a man who has been a long-time member of their community. He is also a judge in the municipal court, Los Angeles Judicial District, and it is in both his private and public capacity that the Honorable Glenn A. Wymore will be honored.

Judge Wymore is currently assigned to the San Pedro Branch of the Municipal Court, but his associations in the Los Angeles harbor area are much deeper than his judicial assignment. He has served on the bench since his appointment in 1968, with all of his service coming while stationed at the San Pedro courthouse.

"Glenn" as he is known to his many friends in the community, was born in 1906 at Mankota, Kans. He moved to Los Angeles in 1923, graduating from Lincoln High School in 1927. In 1936, he completed the requirements for a bachelor of law degree from Southwestern University of Law.

Prior to receiving his appointment to the bench, Judge Wymore had a long and distinguished career in public service. From 1929 to 1939, he was a deputy clerk in Los Angeles municipal court. After being admitted to the bar, he served as deputy public defender for the city of Los Angeles from 1939 to 1943. It was during this time—1941—that Glenn Wymore moved to the San Pedro area, where he has resided ever since.

Glenn Wymore pursued the private practice of law from 1945 until his appointment to the bench in 1968. He still found time for public service, however, as a member of the Public Utilities and Transportation Commission of the city of Los Angeles. During his tenure on the commission from 1961 to 1963, Glenn Wymore served a term as president of the commission.

Despite an active professional life and his devotion to his family, Judge Wymore has always found some time in which to devote his talents and energy to community service. He has been a member of the board of directors of the Bay Harbor Hospital, a nonprofit corporation, since 1957, and is a past president of that organization.

Judge Wymore is a past member of the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce board of directors. Professionally, he is a past president of the Harbor Bar Association. Since his appointment to the bench, Judge Wymore has been an honorary member of that group.

On June 2, the Los Angeles Harbor Area will honor Judge Wymore with a testimonial dinner, in recognition of his outstanding service on behalf of the public as a judge in municipal court. His many years as a resident in San Pedro have enabled him to make countless friends in our community, and I am sure that many of them will be present that night to help commemorate Judge Wymore's outstanding career, and wish him good luck as he continues in the future.

My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing Judge Glenn A. Wymore the best of luck as he continues his career in the Los Angeles Judicial District municipal court. We would also like to express our greeting and congratulations to his lovely wife, Dorothy, and their son, Michael.

SENATE—*Friday, May 21, 1976*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Reverend Seth R. Brooks, minister, Universalist National Memorial Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee we have been endowed with memory. We praise Thee as we look back and remember those who were founders and builders of this Nation. We know they bequeathed us a goodly heritage.

We are thankful we can look forward and know that, "Where there is no vision the people perish." We pray for Thy guidance in the time before us both as a nation and individuals.

We are conscious that it is in the present we must live one day at a time. We, therefore, ask Thee always to grant us wisdom and courage for the facing of each hour.

Bless our country, our President, this august body, and all who are in authority that our Nation may live in peace, humility, and high purpose.

Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CURTIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 20, 1976, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ronald G. Coleman, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I request that the President be notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar order Nos. 789, 817, 823, 825, 841, and 852.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL AND DENTAL MANPOWER ACT

The bill (H.R. 12132) to extend as an emergency measure for 1 year the District of Columbia Medical and Dental Manpower Act of 1970 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL WEATHER MODIFICATION POLICY ACT OF 1976

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3383) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to develop a national policy on weather modification, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 4, strike out "projects have" and insert in lieu thereof "technology has".

On page 2, at the end of line 19, strike out "experimentation" and insert in lieu thereof "development".

On page 4, in line 7, strike out "the degree of development of".

On page 5, in line 25, strike out "statement of".

On page 6, in line 1, strike out "description of a"

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Weather Modification Policy Act of 1976".

SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS. The Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Weather-related disasters and hazards, including drought, hurricanes, tornadoes, hail, lightning, fog, floods, and frost, result in substantial human suffering and loss of life, billions of dollars of annual economic losses to owners of crops and other property, and substantial financial loss to the United States Treasury;

(2) Weather modification technology has significant potential for preventing, diverting, moderating, or ameliorating the adverse effects of such disasters and hazards and enhancing crop production and the availability of water; and

(3) The interstate nature of climatic and related phenomena, the severe economic hardships experienced as the result of occasional drought and other adverse meteorological conditions, and the existing role and responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to disaster relief, require appropriate Federal action to prevent or alleviate such disasters and hazards.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is therefore declared to be the purpose of the Congress in this Act to develop a comprehensive and coordinated national weather modification policy and a national program of weather modification research and development—

(1) to determine the means by which deliberate weather modification can be used at the present time to decrease the adverse impact of weather on agriculture, economic growth, and the general public welfare, and to determine the potential for weather modification;

(2) to conduct research into those scientific areas considered most likely to lead to practical techniques for drought prevention or alleviation and other forms of deliberate weather modification;

(3) to develop practical methods and devices for weather modification;

(4) to make weather modification research findings available to interested parties; and

(5) to assess the economic, social, environmental, and legal impact of an operational weather modification program.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(2) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(3) The term "weather modification" means any activity performed with the intention and expectation of producing changes in precipitation, wind, fog, lightning, and other atmospheric phenomena.

SEC. 4. STUDY.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of the state of scientific knowledge concerning weather modification, the present state of development of weather modification technology, the problems impeding effective implementation of weather modification technology, and other related matters. Such study shall include—

(1) a review and analysis of the present and past research efforts to establish practical weather modification technology, particularly as it relates to reducing loss of life and crop and property destruction;

(2) a review and analysis of research needs in weather modification to establish areas in which more research could be expected to yield the greatest return in terms of practical weather modification technology;

(3) a review and analysis of existing studies to establish the probable economic importance to the United States in terms of agricultural production, energy, and related economic factors if the present weather modification technology were to be effectively implemented;

(4) an assessment of the legal, social, and ecological implications of expanded and effective research and operational weather modification projects;

(5) recommendations concerning legislation desirable at all levels of government to implement a national weather modification policy and program;

(6) a review of the international importance and implications of weather modification activities by the United States;

(7) a review and analysis of present and past funding for weather modification from all sources to determine the sources and adequacy of funding in the light of the need of the Nation; and

(8) a review and analysis of the purpose, policy, methods, and funding of the Federal departments and agencies involved in weather modification and of the existing interagency coordination of weather modification research efforts.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, a final report on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study conducted pursuant to section 4. Such report shall include:

(1) a summary of the findings made with respect to each of the areas of investigation specified in section 4;

(2) other findings which are pertinent to the determination and implementation of a national policy on weather modifications;

(3) a recommended national policy on weather modification and a recommended national weather modification research and development program which is consistent with, and likely to contribute to, achieving the objectives of such policy;

(4) recommendations for levels of Federal funding sufficient to support adequately a national weather modification research and development program;

(5) recommendations for any changes in the organization and involvement of Federal departments and agencies in weather modification which may be needed to implement effectively the recommended national policy on weather modification and the recommended research and development program; and

(6) recommendations for any legislation which may be required to implement such policy and program.

Each department, agency, and other instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized and directed to furnish the Secretary any information which the Secretary deems necessary to carry out his functions under this Act.

(b) OPERATION AND CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall solicit and consider the views of State agencies, private firms, institutions of higher learning, and other interested persons and governmental entities in the conduct of the study required by section 4, and in the preparation of the report required by subsection (a).

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act not to exceed $1,000,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 8, strike "and".

On page 2, line 15, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof "; and".

On page 2, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

"(4) Weather modification programs may have long-range and unexpected effects on existing climatic patterns which are not confined by national boundaries.".

On page 3, line 8, strike "and".

On page 3, line 11, strike the period and insert thereof "; and".

On page 3, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"(6) to develop both national and international mechanisms designed to minimize conflicts which may arise with respect to the peaceful uses of weather modification.".

On page 5, line 7, strike "and".

On page 5, line 12, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof "; and".

On page 5, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(9) a review and analysis of the necessity and feasibility of negotiating an international agreement concerning the peaceful uses of weather modification.".

On page 6, line 15, immediately after "program" insert "or for any international agreement which may be appropriate concerning the peaceful uses of weather modification".

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from Kansas for accepting my amendment to his bill, S. 3383, the National Weather Modification Policy Act. I share Senator PEARSON's concern for the development of a coordinated and comprehensive national policy with respect to the use of weather modification techniques.

As we are all aware, I am sure, any comprehensive or extensive national weather modification program could have long-term and unexpected effects on existing climatic patterns which are not confined by national boundaries. It is my belief that the development of a comprehensive and coordinated national weather modification policy should thoroughly take into account the internation implications of such a program. Therefore, it is the purpose of my amendment to include in the process of developing a national policy, adequate consideration of the international impact of such a program.

I wish to thank Senator PEARSON again for accepting my amendment and thereby eliminating the need for a rereferral to the Foreign Relations Committee, and I urge my fellow Senators to pass S. 3383, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3383

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Weather Modification Policy Act of 1976".

SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Weather-related disasters and hazards, including drought, hurricanes, tornadoes, hail, lightning, fog, floods, and frost, result in substantial human suffering and loss of life, billions of dollars of annual economic losses to owners of crops and other property,

and substantial financial loss to the United States Treasury;

(2) Weather modification technology has significant potential for preventing, diverting, moderating, or ameliorating the adverse effects of such disasters and hazards and enhancing crop production and the availability of water;

(3) The interstate nature of climatic and related phenomena, the severe economic hardships experienced as the result of occasional drought and other adverse meteorological conditions, and the existing role and responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to disaster relief, require appropriate Federal action to prevent or alleviate such disasters and hazards; and

(4) Weather modification programs may have long-range and unexpected effects on existing climatic patterns which are not confined by national boundaries.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is therefore declared to be the purpose of the Congress in this Act to develop a comprehensive and coordinated national weather modification policy and a national program of weather modification research and development—

(1) to determine the means by which deliberate weather modification can be used at the present time to decrease the adverse impact of weather on agriculture, economic growth, and the general public welfare, and to determine the potential for weather modification;

(2) to conduct research into those scientific areas considered most likely to lead to practical techniques for drought prevention or alleviation and other forms of deliberate weather modification;

(3) to develop practical methods and devices for weather modification;

(4) to make weather modification research findings available to interested parties;

(5) to assess the economic, social, environmental, and legal impact of an operational weather modification program; and

(6) to develop both national and international mechanisms designed to minimize conflicts which may arise with respect to the peaceful uses of weather modification.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(2) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(3) The term "weather modification" means any activity performed with the intention and expectation of producing changes in precipitation, wind, fog, lightning, and other atmospheric phenomena.

SEC. 4. STUDY.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of the state of scientific knowledge concerning weather modification, the present state of development of weather modification technology, the problems impeding effective implementation of weather modification technology, and other related matters. Such study shall include—

(1) a review and analysis of the present and past research efforts to establish practical weather modification technology, particularly as it relates to reducing loss of life and crop and property destruction;

(2) a review and analysis of research needs in weather modification to establish areas in which more research could be expected to yield the greatest return in terms of practical weather modification technology;

(3) a review and analysis of existing studies to establish the probable economic importance to the United States in terms of agricultural production, energy, and related economic factors if the present weather modification technology were to be effectively implemented;

(4) an assessment of the legal, social, and ecological implications of expanded and effective research and operational weather modification projects;

(5) recommendations concerning legislation desirable at all levels of government to implement a national weather modification policy and program;

(6) a review of the international importance and implications of weather modification activities by the United States;

(7) a review and analysis of present and past funding for weather modification from all sources to determine the sources and adequacy of funding in the light of the needs of the Nation;

(8) a review and analysis of the purpose, policy, methods, and funding of the Federal departments and agencies involved in weather modification and of the existing interagency coordination of weather modification research efforts; and

(9) a review and analysis of the necessity and feasibility of negotiating an international agreement concerning the peaceful uses of weather modification.

Sec. 5. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, a final report on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study conducted pursuant to section 4. Such report shall include:

(1) a summary of the findings made with respect to each of the areas of investigation specified in section 4;

(2) other findings which are pertinent to the determination and implementation of a national policy on weather modifications;

(3) a recommended national policy on weather modification and a recommended national weather modification research and development program which is consistent with, and likely to contribute to, achieving the objectives of such policy;

(4) recommendations for levels of Federal funding sufficient to support adequately a national weather modification research and development program;

(5) recommendations for any changes in the organization and involvement of Federal departments and agencies in weather modification which may be needed to implement effectively the recommended national policy on weather modification and the recommended research and development program; and

(6) recommendations for any legislation which may be required to implement such policy and program for any international agreement which may be appropriate concerning the peaceful uses of weather modification. Each department, agency, and other instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized and directed to furnish the Secretary any information which the Secretary deems necessary to carry out his functions under this Act.

(b) OPERATION AND CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall solicit and consider the views of State agencies, private firms, institutions of higher learning, and other interested persons and governmental entities in the conduct of the study required by section 4, and in the preparation of the report required by subsection (a).

Sec. 6. AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act not to exceed $1,000,000.

CENTRAL, WESTERN, AND SOUTH PACIFIC FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2219) to amend the Central, Western, and South Pacific Fisheries Development Act to extend the appropriation authorization through fiscal year 1979, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments as follows:

On page 1, beginning in line 7, after "(2)" strike out:

by striking in section 4 "June 30, 1976," and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1976, and September 30, 1979,"

And insert in lieu thereof:

by striking in section 4 the words "June 30, 1976, a complete" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "January 30 of each year, an annual"

On page 2, beginning in line 3, strike out:

(3) by inserting in section 7 after "$3,000,000" a comma and the following: "and for the succeeding three years through fiscal year 1979, the sum of $4,000,000.".

And insert in lieu thereof:

(3) by striking section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act not to exceed $300,000 for the transitional fiscal quarter ending September 30, 1976; not to exceed $1,333,333 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977; not to exceed $1,333,333 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978; and not to exceed $1,333,333 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979. Such sums as may be appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Central, Western, and South Pacific Fisheries Development Act (86 Stat. 744; 16 U.S.C. 758a note) is amended—

(1) by striking in section 2 the words "three-year";

(2) by striking in section 4 the words "June 30, 1976, a complete" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "January 30 of each year, an annual"; and

(3) by striking section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act not to exceed $300,000 for the transitional fiscal quarter ending September 30, 1976; not to exceed $1,333,333 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977; not to exceed $1,333,333 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978; and not to exceed $1,333,333 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979. Such sums as may be appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

(Later in the day the following proceedings occurred:)

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate passed S. 2219 by unanimous consent, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 13380; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that it be considered as having been read the first and second times; that all after the enacting clause be stricken; that the text of the Senate-passed bill, S. 2219, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill then be considered as having been read the

third time and passed and the motion to reconsider laid on the table; and that the action on S. 2219 be vitiated and S. 2219 then be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FISHERIES PROGRAMS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1414) to make the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands eligible to participate in certain Federal fisheries programs, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2 of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 779) is amended by striking out the words "and Guam" in the definition of "State" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS OF BIOMEDICAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH ACT OF 1976

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2515) to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the President's Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects Involved in Biomedical and Behavioral Research, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "President's Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research Act of 1976".

AMENDMENT TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 2. Title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting the following new part at the end thereof:

"PART J—PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

"ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

"SEC. 477. (a) There is established a Commission to be known as the President's Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Commission'). The Commission shall be composed of eleven members appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall select members of the Commission from individuals distinguished in the fields of medicine, law, ethics, theology, the biological, physical, behavioral and social sciences, philosophy, humanities, health administration, government, and public affairs; but five (and not more than five) of the members of the Commission shall be individuals who are or who have been engaged in biomedical or behavioral research involving human subjects. All members shall, prior to appointment, have received all security clearances from the appropriate departments or agencies. Until such time as the President acts to appoint members of the Commission, those members of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavorial Research, who are serving upon the date of enactment of this Act, are deemed members of the Commission: *Provided*, That no classified information be made available through a request of the Commission until appropriate security clearances be obtained by such members.

"(b) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be four years; except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; (2) the terms of office of members first taking office shall begin on the date of appointment and shall expire, as designated at the time of their appointment, four at the end of one year, four at the end of two years, and three at the end of four years; and (3) a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

"(c) The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman, and one as Vice Chairman. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

"(d) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or full-time officers or employees of the United States shall serve without additional compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. All other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Commission, but not exceeding for any day (including traveltime) the daily equivalent of the effective rate for GS–18 of the General Schedule while engaged in the actual performance of the duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of such duties.

"(e) The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or at the call of a majority of the members thereof.

"(f) Representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Science Adviser to the President, and the Veterans' Administration shall serve as nonvoting, ex officio advisers to the Commission.

"(g)(1) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

"(2) The Commission may procure, in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants. Persons so employed shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Commission, but not exceeding for any day (including traveltime) the daily equivalent of the effective rate for Grade GS–18 of the General Schedule. While away from his home or regular place of business in the performance of services for the Commission, any such person may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(h) The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency information necessary to enable it to carry out its duties. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, each department or agency shall furnish all information requested by the Commission which is necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties. For purposes of this part, the term "information" includes any information which is deemed to be classified for any purpose (including national security) by such agency or department.

"COMMISSION DUTIES

"SEC. 478. (a) The Commission shall carry out the following:

"(1)(A) The Commission shall (i) conduct a comprehensive investigation and study to identify the basic ethical principles which should underlie the conduct of biomedical and behavioral research involving human subjects, (ii) develop guidelines which should be followed in such research to assure that it is conducted in accordance with such principles, and (iii) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the appropriate agency or department for such administrative action as may be appropriate to apply such guidelines to biomedical and behavioral research conducted or supported under programs administered by the appropriate agency or department, and concerning any other matter pertaining to the protection of human subjects of biomedical and behavioral research.

"(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider at least the following:

"(i) The boundaries between biomedical or behavioral research involving human subjects and the accepted and routine practice of medicine.

"(ii) The role of assessment of risk-benefit criteria in the determination of the appropriateness of research involving human subjects.

"(iii) Appropriate guidelines for the selection of human subjects for participation in biomedical and behavioral research.

"(iv) The nature and definition of informed consent in various research settings.

"(v) Mechanisms for evaluating and monitoring the performance of Institutional Review Boards established in accordance with section 474 of this Act and appropriate enforcement mechanisms for carrying out their decisions.

"(C) The Commission shall consider the appropriateness of applying the principles and guidelines identified and developed under subparagraph (A) to the delivery of health services to patients under programs conducted or supported by any department or agency.

"(D) The Commission shall continually review and suggest the ethical, social, and legal implications of all biomedical and behavioral research on human subjects conducted by and through any department or agency, and shall make appropriate recommendations for the protection of human subjects of biomedical and behavioral research to such department or agency.

"(2) The Commission shall identify the requirements for informed consent to participation in biomedical and behavioral research by children, prisoners, military personnel and the institutionalized mentally infirm. The Commission shall investigate and study biomedical and behavioral research conducted or supported under programs of any department or agency and involving children, prisoners, military personnel, and the institutionalized mentally infirm to determine the nature of the consent obtained from such persons or their legal representatives before such persons were involved in such research; the adequacy of the information given them respecting the nature and purpose of the research, procedures to be used, risks and discomforts, anticipated benefits from the research, and other matters necessary for informed consent; and the competence and the freedom of the persons to make a choice for or against involvement in such research. On the basis of such investigation and study, the Commission shall make such recommendations to any department or agency as it determines appropriate to assure that biomedical and behavorial research conducted by or supported under the appropriate department or agency meets the requirements respecting informed consent identified by the Commission. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'chil-

dren' means individuals who have not attained the legal age of consent to participate in research as determined under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research is to be conducted; the term 'prisoners' means individuals involuntarily confined in correctional institutions or facilities as defined in section 601 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (43 U.S.C. 3781); and the term 'institutionalized mentally infirm' includes individuals who are mentally ill, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, psychotic, or senile, or who have other impairments of a similar nature and who reside as patients in an institution; the term 'military personnel' means individuals who are active and inactive members of the United States Armed Forces and employees and agents of the Central Intelligence Agency.

"(3) The Commission shall conduct an investigation and study of past, present and projected research in the modification of any living organism or virus by the insertion of recombinant DNA molecules. The Commission shall consider the ethical, social, and legal implications of such research, and evaluate the potential hazards posed by such research both to research personnel, the human subjects of such research, and to the public at large. The Commission shall, if appropriate, develop guidelines on how such research should be carried out in order to protect human health.

"SPECIAL STUDY

"SEC. 479. The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study of the ethical, social, and legal implications of advances in biomedical and behavioral research and technology. Such study shall include—

"(a) an analysis and evaluation of scientific and technological advances in past, present, and projected biomedical and behavioral research and services;

"(b) an analysis and evaluation of the implications of such advances, both for individuals and for society;

"(c) an analysis and evaluation of laws and moral and ethical principles governing the use of technology in medical practice;

"(d) an analysis and evaluation of public understanding of and attitudes toward such implications and laws and principles; and

"(e) an analysis and evaluation of implications for public policy of such findings as are made by the Commission with respect to advances in biomedical and behavioral research and technology and public attitudes toward such advances.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 480. (a) The Commission may for the purpose of carrying out its duties hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission deems advisable.

"(b) Within sixty days of the receipt of any recommendation made by the Commission under this part, the appropriate department or agency shall publish it in the Federal Register and provide opportunity for interested persons to submit written data, views, and arguments with respect to such recommendation. The appropriate department or agency shall (1) determine whether the administrative action proposed by such recommendation is appropriate to assure the protection of human subjects of biomedical and behavioral research conducted or supported under programs administered by it, and (2) if it determines that such action is not so appropriate, publish in the Federal Register such determination together with an adequate statement of the reasons for its determination. If the appropriate department or agency determines that administrative action recommended by the Commission should be undertaken by it, it shall undertake such action as expeditiously as is feasible.

"(c) For purposes of sections 477, 478, and 480 of this Act, the term 'department or agency' means any department, agency, instrumentality, grantee, or contractor of the Federal Government.

"AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT

"SEC. 481. The Commission may contract for the study and design of mechanisms to be included in such recommendations.

"AUTHORITY TO PUBLISH

"SEC. 481. The Commission may contract authority to publish reports and other material which it deems necessary.

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 483. The functions, powers, and duties of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research and those of the National Advisory Council for the Protection of Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research (88 Stat. 348-354) are transferred (except those duties regarding studies required under section 202 of the National Research Act which have been completed and published) to the Commission.".

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 3. (a) Part A of title II of the National Research Act (42 U.S.C. 2891) is repealed.

(b) Section 211 and 213 of the National Research Act are repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN STATISTICS FOR AMERICANS OF SPANISH ORIGIN

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 92) relating to the publication of economic and social statistics for Americans of Spanish origin or descent was announced as next in order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, many of our allocation decisions are closely tied to official census, unemployment and other statistics that are collected, analyzed and published by Federal agencies. We also rely on official statistics to measure changes in our society and progress made toward national goals.

If Government efforts are to be timely and effective, we cannot base program decisions on data that is sluggish in its inaccurateness. Such is the case with Government data on economic and social statistics relating to Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

House Joint Resolution 92 relating to the publication of economic and social statistics for Americans of Spanish origin or descent, has passed the House of Representatives October 29, 1975, with an amendment to the preamble and has received a "do pass" recommendation from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. As amended, this joint resolution is almost identical with Senate Joint Resolution 115 which I introduced on July 9, 1975, with Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BROCK, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. STONE, and Mr. WILLIAMS as cosponsors.

The only change was in the preamble which originally stated that there was not a "regular, nationwide evaluation" to "determine accurately the urgent and special needs of the Spanish origin or descent in the United States." General Counsel of the Department of Commerce pointed out the fact that the Census Bureau currently "provides regular statistical reports on the social and economic characteristics of the population of Spanish origin for the Nation as a whole." The Department of Commerce agrees, however, that there is a need for "improved evaluation of the economic and social status of Americans of Spanish origin or descent." With the modified preamble, the Department now fully supports our call for "accurate determination of the urgent and special needs" of these heretofore undercounted Americans on a par with that available for the general population of the United States.

Enactment of House Joint Resolution 92 will require a one-time expenditure of about $650,000, and requires the following action relating to Americans of Spanish origin or descent:

(1) Improved unemployment data;

(2) Improved indicators of social, health and economic condition;

(3) A government-wide program for the collection, analysis and publication of data;

(4) Creditable estimates of undercounts in future censuses;

(5) The use of Spanish language questionnaires, bilingual enumerators and other appropriate methods; and

(6) An affirmative action program within the Bureau of the Census for the employment of personnel of Spanish origin or descent and a report of progress in such program.

Passage of this joint resolution will lead to a coordinated interagency effort to improve this important data base and the closely related quality of our decisions affecting Americans of Spanish origin or descent. These Americans have contributed much to the cultural treasure of the United States and can be counted on in our national efforts to improve the quality of life here and in freedom-loving foreign countries.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 92, which is long overdue.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was amended so as to read:

Whereas improved evaluation of the economic and social status of Americans of Spanish origin or descent will assist State and Federal Governments and private organizations in the accurate determination of the urgent and special needs of Americans of Spanish origin or descent; and

S. 3476—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GEORGE W. NORRIS HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE IN NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today I am very proud to introduce a bill in honor of a great American, a man much beloved. In 1944, a poet, John Beecher, wrote this gentle verse in tribute to George W. Norris:

Hearing that he is dead
All I can think of
Is the white foam breaking
Over the spillway
And the lights in the hills

As we drive through the silent countryside at night, and see illuminated squares in distant houses, it seems that George Norris is still with us.

Who are those boys and girls
Reading by these lights?
What lessons are they studying?
—BEECHER.

Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce for myself and for my esteemed colleagues, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HUGH SCOTT, and a total of 55 cosponsors, a bill to provide for establishment of the George W. Norris Home National Historic Site at McCook, Nebr.

There is in this Senate overwhelming support for this bill to provide for national recognition of one of the most renowned Americans to have served in the Senate.

As I said, the bill has 55 cosponsors. They are:

Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HUGH SCOTT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BROCK, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DOLE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FORD, Mr. GARN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GARY HART, Mr. PHILIP A. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. YOUNG.

George W. Norris is remembered for his coauthorship of the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932, which outlawed the "yellow dog" contract which had allowed employers to force employees to sign contracts that they would not join a union, his sponsorship of the Rural Electrification Administration, his support of the United Nations preliminary organization, his authorship of the Muscle Shoals Act of 1928, his leadership in the establishment of the unicameral legislature in Nebraska during his term as U.S. Senator, and on and on.

Born on July 11, 1861, in Ohio, George Norris settled in Nebraska in 1885 at the age of 24. He served three terms as county attorney of Furnas County and as district judge from 1895 to 1902. In 1903, he was elected to Congress. After 10 years in the House, he served in the Senate from 1913 to 1943. His total service in the two Houses of Congress amounted to 39 years and 10 months. During that time, he authored many programs.

George W. Norris authored the 20th amendment to the Constitution dealing with the terms of the Presidency and the Congress, and the sessions of Congress. It is this amendment that eliminated the previously lengthy lame duck sessions of Congress.

The achievement Norris considered his proudest was his authorship of the legislation that established the Rural Electrification Administration. Because of his work for the REA, we now have vitally needed electrical energy supplied to millions of American farms.

Let Art Grimm, writing in the Rural Electric Nebraskan of March 1975 tell the story:

What Norris did in getting rural electricity started when investor-owned firms (IOU's refused to serve the farmer because profits would have been low, was vital to both Nebraska and the nation. Aside from laws enabling farmers to band together in cooperatives for their common good, the Norris-Rayburn bill bringing electricity to the land was perhaps the most important ever for development of American agriculture.

We need only one statistic: Previous to Norris action in 1936, about 7 per cent of Nebraska's farms had electrical power. Today most have.

The Norris attitude toward electricity after his experiences in Nebraska and elsewhere was that, "Electricity, being a modern necessity of the farm, ought to be provided without profit. If the element of profit is eliminated, one of the greatest of economies can be extended at once to rural electrification."

His wish came true in the rural areas. Today, nearly 1,000 rural electric districts indeed do provide electricity to a batch of out-of-state stockholders. They are cooperatives, which return funds left over to their members, or public power districts, as in Nebraska.

Another story, this one from Harold Hamil, retired vice president of Farmland Industries, illustrates Norris' compassion:

Stopping at a Custer County farm on a hot day many years ago with a friend, Norris noticed a young wife fanning flies away from the face of her baby. He became almost intemperate in expressing his disgust with a system that made electric fans available to most urban dwellers but could not find ways to bring power to rural areas so children could sleep in comfort, untroubled by flies.

As a Nebraskan, I want to pay tribute to the work of George Norris in sponsoring the Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District. He was very instrumental in getting this project approved by the Public Works Administration in the Roosevelt years. His efforts involved not only the approval of the project but obtaining the money and working out the many other details which are necessary in an undertaking of this kind. This project is known as the Tri-County District. It is an electric power district and an irrigation project also. It is operated primarily for irrigation purposes. The Tri-County supplies power wholesale and is not engaged in distribution or retailing of electricity.

It would be difficult to tabulate the economic benefits of this very important irrigation district. It has enhanced the income and the property values of farmers and townpeople alike in the counties of Gosper, Phelps, Kearney, and Adams. It has raised the standard of living. The added farm income in this area has made it possible for many young men and women to secure an education who perhaps would not have been able to do so if the income of the area was not enhanced by this project. This added income has brought about all the cultural and business benefits that come when the standard of living of people is raised. I regard George W. Norris' sponsorship of this irrigation district as one of his major achievements.

I think it is extremely fitting in this Bicentennial Year when we honor people and events that have made this country strong that we work to establish the George W. Norris home as a national historic site.

During his political career, Norris maintained his home at 706 Main Street—now Norris Avenue—in McCook, Nebr. When he left the Senate he went back to his home at McCook. There he wrote his memoirs and there he died on September 2, 1944.

He is dead
But the white foam breaks
Over the spillway
And the lights in the hills
Come on

—BEECHER.

Mr. President, I urge the favorable consideration of this bill to establish the Norris home as a national historic site.

I send the bill to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3476) to provide for the establishment of the George W. Norris Home National Historic Site in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be considered as having been read the second time at length, and the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I say this matter has been cleared with the leadership on both sides, the chairman of the committee, the ranking minority member, and all the rest.

I thank the distinguished majority leader and the Chair for their cooperation.

I thank my distinguished colleague from Nebraska for his help in regard to this bill all through the years. Part of that time he has been the principal sponsor and I have been a cosponsor. Then today it happens that it is my bill and he is a cosponsor. But I am very happy to yield to him such time as he desires.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I am pleased to express my support for S. 3476, a bill sponsored by my colleague from Nebraska, Senator CURTIS, and by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), to establish the George W. Norris Home National Historic Site. I have long sought proper recognition and standing for it. I am a cosponsor of the pending measure.

This bill would allow the National Park Service to assume responsibility for the home of this distinguished Senator from Nebraska, which is located in McCook.

Senator Norris represented my home State in this body for 30 years, and in the other body of Congress for 10 years. During that time he gained the respect and admiration of his colleagues and people all across our great country. His contributions to the Nation were many.

He was the father of the Rural Electrification Administration, which brought much-needed electrical energy to rural America at a reasonable price. Senator Norris was the driving force behind the establishment of Nebraska's unique Unicameral Legislature, which stands today as a model for the Nation in efficient, representative, and clean government.

Although born in Ohio, George Norris settled in Nebraska in 1885 and quickly became part of our young State's struggle for maturity. He was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1902 and to Senate in 1912. Senator Norris died in 1944 at his home in McCook.

Mr. President, it is indeed very apropriate that the Norris Home receive the recognition it so richly deserves. I have been in past years the sponsor of several bills similar to this one. They were not successful. Let us hope that this bill will be approved by both bodies of the Congress and become law so the Norris Home will stand as a national landmark to the life and career of George Norris.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues and others interested in the accomplishments of Senator Norris might know more about him, I ask unanimous consent that an article authored by Carol Schliesser, entitled, "Prestige on the Line: The Lonely Liberal from McCook," published in 1970 by the school of journalism at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESTIGE ON THE LINE: THE LONELY LIBERAL FROM MCCOOK

(By Carol Schliesser)

"If I offered the Lord's Prayer as an amendment, they would fight it."

The speaker: George William Norris. The place: McCook, Nebraska, his home town. The time: November 5, 1934. The words represented a moment of discouragement in the life of a man for whom lonely political battles had been not the exception but the rule.

These weary words spoken in 1934 came at the end of another battle. They were spoken on election eve when Nebraskans were pondering the fate of the proposed unicameral legislature amendment, Norris's final plea was recorded by the McCook Gazette:

"In a voice shaking with emotion, Senator George William Norris told approximately a thousand southwestern Nebraska voters that he would rather death close his eyes before a check is made of today's ballots if the vote brings defeat to his proposal to install a Unicameral Legislature in Nebraska."

The next day the voters fulfilled a dream of George Norris. He had written the amendment advocating this type of state government and he had been a factor—perhaps the prime factor—in convincing the people that it would bring better government than the old bicameral system.

It is hard to pinpoint when Norris first became interested in a unicameral legislature. He rarely gave dates in his autobiography, Fighting Liberal, but said that he first became interested while living in Furnas County, which would put the date sometime between 1885 and 1900. He said, "I was anxious that the State of Nebraska abolish its illogical clumsy two-house legislature and substitute the unicameral plan for it."

The earliest record of Norris's interest in a one-house legislature is an article he wrote for the New York Times, January 28, 1923, in which he likened state government to a business:

"The governor is the president of the corporation, the legislature is the board of directors, and the people are the stockholders. The stockholders have a right to know what their board of directors does and how it is done. They have a right to be able by the record of the votes, to know whether the members of the board of directors have properly represented the stockholders."

His article urged that the house be small and well paid, with few enough members to be carefully watched by the public. He did little else about the unicameral legislature until 1934.

AN OLD DREAM

The unicameral legislature was no sudden fantasy on his part. For years he had studied the idea of providing a unicameral legislature by amendment to the constitution. He had been asked to run for both the House and the Senate in the state legislature, he wrote in his autobiography, but could not afford to live on the low pay ($300 a term).

But, he did not invent the idea of a unicameral legislature. John Norton probably was Nebraska's first vigorous advocate. And much earlier other states—Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Georgia—had created one-house legislatures during the Revolution but, Georgia and Pennsylvania had abandoned the one-house system in 1789 and 1790. Vermont followed suit in 1836—a century before Nebraska embarked upon the "great experiment."

Norris traced the adoption of the bicameral assembly back to the early struggles between the English classes and hailed the ascendency of the people's branch and the decline of the House of Lords in the English Parliament.

"Assuming two such classes exist and that their interests conflict," he said, "there is some reason for a two-house legislature, but in this country we have no such classes and the constitutions of our various states are built upon the idea that there is but one class. If this be true, there is no sense or reason in having the same thing done twice, especially if it is to be done by two bodies of men elected in the same way and having the same jurisdiction."

For years Norris had watched the machinations of the two-house system of legislation, both in the state and federal government. He learned from the inside the vast powers held by the conference committee—a group of three senators and three representatives who met in secret to decide the fate of bills already passed by both houses. He saw these conferees modify and even thwart legislation which had been approved by a majority of their colleagues.

In this system, lobbyists did not have to control both houses, Norris pointed out, but merely two members of the conference committee from either chamber.

It is not certain just what induced Norris to pick 1934 for the year to stump the state for the unicameral legislature, but he said that he had promised friends to help in the movement in 1934. In his biography of Norris, Alfred Lief wrote that the people urged Norris, "by mail and in person, to lead the way."

With Professor John P. Senning of the University of Nebraska, Norris worked out an amendment embodying his plan. It provided for a single legislature of from 30 to 50 members. To Norris the most cherished part of the amendment was the sentence that read:

"Each member shall be nominated and elected in a nonpartisan manner and without any indication on the ballot that he is affiliated with or endorsed by any political party or organization."

His proposal to eliminate partisanship in state government gained for this amendment the opposition of both Nebraska political parties.

John Senning wrote that Norris "felt the time was ripe to give the people an opportunity to free themselves of a bicameral legislature if they so desired." Senning gave credit to Norris not for his speaking, but for his leadership and for choosing "the strategic moment in which to present the question to the people."

On December 21, 1933, Senator Norris drafted the original amendment. After preliminary discussions, a public meeting was arranged for February 22, 1934, in the auditorium of the Cornhusker Hotel in Lincoln. Norris traveled from Washington to address the meeting, "at which, to my surprise, eight hundred men and women from all parts of the state, were present," he said.

This was to be the beginning of a long and strenuous campaign by Senator Norris. "I never made a more complete campaign in Nebraska, or in any other political contest in which I became engaged. I traveled every section of the state, nearly wearing out my automobile," he said.

"The Senator and his son-in-law, John Robertson, started out in a car and wore out two sets of tires and two windshields, and hit every nook and cranny in Nebraska," Mrs. Norris, the Senator's widow, recalled at her McCook home in 1961.

REACHING THE PEOPLE

"At first he was discouraged," she continued, "but when he got out among the people, they were for it. The mail was preponderantly for it." Mrs. Norris told of the Senator's discouragement when the meetings for the unicameral legislature got almost no publicity because all the state papers, except the Hastings Daily Tribune and the Lincoln Star, were against it. If the publicity was good, many people came to hear the Senator speak, but if the publicity was poor, few turned out, his wife said. "When they put up handbills to announce the meetings, sometimes the opposition tore them down," she explained.

It is estimated that Norris delivered over 40 speeches between October 8 and November 5, 1934, in all parts of the state. He was heard in person by 20,000 to 30,000 persons. Many more thousands of persons heard the Senator over the radio. He spoke in all kinds of halls; to men, women, farmers and ranchers, businessmen and laborers. He spoke under the auspices of various farm organizations, women's clubs, commercial clubs, church groups, service clubs, and the Democratic party, although he was nominally a Republican. He had the support of labor, farm groups, and an organization including at least four ex-governors and other influential Nebraskans, wrote Phillip Knox Tompkins in his master's thesis on "George Norris's Persuasion for the Unicameral Legislature."

The Senator's speeches usually contained arguments dealing with the evils of a bicameral system and extolling the virtues of a unicameral system. These would be followed by his "last and best fight," a personal appeal directly to those who had supported him for 30 years, Tompkins said.

Norris often put humor into his speeches. The Falls City Journal reported: "Senator Norris was full of the pointed quips which have made him famous. 'Checks and balances,' he chortled. 'After the legislative session comes to an end and we balance the books, we generally find that the politicians get the checks and the special interests get the balance.' "

"During the campaign someone spread the rumor that the Negroes in Omaha would lose their representation if the unicameral legislature were approved," Mrs. Norris said. "He was slow to anger, but he was perfectly furious over that. He had to laugh when he saw how it turned out. The only Negro representative to the Unicameral Legislature was elected from that Omaha district."

Denying charges that he had ulterior motives in advocating a unicameral legislature, Norris told a large audience in O'Neill, "I haven't many more years to live. Why should I deceive you now?"

The date of the first session of the Unicameral Legislature, January 3, 1937, was also the date for the opening at Washington of the first Congressional session under the new Lame Duck Amendment, which Senator Norris had helped to initiate. However, he chose to be present in Lincoln where he sat on the rostrum as guest of honor when the Unicameral Legislature opened. Another of his plans had become a reality. "I have always been called the worst demagogue who ever walked down the pike," he grinned, "until the things I wanted began to work."

As he walked into the chamber, a thunderous burst of applause greeted him.

"I congratulate you," he told the first session of Nebraska's Unicameral Legislature.

"Every professional lobbyist, every professional politician, and every representative of greed and monopoly is hoping and praying that your work will be a failure."

After giving the Unicameral Legislature this send-off, he devoted all his time to work in Washington, leaving the Unicameral Legislature to work under the ideals he had set up for it.

IMAGE OF NORRIS

The Unicameral Legislature did more than fulfill one of George William Norris's dreams. With its nonpartisan provision, it was his whole way of life.

Yet, when he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1902, Mrs. Norris said, 'there was never a more standpat Republican. Norris was born in poverty in Ohio July 11, 1861. He was first elected prosecuting attorney and later district judge in McCook, Nebraska. Before that he had taught school in the rough, unsettled Washington Territory.

In his youthful enthusiasm, the newly elected member of the 58th Congress "thought the Republican party was perfect," Norris wrote in Fighting Liberal. When he saw party members voting along party lines regardless of the issue involved, he wrote later, he was disappointed and began his life of nonpartisanship and liberalism. In explanation he said, "I cannot be anything but himself." Because of his liberalism, he was not held in favorable regard by some of his fellow Republicans.

"His eternally youthful vision, his courage and his honesty, gave strength and faith to millions of his countrymen," said James E. Lawrence, former editor of the Lincoln Star.

Norris's Congressional record, which covered 40 years in the House and Senate, is one of struggle for what he believed in. He was the author of and led the fight for the 20th Amendment to the Federal Constitution. In 1910 he waged a historic fight to end the dictatorial authority of the speaker of the House over committee appointments. This battle with "Uncle Joe" Cannon required political courage and parliamentary ability of a high degree, said Richard Neuberger in his book about Norris. Integrity: The Life of George W. Norris. Under Norris's leadership the House passed progressive legislation after the change in power.

During four decades on Capitol Hill, George Norris knew many presidents. But a president he did not know—John F. Kennedy—later described the Nebraskan on the day in 1910 when he fired the opening shot in the battle with Joe Cannon. In his book Profiles In Courage, Kennedy envisioned Norris as "a somewhat shaggy looking Representative in a plain black suit and a little shoestring tie."

Norris's successes have been attributed by Time magazine to the fact that through the years, his cocked eyebrows never grew weary while he watchfully waited for an opportunity to come his way. In 1932 he won Congressional approval of the 20th Amendment. He then secured passage of the Norris-La Guardia Bill restricting the powers of courts to grant injunctions in labor cases and forbidding them to entertain suits based on labor contracts that forbid workers to join unions. This was followed by the Tennessee Valley Authority to ensure governmental operation of Muscle Shoals. "At this time many people said that Tennessee had three senators and that Nebraska had only one," said Alex Gochis, resident of McCook and friend of Norris.

Many people feel that his greatest achievement was the Rural Electrification Administration. "It was an electrical revolution," said Judge Victor Westermark of McCook.

PROUDEST OF REA

Carl Marsh, McCook realtor and close friend of the Senator, once asked Norris what was the most important of his accomplishments. Norris replied that he wanted to be remembered for the REA because it relieved the farm woman of the slavery of farm work.

"If I were a citizen of Nebraska, regardless of what party I belonged to, I would not allow George Norris to retire from the U.S. Senate," said Franklin D. Roosevelt. Norris was one of the few men in public life for whom F.D.R. had an almost reverential respect.

"No one doubts George Norris's 100 per cent integrity," said a Time magazine article on January 11, 1937. "Frankness is almost a fetish with him. His other engaging traits include a mild manner, great personal modesty, a disarming habit of coupling every declaration with the frank admission that 'maybe I am wrong,' or 'it seems to me,' and a 15-year-old spirit of disillusionment about the possibility of getting anything liberal done for the benefit of mankind. However, he tried to get the last word in every Senatorial debate and found it hard to believe that his opponents' motives were honest."

RATED TOPS

In a 1939 poll of senators by Washington correspondents, Norris rated tops for integrity, intelligence, industry, and influence. The question visitors asked as they looked down upon the Senate floor was, "Which one is Norris?"

The mainspring of his career took the form of insurgency and liberalism, but it took other forms as well and at bottom it appeared to be an emotional objection to doing anything that was expected of him. He was one of six men who voted against the declaration of World War I. "I feel we are committing a sin against humanity and against our countrymen. I wish we might delay our action until reason could again be enthroned in the minds of men. I feel we are about to put a dollar mark upon the American flag," he said.

His vote against entry into World War I was not his first unpopular stand in those troubled times before American soldiers were first sent out of the Western hemisphere. On March 2, 1917, he led a successful but unpopular filibuster that delayed passage of the Armed Ships Bill designed to arm our merchant ships against German submarine attack.

President Kennedy's book described Norris's return to Lincoln to face an audience after that widely denounced filibuster:

"Calm, but trembling, he walked out on the stage before them and stood for a moment without speaking. A solitary figure in a baggy black suit and a little shoestring tie. . . .

"In his homely, quiet, and yet intense manner, Senator Norris began with the simple phrase:

"'I have come home to tell you the truth. . . .'"

However, in 1941 he voted for President Roosevelt's request to arm all American merchant ships because, he said, of the changing national scene and Hitler's determination to dominate the world.

In 1957 he was on a list being considered by a Senate committee that was selecting the five outstanding senators in history. But, he was not one of those chosen. "Like other prophets and dreamers, he is without honor among some of his own people," said Thomas L. Stokes, United Features Syndicate columnist.

IMAGE LIVES ON

"George Norris ought to be among the five great senators," Stokes said. "But it really won't matter much if his picture doesn't hang in the Senate. It surely wouldn't matter to him. He was a simple and unaffected person to whom such things mattered so little. His image is in the minds and hearts of people all over the world."

An Omaha World-Herald editorial in 1941 said that possibly the real value of Norris had been largely in his independence and imagination and his capacity to follow through. After his death September 2, 1944, Time magazine said that his radicalism had consisted mainly of his persistent belief that the United States could somehow be made into a better place for the plain man to live. Time also said it was his baggy old-fashioned suit, topped by a limp string of a bow tie, and his droopy eyelids under bushy brows that made him look perpetually tired.

And perhaps he was a little tired, for he sometimes worked 16 to 18 hours a day handling correspondence, reading, researching, and preparing for his legislative work. He would not discuss public issues on which he did not feel himself properly prepared.

"He was a studious senator," said his widow. "He always had a room of his own," she said. "The study belonged to Father. When he closed the door, no one went in, but when the door was open, the family enjoyed many pleasant times with him in that study."

"Their social life wasn't too much," said Miss Frances Egan of McCook, who served as Senator Norris's secretary in Washington for 10 years. "His diversion was his family," said Mrs. Norris, "and he was happier when he was home, and was devoted to his family."

Mrs. Norris said the Senator "gave his whole life to his work." He liked to row for enjoyment, but not to hunt. She recalled that as a young man he had been shot in the face while hunting and it was feared for a while that he might lose an eye. "George William knew who had shot him for he saw the man take aim, but the man himself did not know what he had done," she said. "George William never told who fired the shot. I asked and he said, 'I have never told.' I never asked aagin."

"I thought that was very noble of George," she added fondly, her dark eyes sparkling.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am delighted to join in sponsoring legislation to establish the George W. Norris homestead in McCook, Nebr., as a historic site.

This measure had 54 cosponsors in the Senate, in addition to Senator CURTIS and myself, and it is entirely fitting and appropriate that the Department of the Interior establish his home as a tribute to this great American.

The leadership and the record of this great American are well established. The legislation most closely associated with Senator Norris include bills such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Act, and the Norris-La Guardia Act.

The impact of these bills on the lives of rural Americans and working people is almost impossible to measure. We take these acts somewhat for granted today and tend to overlook the fight involved in their establishment.

TVA represented a major undertaking to deal with the total problems of the Tennessee River Valley. It was considered radical by many at the time. Under TVA dams and powerhouses were built, rivers cleared, forests replanted, and electricity brought into remote areas. Visitors came from all over the world to look at this experiment.

Senator Norris introduced legislation, along with Sam Rayburn on the House side, to put the REA on a solid basis and bring electricity to rural America. This bill was strongly opposed by the power companies, but it has been one of this Nation's most successful programs.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 was a major step forward in sustaining unions and union activities in the face of strong opposition.

But beyond specific legislative accomplishments, Senator Norris stands out as a strong and principled leader most interested in pursuing a course which he considered right rather than taking the most acceptable position.

History, deservedly, has treated George Norris well because of his strong rock-like character and his dedication to reform. He worked closely with President Roosevelt on numerous New Deal bills and was referred to by Roosevelt as the "Gentle Knight of Progressive Ideals."

In "Profiles in Courage," John Kennedy suggested:

George Norris met with both success and failure in his long tenure in public office, stretching over nearly a half a century of American political life. But the essence of the man and his career was caught in a tribute paid to the Republican Senator from Nebraska by the Democratic Presidential nominee in September, 1932:

History asks, "Did the man have integrity?
Did the man have unselfishness?
Did the man have courage?
Did the man have consistency?"

There are few statesmen in America today who so definitely and clearly measure up to an affirmative answer to those four questions as does George W. Norris.

I have visited the Norris Home in McCook, and I can think of no more fitting tribute to this great American. My respect and admiration for Senator Norris is unbounded.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude my remarks by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a poem, "White Foam Breaking," by John Beecher, written as a tribute to George W. Norris.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE FOAM BREAKING

(By John Beecher, 1944)

Hearing that he is dead
all I can think of
is the white foam breaking
over the spillway
and the lights in the hills
Who are those boys and girls reading by these lights
what lessons are they studying?
After forty years in the Congress of the United States
George Norris died simply a citizen
and in the Senate seat
which he had made more feared by the strong few
more loved by the weak many
than ever a Senate seat before
sat a small-town undertaker
destroying his work like a weevil in good wheat
Nebraska
thanks for forty years of George Norris
who nourished the spirit of all this land
as your wheat the growing bodies of our children
How you must feel today
Nebraska
we know
who have also struck down blindly
the ones who loved us
and when it was too late
repented
Nebraska your treeless earth
spreads level to the sky's edge
your golden grain upturned to the sun and the blue
it's a long, long way from here
to Tennessee's hills
the rain-blackened cabins in the coves
the thin corn clinging to the slopes
the haggard children
the white water of the rushing streams
What is Tennessee to us?
you said
We want a man who will work for Nebraska
first last and all the time
George Norris grew too big for you
Nebraska
Your great plans bred a vision
vast as themselves and as bountiful
The hills and the plains
are one earth
George Norris saw
and the people of both
one nation indivisible
Omaha Lincoln McCook and Grand Forks
the neighbor up the block
or beside the windmill whirling on the far horizon
are Nebraska you said
and when the Sheriff came to seize Jim's farm
you grabbed the pitchfork and went over

But when the people of Prague
of Warsaw Paris Athens Kharkov
wept in the streets as the hobnails rang on their cobbles
George Norris grabbed his pitchfork

Perhaps you understand him better
Nebraska
now that the neighbor up the block
or beside the windmill whirling on the far horizon
has a gold star in his parlor window

I intend to do as much as I can . . .
George Norris said
the old man of 83
with the young heart
You tried to break it Nebraska
but it was too big for you
you were in it
but it had room for all the rest of us besides

He is gone
the simple citizen who marched at the head of us
but the march goes on
gathering the people from every street
every house that we pass
from the churches and colleges
from the farms and factories
from the tall buildings of cities
from ships in the harbors
from the plains and the hills

We march toward that America
which sleeps in the seeds he planted and others before him
as sure to grow
as wheat on Nebraska plains

He is dead
but the white foam breaks
over the spillway
and the lights in the hills
come on

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve in public ownership the historically significant property associated with the life of Senator George William Norris, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, the land and interest in land, together with buildings and improvements thereon, located at or in the vicinity of, 706 Norris Avenue, McCook, Nebraska, together with such other lands and interests in lands, including scenic easements, as the Secretary shall deem necessary for the administration of the area. The Secretary shall establish the George W. Norris Home National Historic Site by publication of a notice to that effect in the Federal Register at such time as he deems sufficient lands and interests in lands have been acquired for administration in accordance with the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 2. Pending establishment and thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall administer lands and interests in lands acquired for the George W. Norris Home National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (40 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), as amended.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any remarks made in reference to George Norris follow the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), in the RECORD, and I further ask that any remarks offered on a day subsequent to this appear at that place in the permanent RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Montana is recognized for 15 minutes.

ORDER AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 11438

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make technical and clerical corrections in the engrossment of the Senate amendments to H.R. 11438, to amend title 5, United States Code, to grant court leave to Federal employees when called as witnesses in certain judicial proceedings, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2679.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2679) to establish a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

(The amendment of the House is printed in the RECORD of May 17, 1976, beginning at page 14048.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am pleased to say that the House of Representatives has approved by a decisive vote S. 2679, a bill proposing the establishment of a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The House has amended the bill in two respects: first by increasing the number of members of the commission from the 11 members proposed in the Senate bill to 15 members; second, by increasing the funding authority for the commission from $250,000 to $350,000.

I believe these minor changes by the

House are reasonable and the Senate should accept them en bloc, gives its final approval to S. 2679, and send it to the President.

Under the amended legislation, the commission would consist of the following members: six Members from the House of Representatives appointed by Preisdent of the Senate. Four Members shall be selected from the majority party and two shall be selected, after consultation with the minority leader of the House, from the minority party; six Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate. Four members shall be selected from the majority party and two shall be selected, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, from the minority party; one member from the Department of State appointed by the President of the United States; one member of the Defense Department appointed by the President of the United States; one member of the Commerce Department appointed by the President of the United States.

Some may feel that the commission underrepresents the minority party. However, I believe that the monitoring of the Helsinki Accords is a matter above any kind of partisanship—it will require hard work and constant effort and it will focus on the very real human problems of people oppressed by foreign governments. Party membership has nothing to do with carrying out that task. Furthermore, I expect that the executive branch is not going to change hands and so the balance will be redressed somewhat by the President's selections.

Among others, this legislation has been endorsed by the following groups and organizations: American Hungarian Federation; Assembly of Captive European Nations; Association of American Publishers; Association of American Ukrainian Baltic Women's Council; Czechoslovak National Council of America; Estonian American National Council; Federation of American Scientists; Freedom House; Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation; Lithuanian-American Community of the U.S.A., Inc.; Lithuanian Affairs Committee; Ltihuanian Catholic Religious Aid, Inc.; Lithuanian World Review Radio, New York; National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups; National Conference on Soviet Jewry; Polish American Congress, Inc.; the American Latvian Association in the United States, Inc.; the Joint Baltic American Committee; the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.; Ukrainian American Freedom Foundation; Ukrainian National Women's League; Union of Councils for Soviet Jews; U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs; and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

It is clear that the supporters of this bill know the anguish many families and individuals have suffered as a result of policies in the Communist States prohibiting the right of emigration, of family reunion and the free exchange of information and ideas.

The humanitarian sections of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation, signed by 35 nations in August 1975, held out the hope that as a result of a peaceful process these restrictive policies might be changed. But this hope can be realized only if we actively engage in monitoring the agreement and in calling public attention to instances where its goals are fulfilled and to instances where its promises are not backed up by appropriate action.

By our action in approving this legislation today, we will help assure millions of people in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union that the Helsinki pledges are not going to be forgotten by us and they will know that we shall continue to try to be of assistance.

I think President Ford has put it best of all: History will judge the effectiveness of the European Security Conference "not by the promises we make but by the promises we keep."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF THE MARINE PROTECTION, RESEARCH, AND SANCTUARIES ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 818, S. 3147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3147) to extend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act for 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 111 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (33 U.S.C. 1420) is amended by striking "and not to exceed $1,550,000 for the transition period (July 1, through September 30, 1976)," and inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed $1,550,000 for the transition period (July 1, through September 30, 1976), not to exceed $4,800,000 for fiscal year 1977, and not to exceed $4,800,000 for fiscal year 1978.".

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been contacted by the press and have noted several stories to the effect that "MANSFIELD Blocks Gun Control Bill for 1976." The source of this story is given as an "aide" who attended a meeting of the Joint House-Senate Democratic leadership last Wednesday morning.

The story goes on to say that—

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, citing political considerations, has notified House leaders that he will not schedule action on gun control legislation in the Senate this year, a decision that apparently dooms the measure.

May I say this is untrue. No such statement was made. The question was raised and my reply was, first, that there was no such legislation on the Senate calendar, that it was highly doubtful if any gun control legislation would be reported out of the Judiciary Committee, and that even if it were, it would have to be considered by the Democratic Policy Committee before any action could be taken on the floor.

As far as the allegation that I told the House leadership that I "would refuse to bring up the legislation in the Senate, irrespective of any action by the House," that statement is totally false. What the House does is its business; what the Senate does is the Senate's business; and we have detailed procedures by means of which any bill reported out by any committee is given the same consideration by the Policy Committee as any other bill.

I am also supposed to have said that—

The measure is too controversial to tackle this late in an election year.

I do not recall making any statement of that kind. As far as a measure of this kind being controversial, it would be controversial at any time, in any year, and under any circumstances.

The article goes on to say that—

As leader of the majority party in the Senate, MANSFIELD, . . . controls the legislative calendar in the chamber. Thus, he apparently would be able to block consideration of the gun control measure.

That is inaccurate.

I assure the Senate and the press and the people that, if any bill of any nature, including gun control legislation, is reported out by any committee, it will receive the same consideration as any other proposal and that, as far as I am concerned, it will not be blocked. May I say, incidentally, that I have never personally blocked any legislation in my 16 years as majority leader, and I do not intend to start now.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

EXTENSION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be extended for a period not to exceed beyond the hour of 11:45 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 11:30 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 11:30 a.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate at 10:15 a.m., recessed until 11:30 a.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLEN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McCLURE ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Mr. McCLURE be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Roddy, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3399) to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land in Cambridge, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to, without amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 100) expressing appreciation to professional societies for their congressional science and engineering fellowship programs.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12453) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12527) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to increase the authorization of appropriations for fiscal years 1976 and 1977, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 635) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of S. 2498.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 5272) to amend the Noise Control Act of 1972 to authorize additional appropriations.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS).

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Bilingual Education: An Unmet Need" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED ALTERATIONS BY THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator of General Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a prospectus for alterations at the Washington, D.C., Auditors Building, and a prospectus for alterations at the New York, New York, Federal Building (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD (for Mr. CANNON), from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 107. A concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the following committee prints of the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations (Rept. No. 94-911).

S. Con. Res. 114. A concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Subcommittee on Children and Youth committee print titled "Background Materials Concerning Child and Family Services Act, 1975 (S. 626)" (Rept. No. 94-912).

S. Res. 447. A resolution authorizing the printing of the report entitled "Railroad Consolidation and Relocation in Urban Areas" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 94-913).

H. Con. Res. 305. A concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Court Proceedings and Actions of Vital Interest to the Congress, Final Report for the 93d Congress, December 1974" (Rept. No. 94-914).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

William L. Springer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Election Commission.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HUGH SCOTT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BROCK, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DOLE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FORD, Mr. GARN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GARY HART, Mr. PHILIP A. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TUNNEY and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3476. A bill to provide for the establishment of the George W. Norris Home National Historic Site in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes. Considered and passed.

By Mr. ALLEN:

S. 3477. A bill for the relief of Jeanette Green, as Mother of the minor child, Ricky Baker, deceased, and as widow and administratrix of the estate of Enoch Odell Baker, deceased; and for the relief of Mary Jane Baker Nolan, individually, and as widow and administratrix of the estate of John William Baker, deceased. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 3478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a common estate and gift tax credit in lieu of the present exemptions and to make other changes in the present estate and gift tax law. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 3479. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to clarify the provisions relating to the amount of social security contributions required, pursuant to State-Federal agreements entered into under section 218 of such act, by States with respect to employees who receive payments on account of sickness or accident disability. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LONG [for Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. LONG)]:

S. 3480. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Caddo Lake Dam and Reservoir. Referred to the Committee on Public Works.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 3478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a

common estate and gift tax credit in lieu of the present exemptions and to make other changes in the present estate and gift tax law. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

ESTATE AND GIFT TAX REVISION FOR FAMILY FARMS AND SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce today a bill containing additional legislative proposals on estate and gift tax relief and reform for family and small farms and businesses. I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis and the text of the bill be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Mr. NELSON. These proposals arise out of continuing studies by the Small Business Committee, together with various individual Senators who are members of the committee. They may be summarized as follows:

Common credits for estate and gift tax purposes—replacing the dual system of exemptions now in effect;

Phasing out of this credit so as to provide adequate inheritances for family farms and small businesses without giving windfall benefits to very large estates and those consisting largely of stocks and bonds and other financial assets;

Increased and graduated marital deduction—which will recognize the contribution of wives to the building of family enterprises, while reducing the benefits gradually for the most wealthy estates;

A deferral provision—which would permit young persons taking over farms or small businesses from an estate to pay only interest on the tax for 3 years (at a reduced rate) and then pay the balance and interest over a maximum remaining period of 12 years.

A more detailed description of the bill will be found in the analysis at the end of my statement.

THE PROBLEM

As this body is aware, there have been no changes in the fixed-dollar limitations of the estate and gift tax for the last 34 years. During this time, general inflation has increased almost 300 percent. However, the cost of tangible business and farm assets have soared even higher, in some cases as much as 1,000 percent, depending on the worth of the farm acreage in different parts of the country. This is causing an acute problem to farmers and businessmen wishing their children to take over the enterprises which they have nurtured throughout their lifetimes. It has also brought the country to a point of decision about whether we wish to continue farms and businesses in family and local ownership.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS EXPLORED

The Senate Small Business Committee, which I serve as chairman, has made an intensive investigation of this area since mid-1975, in an effort to identify the problems and to prepare solutions which are practical and responsible from a budgetary standpoint.

These studies resulted in the formation of the following bills for revising estate and gift tax laws in behalf of small family enterprise:

S. 2394—the Mondale-Nelson bill.

S. 2819—the Nelson-Mondale-Humphrey "Small Business Estate and Gift Tax Reform Act".

S. 3139 and S. 3140—the Nelson-Packwood bills proposing a credit mechanism as an alternative to the exemption.

We were most gratified when the President joined with the congressional advocates by making proposals on January 5 and March 5, 1976, which have undoubtedly advanced the public and congressional discussion of these important policy matters.

The Small Business Committee has continued its study, and testimony summarizing this work was rendered by myself and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL) before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 16. On May 17, I also testified at the Senate Finance Committee hearing on this subject, to update the committee's observations and suggestions. We were pleased to observe on that occasion that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) also advanced positive proposals for relief of farms and small business which are quite similar to those of the committee.

The bill being introduced today contains several of the more recent recommendations stemming from our research which we feel have several advantages over earlier bills. We feel that it would be helpful for the tax-writing committees to have them in bill form for consideration when the time comes to prepare final proposals in executive session.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee (Mr. ULLMAN) indicates that he expects the House of Representatives to act in this area this year. The Senate Finance Committee has just concluded an extra day of hearings on this subject, setting the stage for adopting the long overdue changes in this session of Congress.

CONTINUING EFFORTS

I want to emphasize that the legislative prospects for tax reform, and estate and gift tax revision in particular, are continuing to evolve almost daily. Our committee likewise wishes to continue its efforts. After the Ways and Means Committee makes its proposals public, we may, if it appears to serve a useful purpose, consolidate many of the small business proposals which appear to have the greatest merit into a final omnibus small business estate and gift tax bill. In all events, we will try to be of maximum assistance to the many Members of this body, small business and farm groups, and members of the public who are concerned with continuation of family farms and small business in this area.

We will be doing all we can to bring about the consensus in this matter envisioned by the New York Times editorial of May 10 so that meaningful estate and gift tax relief and revision legislation can be enacted during 1976.

The section-by-section analysis follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

SMALL BUSINESS AND FAMILY FARM ESTATE TAX RELIEF AMENDMENTS

The following is a brief description of each of the provisions of this bill in nontechnical terms.

Overall, the bill is intended to provide a framework for estate and gift tax relief with proportionately greater benefits of a $40,000 credit going to areas of greatest need—the surviving spouse and owners of small and modest-sized family farms and small businesses. Estates between $600,000 and $2 million and those not possessing business or farm property would receive a $25,000 credit—approximately 2½ times the level of tax-free relief provided by the present $60,000 exemption. The bill also provides for the credit to be phased down and out, so that wealthy estates above $2 million would not enjoy windfall benefits.

The bill is preliminarily estimated to involve a revenue loss of approximately $300 million less than President Ford's proposal, or about $800 million.

SEC. 1. *Title:* "Small Business and Family Farm Estate and Gift Tax Relief Amendments."

SEC. 2. *Common Credit:* There are presently two separate systems for estate and gift taxes, with separate schedules, exemptions, and conditions. The bill proposes a common credit which could be used for either gift or (to the extent unused) estate property. A single credit would simplify this area of the law and would be another step closer to integration of the two taxes. It builds upon the concepts advanced in the bill proposed by many Small Business Committee members in December (S. 2819), and opens the way to "full integration," a concept which is increasingly attractive but beyond the resources of the Small Business Committee to develop.

The objective of a common credit is to restore the option of lifetime gifts of business interests so that farms and businesses can be transferred while the older generation is present to assist in the transitional problems. The present gift tax exemption of $30,000 seriously inhibits this possibility.

Phasedown: In S. 3139, Senators PACKWOOD and NELSON proposed a special "family enterprise credit" which would provide the additional and needed relief for family farms and small business, accompanied by the idea of a rapid phasedown for the larger estates. This bill represents additional effort to refine this concept, which appears to be gaining additional support.

The graduation proposed in section 2016(c) which would be added by section 2 of this bill builds upon this concept. It attempts to target the relief for family farms and small businesses, which in the distribution and manufacturing fields can easily reach a level of $2 to $3 million in assets over an entrepreneur's 30- or 40-year career. At the $2 million dollar level, the relief of such a phased-down credit would taper off more gradually than in S. 3139, but quickly enough to avoid windfall benefits.

The benefits compared to present law are approximated by the following table:

ESTATE TAX SAVINGS OF PHASED-DOWN $40,000 CREDIT [1]

	If left to wife		If all left to children	
Net estate [2]	Present law	Nelson bill [3]	Present law	Nelson bill $40,000 (phased-down credit) [1]
$50,000	0	0	0	0
$100,000	0	0	$4,800	0
$150,000	$1,050	0	17,900	0
$200,000	4,800	0	32,700	$10,700
$300,000	17,900	0	62,700	41,700
$400,000	32,700	$700	94,500	78,700

	If left to wife		If all left to children	
Net estate [2]	Present law	Nelson bill [3]	Present law	Nelson bill $40,000 (phased-down credit) [1]
$500,000	47,700	20,700	126,500	115,700
$750,000	86,500	64,000	212,200	208,200
$1,000,000	126,500	104,700	299,700	300,700
$2,000,000	299,700	282,200	726,200	728,200
$5,000,000	998,200	968,800	2,430,400	2,468,200

[1] $40,000 credit for small businesses and family farm property stepped down pro rata $5,000 per $100,000 of taxable estate beginning between $300,000 and leveling off with a $25,000 credit between $600,000 and $2,000,000 and phasing down to 0 between $2,000,000 and $5,000,000.

[2] Gross estate less debts and funeral expenses.

[3] Marital deduction of $100,000 plus 50 percent plus $40,000 phased-down credit.

Small Business and Family Farm Property: The property eligible for the extra credit up to $600,000 is defined in section 2016(d) as a business interest in a company or firm of less than 10 members, pursuant to section 6166 of the Internal Revenue Code which has been actively managed by the decedent for 5 years prior to death and which constitutes at least 35 percent of his adjusted gross estate or 50 percent of his taxable estate.

It is intended if there is both qualified and unqualified property in the same estate, that the two types of credit will apply pro rata.

SEC. 3. *Increased and Graduated Marital Deduction:* The same principles of graduation are next applied in the area of a marital deduction, subject to further evaluation in light of possible problems with community property states.

The proposal in this bill is aimed at remedying one of the worst inequalities in the present estate tax law, the situation where a surviving wife cannot prove she has contributed "money or moneysworth" to building up the estate, and therefore faces taxes on what both marriage partners had considered partly "hers."

Originally S. 2819, suggested a formula of $240,000, plus 50 percent of the remaining assets be allowed as a marital deduction. However, the adoption of a substantially increased credit or exemption would also help the surviving wife considerably. Therefore, an allowance of $100,000 plus 50 percent, in combination with an additional exemption or credit is therefore proposed as sufficient.

Also, the marital deduction would, under this bill, be phased down to $100,000 plus 25% of the amount between $300,000 and $1,000,000, and out entirely over $1 million. This should provide a maximum of one-half million tax free to any surviving spouse, plus the additional property which would be likely to be so transferred in the case of more sizable estates, so that the survivor would be sure to have very generous means of support.

SEC 4. *Deferral:* The idea for a prolonged extension of the period for payment of the estate tax was offered by President Ford in January with a suggestion of a 25-year period. Many observers have felt that length of time would be impractical. It might ultimately involve two estates. Further, during the lifetime of the survivor, improvements might be inhibited because title to the land and property would be clouded by a lien of the Internal Revenue Service.

The approach contained in Section 4(b) of this bill is to extend the present deferral of Section 6166 to 15 years, and allow the payment of only interest for the first 3 years. The interest rate would be at the cost of money to the Federal Government plus ¼ of 1 percent, so that Treasury would not lose on such transactions. This is also the formula which has been used successfully in Section 7(b)5 of the Small Business Act.

A further provision, Section 4(a)1, would permit the owner of a business interest substantial enough to be potentially disruptive of the business if immediately liquidated—here 20%—to defer payment of the tax on the portion of such interest up to $2,000,000. Such interests would not necessarily be eligible for the business-credit benefit of the bill unless fully qualified under other sections of the bill.

The provisions of S. 2819 relating to relieving the executor of personal liability would be a desirable adjunct to this section for the purpose of making deferral under Section 6166 a practical possibility. They are therefore carried over to Section 4(c) and Section 2016(a)4 added by Section 2 of this bill.

SEC. 5. *Extension of Redemption Provision:* This carries over and updates the proposal contained in S. 2819 for extension of the Section 303 redemption period by making it conform to the deferral provision in Section 4 above and reducing the eligibility standard to 50% ownership in the case of more than one business.

SEC. 6. *Study:* Carries over the S. 2819 provision re: Treasury study of consequences of estate and gift tax limitations.

S. 3478

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business and Family Farm Estate and Gift Tax Relief Amendments".

SEC. 2. COMMON GIFT AND ESTATE TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of subchapter A of chapter 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against estate tax) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 2016 as 2017, and

(2) by inserting after section 2015 the following new section:

"SEC. 2016. CREDIT AGAINST TAX.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—

"(1) GENERAL CREDIT.—There is allowed against the tax imposed by section 2001 a credit of $25,000.

"(2) QUALIFIED ESTATE CREDIT.—If the executor of a qualified estate so elects, there is allowed against the tax imposed by section 2001 a credit of $40,000 in lieu of the credit allowed by paragraph (1).

"(b) REDUCTION OF CREDIT FOR GIFT TAX USE.—The amount of the credit allowable under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount of the credit allowable to the taxpayer under section 2521 claimed by the decedent during his lifetime.

"(c) PHASEOUT OF CREDIT FOR LARGE ESTATES.—The amount of the credit allowable under this section, after the application of subsection (b), shall be reduced—

"(1) in the case of a qualified estate with respect to which the executor elects to claim the credit determined under subsection (a)(2), by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross estate exceeds $300,000 (but such amount shall not be reduced under this paragraph below $25,000), and

"(2) in the case of any other estate, and in the case of an estate described in paragraph (1), by an amount equal to .83 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross estate exceeds $2,000,000.

"(d) DEFINITION; SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) QUALIFIED ESTATES.—An estate qualifies for the additional credit allowed by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) if 65 percent or more of the value of the adjusted gross estate is attributable to a qualified property.

"(2) QUALIFIED PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified property' means property held by a closely held business (within the meaning of section 6166(c)) which has been actively managed by the decedent or his immediate family for the 60 months preceding the date of death of the decedent. For the purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) the term 'immediate family' means the spouse of the decedent, the parent, brother, sister, child, or grandchild of the decedent, and the spouse or child of the brother, sister, child, or grandchild of the decedent, and

"(B) the term 'active management' means the principal employment of the decedent or a member or members of his immediate family, and the exercise of substantial personal control by such person or persons.

"(3) RECAPTURE OF CREDIT FOR EARLY DISPOSITION, ETC.—If the immediate family of the decedent does not own and actively manage the qualifying small business taken into account for purposes of this section for 60 months after the date of death of the decedent, the liability of the estate for tax under this chapter shall be increased by an amount equal to the excess of the amount of the additional credit allowed under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) over the amount of the credit allowed under paragraph (1) of subsection (a).

"(4) DISCHARGE OF FIDUCIARY FROM PERSONAL LIABILITY.—In the case of an estate claiming the credit provided by paragraph (2) of subsection (a), an executor may apply for and be granted discharge of personal liability under sections 2204 and 6165 for any additional tax that may arise because of paragraph (5).".

(b) USE FOR GIFT TAX PURPOSES.—Section 2521 of such Code (relating to specific exemption) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2521. CREDIT AGAINST TAX.

"There is allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for all calendar quarters of a citizen or resident a total of $25,000 for gifts of property which is not qualified property (as defined in section 2016(d)(2)) and $40,000 for gifts of qualified property (as defined in section 2016(d)(2)), but the total credit allowable under this section shall not exceed $40,000 in any event.".

(c) REPEAL OF ESTATE TAX EXEMPTION.—Section 2052 of such Code (relating to exemption) is repealed.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 11 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to section 2052.

(2) The table of sections for part II of subchapter A of chapter 11 of such Code is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2016. Credit aaginst tax.
"Sec. 2017. Recovery of taxes claimed as credit.".

(3) The heading of subchapter C of chapter 12 of such Code is amended by inserting "CREDIT AND" before "DEDUCTIONS".

(4) The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by striking out the item relating to section 2521 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2521. Credit against tax.".

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of this Act and to calendar quarters ending after such date.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN MARITAL DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2056 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—The aggregate amount of the deductions allowed under this section (computed without regard to this subsection) shall not exceed—

"(A) $100,000, plus

"(B) an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross estate exceeds $100,000 and does not exceed $300,000, plus

"(C) an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross estate exceeds $300,000.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section applies to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CHANGES IN PRESENT LAW APPLICABLE TO CLOSELY-HELD BUSINESSES, ETC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6166 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to extension permitted) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) EXTENSION PERMITTED.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—If the value of an interest in a closely held business which is included in determining the gross estate of a decedent who was (on the date of his death) a citizen or resident of the United States exceeds either—

"(A) 35 percent of the value of the gross estate of such decedent, or

"(B) 50 percent of the taxable estate of such decedent, the executor may elect to pay part or all of the tax imposed by section 2001 in two or more (but not more than 15) equal installments.

"(2) CERTAIN NONMARKETABLE ASSETS.—If there is included in the gross estate of a decedent who was (on the date of his death) a citizen or resident of the United States an interest of 20 percent or more in a closely held business, the executor may elect to pay part or all of so much of the tax imposed by section 2001 which is attributable, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to so much of such interest (of a value not in excess of $2,000,000) as consists of nonmarketable assets, in two or more (but not more than 15) equal installments.

(b) INTEREST PAYABLE ON EXTENSION.—Section 6166(g) of such Code (relating to time for payment of interest) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6621, the rate of interest payable on any such unpaid portion shall not exceed a rate determined by the Secretary or his delegate to be one-fourth of one percentage point above the average rate payable by the United States on short term securities issued during the 12-month period preceding the date on which an installment payment is due. At the election of the executor, payments of interest only may be made for the first 3 installments.".

(c) LIEN ON ASSETS OF CLOSELY HELD BUSINESS IN LIEU OF EXECUTOR'S BOND.—

(1) IMPOSITION OF LIEN.—Section 6165 of such Code (relating to bonds where time to pay tax or deficiencies has been extended) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In the event of an extension of time for payment of estate tax under section 6166, the Secretary or his delegate may, at the election of the taxpayer, impose a lien on such of the assets of the closely held business on which such extension is based as may be necessary in lieu of the bond which he may require under the preceding sentence.".

(2) DISCHARGE OF FIDUCIARY.—Section 2204 of such Code (relating to discharge fiduciary impersonal liability) is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (a) and at the end of subsection (b) the following: "For purposes of this subsection, a lien imposed under the last sentence of section 6165 shall be treated as a bond.".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to the estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. CHANGES IN PRESENT LAW APPLICABLE TO STOCK REDEMPTIONS TO PAY DEATH TAXES.

(a) INCREASE IN PERIOD WITHIN WHICH DISTRIBUTIONS IN REDEMPTION OF STOCK TO PAY DEATH TAXES MUST BE MADE.—Section 303(b)(1) of such Code (relating to period for distribution) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) PERIOD FOR DISTRIBUTION.—Subsection (a) shall apply to amounts distributed after the death of the decedent and before the end of the period within which final payment of the tax imposed by section 2001 must be made (including any extensions thereof).".

(b) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS FOR SECTION 303 STOCK REDEMPTION RULES.—Section 303(b)(2)(B) of such Code (relating to distributions and redemption of stock to pay death taxes) is amended by striking out "75 percent" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percent".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to the estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. STUDY OF DEFERRAL AND EXTENSION AND OTHER PROVISIONS.

(a) The Secretary or his delegate shall study the effect of the provisions of section 6161(a)(2) and section 6166 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to hardship estate tax and installments thereof and extensions of time for payment of estate tax where estate consists largely of interest in closely held business) and the regulations prescribed thereunder on decisions to continue a small business or closely held business, including farming business rather than to sell or liquidate such business. The study shall include, but not be limited to, a survey of how such sections and the regulations thereunder are applied in the different Internal Revenue Districts and the impact of the present sections and regulations upon the continuity of such enterprises. The Secretary or his delegate shall submit a report of his findings and conclusions to the Congress within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, together with such recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

(b) The report described in subsection (a) shall contain findings, conclusions, and such recommendations for legislation, or otherwise, as the Secretary or his delegate deems appropriate upon the general subject of the impact of estate, gift, and related tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and Regulations thereunder upon smaller business, and how these provisions should be modified to encourage the prospect of preserving the continuity of smaller, independent, and locally owned businesses and farms in order to strengthen the free enterprise system and the overall economy of the nation. In performing these studies, the Secretary or his delegate shall consult appropriately with the Small Business Administration and private organizations of smaller and independent business persons and farmers.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 3479. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to clarify the provisions relating to the amount of social security contributions required, pursuant to State-Federal agreements entered into under section 218 of such Act, by States with respect to employees who receive payments on account of sickness of accident disability. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the chief administrator of the University of New Mexico, President William E. Davis, recently brought a matter to my attention with regard to social security contributions on payments made by State and local governments to a sick or disabled employee.

The definition of wages in the Social Security Act provides certain exceptions for payments that are not remuneration for services rendered. Two of these exceptions relate to so-called sick pay. Under the law, sick pay under a plan or system is never considered wages. The application of the provision to private employment is clear and unambigious. However, with regard to employment for State and local governments there is considerable ambiguity which causes States to pay social security contributions on payments which would not be taxed if they had been made by a private employer.

In 1972, the Social Security Administration issued a ruling that:

> Sick leave payments disbursed from regular salary accounts and constituting only continuation of regular salary to employees of a State covered by a Federal-State agreement pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, held, not excluded from coverage as payments "on account of sickness" but are "wages" within the meaning of section 209 of the Social Security Act, even though paid under an established plan or system of such State.

As a result, some State and local governments and their employees are paying social security contributions when private employers, and their employees, would not be paying social security taxes under identical conditions. Other States, depending on their laws, as treated like private employers.

In justification of this action, the Social Security Administration's ruling said:

> In order for sick payments to be excluded from "wages" they must be made on account of sickness; if the same payments would have been made if the employee had not been sick, they cannot be considered made "on account of sickness." The Social Security Administration has recognized a distinction between those situations in which a public employee whose services are covered under a Federal-State social security coverage agreement is absent from work because of sickness and receives what a State considers to be payments from his employer solely on account of sickness, and those in which an employee, while absent from work because of sickness, receives his regular salary dispite sickness and absence. The distinction ordinarily is based on the legal authority of the public employer to appropriate public funds; e.g., it may have the legal authority to pay the salary and to excuse absences of sick employees, but not to make payments on account of the employees sickness.

It seems that this interpretation is not in keeping with the intent of Congress in extending social security coverage to State and local governments. Moreover, enforcement of this ruling puts the Social Security Administration in the position of interpreting the meaning and intent of State law. In fact, the ruling says:

> The legal authority for a governmental entity to make payments on account of sickness can only be established if by legislative enactment, provision is made for "sick pay" from funds appropriated especially for that purpose and separate from salary appropria-

tions. Therefore, payments made by a governmental entity to an employee on sick leave are excluded from "wages" only if there is legal authority for the employer to make payments specifically on account of sickness as distinguished from authorization to merely continue salary payments during periods of absence due to illness.

Dr. Davis maintains, and I agree, that the States should be in the same position as a private employer and social security taxes should be required only when they would be required for similar payments made by a private employer.

The legislation I have introduced today would put State and local government sick pay on an equal footing with sick pay in private employment. Under this legislation, a State would not be required to pay social security contributions on sick pay when the sick pay was paid under a plan even though it was out of a regular salary account.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Dr. Davis be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 22, 1976.

Hon. PETE DOMENICI,
U.S. Senator, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMENICI: When the Social Security system was first established, Congress provided for its applicability to employees of the States and their political subdivisions under contracts between the State and its subdivisions on the one hand and the United States on the other hand. Such contracts avoided a possible claim that imposition of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act tax on the States and their political subdivisions would not have been constitutional. In 42 U.S.C. Section 418(e) Congress directed that each contract would require payment of "amounts equivalent to the sum of the taxes" which are imposed by the FICA on private employers. In Section 418(1) Congress authorized the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare "to make the requirements imposed on States pursuant to this section the same, so far as practicable as those imposed on (private) employers pursuant to" the FICA.

The Commission of Internal Revenue interpreted the FICA's exclusion of sick pay under an appropriate plan from taxable "wages," IRC Section 3121(a)(2), to exclude "wage continuation" payments under a proper plan from the FICA tax. Despite identical language in the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. Section 409(b), the Social Security Administrator ruled in SSR 72-56 that sick pay under an appropriate wage continuation plan was includable in the "wages" of a public employee and that the public employer was required to make a Social Security contribution in respect of such sick pay, although a private employer would not have to pay the FICA tax with respect to an identical payment to a private employee.

The University of New Mexico contested the Administrator's ruling, but the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals rejected its challenge on the grounds that 42 U.S.C. Section 418(1) allowed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to discriminate against public employers in comparison to private employers under the FICA. The Tenth Circuit's opinion and the relevant statutory references are set forth in the enclosed copy of the University's Petition for Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court which was denied on January 12, 1976.

Because the issue is financially important to the University of New Mexico, I hereby request enactment of an amendment of the Social Security Act mandating that the sick pay exclusion applicable to private employers shall apply with equal force to public employers. To accomplish that purpose, overruling SSR 72-56, I suggest the addition of the following sentence to 42 U.S.C. Section 418(1):

"In particular, the Secretary shall not discriminate against the States or their political subdivisions by requiring contributions in respect of sick pay meeting the requirements of Section 409(b), where a private employer would not be liable for tax in respect of sick pay meeting the requirements of Section 3121(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code."

Mr. William C. Schaab, of Rodey, Dickason, Sloan, Akin & Robb, P.A., will be happy to work with your staff assistants in preparing a proposed amendments for delivery to Senator Russell Long, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM E. DAVIS,
President.

By Mr. LONG (for Mr. JOHNSTON) for himself and Mr. LONG):

S. 3480. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Caddo Lake Dam and Reservoir. Referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I join with Senator JOHNSTON in cosponsoring this measure designed to provide for Federal assumption of the operation and maintenance of Caddo Dam and Reservoir in northwest Louisiana.

Federal maintenance was provided for when the Caddo Dam was originally authorized in 1910 as a feature of the Federal navigation project "Cypress Bayou and the Waterway from Jefferson, Tex. to Shreveport, La."

It was only when the dam was in danger of failure and had to be replaced in the 1960's that the Caddo Levee Board agreed to assume this responsibility, with the understanding that the Federal Government would resume the operation and maintenance costs at a future date.

Mr. President, the prime purpose for Caddo Dam was for navigation, and the dam has provided many benefits to Texas as well as Louisiana. Yet the State of Texas has never contributed to the maintenance of this project, while the Caddo Levee Board in Louisiana has borne this financial burden every year since the replacement dam was constructed.

Moreover, the Federal Government is already scheduled to assume the responsibility for Caddo Dam as part of the Red River Waterway project at some point in the future.

In the meantime, the Caddo Levee Board does not have the financial resources necessary to continue to provide the yearly costs of maintaining this interstate project, and we are seeking some relief in this regard.

In view of all of these facts, I ask that the Federal Government accept the cost of maintaining this project, and I strongly urge that this measure be included in the omnibus public works authorization bill soon scheduled for consideration by the Senate Public Works Committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, recently I met, along with my distinguished colleagues Senator RUSSELL LONG and Representative JOE WAGGONNER, with representatives of the Caddo Levee Board and the Louisiana Department of Public Works. We discussed amending the report on Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana as published in Senate Docket 39, 89th Congress and other pertinent reports to provide for Federal assumption of ownership and operation and maintenance of the Caddo Dam so that the Caddo Levee Board would be relieved of this responsibility. I am offering at this time an amendment to the report on Caddo Dam and Reservoir Louisiana.

Caddo Dam was authorized in 1910 and completed in 1914 as a feature of the Federal navigation project "Cypress Bayou and the Waterway from Jefferson, Tex. to Shreveport, La." The dam was authorized to prevent the loss of Caddo Lake, then threatened by erosion in the outlet channel after removal of the rafts in Red River and Twelve Mile Bayou, and to insure that navigable depths would continue to be available for the waterway traffic between Mooringsport, La. and Jefferson, Tex.

A study to determine the advisability of replacing Caddo Dam was authorized by a resolution adopted January 2, 1962 by the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate. The study determined that the existing dam was in very poor condition, that a large hole had been scoured downstream of the riprap below the spillway section, that 600 feet of the spillway crest was moving downstream and failure of the dam was eminent. Substantial leakage was occurring through the dam. The dam at that time was almost 60 years old and the possibility of complete failure would result in the loss of Caddo Lake, the loss of navigation and many other existing features.

The new dam was initiated in 1968 and completed in 1971. Prior to construction, it was necessary that some local interest provide assurances for all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and maintenance of replacement dam, to provide adequate public access and recreation development, and to accept and assume ownership and all responsibility for subsequent operation and maintenace of the replacement of the Caddo Dam, La. Efforts were unsuccessful in obtaining the proper State or Federal agencies to assume the responsibility of maintenance and operation of this replacement dam. In order to initiate the construction of this badly needed and endangered Caddo Dam, the Caddo Levee District assumed these responsibilities with the understanding that the Federal Government would resume the responsibility for maintenance and operation of Caddo Dam at a future date.

Up until this time, Caddo Dam had always been a responsibility of the Federal Government—U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers—for the maintenance and operation of the dam. As shown in the study reported by the Corps of Engineers, there were still in 1969 annual benefits from navigation in the amount of $102,000. Even though the other benefits included water supply, recreation, commercial fishing and preservation of existing land values, the original purpose of the dam

for navigation still remained. This is an interstate project with as much benefit to Texas as it has to Louisiana. The Caddo Levee Board became involved due to the reluctance of Texas to participate in the project. Further, the Federal Government will assume the maintenance, operation and control of the Caddo Lake and Dam on the Red River Waterway Project for navigation, as authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1968, constructed from Shreveport, La., to Daingerfield, Tex.

In summation, the following facts are evident:

First. The original Caddo Lake Dam was the responsibility of the Federal Government;

Second. Navigation which was the prime purpose in the original authorization is still one of the purposes of the existing Caddo Lake and Dam;

Third. This is an interstate project and as such should be the responsibility of the Federal Government and not a local public entity like the Caddo Levee Board;

Fourth. The Federal Government is authorized to take over the operation and maintenance as part of the Red River Waterway Navigation Project;

Fifth. The Caddo Levee Board only agreed to act as a sponsor for the project on being advised that action would be taken to return the responsibility of maintenance and operation back to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;

Sixth. Local interests, through the Caddo Levee Board, provided the necessary lands, easements and rights-of-way for the project and provided adequate public access and recreation development as required;

Seventh. It has been estimated by the Caddo Levee Board that the cost to them for the maintenance and operation of this interstate project is costing approximately $16,000 annually. As time goes on, this cost can be expected to increase and place an excessive burden on the available finances of the levee board.

It is obvious that the amendment to the report on Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana to provide for Federal assumption of the ownership and operation and maintenance of Caddo Dam is fully justified. Therefore, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, RUSSELL LONG, and myself, it is requested that the attached amendment be included in the pending omnibus authorization bill presently being considered by the Committee on Public Works so that the Caddo Levee Board can be relieved of this unjustified responsibility.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 2475

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2475, a bill to modify the distribution requirements of private foundations.

S. 3192

At the request of Mr. HARTKE, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HUGH SCOTT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) were added as cosponsors of S. 3192, the Consumer Communications Reform Act.

S. 3433

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT) were added as cosponsors of S. 3433, a bill to require that imported meat be labeled "imported," to provide for the inspection of imported dairy products, to require that imported dairy products comply with certain minimum standards of sanitation, and to require that imported dairy products be labeled imported."

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

NEW RIVER, N.C.—S. 158

AMENDMENT NO. 1667

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. HELMS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 158) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 by designating a segment of the New River as a potential component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES—S. 3439

AMENDMENT NO. 1668

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

SUSTAINING HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO CYPRUS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am sending to the desk an amendment to S. 3439, amending the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide continued humanitarian assistance to the people of Cyprus.

Although the human and political tragedy of Cyprus has been crowded off the pages of our newspapers by newer problems in other areas of the world, serious humanitarian problems remain in the aftermath of the Turkish invasion of the island in 1974. The immediate relief requirements of refugees and other needy people on Cyprus have now largely been met. But the process of rehabilitation and recovery has still just begun.

Not only have no Cypriot refugees returned to their homes, new refugees have been expelled from Turkish occupied areas. Tens of thousands of refugees still remain in temporary shelters or special housing camps, and nearly all live in crowded conditions far worse than their homes of 1974. And although the economy of Cyprus has remarkably improved, the massive economic dislocations caused by the Turkish invasion and occupation of 40 percent of the island have only partially been restored. In short, all observers agree that there remain serious humanitarian problems on Cyprus, which continue to be a source of deep concern to many Americans.

Regrettably, this concern is not reflected in the administration's request for funds for Cyprus for this coming year, even as it has also not been reflected in how the administration has spent funds authorized and appropriated this past year.

Mr. President, I believe the administration's proposal of $10 million for Cyprus this fiscal year neglects the real needs of the people of Cyprus, and it is based upon inaccurate and misleading information—as well as upon a sloppy and bureaucratic record of obligating prior year funds. Even as we are asked to spend tens of millions more in taxpayers' dollars for more military aid to Turkey and Greece, we are told by the administration that it wants to reduce humanitarian assistance to Cyprus by over half because it has not spent what Congress authorized and appropriated last year.

Officials in the Agency for International Development—AID—have told us that they still have funds left from this fiscal year to use for Cyprus, and that this amount, coupled with the additional $10 million, will be sufficient for the coming year. However, what these officials neglect to say is that the only reason they have money left from last year is because AID has been extremely slow and bureaucratic in responding to the many rehabilitation projects and proposals submitted in 1975–76 by the Cyprus Government through the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.

In short, the humanitarian needs of the people were there. The projects were there. And the funds for 1976 were authorized, and through the continuing resolution, were appropriated by Congress. What has been lacking is the speedy use of these funds by AID.

Mr. President, there simply is no excuse for the callous and petty bureaucratic approach which has characterized our AID effort on Cyprus. There is no excuse for putting needless roadblocks in the way of our support of the UNHCR program on Cyprus. And there is no excuse for not spending money for worthwhile projects that have been proposed by the Cyprus Government to help people in need.

Furthermore, the administration's statistics on the scope of need are misleading. AID officials have told many Senators that "most of the Cypriot refugee relief and rehabilitation needs will be met by the end of calendar year 1977—that the needs will be down to about $33 million—less than half the 1976 needs."

This assertion is not true. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees I have closely followed developments on Cyprus, and in a report filed with the Senate earlier this year, as well as on the basis of information I just received today from Nicosia and the Embassy of Cyprus, I can state categorically that the administration is underestimating the scope of humanitarian relief and recovery needs on Cyprus. According to these field reports, the program of the Government of Cyprus for next year totals some $111 million—not the $33 million AID has reported. A breakdown of the Government's program for refugee rehabilitation and reactivation projects is as follows:

ESTIMATED NEEDS FOR CYPRUS REFUGEES: CALENDAR YEAR 1977

(Source—Cyprus Government)

Housing	$50,000,000
Food	23,000,000
Cash allowance	8,000,000
Welfare	2,000,000
Household items	4,000,000
Health care	1,000,000
Education	8,000,000
Reactivation projects	15,300,000
Loans	3,000,000
Handicrafts	300,000
Agriculture	10,000,000
Reforestation	2,000,000
Total	111,300,000

Mr. President, Cyprus requires continued American assistance not only because the refugee situation has not changed, and all the basic problems created by the Turkish invasion remain the same, but also because the level of support from other quarters has sharply declined, placing additional strain on the Government of Cyprus. AID, in its "talking points" prepared for the Foreign Relations Committee, ignores this fact. Indeed, it suggests that external resources, combined with internal contributions from the Government itself, will be sufficient next year.

I do not believe that the facts warrant this judgment. As I also do not believe that AID's performance in obligating, and in responding to the relief and rehabilitation programs on Cyprus, has been satisfactory. It is time that our officials in Nicosia stop dragging their feet, and finding endless bureaucratic excuses for not spending American humanitarian assistance, granted by Congress to help meet the needs of refugees and other needy people on Cyprus.

My amendment will assure that the help and concern offered by the American people since the invasion of Cyprus in 1974 will continue this coming fiscal year at the same level—to add that extra measure of support for the refugees of Cyprus. Until there is an honorable and just resolution of the Cyprus crisis—until the refugees are able to return to their homes or receive just compensations for their losses—I believe we have a clear humanitarian obligation to help meet their rehabilitation and recovery needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my proposed amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 1668

On page 86, between lines 11 and 12, add the following new section:

CYPRUS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

SEC. 507. Section 495 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out the period immediately after "$30,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and for the fiscal year 1977, $25,000,000.".

AMENDMENT NO. 1669

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. ABOUREZK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3439) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1670

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. CRANSTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 3439), supra.

OPPORTUNITIES INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTERS JOB CREATION AND TRAINING ACT OF 1976—S. 2939

AMENDMENT NO. 1671

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am submitting for printing an amendment to S. 2939, the proposed "Opportunities Industrialization Centers Job Creation and Training Act of 1976." I am proposing this amendment in order to expand the scope of the bill to provide jobs and job training opportunities through other community-based programs such as Jobs for Progress—SER—Urban League, Operation Mainstream, recruitment and training program, community action agencies, community development corporations, labor programs, and other community-based organizations.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee is holding hearings on S. 2939 on May 25, and my intent is that this amendment will be considered at that hearing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 1671

On page 1, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof "That this Act may be cited as the 'Community-Based Job and Job Training Opportunities Act of 1976'."

On page 1, strike out lines 6 through 9, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 through 3.

On page 2, line 4, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 2.".

On page 2, line 5, after "Centers" insert a comma and "Jobs for Progress (SER), Urban League, Operation Mainstream, Recruitment and Training Program, community action agencies, community development programs, labor programs, and other community-based organizations".

On page 3, line 4, strike out all after the second comma, through line 7 and insert in lieu thereof "Jobs for Progress (SER), Urban League, Operation Mainstream, Recruitment and Training Program, community action agencies, community development corporations, labor programs, and (as defined in section 701(a)(1) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, as amended) other community-based organizations (which shall collectively hereinafter be referred to as "community-based programs") in order to provide through such programs comprehensive employment services and jobs for unemployed and underemployed persons in accordance with the provisions of this Act."

On page 3, lines 14 and 15, strike out "Opportunities Industrialization Centers" and insert in lieu thereof "community-based programs".

On page 4, line 9, strike out "the Opportunities Industrialization Centers organization," and insert in lieu thereof "a community-based program."

On page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out "Opportunities Industrialization Centers, Incorporated," and insert in lieu thereof "the community-based program".

On page 5, lines 17 and 18, strike out "(B) the Opportunities Industrialization Centers" and insert in lieu thereof "the community-based program".

On page 9, line 19, strike out "Opportunities Industrialization Centers, Incorporated," and insert in lieu thereof "the community-based program".

On page 10, lines 15 and 16, strike out "Opportunities Industrialization Centers, Incorporated," and insert in lieu thereof "the community-based program".

On page 13, lines 5 and 6, strike out "the Opportunities Industrialization Centers organization" and insert in lieu thereof "a community-based program".

On page 12, strike out lines 24 through 25, and on page 13, strike out lines 1 through 3 and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 8. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of this Act.".

Amend the title so as to read "To provide a special program for financial assistance to expand employment and training opportunities through community-based programs, and for other purposes.".

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

COSTS OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, during recent years, the costs of health care services have risen at an extremely rapid rate, far in excess of the cost of living in general. While it is true that some of the expenditures have resulted in improved health care for many Americans, in my view, the rate of expenditure is way out of proportion to the benefits derived.

While in many ways we have the finest medicine in the world in the United States, we also have what is one of the most inefficient health care systems in the world. Our per capita expenditure is currently three times that of Great Britain. One factor often cited as a cause for the rapid increase in total health care expenditures is advances in expensive technologies.

While many new technological procedures are of great benefit to the patients they are intended to serve, many are, in my opinion, not worth their expense to society. If we are ever to solve the problems of equity and fairness in our health care industry, we must begin to scrutinize the way we use resources which are, after all, not limitless. We must begin to look at the benefits of costly and often marginally effective technology.

Dr. Howard Hiatt, dean of the Harvard School of Public Health, has recently written in the New England Journal of Medicine about this problem. His essay is, I believe, one of the clearest and most cogent discussions of this important subject I have seen.

The Senate Health Subcommittee has begun a series of hearings into basic biomedical research policy, which will examine this question, among others. These hearings will be conducted throughout

this spring, and will resume early in the next session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Hiatt's article "Protecting the Medical Common: Who is Responsible?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECTING THE MEDICAL COMMONS: WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

(By Howard H. Hiatt, M.D.)

ABSTRACT

The resources for medical care are clearly finite, but demands on those resources are growing rapidly. Of particular concern are the demands on those resources for medical practices of three kinds: those that pose conflicts between the interests of the individual and those of society; those of no value or of undetermined value; and those for potentially preventable conditions. Such practices must be evaluated in terms of social and medical priorities, and this requirement will become more urgent with the establishment of national health insurance. Who will make decisions is less clear, but it is not likely to be physicians alone. It is imperative that physicians and other health providers work closely with professionals from many fields, and with consumers, to ensure the availability and dissemination of information that will permit decisions that are in the best interests of society. (N Engl J Med 293:235–241, 1974)

In 1968, in an article called "The Tragedy of the Commons," Garrett Hardin discussed a class of human problems that in his view had no technical solution.[1] Focusing on the populaion problem, Hardin likened our present dilemma to that of a group of herdsmen whose cattle shared a common pasture. As long as the number of animals was small in relation to the capacity of the pasture, each herdsman could increase his holdings without detriment to the general welfare. As the number of cattle approached the capacity of the land, however, each additional animal contributed to overgrazing. Any single herdsman attempting to maximize his own gain could reasonably project that the addition of one or a few cattle to his holdings would have minimal effect on the general welfare. All herdsmen reasoning and acting individually in this fashion, however, would destroy the commons. "Ruin," concluded Hardin, "is the destination toward which all men rush, each pursuing his own best interest in a society that believes in the freedom of the commons. Freedom in a commons brings ruin to all."

The total resources available for medical care can be viewed as analogous to the grazing area on Hardin's commons, and the practices drawing on those resources to Hardin's grazing animals. Surely, nobody would quarrel with the proposition that there is a limit to the resources any society can devote to medical care, and few would question the suggestion that we are approaching such a limit. Yet there is almost universal recognition that among the additional demands that must be made on our resources are those designed to address the current inadequacy of medical care for large sectors of population. The dilemma confronting us is how we can place additional stress on the medical commons without bringing ourselves closer to ruin.

In our society, demands from both preventive and curative medicine are made upon the same commons and therefore must be regarded as in competition with each other and with needs for research and teaching. Priority setting is further complicated by the inadequacy of data that are critical to intelligent decision-making. Failure to recognize these realities has in the past often led to unwise policy setting, without the due consideration of long-term consequences. We need to consider problems arising from ways in which the medical commons has traditionally been used and the need for alternative approaches.

First of all, let us look at a principle on which medical practice has been based—that one should do everything possible for the individual patient. Let us then examine this principle in the context of our system, in which few constraints are placed upon the introduction of new medical practices. I believe this is a luxury we can no longer afford. As we develop more and more practices that may be beneficial to the individual but not to the interests of society, we risk reaching a point where marginal gains to individuals threaten the welfare of the whole.

Secondly, we must examine another consequence of freedom of access to the medical commons: the utilization of precious resources for practices that benefit neither the individual nor society, and that indeed are frequently harmful to both. Such practices are especially important in a campaign to reduce demands on the medical commons, for their elimination would benefit both individual and society.

Thirdly, there is a widely accepted but narrow interpretation of health as an exclusively medical concern, which, together with a failure to appreciate fully the limitations of curative medicine, contributes to continuing raids on the commons by expensive practices. At best, many of these deal imperfectly with conditions that could be prevented by less costly approaches.

Although no one should be optimistic that we can rapidly change existing practices and thereby redirect resources to other pressing needs, an examination of a few of our present problems may be useful, especially in preventing their replication, and possibly in contributing to their amelioration.

MEDICAL PRACTICES THAT POSE CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE INTERESTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND THOSE OF SOCIETY

An infant born with agammaglobulinemia has marked reduced resistance to and may die from infection. The test for detecting the condition is simple and relatively inexpensive. Once the condition is diagnosed, one can immediately institute treatment that will prevent or ameliorate serious infections. However, the condition is so rare that in a society with limited resources it would be difficult to argue for a universal screening campaign, even though it might prevent serious illness and occasionally even death among a few infants.

Detection of agammaglobulinemia may be an extreme case, but a sensitive one nonetheless. Even more troubling are questions that arise concerning more prevalent conditions. A most poignant example today may be kidney dialysis and transplantation, access to which has been largely determined by economic and geographic considerations. Other procedures pose similar questions. If coronary-artery bypass graft operations were shown to be effective for all patients with coronary-artery disease, if an effective artificial heart were found, if the artificial pancreas now being investigated were shown to be potentially useful to the estimated four million Americans with diabetes, what fraction of our resources should be given to these measures, and at what cost to others dependent on the commons?

A decision that may shortly be before us provides another example. A recent report[2] suggested that trained prehospital rescue units may contribute to increased survival of patients with cardiac arrest. The report described 301 subjects with prehospital ventricular fibrillation for whom the rescue units were used. For the 42 who survived to leave the hospital, the mean survival period was 12.7 months (and five of the survivors required long-term care for brain damage). For discussion purposes, let us grant that such an approach to patients with cardiac arrest did save these lives. Reasoned decision making would then require that society first ascertain the cost per life saved and determine whether a universal program of implementation were worthy of further consideration. Two critical questions would be: What can really be achieved? Are the benefits of wide application such as to warrant displacing something else? In raising such questions, it is essential to recognize the needs for continuing research in medical care, such as that represented by the study on the rescue units, on the one hand, and for decision making regarding the dissemination of new practices, once proved effective, on the other.

A deeply troubling (and perhaps insoluble) ethical dilemma comes sharply into focus when we attempt to set a monetary value on a human life. However, the dilemma is unnecessarily intensified by a widespread misconception that the principal objective of medical practice is the prevention of death. Bunker[3] points out that only a small fraction of surgery and a much smaller fraction of nonsurgical encounters involve life-and-death decisions, most being directed at the provision of relief from physical or emotional discomfort or disability. In these circumstances we must think in such terms as which measures will provide greater relief, which conditions are more burdensome, and which patients are in greater need of help. Although these questions are obviously thorny ones, they provide a more common framework for discussion of tradeoffs than attempts to relate the value of a life to the resources of the commons. The latter question, too, must be dealt with, but much less often than the former.

The issues that arise with regionalization of medical resources seem so much easier to resolve that one wonders why they are so prevalent. Early in the 1960's, for example, it was found that of almost 800 hospitals in the United States equipped for closed heart surgery, over 90 per cent did fewer than one case per week, and 30 per cent had done none in the year studied.[4] Although regionalization may sometimes lead to inconvenience and questions of "status" (some take pride in having "everything" locally available), the drawbacks seem trivial when compared, first, to the medical advantage of having such complicated procedures carried out by specialists whose skills are honed on a continuous basis and, second, to the obvious economic benefits.

MEDICAL PRACTICES OF NO VALUE OR OF UNDETERMINED VALUE

Nancy Mitford[5] may have been indulging in literary license when she predicted that "in another two hundred and fifty years present day doctors may seem to our descendants as barbarous as Fagon and his colleagues seems to us . . . In those days terrifying in black robes and bonnets, they bled the patient; now, terrifying in white robes and masks, they pump blood into him." Wholesale bloodletting disappeared from our "therapeutic" kit long ago, but within my own professional lifetime, I recall seeing patients "treated" for multiple sclerosis by having blood pumped into them until they were polycythemic.

How do we determine which practices should be discarded and which continued? More than 20 years ago the British statistician Sir Austin Bradford Hill demonstrated the importance to medical investigation of the randomized controlled trial, which had been developed earlier in agriculture by R. A. Fisher. It was used for testing the Salk vaccine, and partly as a result, when the field trials of the vaccine were completed, the

Footnotes at end of article.

vaccine's usefulness had been unequivocally proved.

One could cite a substantial number of procedures that were at one time practiced rather widely in this country, many of them within relatively recent years, but that have now been virtually abandoned. Such a list might include gastric freezing for peptic ulcer, colectomy for epilepsy, bilateral hypogastric-artery ligation for pelvic hemorrhage, renal-capsule stripping for acute renal failure, sympathectomy for asthma, internal-mammary-artery ligation for coronary-artery disease, the "button" operation for ascites, adrenalectomy for essential hypertension, complete dental extraction for a variety of complaints thought to be the result of local sepsis, lobotomy for many mental disorders, and wiring for aortic aneurysm. It is interesting that most of these practices disappeared not because better procedures came along (which would have been an appropriate reason) but because they were found ultimately to be without value. No careful pilot studies were undertaken to evaluate them at the time they were introduced. As a result, even though some merited introduction on an experimental basis, they remained on the medical commons much too long, at costs that went beyond those of the economic resources inappropriately used.

A number of other medical practices, shown or suggested to be without merit, remain with us. For example, treating critical phases of acute illnesses in intensive-care units has become an established practice in many general hospitals over the past decade. Griner[6] compared adult patients suffering from pulmonary edema of nonsurgical causes who were admitted to the intensive-care unit of a university hospital with those admitted to a general medical floor immediately before the opening of the special unit. His studies revealed no difference in mortality and a slightly but not significantly increased duration of stay for patients in the unit. In Griner's words, "The most noticeable change in the overall experience of adult patients hospitalized with acute pulmonary edema . . . since the opening of an intensive care unit has been a marked increase in the cost of rendering care to these patients." (Note that charges for a day of care on the general medical services of the Boston teaching hospital at present average $250; charges for a day on the intensive-care unit exceed $400!) The Griner study requires confirmation, particularly since his "control" group may have differed from the experimental. But if it were proved valid, what steps might be taken to protect the commons?

Although tonsillectomy surely has a place in medical practice, some pediatricians suggest that over 90 per cent of the one million children who underwent tonsillectomies last year in the United States did so unnecessarily. Consistent with this estimate, one study showed a greater than 10-fold difference in the procedure from one area to another in the same state.[7] If 90 per cent is a reasonable approximation, the $400 million taken from the medical commons for this purpose might have been reduced to less than $40 million, the number of hospital days required for people undergoing this operation might have been reduced proportionately, and the number of deaths, using only a conservative estimate of deaths expected from general anesthesia alone, might have been cut from 70 to seven. The reduction in human suffering, of course, cannot be described in such quantitative terms.

Oral hypoglycemic agents were initially hailed as an alternative to insulin injections for many diabetic patients. Randomized clinical trials, however, gave evidence, first published over five years ago,[8,9] of increased cardiovascular disease, which in the view of most experts outweighs any possible short-term benefits of the drugs. Nonetheless, according to a rough estimate based on the number of prescriptions written and the prescription renewal rate, 1.4 million Americans were taking these compounds last year. This figure has gone up progressively over the years despite increasing adverse evidence concerning the usefulness of the drugs.[10]

It is important to recognize that randomized trials cannot always be done,[11,12] but the problem is compounded in dealing with practices already adopted. Once disseminated, a practice is not quickly abandoned, even after it has been shown ineffective—another strong reason for careful evaluation before widespread adoption of new procedures. Let us consider the drain on resources resulting from a few practices whose true usefulness still remains to be established.

At present, there are few hospitals without coronary-care units. There is no disputing the cost they have added to our medical bills, but there is much debate about their effects on mortality from myocardial infarction.[13,14]

Cytologic examination of uterine cervical secretions is commonly assumed to be responsible for the acknowledged recent decline in deaths from carcinoma of the uterine cervix. However, this cause-and-effect connection has by no means been conclusively demonstrated. Since the death rate began falling some years before there was widespread use of the examination, and, further, since the rate of decline has been much the same in different areas, irrespective of the proportion of women screened,[15,16] serious questions must be raised concerning the role of the procedure.

These data emphasize the need for further evidence and cast considerable doubt on the justifiability of the enormous drain of resources. However, both the coronary-care unit and cervical cytologic examination are so much a part of the medical culture that it now seems impossible to carry out proper evaluation. Indeed, one effect of premature adoption is to place ethical difficulties in the way of truly controlled trials.

A present case in point may be coronary-artery bypass graft operations. It is estimated that 38,000 such procedures were carried out in the United States in 1973, at a cost in excess of $400 million. Almost 400 hospitals are believed to have by-pass teams, and one of the strongest proponents for this approach to management of coronary-artery disease was recently quoted as having said that the United States should prepare to do 80,000 coronary arteriograms a day.[17] Rough calculations indicate that such a radiologic assessment alone would cost in excess of $10 billion a year and would average one catheterization for every American every 10 years. If today's ratio of arteriograms to by-pass surgery were to prevail, the cost of the resultant surgery would exceed $100 billion a year, a figure almost equivalent to the total resources now on the commons!

The current absence of regulatory mechanisms for dissemination of such procedures offers little hope for restraints, even long enough for proper evaluation. Ironically enough, in the absence of regulatory mechanisms, national health insurance, particularly if limited to catastrophic events, could accelerate premature application of this and similar costly procedures.

At an earlier stage of utilization is the computerized axial tomograph machine for radiologic examination. The capital cost of each machine is nearly $400,000. It permits extremely sophisticated diagnostic studies of the brain without the need for invasive procedures, and may prove an important addition to the diagnostic armamentarium. However, its role remains to be established. Furthermore, it requires more highly specialized personnel, and there already is evidence of its being used for purposes for which much simpler equipment is adequate. Will we be able to establish guidelines for the purchase and use of this machine before it, too, becomes a prominent and unregulated occupant of the medical commons?

MEDICAL PRACTICES FOR POTENTIALLY PREVENTABLE CONDITIONS

There are at present substantial claims on our resources that could be reduced appreciably on the basis of existing knowledge. The savings in lives, disability, and money resulting from polio vaccine are often and appropriately cited as evidence of a triumph of modern medical research. However, carelessness in prophylactic programs has recently led to a recrudescence of poliomyelitis. Another striking example was the increased incidence of measles that followed a decrease in distribution of measles vaccine (at least in part the result of decreased federal support). The annual number of reported cases of measles decreased from almost 500,000 in 1962 to 22,000 in 1968,[18] but, with lessening of attention to control programs, rose again to a high of 75,000 in 1971. The incidence has since receded, but the need for constant attention is apparent. It has been estimated that the economic benefit of measles vaccine over a 10-year period exceeded $1.3 billion. The savings in terms of lives saved and cases of mental retardation averted[19] are even more important.

Fluoridation provides another example of how preventive measures can spare our resources. There is persuasive evidence that we could halve dental decay among children by fluoridation, at an annual cost of less than 20 cents per person. Nevertheless, less than 60 per cent of the United States water supply was artificially fluoridated in 1972.[4]

Compensation paid last year in the United States by the Social Security Administration alone for victims of black lung exceeded $500 million. The physician, lacking specific treatment for this condition, is largely limited to treating complications and providing the emotional support required by patient and family. Although it is admittedly difficult to estimate the cost of preventing this condition, it seems likely that it would not begin to approach present costs in economic, let alone human, terms.

Although preventive medical care often has little effect where poor social conditions are allowed to persist,[20] this is not always the case.[21,22] Cordis,[22] for example, has shown that over a three-year period in an urban area with comprehensive medical care, rheumatic fever was about one third lower than in comparable parts of the same city without such care. The implications for reductions in valvular heart disease and nephritis are apparent, and the long-term economic effects would probably be highly beneficial.

There is, perhaps, even more evidence of how changes in social conditions can reduce demands on medical resources. For example, it is well known that, probably in large part because of improved nutrition, deaths from tuberculosis had fallen 10-fold in Britain in the century before the first effective medical measures became available.[23] Also highly relevant, although difficult to quantitate in terms of economic effects on the commons, are conclusions drawn from an examination of birth certificates for New York City for the year 1968. If a New York mother was white, native born, and a college graduate, her infant's chances of dying before his first birthday were 9 per thousand. Corresponding chances for the infants of black, native-born mothers with an elementary-school education were 51 per thousand.[24]

Also difficult to deal with are conditions whose prevention requires changes in individual behavior. This year 70,000 American males will die of lung cancer—more than the total number of victims of the three next most common forms of cancer, well over 90 per cent of all people with lung cancer, and

Footnotes at end of article.

approximately the same proportion killed by it more than 25 years ago. The admittedly impressive advances in cancer surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, and anesthesia and in our understanding of certain aspects of carcinogenesis have had no effect on this or, in fact, on most prevalent forms of cancer. It is estimated that as much as 90 per cent of all cancer in this country is the result of environmental factors. In lung cancer, cigarette smoking has unquestionably been implicated. How to respond to that information, thereby sparing the medical commons, remains a challenge. So far as other forms of cancer are concerned, has an adequate fraction of the massive resources committed to cancer programs been allocated to identifying carcinogens and to reducing exposure?

PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS IN HEALTH-CARE DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

While we must draw further upon our resources to increase access to medical care for the people who are now underserved, the commons is clearly approaching depletion. This fact makes it the more urgent that new demands be limited to practice that have been conclusively demonstrated to meet well defined needs. New practices must also be shown to be more important than whatever will be displaced as a result of their adoption.

McKeown[25] points out that too often in medicine tasks are approached without any adequate survey of the nature of the most important problems. Now that there is generally successful management of infectious diseases, he emphasizes, the currently most pressing problems in Western societies are congenital disabilities, including mental defects, mental illness, and diseases of aging. Any approach designed to provide access to health care for an underserved population cannot purport to be comprehensive if it does not give serious attention to these problems. McKeown's list was neither offered as all-inclusive nor in fact was it intended to describe needs specific to the United States. In a study of children in a large urban American community, Kessner, Snow, and Singer[26] found a shockingly high prevalence of all the conditions being investigated. More than one fourth of children six months to three years old had anemia, and more than one fourth of children four to 11 years of age failed a comprehensive vision screening examination. Twenty percent of all children had evidence of middle-ear disease, and 7 percent of those four to 11 years old had hearing loss in speech frequencies that could interfere with learning. Illustrating yet another kind of need, the studies of Brook et al.[27] have shown that even by minimal criteria, only two thirds of the patients discharged from a highly respected American teaching hospital had adequate follow-up care during the six months after discharge. For most of the other patients, any benefit derived from hospitalization had been lost by the time of the six-month evaluation interview. All these diverse needs point to the necessity of attention to deficiencies frequently found in planning the delivery of health care—deficiencies in collecting and evaluating information, in analyzing results, in determining costs, and in using valid data as a basis for action.

Admittedly, not all needs of an adequate medical-care delivery system can be described in quantitative terms. One example in my view is the security implicit in the existence of an organized medical-care system to which people can quickly and easily turn. There must be a telephone number that can be called at any time of day or night and that offers access to enlightened advice, and, if needed, entry into the system. The voice on the telephone need not be that of a physician; indeed, that would be wasteful. However, it is not too much to expect it to be that of a person who is concerned, compassionate, and informed, who has access to the caller's medical record, and who can offer practical and sensitive responses—that is suggestions for effective action and reassurance appropriate to the problem. My own experience with a prepaid group practice left a strong impression that this service was as much appreciated as any other.

Like most contemporary medical dilemmas, assessing the quality of medical performance is easier to identify as a problem than to deal with. Economic as well as sociologic, psychologic, and other considerations suggest that medical-care systems be arranged so that the skills of the medical-care provider are matched to the job undertaken. Methods for continuing evaluation of performance would help to achieve this end and to promote flexibility as our capabilities improve.

Of course, medical care, no matter how well delivered, is not the sole solution to most of the health problems that confront us. Kessner's population was an urban one, and many of the deficiencies that he and his colleagues observed could be attributed more to the social, economic, or demographic characteristics of the children than to how or where they received medical care.[28] This is not an argument against the need for greater access to better medical care, for it would surely be possible to improve the medical situation described. Rather, it is a way to emphasize that changes in social factors—housing, nutrition, education, etc.—are necessary in any comprehensive and effective approach to health problems.

The innovations that are needed or that are in prospect must be preceded by pilot tests. Not only is pre-testing an integral part of any research endeavor, but as has been indicated, the difficulties of eliminating medical practices once they are widely disseminated make it imperative that there be rigorous evaluation.

WHO WILL PROTECT THE COMMONS?

It was not so long ago that the commons bore relatively few expensive practices, there were no well-defined limits, and the conscientious physician took from it what he deemed essential for his patient. Recently, however, we have witnessed major advances in expensive technology, greater complexity of medical problems, greater expertise in medical and health matters on the part of nonmedical professionals, and greater participation by consumers in dealing with major issues. These developments have all taken place in a short time and appear to be accelerating. Meanwhile, no well conceived methodology for governing access to the medical commons has evolved, despite the ever increasing need for setting priorities, particularly as we approach the institution of national health insurance. Certainly, our failure to confront these very difficult problems has not meant that problems have not been dealt with. However, when we had relatively limited capabilities and seemingly unlimited resources, the consequences of a largely laissez-faire policy were not so visible and so painful as they now are. Unless safeguards not in view are conceived and applied, the priorities for use of the commons will continue to be set as they have been—at best by well intentioned policy makers with information of limited quantity and quality, and at worst in anarchic fashion.

How should priorities be set in the United States? Who should set them? How much should be allocated for health in toto? Of that total, how much should be allocated for medical care? How much research, and in that category how much for basic science and how much for applied? How much for medical education? How much for educating the public? Of each fraction, how should apportionments be made? and what, in each case, should be the quid pro quo? If a hypertension management program can receive only a limited sum, how should that money be optimally used? If renal dialysis cannot be universally available, who should qualify for treatment? What kinds of people should make these decisions? On what basis should their decisions be made?

Although there are no simple answers to these questions, let me first emphasize how I believe national priorities cannot and should not be set. It is surely not fair to ask the physician or other medical-care provider to set them in the context of his or her own medical practice. A physician or other provider must do all that is permitted on behalf of his patient. In that sense the physician is and should be responsible, with his patient and the patient's family, for setting priorities for that patient's management, within the limits available. The patient and the physician want no less, and society should settle for no less. For example, if society has set no ground rules for the use of kidney dialysis other than medical ones, and if in a physician's judgment his 80-year-old patient's overall condition warrants dialysis, everything must be done to see that he is so treated. On the other hand, the physician can, however reluctantly, accept society's constraints regarding eligibility requirements for kidney dialysis, even if he does not consider them to be in the best interests of his patient.

I believe it is as inappropriate to indict physicians for the depletion of resources on the commons as it is to expect physicians alone to determine priorities. The challenge for the medical profession to how to join with others in effective decision making. In this context, let us return to the three problem areas of the commons described earlier.

In the face of conflicts between the interests of the individual patient and of society, choices must be made concerning how much of (or whether) our resources should, for example, be spent for kidney dialysis and for heart transplants, and if so, who is eligible. Physicians must help gather and present as realistically and comprehensively as possible scientific and medical information about kidney dialysis and heart transplants, and then join with a variety of other professionals, including statisticians, epidemiologists, economists, policy analysts, lawyers and ultimately, politicians and the public in setting priorities. Clearly, decisions will heavily depend on both the quality and the quantity of information provided by the medical profession.

To protect the commons from useless, prematurely introduced, or otherwise inappropriate practices, the physician must join statisticians, epidemiologists and economists to ensure that no practice is widely adopted without prior evaluation. As reported by Cochrane,[29] the British National Health Service encourages examination of new diagnostic and therapeutic practices, often by randomized clinical trial, and then submits them for approval by an officially appointed board. (Thus, for example, at the time of Cochrane's presentation neither the carcinoembryonic antigen test for cancer nor coronary-artery bypass graft operations had yet been approved.) As Cochrane has stressed,[29] clinical validation of a practice is not by itself adequate reason for its dissemination. It must be shown to be more effective that other practices available for the same medical problem. And even if this second requirement is satisfied, its value should be manifestly greater than that of those other practices that its adoption would displace.

It is in the third area, prevention, that long-term opportunities are greatest for protecting the resources of the commons. Here, too, the physician must join with others, including consumers, if programs are to be maximally effective. The example of the costs and our therapeutic limitations in the management of black lung was earlier stressed.

Footnotes at end of article.

Although the physician by himself can do little to prevent the condition, his effectiveness in prevention could be amplified many times if he were joined by the mine operator, the union official, the politician, the lawyer, the chemist, the engineer and others. In addition, a more widespread understanding of the limitations of therapeutic medicine could generate greater attention to the need for campaigns directed at preventing black lung and the myriad other conditions for which we can now do so little.

It cannot be overemphasized that our successes in prevention of disease reflect in large part the fruits of research. If these successes are to be followed by the many others we and future generations so badly need, a substantial and predictable fraction of our resources must be set aside for basic scientific research, and for education of research scientists. In my view it is essential that society create mechanisms that separate the demands on the commons of research and of education from those of medical care, for these should not be forced to compete with each other on a continuing basis.

In conclusion, two points seem to me worthy of special emphasis. The first is that the critical question confronting the medical professions is not whether society will find ways to govern access to and control the use of the medical commons. (A people that was sufficiently aroused to create a Food and Drug Administration to control pharmaceutical preparations will surely find mechanisms for controlling medical and surgical procedures when the effects of inadequate restraints become more widely evident.) The question, rather, is how physicians will participate in the creation of control mechanisms in a matter that reflects both enlightened self-interest and the public interest. Physicians must join with educators and others to find ways to encourage the general public to understand more about not only their bodies but also the limitations and uncertainties of medical care, so that society's decision-making can be as fully informed as possible. Indeed, only if physicians assume a major role can they contribute adequately to the protection of the public interest.

Secondly, it is essential that the process of decision making with respect to the medical commons be maximally flexible. Many technical approaches to medical care that were acceptable a decade ago are inadequate today; the same thing must be said about medical judgments and even ethical and moral decision making. Much of what we physicians and our fellow members of society agree is appropriate for 1975 will probably be inadequate for the conditions of 1980. Although it is unfortunately true that existing data are inadequate in most cases to permit fully enlightened decision making today, decision making must and does go on, nonetheless, sometimes by default. This fact makes it more urgent that the process undergo continuing review and revision, to permit us to deal with the issues that inevitably emerge from any reordering of priorities and from continuing progress.

I am indebted to Drs. Herbert Sherman, John Bunker, Harvey Fineberg, and Donald Berwick for many helpful discussions, and to Ms. Cordelia Swain and Miss Constance West for technical assistance.

(From the Center for the Analysis of Health Practices, Harvard School of Public Health (address reprint requests to Dr. Hiatt at the Office of the Dean, Harvard School of Public Health, 677 Huntington Ave., Boston, MA 02115).

(Supported by grants from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Commonwealth Fund.

(Based on the keynote address at the First Annual Conference on Progress and Prospects in Health Care Distribution Systems, Miami, FL, November 25–27, 1974.)

FOOTNOTES

[1] Hardin G: The tragedy of the commons. Science 162:1243–1248, 1968.

[2] Liberthson RR, Nagel EL, Hirschman JC, et al: Prehospital ventricular defibrillation: prognosis and follow-up course. N Engl J Med 291–317–321, 1974.

[3] Bunker J: Risks and benefits of surgery, From Benefits and Risks in Medical Care: A symposium held by the Officer of Health Economics. Edited by D Taylor. Luton, England, White Crescent Press, Ltd, 1974.

[4] Maxwell RJ: Health Care: The growing dilemma. New York, McKinsey and Company, Inc., 1974.

[5] Mitford N: The Sun King. New York, Harper and Row, 1966.

[6] Griner PF: Treatment of acute pulmonary edema: conventional or intensive care? Ann Intern Med 77:501–506, 1972.

[7] Wennberg J, Gittelsohn A: Small area variations in health care delivery. Science 182:1102–1108, 1973.

[8] The University Group Diabetes Program. A study of the effects of hypoglycemic agents on vascular complications in patients with adult-onset diabetes. Diabetes 19:Suppl 2: 747–830, 1970.

[9] Knatterud GL, Meinert CL, Klimt CR, et al: Effects of hypoglycemic agents on vascular complications in patients with adult-onset diabetes. IV. A preliminary report on phenformin results. JAMA 217:777–784, 1971.

[10] Report on the Committee for the Assessment of Biometric Aspects of Controlled Trials of Hypoglycemic Agents. JAMA 231: 583–608, 1975.

[11] Jaffe N, Frei E III, Traggis D, et al: Adjuvant methotrexate and citrovorum-factor treatment of osteogenic sarcoma. N Engl J Med 291:994–997, 1974.

[12] Weinstein MC: Allocation of subjects in medical experiments. N Engl J Med 291:1278–1285, 1974.

[13] Astvad K. Fabricius-Bjerre N, Kjaerulff J, et al: Mortality from acute myocardial infarction before and after establishment of a coronary care unit. Br Med J 1:567–569, 1974.

[14] Martin SP, Donaldson MC, London CD, et al: Inputs into coronary care during 30 years: a cost effectiveness study. Ann Intern Med 81:289–293, 1974.

[15] Mitchell JW: Exfoliative cytology in screening for cervical cancer—a critique. Can Med Assoc J 105:833, 836, 1971.

[16] Kinlen LJ, Doll R: Trends in mortality from cancer of the uterus in Canada and in England and Wales. Br J Prev Soc Med 27: 146–149, 1973.

[17] Does the U.S. need 80,000 coronary angiograms a day? Med World News 15(34): 14–16, 1974.

[18] Landrigan PJ, Conrad JL: Current status of measles in the United States. J Infect Dis 124:620–622, 1971.

[19] Barkin RM, Conrad JL: Current status of measles in the United States. J Infect Dis 128:353–356, 1973.

[20] McDermott W, Deuschle KW, Barnett CR: Health care experiment at Many Farms. Science 175:23–31, 1972.

[21] Alpert JJ, Heagarty MC, Robertson L, et al: Effective use of comprehensive pediatric care: utilization of health resources. Am J Dis Child 116:529–533, 1968.

[22] Gordis L: Effectiveness of comprehensive-care programs in preventing rheumatic fever. N Engl J Med 289:331–335, 1973.

[23] McKeown T. Lowe CR: An Introduction to Social Medicine. Second edition. Oxford, Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1974.

[24] Institute of Medicine, Panel on Health Services Research. Infant Death: An analysis by maternal risk and health care (Contrasts in Health Status, Vol 1). Washington, DC, Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, 1973.

[25] McKeown T: A conceptual background for research and development in medicine. Int J Health Serv 3:17–28, 1973.

[26] Institute of Medicine, Panel on Health Services Research. Assessment of Medical Care for Children (Contrasts in Health Status, Vol 3). Washington, DC, Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, 1974

[27] Brook RH, Appel FA, Avery C, et al: Effectiveness of inpatient follow-up care. N Engl J Med 285:1509–1514, 1971.

[28] Cochrane AL: The feasibility of relating quality control to medical outcomes: a critical appraisal. Presented at the fall meeting of the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC, November 6, 1974.

[29] *Idem:* Effectiveness and Efficiency: Random reflections on health services. London, Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, 1972.

BETTER SPEECH AND HEARING MONTH

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that May is "Better Speech and Hearing Month." Speech and hearing disabilities are a serious national problem—one that affects 16.9 million adults, children, and infants. In my home State of Connecticut, there are roughly 40,00 adults, children, and infants with speech difficulties and hearing impairments.

The ability to communicate is essential in order to compete in school, at work or in establishing meaningful and healthy relationships with others. Persons who cannot communicate properly as a result of speech and hearing disorders are at an inherent disadvantage. They are singled out in school and pushed aside or avoided by employers. Many of these persons can be taught to overcome their disability and be a productive member of society. To achieve this goal, however, prevention, early detection, and improved treatment of such disorders is crucial.

I am pleased to note that the State of Connecticut has taken the lead in this area. Connecticut was one of the first States to enact legislation which provided for special public education services and programs to meet the special needs of those children and young adults with speech and hearing disorders.

In this regard, in 1960, the Center for Communication Disorders was established as an independent department within Southern Connecticut State College. It was charged with the responsibility of training qualified individuals to become speech and hearing pathologists. Over the past 16 years, the center has expanded its capacity to provide clinical care for those with these disorders. Presently, the center has become a model clinic for southern Connecticut and provides treatment and care to 100 clients per week from the outlying community. Also this center continually keeps practitioners abreast of the latest procedures and techniques by sponsoring seminars, conventions, research, and classes.

Since May is "Better Speech and Hearing Month," I would like to commend the faculty, staff, and students of this cen-

ter for their untiring efforts and devotion to those who are in need of special care.

MISS KATHERINE T. QUINN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on June 2, 1976, the people of Connecticut on a nonpartisan basis will honor the greatest of all Democratic ladies in the history of the State of Connecticut.

Katherine T. Quinn, is "The Democrat" for the State of Connecticut. For these many years, Katherine has worked in behalf of all of us who have achieved high public office. She has been tireless in the cause of good government represented by good candidates and good issues. Teamed with the late John Bailey, she brought many victories to the Democratic Party. It is symbolic of the high regard in which Katherine is held by all the people of Connecticut that this tribute to her is nonpartisan, participated in by Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. Connecticut will never be the same without Katherine at 525 Main Street, Hartford, Conn.

Over the years, many tributes have been paid to Katherine Quinn by the press of our State. I ask unanimous consent that some representative columns be printed in the RECORD.

Lois and I join with all who love and respect Katherine in wishing for her a happy and healthy retirement. I know that even in retirement she will always remain an active worker for good Democrats and good government.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times, Mar. 11, 1976]

DEMOCRATS PLANNING BIG FAREWELL BASH FOR QUINN

(By Bob Conrad)

Connecticut Democrats are going to make sure that when Katherine Quinn retires in July, after four decades of running party headquarters here, she goes out in style.

They are beginning to plan a testimonial for Katherine that will allow Democrats and many others she has helped over those years a chance to show their appreciation.

Katherine Quinn has been vice chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee since July, 1962, but she was the one to see and the force that held the operation together almost from the time she went to work for the party in the mid-1930s.

She was an assistant secretary there and later a kind of director, but always recognized—Democrats agree—as the reliable right arm of the several state chairmen for whom she worked.

There were seven in all. The best years were those from 1946 to last year, when the late John M. Bailey was chairman. It was a working relationship that brought the party to its peaks of power and its greatest numerical strength in the state.

Bailey was the boss, the power broker and the policy chief. He got to be national chairman in the 1960s and during that period Miss Quinn had the heaviest burdens in keeping the party on an even keel while Bailey was commuting to Washington.

He said many times that he couldn't get along without Katherine running headquarters.

Katherine handled most of the patronage when Democrats had it to bestow—which was most of the time. Before every session of the legislature got going, Miss Quinn would arrive at the capitol one day with a bulging leather case under her arm and the lines would form outside the door of the Democratic caucus room after she disappeared inside.

Miss Quinn was not a public figure. Hardly anyone would recognize her on the street. She avoided the hassles that go with campaigns and steering legislation through the General Assembly. She operated best in her back-room office at the party's plain little storefront quarters on Main Street.

Miss Quinn hasn't recovered from Bailey's death last year. It isn't likely she ever will. But she decided recently to retire and watch the political scene from her home in Wethersfield.

During some of the hectic internal party struggles between the up-and-coming liberals and the Old Guard in the late 1960s, Katherine Quinn got knocked around a bit, but not for long. She was bumped from the state central committee when she was living in West Hartford. Katherine was down, but not out.

She held the second spot in the party hierachy and the Democrats decided they ought to let her know they still loved her. So she was the guest at a tribute in December, 1972.

This time, she is leaving the party post and membership on the national committee as well. It's her own decision.

But before she gets away, Democrats intend to give her a proper good-bye.

QUINN MAY END DEMOCRATIC ROLE

(By Jack Zaiman)

Katherine T. Quinn of Wethersfield, regarded as one of the most powerful women in Connecticut political history, is expected to retire in July as vice chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee and director of state party headquarters.

Miss Quinn, in charge of clearing Democratic political patronage for more than 40 years, would not comment Wednesday. Reports said she intends to step down when her current two-year term ends at the Democratic state convention next summer.

Her retirement is expected to coincide with the replacement of another top state Democratic leader this summer—National Committeeman John M. Golden of New Haven, who has been ill for the last few months.

State Chairman William A. O'Neill of East Hampton, serving an interim term after the death of Chairman John M. Bailey last April, has not yet decided whether to seek election to a full chairman's term, seek reelection to the state House of Representatives or try to continue in both offices. O'Neill is House majority leader.

Miss Quinn and Bailey were political sidekicks. They started out in state politics together, forging an alliance that brought them to state party control in 1946.

"I never hesitate to admit," Bailey said at a dinner for Miss Quinn in 1960, "that she is the real boss of the Democratic organization in Connecticut.

"Whatever little success I have had as state chairman could never have been accomplished without her help."

U.S. Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, D-Conn., while governor in 1960, said: "I don't think there is a man or woman, any Democrat who has risen to high office in Connecticut, who doesn't owe a debt of gratitude to Katherine Quinn."

Miss Quinn has worked for seven Democratic state chairmen at state party headquarters since 1935. During Bailey's tenure from 1946 to 1975, he rarely went to party headquarters. He let Miss Quinn run it.

Miss Quinn, who lived in West Hartford until about three years ago, served on the Democratic State Central Committee for 40 years, the longest tenure of anyone on a state political committee in history. She left the committee post in 1968, but continued as vice chairman and headquarters director.

She served many years as West Hartford's Democratic town chairman and as assistant secretary of the State Central Committee.

"In her own quiet way," then Gov. John N. Dempsey said in 1968, "she has built a monument not only for herself but for good government in Connecticut."

Both Gov. Grasso and O'Neill said Wednesday they have not yet been informed of Miss Quinn's decision. Miss Quinn was at the State Capitol during the day.

MISS QUINN HONORED AS "REAL BOSS" OF PARTY

(By Jack Zaiman)

The "real boss" of the Democratic Party organization in Connecticut was disclosed Thursday noon.

It is Miss Katherine Quinn of West Hartford, assistant secretary of the Democratic State Central Committee.

The news as to who is running the show was disclosed by Democratic State Chairman John M. Bailey at a Statler Hilton luncheon honoring Miss Quinn as "Connecticut Democratic Woman of the Year."

ALLIES SINCE 1935

"The real boss of the Democratic organization in Connecticut," Bailey said, "is Katherine Quinn. I never hesitate to admit that whatever little success I have had as state chairman could never have been accomplished without the help of Katherine." Bailey and Miss Quinn have been political allies since 1935.

Gov. Ribicoff, who gave Miss Quinn a silver bowl as a gift, told nearly 400 Democrats at the luncheon that "if ever a split developed between John Bailey and Miss Quinn, and you had to make a choice between the two, you would pick Miss Quinn."

Ribicoff said Miss Quinn was the "maker" of the "great Democratic victory" in 1958, when the party swept the state in a landslide victory.

DEBT OF GRATITUDE

"I don't think there is a man or woman since 1930 who has risen to high public office in Connecticut who doesn't owe a debt of gratitude to Katherine Quinn," the Governor said.

Miss Quinn, who has been assistant secretary since 1938 and a State Central Committee member since 1928, told about her political relationship with Bailey. It was the first time most of those in the audience had ever heard her make a public speech.

"Some may feel," Miss Quinn said, "that John Bailey and I never disagree. That is not true. No two people argue more politically than John Bailey and I. A few times I may win. But we never agree to disagree. We always agree as a team."

Many of the political professionals of the Democratic Party in the state were in the audience as Miss Quinn, who shuns publicity and the limelight, was given the first annual award.

"I have served with six state chairmen," Miss Quinn said. "John Bailey is the best state chairman, in my time, that either party has ever had."

Miss Quinn was given a series of gifts by various party organizations, including a charm bracelet, numerous charms to go with it, a 50-state flag from the Democratic National Committee, and others.

Bailey, after declaring Miss Quinn to be the "real boss" of the party, placed a paper crown on her head.

Among those who took part in the program were Mrs. Ella Grasso of Windsor Locks, secretary of the state; National Committeeman John Golden of New Haven; Mrs. Bea-

trice Rosenthal, national committeewoman; Rep. Clara O'Shea of Beacon Falls; Judge Stephen K. Elliott of Southington; Mrs. Ward Duffy of West Hartford; Lt. Gov. John Dempsey of Putnam; House Speaker William O'Brien of Portland; Sen. Arthur Healey of New Haven, and others.

THE NEEDLE'S EYE—A WOMAN WITH POWER

(By Jack Zaiman)

Miss Katherine Quinn of West Hartford, a short, heavy-set, quiet-spoken woman, has risen to the greatest political heights a person of her sex has ever achieved in Connecticut. She is one of the real big shots in the Democratic Party in Connecticut. She doesn't have to depend on someone else. She has the political strength herself.

To the general public, Miss Quinn is an unknown. But to the political professionals, she is a buddy. They know, admire and respect her. She runs the mechanics of the Democratic Party in this state. Nothing happens in the party on the statewide level without her knowing about it first. She has what is known as a political mind—a thinking process that translates every incident into political terms.

Rarely does a woman think politically as a man, but Miss Quinn has that ability. She can be just as politically ruthless as any man, when the occasion requires. And she can be just as politically loyal as any male politician. She has a natural political mind.

No decisions are reached on the state or county level of Democratic politics—and that covers just about everything—without Miss Quinn being in on it. She sits in with the top level leadership on every problem. Her opinions carry tremendous weight, for Miss Quinn has the political strength behind her to enforce any stand she may take.

Her closest political friend is John M. Bailey of Hartford, the Democratic state chairman. The alliance they formed in 1935 has brought them, today to the leadership of the Democratic Party in this state.

"She is one of the most important housekeepers in the state," Bailey said a day or so ago in discussing Miss Quinn's role as the party's boss of mechanics.

"Not only that," he said, "she's considered as one of the leading political figures in the state, not as a woman, but as a leader and a personality. Her being a woman doesn't mean a thing. She's one of the leaders."

Miss Quinn is assistant secretary on the Democratic State Central Committee. But the title doesn't mean a thing. She runs it. She's been running it since 1938, which is pretty close to 30 years. She has a mental dossier on every Democratic politician in each of the 169 towns, a private filing system that goes back more than 30 years. She runs the party headquarters in Hartford seven days a week, and many nights.

Katherine fits into the traditional smoke-filled room as naturally as a cigar. There has not been an important party huddle in the past 20 years that she hasn't been in on, even though she makes no contribution to the smoke. She knows more about the art of handing out and withholding patronage than just about anybody else in th state.

If there's a job open anywhere, Miss Quinn is almost sure to know about it. She has been responsible for innumerable political appointments in this state.

Miss Quinn has been on the Democratic State Central Committee longer than anybody else in this state. Next month, she completes 28 years on the committee. She's automatically going back on from the 5th Senatorial District, which she controls. Her alliances with other party leaders in the state have brought her, over the years, the power, prestige and influence she now wields—in combination with Bailey.

She has a passion for anonymity. Her work is made up of vital background things that run a political party, things that the ordinary citizen doesn't know about and would not understand. It is around-the-clock work. There are no hours in politics.

Despite the technical nature of her work and the long hours involved, Miss Quinn is not unhappy. "I like it," she said recently. "I don't know why, but I do."

It was in 1922 when she got her first good taste of politics. Miss Quinn's brother, Ed, who is now the Democratic registrar of voters in West Hartford; was a candidate for the Town Council.

"I really got interested in it that year," she said. "They put me to work in headquarters typing things, and stuff like that, and I found that I really liked it."

Two women who influenced Miss Quinn to take up politics as a profession are the late Mrs. John J. Kennedy and Mrs. Ward Duffy. "They organized the first Democratic Women's Club in 1922," Miss Quinn said, "and they got me interested in it." She has been, ever since.

She went on the State Central Committee and later became town chairman in West Hartford for 10 years. She worked in the state Attorney General's office when Judge Edward J. Daly headed that office. She was executive secretary to three Democratic state comptrollers—the late Charles Swartz, the late John Dowe and Raymond S. Thatcher, now state auditor. The comptroller's office is a place where patronage is really an art, since insurance premiums are widely distributed from there.

Miss Quinn's big job now is setting up the Democratic state convention here on July 6 and 7. She will sit on the stage at the Bushnell and run the mechanics. Soon she will be setting up the mechanics for the trip to Chicago by the Connecticut delegation to the Democratic National Convention. After that, she'll be involved in state election machinery.

"I do my best work at night," she confided. "Then I can use the dictaphone and get things done without the constant interruptions I get during the day."

WELL-DESERVED HONOR

The choice of Miss Katherine T. Quinn to be Connecticut's Democratic Woman of the Year honors a lady who has been a leading figure in the party every year since she entered politics in 1928 to take part in the Al Smith campaign.

Miss Quinn is a "grass roots" operator, so she is known to almost everyone in either Democratic or Republican affairs in this state, though she rarely is mentioned among top leaders when party decisions fill the news columns. Yet she helps make almost all of them, and her role in seeing to it that the decisions are carried out down the line is most important and well known.

Young women, or young men for that matter, thinking about careers in political service, should be particularly interested in her accomplishments. She was elected in 1928 to the Democratic State Central Committee and she is the member having longest continuous service on it. Since 1939 she has been the committee's assistant secretary.

She served from 1935 to 1947 as executive secretary to the Attorney General and the State Comptroller, with four years excepted during Republican tenure of these offices. From 1941 to 1953 she was Democratic Town Chairman of West Hartford, the only woman to have held that office. For several terms she was president of the West Hartford Democratic Women's Club and has long been a member of the executive board of the Connecticut Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs, and is its vicepresident.

At Democratic national conventions for years she has had a leading role with Connecticut delegations. At election time she is indefatigable, and everyone knows that if a problem arises it can be solved by "a talk with Katherine." As an organization counsellor she is held in highest esteem. It would be impossible to list the many ways in which she has devoted herself to the party as its executive officer through many years.

We congratulate Miss Quinn. She has faithfully served her party's organization in Connecticut.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased the conference report on S. 2498 includes the Senate provision calling for a Presidential study of disaster loan authorities. I cosponsored this provision, along with Senator BURDICK, chairman of the Disaster Relief Subcommittee, during Senate consideration of the bill last December. I believe the comprehensive study will assist the Congress in reviewing and making improvement to this part of the Federal disaster relief effort.

Under the conference agreement, the Presidential study, including appropriate recommendations and legislative proposals, will be submitted to the Congress by the first of December. This will allow nearly 7 months to complete the study, sufficient time to undertake a complete, thorough study. The study will address not only the possible consolidation of such authorities and ways to alleviate management burdens of administering agencies but will also address other aspects of the various disaster loan authorities including termination of unnecessary administrative procedures and duplication of effort by Federal agencies; the feasibility of a single disaster loan authority; standardization of eligibility requirements for and the nature, terms, and extent of Federal loan assistance to those affected by disasters; specific alternative relief measures and ways to assure minimal disruption of the normal activities of Federal agencies charged with responsibility for providing loan assistance.

The disaster loan program has grown considerably in the last few years and necessary changes in organization and functions have not kept pace. A complete analysis is needed and will, I believe, serve as a basis for developing a better, more effective and efficient delivery of disaster relief.

PEACE ACADEMY SUPPORT GROWING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter I received from the distinguished professor emeritus of psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Dr. Jerome D. Frank, concerning his support for my bill, S. 1976, to establish the George Washington Peace Academy. I was honored to hear Dr. Frank's testimony on my bill before the Senate Subcommittee on Education on May 13, 1976. His eloquent statement in support of S. 1976 should be read by all Members of the Senate and, in a brief conversation after the hearings, Dr. Frank and I discussed the theoretical and practical considerations relevant to the establishment of the academy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a

letter from Dr. Jerome Frank concerning the conversation we had after the subcommittee hearings on legislation to establish the academy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL,
Baltimore, Md., May 13, 1976.

Senator VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Our too-brief conversation after the hearing this morning has stimulated some further thoughts. I fully share your concern that the George Washington Peace Academy does not become just another site for theoretical exercises with little relevance to or impact on the real world. On the other hand, we really know practically nothing about the maintenance of international peace. The major theoretical insights and technological break-throughs are yet to be made. Maintenance of peace, like waging war, involves every aspect of human group behavior, and its realization will require inputs from all fields of knowledge, as well as their integration. For me, the only reason that maintenance of peace becomes a thinkable goal lies in the new possibilities created by the highly innovative world in which we are living. As Howard and Harriet Kurtz have shown, even advances in military hardware have opened new prospects for maintaining peace. In my testimony I also mentioned the possibilities from international telecommunication, as well as the sudden emergence of a host of problems whose solutions require international cooperation. Therefore, in my estimation, confining the curriculum of the Peace Academy to training students in the existing arts of negotiation and the like, while highly important, would prevent it from making the necessary contributions of which it could become capable. It would be analogous to confining the curriculum of the service academies to practice in the use of existing weapons systems, whereas, as you know, they spent a good deal of time thinking about alternative models, world politics, economic issues and the like.

Of course, it is equally important that the Academy not succumb to the opposite temptation (to which academicians like me are especially susceptible) of stressing theory-building and speculation, divorced from the crucial test of practice. It should be possible, however, to devise a curriculum in which practice and theory both receive adequate weight.

I cannot close without expressing the gratitude not only of myself but of the thousands who recognize that the maintenance of peace represents the only hope for survival of our civilization, for your courageous leadership in furthering a still unpopular subject.

If I can be of any further help, please feel free to call on me. With a little warning, it is very easy for me to get to Washington.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify and for reading this letter.

Sincerely,

JEROME D. FRANK, M.D.,
Professor Emeritus of Psychiatry.

THE UNION DOESN'T SUIT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe all Members have heard about plans of the American Federation of Government Employees to attempt to organize and unionize the men and women of our Armed Forces. But I am not sure everyone is fully conversant with what such a plan would do to this Nation's military effectiveness in future emergencies.

The security and tranquility of the United States in peace and defense in war is wholly and unconditionally dependent on the unswerving obedience of each member of the Armed Forces and this obedience would be seriously eroded were the members of our Armed Forces allowed to join servicemen's unions. The chain of command would be disrupted and discipline undermined.

Mr. President, we do not need a dilemma of divided loyalties in our armed services. We do not need to undermine the esprit de corps and patriotic motivation of our men and women in uniform. This entire subject is one that requires careful analysis. Such an analysis has been provided by the Association of the U.S. Army in a recent factsheet entitled, "The Union Doesn't Suit." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 7, 1976.

THE UNION DOESN'T SUIT

Among the most timely resolutions approved during the 1975 Association of the United States Army Annual Meeting was the following:

UNIONIZATION OF THE MILITARY

"The American Federation of Government Employees, a union affiliated with the AFL-CIO, has announced that it is considering plans to organize and unionize the men and women of the Armed Forces.

"Since there exists now legal prohibitions against a union engaging in traditional contract bargaining and grievance processing for servicemen, the union envisions initially a limited role on behalf of servicemen—beginning with representation in disciplinary proceedings and other military hearings where outside counsel is currently authorized. Once established, it seems clear that the union would commence lobbying to remove the bars to complete collective bargaining.

"The training and discipline of Armed Forces is predicated on the essential requirement for immediate response to orders in combat. There can be no room for bargaining or negotiation in the critical moments of battle.

"Even more basic is the further effort to equate service in the Armed Forces as just another job or means of employment. Military service is a career service that, to function effectively, requires highly motivated, dedicated people. There can be no adequate remuneration for the hardships and dangers to which the military may be subjected. Nor can hourly wage scales be meaningfully applied.

"We therefore resolve to place AUSA in unalterable opposition to any effort to unionize the military personnel of the Armed Forces."

Since this resolution was passed last October, a number of associations and organizations, including the AUSA, which support a strong United States defense posture have studied in detail the impact of unionization on U.S. military forces. The matter has also received considerable attention from the Department of Defense. This factsheet summarizes some of the highlights of this research and analysis.

WHY UNIONIZATION WON'T WORK

The security and tranquility of the United States in peace and its defense in war is wholly and unconditionally dependent on the unswerving obedience of each member of the Armed Forces. In other words, the need for discipline, obedience, and undivided loyalty is an absolute military necessity. These precepts would be seriously eroded were military members allowed to join servicemen's unions. The chain of of command would be disrupted and discipline undermined.

A union would create the dilemma of divided loyalties—a soldier would have to choose between his officer and union representative. This problem would be even more acute for the officer who was a union member.

Based on past experience, the most likely areas of discontent within the military life in the areas of compensation and benefits. These are in the final analysis determined by the Congress. There is no difficulty now in presenting the servicemen's point of view to the Congress. No union would be able to coerce the Congress, nor present the servicemen's case better than is currently being done by the Services and the various Associations which support the military and national defense.

The union attitude of "it's just a job" belies the unique character of military service and undermines esprit de corps and patriotic motivation. There can be no standard, adequate remuneration for the hardships and dangers to which the military may be subjected. Nor can hourly wage scales be meaningfully applied.

The history of unions in the U.S. has amply demonstrated that they will strike if they think that it is in their best interest, regardless of any existing prohibition in law. To deny a military union the right to strike would be no guarantee of its compliance with the law. Clyde Webber, president of AFGE, has stated that "it doesn't matter if we have a law or we don't have a law. There isn't anything that is going to keep me from asking the government . . . to give us the right to strike under certain conditions . . ."

Current union statements, therefore, appear to offer a cruel deception by seeming to hold out the hope for improvements in service life through collective bargaining. Such bargaining would be illegal if carried beyond the present system of informing the Congress of servicemen's needs and desires, as well as against the best interests of the American people.

Assuming that the union would not be given the right of compulsory membership, substantial friction would surely be created between the union and non-union members of the Armed Forces.

Union bargaining for wages, etc., would force a sovereign government to negotiate with a private organization (the union). "By definition, collective bargaining suggests a parity of powers which is essential to the bargaining process. In the public sector, this parity is non-existent." (Rep. Marjorie S. Holt, R.-Md.—in *Congressional Record* (V. 121 No. 113) dated 17 July 1975.)

It is the NCO's who enforce discipline and see that orders are carried our properly. This NCO leadership lies at the heart of a Service's performance and reliability, especially in time of war or emergency, and this is why the NCO's are called the backbone of the Service. In a real sense, the NCO corps is an integral part of the command and management of each Service. Our NCO's understand this and know that their authority depends upon their remaining part of the command and supervisory echelon. Conversely . . . joining a union would clearly dilute, if not destroy, their traditional position of authority. (From Defense Manpower Commission Report, April 1976.)

Membership in military associations provides a viable alternative to unions.

CURRENT LEGAL BARRIERS TO UNIONIZATION

Presidential: Executive Order 11491 bars unions from engaging in contract and grievance negotiations with the armed services (uniformed military personnel).

DOD: Under Title 10, USC, 133 (b), the Secretary of Defense is the regular constitutional organ of the President for the administration of the military establishment of the nation; and rules and orders publicly promulgated through him must be received as the acts of the executive, and as such, be binding upon all within the sphere of his legal and constitutional authority.

Under this authority, DOD Directive 1325.6 says, "Commanders are not authorized to recognize or to bargain with a so-called servicemen's union."

Congressional: Article 1, Section 8, U.S. Constitution—The Congress shall have power . . . to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces . . . To provide for organizing, arming and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . .

Under this authority, Congress has enacted several laws impacting directly or indirectly on unionization.

18 USC, 1918—Striking against the Government.

18 USC, 2387—Counseling insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny or refusal of duty.

18 USC, 2388—Causing or attemption to cause insubordination.

10 USC, 889 (Article 89, UCMJ)—Disrespect toward a superior commissioned officer.

10 USC, 891 (Article 91, UCMJ)—Disrespect toward a warrant officer or non-commissioned officer in the execution of his office.

10 USC, 917 (Article 117, UCMJ)—Provoking speech or gestures.

Supreme Court Cases: ". . . the rights of men in the armed forces must perforce be conditioned to meet certain overriding demands of discipline and duty." United States Ex Rel. *Toth v. Quarles*, 350 U.S. 11 (1955). See also: *Orloff v. Willoughby*, 345 U.S. 83 (1953); *Parker v. Levy*, 417 U.S. 733 (1974) which states in part:

"The fundamental necessity for obedience, and the consequent necessity for imposition of discipline, may render permissable with the military that which would be constitutionally impermissible outside it."

This is only a partial listing of cases that take a similar position.

UNIONS DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY INVOLVED WITH U.S. ARMED FORCES

Association of Civilian Technicians (ACT). This union has 8,000 members among the 47,000 civilian technicians who work at National Guard and Reserve armories and bases. ACT has bargaining rights for 10,000 Guard and Reserve technicians in seventeen states.

National Maritime Union (NMU). NMU has 55,000 civilian members working mostly on American vessels. "The union has many members working for the Federal Government with the military commands, including the Military Sealift Command and the Corps of Engineers."

American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE): This union has approximately 300,000 members—about half of them civilian employees in DOD. The ACT is a branch of AFGE. AFGE is currently the largest union representing Federal employees.

MILITARY UNIONS IN EUROPE

Holland: Unions concerned with wages, benefits, do not get involved with military decisions. In national emergencies, union operations can be suspended. Prohibited from striking.

Denmark: Membership in union automatic unless otherwise requested. (All eligible except draftees.) Union primarily concerned with improvement in pay and working conditions. Cannot interfere with military decisions or chain of command. No right to strike under any circumstances.

Austria: In 1967 ,a specific servicemen's union was formed. Union authority is restricted to economic and welfare matters. Military decisions outside the purview of unions. During national emergencies, union may not interfere in any matters. GEU (Government Employees Union) can strike, but the servicemen's union, a part of GEU, cannot. Though not specifically prohibited by Austrian law from striking, military personnel have an unwritten, self-imposed rule that they will not strike.

Germany: Union is limited to non-military aspects of service life—concentrates on pay, promotion, recreational facilities, health coverage. Union forbidden by law to strike. Union in Germany is in a unique position since there is still a great fear of the armed forces in Germany, and the union is primarily concerned with PR work, bettering the image of the serviceman and attracting recruits to serve in this warily-regarded institution.

Norway: Governed by a labor party from 1935 to 1965, the country is highly unionized. Armed forces belong to the BFO union, which is concerned with wages, hours, promotions, housing, retirement, and other social benefits for its members. Union membership is mandatory. No right to strike. No interference with military law. No union control in battle or other national emergencies.

Finland: No information or specifics.

Belgium: No information.

Italy: No information.

France: Military prohibition from union or political activities while on active duty.

CURRENT STATUS OF UNIONIZATION ACTIONS

AFGE, part of the AFL–CIO, has not taken any action at present. The question as to whether or not it will attempt to move into the military will be decided at its annual convention, to be held in September, 1976.

On the legislative front, several bills have been introduced to prohibit unionization of the armed forces. They are:

S. 3079 introduced by Senator Strom Thurmond (R) South Carolina.

HR 12526 introduced by Representative Floyd Spence (R) South Carolina.

HR 12691 introduced by Representative "Sonny" Montgomery (D) Mississippi.

The Defense Manpower Commission in its report of April 1976 (page 64) recommends: "Whereas all officers, whether commissioned, warrant, or noncommissioned, are an essential and integral part of command and management, the Secretary of Defense should prepare and publish a regulation throughout the Services that membership in any union by any such officer is expressly prohibited, and that in the event any such officer in violation of such regulation joins a union, charges shall be preferred against him under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to the effect that such officer has committed an offense against good order and discipline. The term "union" should be defined as any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

CURRENT ASSOCIATION POSITIONS AGAINST UNIONIZATION

VFW: Unions would interfere with the chain of command, would impair discipline and response to orders.

NAUS: Unions within the military would still be likely to strike even if prohibited by law; also, "benefits provided by Congress in recent years are considered equal to or greater than those that could have been provided by a military union."

AFSA: "Unionization tears at the very heart of Command authority and military discipline."

American Legion: Unions are not needed because "armed forces personnel are adequately represented" by officers, military associations, Congress, etc.

NCOA: Military personnel cannot have divided loyalties between the government and the unions.

FRA: If all enlisted men belonged to military associations, they would be more effective and get better representation. The associations provide a viable alternative to unions.

Navy League: "It may be that unionization serves other countries well. If so, more power to those countries. But we do not believe it would serve America well, whether we be at peace or at war. Therefore, we urge promptness in having it forbidden by the law of the land."

TROA: "Unions are alien to our defense system. We, and all concerned Americans, must stand firm against them."

CONCLUSION

There can be no question but that unionization of the Armed Forces would present myriad problems detrimental to the operations of those forces. Therefore, both Congressional legislation and positive action by the Administration is required now to ensure that the needs of the military remain paramount and to foreclose any further actions on the part of the unions. Otherwise, the unionization issue will engender thousands of needless and costly man-hours of study and evaluation by the Department of Defense, the Administration and the Congress to a fruitless end. Any potential disruption of the ability of our Armed Forces to respond immediately to the country's needs is unthinkable.

POSSIBLE VAGUENESS WITHIN GENOCIDE CONVENTION FORMED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the objections loudly voiced against ratification of the Genocide Convention is directed at article II of the convention which describes one form of genocide as: "Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group." Critics of the convention have contended the phrase "mental harm" could be interpreted to mean the continued use of slurs against an individual group.

However, this argument is totally groundless. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in its report on the treaty, recommended that we adopt an understanding in order to prevent any misconception of the meaning of the phrase "mental harm." the committee stated:

> That the United States Government understands and construes the words "mental harm" appearing in Article II(b) to mean permanent impairment of mental faculties.

This concise phrasing of the understanding provided by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has removed any vagueness which might be attributed to article II.

It is now clear that the convention is not attempting to outlaw free speech. Rather, the convention seeks to preserve not only the right of every group to exist, but also the right of every group to live free from fear of permanent mental

harm. This is both humane and imperative. We must take a stand against any actions which we perceive to be in any way seriously damaging to the permanent health or existence of national, ethnic, or religious groups. Mr. President, there is no excuse for any further delay on our part; ratification of this convention is essential if we are to continue to enjoy the rights which are so precious to us all.

DESEGREGATION AND THE CITIES: PART VIII

LOCAL EXPERIENCES: THE VIEW FROM CHARLOTTE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when the Supreme Court upheld a court order requiring countywide busing in the 1971 Charlotte case, the way was open for the desegregation of a number of southern cities' schools, and the initiation of a serious drive against de jure segregation in the North. Charlotte was the first major American school district to experience large-scale busing that produced approximately proportional numbers of blacks and whites in virtually every school of a large metropolitan area. The program began amid a huge national controversy and in the face of organized and active local opposition.

Almost 5 years later, problems remain but the city appears to have made a remarkable adaptation to this far-reaching educational change. In a tribute to the good faith of local officials, the Federal district court has now withdrawn from active supervision of the local schools. Even U.S. News & World Report, a consistent critic of busing, has pointed out the change. In its April 5, 1976, special section, "Are All Big Cities Doomed?" the magazine points to Charlotte as one of four cities "On the Way Up." One basic reason, it says, is the city's resolution of its school problem:

> Increasingly seen as a boon to the city is Charlotte's desegregation program, one of the toughest in the nation and employing massive court-ordered busing.

The success and increasing stability of the plan means that Charlotte does not face a steadily expanding "ghetto" school system within the central city, schools that would tend to accelerate racial concentration and middle class departure from the central city.

Charlotte's story has great importance for all of us as we think about the future of desegregated education and what it means to our cities. Members of the Senate will be interested in the appended recent report on Charlotte by John Egerton, one of the most experienced Southern journalists now covering the school issue. Bart Barnes' Washington Post story on the opening of Charlotte's school year reflects the growing acceptance of the plan.

It is a tribute to the good sense and decency of the people of Charlotte that, while denunciations of busing ring from Capitol Hill and even the White House, they have found ways to make desegregated education work on a metropolitan scale. While Congress involves itself in a variety of ill-advised antibusing agitation, the local leaders in Charlotte have been finding ways to build stable, high-quality schools.

Perhaps the most interesting material today is a speech given recently by Charlotte-Mecklenburg's School Superintendent Dr. Rolland W. Jones. The speech assesses the very real measure of success local leaders have achieved in making the desegregation process work. One outstanding example was the intensive study of public feelings in 1974 and 1975 by the citizen-directed quality education committee, which led to the design of an improved desegregation plan meeting many parent concerns.

The reports from Charlotte cast a new light on reports that the Justice Department may be considering a plan to ask the Supreme Court to reverse the Charlotte case. This would be the kind of thoughtlessness that has continually multiplied the difficulties of local leaders seeking to sustain the Constitution during the past several years. The gesture would be legally meaningless since the chance of reversal of a unanimous decision, continually reaffirmed, are nil. But, it would be destructive because it would undermine the peaceful concentration on educational issues that has come to prevail in cities like Charlotte. We should be listening to the voices from Charlotte and learning from them, not using essentiall busing to exploit fears in an election year.

I ask unanimous consent that these intervals be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From "School Desegregation: A Report Card From the South," Atlanta: Southern Regional Council, 1976]

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG COUNTY, N.C.:

FOLLOWING THE CONSTITUTION

With grateful appreciation to all who have made possible this court's graduation from Swann, *it is therefore Ordered:*

1. That this cause be removed from the active docket.

2. That the file be closed.

This 11th day of July, 1975.—James B. McMillan, United States District Judge.

Aside from *Brown v. Topeka*, no other school desegregation case in American history is better known than *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg*. It kept North Carolina's largest city in court for 10 years. It led to the U.S. Supreme Court's unanimous ruling on April 20, 1971, that bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation is constitutionally permissible. It resulted, finally, in an approximate balance of black and white children in each of the public schools in Charlotte-Mecklenburg County.

Last July, in an anticlimactic final order appropriately labeled "Swann Song," the federal judge in whose court the case had originated noted that, "though continuing problems remain as hangovers from previous active discrimination, defendants are actively and intelligently addressing these problems without court intervention." The time had come, said Judge James B. McMillan, for "closing the suit as an active matter of litigation."

Neither Judge McMillan nor anybody else in Mecklenburg County apparently believes that the schools there are now completely free of all racial problems traceable to the era of segregation. What *is* widely believed is that significant change has taken place, that equality under the law is now an achievable goal, and that there is in the school system—and to a lesser extent in the community—an attitude of positive willingness to make desegregation work.

After years of friction and turmoil, Charlotte seemed at the end of 1975 to be at least resigned to, and at most quite comfortable with, a state of affairs that few cities have fully experienced: stability, progress, busing and racial balance in the public schools. McMillan's "Swann Song" does not signal a happy ending to a tale of trouble, but it does appear to mark a hopeful new beginning in the long pursuit of equal educational opportunity.

It has indeed been a long journey. In the 1950s, when an education official labeled North Carolina "the school-busingest state in the Union," all of the schools, including the ones in Charlotte, were completely segregated by race. The Charlotte and Mecklenburg County school systems were merged in 1960, three years after black students—five of them—were permitted for the first time to transfer to previously all-white schools. By 1965, when black plaintiffs initiated the Swann litigation, the school systems, under a plan calling for a combination of freedom of choice, zoning, and the closing of several black schools, was still using what the Charlotte Observer later called "busing to achieve an arbitrary racial balance—or, more precisely, an arbitrary racial imbalance, for the sought-after ratio of blacks in white schools was usually around zero."

Over the next four years, little changed, in the schools or in the courts. Finally, in April, 1969, McMillan issued his first decision in the case. The schools, he found, were deliberately and overwhelmingly segregated, in violation of the law and the Constitution. He told the school board it had an "affirmative duty" to correct the situation.

In the atmosphere of a building national resistance to school busing, the order of the court rocked Charlotte on its heels, and reaction was swift. The decision was denounced by the school board chairman, attorney William E. Poe, and by numerous local organizations, including the Classroom Teachers Association. A large group of white citizens formed a protest organization, the Concerned Parents Association (CPA). Sign-carrying pickets gathered at the U.S. post office and courthouse, and on the lawn of McMillan's home. Ministers assailed school busing from the pulpit, the Charlotte News condemned the judge—an establishment lawyer in Charlotte before his appointment to the federal bench in 1968—and 80,000 signatures were accumulated on anti-busing petitions.

Throughout the remainder of 1969 and the first eight months of 1970, the school board was in and out of court pursuing a variety of appeals and delaying tactics, and the community remained in a state of high agitation. The court appointed John A. Finger, Jr., a consultant from Rhode Island, to draw up a complete desegregation plan, and McMillan ordered the plan implemented in the fall of 1970. Three candidates of the CPA, meanwhile, won election to the school board, and the first year of large-scale pupil reassignment and busing was marred by boycotts, white flight to private schools, and violence. The law officer of Julius A. Chambers,[1] attorney for the black parents, were burned in February 1971, and his father's garage and service station in nearby Mt. Gilead were set afire twice in the six months prior to that. (Earlier, in 1965, Chambers' automobile was dynamited while he was attending a civil rights rally, and bombs were exploded at his home and the homes of three other black leaders in Charlotte.) Threats against Judge McMillan became so

[1] In addition to being attorney for the plaintiffs, Chambers is also President of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and a member of the Executive Committee of the Southern Regional Council.

numerous and so intense that federal marshals were assigned to protect him.

The Supreme Court's decision in 1971 affirming McMillan's rulings in the case can be seen in retrospect as the turning point in organized white protest, but it was two more years before the first signs of community acceptance of desegregation began to appear. By the fall of 1973, a subtle shift had taken place: expressions of dissatisfaction focused more on instability and inequity than on busing and desegregation. The Citizens Advisory Group, a coalition of whites and blacks of various ideological persuasions, was formed to devise a new plan, one that would distribute the burdens of change more equitably, and McMillan ordered the reluctant school board to give its full cooperation to that effort.

What eventually emerged was a new compromise—and yet another realignment of the schools. It was implemented in the fall of 1974, with the blessing of the court, and that is the plan under which Charlotte's schools now operate.

By the time McMillan closed the books on *Swann*, Mecklenburg County voters had elected one black and four white moderates to the school board. Chairman William Poe said it was time to "put this case, and this whole episode, behind us." Jane Scott, William H. Booe and Tom Harris, the three board members who had been elected earlier with the backing of the CPA, expressed misgivings about the ruling—Harris said McMillan was "holding out an olive branch with a machine gun behind it"—but the consensus seemed to be that Charlotte had at last reached a watershed, a new status quo. The most frequently used word was "stability."

Half-way through the second year of its "new stability," Charlotte was adapting slowly to the changed circumstances, and the principal figures in its decade-long school controversy were able to look back and measure the gains and losses. On balance, the gains seemed predominant.

Between 1968 and 1975, public school enrollment declined from about 85,000 to 78,000 (the net loss resulting from 10,000 fewer whites and 3,000 more blacks), and the black proportion of the total increased from 29 to 35 percent. Private schools in the community increased in number from 17 to 31 during the same period, and in enrollment from about 2,500 to about 7,500. Most of the white decline, however, occurred during the first two years of desegregation; total enrollment in the fall of 1975 was up for the first time in five years, and school officials now estimate that students returning from the private schools outnumber those who leave to enter them.

With a few exceptions, all of the system's 106 schools have a black enrollment of 25 to 45 percent—within 10 points of the countywide black percentage. The exceptions—an isolated rural school and a handful of "walk in" schools that were desegregated without busing—include two which have a bare majority of blacks. More importantly, it is generally felt that all schools at comparable grade levels are approximately equal in equipment and facilities, curriculum, programs, and personnel. There have been complaints, however, that some all-black and all-white classes still exist.

The number of pupils bused to school has increased in the past seven years from roughly 30,000 to 48,000, and the cost of pupil transportation has doubled (from about a half-million dollars to a million). But busing costs still amount to less than 2 percent of the school budget, and a substantial part of the increase in riders is not attributable to desegregation but to a change in state law extending bus service to many city residents.

Racial conflicts erupted into violence in several secondary schools in the first three years of desegregation, when community tensions were high, but there have been no serious incidents since then. Expulsions and suspensions also increased sharply in the early years, but expulsions were down to 11 in 1974–75 (from 106 in 1971–72), and in 1975–76 there has been a marked reduction in the number of suspensions. The proportion of disciplinary cases involving blacks, however, is almost twice as high as the proportion of blacks in the total enrollment, and that is a matter of continuing concern.

In the classrooms, there has been a shift to more individualized instruction, and in general, some expansion and improvement of curricular offerings. Scores from standardized tests administered annually in grades three, six and nine dropped "appreciably" between 1970 and 1973, according to the school system's supervisor of testing, Betsy Hailey. In 1974, she notes, the scores stabilized, and a year later, they showed slight improvement in grades six and nine and a significant rise in grade three. (In 1969, blacks consistently scored from one to five grades below whites on the same tests.) School officials are careful not to attach any special importance to these results yet, especially with regard to desegregation. "We don't have a long enough view to tell whether all of the changes we've made have helped educationally or not," said Betty Stovall, director of the school system's program for gifted and talented students. "It may only be possible to compare generations of students. For the short run, all we've got to go on is hunches, opinions, and mixed experiences." One of her "hunches" is that "integration offers the only way to make full use of every student's potential. Talent and ability and potential can be developed in separate educational situations, but the most can be done for the most students under integration."

The intense public interest in school board deliberations that started when desegregation was the principal agenda item has continued unabated into the "post-*Swann*" period. School board meetings are held every two weeks, and are broadcast live and in their entirety by the local public television station; the home audience usually is substantial, even though the meetings are held during prime-time evening hours and sometimes last until midnight. Board meetings are sometimes held in local schools, with several hundred people present. The board members receive $300 a month for their services, and some of them devote virtually full time to the job.

The systematic and sustained use by educators of students in Charlotte's desegregation process and an active, highly visible campaign to involve parents at every level in the school system are two of the most striking features of what has taken place and continues to take place in this community.

During the late 60s, while desegregation was at a trickle in Charlotte, violence between students from opposing schools occurred often, particularly at athletic events. Spurred by the near fatal shooting of one student by a youth from a rival school, the superintendent, at that time, organized a system-wide student group called the Student Coordinating Council. Concerned that the group be representative of the actual racial, sexual, economic, and social make-up of the system, the superintendent devised a formula whereby each high school would send two permanent representatives to serve on the Council. One representative would come from the student council and one would be chosen by the faculty or appointed by the principal or elected by the entire student body. In order to insure a representative mix, on some occasions the superintendent's office added other students to the Council.

The group, initially concerned with intraracial student strife, arranged and conducted visits to different schools for student "rap sessions," and advised the central administration on preventing and handling violence.

Upon receipt of Judge McMillan's now famous order, the administration again turned to the Student Coordinating Council for advice and direction and as a vehicle for communicating factual information to students on pending changes as a result of the court order. Such issues as integrating cheering squads, athletic teams, effective means for communicating to students, etc., were taken to the SCC for advice. Simultaneously with securing the advice and opinions of the SCC, the administration surveyed students throughout the system and found that, with the exception of rare and somewhat insignificant cases, the opinions and answers of those surveyed and the SCC were the same. Consequently, principals were advised to channel information through their football or basketball teams or majorettes as vehicles for rumor control. Principals were directed to devise systems for guaranteeing proportional representation of all races of students, resulting in systems that often included a combination of elections and appointments with equal status.

Stimulated by their involvement with the SCC and personal interest, a small interracial group of students, focusing on students who were not maintaining an interest in the SCC and/or were not involved through the SCC, initiated another, more informal organization of students. This group of students sought as its primary source of support community groups and individuals outside of the system, while developing and maintaining informal ties to the administration. Calling itself 'Project Aries"—the birth sign of one of its conceivers, a black student, Aries, sought to channel the benefit of positive race relations between some students to students throughout the high school and junior high school communities.

Both groups are well organized, with an adult sponsor and advisors, and both carry out their own programs, while remaining on standby to be called upon by individual schools or the entire system to aid in crisis prevention or intervention. Both receive high marks within their school systems, particularly from students. The groups are also nationally recognized by children's rights and youth involvement advocates and by official education agencies, including the U.S. Office of Education, which in 1974 awarded Project Aries a "special" youth involvement grant of about $10,000 to carry on its work. Subsequent to the student involvement and initiatives of students and the administration, other groups within the community, such as the Charlotte Bicentennial Commission and all of the PTAs (which have since changed their names to PTSAs) are involving young people in their plans and programs. Charlotte's student efforts have also aided youth themselves, according to school officials, through their attempts and apparent successes, at utilizing peer strengths in dealing with an assortment of academic and race relations and "generation gap" problems in the schools and community.

Preceding desegregation a few church groups were provided volunteers to assist teachers in a small number of Charlotte schools. Faced with the almost hysterical state of many adults throughout the community, the school system's administrative staff, in conjunction with the PTA, decided to respond to the concerns and anxieties of parents through the creative channeling of parents' energies into the school system. The PTA in 1970 secured a $71,000 desegregation assistance grant (ESAA) from the U.S. Office of Education with which it hired coordinators to go out into communities and identify parents who would be willing to be tutors, to read to students, etc. Once parents and other adults came into the schools and saw that their fears of safety for their

children were groundless, they started to filter back to being actively involved in school activities. (Participation had slacked off during the prolonged legal battle over desegregation.) Eventually the funds ran out, but the idea had taken root and thus continued as before. In fact, according to school system records, 8,000 parents and community people volunteered to help out in the schools in school year 1974–75.

College students and persons from industry also were solicited for their various talents to come to the schools and speak with the children about useful or interesting things and experiences that had happened to them.

After initial fears were removed as a result of desegregation, parents and community persons became committed to helping the children and becoming actively involved. Mothers whose children were in school or already out started taking training so that they might help out in the schools.

Parents were used to tutor, help slow learners, and develop relationships with the children in order to break down the barriers. Parents who had previous office skills or experience assisted in the school offices and also helped to type papers for the teachers' class plans.

A book was published by parents listing those who could be called on for advice in various areas of education and who would come into the school and give "talks" in their particular field of interest.

Parents were involved in the curriculum planning process so that better understanding could be gained as to what children were being taught. Parents could thus give input, make changes, and have a "voice" in what they wanted their children to be taught.

All in all, there apparently is a general sense of satisfaction in Charlotte that a measure of calm has finally come to the schools, and that some educational progress is now being made. If whites remain overwhelmingly opposed to busing—and one close observer of local attitudes guesses that 80 percent of them would say they are—blacks in the community apparently are not. Busing aside, the proponents and opponents in both races acknowledge that full desegregation is the governing fact in the schools, and almost all of them expect it to remain so. "People are tired of fussing and fighting," said Ed Sanders, one of the school system's associate superintendents. "We've got a pretty equitable plan, a stable plan, and we're making progress. It may not be what everybody would want, but it's working, and I think the dominant feeling in the community now is, let's get on with it."

What the schools now struggle to "get on with," for all its imperfections, is a new order based on the principle of equity. Separate educational facilities, the Supreme Court concluded in the *Brown* case, are "inherently unequal"—not because blacks are inferior to whites, but because whites, in controlling and imposing segregation, have systematically skewed things to their own advantage. Charlotte is trying to correct that systemic bias. It no longer has racially identifiable schools. It has brought the races together in a single system without diminishing the number or percentage of black teachers and administrators. It has established the presence across the board of blacks in what were white schools and whites in what were black schools. It has, under Superintendent Rolland W. Jones—now in his third year on the job—a central administrative staff that is biracial.

From all of this, one overriding and ironic conclusion can be drawn: whites, who complained the most about desegregation, have gained much from it, and seemingly lost nothing; and blacks, who complained the least, have likewise gained much but also made the most sacrifices and carried the heaviest burden of change.

The gains for whites have been mainly social: they now have an opportunity to overcome a pervasive condition of "cultural deprivation" that has shielded them from a realistic understanding and appreciation of the black minority. Conversely, there is nothing in the record to indicate that whites have suffered academically. To be sure, many whites have been inconvenienced, and, particularly in the early stages of desegregation, some of them faced physical threats and bodily harm. But in the main, what whites have lost is an advantage—an unconstitutional advantage—accorded to them by the society solely because of their race.

Blacks, on the other hand, must weigh their gains—better academic opportunities, improved chances for success in the larger society, and so forth—against some specific and disproportionately great sacrifices. They too, of course, have known inconvenience and physical danger. Black youngsters in the first four years of school are bused far more than whites, and over the course of their school careers they are required for many years to ride relatively more miles than Charlotte whites. For whatever reasons—and the reasons are too complicated to be attributed entirely to racial discrimination—blacks are far more likely than whites to be punished in school. Blacks make up one-fourth of the professional staff of the school system, as they did before desegregation, but blacks comprise more than one-third of the student population. And finally, the conversion of all schools to majority-white status has required blacks to surrender the new places in which they could be assured of identity, recognition and a degree of control. They have opportunities for those rewards now, but no assurances; with the end of segregation has come an end to racial sanctuaries—for both races.

Still, the adjustment from old to new circumstances is continuing. There is every reason to believe that the transition will not be complete for some years to come, but there is a rude consensus—or at least a sense of resigned acceptance—that appears to support the general direction of movement and change. The population of Mecklenburg County has maintained its rate of growth (from 275,000 to about 400,000 in the past 15 years) and its white-black ratio (75–25). Local and state politicians generally looked the other way during Charlotte's school crisis—a stance that had the questionable virtue of being neither helpful nor destructively harmful—but now their ranks include some blacks, and their collective leadership is somewhat more positive. The school board, whose earlier behavior during almost 20 federal court encounters can fairly be described as obstructionist and defiant, now appears to be looking positively to the future, and at least six of its nine members seem to accept the permanence and finality of desegregation. Here and there in the city, there is evidence of some desegregation in housing, and substantial improvement in job opportunities for blacks. The city, under the pressure of a lawsuit, has turned to scattered-site public housing construction in an effort to prevent the creation of new ghettos for the poor.

The reconstruction of the school system was, and is, the key element in Charlotte's long and continuing movement toward equality under the law. Change began in the schools, and it is still underway there; now it is moving gradually into other areas of community life. Hardly anyone disputes that anymore. What people do disagree about is the pace and the direction of it. The attitudes and opinions of a few Charlotte citizens are illustrative of the differences.

To school board member William Booe, a steadfast opponent of busing, "the whole thing has failed miserably." To Margaret Ray, a central figure in the biracial Citizens Advisory Group whose participatory democracy tactics lied to to the current desegregation plan, "a great thing has happened here. We've really grown and changed—in attitudes, in beliefs. We've got a lot of problems left, real problems, but we've come a long way, and we're moving in the right direction." To Jim Postell, actively and outspokenly against busing in the early days and still "bitter" about the changes, "this is the cross of the day, that black and white people have got to learn to live together. But it's a hard thing. Black and white is hard." Within the schools there are, by most accounts, individual examples of resentment and hostility, and overall, a growing atmosphere of acceptance and respect.

Finally, three other viewpoints seem especially pertinent to what has happened in Charlotte, and to what may happen there in the future.

William Poe, the school board chairman, has served on the board for 12 years. During that time, while he was leading the opposition to court-ordered desegregation, all six of his children were in the public schools. Now, all but one of them has graduated, and Poe, in December, was considering whether or not to run for re-election. About the busy years of his tenure, he was quietly reflective:

"You have to view all of this in a broader perspective than just schools. Overall, I think its been good for the community. It took school desegregation to make us see that you don't build new slums with concentrated public housing, or allow public transportation to become an all-black bus system, or build parks where they are inaccessible to people. I don't like the ratio concept, but it does bring into focus what's fair, what's equitable. In the schools, we also have to take a broader view. I thought at the outset that Judge McMillan was going entirely too far, and in many ways. I still think so. Much of this community has been alienated by what he has done. But shifting from the practical to the philosophical, trying to see things in some historical perspective, I'd hazard a guess that desegregation was clearly necessary and bound to come, and he speeded up the pace of it, and I think he'll be vindicated on that score. Things are smoother now, and working better than I thought they would be. There would be no way to undo all of what we've done, not even with a constitutional amendment, and I'm not even sure there would be the will to do that. I fight off the temptation to be smug about Boston. I think it's a fair prediction that in another generation, the South may have all the desegregation there is—and be glad of it. It may even be that the only viable cities in years to come will be cities like Charlotte, which have settled the race issue."

Julius Chambers, the soft-spoken attorney who persevered and finally was victorious in the *Swann* case, thinks the fruits of that victory still have not been harvested—but will be. "Comparatively speaking," he says, "it has worked well. There are some problems, but given time, I think they will jell. Students and parents appear to be adjusting, and there's not a political problem now. Compared to 1970, there's been real progress. The problems? In the board and staff, there are some who stress obeying the law, but not commitment to an integrated school system. The representation of blacks on the board and staff is still token, and the blacks often don't have real authority. There are areas of weakness among principals and counselors, and some departments are virtually all-white, and some teachers have complained of discrimination in promotion and placement. Grouping and tracking is also a problem; there are some all-white and all-black classes, and EMR (educable mentally retarded) classes have a disproportionate ratio of blacks. But all in all, many blacks see what they have now as a better deal for them. I think only a small percentage of blacks would prefer majority-black schools to this. With the kids, I think there

is a growing respect, an appreciation for each other as human beings. The elementary generation now—they're the ones. They have no hangups like we do, no self-consciousness or defensiveness about race."

James B. McMillan thinks of his time on the bench in the *Swann* case as a valuable part of his education. "Like most people, I just assumed we had been moving toward desegregation," he recalls. "I really had no idea how pervasive the discrimination was at first. There are people who don't understand the extent of it yet—and some of them are on the board. I haven't got the slightest regret about what I did. When you take the government out of the business of perpetuating discrimination, drawing lines, causing race strife, then you've done as much as you can do. I think we're coming through it amazingly well. There are still kids who can't read, who aren't happy, who want their old schools back—but those problems were not created by observing the law."

What will be the consequences of *Swann* for Charlotte? "I think the consequences will be good: a greater respect for the law," McMillan says. "The actions of public officials are short-term—they do what they do because they think that's what pepole like and want. But the Constitution is long-term, and a judge must go by it, despite all. In the long run, the majority will have its way, but it's a slow, orderly, lawful process—and it has served us very well."

It was Judge McMillan's unyielding determination to follow the Constitution that brought Charlotte at last into compliance with the law, and allowed its schools to turn from racial considerations to educational ones. In his final order concluding *Swann*, McMillan wrote:

Ghosts continue to walk. For example, some perennial critics here and elsewhere are interpreting Professor James Coleman's latest dicta in support of the notion that courts should abandon their duty to apply the law in urban school desegregation cases. Coleman is worried about "white flight," they say; school desegregation depends on Coleman; therefore, the courts should bow out . . .

The local School Board members have not followed that siren. Perhaps it is because they realize that this court's orders, starting with the first order of April 23, 1969, are based, not upon the theories of statisticians, but upon the Constitution of the United States . . .

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 3, 1975]

CHARLOTTE LEARNS TO LIVE WITH BUSING

(By Bart Barnes)

CHARLOTTE, N.C.—Bill Smith recalls what it was like to teach in an all-black school 10 years ago in the segregated Charlotte-Mecklenburg system.

"You'd get 40 kids in a class and you didn't have books for all of them," he says. "I was trained in English and social studies, but sometimes they just told me to teach something else. One year they told me to teach eighth grade math, but I never had any formal math training. They said, 'Teach it anyway.' "

Not today. "Now I notice that my children are being exposed to the things that white children have been exposed to all along. You find that when white children attend a school in large numbers, the Board of Education is willing to give you what you need."

Since the fall of 1970 both black and white children of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school district have been attending racially integrated schools under a court-ordered plan in which 35,000 to 40,000 children are bused to school outside their neighborhoods.

They have been busing for five years in Charlotte, longer than anywhere else in the nation. For it was the order to bus in Charlotte, later affirmed by the Supreme Court, that set the precedent for busing orders elsewhere.

Five years ago, when the buses first rolled here, there were threats of white boycotts. Ministers denounced busing from their pulpits, and thousands of cars sported anti-busing bumper stickers.

The first few years of busing saw numerous racial incidents and inter-racial fighting, particularly at the high school and junior high school levels. School officials estimate that as many as 10,000 whites may have fled the public schools, either to private segregated academies or to other school districts.

Now, as schools open for the fifth year of busing, the schools and people of Charlotte-Mecklenburg have found busing is something they can live with.

White flight appears to have stabilized, and most schools reflect the ratio of 31 per cent black, 69 per cent white of the entire school system. For the first time since busing began, scores on standardized tests showed improvement last year. Each year, the number of race-related incidents in schools decreases.

Last July, 10 years after the original desegregation suit—called Swann vs. Charlotte-Mecklenburg—was filed, U.S. District Court Judge James B. McMillan closed his file on the case and said he did not intend to reopen it. The school board, the judge observed, "has taken a more positive attitude towards desegregation and has at last openly supported affirmative action to cope with recurrent racial problems in pupil assignment."

While no one suggests the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools are free of racial problems, there is a conviction that whatever comes along can be handled and that busing, however distasteful, has been made to work.

There is also virtually unanimous agreement that new educational avenues are now open to black children.

"There are educational opportunities afforded black children now that were not before," says school board chairman William E. Poe, a firm opponent of the busing order when it was handed down. "If they will take advantage of them, the result will be astonishing."

Like many Southern school districts, the school system here includes the schools inside the city of Charlotte and beyond the city limits in surrounding suburban Mecklenburg County. This means it is not possible to escape busing by moving to the suburbs, and there is not the sense here that city dwellers are being asked unfairly to pay the full price for society's ills.

In many respects, Charlotte might be an example of what civil rights workers would hope might eventually happen after schools desegregated.

"I'm against busing, but it was the only way to accomplish what we had to accomplish," says Cloyd Goodrum Jr., a mathematics professor at the University of North Carolina's Charlotte campus.

Goodrum has three children, two of whom are bused from their predominatly white neighborhood to formerly all-black West Charlotte High School. Generally, Goodrum says, West Charlotte is a good high school, and he's pleased his children are there.

Like many people, Goodrum can recognize busing as necessary in the name of social justice, but his experiences with it have not been entirely happy.

His son was knocked down a flight of stairs at school by a group of black youths and his daughter is often the target of racial epithets in the girls' rest room.

"It's hard to explain this sort of thing to kids," Goodrum said. "You tell them blacks have been mistreated for years and they say, 'Yeah, but we didn't do it.' Of course they're right."

As it did in many cities, busing had ramifications beyond the school system, and it was more complicated than a simple whites vs. blacks issue. It pitted neighborhood against neighborhood as sections of the city fought each other over who would bear the greater burden of busing. It affected residential patterns as neighborhoods changed from white to black because of the way busing schedules were drawn.

Goodrum's old neighborhood, a subdivision called Hidden Valley on the northern rim of the city, is a prime example. Five years ago it was virtually all white, but the initial busing plans called for Hidden Valley Children to be bused for eight of their 12 years in school. Almost immediately, whites began to move out and blacks to move in.

As the neighborhood became integrated, Hidden Valley residents petitioned to be allowed to attend their neighborhood elementary school, but the request was not granted until the neighborhood was well over half black. It is currently about 90 per cent black and Goodrum moved out with his family about a year ago.

Among those who moved in was Bill Smith, the teacher in the segregated, all black school years ago. Smith gave up teaching for a better-paying job as an underwriter with Aetna Life & Casualty Insurance company here is now pleased with the education his children are getting, and is active in parent-teacher organizations.

When his children were in all-black schools, Smith said, "the black parents did not know how or did not have the political clout to demand that the board give the schools what they needed."

While busing is now accepted as a way of life in the Charlotte public schools, it has left in some with bitterness that there are people who managed to escape it.

"The people who have money. They just will not do it," says Jim Postell, a structural steel contractor, father of three children and a busing opponent. "They will send their children to private schools. My people are the middle class. We pay for everything and we get nothing. If you stand up and speak out for what you believe in, you're either a racist or a rabble rouser. I think it's wrong to bus those children across town black or white.

I do think that everybody ought to have an equal opportunity to get an education. But our schools here in Charlotte are now the most integrated in the world . . . not in the country, in the world."

Billingsville Elementary School, in a low-income black neighborhood called Griertown on the east side of Charlotte, is one such intergated school. It draws students from its own neighborhood and from an affluent white professional area in another part of town.

Its principal Kathleen R. Crosby, began her teaching career 25 years ago in Mecklenburg County in an all-black school with no running water and a pot-bellied stove. In those days the black schools began their year in July so the black children could be released in the fall to work in the fields.

Now Mrs. Crosby greets a visitor in her office proudly displaying computer printouts showing some of her 6th graders reading and doing mathematics at the 9th and 10th grade levels. Many are the children of the white professionals but some are the children of low-income blacks from the Billingsville neighborhood.

"Every child here will be taught" Mrs. Crosby says. "I have told my staff here that we will not have any child placed in a 'dumb' group."

Since she's been at Billingsville, Mrs. Crosby has involved both black and white parents in the school and has gotten the PTA to run such fund-raising events as a spring fair and a fall clothing sale.

"I think this is going to work" she says. "I have found that where schools provide

a good learning experience for children and when the parents are happy with what's at the end of the ride they don't care about the bus."

THOUGHTS ON INTEGRATION

(By Dr. Rolland W. Jones, Superintendent of Schools, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C.)

Judge Jim McMillan said he wanted to get off the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board. He meant it. He did. And it looks like we have a pupil assignment plan that will be stable enough to last for awhile. As a compliment to the pupil assignment plan we aimed also for the development of a specific and comprehensive program for integration that would not bog down in the superficial aspects of desegregation.

Much of our time has been consumed with the matter of the legal, historical, numerical, and geographical logistics of bus schedules and assigning students. We've struggled with all the desegregation techniques—closure, pairing, zoning, clustering, satelliting, magnet schools. Though we know that we might never be completely free of all that we began to look at integration in larger perspective.

Most of us wished we did not have to bus children and break up the neighborhood schools. Yet we had no other workable options. Our city has economically, physically, and racially segregated sub-communities. In our commitment to compliance with the law, we were unable to find solutions that didn't require busing. Desegregation, among other things, means busing in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. Though it is not an ideal solution or a panacea, there is, right now, no other way.

If we can believe that judges' orders are less important than the spirit with which our entire community responds, in the last analysis that response may well be the one which decides whether or not we are divided or united. If our hostility divides us into warring factions, it will set an example for more and worse violence in our schools and community. If we can unite and live diversity without disunity, we will demonstrate what America can become by demonstrating what Charlotte-Mecklenburg could be. More important than the history of desegregation and the machinery of pupil assignment is the spirit by which we are animated.

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board is on record (at the recommendation of the administration) in support of the principles of desegregation and integration. The board and its administration is on record in a thousand ways (by policy and action) of giving unequal services in order to achieve equal educational opportunity, if it benefits the individual and does not harm others or the overall quality of education.

We attempt to fulfill the spirit of those ideals in practice. It would be a shame if we had to be taken to court and ordered to take every human step we must take toward achieving quality education for every child.

It is the action of the board, administration, students, teachers, parents, and other citizens which lead the court to say we are responsible, we no longer need to be under court order, we are with a few remaining constraints, a unitary school system. We have enough people of good will in our community to do the job.

All of the efforts we have already undertaken, do not seem too widely known. Desegregation of personnel assignments and our affirmative commitment to equalize employment opportunities has increased the opportunities for minority students to model themselves after and identify with adult authority figures. Participation and representation by students, citizens and professionals in both curricular and co-curricular student activities have been enhanced. Our school system has been engaged in a vigorous program for the upgrading of school facilities. Workshops are giving teachers skills to help children learning respect for one another. We have undertaken a serious implementation of a human relations effort by the Community Relations Committee.

There are many things we are doing in curriculum to meet our needs. We are encouraging cooperative educational and recreational programs with other social agencies, the local institutions of higher learning, police and city government, business and industry. We have developed a police resource officer program with our schools. We are broadening parent involvement, to help in the library, to tutor and to construct learning materials. We are using such techniques as: changing materials often because of short attention spans, using many different devices (audio-visual aids, etc.,) using oral reading techniques giving students a longer time to finish work (less homework and more supervised directed study in school), applying less pressure and increasing the amount of work gradually, etc.

We have developed a program which will help us to identify in a more objective manner the kind, causes, and degree of tension whenever it occurs in our schools so that we can better identify, treat and report these conditions.

Quality education is at work when we open a learning disabilities clinic, when we hire more teachers for our schools, when we hold a workshop on behavioral problems, when we develop a curriculum council to increase participation in decision making, when we have computerized data gathering, evaluate programs, assess pupil achievement, buy a greater variety of books, expand auxiliary educational facilities, make our schools more comprehensive, provide options and alternatives, strengthen the student coordinating council, develop programs in ethnic studies, etc.

It is not as dramatic as talking tough. It may not be the high pitched negativism which makes for the most sensational headlines. But continuous, steady—sometimes boring systematic, nitty-gritty, nuts-and-bolts, hard work is the only way to build for quality education.

The danger is that the parents and other citizens who follow school matters may not always perceive the difference between the subject matter of efforts to discredit and the nuts-and-bolts of the tedious struggle for improvement of the schools. They may become impatient with trusting board members, administrators, teachers and other elected officials to strengthen quality in the schools.

That precious trust is fragile and delicate. We have been close to losing it.

We are very fortunate that lately there seems to be a sustained effort, by all the major newspaper, radio and television institutions in Charlotte-Mecklenburg to portray the outstanding things happening in our real world—the schools. For this, the media deserves our thanks. As the public knows more about what the people in school are doing, the schools will have its support. Confidence in the schools is growing. Citizens have become increasingly involved in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools.

On the whole our integration program is a success. It has broadened the curriculum. It has given the students a better self-image. It has increased their self-determination. It has multiplied learning experiences. Oh yes, tension increased after desegregation but our students are learning to cope and this too is an educational advantage for students.

One of the joys of my life has been a variety of experiences in school systems with significant populations of Oriental, Spanish surnamed, black, Indian, and other cultural, national, and ethnic sub-groups, which lead me to conclude that there is no one answer for the communities in the United States. Each superintendent and his board, staff and community have to go it alone. It must be a do-it-yourself process. It looks like the problem will have to be solved by the schools. The schools will have to turn things around by themselves. We realize the burden that has been placed on the shoulders of schoolboard members and their staffs, teachers, and communities, in every instance where there is a problem of desegregation of schools. Though the basic principles of integration have been outlined for us by the constitution and the courts, we're the ones who are charged with the responsibility for making it work.

Not very many of us really believe Charlotte-Mecklenburg will ever go back to the old days, even if we could legally do so.

There was a time when it could be said that we were pushed down the desegregation road, but we haven't been kicked every inch of the way. This school system has not been dragging its feet all the way. Nor have we waited every time for the courts to force us. We have had the courage to move ahead and the leadership to do what in good conscience, we think is proper.

We desperately need support of our efforts and our good faith. For instance, our objective in such matters as the improvements in the Talent Development Program was not fear of losing federal funds. It was the elimination of discrimination, as the courts have charged us, "root and branch".

There aren't very many areas of public life now that attract more charges of feet dragging, hypocrisy, failure to practice what's preached, knuckling under to federal officials, etc. Fear and hate are learned—not inherited. Hate for the whites isn't inherited by the black man. The white man doesn't inherit fear of the black. Sometimes, we have shown an extraordinary insensitivity to the concerns of some groups in American society. Whether justified or not, many of our citizens have had genuine fears that we have failed to appreciate, and that we should not dismiss as being solely racist in nature. Whites are overcoming the fact that most white parents, raised on the myths that blacks are ignorant, lazy, and immoral, fear every aspect of desegregation at an emotional level of which they, themselves are sometimes unconscious. And blacks are overcoming their sympathy with those separatist movements which threaten the implementation of an integrated society.

We have extended our objectives beyond that of mere physical desegregation. By setting these objectives we have immeasurably enhanced our pupil assignment plan, have demonstrated good faith in our program for integration and have come closer to qualifying as a free and autonomous unitary school system.

We think desegregation is a lot more than the transporting of students from one school to another. It can't be accomplished only by establishing bus schedules. Integration isn't something that is designed just for minority children. At the heart of integration is the question: How do you educate the child of Everyman?

What integration says is that though the child's family background and home environment determine much of his success in life, schools also make a difference.

We have many things in common with all the rest of the schools in the United States. One of the responsibilities we share is that of getting every child ready to live and work in a heterogeneous nation composed of many racial, cultural, political, ethnic, religious, national and philosophical backgrounds. These are represented by many life styles and are equally respected. The mutual celebration of these differences must be reflected in our curriculum, our policies, and our administrative practices. Without it the general quality of education and its relevance to our young people will suffer.

Education is one of the helping professions. It is now the school's responsibility to exercise leadership in helping our community to acquire a greater awareness of intergroup relationships. But that isn't enough. We must also help the community to correct whatever conditions cause inequality. We can no longer be satisfied with complaining that someone else caused the problem.

We must examine all our policies and practices and take whatever action is most consistent with our highest hopes for society.

Most of us were brought up to believe that the melting pot concept held the highest promise for America. For the young nation, struggling for identity as a nation it might have had some relevance. It doesn't have relevance today. Our nation itself is established. It is our people and the individuals in it which need identity.

The melting pot concept would boil us all down to some common denominator like a stew in which the potatoes, carrots and meat all taste and smell alike.

We are a nation of many distinct cultures, religions, colors, nationalities and life styles. Each yearning to be recognized and respected, each yearning for psychological autonomy not to be assimilated and effaced.

Our nation is a mosaic of many cultures and people who want to be mutually appreciated, not absorbed. As in the mosaic each person has his own individual qualities, yet with others forms a part of a larger entity without losing his own personhood. Integration means more than physical inter-relationships among peoples. It is an extremely complex interaction of personal and sociological relationships.

This struggle against a monolithic culture for the recognition of differences has been going on since our nation was founded.

Our society is now mature enough to embrace a pluralism which shares power without trembling on the verge of civil war. This does not mean that we are not one people. It does mean that one part is not subjugated to the other.

It was inevitable that the social and political struggle would someday touch the schools. For twenty years the nation's schools have been preoccupied with various forms of physical desegregation. Now we are returning to our basic charge: Preparing children to live in today's world now, as well as the one which they are going to inherit and in which they are going to live, love and work. It will be a world based on cultural, ethnic and racial pluralism which will give everyone opportunities for self-respecting activities. That is what gives integrated education a new meaning for all of us. In pursuit of this goal our board has made a commitment. Now we are called upon to design a program and develop a model which will be comprehensive enough to do the job in every part of our educational enterprise: Personnel, staffing, student-teacher relationships, after school and curricular activities, relationships with the community, ways of teaching, kinds of buildings, use of materials.

We could not hope to develop such a design without the total involvement of the community.

After the staff with principals and school committeemen engaged in a study later called the Blue Book, which identified some key inequities and instabilities, we began work on a more lasting pupil assignment plan. The process (particularly the Citizens Advisory Group) involved thorough research as well as participation by members of the community, the staff and the board members. The outcome was a more stable and equitable pupil assignment plan. Already white flight has dramatically reversed. For the first time in six years, our enrollment exceeds projections. We can now devote more attention to the educational questions of how we can best help children to learn and teachers to teach.

CARL BOZENSKI

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, one of the outstanding citizens of Torrington, Conn., is Carl Bozenski. For many years, he has been the superintendent of recreation for that great city. Carl has brought joy to children and adults in the Torrington area with the many special projects he has created. His Christmas village and the civic center design will be remembered by countless thousands. I would add his Halloween celebration, the Mardi Gras Ball, the Fourth of July celebration, and many others.

Nellie J. Sullivan paid Carl a special tribute in a letter to the editor of the Torrington Register. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I join Carl Bozenski's many friends in wishing him good health and happiness in his retirement. He is a great guy, and we all love him.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Torrington Register]

TRIBUTE TO CARL BOZENSKI

Editor of the Register:

Last week's Register printed the news that Carl Bozenski will shortly retire as program director of the Recreation Department of Torrington. What a shock.

There came to my mind Carl's many innovative programs which for 37 years brought delight to old and young alike.

In addition to the nationally acclaimed Christmas Village I would like to mention four favorite projects. First was the original Halloween celebration when the mystery man, Mr. Jack O'Lantern, seated in a giant pumpkin arrived in great splendor at Fuessenich Park while band music and handclapping shook the brisk autumn air.

The annual Mardi Gras Ball for teenagers was another example of Carl's imagination. The local armory was transformed into a magnificent ballroom; four glittering thrones were constructed to seat the sectional kings and queens selected by popular vote. The climax of this festive affair came when by popular applause the King and Queen of the Mardi Gras were singled out for special recognition.

To make youngsters aware of the advent of the space age, Carl initiated a sputnik balloon race. For the princely sum of 10 cents each child at the park was given a balloon filled with helium to which was attached a card with his name and address. At a given signal all the red balloons were released, then all the blue ones, then the green ones—and so on until the sky was dotted with a rainbow of colors. The child whose balloon traveled farthest was given a prize. In addition the person at the other end who found the balloon was rewarded if he mailed the card back to the owner. One balloon was retrieved at sea by a sailor. One youngster attempted to tie a mouse to his balloon. Such fun!

The fourth one, my very most favorite, was the big Fourth of July celebration. People poured into Fuessenich Park equipped with jackets, blankets, and kazoos. While the band rendered favorite songs, while the thousands sang or played their kazoos in accompaniment, there was displayed at the east end of the park a fireworks picture of the specific song—with moving parts yet! Remember. The final number was always the rendition of "God Bless America" as the fireworks-flag waved gently in the soft summer air.

I'm sure many folks join me in thanking Carl Bozenski for these magic moments in our lives—and in wishing him as much future happiness as he has brought to us children of all ages.

NELLIE J. SULLIVAN.

Torrington.

S. 1284, THE ANTITRUST IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1976 AND H.R. 8532, ITS PARENS PATRIAE COUNTERPART

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, next week the Senate will be called on to consider one or both of these bills. All should be aware that these bills are mislabeled. H.R. 8532 permits basically the same course of action as does title IV of S. 1284. My remarks directed to title IV of S. 1284 are with the understanding that they are generally applicable to H.R. 8532. The other 4 titles in S. 1284 have no counterparts as of today from the House of Representatives. Title IV of S. 1284, the most onerous, will receive my attention first.

This bill, as I stated at the time it was reported favorably by the majority, is a cruel hoax on the consumer. The "damages" to be recovered will typically amount to a few dollars, perhaps but a few pennies, per person—no one seriously expects individual consumers to go through the administrative bother of trying to collect these small sums. After the lawyers skim their fees off the top, the bulk of the booty will apparently be distributed at the discretion of the judge, unless there is some State law setting up an appropriate general welfare program to be funded by the proceeds of such litigation.

In the worst sense, this is blackmail litigation. Few firms could afford the risk of losing a judgment in the billions, even if totally convinced of their innocence, and so these massive suits will have to be settled. In a well-known case, a group of drug companies was faced with claims which, according to one judge's theory, could have reached $4 billion or more. So they settled, with all the plaintiffs but one, for about 5 percent of that amount—$200 million, of which some $40 million has gone to the lawyers.

One plaintiff State insisted on taking the case to court for a ruling on the merits—and the court found there had been no violation of the antitrust laws. But because of the risk of an adverse ruling, the companies had already paid $200 million as insurance against bankruptcy. As could have been predicted, the bulk of the settlement money earmarked in these suits for consumers has gone unclaimed; apparently, the amounts are individually too small to bother with.

Thus, not only does the consumer fail to benefit from such suits, but as history has demonstrated, the high costs of settling or defending them will invariably be passed on to the customer.

Title VI lies at the heart of the bill's potential for abuse of the judicial process. This title is the ultimate mockery of the term "consumer benefit." The "benefit" it promises would in fact not inure to consumer-plaintiffs but to antitrust lawyers who would be awarded a veritable bounty-hunters' license to file unlimited liability actions, based on obscure and uncertain theories, against every size and species of private firm.

There seems to be a widespread misconception that the legislation is directed only against giant corporations. Private firms and business entities of all kinds, including those in the professions, could be sued under title IV. For that matter, labor organizations which have a partial antitrust exemption would also be subject to suits under title IV, in the same manner as corporate entities.

In brief, title IV poses a potential threat to every segment of the American economy, excepting only, as I stress once again, the legal antitrust trade. For lawyers specializing in that trade, title IV represents a bonanza and boom in prospective business.

What is especially illusory about this title is its theoretical "improvement" of extending to the State attorneys general power to file suits for alleged antitrust violation. How far we have departed from the Founding Fathers' conception of the Constitution, when Congress presumes to give State officials authority which the States already have. Have we "progressed" so far in our view of the Federal Government as the dispenser of all powers, as to forget the fact that under the Constitution the States, if they desire, have their own authority to enact and enforce State laws regarding price fixing and other antitrust violations within their boundaries?

It is unnecessary for the Federal Government to empower state attorneys general to proceed in Federal court to protect consumer interests. If the States, through their executive and legislative branches, believe their State attorneys general should be empowered to file suits of the kind described in title IV, then laws to that end should be enacted on the State level, authorizing suits in State, rather than Federal, courts.

President Ford on March 17 made quite clear, in opposing the concept of parens patriae in this type of legislation, that this was a State matter best left to the States.

In addition, and recognizing that the vast majority of State attorneys general are honest and conscientious public servants, we cannot ignore that in most States the office is political and elective. Stated bluntly, title IV proposes to dispense broad and hitherto unknown powers to use the Federal court system to State officials subject to political motivations and pressures.

It is a regrettable fact that abuse of existing powers held by some State attorneys general has in past years been a blot on the administration of justice. Several flagrant examples are a matter of record. When the bill is considered, more detail will be presented on this issue. One example is sufficient today.

A former attorney general of Washington was accused of accepting a bribe, by virtue of being paid nearly $1 million in fees for handling an antitrust suit on behalf of government entities while holding office. He was acquitted, the court finding that he was authorized to "practice law" while in office. While he was prosecuting the suit, in the courts and in the headlines, he ran unsuccessfully for Governor.

With this in mind, it is incumbent on Congress to consider title IV's potential for abuse.

As for the bill's provisions permitting large antitrust treble-damage actions to be filed by State-hired private lawyers, we have seen in recent years how the abuse of the judicial system in the filing of professional malpractice suits has assumed dimensions of a major national scandal. This situation has become so bad that in some areas of the country doctors have launched what has been called a legal counterattack against unscrupulous legal malpractice practitioners.

Title IV offers such private practitioners tempting new possibilities to ply their trade. The committee majority has given its stamp of approval to what amounts to an "antitrust lawyers full employment act." But if the provisions of that act are read carefully, it will be found that there is little, if any, benefit within it accruing to those lawyers' consumer-clients.

Titles II and III and V suffer equally grave defects, by rejecting established due process safeguards and granting unnecessary and potentially abusive powers to government officials.

Title II would authorize an unprecedented inquisitorial power in the Department of Justice, tailored uniquely for use against businessmen. These powers could be used not only to prepare for government antitrust suits, but also to gather information for use in bureaucratic and administrative agency proceedings. Moreover, title II grants these powers and simultaneously withholds or dilutes traditional due-process rights to adequate representation by counsel, to inspect one's own testimony for accuracy, and to challenge the interrogators' authority in a court of law.

Would S. 1284's supporters approve such powers in the hands of the FBI or the IRS? What gives the Antitrust Division a superior right to such powers?

Title V would allow the Government to stop at will, and effectively kill, virtually any business acquisition or merger, by turning completely on its head our time-honored judicial principle that the Government must prove its case before it can restrict the citizens' freedom of action. Instead, the Alice-in-Wonderland title V would force the defendant to demonstrate that the Government could not prove its case.

The hodgepodge of title III would inject the Federal authorities and the Federal courts into the most local business practices, ferreting out local transactions alleged to merely "affect" interstate commerce. It would further help the lawyers who file antitrust treble damage suits, by unleashing them against local businesses and local trade practices. It would further overload the court system by assigning priority status to any case, government or even private suit, designated a "complex antitrust case." The majority does not explain how this priority is to rank alongside the dozen or more different types of cases, including criminal cases, which recent legislation has also decreed should take precedence over everything else on the court's docket.

In the noble name of "antitrust improvements," the committee majority would create new legal machinery that would in fact be unfair to business, costly to the consumer, and a grave threat to our heritage of due process and protection from Federal Government interference in business.

It is particularly disturbing that the majority ignores that enacting this legislation will create very serious constitutional problems involving denial of due process.

This bill "improves" nothing. On the contrary, its enactment would wreak havoc on the American economy, including large and small businesses alike, as well as on the administration of the Nation's judicial system. So great is this potential threat that no less an authority than Erwin Griswold, former dean of the Harvard Law School and former Solicitor General of the United States, has deemed it appropriate to critically question the constitutionality of major areas of the bill.

Senator BURDICK, who later voted to report the S. 1284 package, was concerned about these serious questions and offered amendments to hopefully make title IV "constitutional" and "legal." He now opposes title IV because his amendments failed.

My fundamental objection to this legislation is that, beneath the facade of "improvements" and "consumer interests," it really assumes that private business, small and large, is an economic evil, endangering "our democratic institutions and personal freedoms."

In my opinion, the foremost threat to "our democratic institutions and personal freedoms" this election year is not the Amercan free enterprise system as title I implies. Rather it is the legislation enacted over the years which has placed ever-increasing power and authority in Government hands to regulate Americans in every facet of our daily lives.

The worst of such regulatory legislation has been enacted in the name of "protecting" or "improving" citizens' rights and interests against the alleged depredations of the private sector of the American economy. That is the case with the instant bill.

American consumers enjoy the benefits of the most abundant, efficient, and competitive economy on the face of the globe. Ours is an economic system that advances "our democratic institutions and personal freedoms" to the envy of peoples throughout the world.

Nevertheless, in focusing only on some purported problems in our national economy, this bill unfairly seeks to make our free enterprise system a political scapegoat. Toward that end, title I alleges that "anticompetitive practices" in business and industry are a root cause of unemployment and inflation. The clear implication is that the provisions of this bill represent a step in the direction of curing those ills.

Such polemics confound rather than enhance general public understanding of the complexity of the country's current economic problems. Specifically, the broad charges made and implied in title

I conveniently overlook the fact that to a large extent those problems are the result of the high cost of government itself; a cost, let me submit, which has been made all the greater over the years by the development of just such legislative "improvements" as are embraced by this bill.

Moreover, the burden placed on the system by ill-conceived but resoundingly titled "consumer interest" legislative measures and bureaucratic devices have compounded rather than cured the country's economic ills. Indeed, in many important areas they have created economic ills where none previously existed.

If enacted into law, the majority-approved bill would assume a first-rank position in that onerous category of "consumer interest" legislation. Its provisions would not only inhibit the expansion of the national economy when that economy is on the upswing, but title IV in particular would place a potentially crushing burden on our Federal court system at a time when the administration of criminal and civil law and justice is in crisis because of an already existing court overload.

This last point was tellingly made by Prof. Milton Handler in his critiques of the majority-approved bill. Professor Handler pointed out that "any court unlucky enough to be chosen as the forum for a State parens patriae action would have no option but to adjudicate the claims brought before it, however, numerous and miniscule they might be * * *. Not only will this enterprise consume lifetimes of judicial energy, but the result will be meaningless for the consumers themselves, since the expense of litigating, including attorneys' fees, will exceed their maximum possible recoveries."

SENATOR TUNNEY ON HELSINKI AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, last week my colleague from California, Senator TUNNEY, released the text of a study which he had commissioned on the subject of Soviet and East European implementation of the Helsinki Accords. Special emphasis was placed in the study on the human rights—or "Basket Three"—provisions of that agreement.

Because I believe the Library of Congress study requested by Senator TUNNEY, in his position as chairman of the Helsinki oversight committee of the North Atlantic Assembly, underlines both the importance of those human rights provisions themselves and the need to continue to press the Soviet Union and her Eastern European allies for adherence to the terms of the Helsinki understandings, I am submitting the texts of Senator TUNNEY's announcement and the report itself for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that these texts be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN V. TUNNEY RELEASING TEXT OF REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF BASKET THREE PROVISIONS OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be here today both because I believe we have something important to contribute to the dialogue over human rights in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in general and because it is really the first opportunity that I have had to sit down with a man I have long admired, whose courage and perseverance has served as a great encouragement both to the many thousands of Soviet citizens who, like Alexander Luntz, desire the freedom to decide for themselves the course of their lives, and for many many Americans as well who have dedicated their own time and effort to help others pursue those goals of freedom. Dr. Luntz, I want to say welcome, at last, to the United States. You have been much too long in coming, my friend.

As I'm sure you know, the purpose of our gathering here today is to announce the completion of what I think is an important report on compliance by East European countries and the Soviet Union with provisions of the Helsinki Accords relating to Human Rights, the so-called "basket three" provisions. Roughly six months ago in Copenhagen, at the annual meeting of the member states of the North Atlantic Assembly, the Parliamentary arm of NATO, the Committee of which I was Chairman was given the task of overseeing the provisions of the Helsinki agreements. Because I was firmly convinced that we in the West would lose the momentum that we had established in the Helsinki negotiations if we did not continue to closely monitor their implementation I undertook to prepare a report on the record of performance with the terms of Helsinki after its first six months. This report today is the final result of that pledge, but I can assure you that it does not represent the final results of our efforts to achieve more openness and a willingness to observe basic human rights on the part of the Eastern bloc. That flight, as this report so clearly demonstrates, must go on.

I would like to say a few words about the report and then I will turn the discussion over to Mr. Luntz who will comment both on the report itself and his own experiences in trying to hurdle the obstacles in the path of Soviet citizens who wish to emmigrate.

Less than one year ago in an atmosphere of high expectations and exuberance the heads of State of 35 nations gathered together in Helsinki to sign an accord which was the culmination of almost 3 years of tedious negotiation. Since last August, the controversy over that accord seems to have grown rather than diminished. On the one side are critics who suggest that the negotiations represented a diplomatic coup for the Soviet Union and its allies, the initiators of the conference who have eagerly sought recognition of the geopolitical status quo in Eastern Europe for thirty years.

On the other side of the debate are the optimists who thought that the provisions of Basket Three dealing with human rights and the freer flow of information represented a fundamental breakthrough in easing Soviet and East European repression. According to them, their signature upon this document would force the Soviets to reduce their restrictions on travel, communications, and individual freedom. It would deter another Czechoslovakia and eventually open the floodgates of the iron curtain to waves of citizens freely allowed to emigrate.

In a grandiose statement of purpose, Basket Three began with a pledge by all signatories to "Make it their aim to facilitate freer movement and contacts, individually and collectively, whether privately or officially, among persons, institutions and organizations of the participating States, and to contribute to the solution of the humanitarian problems that arise in that connection." To accomplish this the States undertook specifically to promote further development of family ties by favourably considering both temporary visa applications and applications for permanent emigration. In connection with this they promised to lower the fees for these applications and pledged not to intimidate those who apply by modifying in any way their rights or obligations or those of other members of their family.

Beyond emigration, the parties promised to allow religious institutions to have contacts and meetings among their own members and exchange information. They promised to facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds, to encourage cooperation in the field of information and the exchange of information with other countries, and to improve the conditions under which journalists from one participating State exercise their profession in another participating State. And they pledged themselves to promote substantial progress in cultural and educational exchanges.

But have the grandiloquent promises so perserveringly bargained for by the Western Powers produced any real change in Soviet or Eastern European behavior? Sadly not. What changes that have occurred in repressive policies in Eastern Europe with but few exceptions have proven either illusory or cosmetic. In fact, the Soviet record of noncompliance has amounted to a purposive and systematic violation of provision after provision.

Since completion of the Accords the Soviet attitude towards the human rights provisions of Basket Three has hardened and the Soviets have returned to their original interpretation—that the security provisions of the pact are binding while the human rights and information provisions are only agendas for future discussions.

While some Soviet emigration rules have been simplified, the changes are misleading. The fees for emigration have been lowered from 900 rubles to 800, but the source of most of the money for potential emigrants—foreign contributions—has now been cut off. The Report concludes: "there is no evidence to date that more people are actually being allowed to emigrate. In fact, since Helsinki, the rate of visa approvals has been about 11,000 per year as compared to 35,000 in the years prior to Helsinki." And of the 641 individuals who were on the official "Representation List" of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow for visas, 517 were still there nine months after the signing of the agreement.

With regard to freer travel, the Report concludes: "There has been no substantial change in the number of Soviet citizens traveling to the West since CSCE. Some prominent Soviet dissidents, like Andrei Sakharov, have been refused permission to visit the West."

And the record is no better on the dissemination of information. While conditions have improved with regard to the treatment of foreign journalists, these agreements were reached under the Soviet framework of additional bilateral discussions on the "agenda of Helsinki." Newspaper and magazine circulation have not been expanded. The broadcasts of several radio stations, including Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are still being jammed, and in fact the Soviets have recently been successful in convincing international Olympic officials to bar those stations from coverage of the Olympic games. The situation of the paper Le Monde—which has perhaps the highest circulation of any

major Western paper in the Soviet Union—is symbolic. Today, almost a year after the signing of the accord, the Soviet Union receives forty copies of Le Monde.

Ladies and gentlemen, the facts are there. This is no longer idle speculation or rhetoric. From this report there emerges a pattern of flagrant Soviet violations of undertakings which they themselves have said were morally—if not legally-binding. They have revised their assssment of the importance of the Third Basket. They have adopted cosmetic changes on the one hand while tightening the screw of repression on the other. They have mounted their own propaganda offensive at the same time as they are denying Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty the right even to cover the summer Olympics.

I am not saying here that the critics were completely correct. Nor am I saying that we should abandon our efforts to bring about some fundamental changes in Soviet and Eastern European observance of the human rights provisions of this accord. What I am saying is that we should not delude ourselves about the willingness of the Eastern block to forego patterns of repression that have been built-up over decades.

This is as much a call to action as an exercise in villification. We must not let up the pressure. We must increase our efforts to make the Russians and others deliver on their promises. I have supported and I wholeheartedly endorse the creation of a joint Congressional-Executive Helsinki oversight committee as the first step. The Senate has already passed this legislation and the House will hopefully act soon. Beyond this, I look forward to the Helsinki review conference scheduled for Belgrade in January of 1977 as an opportunity to air our grievances. But I don't think we should wait that long. Nor do I believe we can afford to. For this reason, I would propose two additional concrete steps which I believe can and should be taken immediately.

First, I urge Secretary of State Kissinger to conduct immediate, high-level discussions in either a public or a private mode with the Soviet Union and other Eastern European signatories of the Helsinki Accords for the purpose of raising the question of non-compliance by the Eastern bloc nations.

Second, I would urge the Secretary to take strong decisive action if those talks are not fruitful—by urging a suspension of American observance of the First and Second baskets of that Agreement dealing with security arrangements and economic exchanges.

I myself plan to offer a resolution of the Senate expressing our concern over the failure of certain parties to implement the Basket Three provisions. And I firmly intend to pursue this matter in multilateral channels when my committee of the North Atlantic Assembly meets again this year. I want to assure those of you who have shown a long and persevering interest in the problem of human rights that this fight is going to go on.

THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE: IMPLEMENTATION OF BASKET THREE

BASKET THREE'S PLACE IN THE FINAL ACT

The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) signed at Helsinki on August 1, 1975, was grouped under four headings, popularly termed Baskets. Basket Three, containing provisions on the freer flow of people, information, and ideas between East and West proved the most difficult to negotiate. Agreement on the nature and scope of Basket Three was achieved only in the final weeks of the negotiating stage of the Conference.

Since the early 1950s, the Soviet Union had pushed the idea of an all European conference to deal with problems of security and to gain formal acceptance of the results of World War II. West European nations, as well as the United States and Canada, agreed to attend the Conference, finally, on condition that its scope be expanded from strictly security questions to include consideration of ways to eliminate barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. The West insisted on Basket Three because it regarded rigid control of individual contacts and the dissemination of information as detrimental to European security interests. It looked upon expanded inter-bloc contacts as a means to dispel suspicion and fear. Without the provisions for change contained in Basket Three, many Western nations were unwilling to formally ratify the status quo in Europe.

The Soviet Union and several Eastern European governments, for a long time, resisted Western demands on Basket Three. Once the Soviet Union accepted Basket Three in principle, as the necessary price for what it considered to be the crucial security agreements regarding inviolability of frontiers and noninterference in internal affairs, the Soviet negotiating tactic became essentially one of damage limiting.

Consequently, a compromise agreement was reached under the formal title "Cooperation in Humanitarian and other Fields." It still contained provisions addressed to the freer flow of people, information, and ideas, but to these were added others addressed to cultural and educational cooperation. The Soviet Union failed in attempts to restrict agreements on contracts to those regulated on a government-to-government basis, owing to the unequivocal stand taken by many NATO and Western neutral nations.

DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS OF BASKET THREE

The preamble to Basket Three of the Final Act states that the parties aim to increase cultural and educational cooperation, the dissemination of information, contacts between people, and to achieve the solution of humanitarian problems in order to further peace and increase understanding among themselves, regardless of political, economic, or social systems. The text of Basket Three outlines the specific areas in which cooperation is to be expanded. Despite the years spent by delegates to establish language acceptable to all, differences among participating states over interpretation of Basket Three have continued to this day.

The Western view

The general Western view of the final Act holds that the security and cooperation provisions of the agreement carry equal weight. While the first recognize present realities in Europe, the second commit the 35 signatory nations to go beyond those realities in Europe. American, Canadian, and West European officials have repeatedly rejected arguments by some communist governments that the security provisions of the agreement, such as recognition of present day borders, take priority over other provisions, including those aimed at the freer flow of people, information, and ideas between East and West.

The Western rationale for emphasizing Basket Three since the Helsinki summit is that this section contains those provisions which require further implementation, while the security provisions, with a few exceptions, do not. President Ford, in his Helsinki speech underlined the importance attributed to Basket Three by the United States. He said:

"The United States considers that the principles on which this Conference has agreed are part of the great heritage of European civilization which we all hold in trust for all mankind. To my country they are not cliches or empty phrases. We take this work and these words very seriously. We will spare no effort to ease tensions and solve problems between us. But it is important that you recognize the deep devotion of the American people and their Government to human rights and fundamental freedoms regarding the freer movement of people, ideas, and information." [1]

In principle, the Western signatories have given the provisions of Basket Three a broad interpretation. They have not accepted that the pledges in areas such as family reunification, emigration, freer movement and information apply only to specific groups (i.e., certain minorities) or specified types of information. As a practical matter, however, they have recognized the greater chances of success of a step-by-step approach in seeking compliance from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Differences reportedly have arisen among NATO and other Western nations on how hard the other side should be pushed to implement Basket Three. But there has seemed to be general agreement that implementation of Basket Three would be a long hard road requiring Western persistence and that the results would not be immediate.

The Soviet view

The Soviet attitude toward Basket Three appears to have undergone some subtle changes since the signing of the Helsinki accord. The initial Soviet stand emphasized Basket Three's clearly subordinate position to the security provisions of the Final Act. Soviet commentators in particular stressed the importance of the noninterference and inviolability provisions of Basket One, as well as the Declaration of Principles guiding relations among participating states which was called the "core" of the Helsinki accord.[2] The Soviet press warned that attempts to shift the weight in the Helsinki principles would be rejected.

While emphasizing the importance of Basket One, the Soviet Union also dismissed the idea that it owed the West something in Basket Three, as the price for the Helsinki accord. Soviet foreign policy expert Georgi A. Arbatov wrote in September 1975 that the Soviet Union could not accept the Western view that the fixing of post-World War II borders was a major concession for which it must pay the West under Basket Three. He went on to criticize the West for treating the provisions on humanitarian cooperation as the main element of the final act.[3]

A feature of the Soviet attitude toward Basket Three since the Helsinki summit, noted by many Western observers, is the apparent return to interpretations voiced in the early stages of CSCE negotiations. For example, shortly after the conclusion of the Conference, Soviet officials began to let it be known that many of the Basket Three provisions could only be implemented on the basis of further bilateral and multilateral negotiations.[4] According to this view, rejected by the West, Basket Three was no more than an agenda for future negotiations to codify events which would take place anyway in the normal course of detente.[5] The CSCE agreement, simply created the favorable prerequisites.

The Soviets responded to Western pressure for compliance with Basket Three by invoking the Basket One principle of noninterference in one anothers affairs. Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev stated in his speech at the Helsinki summit:

The main conclusion, which is reflected in the Final Act is this: No one should try, out of foreign policy considerations of one kind or another, to dictate to other peoples how they should manage their internal affairs." [6]

Certain elements in the West were accused of trying to gain under detente what they could not achieve during the Cold War, namely a wedge to interfere in Soviet internal affairs through the vehicle of Basket

---

Footnotes at end of article.

Three.[7] Soviet writers stressed that Basket Three did not open the doors to ideological subversion, during what they termed a period of heightened ideological warfare. Brezhnev underlined this view in October when he rejected visiting French President Giscard d'Estaing's call for ideological detente.[8] Furthermore, it was emphasized that Basket Three could be implemented only subject to the internal laws of each country.

Western analysts generally believed that these qualifications to Basket Three were resurrected after the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in part as an effort to tone down expectations among Soviet citizens.

A shift in the Soviet attitude toward CSCE as a whole began to emerge in September 1975. The initial Soviet reaction had been one of unrestrained enthusiasm for the results of the conference and scant attention to Basket Three. In response to growing pressure from the West and from dissidents within the Soviet Union, spokesmen moved to confront critics head on. Their position on the Conference began to reflect less enthusiasm as they were forced to pay more detailed attention to Basket Three. Soviet hopes for CSCE may have receive received their sharpest blow when West European communist parties, including the French and British CPs, began to demand that the Soviet Union live up to the humanitarian provisions of the Final Act, while condemning the Soviet record on human rights.[9]

East European views

With the exception of Yugoslavia, the East European nations have followed the Soviet Union quite closely in their public attitude toward Basket Three of the Final Act. Thus they have repeated the themes that the security provisions were the most important of the accord, that the Basket Three provisions were subject to further negotiations, that they could not become tools for interference or ideological subversion from abroad, and that they could only be implemented according to the laws of each country.

Despite these visible similarities, there have been interesting variations in the approach of some East European countries. In general East European comment on Basket Three has been less anti-Western in focus than recent Soviet comment. The differences have been attributed in part to the fact that most Eastern European countries were more open to contacts and exchanges with the West even prior to Helsinki.

The Bulgarian, East German, and Czechoslovak reactions to the CSCE Final Act have most closely reflected those of the Soviet Union. In the case of Czechoslovakia some Western analysts have discerned tensions and differences within the government. The Czechoslovaks have charged that the Western concept of Basket Three is a "system of thousands of communication channels, 'bridges', designed to facilitate the passage and spreading of bourgeois ideas throughout the socialist countries."[10] However, Czechoslovak actions have not always conformed to the rigid public stance. Poland and Hungary have shown less concern over the impact of Basket Three, than their communist neighbors.

The Romanian attitude toward the Final Act has reflected ideological rigidity concerning Basket Three. At the same time, the Romanian media has not followed the dictates of Moscow, instead stressing those provisions of the CSCE agreement which seem to reinforce Romania's right to an independent course.

Yugoslavia has been well ahead of the other communist countries in Europe in allowing freer movement of the people and information. Its position with regard to Basket Three in many ways may more closely resembles that of the West than the East.[11]

Footnotes at end of article.

THE RECORD OF COMPLIANCE WITH BASKET THREE

Problems of measurement

The vagueness of the language of the Final Act resulting from the requirement of consensus among 35 nations on each clause, makes different interpretations among signatory nations likely and provides one of the difficulties in measuring compliance. Furthermore, the Final Act is not legally binding. Nevertheless, the summit level ratification of the agreement places moral and political pressure on each nation to comply with Basket Three.

The West has generally held that the conduct of most of the Western nations is already in compliance with the spirit of CSCE's provisions. Where compliance is lacking, it is often said to be in direct retaliation for restrictions and barriers imposed by communist countries. The burden of reform and change is seen as resting on the East.

The Soviet Union promised to take seriously the CSCE pledges. Soviet leader Brezhnev said in Helsinki:

We proceed from the assumption that all the countries represented at the Conference will translate into life the agreements reached. As regards the Soviet Union, it will do precisely that.[12]

With regard to compliance with Basket Three, specifically, Georgi Arbatov wrote:

As is known this terminology covers the provisions which mention the intentions and readiness of the states to cooperate in such spheres as the development of relations in the fields of culture, science, education and information, contacts between people and the solution of various humanitarian questions including family contacts, marriages between citizens of different states and so forth. The Soviet Union, by signing the Final Act, has expressed absolutely clearly its intention to implement these provisions of the Final Act too (on the basis of reciprocity and in precise accordance with the spirit and letter of the document of course.) [13]

At the same time, Soviet commentators angrily denounced the Western view that the accords concluded under Basket Three required no action by Western governments. Arbatov said on this score:

I should just like to stress that this is a reciprocal matter. The implementation of the provisions of the "third basket" just as of the other sections of the Final Act, requires efforts not only on our part but also on the part of the West, and all the more so because the practice that has developed there is at the moment, still creating many obstacles to cooperation in the aforementioned spheres.[14]

The Soviet press cited examples of alleged Western violations of the Basket Three provisions. In November 1975, the Soviet news agency TASS accused West Germany of "massive and legalized" violations of human rights involving new procedures for checking the loyalty of government employees. Britain was accused of discrimination against its non-white residents. The U.S. was accused of racial discrimination, as well as of violating specific Basket Three provisions through illegal wiretapping and mail covers. The West was also accused of placing more restrictions on exchanges than the East.[15] The Soviet views on compliance were echoed by several East European countries.[16]

Human contacts

Basket Three pledged each signatory state to facilitate contacts between separated families by allowing regular entry and exist, by providing travel permits within a reasonable period of time, and by lowering passport and visa fees where necessary.

Applications for relocation from one country to another for purposes of family reunification and marriage would be handled in a positive and humanitarian manner. Fees would be lowered where necessary. If applications were refused they would be reconsidered within a reasonable period of time. Fees would only be charged a second time if application were successful. Individuals would be allowed to take household and personal belongings with them. Persons would not be disadvantaged in any way because of their application to leave the country. The country of destination would assist them by granting the same social benefits as those enjoyed by its own citizens and by aiding in the search for a job.

Opportunities for travel in general would be expanded. Procedures for gaining entry and exit permits would be simplified. Tourism was to be promoted by each country. Meetings among young people and for the sake of sports were to be encouraged and facilitated.

Soviet policies since Helsinki

Much of the Western attention to implementation of Basket Three has focused on emigration policy. Several of the Basket Three provisions can be included under this heading since they involve questions of free movement, family reunification and marriages between different nationals.

According to Soviet Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs Boris Shumilin, "Soviet emigration rules are in full accord with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1966." He stressed, however, that the Covenant permits restrictions on emigration for protection of state security, public order, health or moral standards.[17]

The Soviet Union has taken a few recent actions which may reflect an effort to bring formal Soviet emigration regulations into closer line with the requirements of Basket Three. The Soviet news agency TASS reported on January 22, 1976 that the rules governing applications for emigration had been simplified.[18] The rule changes were later revealed to include the following: (A) reduction of the exit visa fee from 400 rubles to 300 rubles; (B) elimination of the requirement that applicants for emigration produce character references from their place of work; (C) review of cases every six months (previously, applications had to wait a year for review); (D) refusals could be appealed within a state visa system.[19]

The changes in the regulations do not of themselves guarantee that emigration from the Soviet Union will become less difficult. Reports of would-be emigrants being harassed, losing their jobs and homes continue. A 500 rubles fee is still charged for the required renunciation of Soviet citizenship. Other new rules have been introduced with may make life more difficult for applicants. According to a regulation which went into effect on December 22, 1975, Soviet citizens can no longer receive hard currency or prepaid gifts from abroad. Dissidents and would-be emigrants who have been fired from their jobs are most dependent on gifts from abroad for their survival. Now such gifts are to be received from the state bank of foreign trade in rubles converted at the official exchange rate, after deduction of a thirty percent tax on foreign currency.[20]

The overall impact of the new Soviet regulations on emigration is unknown. There is no evidence to date that more people are actually being allowed to emigrate. The number of Soviet Jews who were allowed to emigrate in 1975 was between 11,000 and 14,000 (estimates vary—the Soviet Union claims 11,700 were given visas). The Jewish emigration figure for the first two months of 1976 is just over 2,000, or approximately the 1975 rate. These figures are a sharp drop from the peak year 1973 when almost 35,000 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union. The official Soviet explanation for the decline in emigration is simply that the number of applicants has dropped. Deputy Minister of

Internal Affairs Boris Shumilin claims that only 1.6 percent of applications are denied in those cases where individuals have had access to state secrets or where departure would bring hardship to family members. On the other hand, some Western sources have estimated that there is a backlog of 150,000 applications for emigration.[21] This ngure does not include those who may not apply for fear of losing their job or other consequences.

Soviet ethnic Germans estimated at 1,800,000 are another large minority group affected by Soviet emigration policy. Soviet authorities have reportedly received more than 40,000 applications from Germans wishing to leave the country. In 1975 over 1,000 emigrated to Germany.[22]

Shortly after the conclusion of the CSCE sumit, the United States presented the Soviet government with a new representation list of 641 Soviet residents (249 families) who were considered to have legitimate claims to go to the United States. Some of these persons had been trying without success to leave the Soviet Union for many years. It was hoped that following CSCE, Soviet officials would act positively on these cases. The number still on the list in April 1976 was 517.[23]

No figures are available on the number of Soviet citizens awaiting permission to marry foreigners. The Soviet Union claims that 5,500 Soviet citizens who married foreigners in recent years have been allowed to leave for 110 different countries.[24] In a much publicized case Soviet chess champion Boris Spassky was recently granted permission to marry a Frenchwoman after some delay by officials. Many other cases await favorable Soviet action.

Recently, the Soviet Union has given a number of prominent dissidents permission to leave the country, including Alexander Lunts, Leonid Plyushch, Ernest Neizvesty, and Andrei Amalrik. Other prominent dissidents continue to be refused permission to emigrate.

The Soviet record of compliance with the "freer travel" provisions of Basket Three is difficult to assess. There has been no substantial change in the number of Soviet citizens traveling to the West since CSCE. Some prominent dissidents have been refused permission to visit the West. Physicist Andrei Sakharov was not allowed to go to Norway to receive the Noble Peace Prize. The official reason for denying him an exist visa was his alleged knowledge of state secrets, even though he has not had access to classified information for some years. At the same time, Soviet authorities openly voiced their displeasure at the award of the prize to Sakharov, who according to commentators is "constantly on the side of those who by their aggressive actions more than once made the international situation extremely tense."[25]

The Soviet media has recently conducted a campaign to show that the West actually places more barriers on free travel than the Soviet Union. Some of the examples cited are: a Soviet entry visa can be obtained within a week, while Soviet citizens must wait three weeks for an Italian or American visa and a month for a West German, Swiss or Japan visa; Soviet visa fees have remained constant since World War II, while the prices Soviets must pay for Western visas have risen significantly.[26] Georgi Arbatov has complained that an American scientist can gain admission to the Soviet Union simply by personally applying to the Intourist agency, while a Soviet scientist wishing to visit the United States needs an official invitation and an organization or person vouching for his good behavior.[27]

Footnotes at end of article.

East European policies since Helsinki

East European policies toward the issue of human contacts have varied considerably from country to country before and after CSCE. With regard to minority emigration the problems differ in each country. The 800,000 Turks living in Bulgaria could pose one of the most serious problems but there has been no reported pressure from Turkey to increase the number allowed to leave.[28]

Over 280,000 Germans live within the postwar borders of Poland (the West German Red Cross gives a figure of 307,000). On the basis of a Polish-West German agreement signed in October 1975, Poland will allow 125,000 ethnic Germans to emigrate to West Germany over the next four years. To gain the West German parliament's approval of the pact, it has been agreed that more Germans (beyond the 125,000) will be allowed to leave Poland at a later date. In return, the West German government will extend to Poland long term credits of $900,000,000. West Germany will also make a lump sum payment to Poland as settlement of pension claims dating from the wartime German occupation of Poland.[29]

Over 330,000 Jews have left Romania since World War II. Another 80,000 remain. In 1975, Romania signed a trade agreement with the United States, providing for most-favored-nation status. Under the restrictions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment on granting MFN by the United States, Romania would have to show continued progress on emigration. Romania emphasized as recently as December 1975, that there could be no question of large scale emigration by that country's German population numbering some 400,000.[30]

Movement between East and West Germany has increased in recent years. However, the increase in contacts has been largely one sided, allowing the West Germans to travel to East Germany. Those East Germans allowed to move to the West have been chiefly the retired and elderly. An estimated 7,000 people have been allowed to leave East Germany annually in recent years. Another 5,000 a year have escaped. In 1975, approximately seven million West Germans and West Berliners were said to have visited East Germany.[31] The East German government has claimed that over one million of its citizens visited the West.[32]

Czechoslovakia has a German population of approximately 80,000 of whom some 20,000 are believed to want to emigrate. Thus far, Czechoslovakia authorities have not shown a willingness to allow them to leave. According to the Czechoslovak press, 60,000 citizens have been allowed to leave the country in the past ten years, most of them ethnic Germans.[33]

Hungary's German minority numbers 200,000. There has been no known pressure from this group to emigrate. In general, Hungarian emigration policies are considered to be among the more liberal in Eastern Europe.[34]

In terms of allowing their citizens to travel to the West, the East European countries generally have a better record than the Soviet Union. There remain significant differences in performance from country to country.

Since Helsinki, the East European media has generally echoed the Soviet criticism that the West is placing more restrictions on free movement than the East, using such examples as the relative time period involved in gaining a visa and the cost involved.

Information

According to the provisions of the Final Act, the signatory states make it their aim to achieve a freer and wider dissemination of all types of information. Each country aims to allow in more foreign newspapers and to distribute them through the same channels as domestic publications. Sales outlets for foreign publications are to be increased and facilities for subscription to foreign newspapers are to be improved. Foreign printed information is also to be made available on loan from public libraries.

The dissemination of filed and broadcast information is to be increased. The signatory states note the expansion of information broadcast by radio and express the hope that this process will continue. The United States is the sponsor of this provision aimed at eliminating the jamming of Western broadcasts by communist countries.

Contacts among journalists of different countries are to be encouraged, as are exchanges of articles by newspapers of different countries. Working conditions for foreign journalists are to be improved. This provision contains specific clauses concerning the granting of multiple exit and reentry visas for foreign journalists, freer travel within countries, freer access to news sources, and freer passage of news to a journalist's home country, etc.

Dissemination of newspapers and printed information

In most Western countries which participated in CSCE, foreign newspapers, journals and other publications can be distributed freely and the circulation of foreign publications is based primarily on the level of demand.

Most communist countries, on the other hand, tightly control the importation of Western newspapers and publications and severely restrict access to them. There have been no significant changes in this area since the conclusion of CSCE. While the Soviets have made some modest gestures, they have also made statements interpreted by many Western analysts as outright repudiation of the Basket Three provisions.

Georgi Arbatov warned that "if some people regard (the provisions) as an invitation to fling open the door to subversive anti-Soviet pro-violence propaganda, or to fan national and racial strife, then they are laboring in vain. Neither the document signed in Helsinki nor detente will permit such occurrences."[35] A major Soviet article published in February 1976 on the freedom of information topic charged that "implementation of the principle has in fact developed into an unprecedented anti-communist campaign, into attempts to violate the sovereignty of the socialist countries and interfere in their internal affairs through the mass media." The article went on to insist that "the problem of information exchange between countries must be resolved on a basis other than that of the free-flow-of-information principle" and claimed that "the concept that the state has a sovereign right in the matter of disseminating mass information on its territory has received increasing recognition in recent years in the practice of international relations."[36]

On January 21, 1976, TASS announced that eighteen Western newspapers would go on sale in the Soviet Union. While this measure aimed at showing compliance with Basket Three, the Soviet Union hinted that these newspapers would be available to the same extent Western newspapers already sold in the Soviet Union, such as Le Monde, were available, i.e., allowed in very small numbers to be sold exclusively at tourist hotels.[37]

The East European countries have not taken any formal steps to increase the dissemination of Western newspapers since the CSCE agreement. However, such newspapers have received wider distribution in those countries even prior to Helsinki. To cite one example, the circulation of Le Monde in the Soviet Union stands at 40 copies, while Poland receives 1000 copies and even Czechoslovakia receives 250 copies.[38]

Filmed and broadcast information

In the post-war period, radio broadcasts have been used widely by East and West to communicate with the people of other countries. While Western countries have not physically interfered with broadcasts from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, those countries have used jamming devices to attempt to block the reception of Western broadcasts. The practice of jamming has been reduced in recent years (the Voice of America and BBC, for example are no longer jammed). Nevertheless, the broadcasts of some Western stations, including the American government-funded Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, have continued to be interfered with by the Soviet Union and some East European countries.

The Western participants at CSCE interpreted jamming to be irreconcilable with the Basket Three provisions on the dissemination of information. Soviet and East European actions regarding foreign broadcasts were therefore viewed by many Western officials as providing a yardstick for measurement of Soviet and East European compliance with the CSCE Final Act. To date there has been no discernible decline in jamming activities since the Helsinki summit. At the same time, a vigorous campaign against Western broadcasts in general, and the broadcasts of Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe and the Deutschlandfunk in particular, has been launched.[39] The campaign has been conducted primarily by the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and East Germany, which have accused these stations of "inflicting great harm to detente" and violating the principles of CSCE.[40] Under pressure from the communist countries, the International Olympic Committee refused Radio Free Europe permission to cover the winter Olympic games in Innsbruck. In March 1976, East German authorities refused permission for three West German radio broadcasters to cover the Leipzig trade fair. In both instances Western governments and the Western media in general sharply condemned the actions which were viewed as contradictory to the Helsinki agreement.

There has been less controversy on the subject of exchanging films. As in other areas, the Soviet and East European press have criticized the West for showing fewer films from the communist countries, compared to the number of Western films that have been imported by those countries.

Working conditions for journalists

The greatest progress toward compliance with the provisions of Basket Three has been visible in the area of improving working conditions for foreign journalists. In the past, the communist countries placed severe restrictions on the movement and work of Western journalists. Many Western governments retaliated by placing restrictions on the movement and activities of journalists from those countries. The CSCE Final Act outlined specific ways in which the situation was to be improved.

In September 1975, the Soviet Union announced that it was prepared to grant multiple entry and exit visas to foreign journalists who previously had been compelled to apply for a visa each time they wanted to leave or reenter the country. As of March 1, 1976, Western journalists were no longer required to seek special permission to travel outside the restricted forty kilometer limit within the Soviet Union. Both measures were implemented on the basis of reciprocal bilateral agreements with the United States, Canada, and the individual West European countries.[41]

The problems in Eastern Europe are different from those faced by Western journalists in the Soviet Union. Far fewer Western journalists are permanently stationed in East European countries. It is generally easier for Western journalists to make short visits to Eastern Europe from news bureaus in the West or in the Soviet Union. Journalists generally find it most difficult to gain entry into East Germany and Czechoslovakia. These countries have taken no steps to implement new regulations concerning foreign journalists.[42]

Cooperation in culture and education

The Basket Three provisions dealing with cultural cooperation state that the signatory states make it their aim to increase cultural exchanges and facilitate access to the cultural achievement of other states, as well as to develop contacts among persons in the cultural field. Contacts between authors and foreign publishing houses are to be expanded; the sale and exchange of foreign books are to be increased; joint book, radio and television production are to be encouraged.

In the sphere of education, CSCE participant states aim to promote exchanges of knowledge and increased contacts among individuals, universities and other institutions. Opportunities for study abroad are to be increased and travel for these purposes is to be facilitated. The teaching of foreign languages is to be expanded.

This section of Basket Three has been less controversial than those on human contacts and the dissemination of information. There have been meetings aimed at increasing cooperation between East and West in these areas. Even prior to CSCE there was considerable cooperation in many of these areas.

The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe qualify their commitment to the provisions of this section by stressing that they will continue to be selective about the types of Western culture which will be allowed into their countries. They also accuse the West of lagging behind the East in areas such as the publication of foreign books, the teaching of foreign languages, and other areas of cultural exchange.[43]

Congressional initiatives on CSCE implementation

Since the conclusion of the CSCE Final Act, many Members of the United States Congress have voiced the need to ensure that the agreements reached become more than empty phrases. They have expressed the view that the instruments for monitoring the accord should be strengthened. In particular, they have felt that it would be useful for the Congress to take an active role in monitoring. To this end, bills have been introduced by Representative Millicent Fenwick in the House of Representatives and Senator Clifford Case in the Senate to establish a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Commission would be composed of four members from the House of Representatives, four members from the Senate, as well as representatives from the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Commerce, appointed by the President of the United States.

The supporters of this bill have stressed it does not aim to interfere in the affairs of foreign countries. The Commission is to perform solely an information gathering function for the purpose of keeping the Congress and the American people informed on the record of compliance with the CSCE Final Act by the 35 nations which signed the document.

The Commission is not meant to replace any of the existing U.S. agencies assigned the task of implementing the Helsinki accord.[44]

BASKET THREE PROSPECTS

The first nine months since the conclusion of CSCE are generally viewed as having produced only modest results in the areas covered by Basket Three. Soviet concessions on freer contacts and the wider dissemination of information have been limited. Soviet leaders thus far have seemed to choose to comply in those areas which would have the least domestic impact. Nevertheless, some small steps toward implementation have been taken. These steps represent some achievement compared to the most pessimistic Western expectations.

The East European governments generally have seemed less concerned about the consequences of Basket Three and have shown a greater readiness to live with them. However, the record of the past nine months also seems to have shown that there are severe limits to the extent to which those countries are willing or able to depart from the Soviet position.

CSCE has not been able to remove the barriers and mutual suspicions between East and West. Realistically, there seems little prospect of their elimination in the foreseeable future. On the other hand, no government has been able to ignore the CSCE provisions. It seems likely that given continued interest and pressure from the West, the process of implementing the Final Act will continue, if only hesitantly.

FOOTNOTES

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 9, 1975, p. 28036.

[2] Arbatov, Georgi A. The maneuvers of the opponents of detente. Izvestia, September 4, 1975: 3, 4.

[3] Arbatov, Georgi A. The maneuvers of the opponents of detente. Izvestia, September 4, 1975: 3, 4.

[4] Wren, Christopher S. Rights in Soviet–a fading hope. New York Times, August 20, 1975: 14.

[5] What will the Helsinki Agreement mean for Soviet scientists and human rights. F.A.S. public interest report, v. 28, no. 10, December 1975: 1.

[6] In the name of peace, security and cooperation: speech by Leonid Brezhnev at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. New times (Moscow), no. 32, August 1975: 5.

[7] Larrabee, F. Stephen. Soviet attitudes and policy towards "Basket Three" since Helsinki. Radio Liberty research, no. RL 135/76, March 15, 1976: 6.

[8] Ibid., p. 8.

[9] Soviet rebuffs criticism of human rights stand, New York Times, February 21, 1976: 1.

[10] Six months after: The East European response to Helsinki. Radio Free Europe research, RAD background report 46, February 18, 1976: 28.

[11] Ibid., p. 40–41.

[12] In the name of peace, security and cooperation, op. cit., p. 5.

[13] Arbatov, op. cit., p. 4.

[14] Ibid, p. 3, 4.

[15] Soviets strike back on civil rights criticism. Washington Post, November 25, 1975: A12.

[16] Six months after, op. cit., p. 30.

[17] Seltzer, Richard J. Dissident Soviet scientists under attack. Chemical and engineering news, March 29, 1976: 18–20.

[18] The economist, v. 28, January 31, 1976: 12.

[19] Larrabee, op. cit., p. 10–11.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Seltzer, op. cit., p. 18.

[22] Soviet Germans want to go home. Los Angeles times, January 20, 1976: 7, 8.

[23] Information supplied by the Department of State.

[24] Soviet rebuffs criticism of human rights stand. New York times, February 21, 1976: 1, 8.

[25] Rakhmaninov, op. cit., p. 50.

[26] Six months after, op. cit., p. 32.

[27] Arbatov, Georgi A. Reciprocity after Helsinki. New York times, October 8, 1975.

[28] Six months after, op. cit., p. 25.

[29] Getler, Michael. Last minute compromise saves Warsaw-Bonn pact. Washington post, March 13, 1976.

[30] Six months after, op. cit., p. 26.

[31] Whitney, Craig R. East Germans grow frustrated under restrictions. New York times, April 5, 1976: 3.

[32] Helsinki and us: Interview with Erich Honecker. Neues Deutschland, August 6, 1975: 3.

[33] CSSR in Europe—Europe in the CSSR. Mlada fronta, March 10, 1976: 4.

[34] Six months after, op. cit., p. 25.

[35] Arbatov, op. cit.

[36] Korobeinikov, V. What is behind the 'freedom of information' concept. International affairs (Moscow), no. 2, February 1976: 105–106.

[37] Larrabee, op. cit., p. 9.

[38] Six months after, op. cit., p. 7.

[39] Getler, Michael. Campaign seen to hamper West's broadcasts to Bloc. Washington Post, March 16, 1976.

[40] Korobeinikov, op. cit., p. 105.

[41] Osnos, Peter. Soviets ease reporters visas in first Helsinki Pact response. Washington, September 16, 1975; and Larrabee, op. cit., p. 9.

[42] Doder, Dusko. Helsinki Pact's mixed legacy. Washington post, February 27, 1976.

[43] Six months after, op. cit., p. 24–32.

[44] The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 9, 1975, p. 28036.

NATIONAL HANDICAPPED AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, this week has been designated as National Handicapped Awareness Week. Congress has adopted the policy of recognizing the right of all citizens, regardless of handicap, to full use of the manmade environment. I was proud to be a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, Toward a Barrier-Free Environment for All Handicapped Americans, which was passed by this body last year, and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, which was signed into law November 29, 1975. The Subcommittee on the Handicapped will soon begin its deliberations on legislation to extend the Rehabilitation Act to insure the availability and quality of rehabilitation services and to insure affirmative action in employment and advancement in employment of handicapped individuals.

In this Bicentennial Year we are becoming increasingly aware of the many contributions handicapped individuals have made to our country. I look forward to true independence for handicapped citizens during our Nation's third century.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE OF SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under the Senate rules, I filed with the Secretary of the Senate on May 14, 1976, a "Statement of Contributions and Honorariums" which discloses all contributions or honorariums received by me during the calendar year 1975; also it incorporates by reference all reports of campaign contributions which are on file with the Secretary of the Senate. These reports are public documents.

In addition, on May 14, 1976, I filed, under the Senate rules, with the Comptroller General of the United States a "Confidential Statement of Financial Interests" which includes a list of my assets and liabilities in 1975 and my 1975 tax returns. As that report is not available to the public and as I have heretofore followed a policy of annual financial reports for many years, I am publishing a list of my assets and liabilities for calendar year 1975 as filed on May 14, 1976. The listing includes:

First, each of my interests in property having a value of $10,000 or more;

Second, the assets held in a family trust established in 1937, of which I am the trustee and in which as a beneficiary I have a life interest, each item having a value of $5,000 or more; and,

Third, each of my liabilities having a value of $5,000 or more.

Finally, I am including a summary of my 1975 Federal income tax returns and the amounts of State and local taxes paid for 1975.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERESTS IN PROPERTY (1975)[1]

Nature of interest, type of property, and location:

Indian Trail Groves, Ltd. Shareowner—Indian Trail Ranch, Inc.—real estate interests, land, Miami, Fla.

Big Mound Trail Corp.—trust, land, Miami, Fla.

Arrowhead Associates, land, Tyson Corners, Va.

TBV Lessors, land, California.

Molycorp., corporate stock, New York, N.Y.

Westmorland Coal Co., corporate stock, New York, N.Y.

Watergate West, Inc.—stock, residence, Washington, D.C.

Computer Investors Group, Inc.—stock, corporate stock, New York, N.Y.

L.S. Inc.—stock, corporate stock, New York, N.Y.

I.M.C. Magnetics Corp., corporate stock, New York, N.Y.

Terra Bella Vineyards (investor—noncontrol), vineyards, California.

Northgate Associates (investor—non control), land and buildings, Chicago, Ill.

West Indies and Caribbean—development debentures, stock.

Checking account, cash, First National City Bank, N.Y.

Checking account, cash, National Commercial Bank & Trust Co., Schenectady, N.Y.

Paintings, art works, objects and household furnishings, Watergate West, Washington, D.C.

BENEFICIAL INTEREST IN TRUSTS (1975)[2]

Name of trust of fiduciary interest: Ida Javits Trust.

Name of trustee or other fiduciary: Jacob K. Javits, Trustee.

Address of trustee or other fiduciary: 110 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.

Trust holdings:

Belco Oil & Gas Fund, land interest.

East Hampton property, land interest.

Loxahatchee real estate, land interest.

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., bonds.

Bartell Media, bonds.

Carolina Telephone & Telegraph, bonds.

Government Employees Corp., bonds.

Government Employees Financial Corp., bonds.

New York State tax anticipation notes, bonds.

Suffolk County, N.Y., tax anticipation notes, bonds.

U.S. Treasury bills, short-term paper.

American Standard, Inc., stocks.

American Water Works, stocks.

Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., stocks.

Arlen Realty & Development, stocks.

Bankers Securities Corp., stocks.

Carolina Power & Light, stocks.

Cenco Instrument, stocks.

Citicorp, stocks.

Cities Service Co., stocks.

Cone Mills, stocks.

Consolidated Marbenor Mines Ltd., stocks.

Continental Illinois Properties, stocks.

Corporate Property Investors, stocks.

Corporate Realty Consultants, stocks.

Criterion Insurance Co., stocks.

Crown Zellerbach Corp., stocks.

Duke Power Co., stocks.

Federal Paper Board Co., stocks.

Government Employees Financial Corp., stocks.

Government Employees Insurance Co., stocks.

Government Employees Life Insurance Co., stocks.

Great Northern Nekoosa Corp., stocks.

ICM Realty SBI, stocks.

IDB Bank Holding, stocks.

Inland Container, stocks.

IMC Magnetics Corp., stocks.

Kennecott Copper, stocks.

Magic Marker Corp., stocks.

Marcor, Inc., stocks.

Molycorp, stocks.

National Medical Products, stocks.

Peerage Realty Corp., stocks.

Royal Palm Beach Colony, Inc., stocks.

St. Joe Minerals Corp., stocks.

Sherritt Gordon Mines, stocks.

South Carolina Electric Gas Co., stocks.

Telco Marketing Service, stocks.

Transamerica Corp., stocks.

Tubos de Acero de Mexico, stocks.

U.S. Steel Corp., stocks.

Westvaco Corp., stocks.

White Shield Exploration, stocks.

White Shield Indonesia Oil, stocks.

LIABILITIES—1975

[Not including current trade bills]

Name of creditor, address of creditor, and type of liability:

1. Ida Javits Trust, % Jacob K. Javits, 322 East 57th Street, New York, New York, income advances unliquidated.

2. First National City Bank, New York, New York, contingent liability on partnership loan re Southgate Associates.

3. Northwestern Life Insurance Company, Travelers Insurance Company, Union Labor Life Insurance Company, Equitable Life Insurance Company, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company, Mutual of New York, various loans on life insurance policies secured by cash surrender value of policies.

SUMMARY OF 1975 FEDERAL INCOME TAX RETURN OF SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS

Senate salary	$43,025
Dividends	17,576
Interest	470
Income other than wages, dividends and interest (includes rents and royalties, articles and lectures, investments and buy out of interest in law firm (Javits, Trubin, Stillcocks & Edelman) from which Senator Javits retired September 30, 1971); deductions appropriate to this item	90,883
Other deductions (includes charitable contributions of $4,237)	70,365
Income	81,589
Federal tax	40,498

[1] In all cases these are for normal investment only and do not represent any element of control or of relative major size.

[2] In all cases these are for normal investment only and do not represent any element of control or of relative major size.

State and local taxes:	
New York State tax	3,115
New York City tax	621
Total	44,234

WORLD POPULATION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, this country passed a small milestone this year when our population surpassed 215 million people. In March, however, America's population was one relatively small part of a large milestone, when worldwide population reached 4 billion. Ironically, each so-called population milestone we reach takes us further and further down a road of questionable direction, questionable continuation. Not only are projected population figures staggering, but the range of social factors which population levels affect is sobering: food, health, employment, the economy, the environment, and energy.

Population control is something within our individual capabilities for which everyone of us must have a sense of responsibility. We cannot leave it to the other person to deal with. A national population policy, I believe, would help heighten the awareness of Americans, and this, our Bicentennial Year, is a better time than any to implement one.

Of equal concern to me is the need to strengthen the network of family planning programs across the country. Some 3 million women in this Nation have no access to either public or private family planning services. In addition, certain information/eligibility requirements have set up barriers to our programs providing services to those in need. I am currently working with the Senate Finance Committee to make family planning services fully accessible to those whom Congress intended to be served.

Population control requires constant attention. To remind us of our growing numbers in all areas of the world, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the "1976 World Population Data Sheet" just issued by the Population Reference Bureau here in Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the data sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Region or country [1]	Population estimate mid-1976 (millions) [2]	Birth rate [3]	Death rate [3]	Rate of population growth (annual, percent) [4]	Number of years to double population [5]	Population projection to 2000 (millions) [6]	Infant mortality rate [7]	Population under 15 yr (percent) [8]	Median age (years) [8]	Life expectancy at birth (years)	Urban population (percent) [9]	Per capita gross national product (USA) [11]
WORLD	4,019.0	30	12	1.8	38	6,214.0	105	36	22.9	59	38	$1,360
AFRICA	413.0	46	20	2.6	27	815.0	152	44	18.0	45	23	340
Northern Africa	100.0	43	16	2.6	27	190.0	124	44	18.0	52	37	440
Algeria	17.3	49	15	3.2	22	36.7	126	48	16.0	53	50	650
Egypt	38.1	38	15	2.3	39	64.0	98	41	19.4	52	43	280
Libya	2.5	45	15	3.7	19	5.1	130	44	17.8	53	29	3,360
Morocco	17.9	46	16	2.9	24	35.6	130	44	18.2	53	37	430
Sudan	18.2	48	18	2.5	28	37.9	141	45	17.2	49	13	150
Tunisia	5.9	38	13	2.4	29	10.9	128	44	17.4	54	40	550
Western Africa	120.0	49	23	2.6	27	242.0	175	45	17.7	41	17	230
Benin (Dahomey)	3.2	50	23	2.7	26	6.0	185	45	17.3	41	13	120
Cape Verde Islands	.3	33	10	2.3	30	.4	91	44	17.7	50	6	340
Gambia	.5	43	24	1.9	36	.9	165	41	20.3	40	14	170
Ghana	10.1	49	22	2.7	26	21.2	156	47	16.7	44	29	350
Guinea	4.5	47	23	2.4	29	8.5	175	43	18.5	41	16	120
Guinea-Bissau	.5	40	25	1.5	46	.8	208	37	22.1	38	20	330
Ivory Coast	6.8	46	21	2.5	28	13.1	164	43	18.5	44	28	420
Libya	1.6	50	21	2.9	24	3.0	159	42	19.8	45	28	330
Mali	5.8	50	26	2.4	29	11.1	188	44	18.0	38	12	70
Mauritania	1.3	39	25	1.4	50	2.3	187	42	19.0	38	10	230
Niger	4.7	52	25	2.7	26	9.6	200	46	17.2	38	8	100
Nigeria	64.7	49	23	2.7	26	135.1	180	45	17.4	41	16	240
Senegal	4.5	48	24	2.4	29	8.1	159	43	18.3	40	30	320
Sierra Leone	3.1	45	21	2.4	29	5.8	136	43	18.6	44	13	180
Togo	2.3	51	23	2.7	26	4.6	127	46	17.2	41	15	210
Upper Volta	6.2	49	26	2.3	30	11.0	182	43	18.3	38	7	80
Eastern Africa	117.0	48	21	2.8	25	238.0	152	45	17.6	44	12	200
Burundi	3.9	48	25	2.4	29	7.3	150	45	18.4	39	3	80
Comoro Islands	.3	44	20	2.4	29	.5	160	43	18.4	42	5	170
Ethiopia	28.6	49	26	2.6	27	53.6	181	44	18.2	38	11	90
Kenya	13.8	49	16	3.4	20	31.3	119	46	16.7	50	10	200
Malagasy Republic	7.7	50	21	2.9	24	16.7	102	45	17.3	44	14	170
Malawi	5.1	48	24	2.4	29	9.7	148	45	17.5	41	4	130
Mauritius	.9	28	7	1.2	58	1.2	46	38	20.1	66	44	480
Mozambique	9.3	43	20	2.3	30	17.4	165	43	18.8	44	10	420
Reunion	.5	28	7	2.1	33	.7	47	43	18.6	63	43	1,210
Rhodesia	6.5	48	14	3.4	20	15.2	122	46	16.9	52	19	480
Rwanda	4.4	50	24	2.8	25	8.8	133	44	17.9	41	3	80
Somalia	3.2	47	22	2.5	28	6.5	177	45	17.2	41	26	80
Tanzania	15.6	50	22	2.7	26	33.4	162	47	16.6	44	7	140
Uganda	11.9	45	16	3.3	21	24.6	160	44	17.7	50	8	160
Zambia	5.1	51	20	3.1	22	11.3	160	46	17.4	44	34	480
Middle Africa	47.0	44	21	2.4	29	88.0	165	43	18.6	42	22	250
Angola	6.4	47	24	1.6	43	12.3	203	42	18.8	38	15	580
Cameroon	6.5	40	22	1.8	38	11.6	137	40	19.6	41	20	260
Central African Republic	1.8	43	22	2.1	33	3.4	190	42	19.0	41	27	200
Chad	4.1	44	24	2.0	35	6.9	160	41	19.1	38	12	90
Congo (People's Republic of)	1.4	45	21	2.4	29	2.7	180	42	18.8	44	37	380
Equatorial Guinea	.3	37	20	1.7	41	.5	165	37	23.3	44	9	260
Gabon	.5	32	22	1.0	69	.7	178	32	29.8	41	17	1,560
Sao Tome e Principe	.1	45	11	2.0	35	.1	64	33	—	—	23	470
Zaire	25.6	45	20	2.8	25	50.3	160	44	17.8	44	25	150
Southern Africa	29.0	43	17	2.7	26	56.0	119	41	19.5	51	44	1,120
Botswana	.7	46	23	2.3	30	1.4	97	46	17.0	44	13	270
Lesotho	1.1	39	20	2.1	33	1.8	114	38	21.1	46	5	120
Namibia	.9	46	23	2.2	32	1.6	177	41	19.7	41	23	1,200
South Africa	25.6	43	16	2.7	26	50.6	117	41	19.5	52	48	
Swaziland	.5	49	22	3.2	22	1.0	149	46	16.7	44	8	400

Footnotes at end of table.

Region or country	Population estimate mid-1976 millions) [2]	Birth rate [3]	Death rate [3]	Rate of population growth (annual percent) [4]	Number of years to double population [5]	Population projection to 2000 (millions) [6]	Infant mortality rate [7]	Population under 15 yr (percent) [8]	Median age (years) [9]	Life expectancy at birth (years)	Urban population (percent) [9]	Per capita gross national product (USA) [10]
Asia	2,287.0	33	13	2.0	35	3,612.0	121	38	21.1	56	25	$450
Southwest Asia	87.0	43	14	2.9	24	166.0	114	44	18.2	55	41	1,250
Bahrain	.2	44	15	2.9	24	.5	78	44	17.8	61	78	2,225
Cyprus	.7	18	10	.8	87	.8	28	32	24.7	71	43	1,380
Gaza	.4	50	16	3.4	20	.9	—	49	—	52	79	—
Iraq	11.4	48	15	3.3	21	24.3	99	48	16.0	53	61	970
Israel	3.5	28	7	2.9	24	5.5	23	33	25.1	71	86	3,380
Jordan	2.8	48	15	3.3	21	5.9	97	48	16.2	53	43	400
Kuwait	1.1	45	8	5.9	12	3.0	44	43	19.1	69	22	11,640
Lebanon	2.7	40	10	3.0	23	5.7	59	43	18.6	63	61	1,080
Oman	.8	50	19	3.1	22	1.6	138	—	—	—	—	1,250
Qatar	.1	50	19	3.1	22	.2	138	—	—	—	—	5,830
Saudi Arabia	6.4	49	20	2.9	24	12.9	152	45	17.6	45	18	2,080
Syria	7.6	45	15	3.0	23	16.0	93	49	15.4	54	44	490
Turkey	40.2	39	12	2.6	27	71.3	119	42	19.0	57	39	690
United Arab Emirates	.2	50	19	3.1	22	.5	138	34	21.3	—	65	13,500
Yemen Arab Republic	6.9	50	21	2.9	24	13.8	152	45	17.6	45	7	120
Yemen (People's Republic of)	1.7	50	21	2.9	24	3.4	152	45	17.6	45	26	120
Middle South Asia	851.0	37	16	2.2	32	1,493.0	137	41	19.2	49	20	160
Afghanistan	19.5	43	21	2.2	32	36.3	182	44	17.9	40	15	100
Bangladesh	76.1	47	20	2.7	26	144.8	132	46	16.7	43	9	100
Bhutan	1.2	44	21	2.3	30	2.2	—	42	18.9	44	3	70
India	620.7	35	15	2.0	35	1,051.4	139	40	19.6	50	20	130
Iran	34.1	45	16	3.0	23	67.0	139	47	16.4	51	43	1,060
Maldive Islands	.1	50	23	3.3	21	.2	—	44	—	—	11	90
Nepal	12.9	43	20	2.3	30	23.2	169	40	20.3	44	4	110
Pakistan	72.5	44	15	2.9	24	146.4	124	46	16.6	50	26	130
Sikkim	.2	—	—	2.0	35	.4	208	40	19.5	—	5	90
Sri Lanka	14.0	28	8	2.0	35	21.0	45	39	19.9	68	22	130
Southeast Asia	327.0	38	15	2.4	29	583.0	108	43	18.3	51	20	220
Burma	31.2	40	16	2.4	29	53.5	126	41	19.6	50	19	90
Indonesia	134.7	38	17	2.1	33	230.3	125	44	18.1	48	18	150
Khmer Republic	8.3	47	19	2.8	25	15.8	127	45	17.2	45	19	—
Laos	3.4	45	23	2.4	29	5.7	123	42	18.9	40	15	—
Malaysia	12.4	39	10	2.9	24	22.0	75	44	17.7	59	27	660
Philippines	44.0	41	11	3.0	23	86.3	74	43	18.4	58	32	310
Portuguese Timor	.7	44	23	2.1	33	1.1	184	42	18.9	40	10	130
Singapore	2.3	20	5	1.6	43	3.1	16	39	19.7	67	100	2,120
Thailand	43.3	36	11	2.5	28	86.0	81	45	17.3	58	13	300
Vietnam (Democrati Republic of)	24.8	32	14	1.8	38	44.1	—	41	19.1	48	12	130
Vietnam (Republic of)	21.6	42	16	2.6	27	34.9	—	41	19.3	40	19	170
East Asia	1,023.0	26	9	1.7	41	1,369.0	23	33	23.9	63	30	710
China (People's Republic of)	836.8	27	10	1.7	41	1,126.0	—	33	23.5	62	23	300
Hong Kong	4.4	19	5	2.1	33	5.8	18	36	22.0	71	90	1,540
Japan	112.3	19	6	1.2	58	132.7	11	24	29.6	73	72	3,880
Korea (Democratic People's Republic of)	16.3	36	9	2.7	26	27.5	—	42	18.5	61	38	390
Korea (Republic of)	34.8	29	9	2.0	35	52.3	47	40	19.6	61	41	470
Macau	.3	25	7	1.8	38	.4	78	38	18.9	—	97	270
Mongolia	1.5	40	10	3.0	23	2.7	—	44	18.1	61	46	620
Taiwan (Republic of China) [11]	16.3	23	5	1.9	36	22.0	26	43	18.2	69	63	720
North America	239.0	15	9	0.8	87	294.0	16	27	27.9	71	74	6,580
Canada	23.1	15	7	1.3	53	31.6	16	29	26.5	73	76	6,080
United States	215.3	15	9	.8	87	262.5	17	27	28.1	71	74	6,640
Latin America	326.0	37	9	2.8	25	606.0	75	42	18.9	62	59	940
Middle America	81.0	45	9	3.4	20	172.0	65	46	16.9	62	56	900
Costa Rica	2.0	28	5	2.3	30	3.6	45	42	18.2	69	41	790
El Salvador	4.2	40	8	3.2	22	8.8	54	46	16.9	58	39	390
Guatemala	5.7	43	15	2.8	25	11.1	79	44	17.6	53	34	570
Honduras	2.8	49	14	3.5	20	6.2	117	47	16.5	54	28	340
Mexico	62.3	46	8	3.5	20	134.4	61	46	16.8	63	61	1,000
Nicaragua	2.2	48	14	3.3	21	4.8	123	48	15.7	53	49	650
Panama	1.7	31	5	2.6	27	3.2	44	43	18.2	66	49	1,010
Caribbean	27.0	31	9	2.1	33	44.0	71	41	19.9	64	43	820
Bahamas	.2	22	6	4.2	16	.3	32	44	18.7	66	58	2,460
Barbados	.2	21	9	.8	87	.3	38	34	22.3	69	4	1,110
Cuba	9.4	25	6	1.8	38	14.9	29	37	22.4	70	60	640
Dominican Republic	4.8	46	11	3.0	23	10.8	98	48	16.1	58	40	590
Grenada	.1	26	8	.4	173	.1	32	47	—	63	8	300
Guadeloupe	.4	28	7	1.5	46	.5	44	40	19.2	69	9	1,050
Haiti	4.6	36	16	1.6	43	7.1	150	41	18.8	50	20	140
Jamaica	2.1	31	7	1.9	36	2.8	26	46	17.3	68	37	1,140
Martinique	.3	22	7	.5	139	.5	32	41	19.0	69	33	1,330
Netherlands Antilles	.2	25	7	1.8	38	.4	28	38	—	73	32	1,530
Puerto Rico	3.2	23	6	2.4	29	4.0	23	37	21.6	72	58	2,400
Trinidad and Tobago	1.1	26	7	1.5	46	1.4	26	40	19.3	66	12	1,490
Tropical South America	178.0	38	9	2.9	24	338.0	82	43	18.1	60	58	8400
Bolivia	5.8	44	18	2.6	27	10.6	108	43	18.3	47	35	250
Brazil	110.2	37	9	2.8	25	207.5	82	42	18.6	61	58	900
Colombia	23.0	41	9	3.2	22	44.3	76	46	16.9	61	64	510
Ecuador	6.9	42	10	3.2	22	14.0	78	47	16.3	60	39	460
Guyana	.8	36	6	2.2	32	1.2	40	44	17.2	68	40	470
Paraguay	2.6	40	9	2.7	26	5.1	65	45	16.6	62	38	480
Peru	16.0	41	12	2.9	24	30.9	110	44	17.6	56	60	710
Surinam	.4	41	7	3.2	22	.9	30	50	15.1	66	49	870
Venezuela	12.3	36	7	2.9	24	23.1	54	44	17.4	65	75	1,710

Region or country [1]	Population estimate mid-1976 (millions) [2]	Birth rate [3]	Death rate [3]	Rate of population growth (annual percent) [4]	Number of years to double population [5]	Population projection to 2000 (millions) [6]	Infant mortality rate [7]	Population under 15 yr (percent) [8]	Median age (years) [5]	Life expectancy at birth (years)	Urban population (percent) [9]	Per capita gross national product (USA) [10]
Temperate South America	39.0	24	9	1.5	46	52.0	67	32	25.7	67	80	$1,540
Argentina	25.7	22	9	1.4	50	32.9	64	29	27.4	68	81	1,900
Chile	10.8	28	8	1.7	41	15.9	78	39	20.5	63	76	820
Uruguay	2.8	21	10	1.1	63	3.4	45	28	29.4	70	80	1,060
Europe	476.0	15	10	.6	116	540.0	22	24	32.2	71	64	3,680
Northern Europe	82.0	13	12	.2	347	91.0	15	24	33.4	72	73	3,960
Denmark	5.1	14	10	.4	173	5.4	12	23	32.5	73	80	5,820
Finland	4.7	13	10	.4	173	4.8	10	24	30.1	69	58	4,130
Iceland	.2	20	7	1.3	53	.3	11	32	24.7	74	86	5,550
Ireland	3.1	22	11	.7	99	4.0	17	31	26.8	72	52	2,370
Norway	4.0	15	10	.6	116	4.5	12	24	32.4	74	45	5,280
Sweden	8.2	13	11	.4	173	9.3	9	21	35.3	75	81	6,720
United Kingdom	56.1	13	12	.1	693	62.3	16	24	34.0	72	76	3,360
Western Europe	153.0	13	11	.5	139	171.0	16	24	33.1	72	77	5,460
Austria	7.5	13	12	.1	693	8.1	23	24	33.7	71	52	4,050
Belgium	9.8	13	12	.3	231	10.7	16	23	34.3	71	87	5,210
France	53.1	15	10	.8	87	61.9	12	24	32.6	73	70	5,190
Germany (Federal Republic of)	62.1	10	12	.2	347	66.5	21	23	34.4	71	88	5,890
Luxembourg	.4	11	12	.7	99	.4	14	21	35.2	71	68	5,690
Netherlands	13.8	14	8	.9	77	16.1	11	27	28.9	74	77	4,880
Switzerland	6.5	13	9	.7	99	7.3	13	24	32.1	73	55	6,650
Eastern Europe	107.6	17	10	.7	99	122.0	26	23	31.4	70	55	2,670
Bulgaria	8.8	17	10	.7	99	10.0	25	22	33.5	72	59	1,770
Czechoslovakia	14.9	20	12	.8	87	16.9	20	23	31.8	70	56	3,220
Germany (Democratic Republic of)	16.8	11	14	−.3	—	17.9	16	23	34.5	71	75	3,340
Hungary	10.6	18	12	.6	116	11.1	34	20	34.2	70	49	2,140
Poland	34.4	18	8	1.0	69	40.1	24	25	28.4	70	55	2,450
Romania	21.5	20	9	1.0	69	25.8	35	25	31.0	69	42	—
Southern Europe	134.0	18	9	.8	87	156.0	26	26	31.1	71	51	2,130
Albania	2.5	30	8	2.4	29	4.1	87	40	19.2	71	34	530
Greece	9.0	16	8	.4	173	9.7	24	25	33.4	72	53	1,970
Italy	56.3	16	10	.8	87	61.7	23	24	32.7	72	53	2,770
Malta	.3	18	9	.4	173	.3	21	26	27.1	70	94	1,060
Portugal	8.5	19	11	−.4	—	9.6	38	28	29.4	68	26	1,540
Spain	36.0	19	8	1.1	63	45.1	14	28	30.2	72	61	1,960
Yugoslavia	21.5	18	8	.9	77	25.7	40	27	28.8	68	39	1,250
U.S.S.R.	257.0	18	9	.9	77	314.0	28	28	29.7	70	60	2,300
Oceania	22.0	22	10	1.8	38	33.0	53	33	25.7	68	71	3,800
Australia	13.8	18	9	1.5	46	20.0	16	29	27.6	72	86	4,760
Fiji	.6	28	5	1.9	36	.8	21	41	18.9	70	33	720
New Zealand	3.2	19	8	2.2	32	4.4	16	32	25.8	72	81	4,100
Papua-New Guinea	2.8	41	17	2.6	27	5.1	159	45	17.8	48	11	440

NOTES

World population data sheets of various years should not be used as a time series. Because every attempt is made to use the most accurate information, data sources vary and radical changes in numbers and rates from year to year may reflect improved source material, revised data, or a later base year for computation, rather than yearly changes.

Birth and death rates: Annual number of births or deaths per 1,000 population.

Population growth rate: Annual rate of natural increase (birth rate minus the death rate in a given year) combined with the plus or minus factor of net immigration or net emigration.

Infant mortality rate: Annual number of deaths to infants under 1 year of age per 1,000 live births.

Median age: That age which divides the population into 2 equal-size groups, 1 of which is older and the other which is younger than the median.

Sources of data: Aside from per capita gross national product, almost all the data in this table were reported in United Nations (U.N.) publications or were estimated by the International Statistical Programs Center of the U.S. Bureau of the Census or by the Population Reference Bureau. The U.N. publications referred to are: "Demographic Yearbook, 1973;" "Monthly Bulletin of Statistics," November 1975; "Population and Vital Statistics Report, Data Available as of Oct. 1, 1975," statistical papers, series A, vol. XXVII, No. 4; and "Selected World Demographic Indicators by Countries, 1950–2000." ESA/P/WP.55, May 28, 1975. The estimates by the Bureau of the Census were published in "World Population: 1973," May 1974, or are contained in the review draft of "World Population: 1975," forthcoming.

Figures for the regions and the world: Population totals take into account small areas not listed on the Data Sheet. Totals may also not equal the sums of their parts because of independent rounding. All other data are weighted averages for countries for which data are available.

Dashes indicate data are unavailable.

[1] The data sheet lists all U.N. members and all geopolitical entities with a population larger than 200,000.

[2] Based on the U.S. Bureau of Census estimate for mid-1974 or on the most recent official country or U.N. estimate; for most countries the latter estimate was for mid-1974. Each estimate was updated to mid-1976 by applying the same rate of growth as indicated by population change during part or all of the period since 1970.

[3] For the more developed countries, with complete or nearly complete registration of births and deaths, nearly all the rates shown pertain to 1973 or 1974. For nearly all the developing countries, with incomplete registration, the rates refer to the 1970–75 period and are taken from the medium variant estimates and projections as assessed in 1973 (U.N. Selected World Demographic Indicators . . .). These figures should be considered as rough approximations only.

[4] Based on population changes during part or all of the period since 1970. For most countries these rates are the same as those for natural increase, but because the time periods to which the two rates pertain are different and because the birth and death rates as well as the population estimates for the less developed countries are generally rough approximations only, small differences between the 2 rates should not be considered as precise estimates of net immigration or net emigration. Larger differences between them do indicate that migration has been a factor in population change.

[5] Based on the rate of population growth shown and assuming no change in the rate.

[6] Except for the United States, based on the application of the percentage increase in the population 1975–2000 implied by the U.N. medium variant projections to the population total as estimated for mid-1975. For the United States, the figure shown is the series II projection given in the U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Projections of the Population of the United States: 1975 to 2050," P-25, No. 601, October 1975.

For countries with complete or nearly complete registration of births and deaths nearly all rates pertain to 1973 or 1974. For many developing countries with incomplete registration, rates are the latest available estimates generally obtained from the sources cited above.

[8] In addition to the sources cited above, Centro Latinoamericano de Demografia, Boletin Demografico, vol. VII, No. 13, and vol. VIII, No. 15, were used for figures for the Latin American countries.

[9] The percentage the total population living in areas defined as urban by each country.

[10] Published in "World Bank Atlas: Population, Per Capita Product," and "Growth Rates," 10th ed., 1975. Data refer to 1974 except for 14 of the smaller countries for which the data refer to 1973.

[11] The U.N. does not show figures for Taiwan. These figures were separately estimated. The population of Taiwan was assumed to increase to 2000 at the same rate as that of the People's Republic of China.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business to be transacted? If not, morning business is closed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF HAINES, ALASKA

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 858.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1365) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of

Haines, Alaska, interests of the United States in certain lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of August 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 470), requiring that lands patented thereunder be used only for school or other public purposes, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to issue a new patent or deed to the city of Haines, Alaska, for the following described lands, without such a use restriction, but containing all other reservations to the United States required by that Act, upon relinquishment of the existing deed, provided that the requirements of sections 2 and 3 of this Act have been met:

Beginning at the northwest corner of lot 17 in block 13, which is the same as corner 1 of the Native School Reserve; thence north 76 degrees 23½ minutes west 58.11 feet to corner numbered 2; thence south 17 degrees 58 minutes west 165.26 feet to corner numbered 3; thence south 76 degrees 45 minutes east 82.08 feet to corner numbered 4; thence north 9 degrees 38 minutes east 164.65 feet to corner numbered 1, the place of beginning, containing 17,531 square feet.

Lots 8 and 9 of block 13 in the townsite of Haines, Alaska, containing a total of 7,330 square feet.

Lot 17 of block 13 in the townsite of Haines, Alaska, containing a total of 5,885 square feet.

SEC. 2. No conveyance may be made under this Act unless the city of Haines has shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

(1) the city of Haines will sell such lands and improvements identified in section 1 at not less than fair market value;

(2) the proceeds from the sale thereof will be used to acquire property to be used for school or other public purposes; and

(3) any amounts by which the proceeds from the sale of such lands and improvements identified in section 1 exceed the fair market value of the property acquired under clause (2) of this section shall be paid to the United States.

SEC. 3. If the requirements of section 2 are satisfied, the Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement or agreements with the city of Haines, Alaska, whereby in consideration of issuance of a new patent pursuant to section 1, the city of Haines—

(1) agrees that title to property acquired pursuant to section 2(2) will vest in the United States if such property ever ceases to be used for school or other public purpose; and

(2) agrees to execute, within ninety days after acquiring such property pursuant to section 2(2), a deed to this effect and deliver said deed to the Secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YAKUTAT, ALASKA

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 859.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2798) for the relief of the city of Yakutat, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of August 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 470), requiring that lands patented thereunder be used only for school or other public purposes, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to issue a new patent to the city of Yakutat, Alaska, for the following described lands without such a use restriction, but containing all other reservations to the United States required by that Act, upon relinquishment of the existing patent, provided that the requirements of sections 2 and 3 of this Act have been met:

Beginning at corner numbered 4 of school reserve, identical with meander corner numbered 4, tract A, of United States Survey numbered 1897, from which United States location monument numbered 179 bears south 54 degrees 6 minutes east, 37.04 chains distant; thence south 52 degrees 54 minutes east, 243.17 feet to meander corner numbered 1 of school reserve; thence north 33 degrees 41 minutes east, 177 feet to corner numbered 2 of school reserve; thence north 43 degrees 15 minutes west 184.65 feet to corner numbered 3 of school reserve; thence south 50 degrees 47 minutes west 213.75 feet to corner numbered 4, the place of beginning, containing 41,169 square feet, according to the official plat of the survey of the said land, approved March 1, 1937, on file in the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 2. No conveyance may be made under this Act and no new patent issued unless the city of Yakutat has shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

(1) the lands described in section 1 will be sold at not less than fair market value;

(2) other lands of at least comparable value to the lands described in section 1 and more appropriate for school or other purposes than the described lands will be acquired and used for school or other public purposes in perpetuity; and

(3) that any amount by which proceeds of any sale of the described lands exceed the fair market value of the property acquired under clause (2) of this section shall be paid to the United States.

SEC. 3. If the requirements of section 2 are satisfied, the Secretary is authorized and directed to enter an agreement or agreements with the city of Yakutat, Alaska, whereby in consideration of issuance of a new patent pursuant to section 1, the city of Yakutat agrees that—

(1) title to any property acquired pursuant to section 2(2) will vest in the United States if such property ever ceases to be used for school or other public purposes; and

(2) that the city of Yakutat will execute, within ninety days after acquiring such property pursuant to section 2(2), a deed to this effect and deliver said deed to the Secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to eliminate a restriction on use of certain lands conveyed to the city Yakutat, Alaska.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that appropriate extracts from the committee reports be printed in the RECORD in explanation of the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The act of August 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 470) directs the Secretary to convey to local officials all right, title, and interest of the United States to any parcels and improvements thereon for school or other public purposes, whenever he determines that the lands or improvements thereon are no longer required by the Alaska Native Service (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) for school purposes. The act required that all such conveyances must reserve minerals to the United States, together with the rights to prospect for and remove such minerals under regulations by the Secretary. In addition, it required that the United States retain a reversionary interest insuring that the lands and improvements on such conveyances will be used for school and public purposes only, and that the school facilities will be available to all Native children.

A patent for the approximately 1 acre described in S. 2798 was issued on April 20, 1954, to the city of Yakutat. The patent contained a reversionary clause providing that the land could be used only for school or other public purpose, and reserved to the United States not only the mineral rights, but various rights-of-ways including those for canals and ditches. The city no longer needs the property for schools nor does it envision the need for more municipal land. Therefore, the city would like to remove the reversionary clause so that this land can be sold and revenues used for public purposes.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

S. 2798 was introduced by Senators Gravel and Stevens on December 17, 1975. The Subcommittee on the Environment and Land Resources held a hearing on this measure on February 26, 1976. The Department of the Interior expressed opposition to the bill as introduced but indicated, in recognition of the city's changing land use needs, that the administration would have no objection to enactment of their substitute draft bill.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amendment, which closely reflects the Department's suggested changes, directs the Secretary to issue a new patent to the city for the described land without a use restriction, but containing all the other reservations to the United States under the 1950 act. The conveyance would be made when the Secretary is satisfied that: the land would be sold at fair market value, other lands of comparable value would be acquired and used for school or other public purpose in perpetuity, and any amount by which the proceeds of any sale of the land exceed the fair market value of the acquired lands would be paid to the United States. Title to any acquired property would vest in the United States if such property ever ceased to be used for school or other public purposes.

The principal difference between the bill as introduced and the committee amendment is that the former would allow expenditure of the proceeds from the sale of the school land for any public purpose whereas

the latter would require that the proceeds be used for the purchase of land for public purposes (which will have attached the reversionary interest).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a nomination which was reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration earlier today. I have been asked by the distinguished chairman of that committee to report this nomination, and I ask that it be stated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William L. Springer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Election Commission for the term expiring April 30, 1977.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on the confirmation of this nomination at 12:05 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination at 12:05 this afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about the nomination of William Springer to be the sixth member of the Federal Election Commission.

Knowing Bill Springer as I do, I find it particularly appropriate to quote from the statute under which he is being appointed. Section 437, establishing the Federal Election Commission, says that members of the Commission "shall be chosen on the basis of their maturity, experience, integrity, impartiality, and good judgment."

Mr. President, Bill Springer is one of the finest examples that I could imagine of the words used in the statute—maturity, experience, integrity, impartiality, and good judgment. I have known Bill Springer since 1957, when I was first sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives. His service in the House had preceded mine by some 6 years. We served together in the House of Representatives until I came to the Senate in 1966.

He is one of the finest individuals I have ever known. His background, it seems to me, is particularly appropriate and can be very beneficial to the Commission. From 1936 to 1940, he practiced law as a member of a private law firm. Then, for 2 years, he was a State's attorney in Illinois, which, I take it, is similar to the prosecuting attorney that we have in Michigan.

For the years between 1942 and 1945, Bill Springer served in the U.S. Navy. After he came out of the service, he again engaged in the private practice of law for several years until 1947, when he went on the bench as a county judge in Champaign County, Ill., serving in that capacity for 3 years. In 1950, he was elected to the House of Representatives. He served as a Member of the House of Representatives from 1951 until 1972, when he was appointed by the President as a member of the Federal Power Commission. He served on the Federal Power Commission from June 1973 until 1975 and was vice chairman of the Commission during 1974.

He brings to the Federal Election Commission a splendid background of experience. A man with legal understanding and judicial, elective office and regulatory commission experience he, therefore, understands the problems and issues confronting candidates for office and the Commission.

In addition to these credentials, he will bring a wealth of good judgment to the Commission, and I have no doubt that we will be proud of his service.

I commend the Committee on Rules for promptly holding hearings and reporting this nomination. I feel confident that the Senate will do itself, the Commission and the country a real service by confirming the nomination today so that all six members of this bipartisan Federal Election Commission can be sworn in and can get about the very difficult job that has been assigned to the Commission by the statute.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STONE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Springer nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. As in executive session the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the nomination for Mr. Springer be a 20-minute rollcall with the warning bell to sound midway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on May 17, the President submitted the nomination of William L. Springer to be a member of the Federal Election Commission. This nomination was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which today, May 21, held a hearing and has reported the nomination favorably to the Senate. In view of the urgent need for the Commission to resume its operations at the earliest possible moment, and if the Senate confirms Mr. Springer's nomination, I hope that the President will move affirmatively to administer the oath of office to the new Commission members as early as this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to vote on the nomination of Mr. Springer.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William L. Springer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Election Commission? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. DURKIN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PHILIP A. HART), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL), the Senator from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), the Senator from California (Mr. TUN-

NEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Abourezk	Hart, Gary	Nelson
Allen	Hartke	Nunn
Bartlett	Helms	Packwood
Bumpers	Hollings	Pastore
Byrd,	Hruska	Pearson
Harry F., Jr.	Huddleston	Pell
Byrd, Robert C.	Humphrey	Proxmire
Clark	Inouye	Ribicoff
Cranston	Jackson	Roth
Culver	Javits	Schweiker
Curtis	Kennedy	Scott, Hugh
Domenici	Leahy	Stafford
Eagleton	Long	Stennis
Fannin	Mansfield	Stevenson
Fong	McClellan	Stone
Ford	McGovern	Symington
Garn	Metcalf	Thurmond
Glenn	Mondale	Weicker
Griffin	Morgan	Young
Hansen	Muskie	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—42

Baker	Durkin	Montoya
Bayh	Eastland	Moss
Beall	Goldwater	Percy
Bellmon	Gravel	Randolph
Bentsen	Hart, Philip A.	Scott,
Biden	Haskell	William L.
Brock	Hatfield	Sparkman
Brooke	Hathaway	Stevens
Buckley	Johnston	Taft
Burdick	Laxalt	Talmadge
Cannon	Magnuson	Tower
Case	Mathias	Tunney
Chiles	McClure	Williams
Church	McGee	
Dole	McIntyre	

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GLENN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1977

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12438) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1977, for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the pending matter before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending bill is H.R. 12438.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, is the pending amendment No. 1663 by Mr. KENNEDY?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending amendment, No. 1663.

ORDER THAT THERE BE NO ROLLCALL VOTES ON MONDAY, MAY 24, 1976, PRIOR TO 4 P.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be no rollcall votes on Monday next prior to the hour of 4 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR VOTE TO OCCUR MONDAY, MAY 24, 1976, AT 4 P.M. ON CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF S. JOHN BYINGTON

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent as in executive session, that at the hour of 4 p.m. on Monday next, a vote occur on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. S. John Byington of Virginia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF A PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON MONDAY, MAY 24, 1976

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after the two leaders have been recognized on Monday and the orders for the recognition of any Senators have been completed, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 1 p.m., with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each; and that at 1 p.m. on Monday, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 12438.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONVENING OF SENATE TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, AND 26, 1976 AT 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Monday it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Tuesday it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 12438

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no further amendments to H.R. 12438 other than amendments in the second degree be in order unless they are presented in writing at the desk no later than the hour of 2 o'clock p.m. on Monday; and that no amendment in the second degree be in order at any time with reference to H.R. 12438 unless such second degree amendment is germane to the amendment in the first degree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RESUMPTION OF CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 12438, AND TIME LIMITATION AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday at the hour of 1 p.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 12438 with a time limitation for debate thereon that day not to exceed 6 hours, the time to be equally divided between Mr. STENNIS and Mr. THURMOND; that the time on any amendment to H.R. 12438 that day be limited to 2 hours—the time to be divided and controlled in the usual form—and that H.R. 12438 not be vulnerable to a call for the regular order on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1284

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday it be in order for the leadership at any time during the day to call up the antitrust legislation, S. 1284) and that when called up, a call for the regular order on Tuesday not bring down the antitrust legislation on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIME LIMITATION AGREEMENT ON KENNEDY MINUTEMAN MISSILE AMENDMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday there be a 2-hour limitation on the Kennedy minuteman missile amendment—to be divided and controlled in the usual form—the time to begin running at 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—H.R. 12438 AND S. 1284

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at any time next week a call for the regular order not bring down either the military procurement bill, H.R. 12438, or the antitrust legislation, S. 1284.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the agreement is as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, May 24, 1976, at the hour of 1:00 p.m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 12438 (Order No. 834), the Military Procurement Bill, and that time on the bill on Monday be limited to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled in the usual form, and the time on any amendment be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled in the usual form: Provided, That no amendment other than an amendment in the second degree be in order to H.R. 12438, unless it has been presented in writing no later than 2:00 p.m. on Monday: Provided further, That no amendment in the second degree be in order unless it is germane to the amendment in the first degree: Provided further, That no call for the regular order displace H.R. 12438 or H.R. 8532 during the week of May 24–28, 1976, if they are pending.

Ordered further, That on Tuesday, May 25, 1976, it be in order at anytime for the leadership to call up H.R. 8532 (Order No. 781), an act to amend the Clayton Act to permit State attorneys general to bring certain antitrust actions, and for other purposes.

Ordered further, That on Wednesday, May 26, 1976, the Senate proceed to H.R. 12438 at the hour of 1:00 p.m. and that an amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), concerning the Minuteman missile, be made the pending business, with a limitation of 2 hours on the amendment, to be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATORS TO SUBMIT STATEMENTS AND INTRODUCE MEASURES

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators may have until 5 p.m. today to submit statements into the RECORD and to introduce bills, joint resolutions, petitions, and memorials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DURING ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 24, 1976

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that until the convening hour on Monday of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives and the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRESIDENT, THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, AND THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate over until 12 noon on Monday, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign all duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene on Monday at 12 noon.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 1 p.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

At 1 p.m., the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 12438, the military procurement bill. There is a time agreement thereon, so far as Monday is concerned. Rollcall votes are expected on amendments and possibly motions in relation thereto.

At 4 p.m. on Monday—and there will be no rollcall votes on Monday prior to 4 p.m.—the Senate will go into executive session, by unanimous consent, and proceed immediately, without any intervening motion or debate to vote on the confirmation of the nomination of S. John Byington to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for the remainder of the time expiring October 26, 1978. That will be a rollcall vote, because the yeas and nays will have been ordered by that time; and by unanimous consent, the Senate, immediately upon the disposition of the nomination, will resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. So there will be rollcall votes on Monday, but not prior to 4 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 1:51 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 24, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 21, 1976;

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Harold Frank Hardin, Jr., [redacted] xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Lee Kirwan, xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

In the Air Force

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, Title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Lieutenant colonel to colonel

Adams, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alder, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aldrich, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alexander, Gerald F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alldredge, Gordon D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Clifford H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Dan C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allison, Cecil L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anders, Loyd J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Apel, Frank J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Appleby, Ivan D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Armstrong, Donald C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arth, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ash, Rolland S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Assalone, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Audette, Albert D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Austin, Hugh S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Axley, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bagwell, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Bailey, Clentis W., [redacted]
Bain, Wilfred C., [redacted]
Baker, Paul R., [redacted]
Baliles, Roy K., [redacted]
Ballard, William T., [redacted]
Baltz, Frederick M., [redacted]
Barlow, Earl C., [redacted]
Barnes, Jerome R., Jr., [redacted]
Barnes, Kyle D., Jr., [redacted]
Barnett, James H., [redacted]
Barnett, Robert W., [redacted]
Barrett, Sam B., [redacted]
Barthello, Marc S., Jr., [redacted]
Bateman, Thomas S., [redacted]
Battle, Benjamin R., [redacted]
Bell, Tommy I., [redacted]
Bell, William, R., [redacted]
Bennett, Robert F., [redacted]
Bennett, Walter R., [redacted]
Bergeron, George L., Jr., [redacted]
Bergstrom, Vernon M., [redacted]
Berry, Bobby J., [redacted]
Besley, Richard D., [redacted]
Biancardi, Andrew P., [redacted]
Bidner, Arthur, [redacted]
Bishop, Charles E., [redacted]
Bishop, Joe D., [redacted]
Bissell, Schuyler, [redacted]
Black, Harley S., [redacted]
Black, Robert B., [redacted]
Bogoslofski, Bernard J., [redacted]
Bohn, Lowell F., [redacted]
Borland, Robert L., [redacted]
Boss, Luther D., [redacted]
Boughton, Alain G., [redacted]
Bowersux, Ralph H., [redacted]
Boykin, Luke H., Jr., [redacted]
Brake, James L., [redacted]
Brammer, Robert L., [redacted]
Brandeberry, James R., [redacted]
Breitinger, Frederick L., [redacted]
Brennan, Philip A., [redacted]
Brentnall, Burden, [redacted]
Brewer, Harry L., [redacted]
Briscoe, Henry B., [redacted]
Brockman, William F., [redacted]
Brockmann, Robert F., [redacted]
Brooks, John R., [redacted]
Brooksher, William R., [redacted]
Brown, Frederick D., Jr., [redacted]
Brown, James R., [redacted]
Brown, Joseph K., [redacted]
Brown, Lawton C., [redacted]
Brown, Peter W., [redacted]
Brown, Stanford E., [redacted]
Brownlee Charles R., [redacted]
Brunson, Carl L., [redacted]
Brunstrom, Alan L., [redacted]
Bryan, William G., [redacted]
Bulka, Edward G., [redacted]
Burdett, Richard F., [redacted]
Bures, Eugene F., [redacted]
Burkett, William M., [redacted]
Busch, Richard J., [redacted]
Buschmann, Eugene F., [redacted]
Butler, Donald R., [redacted]
Caffery, William J., [redacted]
Callero, Monti D., [redacted]
Campbell, Billy C., [redacted]
Campbell, Jesse W., [redacted]
Campbell, William J., [redacted]
Carson, James M., [redacted]
Carter, Charles H., [redacted]
Cary, John F., [redacted]
Catron, Walter L., Jr., [redacted]
Caudry, Robert D., [redacted]
Chabolla, Gilbert A., [redacted]
Chambers, William C., [redacted]
Chisholm, Richard K., [redacted]
Clarke, Melvin P., [redacted]
Clarke, William S., Jr., [redacted]
Claypool, Robert B., [redacted]
Coburn, Robert B., [redacted]
Coggins, Edward V., Jr., [redacted]
Colclazier, Robert D., [redacted]
Collins, Richard B., [redacted]
Colvin, Thomas E., [redacted]
Conaway, Richard E., [redacted]
Conner, Hendsley R., [redacted]
Conway, Don R., [redacted]
Cooper, Billy R., [redacted]
Cooper, Kenneth M., [redacted]
Cooper, Larry T., [redacted]
Cooper, William L., Jr., [redacted]
Coraine, Richard W., [redacted]
Couch, Gerald C., [redacted]
Council, James W., [redacted]
Cowan, James E., [redacted]
Cox, Robert G., [redacted]
Craver, Joseph W., Jr., [redacted]
Creedon, James S., [redacted]
Crist, Jerry A., [redacted]
Crooke, William J., [redacted]
Crooks, Kenneth E., [redacted]
Crutchfield, Don F., [redacted]
Culp, Gerard H., [redacted]
Cummings, Jack, [redacted]
Curry, Robert W., [redacted]
Daiuto, Ronald J., [redacted]
Daneu, Joseph F., [redacted]
Daniel, James E., Jr., [redacted]
Danis, Lionel A., [redacted]
Darden, Robert F., Jr., [redacted]
Daubs, Charles E., [redacted]
Davis, James L., [redacted]
Davis, John S., [redacted]
Dearborn, James W., [redacted]
Deavies, Emmett G., III, [redacted]
Degeneres, Frederick S., Jr., [redacted]
Degroote, Albert J., [redacted]
Dennison, Jack E., [redacted]
Densmore, Peter K., [redacted]
Deschamps, Melvin T., [redacted]
Devall, Larry S., [redacted]
Devall, Larry S., [redacted]
Dewey, Robert G., [redacted]
Dickey, William R., [redacted]
Dillon, John Z., [redacted]
Dinger, Don L., [redacted]
Dixon, Robert E., [redacted]
Dobson, Robert T., [redacted]
Donahue, John F., [redacted]
Doran, Donald A., [redacted]
Dorsey, Richard M., [redacted]
Doublfday, Van C., [redacted]
Downing, Morgan A., [redacted]
Drennon, Philip R., [redacted]
Drew, Frank M., [redacted]
Drugan, William P., [redacted]
Duke, Rodger C., Jr., [redacted]
Duncan, Dean D., [redacted]
Dunn, Clyde F., Jr., [redacted]
Dunn, James M., Jr., [redacted]
Durband, Rudolph F., [redacted]
Eddington, Robert B., [redacted]
Edwards, Lowell R., [redacted]
Egan, Thomas F., [redacted]
Ellington, Robert F., [redacted]
Enney, James C., [redacted]
Evenson, Mervin L., [redacted]
Fanning, Robert W., [redacted]
Fears, Walter H., [redacted]
Fellows, Allen E., [redacted]
Fisher, Oliver P., Jr., [redacted]
Ford, Walter J., [redacted]
Foster, Dudley J., [redacted]
Foster, Robert A., [redacted]
Fox, James K., [redacted]
Frankenberg, David C., [redacted]
Frazier, Stephen T., [redacted]
Freaney, Robert E., [redacted]
Frei, James R., [redacted]
Frey, Russell B., [redacted]
Funderburg, Charles E., [redacted]
Gallagher, Thomas K., [redacted]
Gallo, Frank G., [redacted]
Gardner, Gilbert D., [redacted]
Gaseor, Chester J., [redacted]
Gaylor, Donald F., [redacted]
Gentry, Roy L., Jr., [redacted]
German, Kenneth F., [redacted]
Gibson, Donald R., [redacted]
Giesy, Lloyd H., [redacted]
Gilbert, John L., [redacted]
Gilkey, Raymond R., [redacted]
Gillis, Melvin P., [redacted]
Gilster, Herman L., [redacted]
Gindoff, Alan S., [redacted]
Glasgow, Warwick H., [redacted]
Glogowski, Richard M., [redacted]
Goodkin, Sheldon I., [redacted]
Goldberg, Nathan S., [redacted]
Goodwin, Charles E., [redacted]
Gordon, John W., [redacted]
Gormley, James D., [redacted]
Goss, Darr L., [redacted]
Graeter, Edwin A., Jr., [redacted]
Grammer, Richard G., [redacted]
Green, Fredrick B., [redacted]
Gregory, Jack I., [redacted]
Grenzebach, Earl W., Jr., [redacted]
Griffin, William E., [redacted]
Gross, Harold E., [redacted]
Gustafson, Gerald C., [redacted]
Hadeen, Kenneth D., [redacted]
Haeffner, Fred A., [redacted]
Hall, David M., [redacted]
Hall, George R., [redacted]
Hall, John A., [redacted]
Hamilton, John S., [redacted]
Hannan, Joseph J., [redacted]
Hansard, Joseph F. Jr., [redacted]
Hardin, James T., [redacted]
Harp, Solomon III, [redacted]
Harrison, Everett V., [redacted]
Hartley, Williard W., [redacted]
Hartmann, Arthur J., [redacted]
Hartmann, Edgar C. Jr., [redacted]
Hasbrouck, Lawrence, [redacted]
Hatchell, Ernest L. Jr., [redacted]
Haydon, Robert E., [redacted]
Hendelman, Lewis H., [redacted]
Henderson, William J., [redacted]
Henderson, William M., [redacted]
Henkel, Paul A., [redacted]
Hennessey, Charles B., [redacted]
Henning, Clifford O. C. Jr., [redacted]
Hennings, Paul E., [redacted]
Herndon, Stuart B., [redacted]
Hickenbottom, Richard, [redacted]
Hill, Claude C., [redacted]
Hillerud, Robert T., [redacted]
Hines, James M., [redacted]
Hiteshew, James E., [redacted]
Hodge, James L., [redacted]
Homan, Harold A., [redacted]
Hooper, Claren B. Jr., [redacted]
Hope, Joseph J., [redacted]
Horne, Terrell E., [redacted]
Hubbard, David B. Jr., [redacted]
Hughey, Kenneth R., [redacted]
Huser, Samuel, [redacted]
Ingram, Robert C. Jr., [redacted]
Irions, Charles C., [redacted]
Isgrig, Elvin D., [redacted]
Jacobs, Frederick R. Jr., [redacted]
Jacobs, Morton R., [redacted]
James, Avon C., [redacted]
Jensen, Richard B., [redacted]
Jimenez, Frank I., [redacted]
Jinks, Malcolm R., [redacted]
Johnson, Edward W., [redacted]
Johnson, Isiah, [redacted]
Johnson, Jerry M., [redacted]
Johnson, Roger E., [redacted]
Johnson, Ronald A., [redacted]
Jones, Robert L., [redacted]
Kaapke, Lyle D., [redacted]
Kamm, Herbert H., [redacted]
Karns, Robert C., [redacted]
Katz, Richard F., [redacted]
Kavodkjian, Sarkis H., [redacted]
Keeler, Billie R., [redacted]
Kelly, Henry M., [redacted]
Kennedy, Robert W., [redacted]
Kidder, Lyman M., [redacted]
Kienzle, Robert C., [redacted]
Kilborn, Richard F., [redacted]
Kimsey, Melbourne, [redacted]
King, Edwin H., Jr., [redacted]
Kline, Robert E., [redacted]
Kloberdanz, Harold G., [redacted]
Knight, William J., [redacted]
Koretz, Donald, [redacted]
Kovar, Otto L., Jr., [redacted]
Krautkramer, Gordon J., [redacted]
Krejci, Ronald J., [redacted]
Kronebusch, Robert M., [redacted]
Kunkel, Clifford C., [redacted]
Kyer, George Jr., [redacted]
Kyrazis, Demos T., [redacted]
Lamb, Charles W., [redacted]
Landry, James R., [redacted]

Larson, Doyle E., [redacted]
Law, Ralph, [redacted]
Lawrence, Richard C., [redacted]
Lee, Ben P., [redacted]
Lee, Harry R., Jr., [redacted]
Lemolf, Salvatore R., [redacted]
Lenahan, Frank C., [redacted]
Leonard, Francs D., Jr., [redacted]
Levell, Edward, Jr., [redacted]
Lewis, William H., [redacted]
Lind, John L., [redacted]
Lineberger, Joe G., [redacted]
Lockwood, Frederick S., III, [redacted]
Loessberg, Frank J., Jr., [redacted]
Lowell, Robert E., [redacted]
Lustig, Sheldon J., [redacted]
Lynch, George C., [redacted]
Macdougald, James A., [redacted]
MacIvor, Charles A., [redacted]
MacDubray, James G., III, [redacted]
Madden, Richard G., [redacted]
Magazu, Harry H., [redacted]
Malott, Carrington L., [redacted]
Mann, Chris C., [redacted]
Markarian, Ronald H., [redacted]
Marquis, David J., [redacted]
Marriott, William S., [redacted]
Marsh, Paul F., [redacted]
Martella, Angelo M., Jr., [redacted]
Martin, Samuel H., III, [redacted]
Masterson, William E., [redacted]
Mathews, James R., [redacted]
Matson, William P., [redacted]
Matthews, Richard G., [redacted]
Mayfield, Richard A., [redacted]
McCarthy, Lawrence J., [redacted]
McCartney, Charles E., Jr., [redacted]
McLain, Larry D., [redacted]
McClammy, Herbert C., [redacted]
McClarren, Charles W., [redacted]
McClellan, Robert J., [redacted]
McCurdy, Garvin, [redacted]
McElveen, David H., [redacted]
McFeron, Louis D., [redacted]
McGee, Billy R., [redacted]
McGilvary, David R., [redacted]
McGouldrick, Francis, J., Jr., [redacted]
McGuire, Thomas W., Jr., [redacted]
McMakin, Grover S., [redacted]
McMaster, Billy C., [redacted]
Mendezvigo, Castor, Jr., [redacted]
Mersereau, Gage M., [redacted]
Meyer, Carl W., [redacted]
Michler, Earl E., [redacted]
Migala, Andrew E., [redacted]
Mikulecky, James T., [redacted]
Miller, Alfred M., Jr., [redacted]
Miller, Charles E., [redacted]
Miller, George D., [redacted]
Miller, George H., [redacted]
Miller, Horace W., [redacted]
Million, Herbert A., [redacted]
Mills, Billie B., [redacted]
Millson, Chris, Jr., [redacted]
Mirth, Joseph D., [redacted]
Misencik, William T., [redacted]
Molla, Afred C., Jr., [redacted]
Moon, Lloyd B., [redacted]
Morison, Joseph S., [redacted]
Morris, Quentin J., [redacted]
Morris, Robert L., [redacted]
Mourges, Agamemnon R., [redacted]
Mulberry, Eugene W., [redacted]
Murane, David M., [redacted]
Murphy, Michael, [redacted]
Murphy, William A., [redacted]
Murray, Edmond F., [redacted]
Nakano, Albert S., [redacted]
Naylor, Edward R., [redacted]
Neathery, Herbert L., [redacted]
Needham, Paul E., [redacted]
Nelson, David A., [redacted]
Nemeth, Richard S., [redacted]
Nicola, Oliver P., III, [redacted]
Nida, Charles L., [redacted]
Nielson, Roger W., [redacted]
Nizko, Henry S., [redacted]
Nugteren, Cornelius, [redacted]
Nunemaker, Roger P., [redacted]
O'Brien, Denis R., [redacted]
O'Donnell, Edward F., Jr., [redacted]
O'Donnell, John F., [redacted]
Ohlinger, Kenneth W., [redacted]
O'Keefe, Robert W., [redacted]
Olesen, Leo E., [redacted]
Olson, James R., [redacted]
O'Malley, Jerome F., [redacted]
O'Neill, Timothy F., [redacted]
Orange, William L., [redacted]
Orr, Kenneth B., [redacted]
Palmer, Gilbert S., Jr., [redacted]
Palmer, William F., [redacted]
Park, Maynard L., [redacted]
Patrick, Richard A., [redacted]
Patterson, Kenneth M., [redacted]
Patterson, Robert E., Jr., [redacted]
Pedroli, Attilio, [redacted]
Pence, Ray [redacted]
Pennella, Anthony J., [redacted]
Pennington, Lawrence E., [redacted]
Peoples, Paul L., [redacted]
Peterson, George A., [redacted]
Petrie, Walter H., [redacted]
Pfautz, James C., [redacted]
Phillips, Richard W., Jr., [redacted]
Picinich, Alfred A., [redacted]
Pluenneke, Harold C., [redacted]
Portis, James N., [redacted]
Powers, Elliott, [redacted]
Powers, Jack A., [redacted]
Powers, Joseph G., [redacted]
Powers, Winston D., [redacted]
Presley, Bobby W., [redacted]
Pritchett, Thaddeus C., [redacted]
Pryor, Richard W., [redacted]
Pugh, William M., [redacted]
Radke, Thomas L., [redacted]
Rainey, June I., [redacted]
Ramsey, Robert F., [redacted]
Rauhe, Bruce R., [redacted]
Rawlings, Gene D., [redacted]
Rayfield, Robert E., [redacted]
Reed, Parker E., [redacted]
Reed, Robert H., [redacted]
Reeder, Frank D., [redacted]
Reeves, Charles W., Jr., [redacted]
Rega, Michael J., [redacted]
Rehm, Daniel J., [redacted]
Renner, Charles F., [redacted]
Renner, William D., [redacted]
Rhude, Donald P., [redacted]
Richardson, William J., [redacted]
Rigney, James H., Jr., [redacted]
Ring, Richard E., [redacted]
Robb, William G., [redacted]
Roberts, Russell C., Jr., [redacted]
Robertson, John L., [redacted]
Rock, James T., [redacted]
Rodda, Ronald J,, [redacted]
Rodgers, Charles A., [redacted]
Ross, Fredric S., [redacted]
Roth, Paul H., [redacted]
Rowland, John R., [redacted]
Ruck, Robert L., [redacted]
Rupert, Arthur B., [redacted]
Rushfeldt, John W., [redacted]
Saccone, Joseph D., [redacted]
Salisberry, Rex C., [redacted]
Salvucci, Joseph D., [redacted]
Sandfort, Dorrence O., [redacted]
Sauls, George M., [redacted]
Savage, William B., [redacted]
Schaefer, Thomas E., [redacted]
Schow, Kenneth C., [redacted]
Schroeder, Arthur H., [redacted]
Schroeder, John K., Jr., [redacted]
Schumacher, Herman E., [redacted]
Schwene, Donald J., [redacted]
Scott, Jimmy F., [redacted]
Sears, Michael T., [redacted]
Sexton, A. D., [redacted]
Shadburn, Theodore H., [redacted]
Sheehan, Anthony T., [redacted]
Sheehan, Dennis T., [redacted]
Sherman, Stuart H., Jr., [redacted]
Shipe, John R., [redacted]
Shirey, William C. [redacted]
Shockley, Crewford O., [redacted]
Shubert, Richard E., [redacted]
Sigethy, Robert, [redacted]
Simon, Ervin P., [redacted]
Singhoff, Forest A., [redacted]
Smith, Curtis R., [redacted]
Smith, David C., [redacted]
Smith, John B., [redacted]
Smith, Pierce L., [redacted]
Smith, Ronald C., [redacted]
Smith, Stanley D., [redacted]
Smitherman, John A., [redacted]
Snyder, Phillip D., [redacted]
Sovern, Stanley B., [redacted]
Spannaus, Harry A., [redacted]
Sperling, Daniel P., [redacted]
Sperry, Donald H., [redacted]
Sprague, Roger L., [redacted]
Spruill, Dameron R., [redacted]
Standfrwick, Robert L., [redacted]
Stater, Nat A., [redacted]
Stem, Taylor F., Jr., [redacted]
Stewart, James E., [redacted]
Stoneburner, James J., [redacted]
Storrie, John H., [redacted]
Strand, William L., [redacted]
Strasheim, Arnold L., [redacted]
Stringer, Henry D., Jr., [redacted]
Studer, Thomas A., [redacted]
Sutter, Bradley, [redacted]
Sutton, Everett M., [redacted]
Sveska, Robert F., [redacted]
Swick, George E., [redacted]
Sylvester, David N., [redacted]
Tatum, Lawrence B., [redacted]
Taylor, Robert C., [redacted]
Taylor, William M., [redacted]
Terlouw, Garrett W., [redacted]
Terpening, Russell D., [redacted]
Terrell, Lester R., [redacted]
Thoburn, Russell E., [redacted]
Tholen, Lloyd A., [redacted]
Thomas, James C., [redacted]
Thomas, James H., [redacted]
Thomas, John P., [redacted]
Thomas, Lloyd E., [redacted]
Thompson, Hadley N., [redacted]
Thompson, Kenneth L., [redacted]
Thompson, Paul D., [redacted]
Thompson, Roy L., [redacted]
Thompson, Thomas H., [redacted]
Throckmorton, Robert W., [redacted]
Thuemmel, John P., [redacted]
Thulin, John H., [redacted]
Thurman, James A., [redacted]
Tietge, Jerry W., [redacted]
Tilson, Philip A., [redacted]
Tixier, Edward L., [redacted]
Todd, Robert E., [redacted]
Tolman, Frederick G., [redacted]
Tomlinson, Frank J., [redacted]
Trimeloni, Bianca D., [redacted]
Trott, Allen L., Jr., [redacted]
Trott, William R., [redacted]
Tucker, Joseph E., [redacted]
Tucker, Roger D., [redacted]
Tullett, Jack E., [redacted]
Turner, Alex, Jr., [redacted]
Turpen, James R., [redacted]
Twinting, William T., [redacted]
Tyler, George E., [redacted]
Uhalt, Alfred H., Jr., [redacted]
Uppstrom, Richard L., [redacted]
Valenti, Joseph M., [redacted]
Vanderpyl, Ellis C., Jr., [redacted]
Varvi, Charles J., Jr., [redacted]
Vebling, David R., [redacted]
Vehrs, George J., [redacted]
Velez, Louis E., [redacted]
Vest. Daurice C., [redacted]
Vogel, Stephen J., [redacted]
Vogt, Donald A., [redacted]
Vonhausen, William W., [redacted]
Vontersch, George L., [redacted]
Wackym, Fred N., Jr., [redacted]
Waddle, Dannie I., Jr., [redacted]
Walborn, Chester A., [redacted]
Walbrecht, Donald A., [redacted]
Watman, Gerald, [redacted]
Ward, Harrison M., Jr., [redacted]
Watkins, Jack L., [redacted]
Watnee, Lloyd, Jr., [redacted]
Watson, Robert B., [redacted]
Weber, Kenneth L., [redacted]
Weeks, Allen R., [redacted]
Wenzel, Donald F., [redacted]

West, Bobby P., [redacted].
Westberry, James H., [redacted].
Wheeler, George H., [redacted].
Wheeler, Harold P., Jr., [redacted].
White, Harold R., [redacted].
White, Philip J., [redacted].
Whitlatch, Wayne E., [redacted].
Wiegand, Karl L., [redacted].
Wieland, Paul L., [redacted].
Wiese, William A., [redacted].
Williams, Joe C., [redacted].
Williams, Lavern E., [redacted].
Williams, Peter D., [redacted].
Williams, Robert Q., [redacted].
Williams, Stuart J., [redacted].
Williamson, Don I., [redacted].
Willis, James R., [redacted].
Wilson, Charles H., [redacted].
Wilson, Harold E., [redacted].
Winemiller, William E., [redacted].
Wippermann, Donald R., [redacted].
Wold, James W., [redacted].
Wolters, Thomas E., [redacted].
Wondrack, Walter M., [redacted].
Wood, Horace E., Jr., [redacted].
Wood, Richard H., [redacted].
Woods, Jerry K., [redacted].
Wright, Dwayne P., [redacted].
Yasuhara, Thomas H., [redacted].
Young, Edward D., [redacted].
Young, Edward D., Jr., [redacted].
Young, James F., [redacted].
Young, Keith R., [redacted].

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Boggs, William G., [redacted].
Bowers, George P., [redacted].
Caudill, Charles C., [redacted].
Davis, Paul D., [redacted].
Ellison, Ervin D., III, [redacted].
Franks, William D., [redacted].
Hendricks, Robert E., [redacted].
Larche, Lucien E., Jr., [redacted].
Ledoux, Louis V., [redacted].
Lyngdal, Lloyd W., [redacted].
Lyons, Leo J., [redacted].
Naughton, John T., [redacted].
Overman, Robert F., [redacted].
Pritz, Raymond, [redacted].
Reese, Charles T., [redacted].
Rodell, Jeremiah J., [redacted].
Townsend, James E., [redacted].

DENTAL CORPS

Bales, David J., [redacted].
Birmingham, Frederick D., [redacted].
Blackman, Ronald B., [redacted].
Clark, William J., [redacted].
Hamrick, Joseph E., [redacted].
Wellner, Charles R., [redacted].
Young, John M., [redacted].

JUDGE ADVOCATE

Blinn, Donald P., [redacted].
Cicchini, Michael J., [redacted].
Dick, Howard F., [redacted].
Edwards, Charles E., [redacted].
Ginsburg, Gordon A., [redacted].
Isenberg, Jerome R., [redacted].
Knowles, Kenneth B., [redacted].
Lippert, Ludwig E., Jr., [redacted].

MEDICAL CORPS

Adamson, Godfrey D., Jr., [redacted].
Cowan, William R., [redacted].
Dannemiller, Francis J., [redacted].
Davis, Jefferson C., [redacted].
Dennis, Lebaron W., [redacted].
Foster, Richard S., [redacted].
Hagood, Clyde D., Jr., [redacted].
Johnson, Leonard W., Jr., [redacted].
Ledbetter, Edgar O., [redacted].
Mohr, George C., [redacted].
Oi, Richard H., [redacted].
Oliver, James H., Jr., [redacted].
Otoole, Robert V., Jr., [redacted].
Schwamm, Harry A., [redacted].
Silberman, Irwin A., [redacted].
Smith, Lawrence R., [redacted].
Wittmer, James F., [redacted].
Young, Gerald D., Jr., [redacted].

NURSE CORPS

Hines, Anne T., [redacted].
Migliorino, Jean M., [redacted].
Sones, Betty J., [redacted].

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baddour, Robert A., [redacted].
Baird, Joseph A., Jr., [redacted].
Crews, James M., Jr., [redacted].
Holder, William L., [redacted].
Kaye, George A., [redacted].
Suchenski, Richard C., [redacted].
Thomas, Russell J., [redacted].
Tustison, Donald F., [redacted].
Wagner, Donald B., [redacted].
Winney, Charles W., [redacted].

VETERINARY CORPS

Osborne, Donald V., [redacted].
Ziegler, Ralph F., [redacted].

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Darling, Charles L., [redacted].
Hall, Giles W., [redacted].
McNeil, John S., [redacted].
Robertson, William J., [redacted].
Wilson, Myrl E., [redacted].

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, May 21, 1976:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Ronald G. Coleman, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

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

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

William L. Springer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Election Commission for the term expiring April 30, 1977.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, May 21, 1976*

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

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

Only fear the Lord, and serve Him faithfully with all your heart; for consider what great things He has done for you.—I Samuel 12: 24.

O God and Father of us all may Thy spirit of truth and love guide and direct the Members of this House of Representatives and the former Members we are happy to have with us today. Help them to realize that during days of difficulty and passing through periods of prosperity Thou art with them always and all the way. Give them wisdom, courage, and patience and work through them for the welfare of our country and the well-being of our world.

Grant that each one may play his full part in bringing about an order of society where there will be no just cause for a bitterness of spirit, nor a resentment of mind nor a hunger of body and where every person may have the opportunity to grow in body, mind, and spirit.

Give us all grace to maintain our faith and our freedom in righteousness, for peace and with good will.

In the spirit of the Master we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2129. An act to provide for the definition and punishment of certain crimes in accordance with the Federal laws in force within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States when said crimes are committed by an Indian in order to insure equal treatment for Indian and non-Indian offenders.

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

H.R. 5272. An act to amend the Noise Control Act of 1972 to authorize additional appropriations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11438. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to grant court leave to Federal employees when called as witnesses in certain judicial proceedings, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12455. An act 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; and

H.R. 12838. An act to amend and extend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, to provide for the improvement of museum services, to establish a challenge grant program, and for other purposes.

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. 3308. An act to provide for interim regulatory reform as to certain independent regulatory agencies.

ANTINUCLEAR INITIATIVES—HOAX ON PUBLIC

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. Peter Metzger of the Rocky Mountain News has just written an article entitled "Antinuclear Initiatives—Hoax on Public." Mr. Metzger is an excellent authority on this subject matter, and is the science editor of the Rocky Mountain News. I think this article is a must reading for all who want the truth on the nuclear balloting taking place in California and Colo-

rado and later in some 20 States. I believe the balloting is largely a hoax also, and that the moratorium should be defeated, regarding the suspension of nuclear power generation.

I recommend this reading to all of the Members.

The item appears in today's Extensions of Remarks.

STATUS REPORT ON THE FISCAL YEAR 1976 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on the Budget I rise to inform my colleagues about the status of the fiscal year 1976 congressional budget. This notification is the 13th time this fiscal year that the Budget Committee has made its notification to the House about where the Congress stands in relation to the ceilings on budget authority and outlays and the floor on revenues which Congress set for itself in House Concurrent Resolution 611. This report reflects two items: The first is this week's action by both Houses to adopt the conference agreement on H.R. 13172—second supplemental appropriations, 1976; and a series of reestimates submitted by the President.

Although the spring supplemental contains $9.4 billion in budget authority and $8.5 billion in outlays, the scorekeeping procedure reserves funding for entitlement authority which requires subsequent appropriations at the time the entitlement bill passes Congress. This scorekeeping procedure is necessary since, by the time the bill reaches the Appropriations Committee, it is a mandatory funding item, and only the cost estimate may vary. Therefore, the net cost of the spring supplemental to the current level is far less than the total cost of the bill.

The reestimates included in this report were submitted by the President as part of his requirements to keep Congress informed about the current status of Government programs. These reestimates have been reviewed jointly by the staffs of the House and Senate Budget Committees as well as the Congressional Budget Office.

These two items have a net effect on the amount remaining as follows:

	Budget authority	Outlays
H.R. 13172, second supplemental appropriations, 1976	−1,949	−480
Presidential reestimates	+115	−282

These two items have affected the congressional budget as of close of legislative business Wednesday, May 19, 1976, as follows:

STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1976 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF MAY 19, 1976

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level	408,000	374,900	300,800
Current level	403,962	372,367	301,100
Amount remaining	4,038	2,533	300

A complete analysis of the various items included in the current level may be found in today's Extensions of Remarks.

I urge my colleagues in the House to be watchful of spending legislation as it comes before this Chamber in the coming weeks. Congress has yet to pass on two regular appropriation bills before the end of the fiscal year. My current budget year projection of the amount remaining indicates that there is little room left under the ceilings. If you add the amounts included in the conference agreement on H.R. 12203, foreign assistance appropriations, 1976, and the anticipated appropriations for the District of Columbia, my budget year estimate of the amount remaining is approximately $1.8 billion in budget authority and $1.3 billion in outlays.

In addition to these bills, the pressures of changing economic conditions continues to make the budget vulnerable to increased spending.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I must warn my colleagues in the House, that as the end of the fiscal year draws near, and less room remains under the budget ceilings, we must exercise restraint in budgetary decisionmaking. The projection of the current level leaves little room for new legislation of either the President or Congress which was not contemplated in this year's budget resolution.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES FOR CONGRESSIONAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Technology be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 100) expressing appreciation to professional societies for their congressional science and engineering fellowship programs, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 100

Whereas the Congress increasingly deals with issues with scientific and technological components; and

Whereas the Congress increasingly requires a better understanding of science and technology, and finds it important to maintain liaison and exchange with the scientific and engineering communities; and

Whereas the Congress increasingly requires the services of persons who have an understanding of science and technology as well as of governmental policymaking processes, in order to better to serve the public; and

Whereas scientific and engineering societies within the United States have, on their own initiative, instituted Congressional Fellowship Programs designed to contribute to the Congress professionally trained scientists and engineers, as well as to contribute to the scientific and engineering communities a better understanding of governmental processess; and

Whereas these Congressional Fellowship Programs are now in their third year of operation, and have furnished a total of thirty-seven scientists and engineers to work on Senate and House Committee staffs, on personal staffs of Members, and on the staff of the Office of Technology Assessment; and

Whereas these scientists and engineers have made significant contributions to the legislative activities of the Congress, and have provided a valuable pool of scientists and engineers from which permanent staff positions have been filled: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States expresses its appreciation to the following scientific and engineering societies for their Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Programs: The American Association for the Advancement of Science; The American Physical Society; The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers: The American Society of Mechanical Engineers; The American Psychological Association; The American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics; The Optical Society of America; and The Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, and additionally thanks The American Association for the Advancement of Science for its role in coordination the fellowship programs of the various societies; and be it further

Resolved, That because of its valuable contributions to the legislative process, the Congress strongly encourages the scientific and engineering communities to continue and expand this vital public service activity.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to present to the House a concurrent resolution of the House and the Senate expressing our appreciation to the professional societies for their congressional science and engineering fellowship programs.

Since 1973 the Congress has had the benefit of having congressional fellows working as staff members of our committees and in the offices of individual Members. The scientific and engineering societies select the interns according to carefully drawn criteria, and they have all been of exceptionally high caliber. Most of them have completed their Ph. D. in a field of science or engineering and have several years of experience behind them before they come to the Congress for their year of service.

The criteria for the selection of congressional fellows state that a prospective fellow must demonstrate exceptional competence in some areas of science or engineering; have a rather broad scientific and technical background; be cognizant of many matters in nonscientific areas; be articulate; literate, and able to work effectively with a wide variety of people; exhibit a willingness and flexibility to work in many nonscientific areas; demonstrate sensitivity toward the political and societal issues of the day; and, perhaps most importantly, have a strong interest and some experience in applying his or her knowledge toward the solution of societal problems. I can testify from the experience which we have had with the fellows who have served on the Committee on Science and Technology that they amply have met all those criteria.

The fellowship program was begun by four of the professional societies in 1973. The American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Physical Society, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engi-

neers that year sponsored seven congressional interns. The following year these societies were joined by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, and the American Psychological Association, and together they sponsored 14 interns, double the number of the previous year. Then this year the six sponsoring societies were joined by a seventh, the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, and a total of 16 interns are with us this year. So that in all the Congress has had the help of 37 competent interns as the result of the imaginative and forward looking efforts of these professional societies.

Special notice should be taken of the role played by the American Association for the Advancement of Science in this effort. Under the leadership of Dr. Richard A. Scribner, the AAAS has coordinated the entire effort, and has provided the many liaison and coordination tasks which have made the program both smooth running and successful.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the benefits that this program provide are not limited to the Members and committees of the Congress. The interns themselves benefit in no small degree from their year of service on a congressional staff. Indeed, the purpose of the fellowship program is to broaden the perspective of both the scientific and engineering communities about the way the Congress deals with questions of research and development. That payoff may well take a little longer to reach fruition, but as more and more of the fellows return to their universities and engineering organizations I believe that over the longer term the return of this investment will multiply manyfold.

Mr. Speaker, a comparable House concurrent resolution was introduced in the House by our distinguished colleague, Mr. PRICE, of Illinois. I was delighted to join him and Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOSHER, and Mr. BROWN in cosponsoring that resolution. Because the other body acted on their version on March 10 of this year, I am asking the House to consider the Senate-passed version at this time. The resolution would recognize a job well done, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

The professional scientific and engineering societies in the United States have made a direct, valuable contribution to our understanding of scientific issues by their support of technical specialists to work with the various committees and Members' offices. The persons involved are highly motivated individuals with advanced degrees in the sciences and engineering. They are selected by their respective sponsoring groups only after keen competition and close examination.

The scientists participating in this program bring not only their formal academic training to their temporary Hill positions but also their work experience from industry, government, and universities. The exchange which takes place is certainly a two-way street. The Congress obtains the benefit of outstanding analysis and insight on major issues involving science and technology. The varied background of the program participants and their yearly rotation assures that fresh minds and ideas will be addressing the issues. Conversely, the scientists' exposure to the work of the Congress enables them to understand and appreciate the operation of the legislative branch. This enhances their ability to assure that the scientists' input to the legislative process is effectively made later when they return to their former positions.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the professional societies for their time in selecting persons for temporary assignments on Capitol Hill and for their monetary contribution supplementing the salaries of their members while on the Hill. The direct expense to the Congress for the services of the society-sponsored scientists is only a fraction of its true value. The difference is supplied by the various professional societies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 100.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate Concurrent Resolution 100.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12453, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12453) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statmeent.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 17, 1976.)

Mr. TEAGUE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees have resolved the differences in the House and Senate passed versions on H.R. 12453 the fiscal year 1977 National Aeronautics and Space Administration bill. The bill passed the House on March 22 and passed the Senate on April 1. In acting on the bill the Senate struck all after the enacting clause and substituted new language.

The committee of conference agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain substitute amendments and with certain other stipulations insisted upon by the managers on the part of the House. There were 11 items in disagreement involving amounts to be authorized for appropriations and there were three items of legislative language to be reconciled.

The House had authorized a total of $3,696,070,000 and the Senate had authorized $3,696,850,000 in its bill. Thus, the amount passed by the House was $780,000 less than the Senate amount. The conference substitute would authorize $3,696,170,000 which is $1,680,000 less than the Senate version and $900,000 less than the total amount previously passed by the House. In resolving the language differences in the respective bills, the House receded on the three items.

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

A summary of the substitutes agreed upon by the committee of conference follows:

Space flight operations: The House authorized $198,200,000 for the space flight operations program, a reduction of $7,000,000 in the NASA request, the net result of an $8,000,000 reduction in the development, test and mission operations subprogram and a $1,000,000 addition to the advanced programs subprogram activity.

The conference compromised with an authorization of $202,700,000. Stating that NASA should apply $500,000 additional to its planned effort for advanced programs to improve the structuring and development of this activity in support of future space programs.

Physics and astronomy: The House authorized $169,800,000 for physics and astronomy increasing the NASA request by $3,000,000 to initiate the development program for the space telescope and by $1,000,000 for additional supporting research and technology effort. The conference substitute authorizes $166,300,000 and agrees that an additional $500,000 is to be applied to supporting research and technology activities to help assure the viability of future research in physics and astronomy.

Lunar and planetary: The House authorized $193,100,000 for the lunar and planetary program increasing the NASA request for the planetary advanced studies activity by $2,000,000 to provide for definition studies for a Jupiter orbiter mission.

The conference substitute authorizes $192,100,000 and agrees that NASA

should give particular attention to formulating and presenting new initiatives to reverse the "going out of business" trend apparent in this program and accordingly added $1,000,000 to be applied to studies for this purpose.

Space applications: The House authorized $185,700,000 transferring the Landsat-C spacecraft project and the $13,500,000 associated therewith to a new program entitled, "Earth Resources Operational Systems" and also added $1,000,000 to augment the severe storm activity research.

The conference substitute authorizes $198,000,000 for the space applications program and agrees that the Landsat-C spacecraft development program should be continued in the space applications program as presented in the NASA budget request and provides for increased emphasis on severe storm research activities.

Earth resources operational system: The House established a new program entitled, "Earth Resources Operational Systems" which was not included in the NASA request and authorized $13,500,000 for the program to include those activities associated with the Landsat-C development project.

The conference substitute establishes a new research and development line item in the bill entitled "Earth Resources Operational Systems," agrees that the Landsat Earth resources satellite technology project has reached a state of maturity wherein it is necessary to facilitate arrangements for an operational version of the Landsat system, and authorizes $200,000 to provide for early activities that would initiate transition to an operational mode.

Aeronautical research and technology: The House authorized $192,100,000 for aeronautical research and technology increasing the NASA request by $3,000,000 to accelerate the variable cycle engine components technology program.

The conference substitute authorizes $191,100,000 for the aeronautical research and technology program and provides $2,000,000 to accelerate the variable cycle engine components technology program.

Space research and technology: The House authorized $92,100,000 for the space research and technology program, an increase of $10,100,000 in the NASA request, of which $1,600,000 was for increased rocket engine propulsion technology effort, $3,500,000 was for energy technology identification and verification activity, and $5,000,000 was to significantly broaden the system definition effort on solar satellite power systems.

The conference substitute authorizes $86,300,000 and notes that NASA has a significant capability which can and should be fully utilized in the Nation's program to achieve energy self-sufficiency. To this end the conferees agree that $3,500,000 in the space research and technology program is to be allocated for energy technology. Furthermore, the conferees agree that $800,000 of additional effort should be applied to advanced rocket engine propulsion technology.

Tracking and data acquisition: The House authorized $254,000,000 for the tracking and data acquisition program, a reduction of $4,000,000 in the NASA request.

The conference substitute authorizes $255,000,000 for the tracking and data acquisition program.

Technology utilization: The House added $500,000 to NASA's request greater emphasis on industrial and technology applications, authorizing a total of $8,400,000 for the program. The Senate authorized $8,100,000 increasing the NASA request by $200,000 to initiate one additional regional application center.

The committee of conference adopts the Senate position.

Construction of facilities: The House did not authorize funds for the construction of an addition to the lunar curatorial facility at the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center. The Senate authorized the facility at the requested amount of $2,800,000. The conference compromise authorizes $2,200,000 for the construction of an addition to the lunar curatorial facility.

The House authorized $17,855,000 for the third phase of modifications to launch complex 39, John F. Kennedy Space Center, in support of the space shuttle program, a reduction of $2,000,000 in the NASA request for this facility project. The Senate authorized the NASA request of $19,855,000 for launch complex 39 modifications. The conference compromise authorizes $18,855,000 for this project.

The House authorized $8,700,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 in the NASA request, for the second phase of facilities for processing the solid rocket booster for the space shuttle program at the John F. Kennedy Space Center. The Senate authorized $9,700,000 as requested by NASA. The committee of conference adopts the House position.

The House did not authorize any funds for a crew training facility for the space shuttle program at the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, believing that existing facilities at the Marshall Space Flight Center could be used during the design, development, test and engineering phase of the space shuttle program be deferred. The Senate authorized the construction of this facility item at the requested amount of $780,000. The conference substitute adopts the House position and defers funds for the construction of this crew training facility.

Research and program management: The House authorized $810,455,000, a reduction of $3,600,000 in the NASA request, for the research and program management appropriations category. The Senate authorized $814,055,000, identical with the NASA request. The conference compromise authorizes $813,455,000 for the research and program management activity.

In addition to the changes described, three language changes were in conference. The House included as section 9 in its bill, a sense of the Congress statement emphasizing its concern for the need to expedite the completion of large aeronautical research facilities noting the importance of these facilities to U.S. dominance in the field of aeronautics. The conference substitute does not include this provision.

The House adopted a section 10 in its bill amending section 102 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 enlarging its policy and purpose by declaring that the general welfare requires that the unique competence in science and engineering systems of NASA also should be directed toward ground propulsion research and development. The Senate did not include this provision in its amendment to the House bill. The conference substitute adopts the Senate position.

The House bill included a section 11, complementary to its amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 adopted in section 10 of its bill, which defined the term "ground propulsion system." The Senate did not include this provision in its amendment to the House bill. The conference substitute does not have a comparable provision inasmuch as the basic amendment was not adopted and, therefore, this complementary amendment is not considered necessary.

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

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

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report accompanying H.R. 12453, the fiscal year 1977 authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The President's budget request for NASA for fiscal year 1977 totalled $3,697,000,000. The House authorized $3,696,070,000 and the Senate amendment authorized $3,696,850,000. Your conferees agreed to a total authorization for fiscal year 1977 of $3,695,170,000.

In addition to providing for the sustained vitality of NASA's major programs, the conferees gave special attention to assuring that several promising new areas receive adequate attention. The conferees encouraged NASA to proceed with competitive bidding for the large space telescope project which has been under consideration for several years. They also sought to maintain a credible variable cycle engine components technology program. Progress on a variable cycle engine could set the stage for the next generation of aircraft engines which would be significantly more clean, quiet and efficient than existing ones. While the funding level of such innovative projects is small, they should be allowed to proceed at their own pace and not be squeezed out by the requirements of other near-term, major activities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this bill is a product of a fiscally responsible effort by the House and Senate conferees to assure vital space and aeronautical programs within the confines of the administration budget request. This bill is $1,800,000 under the administration's request and this is the result of an active analysis of NASA's program which calls for increases in specific R. & D. items balanced by decreases in institutional support areas. If congressional committees and conferees in general emulated the kind of penetrating analysis with which we reviewed the NASA budget, the Federal Government would be operating more productively,

efficiently and economically. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conference report on H.R. 12453.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize my support of this conference report on H.R. 12453 the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1977. This report represents a carefully considered House-Senate position and what I consider an austere budget. The Conference report authorizes a total of $3,696,-170,000 which is $900,000 less than the total amount previously passed by the House, $1,680,000 less than the Senate version, and $1,830,000 less than the NASA budget request.

In the bill previously passed by the House, construction of an addition to the lunar curatorial facility was deferred. This project was deferred based on a belief that more austere design alternatives should be considered. The conference substitute of $2,200,000 for this facility is $600,000 less than the NASA request and therefore will provide for more austere construction as well as providing adequate protection for the 840 pounds of lunar samples which are a national treasure and are providing important scientific insights into the origin of the Moon.

The conference bill provides for emphasis in the research and development areas of space science supporting research and technology, planning for Earth resources operational systems, advanced aeronautical propulsion and space propulsion technologies, energy technology and technology utilization as well as small reductions in the institutional categories of facilities and program management. These program augmentations made by the Congress will hopefully emphasize to the administration that there is support for important new program which if undertaken will increase our Nation's ability to deal with the challenges of the environment and limited natural resources and which will help make our Nation energy self-sufficient.

The actions of the Congress provide for an increase of $2,500,000 in the NASA request for research and development programs, a $3,730,000 decrease from the NASA budget request for construction of facilities, and $600,000 decrease from the NASA budget request for research and program management. I believe these actions strongly deserve our unqualified support. I urge my colleagues adopt the report before us as a commitment to maintaining the leadership of this country in science and space.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. WYDLER. 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 255, nays 20, not voting 157, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—255

Adams
Alexander
Allen
Ambro
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Archer
Ashley
Badillo
Baucus
Bauman
Beard, R.I.
Beard, Tenn.
Bennett
Bevill
Biester
Blouin
Boland
Bowen
Brademas
Breaux
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brodhead
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Butler
Byron
Carr
Cederberg
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Cleveland
Cochran
Collins, Tex.
Conte
Corman
Coughlin
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Davis
de la Garza
Delaney
Derrick
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Downey, N.Y.
Downing, Va.
Drinan
Duncan, Tenn.
du Pont
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Emery
Evans, Ind.
Evins, Tenn.
Fary
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Fithian
Foley
Ford, Tenn.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gradison
Grassley
Green
Guyer
Hagedorn
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hannaford
Hansen
Harkin
Harris
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hillis
Holland
Holt
Howe
Hubbard
Hyde
Ichord
Jeffords
Jenrette
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jordan
Kasten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kelly
Kemp
Kindness
Krebs
Krueger
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Levitas
Lloyd, Calif.
Lloyd, Tenn.
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
McClory
McCloskey
McCormack
McDonald
McEwen
McFall
McHugh
McKinney
Madigan
Mann
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Moffett
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Oberstar
O'Brien
O'Neill
Ottinger
Passman
Patten, N.J.
Patterson, Calif.
Pattison, N.Y.
Paul
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Pressler
Preyer
Price
Pritchard
Quillen
Railsback
Regula
Reuss
Richmond
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney
Roush
Rousselot
Roybal
Ruppe
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scheuer
Sharp
Shipley
Shuster
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Nebr.
Snyder
Solarz
Spellman
Spence
Stanton, J. William
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Sullivan
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thompson
Thone
Treen
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wirth
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki

NAYS—20

Baldus
Bedell
Cornell
Early
Edgar
Florio
Hughes
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Keys
Latta
Miller, Ohio
Nolan
Obey
Russo
Seiberling
Simon
Stark
Studds
Yates

NOT VOTING—157

Abdnor
Abzug
Addabbo
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Aspin
AuCoin
Bafalis
Bell
Bergland
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Boggs
Bolling
Bonker
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Carney
Carter
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cohen
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conlan
Conyers
Cotter
Crane
Daniels, N.J.
Dellums
Dent
Duncan, Oreg.
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
English
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fenwick
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Mich.
Frenzel
Frey
Giaimo
Gude
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Harrington
Harsha
Hawkins
Hayes, Ind.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hefner
Heinz
Helstoski
Hicks
Hightower
Hinshaw
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Jarman
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Ketchum
Koch
Litton
Lujan
Lundine
McCollister
McDade
McKay
Macdonald
Madden
Maguire
Mahon
Martin
Mathis
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meyner
Mikva
Milford
Mills
Mineta
Mitchell, Md.
Mollohan
Mosher
Moss
Mottl
Neal
Nowak
O'Hara
Pettis
Peyser
Quie
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Rhodes
Riegle
Risenhoover
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Runnels
Ryan
St Germain
Santini
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Schulze
Sebelius
Shriver
Staggers
Stanton, James V.
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stokes
Stuckey
Symington
Symms
Talcott
Thornton
Traxler
Tsongas
Udall
Wampler
Waxman
Weaver
Wilson, C. H.
Wilson, Tex.
Winn
Wright
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Ga.
Zeferetti

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Harrington against.

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mrs. Meyner against.

Mrs. Boggs for, with Ms. Abzug against.

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Mikva against.

Mr. Dominick V. Daniels for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Dellums against.

Mr. Koch for, with Mr. Ryan against.

Mr. Howard for, with Ms. Holtzman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Aspin.

Mr. Hanley with Mr. Bonker.

Mr. AuCoin with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Bergland with Mr. Burlison of Missouri.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Flowers.

Mr. Phillip Burton with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.

Mr. Carney with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Frenzel.

Mr. Milford with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Cotter with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. English.

Mr. Litton with Mr. Bell.

Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Abdnor.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Ford of Michigan with Mr. Bafalis.

Mr. Riegle with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.

Mr. Stokes with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. Traxler with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Blanchard with Mr. Conable.

Mr. John Burton with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Clay with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Rose with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Hayes of Indiana with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Mottl with Mrs. Fenwick.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Cohen.
Mr. Hefner with Mr. Hicks.
Mr. Hightower with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Horton with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Lundine.
Mr. Mahon with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Martin with Mr. Mathis.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. McCollister.
Mr. McDade with Mr. McKay.
Mr. Mineta with Mr. Mollohan.
Mrs. Pettis with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Quie with Mr. Neal.
Mr. Risenhoover with Mr. Nowak.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Santini.
Mr. Sebelius with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Schulze with Mrs. Schroeder.
Mr. Shriver with St Germain.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Steelman.
Mr. Steiger of Arizona with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Symms with Mr. Thornton.
Mr. Talcott with Mr. Mills.

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT AUTHORIZATION INCREASE FOR FISCAL YEARS 1976 AND 1977

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 12527) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to increase the authorization of appropriations for fiscal years 1976 and 1977, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out "; and by striking out '$50,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$57,233,000' ".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to increase the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1976, and for other purposes.".

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 12677, ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM AMENDMENTS OF 1976

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1191 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1191

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12677) to extend for three fiscal years the programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 12677, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3184, and it shall then be in order in the House move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 12677 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) for the minority, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1191 provides for consideration of H.R. 12677, the Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Amendments of 1976.

This is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill is to be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The rule further provides that upon passage of H.R. 12677, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 3184. It then shall be in order to strike all after the enacting clause of S. 3184 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 12677 as passed by the House.

This legislation would revise and extend through fiscal 1979 the programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970. According to the committee's supplemental report No. 94-1092, authorizations for formula grants to the States total $214 million project grants and contracts authorizations total $249.5 million, and $18 million is authorized for a new program authorizing the Secretary of HEW to designate up to six national alcohol research centers for the purpose of interdisciplinary research relating to alcoholism and other alcohol problems.

Since this legislation, which I cosponsored, was enacted in 1970, advances have been made in increasing public awareness of the dangers of alcohol abuse, but it remains one of the most serious problems impinging on the health and welfare of our society.

Until recently the ratio of alcoholic males to alcoholic females was estimated at about 5 to 1; current estimates indicate that fully one-third of the alcoholic population of this Nation are women, and this estimate may be even higher.

I am concerned too about recent surveys cited in the committee report, indicating that 80 percent of junior and senior high school youngsters drink alcoholic beverages and many become drunk at least once a week. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism estimates that there are 450,000 teenage alcoholics in this country, and even 11-year-old children are entering Alcoholics Anonymous.

I call my colleagues attention also to the fact that only half of the States have enacted legislation decriminalizing public intoxication, and many States have not fully implemented a program which would shift alcoholism from the criminal justice system to the health and welfare system. The committee urges that a continuing effort must be made to expand the number of States which have enacted the provisions of the Uniform Act as well as assist those States which have already done so in developing adequate treatment services.

I am hopeful that the new national alcohol research centers will accelerate our Nation's efforts to formulate effective national programs for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and other alcohol problems. The economic costs associated with the misuse of alcohol are estimated at more than $25 billion annually and the programs supported by the provisions of H.R. 12677 are of critical importance to the health and welfare of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the rule requested is not controversial, and I support its adoption.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1191 is a 1-hour open rule making in order consideration of the bill H.R. 12677, a 3-year extension of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970. After the bill has been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule and

it is reported back to the House and passes, this rule makes it in order to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of S. 3184, strike all after the enacting clause, and insert the language of the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12677 authorizes $15 million for the transition quarter, $60 million in fiscal 1977, $66 million in fiscal 1978, and $73 million in fiscal 1979 in formula grants to the States. The bill also contains authorizations in each of those periods for project grants and contracts and for special grants for implementation of the Uniform Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act, in the amounts of $17.5, $70, $77 and $85 million, respectively. Finally, the bill authorizes $6 million in each of those fiscal years for grants to national alcohol research centers which would conduct interdisciplinary research on alcoholism.

This bill is opposed by HEW on the grounds that it constitutes a narrow, categorical grant approach rather than the broader and more flexible approach to these problems preferred by the administration. The total price tag on this bill for the transition and 3 fiscal years is $481.5 million. There are no minority views with this report. I know of no opposition to this rule which was reported from the Rules Committee by a voice vote. I urge its adoption.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and if the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) has no further requests for time, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. THONE. 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 279, nays 0, not voting 153, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—279

Adams	Brademas	Collins, Tex.
Alexander	Breaux	Conte
Allen	Breckinridge	Corman
Ambro	Brinkley	Cornell
Anderson, Calif.	Brodhead	Coughlin
Anderson, Ill.	Brooks	D'Amours
Andrews, N.C.	Broomfield	Daniel, Dan
Archer	Broyhill	Daniel, R. W.
Ashley	Burgener	Danielson
Badillo	Burke, Calif.	Davis
Baldus	Burke, Fla.	de la Garza
Baucus	Burke, Mass.	Delaney
Bauman	Burleson, Tex.	Derrick
Beard, R.I.	Butler	Derwinski
Beard, Tenn.	Byron	Devine
Bedell	Carr	Dickinson
Bennett	Cederberg	Diggs
Bevill	Chappell	Dingell
Biester	Chisholm	Dodd
Blouin	Clancy	Downey, N.Y.
Boland	Cleveland	Drinan
Bowen	Cochran	Duncan, Tenn.
	Collins, Ill.	du Pont
Early	Landrum	Regula
Edgar	Latta	Reuss
Eilberg	Leggett	Richmond
Emery	Lehman	Rinaldo
Evans, Ind.	Lent	Roberts
Evins, Tenn.	Levitas	Robinson
Fary	Lloyd, Calif.	Rogers
Fascell	Lloyd, Tenn.	Roncalio
Findley	Long, La.	Roush
Fish	Long, Md.	Rousselot
Fisher	Lott	Roybal
Fithian	McClory	Ruppe
Florio	McCloskey	Russo
Foley	McCormack	Sarasin
Ford, Tenn.	McDonald	Sarbanes
Forsythe	McEwen	Satterfield
Fountain	McFall	Scheuer
Fraser	McHugh	Seiberling
Fuqua	McKinney	Sharp
Gaydos	Madigan	Shipley
Gibbons	Mann	Shuster
Gilman	Meeds	Sikes
Ginn	Melcher	Simon
Goldwater	Metcalfe	Sisk
Gonzalez	Mezvinsky	Skubitz
Goodling	Michel	Slack
Gradison	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Iowa
Grassley	Miller, Ohio	Smith, Nebr.
Green	Minish	Snyder
Guyer	Mink	Solarz
Hagedorn	Mitchell, N.Y.	Spellman
Haley	Moakley	Spence
Hall	Moffett	Stanton, J. William
Hamilton	Montgomery	Stark
Hanley	Moore	Steed
Hannaford	Moorhead, Calif.	Stephens
Hansen	Moorhead, Pa.	Stratton
Harkin	Morgan	Stuckey
Harris	Murphy, Ill.	Studds
Hayes, Ind.	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan
Hechler, W. Va.	Murtha	Taylor, Mo.
Heckler, Mass.	Myers, Ind.	Taylor, N.C.
Henderson	Myers, Pa.	Teague
Hicks	Natcher	Thompson
Hillis	Nedzi	Thone
Holland	Nichols	Thornton
Holt	Nix	Treen
Holtzman	Nolan	Ullman
Howe	Oberstar	Van Deerlin
Hubbard	Obey	Vander Jagt
Hughes	O'Brien	Vander Veen
Hutchinson	O'Neill	Vanik
Hyde	Ottinger	Vigorito
Ichord	Passman	Waggonner
Jacobs	Patten, N.J.	Walsh
Jenrette	Patterson, Calif.	Whalen
Johnson, Calif.	Pattison, N.Y.	White
Johnson, Colo.	Paul	Whitehurst
Johnson, Pa.	Pepper	Whitten
Jones, N.C.	Perkins	Wiggins
Jordan	Pickle	Wilson, Bob
Kasten	Pike	Wirth
Kastenmeier	Poage	Wolff
Kazen	Pressler	Wydler
Kelly	Preyer	Wylie
Kemp	Price	Yates
Keys	Pritchard	Young, Fla.
Kindness	Quillen	Young, Tex.
Krebs	Railsback	Zablocki
Krueger	Rangel	
LaFalce		
Lagomarsino		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—153

Abdnor	Carney	Flood
Abzug	Carter	Flowers
Addabbo	Clausen, Don H.	Flynt
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clawson, Del	Ford, Mich.
Annunzio	Clay	Frenzel
Armstrong	Cohen	Frey
Ashbrook	Conable	Giaimo
Aspin	Conlan	Gude
AuCoin	Conyers	Hammer-schmidt
Bafalis	Cotter	Harrington
Bell	Crane	Harsha
Bergland	Daniels, N.J.	Hawkins
Biaggi	Dellums	Hays, Ohio
Bingham	Dent	Hébert
Blanchard	Downing, Va.	Hefner
Boggs	Duncan, Oreg.	Heinz
Bolling	Eckhardt	Helstoski
Bonker	Edwards, Ala.	Hightower
Brown, Calif.	Edwards, Calif.	Hinshaw
Brown, Mich.	English	Horton
Brown, Ohio	Erlenborn	Howard
Buchanan	Esch	Hungate
Burlison, Mo.	Eshleman	Jarman
Burton, John	Evans, Colo.	Jones, Ala.
Burton, Phillip	Fenwick	Jeffords
Jones, Okla.	Moss	Shriver
Jones, Tenn.	Mottl	Staggers
Karth	Neal	Stanton, James V.
Ketchum	Nowak	Steelman
Koch	O'Hara	Steiger, Ariz.
Litton	Pettis	Steiger, Wis.
Lujan	Peyser	Stokes
Lundine	Quie	Symington
McCollister	Randall	Symms
McDade	Rees	Talcott
McKay	Rhodes	Traxler
Macdonald	Riegle	Tsongas
Madden	Risenhoover	Udall
Maguire	Rodino	Wampler
Mahon	Roe	Waxman
Martin	Rooney	Weaver
Mathis	Rose	Wilson, C. H.
Matsunaga	Rosenthal	Wilson, Tex.
Mazzoli	Rostenkowski	Winn
Meyner	Runnels	Wright
Mikva	Ryan	Yatron
Milford	St Germain	Young, Alaska
Mills	Santini	Young, Ga.
Mineta	Schneebeli	Zeferetti
Mitchell, Md.	Schroeder	
Mollohan	Schulze	
Mosher	Sebelius	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Phillip Burton with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. Giaimo with Mrs. Fenwick.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Abdnor.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Frenzel.

Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Risenhoover with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Horton.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. John L. Burton with Mr. Jones of Alabama.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. English with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Mikva with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mrs. Meyner with Mr. Jarman.

Mr. Litton with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Koch with Mr. Heinz.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Jones of Oklahoma.

Mr. Bergland with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. AuCoin with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Jeffords.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Cohen.

Ms. Abzug with Mr. Karth.

Mr. Mineta with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Milford with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Madden.

Mr. Runnels with Mr. Conlan.

Mr. Rose with Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Santini with Mr. Mahon.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Crane.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Aspin.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Hammerschmidt.

Mr. Bonker with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Carney with Mr. Dellums.

Mr. Cotter with Mr. Downing of Virginia.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Helstoski.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Flood with Mr. McKay.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Randall.

Mr. Mottl with Mr. McCollister.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Rees.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Steelman.

Mr. Hefner with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Moss with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Hightower with Mr. Schulze.

Mr. Lundine with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Mathis with Mr. Sebelius.

Mr. Waxman with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Stokes with Mr. Roe.

Mr. Neal with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Novak with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Tsongas with Mr. Symms.
Mrs. Schroeder with Mrs. Pettis.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Traxler with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Ford of Michigan with Mr. James V. Stanton.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Riegle with Mr. Mills.

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.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the District of Columbia budget for fiscal year 1976.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 12679, EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS FOR HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH AND STATISTICS AND MEDICAL LIBRARIES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1192 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1192

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12679) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for three fiscal years assistance programs for health services research and statistics and programs for assistance to medical libraries, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1192 provides for consideration of H.R. 12679, extension of programs for health services research and statistics and medical libraries.

It is an open rule, providing 1 hour of general debate, divided in the customary manner. No provision is made for waiver of any rules of the House. This is a simple, straightforward rule.

H.R. 12679 extends the authorizations of appropriations for the National Center for Health Services Research, NCHSR, the National Center for Health Statistics, NCHS, and the National Library of Medicine, NLM, for 3 fiscal years through fiscal 1979 with a total authorization of $318.25 million. In addition the legislation makes minor substantive modifications in the existing authorities for these programs intended to specify separate authorizations for the cooperative health statistics system, CHSS, increase the number of qualified scientific and professional personnel available to the programs, mandate training programs in health services research and health statistics, and change the due dates of various reports on health in the United States required by law.

Since 1878, the collection, publication, and analysis of vital and health statistics has been one of the oldest health functions of the Federal Government. This bill provides specific legislative authority for the development of a cooperative health statistics system. This cooperative system is designed to provide the framework for a coalition among the various levels, national, State and local, of government for the collection of health statistics. The National Center for Health Statistics has the responsibility for providing the national leadership needed to develop and implement such a system. Further, the bill contains a provision requiring that statistical activities undertaken under the authority of Public Law 93–641, the National Health Planning and Research Development Act of 1974, be coordinated with the CHSS.

The legislation provides an authorization for 30 additional qualified scientific and administrative personnel who can be paid at the top of the general schedule of the civil service system. Fifteen of the personnel will be available to the national center for the intramural research program under the National Center for Health Services Research; 10 will go to the National Center for Health Statistics; and 5 of the additional positions should be available to the National Library of Medicine.

Since the enactment of health services research, our Nation has benefited from the implementation of studies of great value, particularly on physician assistant programs, experimental medical care review organizations, and computerized medical information systems. The need for better planning of the research effort has been recognized and substantial strides have been made in the development of a more coherent research program.

Mr. Speaker, I support the priorities for health services research which have been explicitly defined and which include: Inflation and productivity in the health sector, health insurance and financing, health manpower, the quality of health services, planning and regulation of the health system, health care and the disadvantaged, long-term care, and ambulatory care and emergency medical services.

The committee report contains a statement that a cost estimate was requested on H.R. 12679 when it was ordered reported but the Congressional Budget Office to date has been unable to provide an estimate.

Mr. Speaker, the rule requested is not controversial. It is a straight 1-hour open rule with no waiver of points of order; and I support its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1192 provides 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 12679, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act. Under this rule, the bill will be open to all germane amendments. There are no waivers of points of order.

H.R. 12679 extends the authorization for the National Center for Health Services Research, the National Center for Health Statistics and the National Library of Medicine for 3 fiscal years through fiscal year 1979. The total amount authorized in this bill is $318,250,000. The bill modifies existing programs to specify separate authorizations for the cooperative health statistics system and to increase the number of scientific and professional personnel available to the programs.

The administration is opposed to H.R. 12679 unless it is amended to:

Authorize "such sums as may be necessary";

Delete the 30 additional supergrades and requirement that 30 of the proposed new total of 180 supergrades be for the National Center for Health Services Research, the National Center for Health Statistics and the National Library of Medicine;

Delete the proposed separate authorization for the cooperative health statistics system within the National Center for Health Statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM AMENDMENTS OF 1976

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12677) to extend for 3 fiscal years the programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12677, with Mr. ROBERTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill H.R. 12677, is basically a simple extension for 3 fiscal years, 1977, 1978 and 1979, of the programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention. Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970.

Mr. Chairman, briefly, it would do the following:

First. It would extend, with minor revisions, the authorizations for formula grants to the States.

Second. It would extend, with minor revisions, the authorizations for project grants and contracts for alcoholism programs.

Third. It would authorize the designation of national alcohol research centers to conduct interdisciplinary research on alcoholism and other alcohol problems.

Fourth. It would amend the provisions with respect to State plans to require each State to survey and identify the need for alcoholism prevention and treatment programs for women and youths, and to require each State to provide assurances that programs supported by formula grant moneys provide standards or protocols to measure effectiveness.

Fifth. It would require the Secretary of HEW to give special consideration to project grant and contract applications for programs for women and individuals under the age of 18, which is a growing problem in the field of alcoholism.

Sixth. It would require the Secretary of HEW to issue regulations enforcing nondiscrimination in hospital and outpatient facilities in admission and treatment of alcoholics and alcohol abusers.

Seventh. It would amend the provisions of the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 with respect to State plans to require each State to survey and identify the need for alcoholism prevention and treatment programs for women and youths, and, with respect to project grants and contracts, to require that the Secretary of HEW give special consideration to applications for programs for women and individuals under the age of 18.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would authorize $136 million for fiscal year 1977, $149 million for fiscal year 1978, and $164 million for fiscal year 1979.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, which extends for 3 years the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act, which has been on the books for some time.

This program provides financial assistance for prevention, treatment, rehabilitation and education in the area of alcohol abuse. Abuse of alcohol and alcoholism is the No. 1 health concern in America today. It affects every segment of our society, the rich, the young, the old, black and white. It is a grave national concern, particularly because of the growing number of problem drinkers among teenagers.

The overall problem of alcoholism and alcohol abuse is indeed a serious concern with considerable economic costs as well. In the testimony that was offered before the Committee it was estimated that the economic cost of alcoholism to the Nation as a whole is over $25 billion a year.

Therefore, I feel that the modest amounts authorized under this bill to try to do something about alcohol abuse constitute a moderate expenditure as far as the taxpayers are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that my colleagues vote in favor of extension of this program which has this worthwhile goal.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would ask the gentleman if he can cite for us just one or two positive accomplishments of this program in the field of prevention of alcoholism or treatment of those who have alcohol problems.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I recently had an opportunity to visit with one of the mental health groups in my district which is involved in the operation of programs in the area of alcohol abuse. They have cited a number of success stories in that particular community. They point out that they have been able to work with individuals, young and old, in order to rehabilitate them. Through this program they have been provided the necessary staffing and facilities to provide rehabilitation treatment.

But, above all, the tremendous success that this particular group has had comes from the educational programs they have conducted in the community. This is particularly true among young people. The impact that their program is having, they feel, has been felt especially in the area of changing the drinking habits of teenagers in that particular community.

I can only cite for the Members, at least from my own personal experience, data from the reports that I have had from groups who have received grants under this program. In addition, the Committee has on record, similar reports from groups around the country. Those reports do cite success in dealing with alcoholics, with alcoholism, and with programs to rehabilitate alcoholics, and, particularly, in putting together and sponsoring education programs in the community.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that these efforts are beginning to be evident, and it is apparent that the area of education should be a No. 1 priority in the program.

Mr. Chairman, I am including for the RECORD at this point a summary of the legislation:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION

H.R. 12677 would revise and extend for three fiscal years, 1977, 1978, and 1979, the programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970. Briefly, it would do the following:

1. It would authorize appropriations of $15 million for the period beginning July 1, 1976 through September 30, 1976, $60 million for fiscal year 1977, $66 million for fiscal year 1978, and $73 million for fiscal year 1979 for formula grants to the States.

2. It would authorize appropriations of $17.5 million for the period beginning July 1, 1976 through September 30, 1976, $70 million for fiscal year 1977, $77 million for fiscal year 1978, and $85 million for fiscal year 1979 for project grants and contracts and for special grants for implementation of the Uniform Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act.

3. It would authorize the designation of National Alcohol Research Centers which would conduct interdisciplinary research on alcoholism and other alcohol problems and which would be eligible to receive annual grants of up to $1 million per year for such purposes. $6 million would be authorized for each of fiscal years 1977, 1978, and 1979 for grants to such centers.

4. It would amend the provisions with respect to State plans to include a requirement that each State survey and identify the need for prevention and treatment of alcoholism and alcohol abuse by women and by individuals under the age of eighteen and provide assurances that the State program will be designed to meet such needs. It would also require that the Secretary give special consideration to applications for special project grants and contracts which would establish alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention and treatment programs for women and individuals under the age of eighteen.

5. It would require that State plans assure that programs or projects supported by formula grant funds provide to State alcohol agencies standards to measure, or protocols to determine, the effectiveness of such projects and would require that applicants for special project grants and contracts provide such standards or protocols.

6. It would make the requirements of existing law which prohibit hospitals from discriminating against alcohol abusers and alcoholics in admission and treatment applicable to outpatient facilities and would require that the Secretary issue regulations by December 31, 1976 for the enforcement of these policies. It would require that State alcohol agencies review admissions to hospitals and outpatient facilities to insure compliance with nondiscrimination requirements and that such agencies make periodic reports to the Secretary respecting such review.

7. It would require that all applications for special project grants and contracts be submitted to the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and that no such application be approved unless it is recommended for approval by the Council.

8. It would amend the provisions of the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 to include a requirement that each State

survey and identify the need for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence by women and by individuals under the age of eighteen and provide assurances that the State program will be designed to meet such needs. It would also require that the Secretary give special consideration to applications for special project grants and contracts which would establish drug abuse and drug dependence prevention and treatment programs for women and individuals under the age of eighteen.

I urge favorable consideration of this bill. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of these amendments to the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970.

I particularly want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for his initiatives and continuing leadership in this area, and in my judgment we owe a debt of gratitude to him for his untiring efforts in combating the serious problem of alcohol abuse and alcoholism in this country.

I also want to express my wholehearted support for the provisions contained in H.R. 12677, which place particular emphasis on the treatment needs of female substance abusers.

Just 2 months ago when this body was considering the conference report on S. 2017, the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act Amendments of 1976, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and I engaged in a brief colloquy which pointed up the fact that greater attention had to be afforded to the special problems of female drug and alcohol abusers.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for his expeditious action in bringing to the floor a legislative program which is specifically designed to respond to the unique needs of female substance abusers; and I sincerely believe that the provisions in H.R. 12677 represent a significant step forward in addressing this timely issue.

For some time now I have been deeply concerned that drug and alcohol abuse by women has severely impacted society in many ways. In addition to the problems created for the abuser herself, alcohol abuse has also had a devastating impact on family life. This is demonstrated by recent studies which show that alcoholism is an important factor in an overwhelming number of divorce cases. Another study conducted in 1973 concluded that maternal alcoholism can cause aberrant fetal development, and is a significant factor in child abuse and child neglect. I am also very troubled by the fact that women account for the largest increase in problem drinkers in recent years. For example, according to a 1974 survey, Alcoholics Anonymous found that one out of every three new members in the last 3 years was a woman.

Despite the severity of the problem, it is quite clear that adequate treatment programs and facilities do not exist to respond to the special needs of women alcoholics and the same can be said for all types of drug abuse among women. The committee has clearly recognized this inadequacy by including a provision in H.R. 12677 which would require States to identify the special needs of female alcohol and drug abusers and to develop programs to respond to these needs. Likewise, the bill includes another provision which would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to give special consideration to applications for special project grants and contracts which would establish appropriate prevention and treatment programs for female substance abusers.

I commend the committee for including these meritorious provisions in this legislation, and I am convinced they will go a long way in remedying this serious problem.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12677, the Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Amendments of 1976. The bill would revise and extend for 3 fiscal years programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970. As you may remember the 1970 provisions were designed to provide a comprehensive and coordinated Federal approach to the problem, and recognized the fact that alcoholism is a disease, and the law and court decisions shifted the treatment of alcoholism from the criminal justice system to the health and welfare system.

I concur with the committee report which states that alcoholism is still a growing national problem. I also support the new priority created by H.R. 12677 that will require States to identify the need for prevention and treatment programs for women and youths under the age of 18. This is an important new emphasis and one that has been stressed by some of my constituent groups knowledgeable about the problem.

The current requirements that prohibit hospitals from discriminating against alcohol abusers and alcoholics in admission and treatment have helped in some areas of the country to move the medical professional and the public to the understanding that alcoholism is a disease. The expansion of these prohibitions to outpatient facilities is commendable and has my full support. I would also like to encourage the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to have oversight hearings to see if this requirement is being met in all the States.

Finally the requirement in the new legislation to require States utilizing formula grants to provide standards to agencies for measuring effectiveness of programs is an important new provision. I understand the complexity of defining measures of effectiveness, but the State agencies dealing with the problem are in a good position to assess effectiveness at the local level. Many of us want to support social programs and do so at most times, but knowing the effectiveness of those programs will hopefully strengthen our arguments and increase the value of the programs serving our constituents.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation which extends the programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970.

Alcohol abuse and alcoholism constitute two of the most serious health concerns in this Nation today. These are problems which cut across social and economic class and affect both the young and old.

About 1 in 10—of the 95 million Americans who drink—is either a full-fledged alcoholic—or at least a problem drinker.

Moreover, we heard evidence during the hearings that there has been an upsurge of problem drinking among the young.

Recent surveys show that 80 percent of junior and senior high school youngsters drink alcoholic beverages with many becoming drunk at least once a week.

Indeed this is a frightening and distressing trend which must be addressed through our alcoholism programs.

Furthermore, the economic cost associated with alcohol abuse have been estimated at as much as $25 billion annually.

Indeed, the problem of alcohol abuse impacts profoundly on the whole of society.

In 1970 the Congress enacted the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcohol Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act in recognition of the need for a broadly based Federal approach to the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Congress should continue to support the goals of this legislation by extending its programs of assistance for 3 years.

Specifically this bill would extend the formula and project grant programs and the uniform Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act program through fiscal year 1979 with a total new authorization of $418 million.

I also support the amendment accepted by the subcommittee to strengthen the research effort in alcohol abuse by authorizing the Secretary to designate national research centers.

These centers would conduct interdisciplinary research on alcoholism and other alcohol problems and would be eligible to receive grants up to $1 million.

This bill also amends the provisions with respect to State plans to recognize the importance of preventive activities in this field.

Specifically the State plans would have to include a requirement that each State survey and identify the need for prevention and treatment of alcoholism and alcohol abuse by women and by individuals under the age of 18 and provide assurance that the State program will be designed to meet these needs.

Mr. Chairman, during the past 5 years, awareness of the nature and magnitude of alcohol abuse appears to have increased but the problems has by no means disappeared.

We must continue to improve our efforts in the areas of treatment, prevention, and rehabilitation in order to respond effectively to this national problem.

I urge favorable consideration of H.R. 12677.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time, but I wish to make this statement:

The ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Health and the Envi-

ronment, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) is necessarily absent today. He could not be here, but he does have a statement, and at a later time I will ask unanimous consent that his remarks be extended in the RECORD to indicate his continued support for this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) Section 301 of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 is amended (1) by striking out "and" after "1975,", and (2) by inserting after "1976," the following: "$15,000,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, $66,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and $73,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979".

(b) Effective July 1, 1976—

(1) sections 304(d) and 311(d) of such Act are repealed,

(2) section 304 of such Act (A) is transferred to part B of such Act, (B) is inserted before section 311, and (C) is redesignated as section 310, and

(3) part B of such Act is amended by inserting after section 311 the following new section:

"AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 312. For purposes of sections 310 and 311, there are authorized to be appropriated $17,500,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1976 and ending September 30, 1976, $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, $77,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and $85,000,00 for the fiscal year ending September 3, 1979.".

(c) Section 310(a) of such Act (as so redesignated) is amended (1) by striking out "June 30, 1977" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1979", and (2) by striking out "three grants" and inserting in lieu thereof "six grants".

SEC. 2. Title V of such Act is amended by adding after section 503 the following new section:

"NATIONAL ALCOHOL RESEARCH CENTERS

"SEC. 504. (a) The Secretary may designate National Alcohol Research Centers for the purpose of interdisciplinary research relating to alcoholism and other alcohol problems. No entity may be designated as a Center unless an application therefor has been submitted to, and approved by, the Secretary. Such an application shall be submitted in such manner and contain such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. The Secretary may not approve such an application unless—

"(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that—

"(A) the applicant has the experience, or capability, to conduct, through the biomedical, behavioral, social, and related disciplines, long-term research on alcoholism and other alcohol problems and to provide coordination of such research among such disciplines;

"(B) the applicant has available to it sufficient laboratory facilities and reference services (including reference services that will afford access to scientific alcohol literature);

"(C) the applicant has facilities and personnel to provide training in the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and other alcohol problems; and

"(D) the applicant has the capacity to train predoctoral and postdoctoral students for careers in research on alcoholism and other alcohol problems; and

"(2) the application contains a detailed five-year plan for research relating to alcoholism and other alcohol problems.

"(c) The Secretary shall make, under such conditions as the Secretary may reasonably require, annual grants to Centers which have been designated under this section. No annual grant to any Center may exceed $1,000,000. No funds provided under a grant under this subsection may be used for the purchase or rental of any land or the rental, purchase, construction, preservation, or repair of any building. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'construction' has the meaning given that term by section 702(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292a).

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years.".

SEC. 3. (a)(1) Section 303(a)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "(A)" after "(4)" and by inserting after such section the following:

"(B) include in the survey conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) an identification of the need for prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism by women and by individuals under the age of eighteen and provide assurance that prevention and treatment programs within the State will be designed to meet such need;".

(2) Section 311(c) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications under this section for programs and projects for prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism by women and for programs and projects for prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism by individuals under the age of eighteen.".

(b)(1) Section 409(e)(5) of the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 is amended by inserting "(A)" after "(5)" and by inserting after such section the following:

"(B) include in the survey conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) an identification of the need for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence by women and by individuals under the age of eighteen and provide assurance that prevention and treatment programs within the State will be designed to meet such need;".

(2) Section 410 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by adding after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications under this section for programs and projects for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence by women and for programs and projects for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence by individuals under the age of eighteen.".

SEC. 5. (a) Section 321(a) of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 is amended by inserting, ", or outpatient facility (as defined in section 1633(6) of the Public Health Service Act)" after "hospital".

(b) Section 321(b)(1) of such Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "and outpatient facilities" after "hospitals";

(2) inserting "or outpatient facility" after "hospital" each time it appears; and

(3) striking out "is authorized to make regulations" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "shall issue regulations not later than December 31, 1976".

(c)(1) The heading for part C of such Act is amended by striking out "HOSPITALS" and inserting in lieu thereof "HOSPITALS AND OUTPATIENTS FACILITIES".

(2) The heading for section 321 of such Act is amended by striking out "HOSPITAL" and inserting in lieu thereof "HOSPITALS AND OUTPATIENT FACILITIES".

(d) Section 303(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (10),

(2) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (13) and by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraph:

"(11) provide that the State agency will review admissions to hospitals and outpatient facilities to determine their compliance with the requirement of section 321 and shall make periodic reports to the Secretary respecting such review;".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 303(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (11) (added by section 5(d) of this Act) the following new paragraph:

"(12) provide reasonable assurances that prevention or treatment projects or programs supported by funds made available under section 302 have provided to the State agency a proposed performance standard or standards to measure, or research protocol to determine, the effectiveness of such prevention or treatment programs or projects; and".

(b) Section 311(c) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Each applicant within a State, upon filing its application with the Secretary for a grant or contract to provide prevention or treatment services shall provide a proposed performance standard or standards, to measure, or research protocol to determine, the effectiveness of such prevention or treatment program or project.".

SEC. 7. Section 311(c)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Each application for a grant under this section shall be submitted by the Secretary to the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism for its review. The Secretary may approve an application for a grant under this section only if it is recommended for approval by such Council.".

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 3, strike out line 1.

Page 3, line 14, strike out "the".

Page 4, line 10, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)".

Page 4, line 21, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)".

Page 6, insert after line 13 the following:

"(c)(1) The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to State plan requirements for allotments under section 302 of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 after June 30, 1976.

"(2) The amendment made by subsection (b)(1) shall apply with respect to State plan requirements for grants under section 409 of the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 after June 30, 1976."

Page 6, line 14, strike out "5." and insert "4.".

Page 7, line 7, strike out "HOSPITAL" and insert "HOSPITALS".

Page 7, line 20, strike out "6." and insert "5.".

Page 7, line 20, insert "(1)" after "(a)".

Page 8, insert after line 5 the following:

"(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to State plan requirements for allotments under section 302 of such Act after June 30, 1976."

Page 8, strike out line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "after paragraph (4) (as added by section 3(a)(2) of this Act) the following new paragraph:".

Page 8, line 8, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

Page 8, line 14, strike out "7." and insert "6.".

Page 8, line 14, insert "(a)" before "Section".

Page 8, insert after line 20 the following:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to applications for grants under section 311 of such Act after June 30, 1976."

Mr. ROGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and considered en bloc. They are technical in nature only.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ROBERTS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12677) to extend for 3 fiscal years the programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1191, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. 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 271, nays 3, not voting 158, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—271

Adams
Alexander
Allen
Ambro
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.
Archer
Ashley
Badillo
Baldus
Baucus
Bauman
Beard, R.I.
Beard, Tenn.
Bedell
Bennett
Bevill
Biester
Blouin
Boland
Bowen
Brademas
Breaux
Breckinridge
Brodhead
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Butler
Byron
Carr
Cederberg
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Cleveland
Cochran
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conte
Corman
Cornell
Coughlin
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Davis
de la Garza
Delaney
Derrick
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Downey, N.Y.
Drinan
Duncan, Tenn.
du Pont
Early
Edgar
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Emery
Evans, Ind.
Evins, Tenn.
Fary
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Fithian
Florio
Foley
Ford, Tenn.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gradison
Grassley
Green
Guyer
Hagedorn
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hanley
Hannaford
Harkin
Harris
Hayes, Ind.
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Holland
Holt
Holtzman
Howe
Hubbard
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ichord
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenrette
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jordan
Kasten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kelly
Kemp
Keys
Kindness
Krebs
Krueger
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Levitas
Lloyd, Calif.
Lloyd, Tenn.
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
McClory
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McHugh
McKinney
Madigan
Mann
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Moffett
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Nolan
Oberstar
Obey
O'Brien
O'Neill
Ottinger
Passman
Patten, N.J.
Patterson, Calif.
Pattison, N.Y.
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Pressler
Preyer
Price
Pritchard
Quillen
Railsback
Rangel
Regula
Reuss
Richmond
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Rogers
Rooney
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
Russo
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scheuer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shipley
Shuster
Sikes
Simon
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Solarz
Spellman
Spence
Stanton, J. William
Stark
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stuckey
Studds
Sullivan
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thompson
Thone
Thornton
Treen
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wirth
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki

NAYS—3

Hansen
McDonald
Paul

NOT VOTING—158

Abdnor
Abzug
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Aspin
AuCoin
Bafalis
Bell
Bergland
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Boggs
Bolling
Bonker
Brinkley
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Carney
Carter
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cohen
Conable
Conlan
Conyers
Cotter
Crane
Daniels, N.J.
Dellums
Dent
Downing, Va.
Duncan, Oreg.
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
English
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fenwick
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Mich.
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Giaimo
Gude
Hammer-schmidt
Harrington
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hefner
Heinz
Helstoski
Hightower
Hinshaw
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Ketchum
Koch
Litton
Lujan
Lundine
McCollister
McKay
Macdonald
Madden
Maguire
Mahon
Martin
Mathis
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meyner
Mikva
Milford
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mineta
Mitchell, Md.
Mollohan
Mosher
Moss
Motti
Neal
Nowak
O'Hara
Pepper
Pettis
Peyser
Quie
Randall
Rees
Rhodes
Riegle
Risenhoover
Rodino
Roe
Roncalio
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
Runnels
Ryan
St Germain
Santini
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Schulze
Sebelius
Shriver
Smith, Nebr.
Staggers
Stanton, James V.
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stokes
Symington
Symms
Talcott
Traxler
Tsongas
Udall
Wampler
Waxman
Weaver
Wilson, C. H.
Wilson, Tex.
Winn
Wright
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Ga.
Zeferetti

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Downing of Virginia.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Karth.

Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Bonker.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Rees.

Mr. Zeferetti with Mr. Helstoski.

Mr. Phillip Burton with Mr. Jones of Oklahoma.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Madden.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McKay.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Koch with Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Lundine.

Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Moss.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Dellums.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mahon.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Roe.

Mr. AuCoin with Mr. Randall.

Mr. Tsongas with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

Ms. Abzug with Mr. Aspin.

Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Mathis.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Waxman with Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mrs. Schroeder.

Mr. Yatron with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. James V. Stanton.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Jones of Alabama.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Stokes.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Symington.

Mr. Bergland with Mr. Bafalis.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Abdnor.

Mr. English with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Blanchard with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Brinkley.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Rose with Mr. John Burton.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Carney.
Mr. Santini with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Ford of Michigan with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Hefner with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Hightower with Mr. Cohen.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Risenhoover with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Flood.
Mr. Nowak with Mr. Frenzel.
Mr. Neal with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Mottl with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Mineta with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. Milford with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mrs. Meyner with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Burlison of Missouri.
Mr. Harsha with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Lujan with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Horton with Mr. Maguire.
Mr. Martin with Mr. McCollister.
Mrs. Pettis with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Quie with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Rousselot with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Schulze with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Shriver with Mrs. Smith of Nebraska.
Mr. Symms with Mr. Steelman.
Mr. Talcott with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Traxler with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Young of Alaska with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Mills.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1191, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3184) to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill S. 3184 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12677, as passed, as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) Section 301 of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 is amended (1) by striking out "and" after "1975,", and (2) by inserting after "1976," the following: "$15,000,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, $66,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and $73,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979".

(b) Effective July 1, 1976—

(1) sections 304(d) and 311(d) of such Act are repealed,

(2) section 304 of such Act (A) is transferred to part B of such Act, (B) is inserted before section 311, and (C) is redesignated as section 310, and

(3) part B of such Act is amended by inserting after section 311 the following new section:

"AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 312. For purposes of sections 310 and 311, there are authorized to be appropriated $17,500,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1976 and ending September 30, 1976, $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, $77,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and $85,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979.".

(c) Section 310(a) of such Act (as so redesignated) is amended (1) by striking out "June 30, 1977" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1979", and (2) by striking out "three grants" and inserting in lieu thereof "six grants".

SEC. 2. Title V of such Act is amended by adding after section 503 the following new section:

"SEC. 504. (a) The Secretary may designate National Alcohol Research Centers for the purpose of interdisciplinary research relating to alcoholism and other alcohol problems. No entity may be designated as a Center unless an application therefor has been submitted to, and approved by, the Secretary. Such an application shall be submitted in such manner and contain such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. The Secretary may not approve such an application unless—

"(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that—

"(A) the applicant has the experience, or capability, to conduct, through biomedical, behavioral, social, and related disciplines, long-term research on alcoholism and other alcohol problems and to provide coordination of such research among such disciplines;

"(B) the applicant has available to it sufficient laboratory facilities and reference services (including reference services that will afford access to scientific alcohol literature);

"(C) the applicant has facilities and personnel to provide training in the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and other alcohol problems; and

"(D) the applicant has the capacity to train predoctoral and postdoctoral students for careers in research on alcoholism and other alcohol problems; and

"(2) the application contains a detailed five-year plan for research relating to alcoholism and other alcohol problems.

"(b) The Secretary shall make, under such conditions as the Secretary may reasonably require, annual grants to Centers which have been designated under this section. No annual grant to any Center may exceed $1,000,000. No funds provided under a grant under this subsection may be used for the purchase or rental of any land or the rental, purchase, construction, preservation, or repair of any building. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'construction' has the meaning given that term by section 702(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292a).

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years.".

SEC. 3. (a)(1) Section 303(a)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "(A)" after "(4)" and by inserting after such section the following:

"(B) include in the survey conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) an identification of the need for prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism by women and by individuals under the age of eighteen and provide assurance that prevention and treatment programs within the State will be designed to meet such need;".

(2) Section 311(c) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications under this section for programs and projects for prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism by women and for programs and projects for prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism by individuals under the age of eighteen.".

(b)(1) Section 409(e)(5) of the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 is amended by inserting "(A)" after "(5)" and by inserting after such section the following:

"(B) include in the survey conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) an identification of the need for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence by women and by individuals under the age of eighteen and provide assurance that prevention and treatment programs within the State will be designed to meet such need;".

(2) Section 410 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by adding after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications under this section for programs and projects for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence by women and for programs and projects for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence by individuals under the age of eighteen.".

(c)(1) The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to State plan requirements for allotments under section 302 of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 after June 30, 1976.

(2) The amendment made by subsection (b)(1) shall apply with respect to State plan requirements for grants under section 409 of the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 after June 30, 1976.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 321(a) of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 is amended by inserting ", or outpatient facility (as defined in section 1633(6) of the Public Health Service Act)" after "hospital".

(b) Section 321(b)(1) of such Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "and outpatient facilities" after "hospitals";

(2) inserting "or outpatient facility" after "hospital" each time it appears; and

(3) striking out "is authorized to make regulations" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "shall issue regulations not later than December 31, 1976".

(c)(1) The heading for part C of such Act is amended by striking out "HOSPITALS" and inserting in lieu thereof "HOSPITALS AND OUTPATIENT FACILITIES".

(2) The heading for section 321 of such Act is amended by striking out "HOSPITALS" and inserting in lieu thereof "HOSPITALS AND OUTPATIENT FACILITIES".

(d) Section 303(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (10),

(2) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (13) and by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraph:

"(11) provide that the State agency will review admissions to hospitals and outpatient facilities to determine their compliance with the requirement of section 321 and

shall make periodic reports to the Secretary respecting such review;".

SEC. 5. (a) (1) Section 303(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (11) (added by section 5(d) of this Act) the following new paragraph:

"(12) provide reasonable assurances that prevention or treatment projects or programs supported by funds made available under section 302 have provided to the State agency a proposed performance standard or standards to measure, or research protocol to determine, the effectiveness of such prevention or treatment programs or projects; and".

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to State plan requirements for allotments under section 302 of such Act after June 30, 1976.

(b) Section 311(c) of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (4) (as added by section 3(a)(2) of this Act) the following new paragraph:

(5) Each applicant within a State, upon filing its application with the Secretary for a grant or contract to provide prevention or treatment services shall provide a proposed performance standard or standards, to measure, or research protocol to determine, the effectiveness of such prevention or treatment program or project.".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 311(c)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Each application for a grant under this section shall be submitted by the Secretary to the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism for its review. The Secretary may approve an application for a grant under this section only if it is recommended for approval by such Council.".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to applications for grants under section 311 of such Act after June 30, 1976.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To extend for 3 fiscal years the programs of assistance under the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12677) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 12677.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM FOR HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH AND STATISTICS AND MEDICAL LIBRARIES

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12679) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 fiscal years assistance programs for health services research and statistics and programs for assistance to medical libraries, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12679, with Mr. ROBERTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MADIGAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12679 provides a 3 year extension with minor modifications of the existing legislative authorities for the National Center for Health Services Research, the National Center for Health Statistics and the National Library of Medicine. The present authorities for these programs expire at the end of fiscal year 1976 and would be extended by the bill through the end of fiscal 1979. These three programs are all old, well established programs in HEW which the present administration itself wishes to continue operating and with which the committee has been favorably impressed. The National Center for Health Statistics fulfills one of our oldest Federal health functions, the gathering of statistics about health and disease, and the health system throughout our country. The National Center for Health Services Research performs valuable research on the operation of the health system, as compared to the causes and treatment of disease, which we use in our attempts to write legislation to improve health care in this country. The National Library of Medicine, as many of you know, is the focal point for a nationwide system of regional and local medical libraries which is now the envy of our medical colleagues throughout the rest of the world. Each of these programs in the committee's judgment deserves continued support and even modest expansion.

The legislative proposal makes minor amendments in these authorities which will specify separate authorizations for the cooperative health statistics system, a national cooperative statistical system being designed and implemented by the National Center for Health Statistics, will increase the number of qualified scientific and professional personnel available to the programs, will mandate training programs in health services research and health statistics, and will change the due dates of various reports on health in the United States which are required by the law. The proposal authorizes a total of $318 million for the transitional quarter this year and the next 3 fiscal years. As can be seen by examining the committee report this total authorization has been adjusted to reflect the current appropriations for these programs and the committee recommendations to the Budget Committee for budgets for them for 1977. It is our understanding that the figures involved for 1977 are consistent with the congressional budget for next year.

This is a good legislative proposal with no opposition or proposed amendments that I know of. I urge your support for it.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder what justification the gentleman from Florida can give us for increasing the number of supergrade jobs in this bill under the Public Health Service Act from 150 to 180. Each one of these people are paid in the neighborhood of $30,000 to $35,000. It seems to me with more than $1 million being added annually for salaries, it is a somewhat unreasonable request with our present budgetary position.

Mr. ROGERS. The reason is that we were convinced by the testimony that because of existing manpower and salary ceilings it was necessary to authorize this additional manpower. The positions will be covered by civil service rules, so they will not be paid higher than the Civil Service Commission will permit. These are programs of health statistics, health services research and medical library work. Our hearings have demonstrated that experts qualified to run these programs effectively are rare and command high salaries. Thus, in order to assure effective operation of these programs, we have authorized—not required—HEW to employ these people.

Mr. BAUMAN. I would say to the gentleman, I do not really believe that this high level help is going to produce all that much work. It might have been better to leave these out of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for these suggestions.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 12679 which extends the authorizations for the National Center for Health Services Research—the National Center for Health Statistics—and the National Library of Medicine.

This bill authorizes a total of $318.25 million for a period of 3 years.

The National Center for Health Services Research has explicitly defined priorities for health services research which include: Inflation and productivity in the health sector—health insurance and financing—health manpower—the quality of health services—health care for the disadvantaged—long-term care—ambulatory care—and emergency medical services.

It is my hope that the Center will implement these priorities in as timely a manner as possible.

H.R. 12679 also extends the authorizations for the National Center for Health Statistics. This Center has been actively involved in the study—development—

and maintenance of general purpose statistical systems.

In addition the Center sponsors a wide range of specific programs, and activities to document and generate statistics on illness—mortality—and health services.

The Center also has specific legislative authority for the development of a cooperative health statistics system which is designed to provide the framework for a coalition among the various levels of government—National—State—and local—for the collection of health statistics.

H.R. 12679 also provides a separate authorization for this cooperative system.

Third, H.R. 12679 extends authorizations for the National Library of Medicine, which has become a world leader in the development of library services for biomedical research and medical sciences.

It is the committee's anticipation that approximately half these positions will be made available for the National Center for Health Services Research—another third will be made available for the National Center for Health Statistics.

I urge that we continue our support for these programs and give favorable consideration to H.R. 12679.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 12679 which extends the authorizations for the National Center for Health Services Research—the National Center for Health Statistics—and the National Library of Medicine.

This bill authorizes a total of $318.25 million for a period of 3 years.

As a result of earlier legislation—Public Law 93-353—substantial strides have been made in the development of a more coherent research program.

The National Center for Health Services Research has explicitly defined priorities for health services research which include: Inflation and productivity in the health sector—health insurance and financing—health manpower—the quality of health services—health care and the disadvantaged—long-term care—ambulatory care—and emergency medical services.

It is my hope that the Center will implement these priorities in as timely a manner as possible.

H.R. 12679 also extends the authorizations for the National Center for Health Statistics. This Center has been actively involved in the study—development—and maintenance of general purpose statistical systems.

In addition the Center sponsors a wide range of specific programs and activities to document and generate statistics on illness—mortality—and health services.

The Center also has specific legislative authority for the development of a cooperative health statistics system which is designed to provide the framework for a coalition among the various levels of government—National—State—and local—for the collection of health statistics.

H.R. 12679 also provides a separate authorization for this cooperative system.

Third, H.R. 12679 extends authorizations for the National Library of Medicine. The committee was pleased to learn of the accomplishments of the Library which have made it a world leader in the development of library services for biomedical research and medical sciences.

Mr. Chairman—these programs constitute a comprehensive national research resource—and they fulfill an important Federal health function.

I urge that we continue our support for these programs and give favorable consideration to H.R. 12679.

Thank you—Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12679, the extension of programs for health services research and statistics and medical libraries. The bill extends the authorizations of appropriations for the National Center for Health Statistics, and the National Library of Medicine for 3 fiscal years. The bill also provides a separate authorization within the funds for the National Center of Health Statistics for the cooperative health statistics system to coordinate collection and use of health statistics at the Federal, State and local levels. The agencies authorized by this legislation can have a significant impact on the future health policy of the country.

The statistics collected by the cooperative health statistics system will be the basis for defining our health priorities and programs in the years to come. The information they collect, the manner in which they collect it, and the sources they use will be vital to the welfare of all our citizens. As you know I have always been concerned about the lack of statistics available about blacks, Hispanics and other disadvantaged minorities. I want to stress the importance of obtaining accurate statistics on these groups because their health care delivery systems are in desperate need of reorganization.

I would also like to concur with other priorities mentioned in the committee report for the National Center for Health Services Research. The committee requested that a higher priority be given to the development of alternative approaches to long-term care, the assurance of quality of care in nursing homes, and the development of methods for assuring that individuals needing such care receive it from the most appropriate source. I favor programs which would enable elderly, and other persons requiring long-term care, to remain in their homes as long as possible. I feel home care programs can be cheaper and add substantially to the quality of life of the persons involved.

I would like to commend the work of the committee and encourage the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment to exercise its oversight responsibilities and see that these agencies fulfill the worthwhile priorities mentioned in their committee report.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12679

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) (1) Section 308(1) (1) of the Public Health Service Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" after "1975,", and (2) by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "$20,000,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and $36,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979.".

(2) Effective with respect to appropriations under section 308 of the Public Health Service Act for health statistical activities under sections 304 and 306 of such Act after June 30, 1976, section 308(1) (2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) (A) For purposes of section 306(e), there are authorized to be appropriated $3,500,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, $17,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979.

"(B) For purposes of other health statistical activities undertaken or supported under section 304 or 306, there are authorized to be appropriated $6,250,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, $27,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979.".

(b) (1) Section 208(g) of the Public Health Service Act is amended (A) by striking out "one hundred and fifty" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and eighty", and (B) by inserting after "National Institutes of Health" the following: "and not less than thirty shall be for the National Center for Health Services Research, the National Center for Health Statistics, and the National Library of Medicine."

(2) Section 304(b) of such Act is amended (A) by striking out ", and (B) health services research and health statistics training, and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (B)" and (B) by inserting after and below paragraph (4) the following: "To implement subsection (a), the Secretary shall use personnel and equipment, facilities, and other physical resources of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, permit appropriate (as determined by the Secretary) entities and individuals to use the physical resources of such Department, provide technical assistance and advice make grants to public and nonprofit private entities and individuals, and enter into contracts with public and private entities and individuals, for training in health services research and health statistics.".

(3) Section 308(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "September 1" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31".

SEC. 2. Section 390(c) of the Public Health Service Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" after "1975,", and (2) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: "$5,000,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, $16,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979.".

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the bill?

There being no amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBERTS, Chairman of the Committe of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12679) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 fiscal years assistance programs for health services research and statistics and programs for assistance to medical libraries, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1192, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BAUMAN

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BAUMAN. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BAUMAN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 12679, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, strike out lines 24 through line 5 on page 3; and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the membership that this bill contains authority for increasing the number of supergrade employees under the Public Health Service section from 150 to 180. This means that we would add 30 more people to the payroll of HEW at a cost of perhaps $30,000 to $35,000 each, for an increased annual payroll of more than $1 million.

My motion simply strikes out this authority to increase supergrade jobs and leaves it at the same level. I do not think justification has been offered for this, and I hope the Members will support my motion to recommit on a rollcall vote.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to recommit with instructions. As Members may know, this was reported unanimously from the subcommittee and the full committee. We have gone into this very carefully.

I might mention that these programs—and HEW generally—have had no increase in positions available under this section in years. All this does is say that they "may" have 30 more people. It does not say that they have to do it, but they may have an increase of 30 researchers, scientists, and administrative experts to work in these programs.

This is a $300 million program. If we are going to do something about health care costs, we have got to know where we are in health care, and the statistics arrived at are necessary to determine the course of our legislative effort. It is most important that we do this. Statisticians and scientists are expensive, but so are these programs and health care, and it is incumbent on us to assure that these programs are run by the best people.

Therefore, I would urge that the motion to recommit be defeated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. BAUMAN. 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 111, nays 172, answered "present" 1, not voting 148, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—111

Alexander
Andrews, N.C.
Archer
Bauman
Beard, Tenn.
Bedell
Bennett
Bevill
Biester
Blouin
Bowen
Breaux
Breckinridge
Brooks
Broomfield
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Butler
Carr
Chappell
Clancy
Cochran
Collins, Tex.
Coughlin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan, Tenn.
du Pont
Emery
Evans, Ind.
Fish
Forsythe
Fountain
Ginn
Goldwater
Goodling
Gradison
Grassley
Hagedorn
Haley
Hansen
Harkin
Henderson
Hicks
Holt
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ichord
Jeffords
Johnson, Pa.
Kasten
Kazen
Kelly
Kemp
Krebs
Krueger
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Latta
Lent
Levitas
Lloyd, Tenn.
Lott
McClory
McDonald
McEwen
Mann
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Murtha
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Nichols
O'Brien
Paul
Pickle
Poage
Quie
Quillen
Rinaldo
Robinson
Roncalio
Ruppe
Satterfield
Shipley
Shuster
Skubitz
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Nebr.
Snyder
Spence
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stuckey
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thone
Thornton
Treen
Waggonner
Whitten
Wydler
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.

NAYS—172

Adams
Allen
Ambro
Anderson, Calif.
Ashley
Badillo
Baldus
Baucus
Beard, R.I.
Boland
Brademas
Brodhead
Broyhill
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Byron
Cederberg
Chisholm
Cleveland
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Corman
Cornell
D'Amours
Danielson
Davis
Delaney
Dellums
Derrick
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Downey, N.Y.
Drinan
Early
Edgar
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evins, Tenn.
Fary
Fascell
Fenwick
Findley
Fisher
Fithian
Florio
Foley
Ford, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gilman
Green
Guyer
Hall
Hamilton
Hanley
Hannaford
Harris
Hayes, Ind.
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Hillis
Holland
Holtzman
Howe
Hubbard
Jacobs
Jenrette
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Jordan
Kastenmeier
Keys
Kindness
LaFalce
Leggett
Lehman
Lloyd, Calif.
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
McFall
McHugh
McKinney
Madigan
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Moffett
Moore
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Neal
Nedzi
Nix
Nolan
Oberstar
Obey
O'Neill
Ottinger
Passman
Patten, N.J.
Patterson, Calif.
Pattison, N.Y.
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pressler
Preyer
Price
Pritchard
Railsback
Rangel
Regula
Reuss
Richmond
Roberts
Roe
Rogers
Rooney
Roush
Roybal
Russo
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Seiberling
Sharp
Sikes
Simon
Sisk
Slack
Solarz
Spellman
Stanton, J. William
Stark
Stephens
Stratton
Studds
Sullivan
Teague
Thompson
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Walsh
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wirth
Wolff
Wylie
Yates
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—148

Abdnor
Abzug
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Aspin
AuCoin
Bafalis
Bell
Bergland
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Boggs
Bolling
Bonker
Brinkley
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Carney
Carter
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cohen
Conable
Conlan
Conyers
Cotter
Crane
Daniels, N.J.
Dent
Downing, Va.
Duncan, Oreg.
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
English
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Mich.
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Giaimo
Gude
Hammer-schmidt
Harrington
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hefner
Heinz
Helstoski
Hightower
Hinshaw
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Ketchum
Koch
Litton
Lujan
Lundine
McCollister
McKay
Macdonald
Madden
Maguire
Mahon
Martin
Mathis
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meyner
Mikva
Milford
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mineta
Mitchell, Md.
Mollohan
Mosher
Moss
Mottl
Nowak
O'Hara
Pettis
Peyser
Randall
Rees
Rhodes
Riegle
Risenhoover
Rodino
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
Runnels
Ryan
Santini
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Schulze
Sebelius
Shriver
Staggers
Stanton, James V.
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stokes
Symington
Symms
Talcott
Traxler
Tsongas
Udall
Wampler
Waxman
Weaver
Wilson, C. H.
Wilson, Tex.
Winn
Wright
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Ga.
Zeferetti

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Symms for, with Mr. Annunzio against.

Mr. Rousselot for, with Mrs. Boggs against.

Mr. Schneebeli for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Conlan for, with Mr. John Burton against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Phillip Burton against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Carter against.
Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Cotter against.
Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. Rodino against.
Mr. Eshleman for, with Mr. Horton against.
Mr. Steiger of Arizona for, with Mr. Dominick V. Daniels against.
Mr. Young of Alaska for, with Mr. Dent against.
Mr. Sebelius for, with Mr. Tsongas against.
Mr. Wampler for, with Mr. Howard against.
Mr. Crane for, with Mr. Bingham against.
Mr. Runnels for, with Ms. Abzug against.
Mr. Lujan for, with Mr. Mineta against.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Bergland against.
Mr. Bafalis for, with Mr. Biaggi against.
Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Carney against.
Mr. Frey for, with Mr. Harrington against.
Mr. Mills for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
Mr. Schulze for, with Mr. Koch against.
Mr. Frenzel for, with Mrs. Meyner against.
Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Mitchell of Maryland against.
Mr. Mathis for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.
Mr. Jones of Oklahoma for, with Mr. Zeferetti against.

Until further notice:
Mr. AuCoin with Mr. Blanchard.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Santini.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Rose.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois with Mr. Abdnor.
Mr. Bonker with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. Brinkley with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Flood.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Ford of Michigan.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Mosher with Mr. Moss.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Mottl.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Don H. Clausen with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Hammerschmidt with Mr. Giaimo.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Nowak with Mr. Harsha.
Mrs. Pettis with Mr. Hefner.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Yatron.
Mr. Cohen with Mr. Downing of Virginia.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Conyers.
Mr. Edwards of Alabama with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. English with Mr. Milford.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Erlenborn with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Winn with Mr. Waxman.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. McCollister.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. McKay.
Mr. Risenhoover with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Lundine with Mr. Rostenkowski.
Mr. Maguire with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Mahon with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
Mr. Shriver with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Steelman with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. James V. Stanton.
Mr. Talcott with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Traxler.

Messrs. BLOUIN, BEVILL, HUGHES, SMITH of Iowa, EVANS of Indiana, MICHEL, QUIE, NICHOLS, EMERY, KREBS, and O'BRIEN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 8, not voting 156, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

YEAS—268

Adams
Alexander
Allen
Ambro
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.
Archer
Ashley
Badillo
Baldus
Baucus
Beard, R.I.
Beard, Tenn.
Bedell
Bennett
Bevill
Biester
Blouin
Boland
Bowen
Brademas
Breaux
Breckinridge
Brodhead
Brooks
Broyhill
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Butler
Byron
Carr
Cederberg
Chappell
Chisholm
Cleveland
Cochran
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Corman
Cornell
Coughlin
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Davis
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellums
Derrick
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Downey, N.Y.
Drinan
Duncan, Tenn.
du Pont
Early
Edgar
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Emery
Evans, Ind.
Evins, Tenn.
Fary
Fascell
Fenwick
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Fithian
Florio
Foley
Ford, Tenn.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gradison
Grassley
Green
Guyer
Hagedorn
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hanley
Hannaford
Harkin
Harris
Hayes, Ind.
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Holland
Holt
Holtzman
Howe
Hubbard
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ichord
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenrette
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jordan
Kasten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kelly
Kemp
Keys
Kindness
Krebs
Krueger
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Levitas
Lloyd, Calif.
Lloyd, Tenn.
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
McClory
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McHugh
McKinney
Madigan
Mann
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mezvinsky
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Moffett
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Nolan
Oberstar
Obey
O'Brien
O'Neill
Ottinger
Passman
Patten, N.J.
Patterson, Calif.
Pattison, N.Y.
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Preyer
Price
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rangel
Regula
Reuss
Richmond
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney
Roush
Roybal
Russo
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scheuer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shipley
Shuster
Sikes
Simon
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Nebr.
Solarz
Spellman
Spence
Stanton, J. William
Stark
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stuckey
Studds
Sullivan
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thompson
Thone
Thornton
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wirth
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki

NAYS—8

Bauman
Collins, Tex.
Hansen
Latta
McDonald
Myers, Pa.
Paul
Treen

NOT VOTING—156

Abdnor
Abzug
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Aspin
AuCoin
Bafalis
Bell
Bergland
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Boggs
Bolling
Bonker
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Carney
Carter
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cohen
Conable
Conlan
Conyers
Cotter
Crane
Daniels, N.J.
Dent
Downing, Va.
Duncan, Oreg.
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
English
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Mich.
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Giaimo
Gude
Hammer-schmidt
Harrington
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hefner
Heinz
Helstoski
Hightower
Hinshaw
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Ketchum
Koch
Litton
Lujan
Lundine
McCollister
McKay
Macdonald
Madden
Maguire
Mahon
Martin
Mathis
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Melcher
Meyner
Mikva
Milford
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mineta
Mitchell, Md.
Mollohan
Mosher
Moss
Mottl
Myers, Ind.
Nowak
O'Hara
Pettis
Peyser
Pressler
Pritchard
Randall
Rees
Rhodes
Riegle
Risenhoover
Rodino
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
Runnels
Ruppe
Ryan
Santini
Schneebeli
Schroeder
Schulze
Sebelius
Shriver
Snyder
Staggers
Stanton, James V.
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stokes
Symington
Symms
Talcott
Traxler
Tsongas
Udall
Wampler
Waxman
Weaver
Wilson, C. H.
Wilson, Tex.
Winn
Wright
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Ga.
Zeferetti

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zeferetti with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Waxman with Mr. Burlison of Missouri.
Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. English.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Mosher.
Mrs. Meyner with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Mineta with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Young of Georgia with Dominick V. Daniels.
Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Matsunaga.
Ms. Abzug with Mr. Downing of Virginia.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. AuCoin with Mr. Abdnor.
Mr. Santini with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Bafalis.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Bergland with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Blanchard.
Mr. Tsongas with Mrs. Pettis.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. John Burton with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Carney with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Phillip Burton with Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Clancy with Mr. Brinkley.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Bonker.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Cohen.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Koch with Mr. Runnels.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Traxler.
Mr. Lundine with Mr. Mathis.
Mr. Hefner with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Milford.
Mr. Frenzel with Mr. Flood.
Mr. Frey with Mr. Pressler.
Mr. Pritchard with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Riegle with Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Rose with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Hightower.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Harsha with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Myers of Indiana.
Mr. Risenhoover with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Horton with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Sebelius with Mrs. Schroeder.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Helstoski.
Mr. Mahon with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Nowak with Mr. James V. Stanton.
Mr. Mottl with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Schulze with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Martin with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Lujan with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Shriver with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Steiger of Arizona with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Symms with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
Mr. Talcott with Mr. Maguire.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Rousselot with Mr. Steelman.
Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. McCollister.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Young of Alaska with Mr. Winn.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 12679, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my office and missed the vote on rollcall No. 293.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority whip will be kind enough to yield to me, I will be happy to respond.

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of May 24, 1976, is as follows:

Monday is District day. We have three bills, as follows:

H.R. 13121, District of Columbia Code; H.R. 11009, financial planning, reporting and control systems; and H.R. 12946, Commission To Study Adequacy of Federal Payment.

Following District day, we have the following bill: H.R. 6810, additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

On Tuesday, we will have H.R. 10138, Young Adult Conservation Corps, open rule, 1 hour of debate; followed by H.R. 12945, housing authorization, open rule, 2 hours of debate. General debate only will take place on Tuesday.

For Wednesday, we will have District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal year 1976, followed by H.R. 12945, housing authorization, and we will conclude consideration of the bill at that time.

On Thursday, we will have H.R. 9174, automotive research and development, subject to a rule being granted. Following that, we will have H.R. 12169, Federal Energy Administration, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further notice will be announced later.

The House recesses for Memorial Day weekend at the conclusion of business on Thursday, May 27, until noon on June 1, 1976.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 24, 1976

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

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts whether, after announcing his ambitious program which quite obviously will require extensive leadership on both sides of the aisle, if the gentleman expects to be with us next week to offer his usual outstanding guidance to the House?

Mr. O'NEILL. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that I have been appointed, with some other Members of the leadership, to go to England for a Bicentennial celebration in order to officially accept the Magna Carta which the English Government has offered to loan to us. Consequently, I will not be here.

Following our remarks here, the House will go into recess and we will honor the former Members of the House. Then, we will go back into the House again, at which time there will be one resolution. That resolution will make the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) the Acting Speaker during the time the Speaker will be out of the country.

Mr. BAUMAN. Further reserving the right to object, I only want to tell the gentleman that we will miss him sorely next week. We always enjoy his presence. I hope he has a good trip to London to see the Queen and to bring back the Magna Carta in good order.

The gentleman from Maryland has calculated, after reading the program, that at a minimum there is the possibility of 16 rollcall votes on the final passage of bills and rules, not counting votes on amendments and motions to recommit. The gentleman from Maryland hopes that these rollcalls will not take place, since we will have so many distinguished Members missing on this important mission to Great Britain.

Mr. O'NEILL. I never look at the overall rollcall record. I only consider the man himself and how he acts on national programs and how he affects the economy of his home district and respects the dignity of the people he represents.

Mr. BAUMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and agree with the distinguished majority leader. I wish him and his fellow travelers well on their Bicentennial junket.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Wednesday, April 28, 1976, the Chair declares a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, to receive the former Members of the House of Representatives.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The SPEAKER. My colleagues and former colleagues, on behalf of the House of Representatives, I consider it a high honor and personal pleasure to welcome back to these Halls those former Members who have served in this great body. We all welcome you. We extend the glad hand of friendship, and remember the long years of companionship that we

shared with many of you. Some of you go back more than 30 years before I came, and I am glad to see all of you, with whom I have served through the years and glad to meet those who left before I came.

This occasion, of course, is always a bipartisan affair. In that spirit, the Chair is going to recognize the leadership of both parties.

The Chair now recognizes the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Members of Congress, and particularly the 288 Democratic Members on my side of the aisle, I want to welcome all of our former colleagues on their annual return to the "People's Chamber," to the House of Representatives.

"Once an honorable, always an honorable." The rights and privileges that you enjoyed as elected Members of the House will always remain yours whenever you visit the Chamber in which you served your constituents so faithfully and so conscientiously. In case you do not recall the rules of the House, the rules say that any former Member of Congress is always welcome on the floor. The only other persons who have that privilege is a Governor. A Governor, of course, may have Chamber privileges. That is an honor. Whenever you are in Washington, we will always be delighted to have you come and visit us and see how the operation is and how it has changed in the years since you have left. We are delighted that so many of you have made the trip to the Chamber where you spent the most gratifying and rewarding years of your public service. As we celebrate our Bicentennial Year, a little nostalgia seems fitting. This Chamber is so full of memories of the historic moments which many of our former colleagues shared together.

In this Chamber many of you debated Roosevelt's NRA, lend-lease proposals, and things of that nature.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the first time I ever visited the Congress. I was sitting in the gallery, and the discussion on that day concerned the fortification of Guam. I watched the Members walk through the middle aisle. The measure prevailed, I believe, by one vote, a historic moment. Many of you were here in those particularly trying days previous to World War II.

Many of you made stirring speeches on this floor reflecting the stunning blow of Pearl Harbor. Many of you recall the joint session in which President Roosevelt asked for a declaration of war. Some of you participated in the endless executive-legislative negotiations and compromises over the Marshall plan and the beginnings of the American foreign aid program which came directly after World War II. Others of you who are visiting today will recall the foreign policy deliberations in the 1950's over the Korean war and the Middle East crisis, and some of the younger former Members will remember the impassioned and lively debates in the 1960's over voting rights, civil rights, and open housing. And how many of you remember the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and how you talked about it through the years? And I am sure you remember our subsequent change of policy in Vietnam.

So on this occasion I join my colleagues in welcoming you and applauding your good health and continued happiness. All of us who are presently serving in the House salute you. Some day we will be in the same position you are. We welcome you, and we are delighted and happy to see you here. We are always glad to have this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express how grateful we are to the Members whose idea it was to celebrate this special day so we can have the opportunity of seeing you again.

On behalf of the Speaker of the House and myself, I say to you: Welcome to all of you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair now recognizes the distinguished acting minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My colleagues, may I, too, join in welcoming each and every one of you former Members to the floor of the House. It is a great occasion for those of us who have had the privilege to serve with many of you for a number of years to welcome you back.

I could not help but be a little bit amused just before the previous rollcall vote when the Speaker really had to ask the former Members, who are not eligible to stand for the rollcall, to be seated, because the familiarity of the faces over a period of time makes the process difficult even for so learned a gentleman as the Speaker.

There is one other observation I could not help but make, and that is that I see Les Arends, my predecessor as whip, here today. Les as most of you know served longer as whip than any other member of either party throughout history. He came to this Congress when the minority had only 89 Members. Well, we are now only up to 145, but there are those of you who were here when we were at higher levels.

It is nice to be able to welcome back some of those Members on our side. Believe it or not, over here on our Republican side we were once in the majority and had positions of authority and had our names on bills, and Republican Members were chairmen of committees and subcommittees. So this is just a good nostalgic occasion for us to welcome all of you back, whether you served in the majority or on the minority side. It is nice to see so many of you here.

I join in the salute that was given to you by our distinguished majority leader, and I hope there will be many occasions when you can come back again and share these same good times.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now call the roll of former Members of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following former Members answered to their names:

FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ATTENDING MEETINGS IN WASHINGTON, D.C. MAY 20–21, 1976

Hugh Q. Alexander, North Carolina.
Elizabeth Andrews, Alabama.
Leslie C. Arends, Illinois.
O. K. Armstrong, Missouri.
Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina.
William H. Avery, Kansas.
William H. Ayres, Ohio.
Robert R. Barry, New York.
Laurie C. Battle, Alabama.
Andrew J. Biemiller, Wisconsin.
Iris F. Blitch, Georgia.
J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware.
William G. Bray, Indiana.
Charles B. Brownson, Indiana.
John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin.
J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado.
Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts.
Jeffery Cohelan, California.
Albert M. Cole, Kansas.
Paul W. Cronin, Massachusetts.
Willard S. Curtin, Pennsylvania.
Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin.
Vincent J. Dellay, New Jersey.
David S. Dennison, Ohio.
Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts.
Francis E. Dorn, New York.
Paul A. Fino, New York.
John R. Foley, Maryland.
J. Allen Frear, Jr., Delaware.
Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland.
George A. Goodling, Pennsylvania.
Robert A. Grant, Indiana.
Robert Hale, Maine.
Robert P. Hanrahan, Illinois.
Cecil M. Harden, Indiana.
Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia.
Oren Harris, Arkansas.
Ralph Harvey, Indiana.
Brooks Hays, Arkansas.
Don Hayworth, Michigan.
A. Sydney Herlong, Jr., Florida.
Patrick J. Hillings, California.
Earl Hogan, Indiana.
Evan Howell, Illinois.
W. Pat Jennings, Virginia.
John E. Hunt, New Jersey.
August E. Johansen, Michigan.
Jed Johnson, Jr., Oklahoma.
Walter H. Judd, Minnesota.
Frank M. Karsten, Missouri.
Hastings Keith, Massachusetts.
David S. King, Utah.
Horace R. Kornegay, North Carolina.
Paul J. Krebs, New Jersey.
John Davis Lodge, Connecticut.
Donald F. McGinley, Nebraska.
John A. McGuire, Connecticut.
Hervey G. Machen, Maryland.
William S. Mailliard, California.
D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida.
George Meader, Michigan.
William E. Minshall, Ohio.
Walter H. Moeller, Ohio.
John S. Monagan, Connecticut.
Abraham J. Multer, New York.
F. Jay Nimitz, Indiana.
Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin.
Maston E. O'Neal, Georgia.
Frank C. Osmers, Jr., New Jersey.
George E. Outland, California.
William T. Pheiffer, New York.
Alexander Pirnie, New York.
Howard W. Pollock, Alaska.
Walter E. Powell, Ohio.
Stanley A. Prokop, Pennsylvania.
Graham B. Burcell, Jr., Texas.
R. Walter Riehlman, New York.
Howard W. Robison, New York.
John M. Robison, Jr., Kentucky.
Byron G. Rogers, Colorado.
Harold M. Ryan, Michigan.
Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio.
Fred Schwengel, Iowa.
James P. Scoblick, Pennsylvania.
Carlton R. Sickles, Maryland.
Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey.
Henry P. Smith III, New York.
Lynn E .Stalbaum, Wisconsin.
William G. Stratton, Illinois.
Lera Thomas, Texas.
Clark W. Thompson, Texas.
James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania.
George M. Wallhauser, New Jersey.

John H. Ware III, Pennsylvania.
J. Irving Whalley, Pennsylvania.
Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina.
Ralph W. Yarborough, Texas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that 97 former Members of the House of Representatives have responded to their names.

The Chair now has the honor of recognizing the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. Jeffery Cohelan.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Former Members of Congress, I wish to express to you and to the membership of the Congress our profound appreciation for the manner in which we, the alumni of the Congress, are received on this annual occasion. Today, there are more than 110 former Members returning from 33 States to participate in these sixth annual activities.

I am pleased to report that our relatively youthful organization continues to progress with substantial growth and solid accomplishments. We now number nearly 450 members representing 48 States who served in both House of Congress.

Our organization is unique. The only way you can become a member of it is to take the oath of office in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. We all share the common bond of having served in the Congress, and deeply revere, respect, and believe in the Congress as an institution, regardless of the wide diversity of political viewpoint represented within our membership. We encompass several generations and span the political spectrum of elective American politics. We have though, a common belief in representative democracy. We believe that a strong Congress is essential to the well-being of our Republic. Although we are no longer in the Congress, our concern for its welfare is in no way diminished.

Ours is an organization concerned about the preservation of the history of the Congress and preserving the papers and recollections of those individuals who have served in it. To that end we have established an oral history program, under the direction of Prof. Charles Morrissey of the University of Vermont. Professor Morrissey has conducted oral history interviews for the Kennedy, Truman, and Hoover Presidential Libraries, as well as the Christian A. Hester oral history project of Harvard University. Yesterday, we turned over the first of these oral history interviews to Dr. Daniel Boorstin, Librarian of the Congress, where these oral history tapes and transcripts will be housed and preserved.

Additionally, we are cooperating with the National Commission on the Preservation of Federal Documents to recommend guidelines for the preservation of congressional documents. All too often these documents of great value to future scholars and historians have been carelessly thrown out because there has not been an established policy concerning their retention.

Finally, because of our belief in the Congress as an institution, we want to help the public better understand the operations of the Congress. To that end we have established a speakers' service and will be cooperating this year with the Woodrow Wilson Foundation to provide former Members of Congress still active in their careers to visit campuses and help communicate realistically with political science students throughout the country. We have established a Congressional Information Service that handles dozens of requests each month.

In the coming year, we will continue a program begun this year with the Johnson Foundation of Racine, Wis., utilizing the experience of former Members, as individuals in specialized fields. Earlier this month 20 of us were guests of the Johnson Foundation at a conference on "The United States and The United Nations." This conference brought together those former Members who served on U.S. delegations to the United Nations, as Ambassadors to foreign countries, or with comparable experience in foreign affairs. We produced three radio broadcasts that are being distributed to a network of 100 public broadcast stations, and a publication of the speeches and excerpts of the dialog is being prepared for distribution.

Also, this year we will send a delegation to Japan as guests of the Japanese Government to begin the development of an educational and cultural affairs exchange program.

Additionally, we will plan an appropriate forum to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Marshall Plan in 1977. Many of our Members participated in that historic 80th Congress that passed that legislation.

We are grateful in the last year to the Lilly Endowment, the John Kunkel Foundation, the FMC Auxiliary and to a host of individuals for their financial contributions to further the development of our organization and its academic and social programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have established a Distinguished Service Award for recognition of an individual for his or her service to the country and to Congress. Last fall, we presented the Award to former Speaker John W. McCormack. The preceding spring our organization recognized then Vice President Gerald R. Ford.

Our Board of Directors this spring have voted unanimously to bestow this honor on the long-time House Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler. Mr. Deschler served as House Parliamentarian from 1928 to 1974, more than a quarter of the history of the Congress. We regret because of a recent heart attack, Lew Deschler is not able to be with us today. However, I want to ask Mrs. Deschler to come forward to receive this award on his behalf and extend to him our wishes for a speedy and complete recovery.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. Deschler.

Mrs. DESCHLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take longer than the time utilized by our esteemed and beloved Chaplain in his opening prayer which, by the way, Lew looks forward to every day.

Mr. Speaker, I must explain to the Members that today it would be more appropriate if I were up in that gallery and Lew were down here, but since he is unable to be here, I hope the Members will just bear with me for a few words.

Mr. Speaker, something over 50 years ago my husband, Lewis Deschler, began his service with the House of Representatives. That encompasses a period of more than one-quarter of the period of our form of government. I dare say that during that period of time he has served with more than 2,500 Members. He has devoted his life and his love to this institution. And he has cherished his long and harmonious association with the Members of this body.

Although he is greatly disappointed that he is unable to be here with you today, he has asked me to convey to you the following message.

It is with deep regret that I am unable to attend the ceremonies honoring me today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I have found that very few people are elected to Congress who are not unique and oustanding citizens of their constituency. It has therefore been a rare and honored privilege for me to have been associated with such an astute and distinguished group of American citizenry—and for whom I hold a deep affection.

I greatly appreciate and am deeply honored for your having voted me in as an honorary member and Parliamentarian of the Former Members of Congress.

Today, in awarding me, by not one dissenting vote, this coveted Distinguished Service Award, which has been bestowed by your graciousness upon only two other citizens, I have a sense of deep, deep gratiude for the confidence and esteem that you have in me.

Mr. Speaker, after a long and fond friendship, I wish to express to you and through you to this assembly my heartfelt thanks—and God bless you all.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today as the retiring president of the Former Members of Congress I turn over the reins of leadership to a person who served in this body, in the Senate and as Governor of the State of Delaware, the Honorable J. Caleb Boggs.

We look forward to our continued growth and progress, and to helping in our small way, this vital institution of democracy essential to the continued well-being of our freedom and individual liberties.

In this year of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution we renew our faith in the institutions of our representative democracy. We are confident that they offer the best hope for the preservation and extension of individual liberty and human dignity. We pledge again our support of the Congress as the bedrock of representative democracy through whose protection our freedoms spring.

Mr. Speaker, at the Wingspread Conference our cofounders, Mr. Hays of Arkansas and Dr. Judd, joined with me and our former colleague from California, Mr. Roosevelt, in planting a tree to commemorate the occasion of our conference.

The planting of that tree was symbolic. We hope that our organization has planted a tree of wisdom which bears fruit in the years ahead by utilizing the experience and expertise of those persons

who have served in this great body, the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude it is my sad duty to report to the Congress those former Members who have passed on since our meeting last year. They are:

Gov. John Burns, Hawaii.
William J. Crow, Pennsylvania.
Kenneth B. Keating, New York.
Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia.
John H. Ray, New York.
Albert L. Vreeland, New Jersey.
Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts.
Lester R. Johnson, Wisconsin.
Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico.
Walter S. Baring, Nevada.
Lawrence G. Williams, Pennsylvania.
William A. Blakley, Texas.
Earle Cabell, Texas.
Marvin Jones, Texas.
Charles F. McLaughlin, Nebraska.
Emory H. Price, Florida.
Charles R. Savage, Washington.
S. Walter Stauffer, Pennsylvania.
Wint Smith, Kansas.
Florence Dwyer, New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House to join with me in standing for a moment of silent tribute.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes our presentation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair again wishes to thank the former Members of the House for their presence here today and expects to see them here again in the future.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF THE HONORABLE JOHN J. McFALL AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE DURING THE ABSENCE OF THE SPEAKER

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1211) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1211

Resolved, That Honorable John J. McFall, a Representative from the State of California, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Honorable John J. McFall as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF HON. JOHN J. McFALL AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE DURING ABSENCE OF THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair now asks the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) to administer the oath of office to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. McFALL assumed the chair and took the oath of office administered to him by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

DISCHARGE PETITION ON WORLD WAR I PENSION LEGISLATION

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today presented to the Clerk of the House a motion in writing to discharge the Veterans' Affairs Committee from further consideration of H.R. 3616, the World War I Pension Act.

I introduced this legislation on February 25, 1975, and after 15 months this vital legislation is still pending before the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance. I urge the Members of this House to sign this discharge petition so that the full House of Representatives may be afforded an opportunity to discuss and vote on this pension legislation, which is so desperately needed by the surviving World War I veterans, and their widows. I especially urge my colleagues who have introduced or cosponsored other World War I pension legislation to sign the discharge petition.

My bill, H.R. 3616, would provide a $150 a month pension for either the World War I veteran or his widow, without regard to any source of income that he or she may have.

We have provided very little to these veterans. For the most part, $607.50 is the total benefit which these individuals have received. When they were discharged, there was no education aid system, there was no effort to aid these veterans in finding employment, and there were not veterans hospitals as there are today.

My bill, H.R. 3616, will rapidly drop in annual cost to the Government. In the meantime it will be a godsend to the 893,000 World War I veterans still alive today, and to the surviving widows of deceased veterans. I might add, that at the present time, only 340,873 of these veterans are receiving any kind of a veterans pension.

Mr. Speaker, the pension which I propose is not a special privilege, but rather, this legislation will serve to bring the Nation's treatment of World War I veterans to a point approaching equity with the benefits that veterans of later wars have received.

Again, I strongly urge my colleagues to sign this discharge petition so that this entire body will be able to consider and take a stand on this important issue.

GUAM HEAVILY DAMAGED BY TYPHOON

(Mr. WON PAT asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully report that the Island of Guam was struck early this morning, Washington time, by a devastating typhoon which carried winds up to 190 miles per hour. This is the same typhoon Pamela which, a couple of days ago, hit the island of Truk, killing 10 persons there.

Although it is as yet too early for a comprehensive damage report, preliminary reports from the U.S. Navy and other Federal agencies indicate that Guam has suffered extremely heavy damage to property and perhaps to life, and I am sure many will be homeless.

So far, reports indicate that the southern part of the island has sustained 85 to 95 percent destruction. Our main road connecting the northern and southern parts of the island was destroyed, cutting 30,000 persons off from assistance. The island's major powerplants have suffered damage from winds, leaving much of the island without power. Local communications are extremely limited, and communication with the mainland is disrupted. Severe damage was reported to all structures that were not typhoon-proof, which, I must add, would account for the majority of private homes there. It is also feared that our $1 million vegetable crop was destroyed. U.S. Navy officials also report that the island's supply of fresh water in many localities is les than 24-hour's worth.

While I continue to hope and pray for better news, it now appears that the devastation caused by Typhoon Pamela will reach and perhaps even exceed the almost total destruction caused on Guam 14 years ago by Typhoon Karen.

I am returning to Guam as soon as possible to inspect the area and assist with arrangements for disaster relief, and to add whatever help I can to the residents in their hour of need. I know that many of my colleagues in the Congress share my deep concern for the safety of the people there, and I welcome their expressions of sympathy and interest.

Mr. Speaker, from the news I have received to date, it is clear that your fellow Americans in Guam have suffered a tremendous blow. I have no doubt that the amount of damage will run into the millions of dollars if early reports are correct. For an island already short of capital, this last shock will further plunge the island's residents into deeper economic difficulties and make recovery a most difficult task.

Early last year, I introduced legislation which called for Federal support for Guam in the amount of $56 million. Upon my return to Washington, I will be calling on my colleagues to suspend the Congressional Budget Report deadline so that I may request typhoon rehabilitation funds for Guam. I will make a full report to the Congress on the extent of the damage and present an estimate of the amount of assistance the 100,000 Americans on Guam will require

to make emergency repairs. I trust the tragedy which has struck Guam will not be as great as is presently feared, but that this Congress will stand ready to provide whatever assistance may be needed to help my people overcome the problems which undoubtedly lay ahead in the days as we attempt to rebuild the island.

Mr. Speaker, those wishing updated reports on the damage caused by Typhoon Pamela may call my office for the latest information. In closing, I speak for the people of Guam when I say that all of us will be most appreciative of whatever assistance Congress may see fit to offer and especially for the prayers of our many friends in Washington.

Thank you.

THE THREAT TO FULL EMPLOYMENT FROM CENTRAL ECONOMIC PLANNING

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the question of full employment—the question of putting people to work. I believe all of us would agree that full employment is a bargain. I also believe all of us agree that full employment is an issue too important to play politics with or to make a mistake about.

As a Representative of a district which suffers from an unemployment rate substantially higher than average, I am well acquainted with the human hardship and economic cost of unemployment. I have invested heavily over the years in the study of how best to create jobs and prosperity. My colleagues in the Congress are familiar with the legislation—the Jobs Creation Act—that many of us have put forward as the means to achieve full employment and with the speeches I have made explaining the economic basis for the positive and constructive benefits that the Jobs Creation Act would provide. I have reported in detail to the Congress the results of the econometric studies of the effects on the economy of the Jobs Creation Act. It is an act which I believe promises a $600 billion increase in GNP, millions of new jobs, and higher real wages—all without any budget costs—indeed, the act produces $45 billion in additional Federal revenues over 3 years. It is predicated on the basic economic truth, that the only real and lasting way to create productive jobs and raise the standard of living is to increase the amount of capital invested as a percenatge of the population.

The 126 cosponsors of the Jobs Creation Act know exactly what they are supporting. The act is a set of specific proposals to increase jobs and investment in the private sector of our economy. The economic effects of each on employment, the economy, and the budget have been quantified. The economic analysis underlying the predicted results has been clearly stated and examined in detail.

On the other hand, there is before the Congress the Humphrey/Hawkins so-called full employment bill which, as Herbert Stein has pointed out, identifies goals—some specifically, some vaguely—but with the one exception of proposing more Government jobs, "there is no specific proposal for solving any problem." It is but a mandated statistic telling the President to achieve full employment and if he does not succeed public service jobs will go to everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, whereas I believe the distinguished authors of H.R. 50 should be commended for their hopes of achieving good, I do not believe it is sound to base such a drastic shift in national economic policy as is envisaged by the Humphrey/Hawkins bill on hope and good intentions.

Neither do I believe the Humphrey/Hawkins bill would achieve full employment. I believe it is more likely to achieve an accelerating rate of inflation, bigger government, poorer consumers, and economic chaos that results from central economic planning and fine tuning.

I want to explain why.

H.R. 50 WOULD LOWER LABOR PRODUCTIVITY

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill does nothing toward providing the additional new and better tools, plant and equipment with which to employ our working men and women in real, productive jobs. The bill does nothing to increase the productivity of labor. Indeed, it does much to decrease it by diverting money out of investment and into current consumption.

It is a basic economic law that both the demand for labor and the level of wages depend on the productivity of labor. It is also well-known that the way to increase the productivity of labor is to provide workers with more and better tools and equipment with which to work. The greater the amount of capial investment relative to labor, the greater the productivity of labor and, thereby, the higher the level of employment and real wages.

Without additional investment to provide more and better tools and equipment, the productivity of labor cannot rise, and this discourages job opportunities. Government spending does not do anything to increase the productivity of labor; it is just an income redistribution mechanism which allocates resources away from investment and into public sector spending.

We have a great need for more resources to be allocated into investment, not into consumption. Michael Evens of Chase Econometrics has pointed out that—

> For the past ten years, the fiscal and monetary policies of the federal government have been directed almost exclusively at stimulating consumption while retarding investment.

I agree totally.

The result is unemployment. The study of our industrial capacity utilization rates by the Warton School at the University of Pennsylvania indicates that over this same period the unemployment rate corresponding with any capacity utilization rate has grown progressively greater. In the the 1950's a 4-percent unemployment rate, which is considered full employment, corresponded to a capacity utilization rate of 90 percent, which is considered full capacity. But the 1970's have seen unemployment rates of 5.5 percent even when the economy was operating at full capacity.

The result of our policy of stimulating consumption at the expense of investment is that we no longer have enough profitable productive capacity to provide full employment at existing wage levels.

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill, which simply compounds and accelerates the fiscal and monetary policies of the past 10 years of stimulating consumption while retarding investment, will produce a situation of higher and higher rates of unemployment even when the economy is operating at full capacity.

It is estimated that 2 million additional people will enter the labor market every year for the next 5 years. The American economy has not been growing fast enough—has not been creating enough new tools and equipment—to generate 10 million new jobs in the next 5 years.

NO REAL JOBS WITHOUT INVESTMENT AND NO INVESTMENT WITHOUT A TAX CUT

This is because although the private sector of the economy creates a large number of new jobs every year—the civilian labor force has been growing rapidly, while the profits necessary to finance new jobs have been declining as a percentage of our national income.

Not only is the labor force growing, so is the civilian participation in the labor force. The latest Bureau of Labor Statistics report shows that now almost half of adult females participate in the labor force, raising the overall civilian participation rate to an all-time high.

On the other hand, Department of Commerce statistics show that the retained earnings of corporations, which together with corporate borrowings in private credit markets provide most of the funds for expanded plant and equipment, averaged only $21.3 billion yearly during 1965–74. During this period when national income increased by $519 billion, corporate profits declined both absolutely and as a percentage of national income. Retained earnings fell from $29.4 billion in 1966 to $7.6 billion in 1974. After tax profits have fallen from 7.9 percent of national income in 1966 to 4.5 percent in 1975.

In the 1970's corporate retained earnings have averaged only 1.8 percent of national income. Clearly, our tax policies are out of step with the growing labor force participation. It will be a social tragedy if at the very time barriers in the way of better job opportunities for women and minorities are being removed, the business sector does not have the investment capital to generate enough new jobs for the people seeking them.

INFLATION HURTS INVESTMENT AND EMPLOYMENT

In spite of the fact of low and falling profits, critics speak of "obscene profits" and try to convince Americans that taxes are high because corporations avoid paying their share and that inflation results from corporations pushing up their prices in order to make even greater profits.

What are the facts?

The facts are that inflation results from increases in the money supply necessary to pay for the Federal Government's big spending deficits. Business accounting practices have not been equipped to deal with the effects of inflation on inventories and depreciation. As a result, inflation has caused business profits to be overstated and overtaxed just as individuals have been as well.

For example, in 1974 the corporate sector showed profits before tax of $132.1 billion on which they have a tax liability of $52.6 billion, or an effective tax rate of 40 percent of profit. However, the U.S. Department of Commerce calculates that in 1974 corporate sector inventories were over-valued by $38.5 billion and depreciation was understated by $2.3 billion, with the result that corporations had a tax liability of $52.6 billion on only $91.3 billion in actual profits. As a result, the corporate sector paid taxes on profits at an effective tax rate of 58 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the statutory corporate tax rate is 48 percent, and that is before the investment tax credit and other credit and deductions that reduce the legal effective tax rate below 48 percent. Yet, in 1974 corporations paid taxes at an effective rate of 58 percent—20 percent higher than the statutory rate.

This is one way in which inflation transfers resources out of investment, out of the private sector, into consumption, into the Government sector. It is important, as representatives of the people, for us to understand that reducing the investment capital of the business sector reduces the amount of new jobs that the business sector, which employs four out of five Americans, can create.

The Humphrey/Hawkins bill does nothing to increase the jobs creating investment capital of the private sector.

The monetary expansion—the inflation—it calls for to accommodate the budget deficits necessary to increase public sector employment will simply accelerate the transfer of resources out of investment capital into consumption. Instead of increasing our seed corn to accommodate a growing labor force participation, the Humphrey/Hawkins solution is to fatten the Government sector on the Nation's seed corn; that is, capital investment and savings.

As Chase econometrics and others have pointed out, we have been encouraging consumption at the expense of investment for a very long time now, and the result is not full employment. The result is a labor force that is too large to be fully employed by the existing plant and equipment.

I say to my colleagues in the House of Representatives that it is time to try a better approach to the problem of unemployment—the free enterprise approach. It is time to encourage production in the private sector where the investments are made which provide real, productive jobs and a growing tax base.

H.R. 50 WOULD MAKE NEW YORK CITY'S PLIGHT A NATIONAL EPIDEMIC

It will be an even greater tragedy if we do not learn from the tragedy of New York City that Government deficits to pay for growing public sector employment do not produce prosperity and a growing tax base. The solution offered by the Humphrey/Hawkins bill is just a continuation of the old Washington approach of responding to problems by increasing the size of Government and putting it further into debt—precisely the "solution" that produced the New York plight and has destroyed the British economy.

Mr. Speaker, as representatives of the people we cannot let these conditions spread to the national level. We are already in a situation where the interest on the Federal debt is greater than the retained earnings of the entire corporate sector. More is paid out in interest on past deficits than is left in the hand of corporations to invest in new jobs. If we taxed all corporate profits 100 percent we would still have a deficit in our 1976 budget.

I want to call the attention of all of my colleagues—especially those who believe it is politically advantageous to take an antibusiness stance—to the January issue of the Tax Review. There it is reported by Prof. David Meiselman, a well-known and respected economist, that in "real dollars of 1958 purchasing power, from 1961–65 there was an increase of $55,000 in the gross stocks of business capital for each person entering the labor force. In 1966–70 it was $46,000. By the 1971–74 period it had fallen again to only $41,000." Ironically, labor has been damaged economically in the name of helping labor.

What these figures mean is that the last 15 years has seen a retardation in the growth of plant and equipment relative to the growth in the labor force. It means a lower rate of growth of investment capital as a result of inflation-fueling budget deficits and the bias in the tax code against saving.

The Humphrey/Hawkins bill would simply and tragically take us further in this direction. The bill would turn the Federal reserve into a political-economic tool of central government. The distinguished Senator himself stated in the Senate on April 28 that the bill places new requirements on the Federal Reserve system.

H.R. 50 MEANS MORE INFLATION

The new requirement in that the Federal Reserve accommodates an excessive Government spending policy and cease being independent. The proponents of the bill realize that the large expansion in Government employment, which will be the primary effect of the bill, has to be paid for by printing money. The Federal Reserve, then, must be turned into a money printing machine to pay for the public service jobs.

If the Federal Reserve is not used as a money printing machine, the guaranteed Government jobs will have to be paid for either from increased taxation or from Government borrowings in the private credit markets. The levels of taxes are already too high, and I do not believe that any of us want to take to the people a program of raising taxes in order to provide more Government jobs. So if the Government does not print the money to pay for the guaranteed jobs, it will have to borrow it.

With corporate profits available for investing in expanded plant and equipment averaging only 1.8 percent of the national income, it simply means more investment capital taken out of the private sector that provides the productive jobs in our economy. Interest rates, short and long term will have to rise thus discouraging the construction and housing industry and thus causing unemployment. It's a vicious circle.

At a time when business profits are a smaller percent of national income than they were a decade ago, at a time when the participation of our citizens in the labor force is growing, we must get away from tax policies and away from monetary and fiscal policies which penalize and discourage investment capital.

H.R. 50 HARMFUL TO WORKING MEN AND WOMEN

In addition to having adverse effects on the price level, on job-generating investments, and on productive private sector employment, the Humphrey/Hawkins bill would place our Nation's workers in a no-win situation. And that is another reason I am against the bill. By providing federally funded guaranteed jobs, the bill removes any constraint that the fear of unemployment places on excessive wage demands. At the same time, the inflation caused by the bill would force labor to require wage increases in excess of productivity gains in an effort to stay ahead of inflation. The result would be a steady stream of workers, who have become overpriced and thereby unemployed in the private sector, into Government funded jobs.

This would simply accelerate the inflation. As the cycle pushed wages up higher and higher trying to stay ahead of inflation, more and more workers would be bumped out of the production of goods and services in the private sector into the guaranteed Government jobs. Thus, the supply of goods and services would shrink along with the private sector that produces them, but the demand for goods and services would not because the Government would be printing money to pay for more and more Government guaranteed jobs.

This more than anything else reveals the fallacy in the bill's basic premise—the idea that increased Government spending, rather than increased private sector production, is the road to prosperity and full employment.

The Humphrey/Hawkins bill will result in a smaller economic pie, and the national economic planning aspect of the bill anticipates the fight over shares of a smaller pie. Wage, price, and income controls will be offered by the planning councils as the means of resolving the conflict between the people, the Government, and labor. This will move us further away from the prosperity that only private enterprise can provide and toward the dictated and controlled economy characteristic of Britain.

H.R. 50 IS THE CENTRAL PLANNING ROAD TO FAILURE

The United States has been fortunate to have lagged behind on the road to central economic planning. We must

learn from those who have been struggling to find their way to a free market economy after travelling the road to planning and finding, as has Britain and other nations, that it led to economic ruin and not to prosperity, to controls, and not freedom.

It is strange that today some political leaders are urging us to take a path that was foresworn 10 years ago by the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party. Let me read from the resolution which introduced the economic reforms in Hungary in 1966:

The development of an active role for the market system requires that the laborious and bureaucratic system of the centralized allocation of materials and products should give place to market relations.

That is, producers should be able to decide within the range of their activities what and how much they produce and offer for sale as well as in what quantity and from whom they purchase the necessary inputs.

Producers and users should be free to establish commercial relationships. Sellers and buyers should be free to agree on the conditions of sale and also on the prices.

Buyers should be free to choose between domestic goods and imports and the sellers between selling on domestic or export markets.

Mr. Speaker, that is the way the leadership of a nation speaks—a leadership that was committed to central planning—after 20 years of experiencing the results of planning. And it is not only Hungary that has come to this conclusion. We in the Congress should realize that there is a great deal of experience in the world with planning. We should look to results where it has been tried, not to rhetoric by its advocates.

The national economic planning called for by the Humphrey/Hawkins bill will promote further growth in the public sector at a time when the people are fed up with attempts to solve problems by throwing more Government and more inflation at them.

BIGGER GOVERNMENT IS NOT THE ANSWER

The creation of boards, councils, committees, commissions, Presidential reports to Congress—the Advisory Committee on Full Employment and Balanced Growth, the Full Employment Office, the Division of Full Employment and Balanced Growth, reservoirs of employment projects—will create a vast army of consumers who are not producers.

The result is clear. It will be, as in Britain today, a labor force that is too large to be employed by the existing capital stock—that is, a labor force that is too large to be employed productively by the nation's factories and machinery. The result will be a wage and cost structure that is not competitive on world markets—this means a growing inability to export at the very time that, as studies show, our raw material and energy import needs are growing.

Mr. Speaker, the Humphrey-Hawkins bill will have five surefire effects, none of which the people want and all of which are good reasons for voting against the bill.

First, the bill will increase Government sector employment relative to employment in the productive private sector that produces the goods that people use their money income to purchase.

Second, it will increase inflation.

Third, it will reduce capital investment and the productivity of labor.

Fourth, it will generate social strife when the economic pie turns out to be too small to support both a burgeoning public sector and the expectations of the producers.

Fifth, it is the central planning road to economic failure and the growth of Government power.

Mr. Speaker, we must listen to the people and cease promising full employment policies that only build big centralized government. Let us not Britainize our economy.

FEDERAL AGENCY PILOT TERMINATION AND REVIEW ACT OF 1976

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Federal Agency Pilot Termination and Review Act of 1976. This is a "sunset" bill identical to the one introduced in the Senate on April 14, by Senator GARY HART of Colorado.

I am pleased to respond to Senator HART's invitation to introduce this legislation, which attempts in a pragmatic, limited and commonsense way to deal with one of the most vexing and frustrating problems facing the American people: how to make Government work better.

Under the "sunset" concept, Government agencies face an automatic termination date—or "Sunset"—according to a fixed schedule. This termination triggers a mandatory legislative review of the Agency's performance in light of the purposes for which it was established. The appropriate committees of Congress would have in hand 3 months before scheduled compulsory public hearings three separate assessments of the affected agency, prepared by the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, and the General Accounting Office.

At the public hearings, which would be held well in advance of the scheduled termination date, the Agency's head would be expected to defend his organization's record and make the case for its continued existence. Other interested individuals and groups would also be invited to make their assessments and recommendations.

With all the evidence in hand, the congressional committees involved could then recommend that the agency be continued unchanged, or with modifications, for another 6-year period, after which period the termination and review process would be repeated.

If, on the other hand, committees concluded that the agency should go out of existance and the Congress agreed, no legislative action would be necessary. The agency would cease to exist 1 year atfer its scheduled termination date.

It is important to note that the 1 year of continued life for the agency after the termination date is a safety feature in this bill. It provides for the possibility that the Congress may not be able to act expeditiously, or that the public may disagree with the decision the Congress has made. The grace period would leave ample time for Congress to reconsider any decision to terminate without having to face the prospect of reconstituting an already disbanded office.

The Speaker, I understand that some 44 bills have been introduced in the House to deal with the question of big Government or control of regulatory agencies. I would like to explain why I think this proposal is different and worthy of consideration.

First of all, it is adopted from the original Sunset concept developed by Common Cause and enacted in Colorado last month, with the support of political liberals and conservatives alike.

Second, this bill provides for a pilot project. It would require a trial run involving only six Federal agencies: the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration which would terminate on October 1, 1978; and the Federal Maritime Commission, the Federal Energy Administration, and the Interstate Commerce Commission which would terminate on October 1, 1979.

The two civil aviation agencies were chosen to test the Sunset process as a way to eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort. Any other agencies, however, could have been chosen to demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes a trial run, because the Congress and its various support facilities cannot as presently constituted take on the entire Federal Government. This point has been made by expert witnesses who otherwise support the idea of automatic termination and congressional review of agencies or budget programs as in the case of zero-base review.

My bill would give the Congress a chance to test the Sunset process without the risk of bringing the entire Federal Government to a halt. Based on the results of the trial run, the Congress could decide to reorganize itself and its staff support to perform its envisioned oversight and review function efficiently.

If the trial run proved to be a success, and I am confident that it will, the Congress could apply the Sunset concept to the entire Federal Government or as broad a section of it as seems feasible and wise.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. This bill would provide for the equitable treatment of civil servants on the rolls of any Federal agency that is actually terminated. Also, the Attorney General would assume responsibility for any agency actions pending on the date of termination to see those actions through to a satisfactory resolution.

There is new evidence every day of the disillusionment of the American people

with Government. The Federal Agency Pilot Termination and Review Act of 1976 offers us a practical opportunity to show that we are willing to take steps to make Government more efficient and more responsive to the needs of the people.

LOIS WELLS, DISTINGUISHED EDUCATOR, RETIRES

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1976, Miss Lois Wells, of El Monte, Calif., in the district I represent, will be honored at a banquet on the occasion of her retirement after 40 years of service in the field of education, 33 years in California.

As an educator for 40 years Miss Wells has contributed much to the young people and the communities of southern California. She has viewed her life and her career as a high school and community college choir and vocal teacher as a means to serve and develop young people according to the precepts of the highest principles.

Before coming to California Miss Wells taught in Kansas. She then taught music and was chairman of the Music Department for 8 years at El Monte High School. Since 1966, Miss Wells has been teaching at Rio Hondo College in Whittier, Calif.

In addition to her active role as an instructor in the classroom, Miss Wells has been very involved in the musical development of our community. She has served as president of the Southern California Vocal Association, the Los Angeles chapter of Choral Conductors Guild, the State chapter of Choral Conductors Guild and the West San Gabriel Chapter of the National Educators Fellowship. Also among her many other outside activities, Miss Wells has been director of her church choir for 33 years and of choirs in various youth camps around the country. An added indication of her involvement with youth, is her experience as chaperone on six tours abroad with the Southern California Youth Chorale.

On the occasion of her retirement I would like to note that Miss Wells has served our community schools with great dedication. It is a privilege to have had a woman such as Miss Wells working for the people of California and providing guidance and inspiration to so many of its people.

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, last week the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of which I am a member voted out the most expensive defense budget in our Nation's history. I opposed and still oppose this military complex—politically oriented budget. I had offered in committee amendments which were defeated to cut production funds for the B-1 bomber, Trident missile and for overall budget reductions which will be further discussed in separate views I will be filing with the committee's report on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the New York Times editorial of Tuesday, May 18, with which I fully agree, correctly describes the issues and characterization of this year's defense budget and I recommend it to my colleagues for their information and study:

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE—OR FOR POLITICS?

Angola, Russia's continuing military buildup, the Ronald Reagon campaign and doubts about détente all have contributed to the unwillingness of Congress this year to make significant cuts in the Administration's military budget, which now appears likely to exceed $114 billion. But the desire to impress the Soviet Union and Mr. Reagan's supporters cannot justify the virtual abandonment by the nation's legislators of their responsibility to review the country's defense posture.

Apart from the usual "cushion" inserted to prepare for Congressional cuts, estimated at $3 billion or more by Senator Proxmire, the defense budget is traditionally bloated with prestige projects and other questionable expenditures, the products of log-rolling trade-offs among the four armed services. It requires much closer scrutiny than was given last week by the key House Defense Appropriations subcommittee, which voted a reduction of less than one percent, the smallest cut in a decade.

This is the subcommittee that in recent years has normally cut the military budget by 4 or 5 percent. But this year it has voted $948 million in production funds for the B-1 bomber, at $80 million or more per plane, before the completion of tests next November. The decision on whether to go ahead with this deep-penetration bomber, as against a cheaper model, should be left to the next Administration.

The crash program to build giant Trident ballistic missile submarines at more than $1 billion per ship also needs re-examination along with the funds for another nuclear-powered aircraft carrier that, with its planes, would *eventually cost nearly $5 billion*. The Congress, influenced by Admiral Rickover, has foolishly voted more funds for expensive nuclear-powered ships than are wanted by the Navy or the Administration.

There is no good reason to press ahead with a big new naval shipbuilding program before completion of the basic study under way in the National Security Council to determine the role, size and composiiton of American naval forces through the end of the century. The Soviet shipbuilding program appears to have stabilized and is focusing on modernization instead of increased numbers. An effort to curb the Soviet-American naval arms race, rather than to step it up again, is what is needed.

Major policy issues in the defense budget, many of which involve small sums initially, need even closer scrutiny than the big-money projects. Is a large, new, land-based intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM)—combined with new counterforce warheads—going to advance or prejudice American security? The drive for a strategic nuclear warfighting capability, which each side may perceive as a first-strike threat, could destabilize the nuclear balance.

Defense manpower, which takes 57 percent of the budget—despite a 22 percent cutback in military personnel compared with pre-Vietnam 1964—is the chief factor in military costs. The country ultimately must face the question whether it wants to pay the huge cost of a volunteer army. But, even before that reappraisal becomes politically feasible, manpower costs could be cut back by reform of the reserve forces, trimming Pentagon civilian and other support personnel, the closing of more bases, and reductions in extravagant retirement and fringe benefits.

The country is heading toward a $150 billion defense budget in 1980. The question is not whether it can do with less security but whether more security could not be brought for less. A fundamental reassessment is long overdue and should be undertaken as soon as the Presidential election determines the nation's political direction for the next four years.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTOPHER J. DODD TESTIFIES IN SUPPORT OF THE EXTENSION OF THE POST-KOREAN GI BILL

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I testified before the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Education and Training in support of legislation I have introduced which would remove the 10-year time limit on the use of educational benefits under the post-Korean GI bill.

For nearly 3 million veterans discharged between January 31, 1955, and May 31, 1966, the delimiting date will take effect at the end of this month, and they will no longer be eligible to make use of the educational benefits they would otherwise still be entitled to. Unless the delimiting date is extended or the time limit is removed, many of these veterans will be forced to discontinue college education and vocational training programs which are so important to their future.

Because this is a matter which affects veterans nationwide, I would like to insert the text of my statement in the RECORD for the consideration of all of my colleagues.

The text of the statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you, and the distinguished Members of the Subcommittee on Education and Training, for giving me the opportunity to testify in support of the elimination of the ten-year time restriction on the use of veterans educational benefits.

I would like to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that it is a unique experience for me to speak before your Subcommittee, being a member of your Science and Technology Committee as well.

I am pleased that hearings are being held on legislation dealing wth extension of the delimiting date, or removal of the time restriction, on the use of the current G.I. bill.

There are more than forty bills pending before this Subcommittee which call for one or the other of these measures to prevent the cut off of the G.I. bill for many of our veterans at the end of this month.

More than one-hundred of our colleagues in the House have sponsored or co-sponsored these bills; and when we took action on the budget resolution on April 29th of this year, a majority of members of the House—and a majority of members of the House Veterans Affairs Committee—indicated their support for the extension of eligibility by voting in favor of the Edgar amendment.

Nationwide, the real rate of unemployment remains at nearly 10.5%. In my own State of Connecticut, I am sorry to say that the unemployment rate hovers at 12.1%.

We have to face facts: The job market is dismal, for both high school and college graduates. If we are to address this problem effectively, we must approach it in several ways. I believe that one of these is to allow our Post-Korean and Vietnam-Era veterans—who comprise an age group particularly hard hit by unemployment—to receive continued assistance for education and training programs. This type of preparation is essential today in finding employment—and in remaining employed.

I feel that the legislation I have introduced, eliminating the time restriction on the use of the current G.I. Bill, will help to accomplish this goal.

It seems to me that this ten-year time limit is unnecessary, and may be contrary to the public interest.

It tends to discriminate against the veteran who has commitments immediately after leaving active duty, and must postpone the use of their educational benefits.

It puts undue pressure on a veteran to enroll in a program just to beat the deadline, even though the program may not be best to that individual.

The costs involved in removing this time restriction must be a consideration, to be sure, but I am convinced that it will be money well spent. Studies have shown that for each dollar spent on G.I. educational benefits, the Treasury eventually receives four dollars in additional revenues generated by higher veterans' incomes.

With this in mind, it is easy to see that any costs incurred as a result of the removal of the time constraint would be more than offset by taxes paid by these same individuals in later years.

Only a little more than half of all 10.6 million post-Korean and Vietnam-Era veterans have used their educational benefits at this time, yet a 1974 Army Testing survey showed that a majority of armed servicemen and women considered their post-service educational benefits to be among the most important of all their reasons for joining.

Many of our veterans entered the service under the assumption that they would use their benefits once they left. Many were delayed in pursuing their education, however, and for these men and women, May 31st will mean they will no longer be eligible.

In Connecticut, nearly 58,000 Post-Korean and Vietnam veterans will lose their G.I. Bill eligibility.

On the 17,860 Connecticut veterans presently attending college or vocational training under the G.I. Bill, approximately 25% will have their educational assistance cut off if the delimiting date is not removed or extended.

I know from the appeals that I have received from my constituents that many of these veterans will be unable to continue their education or job training without this assistance.

I would like to share with you one such appeal, Mr. Chairman. It is only when you start looking at the matter from the perspective of its effects on individuals like William Schwarm of Middletown, Connecticut, the importance of the extension really comes to light. The text of the letter follows:

DEAR MR. DODD:

I am writing in regard to the possible extension of the G.I. Bill.

I did not find out that I was eligible to receive any educational benefits until January, 1975.

I am employed as a tinsmith and my job requires a lot of physical stamina. One day it happened to dawn on me that, at thirty-five, I was one of the oldest men in the trade. I began to panic, as I was really beginning to feel the physical strain of my job.

I began looking for another type of employment, but at thirty-five, with a wife and three children, you must be careful that you find a job that does not lower your income drastically and yet has security. After some time had passed, a friend informed me that I might be eligible for veterans' educational benefits.

I applied and was accepted at Middlesex Community College. I have completed twelve courses so far and have a high "B" average. I am studying toward a four year degree to teach Industrial Arts.

I am entitled to thirty-six months of benefits, but the time limit will run out long before my benefits.

We live in a State housing project, and we have never been able to get far enough ahead financially to afford a home. The G.I. Bill, I feel, is my big chance in life to make a break from our present life style.

Please help us by giving your vote to extend the time limit on the G.I. Bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. SCHWARM,
Middletown, Connecticut.

I think we often lose sight of the real issues involved, in deciding questions of this type. We tend to speak in aggregates, large numbers of dollars, and large groups of people, without adequately considering the impact our action, or lack of action, will have on individuals. Letters such as Mr. Schwarm's really bring home these effects in a way I think we can all relate to.

Mr. Chairman, we are not just talking about eliminating a program for "X numbers" of veterans. By allowing the delimiting date to stand, we will be forcing a great many "individuals" to discontinue educational and training programs. We are drastically reducing their employment opportunities; as well.

I believe that our veterans, as well as our Nation as a whole, cannot afford such action, and I strongly urge that this Subcommittee remove the delimiting date entirely, and as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to express my concern on this crucial issue.

STATUS OF PUBLIC LAW 480 RICE EXPORT PROGRAM AS OF MAY 21, 1976

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in preparing my seventh report on the status of the rice exports under Public Law 480 in this current marketing year I find that sales equaling slightly more than half of the 850,000-ton objective set for this marketing year by the administration have been completed.

The total in completed sales reached 443,000 tons this week with the addition of 52,000 tons marketed to South Korea, 11,000 marketed to Syria, and 10,000 tons marketed to Guinea. India opened bids on its purchase of 100,000 tons yesterday but the sale is not yet completed. In addition, agreements are signed, purchase authorizations have been issued, or invitations for bids have been issued for the sale of another 178,000 tons.

The chart below summarizes the status of the Public Law 480 rice export program to date:

STATUS OF PUBLIC LAW 480 RICE PROGRAM, 1975-76 MARKETING YEAR, CURRENT THROUGH MAY 21, 1976

[In thousands of metric tons]

	Bangladesh	South Korea	Portugal	Zaire	Guinea	India	Indonesia	Syria	Total
Allocations approved by Interagency Staff Committee:									
Date									
Amount									
Negotiations initiated:									
Date									
Amount									
Agreements signed:									
Date							50	28	78
Amount									
Purchase authorizations issued:									
Date	Apr. 30, 1976								
Amount	50								50
Invitations for bids issued:									
Date						May 13, 1976	May 18, 1976		
Amount						[2] 100	50		150
Programs completed: Amount	170	164	50	27	10			22	
Total	220	[1] 164	[1] 50	27	10	[2] 100	100	50	721

[1] Both South Korea and Portugal normally buy brown rice. These figures are the milled equivalent on the USDA formula of 90 percent extraction from brown rice. The rice industry uses an 85-percent extraction formula.

[2] These figures are lower than in the previous charts because of India's apparent decision to take only 100,000 of the 200,000 tons of rice which were originally allocated to her. On May 20, 1976, India opened bids on this purchase, sale not yet completed.

PROBLEMS IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S STATE DATA EXCHANGE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as originally planned, the Social Security State Data Exchange—SDX—report was designed to provide the States with information on all persons in that State enrolled in the supplemental security income program. The report itself is the only case-by-case information which the States receive, and it represents the major SSI information report which SSA provides to

the States. Many States use the SDX report to determine—

First, SSI recipients' eligibility for other programs; for example, the medicaid program; and

Second, the amount of Federal payment so that any State benefits; that is, State supplements due to an SSI recipient, can be paid.

As part of its continuing oversight of the SSI program, the subcommittee was interested in knowing how the SDX program is working. The subcommittee had received reports that at the beginning of the SSI program in January 1974, the SDX reports were of very poor quality. Therefore, on February 9, 1976, the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee sent a letter to all 50 States and the District of Columbia asking whether or not there had been improvement in the SDX computer tapes, and whether or not the rate of improvement of the tapes was acceptable to them. Thirty-eight responses were received by the subcommittee and 36 indicated improvement in the SDX tapes. Two replies did not indicate whether or not the SDX tapes had improved. No State reported that SDX tapes had not improved. The Social Security Administration is to be commended for this general improvement in the supply of important beneficiary information to the States.

Satisfaction with the rate of improvement varied among the States. Of the 36 replies indicating improvement in the tapes, 4 said the rate of improvement was acceptable. Twenty-seven States did not reply either way, but nearly all of these noted that SDX could be further improved in various ways.

It is disturbing that many of the SDX problems reported by the States to the subcommittee were the same problems that a February 18, 1975, American Public Welfare Association survey revealed. A year has passed and the same problems are still in the system. This is unacceptable and reflects a lack of aggressive electronic data management at the Social Security Administration.

The largest single problem mentioned in the replies to the subcommittee was the inaccuracy of the SDX tapes. Twenty-one replies mentioned errors in the SDX tapes such as wrong names, wrong addresses, duplicate or pseudo-social security numbers, or inconsistent information. The State of Missouri said:

Our main problem has been (and to some extent still is) the purification of incorrect data base information that entered our system during the first six (6) months of SDX operation.

This, of course, causes problems with the use of the tapes, and more incorrect information may be entering the system. The State of Tennessee wrote:

Major improvements in the reliability of the SDX data have been unrecognizable.

Another major problem area is timeliness. That is, the States either do not receive the SDX tapes in a timely manner or there are delays in the correction or change of tapes.

Six States replied that they had untimely delivery of SDX tapes ranging from several days to 2 months late. The delay in receipt of the tapes caused problems for State programs in several States. California stated:

Such delay wreaks havoc in the processing and timely delivery of SDX data to its primary users which are the Department of Health (Medi-Cal I.D. card issuance) and county welfare departments.

Eleven States noted problems in the timeliness of the correction of tapes. This category includes updates which are not corrected and delays in the correction of mistakes. A typical problem was reported by Texas:

There are cases on which the latest SDX is several months old and the client is no longer eligible. We had received no information to that effect.

The State of Georgia says:

Usually when a problem occurs in Baltimore which causes errors to appear on the SDX tape, the States are not notified in sufficient time to cope with the errors. In many instances, States are not notified until after the SDX tapes have been processed.

The State of Pennsylvania says:

All of these problems relating to incomplete and inaccurate data have continually been brought to the attention of SSA but no satisfactory improvement has occurred. One of the major flaws in the SDX system has been the lack of responsiveness to change. Relatively small changes in the system may require a year or more to implement, and even corrections involving specific cases may take months to complete. We have clients who have been receiving incorrect payment amounts since January, 1974 despite numerous attempts at correction. Clients tell us about addresses that were not changed by SSA for over a year and about countless visits to their SSA Office attempting to correct case information.

Another item noted in the responses is a problem with SDX and State medicaid programs. Twelve States noted problems with medicaid eligibility status, and wrong mailing addresses for medicaid recipients. A quotation from New Mexico's reply is fairly typical:

We find, however, that while there has been some improvement in the overall operations of the SDX System, a significant number of SSI eligibles are either not reported to us via SDX, or not reported in a manner that enables us to issue them a current Medicaid Identification Card. In these instances, it becomes necessary to obtain certification of eligibility from Social Security Administration district offices, and prepare Medicaid cards manually at our offices. In addition, we continue to have approximately 500 Medicaid cards returned to us monthly by the Post Office as undeliverable to the addresses provided by the SDX. Occasionally, we find out that some of the beneficiaries have died months ago, Social Security has been notified, and yet the names continue to appear on the SDX as eligible.

The question arises from the New Mexico quote whether those 500 individuals are still being issued SSI checks at the old addresses, and if so, who is cashing the checks?

The following chart indicates which States the subcommittee received replies from and which SDX areas they report problems with:

Replies received from—	Indicated inaccuracy of SDX tapes	Indicated untimeliness of tape delivery	Indicated untimeliness of tape corrections	Indicated problems with medicaid	Indicated receiving incomplete information	Indicated trouble with instructions
Alabama						
Alaska	X					
Arizona						
California	X	X				
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Georgia	X		X	X		X
Hawaii	X					
Illinois	X	X			X	
Indiana						
Kansas						
Kentucky	X			X		
Maryland	X	X				X
Michigan	X					X
Mississippi						
Missouri	X		X			
Montana						
Nebraska		X	X			
Nevada	X		X	X		X
New Hampshire						
New Jersey		X	X			
New Mexico	X			X		
New York	X		X	X	X	
North Dakota	X					
Ohio				X	X	
Oklahoma			X	X		
Oregon						
Pennsylvania	X			X		
South Carolina						
Tennessee	X		X	X	X	
Texas	X		X	X	X	
Utah	X					
Vermont	X	X		X		
Washington						
West Virginia	X		X	X		X
Wisconsin	X		X			
Wyoming						
Washington, D.C	X					
Total	21	6	11	12	5	5

The following examples from Texas and New York further show that many current SDX problems have been known for a long time.

On November 26, 1974, the Honorable J. J. PICKLE entered an October 24, 1974, letter from Texas Welfare Commissioner Raymond W. Vowell into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter cited the following two SDX problems among others:

2. Individuals who are issued an SSI check through a manual process in the SSA District offices are not accreted through the SSA computer system. A manual system to establish Medicaid eligibility has been ini-

tiated. However, many cases still go unreported and many cases remain open for medical assistance after eligibility for SSI has ended.

3. The SDX tape sent to Texas continues to contain individuals with residency addresses in other states."

The March 12, 1976, reply from Texas—also from Commissioner Vowell—to our inquiry noted:

The automated system at SSA does not send all SSI cases that receive a manual payment to the Department. Some of these cases are sent to the Department from the local SSA District Office through a manual Medicaid certification procedure. This procedure was developed in July, 1974 by the SSA Regional staff and the Departmental staff. The purpose of the system was to establish Medicaid eligibility for all individuals who were receiving SSI checks. Individuals who received a check through the SSI manual check writing system are not always processed through SSA's computer system. Recently, this problem has been somewhat alleviated. Currently, most of the manually certified individuals have a follow up SDX record. There are some individuals for which we do not receive such a record indicating that not all SSI cases are recorded on the files at SSA when a manual payment has been made. Since the manual certification process depends on written notification from the District Office, we fear that some individuals may never be manually certified and may never be added to the SSA Central Office files. As a result of this, these eligible individuals would not receive the Medicaid coverage to which they are entitled."

And—

Texas still receives many records which are not relevant to Texas. These records cause extra processing time and are a point of contention as to proper payment for SDX information."

These two examples show that while there has been some improvement in SDX, many problems remain unsolved even though the problems have been known for 19 months and more.

The State of New York replied to an April 18, 1975, Senate Finance Committee questionnaire that the accuracy and timeliness of SDX tapes are major problem areas. These problems were described in detail at that time in a document, "SSI, New York's Perspectives." These problems include:

The State must continually "infer" what is meant by SDX "numbers." For example:

The SDX does not provide data relative to the particular months for which an SSI payment is made and consequently, payments for multiple months appear as State liabilities when, in fact, if properly distributed over past months, could reduce State liabilities for current and prior months.

HEW continually changes SDX data content and system operation changes are made without regard to State objections—this causes increases in the numbers of transaction adjustments and creates unnecessary administrative workload.

The SDX contains inconsistent and incomplete information regarding individual clients which necessitates duplicate client contact, unnecessary administrative expense, and untimely Federal/State liability determination.

There are inadequate quality assurance tests before major SDX data processing "runs" and certain system elements (e.g., MA eligibility dates) are erroneously affected by other unrelated elements (e.g., Social Security benefit increase dates).

One-time payments are received "out-of-date" and are recorded by client security number and not by State (or county) of client residence which makes it impossible for the State to analyze appropriate liability placement.

The SDX is the State's only source of SSI program data, however, it cannot be used as a basis for defensible State audits nor as a reliable accounting of State supplement disbursements. For example:

Social Security benefit increases have erroneously been added to MIL's which appears to increase State liabilities and compromises the utility of SDX information for program planning purposes.

One-time payments are not picked up on the SDX.

The states cannot feed automated information back to SSA and discrepancies between the SDX and State records must be reconciled through tedious manual, individual case-by-case reviews.

The SDX is not designed to meet local needs; accordingly, extensive State reprocessing is required before distribution to local governments for local monitoring purposes.

There is an inability to correct major SDX computer programming errors and to develop simple edit routines applicable to the State's supplementation program.

In reply to the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee's recent questions, New York referred to its 1975 remarks. New York said:

Your letter of February 9, 1976 asked my opinion of the "improvements" in the State Data Exchange System used in the SSI program and if the rate of improvement is acceptable. You also indicated that your Subcommittee is aware of the State's concern about the reliability, completeness, and timeliness of the SDX system. These "concerns" were described in detail in Governor Carey's response to the Senate Finance Committee's Questionnaire on SSI in May 1975 and in June 1975 in my testimony before the Public Assistance Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee . . .

While minor improvements have been noticed the entire SDX process still remains a major problem to the State. The lack of reliability, completeness and timeliness continue to plague the SDX. The poor quality of the data impacts the State in three major areas; (1) Medicaid, (2) Data Processing, and (3) Fiscal, and has a residual effect on quality assurance, emergency assistance, and interim assistance.

I feel that this shows that in many cases last year's SDX problems are this year's current SDX problems.

I might add that the SSI study group, which was created last spring and which issued its final report this January 26, was also highly critical of the SDX operation. The study group noted a number of problems and reported:

Not enough time was allotted to the development of the SDX system. As a result early reports to the States were in very poor shape. The Study Group repeatedly heard complaints along these lines. However, it appears that the reports have been much improved in recent months.

The Study group heard much testimony regarding the seed of the States for good accounting information. *The SDX system was not designed to provide accounting information and it would probably be best not to modify it for this purpose.*

I do not believe that the results of our poll of the States, taken in the spring of 1976, support the study group's comment that "the reports have been much improved in recent months." There has been improvement, but there are still enormous unresolved problems.

SSA must continue to improve its SDX system to provide better service and it must work harder to accelerate the rate of improvement so the SDX data can become acceptable to its users.

Given the slowness in the rate of improvement, the oversight subcommittee will continue to monitor the SDX program. In addition, the problems reported in this area further justify the subcommittee's concerns about the quality of social security's computer operations. It has become increasingly obvious that the entire electronic data systems management at social security must be overhauled and improved.

PENSIONS FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS: THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I filed with the Clerk of the House a motion in writing to discharge the Veterans' Affairs Committee from further consideration of H.R. 3616, the World War I Pension Act, a bill which I introduced 15 months ago.

I have taken this action because I believe that it is imperative that the full House of Representatives be afforded an opportunity to discuss and vote on World War I pension legislation as soon as possible.

H.R. 3616 would provide a $150-a-month pension for either the World War I veteran or his widow, without regard to any other source of income that he or she may have.

I recently presented testimony on this legislation which I would like to include at this time for the purpose of explaining the need for this legislation:

STATEMENT OF HONORABLE GLENN M. ANDERSON PRESENTED TO HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPENSATION, PENSION AND INSURANCE, MAY 17, 1976

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of this committee.

I appreciate this opportunity to present testimony in behalf of legislation which I have introduced relative to pensions for World War I veterans.

The bill, H.R. 3616, the "World War I Pension Act", would provide a $150 a month pension for either the World War I veteran or his widow.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 60 years since these Americans trooped off to Europe. It is easy for us to choose not to reflect on that part of our history, but I believe it is very beneficial and appropriate for us to recall the climate of those times.

When in April of 1917, the United States entered the war, Germany was winning. The United States was ill-prepared to declare war on Imperial Germany—the odds seemed hopeless. The French Army was demoralized and in the midst of mutiny. The British and the French were losing men not by battalions and regiments but by divisions, virtually by armies.

The young Americans who reported to the recruiting offices that year were not seeking adventure. They were convinced, that regardless of the cost, America had to enter the war—and they were well aware of what their part in such an effort would be.

They left this country to face the awesome trench warfare of the Western Front. Due largely to the valor of these men, the bolstered Allied forces began to experience

victory after victory—we know the rest of this history.

What did a grateful nation provide to these valiant veterans? On the day of discharge we presented him with $60—a happily received sum in the day when a dollar had considerably greater buying power. Later, the Congress passed the Adjusted Service Compensation Act which provided the veterans with an average payment of $547.50. This total amount of $607.50 was his reward and "thanks" from the nation which he served.

In 1919, when most World War I veterans were discharged, there was no educational aid system. If there had been, the plight of these veterans might be quite different today, as the average educational level of World War I veterans is the sixth grade.

For a majority of these veterans, their education handicap prevented any large number of them from achieving even moderate economic success. Also, by 1935, when the Social Security system was created, World War I veterans were too old to have time to build up maximum benefits.

In 1919, the Government did not help the veteran find employment, as in the case of recent veterans. Nor were there veterans hospitals as there are today. The only assistance provided to these men was vocational rehabilitation for those disabled in the war.

Has this caused these men to be bitter—quite the contrary. I have always been impressed by the support which World War I veterans have provided for the granting of educational and other benefits to veterans of later wars. In spite of the meager show of gratitude by this nation to World War I veterans, they have always maintained the attitude that such benefits for later veterans have lead to better citizenship and thus a better America.

The legislation which I propose—a $150 a month pension for either the World War I veteran or his widow—will not cost as much as simple arithmetic might indicate. Many veterans are receiving welfare payments, and this pension would permit many to cease drawing such benefits. I believe that it is a national disgrace that men who served this nation with such valor are now forced upon the welfare rolls.

My bill, H.R. 3616, will rapidly drop in annual cost to the government. In the meantime it will be a godsend to the 893,000 World War I veterans still alive and to the surviving widows of deceased veterans. I might add, that at the present time, only 340,873 of these veterans are receiving any kind of a veteran's pension.

The pension system that is in effect now is a type of welfare that is really beneath the dignity of those who have contributed so greatly to our nation. For example, a married veteran of World War I, whose annual income is $300 or less, is entitled to $186 a month pension maximum—$2,232 per year. No pension is payable to such a veteran whose annual income exceeds $4,500.

The veteran without dependents is eligible for a pension only if his annual income is less than $3,300. His maximum monthly pension, based on an annual income of less than $300, is $173—$2,076 per year.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the pension which I propose is not a special privilege, but rather, this legislation will serve to bring the Nation's treatment of World War I veterans to a point approaching equity with the benefits that veterans of later wars have received.

I thank you Mr. Chairman and members of this committee for allowing me this opportunity to share my strong views on this subject. I urge you to report the "World War I Pension Act" to the floor of the House as soon as possible.

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR A. COURSHON BEFORE 1976 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a very able statement upon the subject of housing was made before the southern regional hearing of the 1976 Democratic Platform Committee in Atlanta by Arthur H. Courshon, long-time chairman of the board of Washington Federal Savings and Loan Association of Miami Beach, Fla. Mr. Courshon has been president of the National League for Insured Savings. He has been responsible for setting up housing programs in several of the Latin American countries. He is one of the most knowledgeable men in the country on the subject of housing. His views on that subject and his opinions as to how we might have an adequate housing program in this country are ably expressed in Mr. Courshon's testimony. Since housing is a matter of critical interest to the Members of Congress and the country I ask, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Courshon's excellent statement appear in the RECORD immedately following these remarks:

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR H. COURSHON, CHAIRMAN, WASHINGTON FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., BEFORE THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL HEARING OF THE 1976 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE HEARINGS

It is a not-too-pleasant notion to face up to, but in the United States of America, in our land of plenty, the overwhelming majority of our citizens cannot afford to purchase the home of their choice.

Housing, in recent years, has fallen on bad times. The combination of high unemployment, outrageous levels of inflation, and the skyrocketing costs for land, materials, and money, all have served to bring home this picture and to focus attention on the fact that the construction industry of this nation has as much if not more effect on employment and the welfare of the American economy than any other single industry.

Although there certainly are other pressing issues in the national economy, it is my belief that the Democratic Party ought to have as a major priority in its platform a hard hitting housing program that is aimed at bringing back to reality the Congressional mandate of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American."

We must once again develop the means of providing decent housing to young families just getting started. We ought not to accept as gospel the notion that since these families don't have sufficient cash for the required downpayment that they should be forced out of the housing market.

We ought not to accept the idea that housing is not for everybody.

Indeed, housing in the United States should be for anyone who wants a home of their own.

We already have the vehicles with which to accomplish this. What is required is a fine tuning of the legislation and regulation of financial institutions which place the bulk of their funds into housing.

This does not suggest a restructuring of financial institutions, as is proposed by pending legislation. It rather attacks the heart of the problem insofar as housing is concerned: that is, how do you bring more families into the housing market at prices they can afford today?

This is the issue that should be addressed by the Democratic Party. It is the issue that has been ignored since 1969, and housing and the American economy have taken an entirely predictable beating as a result.

What we have in our nation is a structure, through our thrift institutions, of providing long term mortgage money. What we are missing is the ability of these thrift institutions to provide that money in a flexible manner.

At the present time, the insured savings and loan associations are basically limited to long term, fixed rate, monthly amortizing loans—a vehicle which worked beautifully in the years following the Great Depression until the mid-1960s.

But the long term, fixed rate mortgage no longer accomplishes the job year-in and year-out of providing housing to all Americans who desire a home. Reformers have taken this to indicate the institutions that service the home mortgage market are inefficient.

This, in my view, is erroneous. What is inefficient is the mortgage itself.

It, and not the institutions, should be changed to reflect current economic developments.

There is no question but a major rewriting of the regulations affecting mortgage lending by thrift institutions should be undertaken. The inability of current regulations to meet today's pressing needs is seen every time a young family, whose head earns a reasonable wage, tries unsuccessfully to secure funds with which to purchase a home.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has, in recent years, attempted to broaden the scope of mortgage lending of insured savings and loan associations, but without legislative changes, the type of which the writer suggests should be sponsored by the Democratic Party, it lacks the authority to do the job that needs to be done.

I propose the Democratic Party urge an updating of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933. This is the basic law under which the nation's savings and loan associations operate. If it were revised and tailored to suit today's needs, I feel we might well provide the answer to housing all Americans at prices they could afford.

The basic problem is that the mortgage instrument is too inflexible.

Today's economy, because we have had high inflation rates, high unemployment, and high land, material and money costs, requires the mortgage to be varied to suit the borrower. Some of the types of mortgages that today's economy requires, and which I propose the Democratic Party consider for its Platform, are as follows:

(1) For the young family, and here is a critical need today, a long term mortgage that would require little or no amortization during its early period, and a lower repayment amount. As the borrower ages and matures, and can afford to pay more, this mortgage instrument would provide for increased payments, and at the end of the term it would be fully paid out.

The advantage of this type of mortgage is, of course, to qualify more families—mostly young families—for housing they otherwise wouldn't be able to purchase. There obviously would have to be some screening process of applicants in the sense they should be "upwardly mobile" insofar as future employment prospects are concerned, but the concept is to qualify hundreds of thousands, and perhaps millions, of families and individuals who could buy the home of their choice today if the mortgage instrument were made flexible enough to accommodate their particular needs.

(2) We need to address ourselves once again to housing the poor. This is an area that has been given only lip service during the current decade. I propose, however, that we relieve the taxpayer of the burden of having tax

dollars allocated to low cost and public housing. Rather, we should have in our national arsenal of mortgage instruments a mortgage whose interest is tax free to the lender who makes the loan, provided that these tax free mortgages are limited to housing loans for low cost housing.

Such a tax free mortgage instrument would open the doors once again to inner city housing, but in a manner that would insure the program's success. With this type of tax exempt mortgage, we would be encouraging much more funds into one of the more pressing housing needs of the nation.

(3) We should also consider legislation that would allow low cost term insurance to be used in conjunction with low cost housing loans. This proposal would retire the mortgage debt of the borrower without requiring the borrower to amortize the loan during the borrower's lifetime. All he need do is (a) be insurable, and (b) pay the annual premium on the term insurance.

The savings and loan, under this proposal, would advance the funds for the home and retain title to the property. There is no subsidy involved in this and no impacting on the Federal Treasury. Yet, although simplistic in nature, it appears to be able to do the job of housing the poor through term life insurance.

At the borrower's death, the proceeds of the term insurance policy would be used to repay the lender—including interest on the advanced funds—and the borrower's family then owns the property free and clear.

This proposal, I would add, is a risk free loan on the part of the lender, since the insurance proceeds would come to the lender and, until then, he retains title to the property. As such, this type of investment would be an attractive one for thrift institutions up to a certain percentage of their assets.

(4) Another innovation which ought to be brought about are tax free mortgage backed bonds, the proceeds from the sale of which would be earmarked for low cost housing.

Because of the experience of New York City, people are seeking tax free investments with safety features built in. These could be offered where a pubic purpose is served, and there is no greater public purpose than to shelter the poor and elderly of our country without adding to the tax burden of our country.

(5) Legislation should be enacted authorizing an experimental program to index savings and certificate accounts as well as mortgages, in order to encourage savings and to insure sound mortgages leading during periods of inflation and as a deterrent to inflation.

As a nation to date we have turned our backs on the thought of indexing. We look upon it as a kind of giving in to inflation. As I see it, however, rather than being a giving in to inflation, it is a recognition that we are battling inflation—and while we do we ought to do something to allow families to retain the value on their life savings, and permit lenders to retain the value on their investments.

This type of program has worked well in some South American countries. The writer of this paper wrote the law in Chile that set up the savings and loan system in that nation. The law contained—and continues to contain—an indexing feature. What is done in Chile is the indexing of the principal on savings and on mortgages, based on a cost of living index.

In other words, if take home pay rises, say, 5 per cent in a given year, the principal on savings accounts rises a like amount, as does the principal on mortgage balances.

I believe we ought to take the bold step of supporting an experimental program of this type in the United States—while we continue to strive to bring inflation under control.

(6) One of the most significant innovations in the thrift industry has been the advent of annuity programs—offshoots of so-called Keogh and IRA accounts—which offer tax sheltered savings programs to anyone. The annuity account represents a probable wave of the future for savings in our nation, and consideration should be given to legislation allowing increased use of this increasingly valuable savings incentive.

(7) We should press forward with a real effort to revitalize the Federal Housing Administration, so as to simplify its laws and regulations and to rid that system of the many evils which our experience has shown us are inherent in FHA.

These seven proposals could be added to. There are other types of mortgages which might be worked on—and successfully. What is attempted, however, is to urge the Democratic Party to make a stand for bringing housing back down to the level of the people in this country—and away from the concept of "housing for the rich," which concept we have been living with for most of this decade.

In short, the Democratic Party should encourage the creation of a legislative task force, whose sole purpose should be limited to the examintion of existing legislation involving housing and housing finance in this country. The aim of the task force would be to modernize that legislation for the purpose of creating more housing for more people at lower cost and with less burden on the taxpayer.

This can be done, and the Democratic Party has the means of doing it. Perhaps more importantly, as we have shown in the past, we have that which has been lacking during the 1970s—the will to do it.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to present these suggestions.

CHAIRMAN BURNS SPEAKS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors speaks, he speaks with great knowledge, deep concern for the public interest, and great wisdom. Chairman Burns is one of the towering figures of our country. He delivered an address at the University of Georgia on September 19, 1975, on the real issues of inflation and unemployment which was a thorough and scholarly review of the economic situation in our country today. What Chairman Burns has said deserves particular note from the Congress and country. To make the Chairman's remarks available to my colleagues and all who read this RECORD, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this very able address of Chairman Burns appear in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

THE REAL ISSUES OF INFLATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

(Address by Arthur F. Burns, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, at the Blue Key Honor Society Annual Awards Dinner, the University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., September 19, 1975)

I am pleased to be here at the University of Georgia and to have the opportunity to address this distinguished audience. Tomorrow promises to be an existing day for you, and you will need all the rest you can muster. I shall therefore not waste many words as I share with you my concern about our nation's future.

Our country is now engaged in a fateful debate. There are many who declare that unemployment is a far more serious problem than inflation, and that monetary and fiscal policies must become more stimulative during the coming year even if inflation quickens in the process. I embrace the goal of full employment, and I shall suggest ways to achieve it. But I totally reject the argument of those who keep urging faster creation of money and still larger governmental deficits. Such policies would only bring us additional trouble; they cannot take us to the desired goal.

The American economy has recently begun to emerge from the deepest decline of business activity in the postwar period. During the course of the recession, which began in late 1973, the physical volume of our total output of goods and services declined by 8 per cent. The production of factories, mines, and power plants fell even more—by 14 per cent. As the over-all level of economic activity receded, the demand for labor rapidly diminished and unemployment doubled, reaching an intolerable 9 per cent of the labor force this May.

The basic cause of the recession was our nation's failure to deal effectively with the inflation that got under way in the mid-sixties and soon became a dominant feature of our economic life. As wage and price increases quickened, seeds of trouble were sown across the economy. With abundant credit readily available, the construction of new homes, condominiums, and office buildings proceeded on a scale that exceeded the underlying demand. Rapidly rising prices eroded the purchasing power of workers' incomes and savings. Managerial practices of business enterprises became lax and productivity languished, while corporate profits—properly reckoned—kept falling. Inventories of raw materials and other supplies piled up as businessmen reacted to fears of shortages and still higher prices. Credit demands, both public and private, soared and interest rates rose to unprecedented heights. The banking system became overextended, the quality of loans tended to deteriorate, and, the capital position of many banks was weakened.

During the past year many of these basic maladjustments have been worked out of the economic system by a painful process that could have been avoided if inflation had not gotten out of control. As the demand for goods and services slackened last winter, business managers began to focus more attention on efficiency and cost controls. Prices of industrial materials fell substantially, price increases at later stages of processing became less extensive, and in many instances business firms offered price concessions to clear their shelves. With the rate of inflation moderating, confidence of the general public was bolstered, and consumer spending strengthened. Business firms were thus able to liquidate a good part of their excess inventories in a rather brief period. Meanwhile, as the demand for credit diminished, tensions in financial markets were relieved, and the liquidity position of both banks and business firms generally improved.

These self-corrective forces internal to the business cycle were aided by fiscal and monetary policies that sought to cushion the effects of economic adversity and to provide some stimulus to economic recovery. On the fiscal side, public employment programs were expanded, unemployment insurance was liberalized, and both personal and corporate income taxes were reduced. On the monetary side, easier credit conditions were fostered, resulting in lower interest rates and a rebuilding of liquidity across the economy.

With the base for economic recovery thus established, business activity has recently begun to improve. Production of goods and services turned up during the second quarter and is continuing to advance. The demand for labor has also improved. Both the number of individuals at work and the length of the workweek are rising again, and unemployment has declined three months in a

row. Retail sales have risen further, and of late residential construction has joined the recovery process.

Along with these favorable developments, however, some ominous signs have emerged. Despite an occasional pause, inflation once again may be accelerating. By the second quarter of this year, the annual rate of increase in the general price level was down to 5½ per cent—about half the rate of inflation registered in the same period a year earlier. But over the summer, prices began to rise more briskly.

This behavior of prices is particularly worrisome in view of the large degree of slack that now exists in most of our nation's industries. Prices increases in various depressed industries—aluminum, steel, autos, industrial chemicals, among others—are a clear warning that our long-range problem of inflation is unsolved and therefore remains a threat to sustained economic recovery.

History suggests that at this early stage of a business upturn, confidence in the economic future should be strengthening steadily. A significant revival of confidence is indeed underway, but it is being hampered by widespread concern that a fresh outburst of double-digit inflation may before long bring on another recession. By now, thoughtful Americans are well aware of the profoundly disruptive consequences of inflation for our economy. They also recognize that these consequences are not solely of an economic character. Inflation has capricious effects on the income and wealth of a nation's families, and this inevitably causes disillusionment and discontent. Social and political frictions tend to multiply, and the very foundations of a society may be endangered. This has become evident in other nations around the world, where governments have toppled as a result of the social havoc wrought by inflation.

If we in the United States wish to enjoy the fruits of a prosperous economy and to preserve our democratic institutions, we must come to grips squarely with the inflation that has been troubling our nation throughout much of the postwar period, and most grievously during the past decade.

A first step in this process is to recognize the true character of the problem. Our long-run problem of inflation has its roots in the structure of our economic institutions and in the financial policies of our government. All too frequently, this basic fact is clouded by external events that influence the rate of inflation—such as a crop shortfall that results in higher farm prices, or the action of a foreign cartel that raises oil prices. The truth is that, for many years now, the economies of the United States and many other countries have developed a serious underlying bias toward inflation. This tendency has simply been magnified by the special influences that occasionally arise.

A major cause of this inflationary bias is the relative success that modern industrial nations have had in moderating the swings of the business cycle. Before World War II, cyclical declines of business activity in our country were typically longer and more severe than they have been during the past thirty years. In the environment then prevailing, the price level typically declined in the course of a business recession, and many months or years elapsed before prices returned to their previous peak.

In recent decades, a new pattern of wage and price behavior has emerged. Prices of many individual commodities still demonstrate a tendency to decline when demand weakens. The average level of prices, however, hardly ever declines. Wage rates have become even more inflexible. Wage reductions are nowadays rare even in severely depressed industries and the average level of wage rates continues to rise inexorably in the face of widespread unemployment.

These developments have profoundly altered the economic environment. When prices are pulled up by expanding demand in a time of prosperity, and are also pushed up by rising costs during a slack period, the decisions of the economic community are sure to be influenced, and may in fact be dominated, by expectations of continuing inflation.

Thus, many businessmen have come to believe that the trend of production costs will be inevitably upward, and their resistance to higher prices—whether of labor, or materials, or equipment—has therefore diminished. Labor leaders and workers now tend to reason that in order to achieve a gain in real income, they must bargain for wage increases that allow for advances in the price level as well as for such improvements as may occur in productivity. Lenders in their turn expect to be paid back in cheaper dollars, and therefore tend to hold out for higher interest rates. They are able to do so because the resistance of borrowers to high interest rates is weakened by their anticipation of rising prices.

These patterns of thought are closely linked to the emphasis that governments everywhere have placed on rapid economic growth throughout the postwar period. Western democracies, including our own, have tended to move promptly to check economic recession, but they have moved hesitantly in checking inflation. Western governments have also become more diligent in seeking ways to relieve the burdens of adversity facing their peoples. In the process they have all moved a considerable distance towards the welfare state.

In the United States, for example, the unemployment insurance system has been greatly liberalized. Benefits now run to as individuals with after-tax incomes almost individuals with after-tax incomes almost as large as their earnings from prior employment. Social security benefits too have been expanded materially, thus facilitating retirement or easing the burden of job loss for older workers. Welfare programs have been established for a large part of the population, and now include food stamps, school lunches, medicare and medicaid, public housing, and many other forms of assistance.

Protection from economic hardship has been extended by our government to business firms as well. The rigors of competitive enterprise are nowadays eased by import quotas, tariffs, price maintenance laws, and other forms of governmental regulation. Farmers, homebuilders, small businesses, and other groups are provided special credit facilities and other assistance. And even large firms of national reputation look to the Federal Government for sustenance when they get into trouble.

Many, perhaps most, of these governmental programs have highly commendable objectives, but they have been pursued without adequate regard for their cost or method of financing. Governmental budgets—at the Federal, State, and local level—have mounted and at times, as in the case of New York City, have literally gotten out of control. In the past ten years, Federal expenditures have increased by 175 per cent. Over that interval, the fiscal deficit of the Federal Government, including government-sponsored enterprises, has totalled over $200 billion. In the current fiscal year alone, we are likely to add another $80 billion or more to that total. In financing these large and continuing deficits, pressure has been placed on our credit mechanisms, and the supply of money has frequently grown at a rate inconsistent with general price stability.

Changes in market behavior have contributed to the inflationary bias of our economy. In many businesses, price competition has given way to other forms of rivalry—advertising, changes in product design, and "hard-sell" salesmanship. In labor markets, when an excessive wage increase occurs, it is apt to spread faster and more widely than before, partly because workmen have become more sensitive to wage developments elsewhere, partly also because many employers have found that a stable work force can be best maintained by emulating wage settlements in unionized industries. For their part, trade unions at times seem to attach higher priority to wage increases than to jobs of their members. Moreover, the spread of trade unions to the rapidly expanding public sector has fostered during recent years numerous strikes, some of them clearly illegal, and they have often resulted in acceptance of union demands—however extreme. Needless to say, the apparent helplessness of governments to deal with this problem has encouraged other trade unions to exercise their latent market power more boldly.

The growth of our foreign trade and of capital movements to and from the United States has also increased the susceptibility of the American economy to inflationary trends. National economies around the world are now more closely interrelated, so that inflationary developments in one country are quickly communicated to others and become mutually reinforcing. Moreover, the adoption of a flexible exchange rate system—though beneficial in dealing with large-scale adjustments of international payments, such as those arising from the sharp rise in oil prices—may have made the Western world more prone to inflation by weakening the discipline of the balance of payments. Furthermore, since prices nowadays are more flexible upwards than downwards, any sizable decline in the foreign exchange value of the dollar is apt to have larger and more lasting effects on our price level than any offsetting appreciation of the dollar.

The long-run upward trend of prices in this country stems fundamentally from the financial policies of our government and the changing character of our economic institutions. This trend has been accentuated by new cultural values and standards, as is evidenced by pressures for wage increases every year, more holidays, longer vacations, and more liberal coffee breaks. The upward trend of prices has also been accentuated by the failure of business firms to invest sufficiently in the modernization and improvement of industrial plant. In recent years, the United States has been devoting a smaller part of its economic resources to business capital expenditures than any other major industrial nation in the world. All things considered, we should not be surprised that the rate of improvement in output per manhour has weakened over the past fifteen years, or that rapidly rising money wages have overwhelmed productivity gains and boosted unit labor costs of production.

Whatever may have been true in the past, there is no longer a meaningful trade-off between unemployment and inflation. In the current environment, a rapidly rising level of consumer prices will not lead to the creation of new jobs. On the contrary, it will lead to hesitation and sluggish buying, as the increase of the personal savings rate in practically every industrial nation during these recent years of rapid inflation indicates. In general, stimulative financial policies have considerable merit when unemployment is extensive and inflation weak or absent; but such policies do not work well once inflation has come to dominate the thinking of a nation's consumers and businessmen. To be sure, highly expansionary monetary and fiscal policies might, for a short time, provide some additional thrust to economic activity. But inflation would inevitably accelerate—a development that would create even more difficult economic problems than we have encountered over the past year.

Conventional thinking about stabilization policies is inadequate and out of date. We must now seek ways of bringing unemploy-

ment down without becoming engulfed by a new wave of inflation. The areas that need to be explored are many and difficult, and we may not find quickly the answers we seek. But if we are to have any chance of ridding our economy of its inflationary bias, we must at least be willing to reopen our economic minds. In the time remaining this evening, I shall briefly sketch several broad lines of attack on the dual problem of unemployment and inflation that seem promising to me.

First, governmental efforts are long overdue to encourage improvements in productivity through larger investment in modern plant and equipment. This objective would be promoted by overhauling the structure of Federal taxation, so as to increase incentives for business capital spending and for equity investments in American enterprises.

Second, we must face up to the fact that environmental and safety regulations have in recent years played a troublesome role in escalating costs and prices and in holding up industrial construction across our land. I am concerned, as are all thoughtful citizens, with the need to protect the environment and to improve in other ways the quality of life. I am also concerned, however, about the dampening effect of excessive governmental regulations on business activity. Progress towards full employment and price stability would be measurably improved, I believe, by stretching out the timetable for achieving our environmental and safety goals.

Third, a vigorous search should be made for ways to enhance price competition among our nation's business enterprises. We need to gather the courage to reassess laws directed against restraint of trade by business firms and to improve the enforcement of these laws. We also need to reassess the highly complex governmental regulations affecting transportation, the effects on consumer prices of remaining fair trade laws, the monopoly of first-class mail by the Postal Service, and the many other laws and practices that impede the competitive process.

Fourth, in any serious search for noninflationary measures to reduce unemployment, governmental policies that affect labor markets have to be reviewed. For example, the Federal minimum wage law is still pricing many teenagers out of the job market. The Davis-Bacon Act continues to escalate construction costs and damage the depressed construction industry. Programs for unemployment compensation now provide benefits on such a generous scale that they may be blunting incentives to work. Even in today's environment, with about 8 per cent of the labor force unemployed, there are numerous job vacancies—perhaps because job seekers are unaware of the opportunities, or because the skills of the unemployed are not suitable, or for other reasons. Surely, better results could be achieved with more effective job banks, more realistic training programs, and other labor market policies.

I believe that the ultimate objective of labor market policies should be to eliminate all involuntary unemployment. This is not a radical or impractical goal. It rests on the simple but often neglected fact that work is far better than the dole, both for the jobless individual and for the nation. A wise government will always strive to create an environment that is conducive to high employment in the private sector. Nevertheless, there may be no way to reach the goal of full employment short of making the government an employer of last resort. This could be done by offering public employment—for example, in hospitals, schools, public parks, or the like—to anyone who is willing to work at a rate of pay somewhat below the Federal minimum wage.

With proper administration, these public service workers would be engaged in productive labor, not leaf-raking or other makework. To be sure, such a program would not reach those who are voluntarily unemployed, but there is also no compelling reason why it should do so. What it would do is to make jobs available for those who need to earn some money.

It is highly important, of course, that such a program should not become a vehicle for expanding public jobs at the expense of private industry. Those employed at the special public jobs will need to be encouraged to seek more remunerative and more attractive work. This could be accomplished by building into the program certain safeguards—perhaps through a Constitutional amendment—that would limit upward adjustment in the rate of pay for these special public jobs. With such safeguards, the budgetary cost of eliminating unemployment need not be burdensome. I say this, first, because the number of individuals accepting the public service jobs would be much smaller than the number now counted as unemployed; second, because the availability of public jobs would permit sharp reduction in the scope of unemployment insurance and other governmental programs to alleviate income loss. To permit active searching for a regular job, however, unemployment insurance for a brief period—perhaps 13 weeks or so—would still serve a useful function.

Finally, we also need to rethink the appropriate role of an incomes policy in the present environment. Lasting benefits cannot be expected from a mandatory wage and price control program, as recent experience indicates. It might actually be helpful if the Congress renounced any intention to return to mandatory controls, so that businesses and trade unions could look forward with confidence to the continuance of free markets. I still believe, however, that a modest form of incomes policy, in some cases relying on quiet governmental intervention, in others on public hearings and the mobilization of public opinion, may yet be of significant benefit in reducing abuses of private economic power and moving our nation towards the goal of full employment and a stable price level.

Structural reforms of our economy, along some such lines as I have sketched, deserve more attention this critical year from members of the Congress and from academic students of public policy than they are receiving. Economists in particular have tended to concentrate excessively on over-all fiscal and monetary policies of economic stimulation. These traditional tools remain useful and even essential; but once inflationary expectations have become widespread, they must be used with great care and moderation.

This, then, is the basic message that I want to leave with you: our nation cannot now achieve the goal of full employment by pursuing fiscal and monetary policies that rekindle inflationary expectations. Inflation has weakened our economy; it is also endangering our economic and political system based on freedom. America has become enmeshed in an inflationary web, and we need to gather our moral strength and intellectual courage to extricate ourselves from it. I hope that all of you will join in this struggle for America's future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business to attend the regional hearings of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee.

Mr. ERLENBORN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, May 21, 1976, through May 27, 1976, on account of official business.

Messrs. ENGLISH and HIGHTOWER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HEFNER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. SEBELIUS (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business with the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), after 11 a.m., today, on account of official business.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for May 21 and May 24, on account of official business.

Mr. MILFORD (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MADIGAN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MANN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HAMILTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DANIELSON, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ADDABBO, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DODD, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ALEXANDER, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANDERSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MADIGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GRADISON.
Mr. HANSEN.
Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.
Mr. KINDNESS.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. MICHEL.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MANN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ.
Mr. RICHMOND in two instances.
Mr. MCDONALD of Georgia in two instances.
Mr. HALL.
Ms. ABZUG.
Mr. DODD.
Mr. FISHER.
Mrs. BURKE of California in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS of Ohio, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had ex-

amined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5272. An act to amend the Noise Control Act of 1972 to authorize additional appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1976, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NATCHER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 13965. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 94–1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 4634. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweek of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 94–1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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 Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 13945. A bill to establish within the Energy Research and Development Administration a program of Federal grants to assist States in carrying out solar energy community utility programs; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 13946. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for optometric and medical vision care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 13947. A bill to establish a pilot system for the periodic review and for the termination, continuation, or reestablishment of Federal agencies and independent regulatory agencies; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Rules.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama (for himself and Mr. WHITTEN):

H.R. 13948. A bill to designate the U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station in Vicksburg, Miss., as the Will M. Whittington Waterways Experiment Station; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 13949. A bill to establish within the Energy Research and Development Administration a program of Federal grants to assist States in carrying out solar energy community utility programs; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. MINK, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. CARR, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. BENITEZ):

H.R. 13950. 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13951. A bill to provide an opportunity to individuals to contribute $1, in connection with the payment of their Federal income tax, to the U.S. Olympic Fund, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 13952. A bill to reaffirm the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce; to grant additional authority to the Federal Communications Commission to authorize mergers of carriers when deemed to be in the public interest; to reaffirm the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service; to require the Federal Communications Commission to make certain findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 13953. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers of securities registered pursuant to section 12 of such act to maintain accurate records and to furnish reports relating to certain foreign payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. TREEN):

H.R. 13954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for payment by the Government of all reasonable litigation expenses to prevailing taxpayers in legal action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES (for himself, Mr. REUSS, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LUNDINE, and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 13955. A bill to provide for amendment of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13956. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska (for herself, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 13957. A bill to provide for the establishment of the George W. Norris Home National Historic Site in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself and Mr. O'BRIEN):

H.R. 13958. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TSONGAS (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. DU PONT, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 13959. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 to establish an Office of Youth Employment in the Department of Labor to administer youth programs under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TSONGAS (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PATTERSON of California, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee):

H.R. 13960. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 to establish an Office of Youth Employment in the Department of Labor to administer youth programs under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 13961. A bill to amend sections 203 and 204 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 13962. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for individual supplemental retirement savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 13963. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the estate tax exemption from $60,000 to $200,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 13965. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DICKINSON introduced a bill (H.R. 13964) for the relief of Jeanette Green, as mother of the minor child, Ricky Baker, deceased, and as widow and administratrix of the estate of Enoch Odell Baker, deceased; and for the relief of Mary Jane Baker Nolan, individually, and as widow and administratrix of the estate of John William Baker, deceased, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

470. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Cyprus Committee for Refugees, Nicosia, Cyprus, relative to recent agreements between the United States and Turkey and Greece, which was referred to the Committee on International Relations.

FACTUAL DESCRIPTIONS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Prepared by the Congressional Research Service pursuant to clause 5(d) of House rule X. Previous listing ap-

peared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20, 1976, page 14960:

HOUSE BILLS

H.R. 13511. May 3, 1976. House Administration. Establishes an Art Bank in Congress, governed by a board of directors and an Executive Director, to select works of art sent to the Art Bank by American artists to be displayed in the House and Senate Office Buildings.

H.R. 13512. May 3, 1976. Atomic Energy. Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish procedures for expeditious review of applications for the licensing of sites for, and construction and operation of, nuclear production and utilization facilities. Requires that opportunity for public hearings on relevant safety and environmental factors be incorporated into the licensing procedure.

H.R. 13513. May 3, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a limited tax deduction for amounts paid during the taxable year for the education of the taxpayer or any dependent at an institution of higher education.

H.R. 13514. May 3, 1976. Judiciary. Grants to aliens of Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, who are presently in the United States on student visas, status as permanent residents of the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act. States that such status changes shall not be charged against immigration quotas.

H.R. 13515. May 3, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Reaffirms the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce. Grants additional authority to the Federal Communications Commission to authorize mergers of carriers when deemed to be in the public interest. Reaffirms the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service. Requires the Federal Communications Commission to make specified findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers.

H.R. 13516. May 3, 1976. Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Provides that for purposes of the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, the following waters lying entirely within the State of New Hampshire are declared nonnavigable: Lake Winnisquam, Lake Winnipesaukee, and specified portions of the Merrimack River.

H.R. 13517. May 3, 1976. Government Operations. Requires Federal agencies or entities to give preference in the awarding of Government contracts, where price is a criterion upon which the award of such contract is based, to contractors located in areas of high unemployment.

H.R. 13518. May 3, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Controlled Substances Act to establish penalties for persons who obtain or attempt to obtain narcotics or other controlled substances from a retail pharmacy by force and violence.

H.R. 13519. May 3, 1976. Veterans' Affairs. Allows the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make payments for tutorial assistance for eligible veterans directly to the educational institution.

H.R. 13520. May 3, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Reaffirms the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce. Grants additional authority to the Federal Communications Commission to authorize mergers of carriers when deemed to be in the public interest. Reaffirms the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service. Requires the Federal Communications Commission to make specified findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers.

H.R. 13521. May 3, 1976. Post Office and Civil Service. Amends the method by which the Federal contribution for Federal employee and annuitant health coverage is determined by basing such contribution on the rates of the two health benefit plans having the highest subscription charges.

H.R. 13522. May 4, 1976. Interior and Insular Affairs. Directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish the National Museum of Afro-American History and Culture in the vicinity of Wilberforce, Ohio.

H.R. 13523. May 4, 1976. Interior and Insular Affairs. Requires the appointment of an election commissioner in American Samoa to conduct a plebiscite on the issue of whether there should be a popular election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of that country.

Provides that a gubernatorial election be held within six months of such plebiscite if there are a majority of affirmative responses.

Enumerates the duties and powers of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of American Samoa.

Authorizes a constitutional convention.

H.R. 13524. May 4, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Reaffirms the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce. Grants additional authority to the Federal Communications Commission to authorize mergers of carriers when deemed to be in the public interest. Reaffirms the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service. Requires the Federal Communications Commission to make specified findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers.

H.R. 13525. May 5, 1976. Government Operations. Requires, under the office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, that Federal agencies pay interest at an annual rate of at least 12 percent on any payment which is overdue by more than two weeks on a contract with a small business concern.

H.R. 13526. May 4, 1976. Judiciary. Grants a Federal charter to the International Veteran Boxers Association.

H.R. 13527. May 4, 1976. Education and Labor; Post Office and Civil Service. Amends the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to provide for the convening of arbitration panels to resolve complaints that handicapped individuals have been discriminated against in hiring by any Federal agency, Federal contractor, or program receiving Federal financial assistance.

Establishes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an office to assist handicapped individuals in obtaining employment.

H.R. 13528. May 4, 1976. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the National Trials System Act to direct a study of the desirability and feasibility of designating the Nez Perce Trail, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana as a national scenic trail.

H.R. 13529. May 4, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Requires franchisors to give franchisees 90 days notice, with limited exceptions, of intent to cancel, or failure to renew a franchise agreement. Allows such cancellation or failure to renew only for certain specified reasons. Requires a franchisor to compensate a franchisee for the value of the franchisee's business when the franchisor, for a legitimate business reason, fails to renew the franchise. Sets forth the judicial remedies available to a franchisee for a violation of this Act by a franchisor.

H.R. 13530. May 4, 1976. Ways and Means. Allows an individual to take a tax credit, under the Internal Revenue Code, for a percentage of the qualified solar heating and cooling equipment expenditures incurred with respect to the taxpayer's principal residence. Allows a tax credit for the portion of the qualified State or local real property attributable to such solar heating and cooling expenditures.

Authorizes an individual to take a tax deduction for a part of the acquisition costs of any qualified solar heating and cooling equipment for any residence.

H.R. 13531. May 4, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act to include, as a home health service in the medicare program, nutritional counseling provided by or under the supervision of a registered dietitian.

H.R. 13532. May 4, 1976. Ways and Means. Exempts from Federal income taxation, under the Internal Revenue Code, a corporation organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit for the purpose of providing, either or both, reserve funds for, and insurance of, shares and deposits in credit unions which have no capital stock and are organized and operated for mutual purposes and not for profit.

H.R. 13533. May 4, 1976. Ways and Means. Provides that in any legal action initiated by the Government, or in any action instituted by a taxpayer contesting the accuracy of a deficiency or claiming a refund of taxes paid where the taxpayer prevails or substantially prevails, the Government shall be liable for the reimbursement in full of all reasonable litigation expenses incurred by the taxpayer as a consequence of legal defense, under the Internal Revenue Code.

H.R. 13534. May 4, 1976. Judiciary. Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse State and local governments for expenditures made at the request of the U.S. Secret Service for the protection of any person the Service is authorized to protect.

H.R. 13535. May 4, 1976. Public Works and Transportation. Prohibits common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel.

Amends the Urban Mass Transportation Act to direct that financial aid preference be given to States and local public bodies which will adopt specially reduced rates during nonrush hours for elderly persons.

H.R. 13536. May 4, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require disclosure on food package labels of the portion of the weight of the food which is sugar in instances where sugar constitutes ten percent or more of the total number of calories in the food.

H.R. 13537. May 4, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Reaffirms the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce. Grants additional authority to the Federal Communications Commission to authorize mergers of carriers when deemed to be in the public interest. Reaffirms the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service. Requires the Federal Communications Commission to make specified findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers.

H.R. 13538. May 4, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act by removing the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance benefits.

H.R. 13539. May 4, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Reaffirms the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce. Grants additional author-

ity to the Federal Communications Commission to authorize mergers of carriers when deemed to be in the public interest. Reaffirms the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service. Requires the Federal Communications Commission to make specified findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers.

H.R. 13540. May 4, 1976. Agriculture. Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate any person who raises or transports hogs for reasonable losses which were incurred as a result of hog cholera controls imposed by the Secretary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WORLD DEMAND FOR SOY PROTEIN

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, although the soybean is under attack from the increased importation of palm oil, its versatility offers sound prospects for the future. Palm oil is no substitute for soybeans to meet the needs of a world short of protein.

New uses of soy protein as an extender or as textured vegetable protein are taking their place along with the time honored and traditional uses of soy protein in the human diet or as protein supplement for animal feeds.

Research on increased soybean yields and dietary acceptance of the soy product will result in decreasing the world's protein shortage.

The soybean producer is encouraged by the increase in foreign demand for soy protein. Overseas growth, related to price of alternative food and need is outstripping U.S. demand for textured vegetable protein and extender products.

The following article from the Wall Street Journal is an excellent update on the exciting progress of the soy protein industry.

The article follows:

FOREIGN DEMAND FOR SOY PROTEIN IS SEEN TIED MORE TO ECONOMICS THAN NUTRITION

(By David P. Garino)

St. Louis. Foreign countries are developing quite an appetite for soy protein.

In Poland, for instance, by government decree, Polish sausage and other meats contain soy protein. In Japan, a soy fiber resembling spaghetti is being used increasingly to extend beef and fish. In West Germany, soy protein goes into coffee whiteners, and in South Africa, the meat pie, a traditional dish, is likely to contain some soy protetin.

While figures are hard to come by, international demand for soy protein is growing faster than domestic demand, industry experts say.

R. E. Burket, a vice president of Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., a soy processor in Decatur, Ill., isn't surprised. He says that "in the U.S. we spend 18% of our disposable income on food. In Western Europe it's 25%, and more than that in Eastern Europe. In developing countries, it's about 40%." Mr. Burket concludes: "We're believers in the overseas market."

GREATER PROTEIN NEEDS OVERSEAS

"Protein needs overseas are obviously greater than in the U.S.," adds Paul F. Cornelsen, executive vice president of Ralston Purina Co., another maker of soy protein. "The protein industry is in its infancy. No one knows what the maximum potential is."

Last year's recession reduced demand in Western Europe for the best-known soy protein, the textured variety, which is used primarily as a meat extender. In 1976, however, sales are resuming a 15% to 20% growth rate.

Sales of isolates, a form of soy protein made by changing soy's molecular structure, climbed about 60% last year, following a gain of about 40% in 1974, Ralston says. Isolates are used to make substitutes for existing foods rather than additions to them. Isolates are about 95% protein; textured soy protein is about 50% protein.

Soy isolates require considerably more capital investment to develop than do extenders, but "they certainly are more versatile," says W. L. Golden, Ralston director of venture management. Ralston is concentrating its soy-protein efforts in this area, he says. The company currently markets about nine different isolates. In raw form, they resemble cream-white powders.

As might be expected, the best foreign markets for soy protein have been Western Europe and Japan, which have sophisticated food-processing systems. But Paul H. Hatfield, director of Ralston's protein and dairy foods systems division, notes, "There has been an upsurge in demand from Eastern Europe."

Ralston recently was host to a Yugoslav contingent of government and industrial representatives interested in utilization of vegetable protein at its corporate headquarters here. This fall, soy-protein seminars will be conducted in Warsaw and Moscow under the auspices of the American Soybean Association and the Agriculture Department's Foreign Agricultural Service.

Phillip St. Clair, general manager of Cargill Inc.'s protein products department, finds Eastern Europe most attractive. "All you have to do is to convince the local government and make one sale," he asserts. "Of course it isn't quite that simple," he adds with a chuckle.

The Middle East also "looks very exciting," Mr. St. Clair continues. "So far sales have been few, but the potential is good," he says. The Shah of Iran, for example, has said he wants to improve school-lunch programs. "One neat thing is that they have lots of money, and a dietary need for protein," Mr. St. Clair says.

MARKET IN SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa also is emerging as a major market, agricultural companies say. Mr. Burket from Archer-Daniels-Midland notes that "sales to Nigeria are picking up nicely." Mr. Hatfield from Ralston says major inroads also have been made in Colombia, Peru and Venezuela.

Although soy protein is being used in an ever-increasing spectrum of foods, its major use continues to be as a meat extender and substitute. And it's largely a matter of economics rather than nutrition, Mr. Hatfield says.

"As a rule of thumb," Mr. Hatfield explains, "it takes two to 2½ pounds of feed to produce one pound of chicken; 3½ to four pounds for one pound of pork, and four to five pounds for one pound of beef, and that's live weight." When feed prices rise as they have in recent years, meat production becomes more costly.

A meat shortage in Poland apparently has made the government receptive to soy protein, for example. But in Australia, which has an abundant meat supply, "soy protein has met with a less than enthusiastic response," Cargill's Mr. St. Clair says.

In the United Kingdom, with its severe economic problems, the high cost of meat boosted Ralston's soy-protein sales there "sharply" in 1975, Mr. Golden says.

SALES IN JAPAN

Likewise, in Japan, sales of a structured isolate resembling spaghetti "met our sales target last year," Mr. Golden says. Adds Mr. Hatfield, "The Japanese import so much beef that soy protein makes economic sense. The Japanese are developing quite a taste for beef," Ralston has just begun test marketing an extended fresh ground meat in Japanese supermarkets.

World-wide, prospective demand is running well ahead of Ralston's productive capability, Mr. Golden says. The company which makes international shipments from plants in Louisville and Memphis, is bringing more capacity on stream in the U.S. More importantly, the company is moving ahead on plans for an isolate plant in Europe. Currently, Ralston has field product-development labs in the U.K., Denmark, Sweden, France and Italy.

Archer-Daniels-Midland, which operates a plant in Manchester, England, is planning another near Rotterdam, Mr. Burket says.

ORDERS COME SLOWER

Despite the optimistic outlook, soy-protein sales abroad aren't made easily or quickly. Mr. Hatfield says that a year to a year-and-a-half may pass from an initial presentation to a firm order. "One obstacle is that we are selling something new," he says. "The key is getting to decision-makers."

Legal barriers are also obstacles. West Germany, for instance, doesn't permit use of soy protein in meat. And, to protect payment balances and domestic soybean processors, some South and Central American countries have established prohibitive tariffs that are in some cases greater than the cost of the soy protein.

Cargill's Mr. St. Clair also cautions those who think "soy protein will feed the world. They forget two things," he says. "This would require a substantial change in eating habits in some parts of the world, and that's tough." In addition, "Compared with other belly-filling foods such as rice, corn, wheat and potatoes, soy protein in almost any form is relatively expensive." He concludes: "Those countries which need protein the most just don't have the money."

SRI LANKA MARKS FOURTH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 22, marks the fourth anniversary of the Republic of Sri Lanka, and signals a most significant upcoming year for the Ceylonese people. For the seventh time since gaining independence from

the British in 1948, the citizens of Sri Lanka will elect a new government through the universal adult suffrage provided by their constitution. Underscoring Sri Lanka's emerging leadership in the developing world, the young nation will be the site of the fifth Non-Aligned Summit Conference, the first ever to be held in Asia.

Sri Lanka's growing eminence among developing nations has been bolstered by the internal progress this country has achieved. In 1974, the Sri Lankan population increased only 1.6 percent, a striking figure for the third world. Trade with the United States has grown significantly in both directions, and a new river diversion project promises irrigation for the dry northern lands and increasing agricultural self-sufficiency.

But while progress and prosperity—as measured by Western indices—are coming to Sri Lanka in these clearly observed ways, the island and the Ceylonese people maintain their essential Asian character and traditions. The Dalada Maligava, a temple located in the city of Kandy, is one of the truly holy places in the Buddhist world. Each year, devout Buddhists from across the globe come to the temple for the Kandy Perahera, one of the most spectacular religious festivals in Asia. The continuing Asian tradition—undiminished in the face of increasing progress and the growth of a middle class—augurs well for the future of Sri Lanka and for the relationship between our two nations.

The Asian world view, more philosophical and reflective than our own, will surely provide new approaches and perceptions of the demanding issues at the core of the relationship between the developed and developing worlds. Recent history has demonstrated that we have no monopoly on wisdom, and the strong and friendly ties between the United States and Sri Lanka are in themselves a hopeful sign for the future as we face the mutual problems of food, population, and energy.

I am confident that the benefits of freedom—including the economic freedom which an expanding private enterprise makes possible—will continue to be realized in the future experiences of the people of Sri Lanka.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy a warm personal relationship with Mr. Neville Kanakaratne, the distinguished Sri Lankan Ambassador, and it is a privilege to congratulate him—and through him, his government and people—on the strides Sri Lanka has made in its first 4 years, on the anniversary of its constitution and on the progress that seems certain to continue.

BETTER SPEECH AND HEARING MONTH

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, May is Better Speech and Hearing Month. Currently, speech pathologists and audiologists are focusing public attention on the services available to people with hearing and speech disorders. For example, in my district, the Cincinnati Speech and Hearing Center will be providing free hearing-screening tests on Fountain Square from May 24 to May 26.

Speech, language, and hearing disorders can adversely affect social interaction, create emotional problems, make it difficult to find a job, or force people to accept a less satisfying job. Such disorders in children are often educational handicaps. In addition, they may be symptoms of serious medical or psychological problems.

One out of twenty Americans suffer from speech or language disorders such as stuttering, difficulty in articulation, voice disorders, aphasia—loss of speech and language abilities generally resulting from stroke—and slowness among children in developing language skills. Seven percent of all Americans have hearing disorders, which include the inability to hear sounds loudly or clearly enough and the inability to understand speech even when it is heard sufficiently loudly and clearly. Audiology and speech pathology are far more sophisticated than in Demosthenes' day. Hearing, language, and speech disorders can be diagnosed and treated if people take the time to have their own and their family's speech and hearing tested. For those who have not done so recently, Better Speech and Hearing Month is a perfect time to have these tests done.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2763

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Roger W. Ach of Middletown, Ohio, who is the president of Chester Products, Inc., testified before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in support of H.R. 2763.

Mr. Ach's comments were directed to the need for providing for funding assistance to provide sheltered recreational facilities. I think it is particularly pertinent to note the support for this proposal given by an outstanding civic-minded, social-conscious businessman with 30 years of association with the field of recreation.

The testimony of Mr. Roger W. Ach follows:

STATEMENT BY ROGER W. ACH OF MIDDLETOWN, OHIO, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2763 AND IDENTICAL LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Distinguished Committee: My name is Roger W. Ach of Middletown, Ohio. I welcome this opportunity to offer my comments on the important legislation now being considered by your Committee.

I have had more than thirty years background in the recreational field during which time I have advocated a broadened governmental policy as provided in the legislation before you. I am particularly impressed by the provision that affords assistance for sheltered facilities. This provision is long overdue and I wish to commend the Chairman and the other Sponsors for the enlightened recognition of this vital need. Surely, recreational opportunities for all Americans must not be confined by climatic limitations.

As the corporate head of Chester Products, Inc., a firm which is primarily involved in large community and institutional pool manufacture and installation, I have repeatedly advocated the use of sheltered or semi-sheltered installations so that the greatest number of Americans could enjoy the year-round benefits of aquatic sports. With installations that range from the tropics to Alaska, my firm recognizes the value of 12 month availability to swimming and related sports activities for the vast majority of our citizens who are deprived of this healthful recreation during the colder months. This is especially true in urban areas where the need for all-year recreation facilities is the most desperate. Therefore, I hail those purposes now included in H.R. 2763 and its related bills and respectfully urge the passage of this bill.

Again, I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the Members of this Committee for providing this opportunity to share my experience in this area of our mutual interest.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—A CIVILIAN OR MILITARY AUTHORIZATION?

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted in favor of an amendment to strike all funds for nuclear weapons activities from the Energy Research and Development Administration—ERDA—authorization bill. I did so with some hesitation for several reasons which I respectfully submit to my colleagues to ponder.

First, I am not categorically against the authorization of funds for the development of nuclear weapons systems and their application. There is no doubt in my mind that the United States needs a strong national defense; but authorizations for the development and the application of these weapons systems should not be contained in a bill primarily designed to explore and develop new avenues for the generation of energy for the individual homeowner and industrial user.

I doubt the efficacy of providing funds for the development of nuclear weapons systems and their application in an essentially civilian-oriented authorization bill. It would be a much better procedural arrangement to have these funding levels placed within the context of a separate authorization bill, or perhaps in the annual military authorization bill. By such a procedure, I believe, the Congress would have a chance to exercise a greater degree of oversight in this area and could possibly prevent the duplication of research in the field of nuclear weapons systems. Even the Office of Management and Budget has recommended that there

be created a separate budget category for nuclear weapons activities.

These could be some of the initial steps toward a more efficient and productive means of determining what nuclear weapons activities are necessary toward our national defense. The separation of such authorizations would give the Congress, I believe, a greater control over the expenditures of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

Authorizations for military weapons and their applications should not be cloaked in an authorization bill essentially designed to develop and explore and give added impetus to new avenues of energy sources and its generation to meet the future domestic and manufacturing energy demands of our Nation.

NOT ALL JOURNALISTS ARE SELF-BLINDED ABOUT MEXICO

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there has been an attempt to ridicule and embarrass those Members of the House who joined with me in calling to the attention of President Ford the serious situation which appears to be developing in Mexico.

Perhaps we need to keep in mind that an unfashionable minority pointed to the dangers of Fidel Castro, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nkrumah of Ghana, and many others who were lauded by the State Department and the liberal press, but who turned out to be Red dictators.

Our warnings about Mexico stem from countless events published in the Mexican press, from the words of both President Echeverria and presidential candidate Lopez Portillo, and from other sources within Mexico. We have not been challenged on the facts.

It is gratifying to note that not all journalists are prepared to ignore a great potential danger to the United States.

An article follows:

[From the Copley News Service, May 21, 1976]

A MARXIST MEXICO IN THE MAKING?

(By Jeffrey St. John)

WASHINGTON.—"Surely you must agree," thirty U.S. Congressmen wrote President Ford in a letter on May 5, 1976, "that the development of a Cuban or Chilean 'road to socialism' in neighboring Mexico would pose a tremendous danger to the United States."

The Mexican-U.S. border stretches for some fifteen hundred miles, most of it unguarded. Yet, here are thirty members of Congress warning an American President that a Marxist takeover is in the making along that border! The foreign policy failures of Ford and Kissinger in Angola, Rhodesia, and their attempt to negotiate away U.S. sovereignty on the Panama Canal seem insignificant by comparison. "Within the past year," the letter to Mr. Ford states, "long strides toward the imposition of a Communist regime have been taken by Mexican President Luis Echverria, who appears to be making himself acceptable to Moscow and Havana."

Bluntly the letter infers that Secretary of State Kissinger has failed to keep the President informed on what has been transpiring in Mexico. In the last twelve months a campaign of violence against property owners has been unleashed by armed Marxist bands as a prelude to total collectivized takeover by the Mexican government. "Officially tolerated land seizures are widespread," asserted the letter to the President. "Compulsory textbook changes are intended to indoctrinate young Mexicans with Castroite propagnada. An amnesty has been proposed that would release hardened Communist cadres from prison and allow them to enter the government."

Most of those whom Mexican President Echeverria plans to release, prior to the expiration of his term as Mexican chief executives in June, stage-managed the bloody and violent "student riots" during the 1968 Olympic Games. President Echeverria, furthermore, has taken into his government the former Chilians who had been foreign minister, minister of economics, and the head of Chile's far-left Socialist party after all three fled Chile when a military junta threw out the Marxist government of the late Salvadore Allende.

"We could and did maintain a very detached attitude," Congressman Steven D. Symms (R-Ida.) observed, one of the thirty Congressmen who signed the May 5 letter to President Ford, "when the Marxists took over in Chile some years ago. However, we have a common border with Mexico and in recent years our relations have been good. But, if the people presently guiding the land seizures and other manuevers in Mexico have their way, the border separating the two countries could become one of conflict."

The alarming and dangerous developments in Mexico are apparently the result of personal ambitions of President Echeverria who has been campaigning for two years to succeed Kurt Waldheim as United Nations Secretary General when his term expires this year. Echeverria knows that the Communist bloc in the U.N. could block his burning ambition to be U.N. Secretary General. Thus, he apparently is prepared to hand Mexico over to the Marxists in exchange for Communist support for the top United Nations post!

The Ford administration, which has been outmanuevered and beaten in Vietnam, Angola, Rhodesia, and by detente with the Russians, because of Henry Kissinger's policies, could serve notice to Echeverria that the U.S. is prepared to block his ambitions. However, does Ford even know what is happening on our Southern border? "Under the circumstances," the thirty Congressmen wrote to the President, "we believe it is very important to determine whether or not the Department of State, under the direction of Henry Kissinger, has seen fit to inform you of this problem. Certainly there has been no effort to inform us, or the public."

If Mr. Ford fails to respond publicly to the grave issue raised by his former Congressional colleagues, Republican challenger Ronald Reagan would be justified in making it a major campaign issue.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION ON MISSED VOTE

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I was in Delaware, and missed a recorded vote in the House. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 289.

"GREAT AMERICA" THEME PARK

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a Bicentennial spectacular will be the grand opening May 27 in my congressional district of the Marriott theme park, "Great America."

This more than $60 million family entertainment park in Gurnee, Ill., is an example of the best in our free enterprise system, another tribute to our Nation on its 200th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, the initiative of the Marriott Corp., spearheaded in this project by J. Willard Marriott, Jr., president and chief executive officer, will bring to Illinois and my 13th Congressional District five examples of Americana which will attract, entertain, and most importantly, educate countless millions of visitors.

These five themes are hometown square, life in a rural town in the 1920's; Yukon territory, a depiction of Klondike gold rush days; Yankee harbor, a journey through early America and a 19th century New England fishing village; the great Midwest livestock exposition and county fair at the turn of the century, and Orleans place, the old South in the mid-1800's.

Citizens of the Village of Gurnee and especially village officials, headed by Mayor Richard Welton, have worked with the Marriott Corp. in this "Great America" project.

During the 2 years since groundbreaking ceremonies which I was privileged to attend, literally thousands of my constituents have been employed as tradesmen and in other capacities in helping in its construction and development. Hundreds more will work in the park once it is opened.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that over 2½ million visitors will enjoy this new family entertainment park with its focus on our American heritage before it closes for the 1976 season October 3.

I take this occasion to draw to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and Americans everywhere this exciting project. I hope many of you have the opportunity to visit "Great America" during this or future years.

Meanwhile, I extend my warm congratulations to Mr. J. Willard Marriott, Sr., Marriott Corp. founder and now board chairman; his son, Mr. J. Willard Marriott, Jr.; Mr. G. Michael Hostage, president of the Marriott restaurants group which operates the theme parks; Mr. David L .Brown, vice president in charge of theme parks, and Mr. James Bouy, general manager of Gurnee's "Great America."

I also commend everyone who has contributed to making the May 29 grand opening a festive occasion. I hope "Great America" will enjoy a long and prosperous career.

Mr. Speaker, this facility is very

accessible from the Tri-State Tollway It is midway between Chicago and Milwaukee, Wis. Overnight accommodations are plentiful in the area, and if any of my colleagues and their families come in response to this invitation, my district staff and myself will be pleased to cooperate in extending our services.

A REPORT FROM THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, as part of the House Committee on the Budget's notification to the House on the status of the fiscal year 1976 Congressional budget, I am inserting the detailed information which reflects the current level of spending as of close of legislative business, Wednesday, May 19, 1976:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1976.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
H-205 Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In my letter of January 30, 1976, I outlined the procedures which the Committee on the Budget has adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Sec. 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending. I am herewith transmitting a revised status report reflecting completed action as of May 19, 1976.

With warm regards,

BROCK ADAMS, *Chairman.*

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1976 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 466

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF MAY 19, 1976

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level	408,000	374,900	300,800
Current level	403,962	372,367	301,100
Amount remaining	4,038	2,533	300

Budget authority

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and which exceeds $4,038 million for fiscal year 1976, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 466 to be exceeded.

Outlays

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and which would result in outlays exceeding $2,533 million for fiscal year 1976, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 466 to be exceeded.

Revenues

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss exceeding $300 million for fiscal year 1976, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 466.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1976.

Hon. BROCK ADAMS,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays and estimated revenues. These estimates are in comparison with the appropriate levels for the items contained in the recently agreed to concurrent resolution of the 1976 budget. This tabulation is as of close of business May 19, 1976.

This report reflects budget reestimates made since March 18 for fiscal year 1976, and changes due to the conference agreement on the Second Supplemental, 1976 (H.R. 13172).

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
1. Enacted	390,689	362,130	301,100
2. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action			
3. Continuing resolution authority	3,879	1,754	
4. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses	9,394	8,483	
Current level	403,962	372,367	301,100
2d concurrent resolution	408,000	374,900	300,800
Amount remaining	4,038	2,533	300

Sincerely,

JAMES BLUM,
FOR ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL 1976, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 19, 1976

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
I. Enacted:		
Permanent appropriations and trust funds	195,372	181,691
Previously enacted appropriations and other spending authority	118,625	137,791
Offsetting receipts	−53,990	−53,990
Enacted this session:		
Appropriation legislation:		
Defense (Public Law 94-212)	90,467	64,704
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Law 94-206)	36,074	31,131
Legislative branch supplemental, 1976 (Public Law 94-226)	33	
Supplemental railroad appropriation, 1976 (Public Law 54-252)	587	545
Rescission/deferral legislation:		
Deferral resolutions (H. Res. 1058, S. Res. 366, 385, 388, and 408)		16
3d budget rescission bill, 1976 (Public Law 94-249)	−71	−5
Emergency supplemental appropriations, 1976 (Public Law 94-266)	1,942	247
Federal Aid Highway Act (Public Law 94-280)	1,650	--
Subtotal, enacted	390,689	362,130

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
II. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action			
III. Continuing resolution authority:			
Foreign assistance	3,054	1,361	
District of Columbia	385	324	
Labor-HEW items not considered	440	69	
Subtotal, continuing resolution authority	3,879	1,754	
IV. Conference agreement ratified by both Houses: 2d supplemental, 1976 (H.R. 13172)	9,394	8,483	
Total, current level, as of May 19, 1976	403,962	372,367	301,100
2d concurrent resolution	408,000	374,900	300,800
Amount remaining:			
Over ceiling			
Under ceiling	4,038	2,533	300

DELIMITING DATE FOR EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS UNFAIR TO OUR VETERANS

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of testifying before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on the important issue of the delimiting date for veterans' educational benefits.

On June 1, when the time to use educational benefits will expire for 3½ million veterans, New York City and New York State will be very hard hit.

For at least 30 percent of the 120,000 veterans enrolled in courses of study in New York State there will be no further opportunity to obtain the learning experiences necessary to compete in today's changing world.

To deny these men and women the necessary opportunities will be to deny them a future they fought so hard to secure.

As I stated in my testimony, this is an entitlement, not a giveaway, and therefore it is unfair to withdraw a benefit which the veterans have rightfully earned.

I urge both the committee and the Congress to act expeditiously and fairly on this matter so that we will be able to repay these men and women for a job well done.

My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSMAN FRED RICHMOND

I want to thank you for this opportunity to appear here today.

I am here today for several reasons.

I am here because I am a product of the G.I. Bill of Rights. After serving in the Navy, I was allowed to continue my education because of the G.I. Bill of Rights.

I am here because Brooklyn, New York where my district is located has more veterans than any other county in New York State. There are approximately 320,000 veterans in Kings County.

I also have the distinction of representing New York City Community College which has 2500 veterans enrolled in its program out of approximately 11,000 students. The City University system in New York has 25,000 veterans of its 250,000 students enrolled in its programs.

This Committee has the tremendous responsibility of reviewing approximately 50 bills extending or eliminating the delimiting date for G.I. educational benefits.

The number of bills and the many Members of Congress involved with this issue reflects the immediate need for the proper solution to this problem.

On June 1st, approximately 3½ million veterans will lose their educational benefits established under the G.I. Bill of Rights because of the present deliminting date.

In recent weeks, my office has been beseiged by calls and letters from veterans and educational institutions requesting our assistance to allow these people to continue their course of study.

According to the Veterans Administration, payments are being stopped in complete disregard to where the veteran stands in his training program. Services are being cut off at the most inconvenient and crucial times. Many veterans will be forced to leave school in the middle of a course, or in the middle or near the end of programs designed to meet well-defined career objectives.

In New York State and New York City the situation is particularly critical because of the present economic condition.

There are now approximately 120,000 veterans enrolled in all types of training programs.

The Veterans Administration Regional Office for New York State anticipates that 25–30% of this number will be affected by the June 1st date. The percentage is even higher in New York City where it is expected that at least 35% of the veterans will not be able to continue their education.

Given the present financial condition of New York State and New York City, veterans with dependents attending school full-time will most certainly have no alternative means of providing for their education. Many full-time students will be returning to the labor force thus swelling the ranks of the unemployed, and abandoning all hopes for their once planned future.

Firemen and Policemen, laid off because of severe cutbacks in New York City are finding that they will have virtually no opportunity to make use of benefits they once earned, but decided to postpone, never suspecting they would forever relinquish this right. Veterans representing the period just prior to Vietnam, and during Vietnam, will be particularly frustrated by this situation because they were forced to choose work over enrollment in an educational institution because economic conditions at the time necessitated that they did so.

In addition to their contributions in the Armed Services, better educated veterans are even more valuable to the United States. Simply stated, it is a worthwhile investment of our tax dollars.

Beyond a shadow of a doubt, the higher level of education generally means a corresponding increase in the level of income. We all know what this means. Higher incomes mean greater tax dollars to our Treasury. It is an almost established fact that for every dollar invested in the G.I. Bill of Rights, there has been a return of three to six dollars to our Treasury. Aside from monetary advantages there is the invaluable return from a more secure, stable and well-informed labor force that higher education provides.

Our rapidly changing society requires that all individuals constantly review their career objectives. All of our citizens, including veterans, are finding it necessary to obtain additional learning experiences in order to keep up with rapid developments in technology.

For the ex-serviceperson who spent one to four years of his or her life serving our country and who might have lost limb in this service, the struggle to keep pace is even more difficult.

Education is not a give-away program and this is not a give-away program. It is an entitlement which has been earned by millions of men and women, and an investment in America's future. We should do everything possible to encourage the use and availability of this entitlement. The present delimiting date will mean that many millions of hours of study will go unused as they did for World War II veterans when an estimated 500 million hours of study were allowed to expire.

I hope your Committee will agree that these men and women should not be deprived of this right.

At the very least, the Nation's veterans who are finding their hopes denied in mid course should have the very minimum of a one year extension to get the most of their education benefits.

Thank you.

MUST READING IF YOU SEEK THE TRUTH ON NUCLEAR BALLOTING

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, this is the Metzger article referred to earlier today:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News, May 9, 1976]

ANTI-NUCLEAR INITIATIVES—HOAX ON PUBLIC

(By H. Peter Metzger)

This fall voters in as many as 22 states, including Colorado, will be asked to consider at the November general election the question of imposing new safety standards and procedures on nuclear-powered electric generating plants and other nuclear facilities, standards that substantially exceed those already required by state and federal law.

The question of controlling nuclear facilities is an emotionally volatile issue that has evoked the increasing attention of the mass media and political interest groups and will have been placed on the ballot through the citizen initiative process.

The initiative movement, in turn, has been spawned and nourished by a group of individuals with their political roots in the old environmentalist movement but who have recently emerged into a new activist anti-nuclear coalition.

On the surface these activists claim that their desire is to make nuclear-generated electric power safer. Anti-nuclear literature emphasizes highly improbable nuclear accidents and plays on the historic resistance by government and the economic establishment to institute reasonable regulatory changes. Because the government and the industry won't take action, they say, the question of nuclear security ought to be placed in the hands of the people at the ballot box, and the people ought to vote in favor of standards to insure their very survival.

The ballot proposals range from a relatively mild measure in Colorado to severe strictures on nuclear power development proposed in the California initiatives. The Colorado ballot item would require the nuclear power industry to "prove" generating facilities are safe, and before any more nuclear power plants could be built the proponents would have to obtain a two-thirds favorable vote from both houses of the State Legislature.

In other states, proposals have been advanced that would declare a moratorium of years on nuclear electric facility construction, and in California there is a proposal that actually calls for the dismantling of some existing plants.

On the other side of the nuclear power issue are some respected scientists and economists, and the nuclear power industry.

They point to America's increasing dependence on imported oil, to the high cost and long lead time required to develop offshore petroleum resources and the nation's abundant western coal supplies, and to the fact that numerous nuclear plants already in operation are generating safe, clean, essential power. Nuclear power, they declare, is an energy resource that must be developed if the industrialized United States is to avoid massive power shortages and economic disaster and social disorder.

Between these two groups stands the American voter—relatively uninformed, increasingly concerned about the nation's energy future, but uncomfortably perplexed by the fact that he is being called on to decide with his vote a vastly complex issue of crucial significance to his future way of life.

While he is bombarded on one side by energy shortage scare stories from those who seek greater latitude in nuclear power development, he is browbeaten and badgered by anti-nuclear activists threatening him with the end of the world and urging his approval for a "moratorium" on nuclear power plant development.

The advocates of nuclear power plant development are easily identified and their motives, business or scientific, are usually readily visible and candidly admitted. But the opponents of nuclear power are less easily identified, and up to now their success in using the mass media and other political instruments to cloud and distort the facts of nuclear power has gone largely unchallenged. It seems these activists are increasingly able to use half-truths, innuendos, misinformation and, in a few cases, outright falsehoods to circument ordinary legislative and regulatory processes and place decisionmaking authority over nuclear power in the hands of the ordinary and generally poorly informed voter.

The anti-nuclear movement began in 1954 when strict atomic secrecy was relaxed. At that time, independent scientists got their first look at the government's measurements of the massive amounts of radiation that were being injected into the air by atomic weapons testing. Through the efforts of nongovernmental scientists who fought the authoritative testimony of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC)—which later was proven wrong—the dangers of intense airborne radiation were publicized and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty finally was signed 10 years later.

But because of the incompetence of the AEC's congressional watchdog, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the AEC was allowed to continue the cover-up of other dangerous activities. These were eventually revealed by outside scientists over the years, and the anti-nuclear movement gained strength and credibility and slowly forced additional changes in the government's plans for how the atom was to serve mankind.

Through the efforts of a few dozen scientists and lawyers, certain foolish and wasteful uses of the atom—such as nuclear rocket planes and using atom bombs for giant engineering projects—were stopped entirely, while many dangerous practices in the AEC's shaky regulatory system were tightened up.

Even more importantly, however, the activities of these dissident scientists and lawyers forced the government and the growing nuclear power industry to redesign nuclear power plant safety procedures and even atomic reactors themselves, so as to make the only obvious constructive use of atomic energy—to generate power—even more safe.

By 1972 there were 29 civilian nuclear reactors in operation (there are 58 now) and nearly 100 U.S. Navy vessels (130 now) were

powered by nuclear energy without a single reactor-related injury, a safety record unmatched by any technology.

But there was still room for improvement. Like the participants in the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, those on both sides of the nuclear issue agreed that delays in the construction of nuclear reactors imposed by environmental considerations were well worth the improvements that finally were built into the new nuclear technology.

But in 1973, after all the important conflicts had been resolved and scientists as well as many environmentalist and industry leaders were convinced nuclear power was safe, consumer advocate Ralph Nader announced his intention of stopping all civilian nuclear reactors.

Nader's publicity star apparently had started to fade, and his Consumer Protection Act, not enacted to this day, was encountering serious opposition. Seeking another issue, Nader turned his attention to the nuclear power industry. Late last year he staged a convention of nuclear critics in Washington, D.C., which drew 1,000 persons, and his followers have since formed regional anti-nuclear groups and entered into an anti-nuclear coalition—which also is directed against western coal development—with groups like the Friends of the Earth and Environmental Action.

These groups have been circulating petitions for citizens signatures asking that anti-nuclear and anti-coal referenda be placed on election ballots in 22 states in hopes they can halt development of energy resources by exploiting public ignorance and stimulating irrational fears.

What if they succeed? Like all self-fulfilling prophecies, bad times are sure to come if Nader and his associates have their way, because without rapid exploitation of nuclear power and coal, our consumption of energy will indeed fall to that of a country like Sweden, Nader's ideal example.

And what would that mean? During the last two years no less than 10 major governmental agencies have produced energy policy statements. Without exception, all have advocated the rapid expansion of all energy alternatives, especially coal and nuclear, as a necessary prerequisite for national survival.

But the new environmental leadership wants nuclear power development stopped entirely and wants coal development confined to the deep mining of eastern coal, leaving the nation's greatest coal reserves in the West untouched for environmental reasons. And the new environmentalists tell us that economic collapse can be avoided by energy conservation and by solar power and wind power.

Nader told the California State Assembly last December that the fact that Sweden uses about half the energy per capita that we do "but has at least as high a standard of living, is living proof that conservation does not mean a lower standard of living."

Typically, Nader didn't explain that Sweden's energy use is less than ours in the same proportion as her production of goods and services, also known as the gross national product. (GNP).

Indeed, energy use per capita and GNP are proportional for most western nations. If anything, the United States is more energy efficient than most. We also produce more goods and services per person in relation to the amount of energy we use than Canada, Australia, Japan, The Netherlands, West Germany and the United Kingdom, according to Barkley's Bank Review.

Since energy use and GNP are so inextricably linked, it's reasonable to suppose that if we reduce our energy consumption to half its present value, we would produce proportionately less goods and fewer services. It follows, then, that our nation would require a proportionately smaller labor force, which, in turn, would require us to dismiss tens of millions of people from their jobs.

As for something more authoritative than Nader's unsupported claims for the energy savings that can be gleaned from a nationwide energy conservation program, the Federal Power Commission conducted a detailed study of that precise question, and the results were released last year.

With a "government sponsored crash program," the study found, the energy savings through conservation by 1985 would be "only 3.2 per cent of the total energy use," nowhere near Nader's 50 per cent figure.

But Nader has two other solutions for the energy shortage: solar and wind power. "If we could ever get the hobbyists of America to start building windmills and solar energy collectors out of Heathkits, it (the energy savings) would be enormous."

Generating energy from the burning of wood is another Nader favorite. But the U.S. Commerce Department has estimated that by 1985 the additional energy available from solar sources combined with the burning of wastes would total about one-half of 1 per cent of the total projected energy demand.

If the United States were to rely on the advice of Ralph Nader and the new environmentalists the certain outcome is that the country would become more dependent on foreign energy sources than we are now, and we are already importing 50 per cent of the oil we use.

We are importing three times as much oil from the Middle East now as we did before the Arab oil boycott of 1973. Considering the gasoline shortage which took place then, any new boycott would be proportionately worse. And Canada, which sends us more than half our imports, has added heavy new tariffs since 1973 and has informed the government that it intends to phase out oil shipments to the United States entirely over the next decade.

And despite what the leaders of the anti-nuclear movement say, there is no meaningful support within the scientific community in favor of banning nuclear power plants or even to slow down their construction.

Nader and the group of anti-nuclear crusaders following him have consistently publicized selected opinions of only about a dozen scientists, most of whom are zealots and who espouse theories that in some cases are held by them alone. These opinions are used in support of initiative campaigns to place anti-nuclear proposals on election ballots.

The most quoted of Nader's scientist-zealots is John Gofman, a professor emeritus at the University of California at Berkeley.

Gofman's oft-repeated charge is that the annual release of toxic and radioactive plutonium from nuclear reactors by the year 2000 will kill 500,000 persons every year. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimates that the amount that would be released would be one-half ounce.

But it was not many years ago when Gofman was an active member of the same atomic establishment that, during the days of the atmospheric nuclear weapons testing, dumped a total of 10 tons of the stuff into the air without any objection from Gofman. Today, by Gofman's own formula, that 10 tons is 100 times more plutonium than would be required to kill off the entire population of the earth each year, every year, since then. If Gofman were correct, the human race would have been wiped out long ago.

Instead, the incidence of cancer has been rising at a steady rate of only about 1 percent a year. Since the astronomic rise in cancers to be expected before now if Gofman was right, has not materialized, something must be very wrong with his calculations.

I asked Gofman about his tendency to exaggerate when I visited him in his California office in 1971, shortly after he changed his mind about nuclear energy. He admitted his figures were misleading, but defended the practice by pointing out that since the atomic industry is so strong and the industry's critics so weak, such extremes were not only justifiable but absolutely necessary.

Another plutonium scientist is Edward A. Martell, a participant in many atmospheric nuclear tests while he was a U.S. Army atomic weapons expert. He is now a senior chemist at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder.

After years of publicizing a convincing argument that plutonium is more dangerous than government authorities believed, Martell recently changed the direction of his research, too.

Later last year Martell claimed that atherosclerotic plaques—the fatty deposits that plug up blood vessels in diseased hearts—are really radiation-induced cancers. His reason for this conclusion: the plaques are more radioactive than surrounding tissue. But so are other deposits, including normal bone.

When reminded that to call heart disease a kind of cancer was so far-fetched that it might damage his professional credibility, Martell replied with some annoyance that, "You're either with us or against us."

Martell's theory would seem to ignore some of the most respected experiments in the history of medicine, which demonstrate that certain chemicals predictably cause cancer in animals. Nevertheless, in the face of this evidence Martell said he continues to believe that "there is no chemical basis at all for lung cancer."

In an interview last month, he said: "I started a whole new line of research. In fact, there is nothing published on it at all, but it's research (indicating) that chemicals are of little consequence in cancer. It's all radiation. The internal alpha emitters (of radiation) are the principal causal agent of human cancer, of atherosclerosis and early coronaries and strokes." But Martell's theories are supported by very few other researchers. That is not unusual in the scientific community. For example, last month two Cornell scientists also rejected conventional wisdom and blamed atherosclerosis on an allergic reaction they had just discovered. But clearly, just because some unpopular views have been proven right in the past is no guarantee that every minority view is correct.

Another oft-quoted anti-nuclear scientist is Ernest Sternglass, a professor at the University of Pittsburgh and the author of an article titled "The Death of All Children," published by Esquire magazine. For several years Sternglass has cranked out statistical studies which he claims show a rise in infant mortality following the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons in Nevada.

But Sternglass recently has taken a new tack with his research. "The effects of radiation become more and more critical as you get lower and lower doses," he claims. "It's completely contrary to common sense, I know, and it's not widely recognized," he said in a telephone interview.

Such speculations are publicized by anti-nuclear organizations as representing proven facts, or at the very least the views held by a majority of scientists.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

But critics of nuclear power among the scientific community—although a minority—are vocal and effective propagandists.

A case in point is David D. Comey, "the famous economist," as Coloradans for Safe Power, an anti-nuclear group, likes to call him. Comey claims nuclear power is uneconomic and will fall of its own weight.

Actually, Comey, who works for a Chicago-based anti-nuclear group, is hardly an economist. He holds a bachelor's degree in philosophy and says he has considered himself a propagandist since 1959, when "I did a series of lectures on overt and covert psychological techniques for the American Army."

But Comey's claim that nuclear economics will kill the industry has to be seen against his own shaky record of credibility on other matters.

"A successful propagandist cannot afford to make mistakes," he said in 1975. "Ten good truthful stories will be canceled by one mistake." But Comey often doesn't listen to his own advice. One of his many "red herrings," as industry publications call them, surfaced last October.

Then, a front-page story in the Chicago Tribune described in detail how a U.S. spy satellite photographed the results of the explosion of a Russian nuclear reactor. The story described in detail how a U.S. spy satellite photographed the results of the atomic explosion. A large crater, fallen trees, human bodies ad no signs of life in the area.

But the story turned out to be an outright hoax, fed to the Tribune environmental editor Casey Bukro by David Comey himself. Comey admitted this in a November interview in Washington.

So it's not surprising that Comey's economic "analyses" of nuclear power and his predictions of economic gloom and doom are actually clever constructs of fact and fancy easily destroyed by bona fide experts in the area of nuclear economics.

"The data (Comey uses) aren't in question," says A. David Rossin of Chicago's Commonwealth Edison Co. "However, he made serious errors in analyzing his data—either as a result of naivete or by deliberate misuse of the data."

No electric utility company argues that nuclear power is uneconomic. Even Public Service Co. of Colorado, which has its coal-fired plants located near the big surface deposits of coal in Wyoming, will pay far less for nuclear power than for coal-generated power.

According to the company's April figures, Public Service pays 5.3 mills per kilowatt for coal and only 1.7 mills for its nuclear fuel. The small amount of oil used by the utility costs 29.2 mills per kilowatt.

Capital costs to build nuclear plants are higher than conventional power plants, but nuclear's relative economic advantage still prevails. Recent figures (the 1975 third quarter) for the generation of electricity by 30 leading utilities, including all costs, is 33.5 mills per kilowatt for oil, 17.5 mills for coal and 12.3 mills for nuclear.

Why, then, has a handful of scientists become nuclear critics? Some of the older scientists, like Gofman, who once took part in the big nuclear oversell of the 1950s, might be motivated by a desire to rectify what they now perceive as their own errors.

But in the main, the middle-aged critics have been radicalized by a single bad experience, either with the old Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) or with the nuclear industry from which they may have received a patronizing response to a legitimate concern.

Comey, for example, says it was a "pat on the head" from a utility company president that turned him into a critic.

"Take the sad case of Dr. Henry Kendall," said Forbes Magazine. After making his complaint, "The AEC, in effect, told him to go jump in the lake." Yet it was Kendall's objections that finally caused the AEC to improve its reactor safety backup systems. But Kendall "was so soured by the experience, that he became a propagandist against nuclear development. It was Kendall, in fact, who got Ralph Nader interested in the subject."

Not unexpectedly, the motivation of the younger zealots has little to do with nuclear energy itself, but rather with the quasi-religious personal life style changes that can be found in virtually every area of American life

For example, the reasons for the much publicized defection of three General Electric nuclear engineers in California recently are diffuse and have nothing whatever to do with any special hazard or problem or example of incompetence which they might have discovered by virtue of their special position as insiders in nuclear industry.

One quit GE because of the "uncertainty of the human factor," another because of the American decision to sell nuclear reactors abroad, and the third because India had exploded an atomic bomb. All are members of the quasi-religious Creative Initiative Foundation which teaches that since plutonium is man-made and not God-made, it is evil.

When the three eventually appeared before the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy they presented a list of things they said must be done to make nuclear power safer, but all three admitted that the problems they point out can be corrected. "The depth of the trio's opposition to nuclear power was, as a result of their testimony, rendered uncertain," according to an observer.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission Chairman William A. Anders said after their testimony, "We've heard all this before in various contexts, and we're doing things about it all the time. That's what we're here for."

So it appears that the great nuclear debate boils down to the question of which side can manipulate propaganda, petitions and the press the best, and the winner will be decided at the polls.

Sensitive to the storm of misinformation on the nuclear question and mindful of the mistakes of the past, more and more scientists are concluding that trial by propaganda is a bad way to handle such a complex and important issue.

But more importantly, the scientists believe a moratorium on nuclear power plants would increase the dependence of the United States upon coal, our only alternative fuel. And the use of coal is a far more hazardous way to generate electric power than with nuclear energy. To stop nuclear reactor construction would cause eventual power shortages which would, in turn, create unmanageable social problems that would dwarf the risks associated with building more nuclear plants.

Most scientists believe that our society must accept the risks of nuclear power generation in any case. Actually, it's a no-win situation, because with oil and natural gas running out, energy will never again be as safe, cheap and available as it has been for the last hundred years.

Although coal and nuclear fuel both carry more risks than oil or gas, only the most improbable hazards of the nuclear option have been publicized. But not a single study has supported the nuclear critics' claim that the absence of nuclear power can be compensated for over time by conservation and the use of solar or wind energy.

In response to recent efforts to ban nuclear power plants in California and other states, the relative risks of nuclear energy and coal have been subjected to detailed analysis and the results are overwhelmingly in favor of nuclear.

The kind of nuclear accident dramatized by Ralph Nader and the anti-nuclear movement is a catastrophic leak of radioactivity from any one of a hundred operating nuclear power plants which would kill a thousand or more persons. Such a leak is possible, but it is probable only once in a million years. It is about as likely as a meteor striking a U.S. population center and causing the same number of deaths.

On the other hand, a National Academy of Sciences estimate of the number of deaths that would occur as the result of the operation of 100 coal-fired generating plants of the same capacity ranges from a certainty of 200 per year to as high as 10,000 a year.

These deaths would be caused mainly by pollution, but also from smaller but more frequent accidents directly related to the power plants as well as from the mining, processing and transportation of the coal to the plants. Considering the factors associated with nuclear power and coal-generated power, electricity produced by nuclear energy is about 500 times safer than the same amount of energy from coal.

The probabilities of nuclear accidents are considered in the so-called "Rasmussen report," which undoubtedly is the most extensive accident assessment study ever produced for any purpose and which was completed last October at a cost of more than $4 million.

Stung by criticism that "very low" was the best description it could come up with for describing the risks of commercial nuclear reactors, the Atomic Energy Commission ordered the study in 1972.

Mindful of its own declining credibility plus the inevitable result that such a study would be scrutinized by its critics, the AEC made every effort to insure the study's impartially and validity.

The study was headed by Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor Norman C. Rasmussen and was completely independent of AEC influence or direction. Only 10 of the 60 full-time persons involved in the project were AEC employes.

While still in draft form, the report was circulated to independent reviewers for comment, and the report was reviewed by a specially constituted committee of the American Physical Society (APS), which included nuclear critics among its members. The Rasmussen team rewrote the draft report to include and reconcile objections from the independent reviewers before it was released in final form.

About the report, on APS committe member and long-time nuclear critic, Nobel prize-winning physicist Hans Bethe said: "The can, therefore, be considered as the total risk from nuclear accidents. . . .

"It does not necessarily follow, however, that the social risks associated with nuclear reactor accidents are more severe than those associated with fossil fuels (and eventually will become less) since there are major opportunities for improving reactor safety," Bethe said.

Another respected authority and author of articles critical of nuclear power, physicist Frank von Hippel of Princeton's Center for Environmental Studies, was an organizer and member of the APS committee which reviewed the Rasmussen report.

"It is not so obvious to me that we should abandon nuclear energy," he says. "Of special concern are the international instabilities associated with the oil economy and the devastating climatic changes which might result from our ever-increasing consumption of fossil fuels—coal in particular."

What are those social instabilities expected to be?

If environmentalists succeed in stopping nuclear power and in squeeze-play style also slow strip-mining and coal-fired plant construction, there will, of course, be serious nationwide power shortages. Rationing and part-time closings of industrial plants will follow and surely will result in widespread unemployment.

By that time, it's likely that an awakened public demand will override environmental extremism and construction of nuclear plants will begin again. But there's a lag-time of six to 10 years between the decision to build a plant and the time it finally comes on line. It's during that period that social disruptions caused by massive unemployment would increase even though social decision makers might be doing their best to develop nuclear energy to get people back to work.

Many fear that the instabilities thus created during the lag-time decade would result in a public demand for oil at any cost. War for plunder is an obvious solution and one which historically governments have resorted to easily.

The APS committee found little wrong with the Rasmussen report. Von Hippel says: "The consequences of each of our wars was

much worse than any nuclear reactor accident could ever be. It might be fair, therefore, to attribute a significant share of the probability of the next major war to the use of oil for the generation of electricity.

"There is a strong case to be made for nuclear power. It is not at all certain that we can do without it."

While there is, of course, no way to measure the probability of war over energy, the Rasmussen report had a lot to say about risk from other factors.

Although it is obviously age-dependent, the average person has a one-in-100 chance of dying each year. Terminal illness kills most of us, while accidents play a very minor role. The greatest accident risk comes from the automobile, which causes nearly 56,000 deaths per year nationally. An individual's chances of dying in an automobile accident are one in 4,000. From all causes combined, the risks of accidental death are one in 1,600 per person each year.

The Rasmussen report estimates the additional risk from a nuclear reactor accident of death to any individual as one in 5 billion a year.

Von Hippel, criticizing "two omissions in the calculations," says the Rasmussen investigators made "an underestimate of the average number of deaths from their 'reference' accident by one or two orders of magnitude."

Thus, accepting Von Hippel's "worst case" estimate, the annual individual death risk from nuclear power plant accident becomes one in 50 million.

Comparing that to the one-in-100 risk from all causes or the one-in-1,600 from all accidents, it's easy to see why there is not widespread support in the scientific community for a nuclear moratorium—especially considering the inevitability of increased risks no matter what happens: the 500-times higher death risk from coal and the much higher although unknown risk of war.

Other studies have assessed the economic impact of a nuclear moratorium, including one in January by Harvard's Energy and Environmental Policy Center.

"It turns out that a nuclear moratorium would cost the United States about $300 billion—equivalent to $1,500 per person or $6,000 for a family of four," the study said.

And a University of Missouri study completed last October concluded:

"If the critics are wrong in their assessment of the safety of nuclear power systems, and their failure to generate any substantial criticisms of the Rasmussen report indicates they are, the only result of a nuclear power moratorium will be additional costs to the consumer with no compensating improvement in the quality of life.

"In fact, the necessity to burn additional coal and oil to make up for the loss of nuclear generating capacity will hasten the deterioration of both the environment and the economy of the United States with an inevitable deterioration in the quality of life," the study declared.

Finally, an increasing number of scientists are beginning to take notice of the alarmist claims made by the anti-nuclear groups. Accordingly, many are scrutinizing the claims closely for the first time.

One thing they have discovered is how simple it is to concoct a scare story "proving" that some new form of power is more dangerous than it actually is. Even solar energy isn't immune.

Thought to be the most benign energy option imaginable, solar energy is the favorite alternative of the nuclear critics. But solar energy to heat homes can be made to sound terrifying by making a few simple assumptions, all far more reasonable than the critics' assumptions concerning nuclear energy, and adding a dash of propaganda.

For example, it's well known that roof-mounted solar heating panels work better when newly fallen snow is cleaned off quickly rather than allowing it to melt away in its own good time.

Accordingly, a homeowner might reasonably be expected to make an extra 10 or 20 trips up a ladder each winter to clean off his solar collectors, trips that he ordinarily wouldn't make and under much worse conditions than usual.

Assume that this increases his total yearly risk to lethal falls by two to four times, a conservative guess. But falls, mostly from ladders, are the second largest cause of accidental deaths in this country. They kill almost 18,000 persons a year. Simply multiply 18,000 by two and four, respectively, and the following can be asserted, though probably falsely:

"Scientists estimate that if all U.S. homes were heated by solar energy, 36,000 to 72,000 additional deaths could result each year from solar-associated falls alone."

It might take another three-year, $4 million Rasmussen report to prove that statement wrong.

Thus, however well intended, or however duped by their leaders, the anti-nuclear environmentalists are doing America an historic disservice because they do not acknowledge the hazards of not going nuclear.

For the fact is that it is far more likely that our children will die in a war for energy than from the pollution that energy causes.

PEOPLE'S BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION: MARXIST CON ARTISTS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the People's Bicentennial Commission—PBC—is a Marxist propaganda organization seeking to present a warped version of America's founding principles to her people. The PBC, founded with the assistance of an old-time Communist Party, U.S.A. organizer, seeks to present Marxism as "Twentieth Century Americanism"—as Earl Browder used to say.

The PBC radicals are currently organizing a mass demonstration for Washington, D.C., on the Fourth of July with the U.S. Capitol as its target. The mass march has distinct possibilities of posing a threat to public order in our Nation's Capital.

Anthony Harrigan of the U.S. Industrial Council is well informed as to the PBC's goals, and I recommend his recent comments on that organization:

PBC DIRTY TRICKS DEPARTMENT

(By Anthony H. Harrigan)

One ordinarily doesn't think of political dirty tricks in connection with the bicentennial of American independence. But, then, the People's Bicentennial Commission isn't a straightforward bicentennial organization. It is a Marxist-oriented political organization masquerading as an organization celebrating America's 200th birthday.

Many communities, organizations and ordinary citizens confuse the People's Bicentennial Commission with the official bicentennial group. The PBC gets much of its material on radio because of this confusion. Civic and college groups have invited PBC representatives to speak, imagining that they have extended an invitation to those who want to uphold American values. They don't know, as syndicated columnist Allan C. Brownfeld has reported, that the founder and head of the PBC, Jeremy Rifkin, is "a self-proclaimed socialist revolutionary."

The PBC is deeply involved in political dirty tricks. For example, when President Ford gave a bicentennial address at Concord, Mass., last year, the PBC sought to disrupt the proceedings with a demonstration. The PBC also hopes to turn July 4 ceremonies in Washington into a triumph for radicalism.

One of the nastiest things the PBC has done to date is to write a hate letter to the wives of prominent businessmen around the country. In its insulting, offensive communication, the PBC writes: "Have you ever asked (your husband) if he or his colleagues or his firm have been involved in criminal activity? Would your husband inform the authorities if he was aware of illegal conduct among his friends or associates? Would you inform the authorities if you uncovered such information?"

Implicit in these questions is a blanket smear of businessmen. The aim of the PBC, of course, is to condemn business and businessmen in advance, to sell the idea that the capitalist system is corrupt.

This letter from the PBC belongs in the trash can, to be sure. The attempt of the PBC to speak on moral issues is outrageous. One hopes that the wives who receive this letter understand the source from which the letter comes.

Another example of the PBC's gutter tactics is a letter it is mailing to the secretaries of senior executives in industry, advising them that "The PBC is offering $25,000 in cash to you if you can provide us with concrete information that leads to the arrest, prosecution, conviction and imprisonment of a chief executive officer of one of America's *Fortune* 500 corporations for criminal activity relating to corporate operations."

The American corporate system is the principal target of the PBC. Writing in *The New American Movement*, Rifkin said the Left must "turn the Bicentennial Celebration into a campaign designed to create a mass revolutionary consciousness." He called for an understanding of "revolutionary ideals" that "links Thomas Paine, Sam Adams, Benjamin Rush and the American people with Lenin, Mao, Che Guevara, and the struggle of all the oppressed people in the world."

Among the sections listed in the "Syllabus and Study Guide to the American Revolution" distributed by the PBC is "The Marxist Interpretation of The American Revolution." The first book listed in this section is a volume written by Herbert Aptheker, longtime Communist Party theoretician.

The full story of the PBC—entitled "A Radical Attempt To Expropriate America's 200th Anniversary"—is available in a booklet from the USIC Educational Foundation. This report on the PBC describes the ways in which that organization seeks to distort the meaning of the American Revolution, which was a conservative political movement wholly unrelated to the Marxist revolutions of modern times.

The background furnished by the Foundation report helps provide the proper perspective for the PBC's current effort to reach wives of businessmen, attempting to create a split between husband and wife, and to put pressure on the husband, while degrading the American free enterprise system.

THE SILENT MAJORITY ON ABORTION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, abortion is an issue which concerns every one of us and it has been the subject of a great

deal of debate in both Houses of the Congress. Although there is a vocal minority opposed to the Supreme Court decision which seeks to overturn it, a majority of the American people support the 1973 landmark decision giving women the right to choose an abortion. An excellent article by Jane O'Reilly appeared in the Washington Star on May 18, and I would like to take this opportunity to insert it in the RECORD:

THE SILENT MAJORITY ON ABORTION

Sooner or later a better way will be invented, but at the moment, women still have the babies. There seems to be a wide consensus in the United States that the woman whose body does the work is the person who gets to decide whether she will continue with a pregnancy or not.

According to the recent CBS/New York Times polls, 67 percent of the American people support the 1973 Supreme Court decision giving women the unrestricted right to choose abortion in the first trimester of pregnancy.

Two weeks ago a new Harris poll concluded that "a clear majority of 54 percent" support the right to choose abortion, and only 39 percent of Americans are opposed. The Harris poll also says that the "widespread feeling that it is politically dangerous for a presidential candidate to support legalized abortion turns out to be wrong."

So, abortion is not a huge issue nationally. Here and there, a few congressmen are still being greeted by shouts of "murderer!" everytime they go home. The shouters are responding to the political organizing of the Catholic bishops' Pastoral Plan for Pro-Life Activities. It would be nice for those few embattled candidates to hear from the clear majority for choice. According to a January survey by Knight-Ridder newspapers the majority for choice include 76 percent of all Catholics.

Abortion is an emotional and moral dilemma which only seems to be a political issue because the right-to-life minority is so extremely loud and tireless, and political, in their ceaseless effort to protect the rights of the fertilized human egg.

They have considerably less sympathy for the human being whose egg it is. As the right-to-life people see it, a woman harboring a fertilized egg should lose certain constitutional rights such as the right to privacy and to freedom of religion. She should, in protection of the egg's presumed "personhood," lose her own personhood and become entirely subservient to her biological condition.

Most of us are quite willing to let them believe that, as long as we don't have to believe it too. But they are not willing to be so democratic. They thrive on schemes and plots to impose their view.

Only a couple of weeks ago, on April 28, the Senate was surprised to find itself debating whether to consider a constitutional amendment to forbid all abortions. Sen. Jesse Helms, assisted by Sens. James Buckley and Dewey Bartlett, was indulging in a little parliamentary plot to circumvent regular procedure. The Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, following regular procedure, rejected all proposed antiabortion amendments after one and a half years of hearings.

During the recent debate on the floor of the Senate it was Sen. Birch Bayh's weary duty, as chairman of that subcommittee to remind the anti-choice faction that abortion "is not an issue that can be properly or effectively dealt with in a constitutional context."

The occasion was ignored by the press, which may or may not indicate something about its importance. But the Congressional Record for the day suggests the afternoon was not without its illuminating moments.

The principal illumination is that United States senators do not feel at home in discussions of human reproductivity, and many of them are ill at ease when reminded of women's role in the process. Even Sen. Bayh, the under-appreciated champion of women's rights, felt great reservations about "here, alive and in full color discussing an issue that involves one of the most intimate personal acts of two human beings in scientific terms."

The senators' scientific attempts centered around notions of fertilization, implantation, and the start of life. No one knows when life begins—they can only believe—so no one persuaded anyone else. Sen. Bartlett suggested "so-called hard cases"—teenage victims of rape and incest—could get a D&C before implantation took place. Compounding the absurdity of his own argument, Sen. Bartlett said "during that period we do not know whether an abortion would be taking place or not. But it cannot be proved that it is, and I feel that is the important fact."

The Senators floundered on. Sen. Buckley made the customary right-to-life leap in logic from abortion to euthanasia. Sen. Harrison Williams and Sen. James Abourezk pointed out that no amendment such as Helms' could be enforced. Almost everyone found time to express their personal abhorrence of abortion. At the end the vote to table the motion to further consider the amendment was 47–40 for tabling. That suggests many senators did not notice that in 1974 all but one of 62 consistently pro-abortion congressmen were reelected, and of 113 anti-abortion congressmen 24 were not returned.

Throughout the afternoon's debate, a pregnant woman's decision to abort was often referred to, with considerable contempt, as a matter of convenience. Bearing a child is an inconvenience no man has ever confronted. As Sen. Bayh said, "we are talking about whether a woman has the right to make that personal decision or whether we are going to make it for her or prohibit her from making it. Although I am prepared to make it as a man, I am not prepared to make it for a woman."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, again, after a good deal of further thought, I voted on May 13 not to approve the conference report on the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1977 (S. Con. Res. 109). I also voted against the resolution when it first was acted on by the House. Although the Senate-House conference recommended a reduction in outlays for fiscal year 1977 of slightly more than $2 billion, with a consequent reduction in the anticipated deficit, I still came down on the side of wanting an even greater outlay and deficit reduction.

The primary reason for my vote was my belief that lower targets or guidelines, particularly for outlays and the deficit, would be desirable at this time. The economy has been improving rapidly and the outlook is favorable even though unemployment remains too high and the rate of inflation has not yet been brought down to a satisfactory rate. But the overwhelming evidence is for continued economic improvement. If the Federal Government is ever to achieve a balanced budget over the duration of a business cycle, it is absolutely necessary to reduce a swollen deficit rapidly during the upswing and prosperous phases of the business cycle. Now is the time to make good on this pledge. Therefore, my vote this time was to disapprove budget targets that I think are still somewhat too high.

I have particularly in mind that the mid-May budget vote is on targets or guidelines which are supposed to influence the consideration of numerous appropriation bills between now and mid-September when the final vote on the fiscal 1977 budget magnitudes will be taken. I think the Congress and the country ought to set targets for outlays and deficit that the country will have to strain to reach. I would have been pleased to vote for a budget resolution that had a lower figure for outlays than $413.3 billion, although I do not subscribe to the President's recommendation of $395.8 billion.

There are a number of budget categories listed within total outlays in the resolution which I think can be reduced somewhat. The particular programs included within the category totals which I will be scrutinizing as appropriation bills come forward include food stamps, the Postal Service, certain welfare expenditures, certain public works, among others. Special effort will have to be made to increase efficiency in these and all government programs so that the same services can be delivered at lower cost. I very much favor, and have sponsored a bill, which will require complete justification of every governmental program at least once every 4 years. I hope this bill will become law promptly because it will help in combing through the various programs to remove unnecessary activities.

If during the course of the next 4 months before final budget guidelines are set, it proves impossible to reduce expenditures, then of course I will have to reconsider the guidelines. But I see every advantage in establishing low ceilings now as an incentive for restraining appropriations that will be voted this summer.

Far less attention has been given to the revenue estimates and targets set out in the budget resolution and there has been almost no disagreement between the Senate and the Housing regarding this matter. Each body has assumed continuation of the existing tax reduction program that was initiated last year. I think it is possible that the pickup in the economy will be strong enough that more revenue will be taken in during fiscal 1977 than has been estimated and that unemployment compensation and other expenditures may be less than anticipated. Particularly on the revenue side this could greatly ease the Government's financial situation and mean a further significant reduction in the 1977 deficit. The economic situation as it unfolds will have to be watched closely so that future revenue estimates can be adjusted appropriately.

I am somewhat disturbed by the assumption in the revenue estimates contained in the budget resolution that a

tax reform measure now pending in the Senate will become law and result in $2 billion in increased revenues for fiscal 1977. This estimate is higher than what would result from the House tax reform measure passed last December, and higher still than what now appears to be likely from the Senate. This is a further reason for preferring lower estimates of outlays.

Finally I want to make it clear that my vote against the budget resolution, both when it was first taken up in the House and again in the conference report should not be interpreted as a vote of no confidence in the new budget process. I think the Budget and Impoundment Control Act which established the new congressional budget process is a most important reform. I simply cannot support the totals which have been set.

FORD LEADING REGULATORY REFORM FIGHT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal notes the diligent efforts of the President to reform the unwieldy and costly regulatory process in the Nation today, and praises him for it, while wondering aloud why it is that a matter of such immense importance has not received the publicity it deserves.

I think the point is well taken, and I think the President deserves some real credit for what he is doing. I for one am prepared to give it to him, and I hope the Nation as a whole will, also.

You see, his decision to tackle this problem represents a real commitment to principle as against expediency. The editorial notes the clear reason for this, without drawing the same conclusion directly. Big business, of which we Republicans are so often thought the tools, is vehemently against real regulatory reform, because the maze of regulations works generally to solidify their market positions and shield them from competition. Thus airlines and other business lobbies have been loud in proclaiming that they need the regulations.

So Mr. Ford might well, in the name of expediency shoved the reforms to the back burner, but he did not. He stuck by Republican principle—the principle of free and competitive economics—even when that position worked to the disadvantage of the captains of industry.

This is leadership at its best; it is doing the right thing, no matter where the chips fall. It is the Ford approach and deserves the applause of all Americans.

The article follows:

SELLING REGULATORY REFORM

One of President Ford's basic shortcomings on the hustings has been his failure to convey to the public the importance of his administration's major economic initiative, regulatory reform.

He has been attempting, against formidable odds, to set in motion processes that would systematically dismantle those activities of government that inhibit competition. It is an effort that is responsive to the very evident public concerns over the impacts of big government. Why, then, is the President having so much trouble persuading the public of the worth of his efforts?

The immediate answer, which we have touched on here before, is that he has not demonstrated sufficient dedication to it himself. He committed a primary error last December by not vetoing the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which continued the costly, wasteful and anti-competitive federal regulation of the oil industry. Few better opportunities present themselves for a President to make a bold and dramatic stroke in defense of the market principle.

But some things should also be said in the President's defense. His initiatives in the direction of deregulation have been considerable, however low the yield in terms of political visibility and substantive results. For example, he managed to introduce more flexibility into the ICC's control over rail freight rates as part of the rail modernization bill earlier this year. He is seeking legislation that would reduce federal restraints on price competition in aviation and trucking.

Federal agencies have been asked to find ways to cut paperwork and regulatory delays, apparently with some results. The administration backed such other successes as the repeal of federal "fair trade" laws, which had allowed some manufacturers to fix retail prices, and the introduction of price competition among stock brokers.

And last week, the President asked Congress to enact a comprehensive agenda to further such attempts. It calls for a four-year national effort to identify areas where the cost of government regulation exceeds benefits and to formulate new laws to reduce regulatory interference. If Congress adopts the measure, the agenda would begin next year with transportation and agriculture, continue in 1978 into mining, heavy manufacturing and public utilities, then in 1979 into light manufacturing and construction and finally in 1980 into communication, finance, insurance, real estate, trade and services.

It is interesting that the general effort towards regulatory reform has attracted bipartisan support in Congress. Senator Kennedy, for example, has introduced his own bill to require federal agencies to promote competition as part of their decision-making processes. Senator Muskie is also taking a tougher line towards the problem of regulatory agency proliferation by promoting a "sunset" bill that would require agencies to justify their existence or shut down.

But the President is leading the movement. Why isn't he getting more credit for it?

The inarticulateness of his campaign generally is partly to blame. Further, it always is difficult to dramatize deregulatory efforts and to forecast their public benefits, even though there can be little doubt that increased market competition yields benefits. Finally, special interest groups are working mightily to try to undermine the deregulatory thrust by attempting to generate public fears about its consequences.

One of the myths the President has exploded through the deregulatory drive is the broad assumption that there is a strong resentment among businessmen of federal regulation. The airlines and trucking companies have demonstrated through their lobbying efforts that some of the strongest support for anti-competitive regulation comes from regulated industries. As one White House official notes, the proregulation constituencies are far more vocal in Washington than any anti-regulation lobbies.

Since deregulation is an effort conducted on behalf of the public and often against the wishes of special interests it requires some political courage. The President has not always been bold enough. But he deserves more credit and support than he has received for the boldness he has demonstrated. What he is attempting is far more important than has so far been perceived.

BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE—MORE THAN A LEGACY

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year's theme was "What Our Bicentennial Heritage Means to Me," and the Idaho winner in this contest was Vaughn Paul Stephenson of Acequia, Idaho.

Vaughn is the son of Eldon and Erlene Stephenson who are both school teachers. Age 16, Vaughn is a student at Minidoka County High School in Rupert, Idaho.

I am proud of Vaughn and pleased with the enthusiasm he expresses for his country and its heritage.

Mr. Speaker, Vaughn's winning speech follows:

Perhaps it is only the constant reminders that every day I see and hear, that I am more fully able to appreciate the events which, over the past two hundred years, have shaped these United States. Even so, I have the highest admiration, gratitude and respect for the people who, like the sculptor, shaping and fashioning rough clay into a true masterpiece of expression, molded thirteen oppressed colonies into the greatest nation earth has seen. All too often when the bicentennial is mentioned all that is thought of is America as it was two hundred years ago. I personally feel that what should be considered is our heritage over the entire course of our nation's history. With that in mind, I would like to delve more deeply into my feelings toward our bicentennial heritage.

Where can one really begin to tell of our great heritage? I suppose that first and foremost should come this unique American form of government, for without it, nothing else could have transpired in the manner which it did. Much as been said about the founding fathers, and there probably cannot be enough credit given to such great men. Allow me to relate a few instances which I feel depict the early American patriotic spirit. Five signers of the Declaration of Independence were captured by the British and tortured before they died. Another signer, Thomas Nelson, noted that the British commander, Lord Cornwallis, had taken over the Nelson home for his headquarters during the battle of Yorktown. Nelson urged General Washington to open fire. The home was destroyed and Nelson died bankrupt. These same Continental Congressmen served without pay, as did George Washington, in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army. All so that this nation could achieve independence. To paraphrase Nathan Hale, they regretted that they had but one life to give for their country.

With the government established, the rest of the great American achievement was able to take place.

What then is the rest of our bicentennial heritage? To me, it is two hundred years of more than just those great sacrifices. It is the compilation of the uniquely American life form. It is our choice heritage as Americans to have our history filled with such great statesmen as George Washington,

Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Andrew Jackson, Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, Henry Clay, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and countless others. But, as I have mentioned, the bicentennial heritage is more than just a legacy of government. The American achievement includes the literature of such geniuses as Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Walt Whitman, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Herman Melville, and John Steinbeck, to name a few. America has danced, sung, and listened to the music of such men as Stephen Foster, Irving Berlin, Rogers and Hammerstein, Louis Armstrong, Frank Sinatra, and countless others. We've laughed over the years at the witticisms of Ben Franklin, Mark Twain, Will Rogers, Groucho Marx, and Mel Brooks. America has cheered for such sports heroes as Jim Thorpe, Babe Ruth, Red Grange, Willie Mays, Joe DiMaggio, Wilt Chamberlain, and major leagues of others. America and the entire world has marveled at the innovations of Thomas Edison, Henry Ford, Alexander Graham Bell, and Eli Whitney.

To summarize my feelings into a short thought, I shall refer to a quotation by Benjamin Franklin. When asked, after the Constitutional Convention had ended, what kind of government had been given to the people, he replied, "We have given you a republic for as long as you will keep it." For two hundred years we have kept it, and been given much more.

MOTHERHOOD, APPLE PIE, AND THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues two articles which appeared in the Washington Star this week on the school lunch program. These articles reveal that the concepts that many Members of the House have about this program—as witnessed by the debate on the school lunch bill last year—need to be updated.

During the consideration of this legislation, I argued that the reason that participation in the regular school lunch program is declining is not the high cost of a school lunch as the school lunch lobby cried, but a result of changing times. We should face up to the changes that the participants—the students—are demanding. This does not mean that we have to have a McDonald's in every school, but it should mean that we cannot continue to subsidize lunches that children do not want and benefit only the trash collectors.

I was pleased that the House accepted some of my views on this last year and voted against a maximum charge of 35 cents for any lunch with the Federal Government making up the difference between the maximum charge and the cost of the lunch. This type of legislating would only have encouraged inefficient school lunch programs. Unfortunately, some lobby groups are still playing on the motherhood and apple pie concept of the school lunch program by saying that a vote for the Goodling amendment was against school lunch. Nonsense. The school lunch program is alive and kicking—but wasteful. The Congress took one step toward improving the program, and at the same time benefiting the taxpayer, by mandating that the Department of Agriculture allow high school students to refuse food items that they do not intend to eat, and to do a comprehensive study on plate waste. I hope that when the final results of this study are in—and the preliminary results show that 20 percent of all food put in front of our kids is wasted—that the Congress will not be afraid to stand up to the lobby group identified in one article as the "nutrabiddies."

The articles follow:

$400 MILLION IN FOOD JUNKED IN SCHOOLS EACH YEAR—25 MILLION SERVED SUBSIDIZED LUNCHES EVERY DAY

(By Michael Satchell)

Of all the federal programs near and dear to America's heart, few combine the ideals of motherhood and apple pie better than school breakfast and school lunch.

The images are irresistible. The jolly cooking lady baking fresh bread and cookies in the school cafeteria, whipping up tasty meals for her little charges. Bright-eyed children from poor families eagerly munching down eggs, bacon and sausage for breakfast. Rosy-cheeked little nippers in the lunchroom, dutifully eating their carrots and peas, coming back for second helpings of her mouth-watering fried chicken, begging for more pineapple upside down cake that's better than mom makes.

All that delicious food, and all that good, wholesome milk to build young bodies and develop young minds. And all made possible by the wisdom and generosity of Uncle Sam. It's tax money invested in the health and well being of America's future generation. For a Washington politician, bankable votes. A blue chip federal aid program beloved by liberals and conservatives alike.

Trouble is, school lunch and school breakfast isn't like that anymore, and the result is that some $400 million worth of food and milk is now being thrown away each year.

Today school breakfast often consists of a gooey, sugary piece of confection called a fortified breakfast cake instead of a plate of eggs and bacon, a meal that sticks to the teeth rather than the ribs.

At lunch many elementary school youngsters line up in front of a table and pick up a cardboard carton of milk, a plastic cold pack and an aluminum foil hot pack that looks like a miniature TV dinner.

When they peel back the plastic wrap and tinfoil, they find food that has been precooked, chilled or frozen, and reheated. It is often bland and soggy. It is largely odorless and often tasteless. It is high in sugar, starch, synthetics, artificial colorings, artificial flavorings and refined foods. It is, says nutritionist Mary Goodwin, "formulated, fabricated, fortified, frivolous and fake"—the five F's of school lunch.

Some of the meat dishes contain up to 30 percent textured vegetable protein or TVP. The kids complain that the hamburger tastes funny. Concerned nutritionists continue to worry over the fact that laboratory tests show TVP may cause kidney damage in rats.

The lunches presented to many elementary school youngsters around the country, including New York, the District of Columbia, and on some days, Montgomery County, will have been cooked and pre-plated several weeks earlier by large food companies, frozen, shipped hundreds, maybe thousands of miles, and then reheated.

The cost in energy, paper, cardboard, plastic and aluminum that goes into pre-plated lunches is staggering. The waste in food could be considered criminal.

Every school day some 25 million youngsters are served subsidized lunches in about 88,000 schools. This year, the federal government and local school districts will put about $2 billion worth of food on the school lunchroom table and spend another $1.8 billion getting it cooked and served.

The kids will waste about one-fifth of what's put in front of them, preliminary figures from a new federal study indicate. That's a nearly half billion dollar cornucopia of pizza, hot dogs, hamburgers, fishwiches, heroes, hoagies, green beans, tater tots and upside-down cake going down the garbage chute.

Compare that dollar waste to the $560 million that the U.S. Congress appropriated this current fiscal year for food aid to the world's hungry nations.

As for milk, the kids will waste about 12 percent of the three billion pints that will be served this year, the new federal studies indicate. That's a river of 360 million gallons down the drain.

Since 1946, when Congress first appropriated funds to provide subsidized meals for school children, the National School Lunch program has been among the most sacrosanct of federal aid plans, a sacred cow munching contendedly in the congressional pasture, growing steadily fatter on bigger and bigger bites of the Department of Agriculture budget.

A decade ago, for example, the federal payment to the school lunch program was $315 million, with almost 20 million youngsters sitting down to eat each day. This year, Washington's contribution—roughly matched by the states—has risen more than fivefold to $1.7 billion although the number of children has increased by only five million.

Ten years ago the government contributed a dime toward each meal. Today the USDA subsidy is close to 24 cents.

The special milk program, which every President since Dwight Eisenhower has tried to dry up, or at least slow to a trickle, will cost the government $144 million this year.

And the school breakfast program has gone from a half million dollar federal payment in 1967 to $85.7 million this year, with 2 million youngsters getting a pre-school meal to start their day. Most of the breakfast youngsters are from poor families but participation by middle cass kids is on the increase as working couples find it easier to drop their kids off at school for their first meal of the day rather than preparing breakfast at home.

On Capitol Hill nothing is liable to give a lawmaker heartburn faster than the prospect of having to vote to trim the school lunch or milk program.

The Ford administration, for example, wants to retool federal food aid programs and, among other things, limit free or subsidized lunches to poor children. Kids from middle class families would have to pay the full price of the lunch, about another quarter per day.

A sponsor has been found in the House but no one in the Senate will touch it and observers feel the proposal has about as much chance of finding its way into law as filet mignon onto the school lunch plate.

"There haven't been investigative hearings on school lunches by Congress in a decade," said John Kramer, special counsel to the House Agriculture Committee. "The nutrabiddies (nutrition lobby), the little old ladies in tennis shoes, run around giving key congressmen like McGovern, Humphrey, Perkins and Talmadge nutrition awards. And the money keeps flowing.

"School lunches have become a big payoff for the middle class. The average food stamp bonus per meal for a poor family is 27 cents. The average school lunch bonus for a middle class kid is 23 cents. The poor (about 10.5 million of the 25 million children in school lunch will eat free or reduced price lunches this year) have been carrying the middle class on their backs in this program."

The school lunch is designed to provide a

10- to 12-year-old child with one-third of the minimum daily nutritional requirement and this is accomplished by serving what is known as the Type A lunch. To be eligible for the federal subsidy, schools must by law serve a lunch consisting of a half-pint of milk, two ounces of either lean meat, poultry, fish, cheese, peanut butter, cooked dry beans or peas or any combination of these.

The lunch must also include three-fourths of a cup of two or more vegetables and fruits, one slice of bread and a teaspoon of butter or margarine. Many school lunch programs supplement this basic menu with such things as potato chips, corn chips, cookies or desserts, but these don't qualify as items to satisfy the Type-A requirements.

The Agriculture Department is considering making potato chips, pickles and a whole range of other snack-type foods permissible as items to satisfy the vegetable portion of the menu, along with cakes and cookies as a substitute for bread. The proposal is highly controversial and nutritionists and parent groups, facing a hard enough time steering youngsters away from junk foods, promise a stiff battle with USDA on that issue.

For years most schools operated kitchens and cafeterias with a small staff preparing the meals from scratch. The cook knew what the kids liked and disliked in each school. Meals would have individual special touches. Most important, the lunches were prepared with fresh food. And leftovers often could be used on next day's menu.

But as costs have risen in recent years, many schools have switched to so-called satellite feeding in order to save money. The pattern is generally for a high school or junior high kitchen to prepare enough food for itself and several of the elementary schools in the area.

Meals for the satellite schools are either shipped in bulk to be portioned right before being eaten, or preplated in plastic and foil, then shipped. Some school districts rely on a central kitchen which prepares all the food. Sometimes the entire meal except for the milk is purchased cooked and frozen from one of the large food processing companies.

School districts say the savings can be significant in personnel, equipment and food costs. Isn't it better, they argue, to save money in the lunchroom rather than in the classroom by laying off teachers and affecting the quality of the educational program?

Pre-plated meals, they insist, can be just as nutritious as freshly prepared meals if they are cooked, frozen and reheated properly, a contention that can and is being argued ad infinitum by nutritionists on both sides of the issue. Pre-plate lunch critics, however, point out that you can lead a horse to water but you can't make it drink. What's the value of a nutritious pre-plated lunch, they say, if the child won't eat it?

One point few argue is that the youngsters aren't tucking into their little plastic and foil packs with the same gusto as those who get to eat food cooked in their own cafeteria.

One of the major problems with pre-plated lunches is the portion size. A cook in a school cafeteria can dole out small amounts for younger children, double scoops for the older kids, with seconds for the hungry ones. Pre-plated lunches are all the same size. Often, the smaller kids can't finish them even if the food is tasty and appealing. For the bigger pupils, it simply isn't enough and they fill up on junk foods often available in school vending machines.

The issue of plate waste is a sensitive one and so is the question of why the U.S. Department of Agriculture hasn't examined the problem in any depth before now.

"There is an appalling lack of information on plate waste," admits William Bolling, head of child nutrition programs for the Agriculture Department and the government's top school lunch official. "Past studies have been poorly designed and inadequate. The feeling has been that the federal government wasn't responsible for plate waste. But the waste is a significant enough problem to be concerned about it."

Bolling's staff is in the process of completing what is scientifically based, comprehensive study of plate waste in the school lunch program. With some reluctance, Bolling made some of the preliminary results available to The Star, stressing that the data still hasn't been put into final form. The testing was done at 100 elementary and secondary schools in 25 states.

Results for pre-plated meals of the main groups of food items served in schools show the youngsters wasted 9.4 per cent of their meat items (fish, cheeseburger, pizza, meat-cheese sandwich and hot dog) and didn't eat more than half of the vegetables served to them—53 per cent of the green beans, green peas and corn being wasted.

Only one child in four ate the plastic-pack cole slaw and six out of ten didn't eat their tossed salad. A little over half consumed their whipped potatoes, and french fries were eaten by 84 per cent of the kids.

Almost one-third of the fruit—applesauce, peaches, mixed fruit, orange juice, fruit-gelatin and pineapple—ended up in the garbage bin.

The overall pre-plate lunch waste in this sample averages out at 36 percent. Tests on the exact same food items freshly prepared and cooked on the premises show that the kids wasted 24 per cent of what was served, a 12 per cent improvement. Officials say that the results from averaging waste on all types of foods served in the test sample is around 20 per cent.

Next: Local menus.

AT ONE ARKANSAS SCHOOL, LUNCH IS FROM McDONALD'S

(By Michael Satchell)

For 1,000 students at the Benton, Ark. high school, lunch in the school cafeteria usually consists of a Big Mac or a Quarter-Pounder, a bag of french fries and a Coke, with maybe chocolate shake or a piece of hot apple pie for desert.

Benton's cafeteria is operated by McDonalds. The menu is exactly the same as any other McDonalds. The prices are the same, with McDonalds taking all of the profits. Nothing is available on the menu but standard McDonalds' fare.

And the students? "They're crazy about it," exults principal Kenneth Cook. "We were losing $4,000 a year on the old school lunch program so we quit participating and asked McDonalds to just take over. The kids think it's the greatest thing on earth. We've never had so many kids eating lunch at school. It's been so successful we're thinking of doing the same thing with the two junior highs."

To those concerned about nutritional deterioration in school lunches, the specter of the Golden Arches straddling the high school lunchroom is about as welcome as a dead cockroach in the asparagus. With the steady incursion of the frozen TV-type meal into the school lunchroom, can the starch and cholesterol laden fast-food invasion be far behind?

School lunch is now a $4 billion-a-year industry and is America's fourth largest single food purchasing business, following McDonalds, Gino's and Colonel Sanders. That $4 billion is a potential bonanza and must be a tempting goal for the big food companies. As schools move steadily into serving the chill-freeze-reheat convenience type of meal—perhaps one-fifth of school lunches are currently pre-plated—what more logical place to expand.

Big business already has a small slice of the school lunch pie, pushing products such as Krumb Super Cake, Super Donuts, Super Hostess Twinkies and Astrofood. ITT's Continental Baking Co., among others, produces fortified cakes and its Morton Foods subsidiary makes frozen pre-packaged school lunches. Subsidiaries of Hershey Foods and the Smith-Corona-Marchant corporation, along with such food giants as Larry's Foods of California and Mass Feeding of Chicago, are among the leaders in selling TV dinner-type school meals.

McDonalds, Hardee's, Shakey's and Burger King have moved onto a few college campuses and McDonalds' establishing a beachhead in a high school signals what some fear to be the start of an inevitable trend. Some school districts, fed up with trying to run a lunch program that doesn't cover expenses, have simply turned their cafeterias over to food management companies.

Not to be left out, the National Automatic Merchandising Association reports that in 1974, the latest year for available statistics, vending machines sold $407 million worth of food and drink in schools.

Apart from all this pre-conditioning of young minds and palates to eat convenience foods—marvelous free consumer education for the frozen food companies—what's wrong with schools buying frozen pre-cooked meals from the food industry? As education costs rise, why not save money by serving pre-plated lunches cooked elsewhere in the school district and reheated just before serving?

Mary Goodwin, a Montgomery County public health nutritionist with a national reputation in the school lunch field, is one of the strongest critics of the trend to convenience foods in schools.

To her, pre-plated lunches are a totally unpalatable issue, not only from the nutrition viewpoint, but for their effect on young children.

Asks Goodwin: "What is the educational message of pre-plated lunches? Will they teach children that eating is a mechanized process, that convenience foods are best, that food comes in plastic, foil and cardboard?

"What are the psychological effects on children of this dehumanizing program? It strips food and eating of social and emotional connotations. Eating good food is one of life's great pleasures. It appeals to all of the five senses. Why rob food of its sensuousness by serving meals that taste like plastic?

"Traditionally, schools should strive for what's best and set the highest standards, not go to the lowest common denominator. What are we doing to our kids when we serve them pre-plated foods that have no smell and taste like boiled laundry?"

Bruno Bettelheim, the noted child psychiatrist, agrees. "How one is being fed and how one eats, have a larger impact on the personality than any other human experience," he contends.

If Bettelheim is right, what are schools doing to an entire generation of American youngsters by marching them into a crowded school lunchroom like recruits in an Army chowline, issuing them a carton of milk, a plastic cold pack, a tinfoil hot pack, and expecting them to wolf down a heap of unappetizing and indifferent pre-cooked, pre-heated food in 15 minutes flat.

Goodwin offers other, equally compelling arguments against pre-plated lunches. Food quality deteriorates in the process of cooking, freezing and reheating. Nutrients originally present in raw food are frequently processed out or greatly reduced. For example, fresh potatoes contain significant amounts of vitamin C. Processed frozen potatoes—used almost exclusively in school lunches in the form of the ubiquitous tator tot or roundabout—contain only one-tenth the vitamin C as the fresh.

Many different types of food additives are used to make the lunches palatable and textured vegetable protein or TVP is widely used to extend meat. "Little is known about the long range effects of additives and TVP has

been found to be a possible cause of kidney damage in laboratory rats," Goodwin argues. "Should we be using our children as human guinea pigs for these products?"

Additionally, there are ecological questions. Preplated lunches use a lot of energy in processing, refrigeration, transportation and freezer storage and there is a phenomenal waste of foil, cardboard, plastic and paper.

Pre-plated lunches or pre-cooked, frozen meals are being served in schools throughout the Washington metropolitan area with some school districts moving steadily into satellite feeding programs and others—resisting the trend.

In the District of Columbia, which has a lot of old schools lacking kitchen equipment, some 20,000 elementary school children eat hot-pack lunches each day that have been purchased from the Mass Feeding company of Chicago. Says D.C. Food Service Director Joe Stewart: "We've been satisfied with them and the acceptance level is good. We gave Mass Feeding our specifications for the meals and I can buy these much cheaper than I could produce them locally. They are nutritious."

The dollar savings in satellite feeding programs are undeniable—$200,000 this year in Arlington County, according to School Food Director Bailey McCreery—but the path to convenience feeding hasn't always been smooth.

In Arlington, for example, where all elementary school meals are prepared at junior high or high schools and shipped preplated, a parent group just last week persuaded the school board to adopt a resolution to vary and improve the school lunch menus.

The group, which ran its own system-wide survey of why the kids weren't eating their lunches, demanded and will presumably get foods that contribute to good eating habits, foods high in protein, fiber, vitamins and minerals. They want excluded from the menu foods that contribute to long range health problems, those high in added sugar, fats, artificial coloring and flavorings.

Montgomery County is switching steadily to satellite feeding programs to save money, even in schools with modern kitchens, and about half its schools have lunches shipped in. One lunchroom in transition, and some turmoil, is North Lake Elementary which in January stopped preparing food on the premises and began shipping in preplated lunches from a nearby junior high.

The PTA wrote to the school board asking questions and expressing concern, but the youngsters make a much more eloquent case for having the old system back in operation. Eating lunch recently with the North Lake youngsters brought forth a barrage of complaints from the kids.

"This new TV food is yuckey," one said. "It tastes terrible. They serve green meatballs. Honest. We have to buy ice cream to fill up on."

On this particular day, their complaints were valid. The hot pack, purchased precooked from the Morton Food Co., consisted of six rubbery meatballs in a watery red sauce, along with some corn. It was edible, but not very appetizing or tasty. The cold pack had a very good coconut cookie and the mixed fruit was fine. It also contained a rolled tortilla that was as hard as cardboard, tasted like paste and was, for all practical purposes, inedible.

A sampling of elementary school lunches with youngsters at the District's Giddings School and Arlington's Long Branch produced meals about the same. And a menu comparison for schools throughout the metropolitan area shows little variation from the same six or seven basic entree items although some have more variety.

Fairfax County students have the option of choosing a hot lunch or a cold salad-based meal, both of which fit the government's Type-A lunch requirements.

In Prince Georges County, food for the 43 schools in the satellite feeding program isn't pre-plated in plastic and foil but is shipped in bulk containers. There seems to be more entree variety too, with beef stew, half smokes, lasagna, and steak submarine sandwiches augmenting the usual pizza, hamburger and fish sandwich diet.

It's ironic, perhaps, that one of the best school lunch offerings seems to be Arlington's Yorktown High School, which four years ago turned over its lunchroom to the Macke Corps. Banks of vending machines, not unexpectedly, offers a variety of junk foods, but they also contain an equally varied selection of "good quality" items such as sugar-free soft drinks, fruit juices and soups.

The main feature of the Macke-operated lunchroom, however, is a delibar that contains an excellent selection of foods, all at reasonable prices. There are 15 kinds of made-to-order sandwiches—beef, chicken, tuna, egg, etc.—available on white or whole-grain breads; juice, yoghurt, fresh fruit, cottage cheese, pizza, stuffed eggs, chef's salad, fruit salad, meat and salad plates and cole slaw.

The deli-bar is operated by Macke on a not-for-profit basis and the company's payoff is the proceeds from the vending machines. Assistant Principal Steve Gurcis says Yorktown is extremely satisfied with the arrangement and the students like it. "Everybody benefits," he said.

While Macke at Yorktown and McDonalds at Benton, Ark., have the same basic operating arrangement, the differences and desirability from a nutritional point of view are obvious. Which of these directions the nation's high school lunchrooms take remains to be seen.

Elementary schools are a different matter. Their direction seems pre-determined and is perhaps irreversible, but that won't stop Mary Goodwin and her supporters from working to halt the trend and push for their ideal school lunch programs. She believes that food can be integrated into the school curriculum at all levels, from consumer lessons to science, anthropology, physics, math and so on.

"Ideally, I would like to see all schools have fresh, regional and local food prepared on site by a well trained staff." she says. "The school kitchen could serve as a learning laboratory on food purchasing, preparation, cooking and service. Children could see whole foods, learn something of the nature of foods.

"The cafeteria manager could come into the classroom for nutrition lessons and consumer topics. This is an excellent way to keeping children in contact with the real world rather than a highly mechanized, impersonal one."

LEFTISTS ATTACK BALTIMORE POLICE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years many campaigns have been launched with the goal of curtailing the functions and reducing the effectiveness of our country's police and others of the law enforcement community who with them are responsible for our safety and security. Among those in the vanguard of many of these campaigns have been the Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—and the Center for National Security Studies—CNSS.

This month, both of these groups have selected as their target the Police Department of Baltimore and a dedicated public servant, Donald D. Pomerleau, its commissioner since 1966.

On May 11, 1976, a Baltimore newspaper featured a six-column banner headline, "City's Anti-Crime Program Hit by Report as a Flop," and in slightly smaller type, "Pomerleau Seen Running 'Fiefdom.'" There followed a nonstory worthy of Jack Anderson in which innuendo was piled upon unsubstantiated allegation and nameless sources vented their spleen on the Baltimore Police Department and Commissioner Pomerleau.

The basis for the newspaper attack on the Baltimore police was a draft copy of a report, "Law and Disorder IV," to be published by the Center for National Security Studies—CNSS—122 Maryland Avenue, NE., Washington, D.C. 20002 (202/544-5380) and written by a CNSS consultant, Sarah C. Carey, an attorney associated with the law firm of Cladouhas & Brashares.

Funding for the report was provided in part by the New World Foundation, the Fund for Peace, and the Ford Foundation. It should be noted that the New World Foundation, 100 East 85th Street, New York, N.Y., has also funded the notorious Highlander Center, long associated with Communist Party organizing in the South; the youth project which in turn has subsidized the admittedly Socialist Georgia Power Project and the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate which was charged by CIA Director Colby with having set up CIA agent Richard Welch for assassination; and the Misseduc Foundation, a front for the National Welfare Rights Organization.

The Center for National Security Studies, as I predicted to my colleagues in a report last year—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 20, 1975—has remained in the forefront of those attempting to destroy our security services.

Organized in the fall of 1974, CNSS was and is an activity of the Fund for Peace among whose trustees at that time was a Mrs. Louise R. Berman. And I again draw attention to a summary of her record—Combat, December 15, 1969:

Mrs. Louise Berman, who is also known as Louise Bransten was born Oct. 10, 1908. She is the former wife of Richard Bransten, also known as Bruce Minton, former owner of New Masses. During the water-front strike in San Francisco, Louise and Richard Bransten carried out assignments for the Communist Party, working with Earl Browder and Gerhart Eisler. In 1944 Louise Bransten made a loan of $50,000 to the People's World, which is the west coast organ of the Communist Party.

Hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities carry much more information, and testimony implicates her in activities of several known Soviet espionage agents. She was, for instance, in contact in Hollywood with J. Peters (also known as Alexander Stevens and half a dozen other names), a leading figure in the underground American CP and in Soviet intelligence work; she was an associate of Steve Nelson, long time Communist organizer and ring leader

of a group that penetrated the research facilities of America's atomic bomb laboratory at Berkeley.

Mrs. Berman (Bransten) has been named as a CP member in Congressional testimony, her husband has been named as a CP official. She invoked her 5th Amendment privilege in two appearances before Congress.

At this time, the CNSS is directed by Robert L. Borosage, an active member of the National Lawyers Guild—NLG—and a former employee—now a trustee—of the Institute for Policy Studies—IPS—a new left think tank dedicated not only to developing ground plans for a noncapitalist society "but is also doing what it can to hasten the demise of the present one."

CNSS has received grants from the Veatch Committee, the Stern Fund, and the Field Foundation. In assisting the Marxist goals of the Institute for Policy Studies, CNSS has developed a wide spectrum of projects attacking the law enforcement community. CNSS describes itself in the following terms:

The work of the Center is separated into a number of interrelated projects, each directed by an associate with experience and expertise in the area. The main projects include:

Project on the CIA and Covert Action: Directed by John Marks. Operating in secret, and engaging in covert action beyond the reach of the law and without the knowledge or consent of the people, the CIA is the institutional expression of Executive national security prerogative. This Center project engages in extensive investigations of the CIA's clandestine operations at home and abroad, and seeks to stimulate public debate on US involvement in covert action.

Project on Democracy and the Military: Directed by David Cortright. The Vietnam War revealed widespread unrest in the military over undemocratic procedures and practices. This project explores the widespread disaffection in the military and the growing union organizing movement. It cooperates with other groups working on issues such as amnesty, troop reductions and military reforms.

Project on Domestic Security: Directed by Jerry Berman. This project is designed to monitor and challenge Executive claims to internal security prerogatives. The focus of the project is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It publishes materials on political intelligence, coordinates a committee of groups exploring ways to reform intelligence agencies, and works closely with organizations engaged in litigation to curb the illegal and unconstitutional activities of those agencies.

Project on National Security and Civil Liberties: Directed by Morton Halperin. Secrecy has provided a veil for national security institutions, behind which every intelligence agency has engaged in activities which violate the rights and liberties of citizens at home and abroad. This project is designed to challenge these abuses. It encourages the use of the newly amended Freedom of Information Act, coordinates litigation and exposes information about various policies of national security bureaucracies, and uses the Act to reveal improperly classified information. It publishes a monthly newsletter which explores the relationship between national security prerogatives and civil liberties.

Project on South Africa and National Security: Directed by Courtland Cox. U.S. policy toward southern Africa provides an important case study of national security policy abroad. A 1970 White House policy review placed the United States in greater sympathy with the white regimes in southern Africa, slighting internationally-declared objections, and the smoldering aspirations of the black majorities. This project has undertaken a study of the policies of national security institutions in this area. It seeks to inform Americans, especially black Americans on evolving American policy towards southern Africa.

Project on Interns: Directed by David Klaus. Undergraduate, graduate and law students work at the Center during the academic year as part of the Center's intern project, participating in the various projects. During the summer they participate in special "task forces" focusing on topics which have included: military intelligence; policing in the social service agencies; and racism in the military.

Special studies sponsored by CNSS include:

Project on the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration: Directed by Sarah Carey. This project is evaluating the activities of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and related state agencies. The findings of the project will be published in a study entitled "Law and Disorder IV."

Project on Police and Military Arms Trade and Aid Abroad: Directed by Mike Klare. This project carries on research and writing on the nature of American aid to police in other nations, and the trade and aid in armaments throughout the world.

STAFF OF THE CENTER

Director

Robert L. Borosage.

Staff

Josie D. Anderson, Jerry J. Berman, David Cortright, Courtland Cox, Morton H. Halperin, Susan Kaplan, David M. Klaus, Christy Macy, John D. Marks, Christy Marwick, Judy A. Mead, Florence M. Oliver.

Consultants

Sarah Carey, Helen Eudy, Sean Gervasi, Michael Klare, Neil Sheehan, Wallace Terry.

Ms. Carey, who has made a career, and doubtless a well-compensated living, by attacking the law enforcement community, is no wild-eyed revolutionary; however, her work with CNSS must be seen as part of the Communist program to finish off our police and security agencies. In her attack on Commissioner Pomerleau, Sarah Carey chose to ignore the facts about the Baltimore Impact program which was the target of her venom. In the same day that her report was leaked to a Baltimore newspaper, Commissioner Pomerleau responded with a news release which stated:

The Police Commissioner branded as totally false the charges made by Ms. Sarah C. Carey against the Baltimore Impact program.

From the onset in January 1972 the program reflected the highest degree of cooperation and supportive efforts between the components of the criminal justice spectrum functioning within the city of Baltimore. The programs developed through the Mayor's Coordinating Council have made and will continue to make a positive impact upon the levels of crime in the city. Our collective efforts stand in stark contrast to some of the crash programs instituted in the other seven impact cities. The propriety of our methods is evident in the continuing decrease in Impact crimes.

The relationship between the Baltimore Police Department and the staff of the MCCCJ is excellent. Contrary to Ms. Carey's reported conclusion, Baltimore police data as available was furnished for purposes of planning and evaluating other Impact programs. The department furnished upon request Uniform Crime Reporting data broken down by police reporting area. Additionally, graphic displays of these data were also provided. This general support of the overall Impact program is in addition to the volumes of analyses provided on a monthly, quarterly and project year basis for the four police projects.

The Commissioner views Ms. Carey's unfounded accusations as a disservice to the many dedicated men and women, both paid and volunteer, who contributed so much of their efforts to the city's Impact program. Our crime data and the growing stability of this community speaks for itself.

The Police Commissioner expressed no disagreement with Ms. Carey's comment that the LEAA should be abolished. He has been recommending the abolition of LEAA for years and has further recommended that law enforcement monies be distributed to Mayors and Governors through revenue sharing. * * *

Can we believe it is by mere coincidence that this early use of Ms Carey's report in an attack on the Baltimore Police Department has been accompanied by a personal attack on Commissioner Pomerleau mounted by a local Baltimore front of the Communist Party, U.S.A.? This front, the Baltimore Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression—BAARPR—is the local affiliate of the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression—NAARPR—formed in the spring of 1973.

The Baltimore Alliance chapter is operating from the home of attorney Herbert L. Singleton, Jr., 817 St. Paul Street, No. 511, Baltimore, Md. 21202 (301/752-0723). It numbers among its most active workers functionaries and close associates of the Communist Party, U.S.A. in Maryland including Jake Green, head of the District of Columbia-Maryland District, CPUSA; Tim Wheeler, Washington writer for CPUSA's Daily World and member of the CP Central Committee; Joyce Wheeler, Tim's wife; Margaret and James Baldridge; Carl Gentile and Simon Jeffries, leaders of the local Young Workers Liberation League—YWLL—the CPUSA youth arm; Joe Henderson; Marcella Avnet, an identified CPUSA member who now heads the Baltimore Women's International League for Peace and Freedom chapter; and Harold Buchman, long-time National Lawyers Guild attorney.

The Baltimore group is demanding:

First. The firing of Commissioner Pomerleau.

Second. Return of the Baltimore Police Department to Baltimore City jurisdiction.

Third. Election of a board of police commissioners.

Fourth. Election of a city-wide Civilian Review Board with full subpoena powers as well as the power too—sic—order disciplinary measurers against police officers found guilty of brutality and harassment.

It must be noted, Mr. Speaker, that similar demands are being raised by other chapters of the Communist Party's NAARPR against police in other cities; and we must expect these campaigns to continue.

All Communist Party members must study Lenin both before and after being

admitted to CP membership. His "State and Revolution" bristles with with the call and instructions for the destruction of government and its branches responsible for law, safety and security. When we consider campaigns such as the one being mounted against the Baltimore police, we must recall that Lenin teaches his followers:

Some may at once undertake to kill a spy or blow up a police station. * * * Let every group learn, if it is only by beating up a policeman* * * *—Collected Works, Vol. 9, pp. 344–346.

The Center for National Security Studies and its consultant, Ms. Carey, must be considered as climate makers for the outrageous demands of the Communist Party's Baltimore alliance. It is the news behind the news that the media have ignored.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, May 24, 1976*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let us draw near to God with a true heart in full assurance of faith.—Hebrews 10: 22.

God of Grace and God of Glory at the beginning of a new week we draw near to Thee humbly and reverently seeking guidance for each day, wisdom for each decision, strength for each task, and love for each person.

Keep us close to Thee that no bitterness or resentment may find lodging in our hearts and that kindness and good will alone may dwell therein.

Bless the family of our beloved colleague—TORBERT H. MACDONALD. Comfort them in their sorrow and strengthen them for the days ahead.

Bind us together in a common endeavor to serve the highest good of our Nation with the very best of our abilities. So may our service be an honor to our country, to ourselves, and to Thee: for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and without objection, announces to the House his approval thereof.

There was no objection.

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. 12132. An act to extend as an emergency measure for one year the District of Columbia Medical and Dental Manpower Act of 1970.

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

S. 2679. An act to establish a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

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. 12384. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12384) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. THURMOND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GIFT AND ESTATE TAX BILL

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

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a major gift and estate tax bill that will be the vehicle for markup in committee beginning on June 2. I urge all Members to carefully study the bill. Today in another part of the RECORD I am including a full explanation of the bill, and it is my hope that on the 1st of June another bill will be introduced. I invite other Members to cosponsor the legislation at that time with me.

THE LATE HONORABLE TORBERT H. MACDONALD

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as acting dean of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, it is my very sad duty to inform my colleagues of the death of our beloved friend and colleague TORBERT H. MACDONALD.

TORBY died quietly Friday night. May 21, at Bethesda Naval Hospital after a long illness. His family was at his bedside.

Our heartfelt sympathies go out to his wife Phyllis, his two daughters—Laurie and Robin, and his two sons—Brian and Torbert, Jr.

Funeral services will be held on Friday, May 28, 11 a.m., at the Sacred Hearts Church, Malden, Mass. In lieu of flowers, the family has asked that donations be made to the Torbert Macdonald scholarship fund.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for special orders so that all of our colleagues may have the opportunity to bid farewell to one of the finest and ablest Members to have ever served in this body.

TORBY's efforts in advancing public broadcasting, the sports antiblackout bill, the fuel allocation bill, and his role in the revitalization of the Northeast railroads are well known. Personally, I will remember him as a gentleman, and as a quiet, effective legislator who never complained; he just did his job. He always went out of his way to be fair and impartial; he never misused his great influence and power. TORBY was a close personal friend whose friendship I valued, and I will miss him very much.

The following is a brief biographical sketch of TORBY's legislative accomplishments. It is a fine record indeed. It is one which speaks for the people—those people he so ably served for 22 years.

Mr. MACDONALD was born in Malden and attended Medford public schools and Phillips Andover Academy. Congressman MACDONALD was a graduate of both Harvard College and Harvard Law School and was an outstanding athlete. He captained the Harvard football team, was an all-East halfback, and, in 1973, was inducted into the Harvard Football Hall of Fame. After graduation from Harvard, Congressman MACDONALD turned down a Rhodes scholarship to try out for the New York Yankees.

A PT-boat commander in World War II, MACDONALD won the Silver Star for heroism in New Guinea, as well as the Purple Heart. Prior to winning election to Congress in 1954, Congressman MACDONALD practiced law in Boston, and served as counsel to the New England office of the National Labor Relations Board.

During his 22 years representing suburbs north of Boston, Congressman MACDONALD worked hard to attain several key positions in the House of Representatives. He was chairman of the House Subcommittee on Communications and the ranking Democratic member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. In his capacity as subcommittee chairman, MACDONALD's influence extended over the various forms of telecommunications, including television, radio, cable television, and satellites. MACDONALD also had a major role in shaping legislation dealing with energy, railroad revitalization, and consumer protection as a senior member of the Commerce Committee.

In addition, Congressman MACDONALD served as a ranking member of two Government Operations Subcommittees—Conservation, Energy, and Natural Resources and Government Information and Individual Rights, and served for 20 years as assistant majority leader for New England.

During his 11 consecutive terms in office, MACDONALD achieved a record of distinction in a number of important legislative fields:

He is recognized as the father of public broadcasting, having introduced key