to 35 percent below established conference rates. For example, FESCO hauls television receivers across the Pacific at a base rate of $38.25 a shipping unit against $45 charged by Japanese or U.S. Flag ships. The U.S. Flag shipowners' association's study charges that, "at the present level of Soviet ship construction, by 1980 the Soviet Union will have a liner capacity sufficient to monopolize either the entire Trans-Atlantic or U.S. Trans-Pacific routes."

In a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal James J. Reynolds, President, American Institute of Merchant Shipping writes, "the relatively recent entry of state-owned fleet of the U.S.S.R. into this picture (meaning freight rates) an entity whose goals can hardly be described as profit-oriented threatens to turn a serious problem into a total calamity." Further, Mr. Reynolds emphasizes, "But we cannot compete indefinitely against a state-owned enterprise which is determined to achieve its political goals, regardless of cost."

On September 18th, the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of U.S. House of Representatives held the latest hearings in regard to the so-called Third-Flag Bill. The Council of European and Japanese Shipowners Association (CENSA), representing shipowners in Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom and claiming some 50 percent of the world's gross registered tonnage, has advised the House Subcommittee that it "remains very concerned about the shipping policies of state trading countries, the rate dumping practices of whose enterprises pose a serious threat, not only to Western shipowners but to the stability of world liner trades, and therefore, the commerce of all major trading nations."

Hans Jacob Kruse, chief executive of Hapag-Lloyd, West Germany's largest shipping concern, said recently: "Political prices are being charged by East Bloc fleets and it is vital that Western shipowners bear in mind that communist fleets are being used as predominately political, and, indeed, strategic instruments of the Soviet Union." "There was nothing that an individual shipping company or shipping conference could do to counter this undoubtedly state- manipulated shipping policy" by normal commercial defense mechanisms, Mr. Krause said.

Equally and more directly worrisome for West European liner operators is the siphoning off of Far Eastern freight from ocean carriers by the Soviet Trans-Siberan Railway. About two years ago, the Soviets began promoting the use of the Siberan rail system as a means of moving containerized cargo between West Europe and the Far East. The routing has turned out to be highly competitive with the ocean route because of the faster transit time involved and comparative costs.

By the middle of 1974 the traditional conference lines in the Far East have lost already 11.4 percent of the cargo volume to the Soviet Trans-Siberian Railway, which is offering "dumping" rates of up to 50 percent off maritime transport charges on the Far East run. The loss of the cargo volume was accompanied by the loss of 20 percent of freight revenue.

Similar experience took place in the Northwest Europe Iranian trade. The U.S.S.R.'s waterways attract significant volume of foreign cargo. However, Soviet authorities bar to the Western transport industry access to its canal system.

COMECON—shipping lines on the Danube river, by way of cargo routing instruction, freight rate dumping and a freight rate freeze since 1955, blocked the adaptation of freight rates adjusted for increased operational costs and thus have forced all Western shipping lines, except two West German lines, to abandon the business. The two remaining companies are in business only because of substantial subsidies by the West German government.

In the U.S.S.R., the state, as sole owner of the centrally controlled merchant fleet, is at the same time the sole forwarding agent and controller of all centrally directed imports and exports, incuding transit goods. Within this tightly controlled structure the total Soviet bloc fleet, with its entire transport potential, primarily serves state policy. In the Soviet Union in particular, Western shipping and transport companies are not permitted to operate. However COMECON-lines enjoy full freedom of action in the Western Europe. Free cargo acquisition, to which COMECON partners have access in the West, is denied to the Western companies in the East.

The only economic consideration encountered in COMECON international shipping and transportation is in their effort to earn convertible currency. In the merchant marine sector, hard currency flow is controlled by carefully determining the best mix of domestic and foreign bottoms to carry national export-import and foreign aid cargoes. In Soviet practice, foreign tonnage is chartered where payment is accepted in the "convertible ruble", leaving Soviet vessels free to carry hard currency producing cargoes. The Soviets and other Communists merchant marines coordinate this charter activity through the COMECON charter center in Moscow.

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG RECEIVES "BOSS OF THE YEAR" AWARD

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, very often we in the Congress get so engrossed in the business of legislating for the Nation or assisting our constituents in solving their problems that we forget about the people who do most of the work around here, our staffs.

All too often these people put in long hours and a great deal of effort and we come to regard it as normal and do not give it a second thought.

So, when one of our colleagues is honored by his staff, it is a noteworthy event. On February 23, my colleague from Philadelphia, Joshua Eilberg, received the "Boss of the Year" award from the D.C. charter chapter of the American Business Women's Association for which he was nominated by a member of his staff, Trish Smith. In her nomination of Congressman EILBERG, Miss Smith stated:

One of the more notable traits of the Congress is the fact that members care little or nothing about the people who work for them. The general attitude is, you are there to serve and no sacrifice of time or effort is too great.

Mr. Eilberg stands out because of his consideration of his employees. He is genuinely concerned when he sees people working late and worries if someone who has been sick comes back to work before they are well.

This attitude of caring makes him easy to work for because one knows that his or her efforts are appreciated. Additionally, Mr. Eilberg is not the type of boss who assigns work and then disappears. It is a rare evening when he is not the last one to leave the office and he does not arbitrarily demand that people work extra hours as do many congressmen. If he is not in the office on weekends, the office is not open.

Because we have a small office, the opportunities for advancement are very limited, but it is the Congressman's policy that we attend his committee meetings and debates on the floor of the House so that we may broaden our knowledge of the workings of Congress and possibly move into higher positions in other offices.

The job of Congressman, unlike executive positions in private industry, is a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week occupation. His time is constantly taken up by the demands of other people wanting help or some favor. For this reason most elected officials become overly demanding of the people who work for them, but Congressman Eilberg is an outstanding exception. He has managed to remember that his employees are people with private lives and aspirations outside of the office, and for this reason I am proud to nominate him as Boss of the Year.

Such praise and respect should not go unnoticed and for this reason I have brought this award to the attention of the Members of the House.

At this time I would also like to enter into the RECORD a short history of the American Business Women's Association:

ABWA HISTORY

The American Business Women's Association, a non-sectarian, non-political, non-union organization, was formed to meet the need of women in business for an association which would increase their efficiency and ability, their success and happiness. This unusual organization, designed to fill a specific purpose, is neither a club nor a sorority, yet it includes many desirable features of both. The American Business Women's Association is an educational association. National Headquarters is at 9100 Ward Parkway, Kansas City, Missouri 64114.

Hilary A. Bufton, Jr., is responsible for the founding of the American Business Women's Association. Conferences with business leaders and women engaged in various occupations confirmed his belief that there was a need for an organization designed to keep women in business informed on improved techniques, to encourage better employer-employee relations, and to increase their self-confidence and efficiency.

In June, 1949, the name, "American Business Women's Association," was registered by the State of Missouri; and on Septmber 22, 1949, after conclusive study, three Kansas City business women, Mrs. Irma Rutter

Beisel, Mrs. Shirley Curry Cupp, and Mrs. Frances Meisenheimer Stuckey, on behalf of themselves and other business women, incorporated the American Business Women's Association as a Pro Forma Decree of Incorporation under the laws of the State of Missouri.

The first chapter, appropriately named "Pioneer Chapter," was installed in Kansas City, Missouri, on November 21, 1949. ABWA has been readily accepted. Now in its twenty-seventh year, the Association has well over 1,300 chapters, members in all fifty states and Puerto Rico and a total active membership of more than eighty-three thousand. New members and chapters are being added continuously. It is one of the fastest growing organizations of its type now in existence.

The responsibility for organizing and developing any organization is great. To relieve officers and members of the Association of the obligation of selecting and training Field Executives, and arranging for efficient, continuous membership service, The ABWA Company (later incorporated) was formed in December, 1950, to assume these responsibilities. Mr. Bufton is Chairman of the Board of this corporation. A similar plan is used by some of the largest organizations in the world today. Its practicability has been proved.

Since ABWA's inception, individual chapters have been encouraged to sponsor scholarships for women. The number of chapter sponsored scholarships has grown until, last year alone, chapters invested over $700,000 locally for scholarships in their communities. In addition, contributions from chapters and others are responsible for the Stephen Bufton Memorial Education Fund, the national educational fund of the Association, which provides college and graduate school scholarships for qualified women. Since the national fund's creation in 1953, scholarships have been awarded to over 2,000 students, in forty states. All chapters have the privilege of recommending scholarship candidates. The fund provides larger scholarships than individual chapters normally sponsor. The nine members of the National Board of Directors of the American Business Women's Association serve as Trustees of this fund.

National Officers who serve as the National Board of Directors are elected and installed annually at the Association's National Convention, when chapters and members are recognized for special achievement. There were more than 3,200 members in attendance at the 1975 National Convention, held in Cincinnati, Ohio. The next National Convention will be held in New Orelans, Louisiana, October 21-22-23-24, 1976; the 1977 National Convention will be held in Salt Lake City, Utah.

PROBLEM OF PUBLIC LAW 480 RICE COMMITMENTS

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, amidst growing concern among Members of Congress and rice farmers across this country about the ability of the administration to fulfill its Public Law 480 rice commitments this year, I met yesterday with Secretary of State Kissinger to discuss the status of negotiations in this regard.

During the meeting with the Secretary and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs Julius Katz, I have received assurances that the commitment for the shipment of 850,000 metric tons of rice under Public Law 480 this fiscal year will be fulfilled.

In a full discussion at the State Department, I was advised that 393,000 metric tons of rice are included in already signed agreements, an additional 187,000 metric tons are in the final stages of negotiation, negotiations are scheduled to begin in the very near future on another 50,000 metric tons, and that 18,000 metric tons have been added to the previously negotiated agreements.

I was also advised that, in addition to the 648,000 metric tons referred to above, 200,000 metric tons of rice have been programed for India and that, if problems cannot be resolved in reaching agreement with India, other countries are already designated to receive these amounts.

I have been further assured by the Secretary that most agreements will be reached by April 15 and that the remaining agreements will be consummated by mid-May. All 850,000 metric tons will be shipped by September 30, 1976.

OPPOSITION TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 606

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose House Joint Resolution 606, which would authorize an Atlantic Convention to which major nations of the world would send such representatives to explore the possibility of closer cooperation between nations in the search for world peace and understanding. This innocent-sounding objective stresses the purpose of the United Nations and offers support for the efforts to achieve those objectives. It is, of course, known that this resolution was scheduled for consideration by the House last week, but was postponed.

This resolution and others like it have been introduced in the Congress each year since 1949. The committee report on the current resolution states that the Atlantic community must become stronger or that it will deteriorate to the disadvantage of the United States and other democracies of the West. Also, the committee states there is a growing realization on both sides of the Atlantic that some more permanent solutions, perhaps Federal, must be found to common problems.

A meeting among NATO democracies to discuss common problems is fine, but we already have such activity going on now. We have the NATO defense pact, the IMF, plus international committees working on energy problems. So, why are we considering a resolution that would authorize an expenditure of $200,000 to send a delegation to Europe to duplicate what is already in progress?

We all recall the objectives of the United Nations, and we see instead the sorry mess that it has produced. The United States is still paying the lion's share of the bills, but instead of providing objective leadership, we are the target of vituperation from the Third World nations which now constitute a large majority of the U.N. members. U.S. proposals, which are patently unselfish, receive little support and, more often than not, are voted down.

It will also be remembered that one of the objectives piously expressed at the time of the formulation of the U.N. was a new world federation of nations looking toward a one-world government. The proposal for an Atlantic Convention appears to be a resurgence of the effort toward a world federation. If there is anything the United States has learned in the trying years since the U.N. was constituted, it is that we want no part of a world federation which would direct our affairs in international programs and, in the process, send us the bills for whatever foreign aid programs the Third World nations could dream up at our expense.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad proposal for it could lead to big government on an international level. It is unnecessary, for it proposes to accomplish what is already being done. It would be costly and, certainly, we want to avoid any additional or unnecessary expenditures. I urge my colleagues to stand against this legislation.

CRIME CONTROL DOES NOT REQUIRE OR JUSTIFY OUTLAWING GUNS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Americans are concerned about crime. Daily people in communities—large and small—throughout the Nation are threatened by violence. They are threatened by criminals, and they are afraid.

Increasingly loudly and widely the claim is being made by some segments of our society that severe gun control will do much to reduce crime. This is a cruel hoax. Gun control as a remedy for our crime sickness is nothing more than snake oil.

Experience and history have clearly shown that gun control has not worked and will not work. It will not solve or contribute to the solution of our crime problem because such control merely imposes restraints on the rights and privileges of the law-abiding.

In State, county, city, and towns, we have a long history of every type of firearm control that can be conceived. And, we have had a long history of failures of those controls. In New York, handgun ownership is smothered by licensing and registration. Yet, crime continues to soar in New York City. Massachusetts now has what the Washington Post recently touted as the "toughest gun law in the Nation." That law does not work, so the Boston Police Commissioner is calling for a New York-style ban. Washington, D.C., has registration and licensing—even of rifiles and shotguns. That ordinance is a flop. None of those approaches work.

There are people who answer the failures of State and local gun laws by say-

ing that what is needed is a strong national law. They contend that because a citizen of, say, Virginia, is allowed to own a handgun with no licensing and registration restrictions, that in some way a New Yorker will buy handguns in Virginia and transport them for sale on the streets of New York. Federal law already prohibits this kind of transaction. Again, the public is told we need a Federal law that prohibits a convicted felon, or a lunatic, or a drug addict, or a drunkard, from purchasing a firearm. This also is a Federal law today.

The reason that firearms laws do not work is that crime has become a paying proposition in this country. If we do not come to grips with the simple fact that convicted criminals ought to be punished, then nothing will change. For some strange reason, many of those who control or influence our major institutions cannot grasp that cold, hard fact.

President Ford tells the American people that " a small percentage of the entire population accounts for a very large proportion of the vicious crimes committed." He also says that "most crimes are committed by repeaters." As an illustration, the President in his crime control message to the Congress last year, cited some appalling but not surprising, statistics: "In one city," he said, "over 60 rapes, more than 200 robberies, and 14 murders were committed by only 10 persons in less than 12 months."

Gun controls will not solve that problem. It is a clear sign of a major breakdown in our criminal justice system. Illustrative of this breakdown in the statement of the South Bronx, N.Y., district attorney that the odds of a convicted felon ever going to jail are 100 to 1. That very fact—those terrible odds—were used by the Bronx police in convincing a kidnapper to release a number of children he was holding hostage. The gunman surrendered, and he is still awaiting trial. Now that is tragic.

Recently, an editorial in the Washington Post on the release of personal bond of a man charged and indicted with the brutal stabbing murder of a young aide to Senator ROBERT MORGAN of North Carolina, said:

> The practice (of allowing murder defendants free on their word) is, in fact, not uncommon. Experience has shown murder suspects to be well behaved while awaiting trial, particularly in comparison with suspects in certain other types of cases—for example, armed robbery. It needs to be repeated that the suspect is presumed innocent until convicted. . . .

The same newspaper editorialized a week later for the total abolition of handguns:

> The wise gun policy toward which this nation must move—and quickly—is one that erects as many hurdles as are possible between citizens and handguns.

The editorial said citizens and handguns—not criminals and handguns.

The very idea that a weapon is responsible for crime does not make any sense. Such thinking boggles the mind.

Gun control is a copout. Those good people who have been sold the gun-control argument have simply been the subjects of a gross deception. For the public policymaker and the media who have been promoting gun control as the be-and-all and end-all of our alarming crime rate, the issue is, at best, an example of self-delusion. Gun control demonstrably has little or nothing to do with crime.

The American people are becoming increasingly aware that the real issues underlying the firearms control controversy are the growth of Federal powers beyond any control of citizens and of the inability of our public and private institutions to deal with crime. We have tried gun control as a crime remedy. The record shows that it does not work. What we have not tried with vigor and imagination, at least in our recent history, is control of criminals. That is the answer to our crime problems.

I am astonished that those who are most concerned about civil liberties should attack the liberties of decent, law-abiding citizens who own firearms.

I am amazed that those who promoted and supported privacy legislation and who emphatically denounce any plan for centralized files of our citizenry would now demand a centralized file of citizens who are gun owners.

I am appalled that those who eagerly want—and demand—an end to victimless crimes would now attempt to create a new victimless crime by making a criminal a person who simply owns a handgun and has committed no other offense.

I am astounded to witness public and private efforts to alienate a large number of our citizens who firmly believe that they have a fundamental right to possess a firearm for legitimate purposes—target shooting, hunting, and defense of themselves and their families.

In the extensive testimony presented to the Congress over many months, little or nothing has been said about the financial cost of the various programs now under consideration. If this lawmaking body decides to confiscate the firearms now held by responsible, reputable citizens, it must be willing to purchase that condemned property. The cost would be many billions of dollars. But the criminal would still own his weapon. He would laugh at the law—just as he now laughs at laws against crime.

By any standard, the cost of the various gun-control programs proposed to this Congress would include not only an oppressive burden upon the taxpayers but also the loss of personal freedom and the estrangement of millions of law-abiding citizens.

To hear the strident voices raised in favor of repressive gun legislation, one would think that firearms-control laws had never been tried in this Nation, that gun controls were a new idea to solve an old problem. The fact of the matter is that firearms laws of various kinds have been part of this Nation's experience for generations. Where is the evidence that any of them have worked?

On various State and local levels, there is registration, licensing, identification cards, waiting periods and a host of other requirements and restrictions. Have they reduced crime? The monumental rise in crime shows clearly and forcefully that they have not. If the various restrictive or prohibitory approaches to gun control have not been successful in jurisdiction after jurisdiction, why should anybody assume that yet another similar attempt would be successful? What is the rationale? Where is the logic?

There is no reason why the people of this country should be saddled with a discredited theoretical solution to a vast and complex socioeconomic problem. The law-abiding firearms owners of the United States are tired of having their rights and freedoms battered and bartered, compromised and sacrificed.

The law-abiding gun owners of America and all the American people deserve better. And they will receive better than a repetition of the efforts to saddle the Nation's law-abiding citizens with new antigun laws. The Committee on the Judiciary, temporarily at least, laid the antigun law hoax to rest. After months of efforts to bring restrictive antigun laws to the House for debate, the committee wisely rejected the proposals. The antigun proposals should now be allowed to rest in peace. There is more important work to be done in Congress.

RADIATION HEALTH AND SAFETY

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today, the Radiation Health and Safety Act of 1976 with 11 cosponsors. They are: Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. OTTINGER, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. WON PAT. I originally introduced this legislation in 1972. It is coauthored in the other Chamber by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

This legislation provides that the Secretary of HEW develop and issue to the States criteria and minimum standards for the accreditation of educational institutions conducting programs for the training of radiologic technologists and develop and issue to the States criteria and minimum standards for the licensure of radiologic technologists.

These standards would be the national minimums required in these fields. The bill would make it unlawful for an educational institution not accredited to conduct such training and would make it unlawful for an individual to apply radiation to a patient for diagnosis or treatment unless he or she is a licensed medical practitioner, a licensed dentist, a licensed dental hygienist, or a licensed radiologic technologist or technologist-in-training. State standards consistent with the Federal criteria and minimum standards under this act will be the standards that will apply in that State.

The New York City Bureau for Radiation Control estimated that New York City usually has about 10 percent of any national radiation problem. And, I feel that the State of New York has come closest of any State to finding a solution. To my knowledge, New York State is one of only three States in the Nation that

license radiologic technologists. The other States are California and New Jersey. Puerto Rico also has a licensing requirement. The following nine States have enabling legislation or an attorney general's opinion to initiate standards for licensure of X-ray technologists: Hawaii, Kentucky, Vermont, Montana, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Delaware, and Georgia. However, the standards of the States are not uniform. The New York State licensing requirement was established in 1964. The State now has almost 12,000 licensed technologists. There is no shortage of qualified radiologic technologists in the State.

Saul J. Harris, former director of the Bureau of Radiation Control of the New York City Department of Health stated in congressional testimony last year that:

> It is our experience that the State radiologic technologist licensing program has been producing technologists who are more career oriented, who remain in the field longer, who are increasingly interested in patient care and radiation safety, and who are providing higher quality radiographs.

There are probably up to 160,000 X-ray technologists in the United States. Obviously, there is a need to insure that radiologic technologists have reached a degree of proficiency and thus can perform competently. However, in my judgment a voluntary certification program is not sufficient and will not work. It is only voluntary and cannot require more than the most minimum standards. At the present time, no more than half of the radiologic technologists in the Nation have registered with the voluntary certification program.

The problem of not having competent personnel operating X-ray equipment is most serious to the patient. So often, the operator of X-ray equipment is not qualified to handle the equipment. Often a physician will train his receptionist, secretary, medical assistant, part-time student or person with no professional background to operate the X-ray equipment. Yet, as Dr. Richard Chamberlain of the American College of Radiology stated at the 1966 congressional hearings, that every physician has, on an average, only 4.4 hours of his entire medical training devoted to lectures on radiological protection and techniques. He has probably relied on the salesman for basic knowledge about the working of the X-ray equipment. Often too, the physician will not supervise the number of X-rays the incompetent operator of the equipment might be giving the patient in order to get a better quality image, thus exposing the patient to unnecessary X-radiation. It is also true that the physician is interested in the immediate results of the X-ray—not so much in the long term somatic and genetic effects of continued exposure to X-radiation which is cumulative in its effect to the patient as well as to generations yet unborn.

A safe level of X-radiation has not been established and people are being subjected to unnecessary radiation exposure. The U.S. Public Health Service found that X-radiation levels lower than previously realized can cause genetic damage. X-rays do harm to a fetus in early pregnancy. Small amounts of radiation can also cause birth defects, damage to the reproductive organs and cell damage to adults.

A study undertaken by the Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation—BEIR Committee—of the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council, was released in November 1972, entitled "The Effects on Populations of Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation." The conclusions reached in this study were that 1,300 to 6,000 cancer deaths annually are caused by exposure of the American public to present levels of diagnostic X-rays. In addition, ill health results from genetic damage caused by the exposure. The NAS–NRC study further shows that present exposure of the population to X-rays and the associated toll in lives can be significantly reduced, through simple improvements in X-ray techniques.

For example, the BEIR Committee concluded that present genetic damage from X-rays can be reduced by up to 50 percent through educational methods and improved techniques—as restricting the size of the X-ray beam to the area of clinical interest. This is especially important during those X-ray procedures in which the reproductive organs are in the direct X-ray beam, as during examinations of the lower back, lower abdomen and hip. In view of the known leukemogenic effect of X-rays, avoiding needless exposure of the bone marrow is also of special significance. Because of the increased radiosensitivity of embryonic tissue, special prudence should be exercised in prescribing X-ray examinations for pregnant or potentially pregnant women.

Untrained, unqualified personnel cannot be permitted to handle X-ray procedures that have the potential for inflicting harm on so many people. We must assure that the personnel be trained as well as possible, and that only those licensed to practice be permitted to practice. Dr. John Cameron has recently found that a person could receive as much as 100 times more radiation during a particular diagnostic X-ray procedure in one medical facility as compared to another.

The most sophisticated and modern X-ray systems cannot protect the health and safety of patients unless the technicians operating the equipment are adequately trained and licensed. In some States, we license car mechanics and TV repairmen. Does it not make sense that we license X-ray technologists who handle the most sophisticated of equipment—equipment which can provide extended life if properly used or shorten life when improperly used.

It is a fact that 95 percent of the radiation to which the American public is exposed comes from medical X-ray exposure. Only 2 percent of man's exposure comes from the nuclear power industry which is stringently regulated, while strangely medical and dental X-ray usage is not, in most cases, subject to control.

The HEW Bureau of Radiological Health stated in their January 1975 staff report that 130 million people received in 1970 212 million medical and dental diagnostic radiological examinations. Of course, some medical X-rays are unavoidable. Medical X-rays are often necessary and have been responsible for the successful diagnostic and treatment of many ailments. However, unnecessary X-radiation is causing death and suffering to untold members of unsuspecting persons, as reported by the International Commission on Radiological Protection. We must do what we can now to control the X-ray machine and license the persons who use them.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Senate passed legislation calling for the licensure of radiologic technologists, but the provision was dropped in conference by the House. The need for this legislation is still as great.

Enactment of this legislation will encourage and attract competent personnel who can be confident in the integrity and responsible outlook of the profession. It certainly will encourage radiation safety for the protection of both the patient and the user of the equipment.

I am appending a recent article from the New York Times on unnecessary dental X-rays and their potential harm.

CONSUMER NOTES: CARE URGED IN ALLOWING DENTAL X-RAYS

(By Frances Cebra)

Just by residing in the United States, the average person is exposed to a certain amount of unavoidable "background" radiation from natural sources.

But there are sources of radiation that can be avoided, among them unnecessary dental X-rays, which, not incidentally, also add to your bill.

Prior to 1968, the official position of the American Dental Association was that "radiographic examinations should not be a standard part of every dental examination." Since that time, the association has modified its position to say that, "The dentist's professional judgment should determine the frequency and extent of each radiographic exam."

Despite that modification, a spokesman for the association said that a dentist should not automatically take a full set of X-rays (usually 16 to 18 films) every time a patient comes in for a routine check-up.

FREQUENCY ADVICE

He said that a full set would show the condition of the jaw and the health of the roots of the teeth, among other things, and that unless there was an indication of a problem, such an examination need not be made more frequently than every three to five years. Some authorities say a full set is needed only every six to 10 years.

If a dentist is simply making a routine check for the presence of decay and suspects that there may be cavities where they touch, a much smaller number of what are called "bit-wing." X-rays can be used, according to the spokesman. However, for people who rarely have cavities or gum trouble, even these X-rays may not be necessary.

What should you do if your dentist orders a full set of X-rays when you visit him for a routine check-up? Refuse them, unless "you have special problems or unless your dentist can justify the need" for them, according to a booklet published by the Health Research Group a nonprofit organization based in Washington and affiliated with Ralph Nader.

The booklet, called "Medical and Dental X-rays, A Consumer's Guide to Avoiding Unnecessary Radiation Exposure," says that "diagnostic X-rays currently constitute the largest source of man-made radiation ex-

posure to the U.S. population." The booklet offers these suggestions for dealing with your dentist on the X-ray question:

If you change dentists or are referred to a specialist, ask that your new dentist obtain past X-rays from the previous dentist rather than take a new set.

If you are in the reproductive years or your child is to be X-rayed, ask for a lead shield to protect the reproductive organs. This is necessary because radiation can affect the genes.

The booklet notes that dental X-rays "do not pose as much of a threat to individual health as a number of medical X-ray examinations." But, it continues, "the practice of conducting routine examinations without any clinical indication that they will yield new information is also widespread in dentistry, and can lead to a significant amount of radiation exposure and risk over a period of time."

The 71-page booklet, which explains the dangers of radiation, the benefits and risks of diagnostic medical X-ray and a check-list of questions for doctors and dentists, can be obtained for $3 by writing to the Health Research Group, 2000 P St. NW, Suite 708, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ALEXANDER (at the request of Mr. DOWNING of Virginia), for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KASTEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CRANE, for 1 hour, March 17, 1976.
Mr. KEMP, for 1 hour, today.
Mr. KASTEN, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. SYMMS, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THORNTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DIGGS, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. MURTHA, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FRASER, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. FLOOD, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. EILBERG, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. REES, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DENT, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. BARRETT, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. AUCOIN, for 20 minutes, March 17, 1976.
Mr. MAHON, for 60 minutes, March 22, 1976.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KASTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBINSON.
Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.
Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mr. KASTEN.
Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mrs. HOLT.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
Mr. THONE in two instances.
Mr. WIGGINS.
Mr. MOORE.
Mr. GRASSLEY.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. HEINZ.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THORNTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.
Mr. NOWAK in five instances.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. DE LUGO in two instances.
Mr. O'HARA.
Mr. TEAGUE.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. JONES of Alabama.
Mr. MCDONALD of Georgia in three instances.
Mr. DRINAN.
Ms. ABZUG in two instances.
Mr. SOLARZ.
Mr. FOLEY.
Mr. THOMPSON.
Mr. DODD.
Mr. UDALL.
Mr. KARTH in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1911. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain persons insured under servicemen's group life insurance (SGLI) with a choice of conversion to either an individual policy of life insurance, including term, or a veterans' group life insurance (VGLI) policy up the expiration of their Servicemen's group life insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS of Ohio, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4034. An act to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital in Loma Linda, California, as the "Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans' Hospital," and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 549. Joint resolution to approve the "Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America," and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS of Ohio, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 15, 1976, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1313. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Rolla, Mo., for airport purposes;

H.R. 2575. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Algona, Iowa, for airport purposes;

H.R. 3440. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Grand Junction, Colo., for airport purposes;

H.R. 9617. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Alva, Okla., for airport purposes;

H.R. 11665. An act to rescind certain budget authority recommended in the message of the President of January 23, 1976 (H. Doc. 94-342), transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974;

H.R. 11893. An act to increase the temporary debt limit, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12193. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the authorization for the National Study Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 17, 1976, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2833. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 502 of title 32, United States Code, and section 2001 of title 10, United States Code, which relate to training requirements for National Guard units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2834. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on loan, guarantee and insurance transactions supported by Eximbank during January 1976 to Communist countries; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

2835. A letter from the Executive Secretary to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting proposed final regulations governing special funding grants to the outlying areas under part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, as amended, pursuant to section 431(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2836. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notice of a partial deferment of the construction repayment installments payable to the United States in 1976 and 1977 by Kansas-Bostwick Irrigation District No. 2, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Kansas, pursuant to the act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 584); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2837. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the annual report of the Board on

its activities under the Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act, covering 1975, pursuant to section 18(f)(5) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (88 Stat. 2197); jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Banking, Currency and Housing.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2838. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities for the Navy to improve its program for scheduling ship alterations; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

2839. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on ACTION's progress in meeting its six goals designated by the President when he established the agency in 1971; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Education, and Labor, and International Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2411. A bill for the relief of Alinor Anvari Adams; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DODD: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeanette Flores Byrne; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSO. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8065. A bill for the relief of Carmela Scudieri (Rept. No. 94-906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DODD: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8119. A bill for the relief of Fernando Alves Macos; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 52. An act for the relief of Miss Rosario Y. Quijano, Walter York Quijano, Ramon York Quijano, Tarcisus York Quijano, Denis York Quijano, and Paul York Quijano; with amendment (Rep. No. 94-908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 223. An act for the relief of Angela Garza; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 804. An act for the relief of Zoraida E. Lastimosa (Rept. No. 94-910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 832. An act for the relief of Kristen Marisol Kneebone (Rept. No. 94-911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1699. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hope Namgyal; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. PATTERSON of California, and Mr. RODINO):

H.R. 12531. A bill to reform residential electric utility rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 12532. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to prohibit any reduction in the monthly benefits of a fully insured individual, who is otherwise entitled to old age insurance benefits, by reason of any outside earnings which may be received by such insured individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12533. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide outpatient dental services and treatment to any veteran who has a service-connected disability rated at 60 percent or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 12534. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEDELL (for himself, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. HAYES of Indiana, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LITTON, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Ms. SPELLMAN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WIRTH):

H.R. 12535. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require candidates for Federal office in certain circumstances to return excess campaign contributions to the persons making such contributions or to deposit such contributions in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BELL (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. HOLTZMAN and Mr. PATTERSON of California):

H.R. 12536. A bill to provide that pay adjustments for Members of Congress may take effect no earlier than the beginning of the Congress next following the Congress in which they are approved; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 12537. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to eliminate the present 10-percent limitation on the proportion of the total number of recipients of aid to families with dependent children in any State who may receive such aid in the form of restricted or protective payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 12538. A bill to amend the Community Development Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 12539. A bill to amend title XX of the Social Security Act to provide that no State shall be required to administer individual means tests for provision of education, nutrition, transportation, recreation, socialization, or associated services relating to multipurpose senior centers to individuals aged 60 or older; to the Committee on Ways and means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 12540. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make certain revisions with respect to the surveys used to establish pay for prevailing rate employees in Federal agencies and nonappropriated fund instrumentalities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BLOUIN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORNELL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 12541. A bill to conserve the use of energy in residential housing, commercial and public buildings, and industrial plants through federally supported State energy conservation implementation programs, and to establish an Energy Conservation Extension Service; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Currency and Housing, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 12542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax any pension or annuity received under a public retirement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOWERS (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. FITHIAN):

H.R. 12543. A bill amending title 5 of the United States Code to improve agency rule making by expanding the opportunities for public participation, by creating procedures for congressional review of agency rules, and by expanding judicial review, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Rules.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 12544. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the medicare program for certain services performed by chiropractors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mr. FARY, and Mr. RISENHOOVER):

H.R. 12545. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12546. A bill to amend section 101(1)(2) of the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. OTTINGER, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 12547. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from unnecessary medical exposure to ionizing radiation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. HOWE, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 12548. A bill to establish a commission to study the results of and other questions relating to the racial integration of public schools, and the use of busing to achieve it; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTON (for himself and Mr. BLANCHARD):

H.R. 12549. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to prohibit any individual from receiving food stamps who receives at least one-half of his income from any other individual who is a member of another household which is ineligible for food stamps; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 12550. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to repeal the age limitation on appointments to the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 12551. A bill to encourage States to provide real property tax relief to low- and moderate-income individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.R. 12552. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to require the U.S. Postal Service to hold a hearing and to take into

consideration certain matters prior to the consolidation or closing of any post office, to provide for the appointment and compensation of certain officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the exemption for purposes of the Federal estate tax, to increase the estate tax marital deduction, and to provide an alternate method of valuing certain real property for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 12554. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act to provide compensation to persons suffering losses due to predators protected under the Endangered Species Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 12555. A bill to correct inequities in certain franchise practices, to provide franchisors and franchisees with even-handed protection from unfair practices, to provide consumers with the benefits which accrue from a competitive and open-market economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 12556. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the disposal of surplus real property to States and their political subdivisions, agencies, and instrumentalities for economic development purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12557. A bill to amend the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide that a rescission or reservation of funds proposed by the President may be disapporved by either House of Congress without waiting for the expiration of the 45-day period prescribed for congressional action under present law; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PREYER (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. REES, Mr. SANTINI, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 12558. A bill to provide for affording equal educational opportunities for students in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 12559. To prohibit the U.S. Postal Service from closing any post office which serves any rural area or any small community or town; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12560. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt farmers from the highway use tax on heavy trucks used for farm purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 12561. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to study the feasibility of recycling organic waste materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 12562. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An Act to amend section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes", and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12563. A bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing certain conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 12564. A bill to increase the aggregate authority for long-term direct loans to nonprofit sponsors for the construction of housing for the elderly and handicapped; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 12565. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by condemnation with a declaration of taking certain tracts of land (and contracts for the sale of timber thereon) in the Big Thicket National Preserve; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. WINN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. FREY, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ROE, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HARKINS, Mr. LLOYD of California, Mr. DODD, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. HALL, Mr. KRUEGER, and Mr. WIRTH):

H.R. 12566. A bill authorizing appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1977; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. BELL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. WINN, Mr. ROE, Mr. FREY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. EMERY, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HARKINS, Mr. LLOYD of California, Mr. DODD, and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 12567. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 and the act of March 3, 1901, for fiscal years 1977 and 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. KRUEGER, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mr. BLANCHARD, and Mr. WIRTH):

H.R. 12568. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Prevention and Control Act of 1974 and the act of March 3, 1901, for fiscal years 1977 and 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Ms. SPELLMAN):

H.R. 12569. A bill to establish the National Diabetes Advisory Board and to take other actions to insure the implementation of the long-range plan to combat diabetes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 12570. A bill to transfer all compliance and enforcement functions of the Federal Energy Administration to the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. WAMPLER):

H.R. 12571. A bill to amend the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Act of 1974 to make certain technical changes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JENRETTE, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KREBS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. THONE, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. WEAVER):

H.R. 12572. A bill to amend the U.S. Grain Standards Act to improve the grain inspection and weighing system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SYMMS:

H.R. 12573. A bill to expand the medical freedom of choice of consumers by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide that drugs will be regulated under that act solely to assure their safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DODD, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mrs. FENWICK, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL Jr., Mr. FLORIO, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CORNELL, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.J. Res. 864. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second full calendar week in March 1976 as National Employ the Older Worker Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself and Mr. HILLIS):

H.J. Res. 865. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second full calendar week in March 1976 as National Employ the Older Worker Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FITHIAN (for himself and Mr. SYMMS):

H.J. Res. 866. Joint resolution providing for the designation and adoption of the American marigold as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. HOLT:

H.J. Res. 867. Joint resolution designating the Eastern Red Cedar (Juniperus virginiana) as the national tree of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 868. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit service by Representatives, Senators, and Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSO:

H.J. Res. 869. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee for purposes of conducting a congressional conference on aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. MAGUIRE):

H. Con. Res. 584. Concurrent resolution indicating the sense of Congress that every person throughout the world has the right to a nutritionally adequate diet; and that this country increase its assistance for self-help development among the world's poorest people until such assistance has reached the target of 1 percent of our total national

production (GNP); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and International Relations.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. Con. Res. 585. Concurrent resolution relating to import relief in the case of stainless steel and alloy tool steel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H. Con. Res. 586. Concurrent Resolution with respect to post office closings; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H.R. 12574. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the interest of the United States in certain lands in Adams County, Miss., notwithstanding a limitation in the Color-of-Title Act (45 Stat. 1069, as amended; 43 U.S.C. 1068); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 12575. A bill for the relief of Pietro Balistreri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H.R. 12576. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Comdr. Thurman Roddy Schnitz, U.S. Navy Reserves, retired, to the rank of captain on the Reserves list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12577. A bill for the relief of Roy A. Harrell, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12578. A bill for the relief of Carla K. Finch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIS:

H.R. 12579. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John N. Hudgens, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12580. A bill for the relief of Masami Ino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 12581. A bill for the relief of Tang Ah-Po; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12582. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Shields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

AMENDMENTS IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 280

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.J. Res. 280 is amended by striking out all after the Resolve Clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The people of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall elect the number of Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State. Each Representative when elected, shall be an inhabitant of the District and shall possess the same qualifications as to age and citizenship and have the same rights, privileges, and obligations as a Representative from a State.

"SEC. 2. When vacancies happen in the representation of the District in the House of Representatives, the people of the District shall fill such vacancies by election.

"SEC. 3. This article shall have no effect on the provision made in the twenty-third article of amendment of the Constitution for determining the number of electors for President and Vice President to be appointed for the District. Each Representative from the District shall be entitled to participate in the choosing of the President in the House of Representatives under the twelfth article of amendment as if the District were a State.

"SEC. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.".

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 280 is amended by striking out all after the Resolve Clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The people of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall elect two Senators and the number of Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State. Each Senator or Representative when elected, shall be an inhabitant of the District and shall possess the same qualifications as to age and citizenship and have the same rights, privileges, and obligations as a Senator or Representative from a State.

"SEC. 2. When vacancies happen in the representation of the District in either the Senate or the House of Representatives, the people of the District shall fill such vacancies by election.

"SEC. 3. The District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall appoint, in such manner as the Congress may direct, a number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District is entitled under this Article. They shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment of the Constitution.

"SEC. 4. Each Representative or Senator from the District shall be entitled to participate in the choosing of the President or Vice President in the House of Representatives or Senate under the twelfth article of amendment as if the District were a State.

"SEC. 5. The twenty-third article of amendment of the Constitution is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.".

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 580

By Mr. EDGAR:

On page 3, line 3, insert "not to exceed $10,000" immediately after "(1)".

On page 3, line 4, insert "not more than five" immediately before "staff members".

FACTUAL DESCRIPTIONS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Prepared by the Congressional Research Service pursuant to clause 5(d) of House rule X. Previous listing appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 15, 1976, page 6441:

HOUSE BILLS

H.R. 11936. February 18, 1976. Government Operations. Requires the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and make public annual consolidated financial statements for all expenditures of the United States utilizing the accrual method of accounting.

H.R. 11937. February 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Requires States which have entered into agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for coverage of State and local employees under the Social Security Act to make payments and reports to the Secretary of the Treasury on a calendar-quarter basis.

H.R. 11938. February 18, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Requires that electric utility rate charges for a subsistence quantity of electric energy provided to residential consumers not exceed the lowest rate charged any other electric consumer.

H.R. 11939. February 18, 1976. Education and Labor. Amends the Higher Education Act of 1965 with respect to: (1) the statement of purpose for student assistance programs; (2) basic educational opportunity grants; (3) State student incentive grants; (4) special programs for disadvantaged students; (5) the guaranteed student loan program; (6) work-study programs; (7) cooperative education programs; (8) the National Direct Student Loan Program; and (9) disposition of student loan funds. Establishes a National Committee on Institutional Eligibility in the Office of Education. Repeals specified titles and programs under such Act. Repeals the International Education Act of 1966.

H.R. 11940. February 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a limited deduction for amounts paid by or on behalf of an individual for an individual retirement account, an individual retirement annuity, an individual retirement bond, an employee's trust, or an annuity contract.

H.R. 11941. February 18, 1976. Post Office and Civil Service; House Administration. Amends the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit any candidate for election to Federal office in any general election in any State, other than a candidate for the office of Vice President, to make a bulk mailing at the rate of postage applied to any nonprofit educational organization.

H.R. 11942. February 18, 1976. House Administration. Amends the Federal Campaign Act of 1974 to establish as an independent establishment of the Executive branch the Federal Election Commission whose members are the Secretary of the Senate (ex officio), the Clerk of the House (ex officio), and six members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

H.R. 11943. February 18, 1976. Public Works and Transportation. Amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to further define the term "navigable waters" as it applies to the issuance of permits for dredged or fill material by the Corps of Engineers.

H.R. 11944. February 18, 1976. Post Office and Civil Service. Sets, without reference to the Executive Schedule, specific maximum salaries for General Schedule Federal employees for calendar years through 1980. Eliminates any limit on such salaries beginning in 1981.

Repeals provisions making percentage pay adjustments based upon General Schedule pay adjustments in the salaries of (1) Executive Schedule officials, (2) the Vice President, (3) Members of Congress, and (4) specified judges and judicial officers.

Revises the periods for which members of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries are to be appointed and during which such Commission is to perform its functions.

H.R. 11945. February 18, 1976. Agriculture.

Amends the Food Stamp Act of 1964 by revising (1) eligibility standards; (2) the method of determining the amount of the coupon allotment; (3) administration of the program by State agencies; and (4) the nutrition education programs.

H.R. 11946. February 18, 1976. Government Operations. Requires that meetings of Federal agencies be open to the public except as stipulated in this Act. Requires agencies to make a public announcement, at least one week before the meeting, of the date, place, and subject matter of the meeting, and whether it is to be open or closed to the public. Requires that edited transcripts of all meetings be made available to the public. Prohibits ex parte communications during on-the-record agency meetings.

H.R. 11947. February 18, 1976. Post Office and Civil Service. Provides, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, that pay adjustments for Members of Congress may take effect no earlier than the beginning of the Congress next following the Congress in which they are approved.

H.R. 11948. February 18, 1976. Judiciary. Extends the authorization of appropriations for the National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works to be coextensive with the life of the Commission.

H.R. 11949. February 18, 1976. House Administration. Amends the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to establish in the Executive branch the Federal Election commission whose members are the Secretary of the Senate (ex officio), the Clerk of the House (ex officio), and six members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

H.R. 11950. February 18, 1976. House Administration. Amends the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide that members of the Federal Election Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

H.R. 11951. February 18, 1976. Judiciary. Amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require that comprehensive State plans under such Act include provisions for the prevention of crimes against the elderly.

H.R. 11952. February 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the limit on the amount of Treasury bonds that may be issued at a rate in excess of 4¼ percent per annum.

H.R. 11953. February 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Establishes conditions, under the Internal Revenue Code, which the State agency, body, or commission lawfully charged with tax administration must meet before the Secretary of the Treasury shall allow the inspection or disclosure of income tax returns or return information.

H.R. 11954. February 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Establishes the National Commission on the Social Security Program to study and evaluate the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance program of the Social Security Act to determine the effectiveness of the program in meeting the needs for which it was established. Requires the study of alternative structures to meet such needs.

H.R. 11955. February 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Authorizes regulated investment companies, under the Internal Revenue Code, to pay exempt-interest dividends in an amount up to 90 percent of the excess of its tax-exempt interest without affecting its tax-exempt status.

Allows shareholders to treat such exempt-interest dividends as excludable from gross income.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS

H.J. Res. 816. February 19, 1976. Government Operations. Expresses the general policy of the United States Government to rely upon private commercial sources for the goods and services required to meet Government needs.

H.J. Res. 817. February 19, 1976. Government Operations. Expresses the general policy of the United States Government to rely upon private commercial sources for the goods and services required to meet Government needs.

H.J. Res. 818. February 19, 1976. Government Operations. Expresses the general policy of the United States Government to rely upon private commercial sources for the goods and services required to meet Government needs.

H.J. Res. 819. February 19, 1976. Ways and Means. Establishes a nine-member National Commission on Social Security. Requires the Commission to study and investigate titles II (Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance) and VIII (Medicare) of the Social Security Act.

H.J. Res. 820. February 19, 1976. Judiciary. Proposes an amendment to the Constitution providing for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

H. Con. Res. 566. February 26, 1976. International Relations. Expresses the objection of Congress to the sale to Saudi Arabia of military equipment as described in the statement submitted by the President on February 17, 1976 (transmittal numbered 76-31).

H. Con. Res. 567. February 26, 1976. International Relations. Expresses the objection of Congress to the sale to Saudi Arabia of military equipment as described in the statement submitted by the President on February 17, 1976 (transmittal numbered 76-32).

H. Con. Res. 568. February 26, 1976. International Relations. Expresses the objection of Congress to the sale to Saudi Arabia of defense articles and services as described in the statement submitted by the President on February 17, 1976 (transmittals numbered 76-26, 76-27, 76-28, 76-29, 76-30, 76-31, and 76-32).

H. Con. Res. 569. February 26, 1976. Post Office and Civil Service. Expresses the sense of Congress that the U.S. Postal Service should not close or otherwise suspend the operation of any post office during the six-month period beginning on the date of adoption of this resolution.

H. Con. Res. 570. March 1, 1976. International Relations. Requests the President to inform foreign countries of certain policy declarations of Congress with respect to arms control, disarmament negotiations, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons material.

H. Res. 1040. February 18, 1976. Sets forth the rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 280.

H. Res. 1041. February 19, 1976. Creates a ten-member select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the events surrounding the release of material contained in the report made by the House Intelligence Committee relative to the investigation of the Central Intelligence Agency and other agencies made by that committee.

H. Res. 1042. February 19, 1976. Directs the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to inquire into the circumstances surrounding the publication of the text and of any part of the report of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

H. Res. 1043. February 19, 1976. Banking, Currency and Housing. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury and other Federal officials to initiate negotiations within the framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the International Monetary Fund with the intent of developing an appropriate code of conduct and specific trading obligations among governments, together with suitable procedures for the settlement of disputes.

H. Res. 1044. February 19, 1976. Appropriations. Expresses the disapproval of the House with regard to proposed budget deferral D76-98 relating to budget authority for the juvenile justice and delinquency prevention program administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the Department of Justice.

H. Res. 1045. February 19, 1976. House Administration. Authorizes expenditures by the House Judiciary Committee for investigations and studies and general oversight responsibilities.

SENATE—*Tuesday, March 16, 1976*

The Senate met at 10:15 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, once more we turn aside from the noise and tumult of the world, from the agenda for today and the pressing problems of tomorrow, to open our hearts to Thee. Help us to remember that we are immortal souls with an eternal destiny. Help us to heed the promptings of conscience and to obey the direction of Thy Spirit. Light up our days with the faith with which we are doing our best to remake the world according to Thy will.

Send us to our duties, O Lord, to hold fast to what is good, to render no man evil for evil, to strengthen the faint-hearted, to support the weak, to help the suffering, to honor and serve the Lord, until at last we come to Thy kingdom.

Through Him who triumphantly walked this way before us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 15, 1976, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR STENNIS AND SENATOR MOSS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 10 minutes allocated to me at this time and the 15-minute special order which I have later in the morning be transferred to the