

H 6182

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 27, 1972

Until further notice:

Mr. Curlin with Mr. Betts.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Erlenborn.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Esch.  
Mr. Reid with Mrs. Dwyer.  
Mr. Kuykendall with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Pirnie.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday last, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1234) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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 joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1234

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1973, namely:*

Sec. 101. (a) (1) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1972 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following Appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1973:

District of Columbia Appropriation Act;  
Department of Housing and Urban Development; Space, Science, Veterans, and Certain Other Independent Agencies Appropriation Act;

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act;  
Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;  
Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Public Works for Water, Pollution Control, and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act;

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act; and

Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriation Act.

(2) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority: *Provided*, That no provision in any Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1973, which makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation, shall be effective before the date set forth in section 102(c) of this joint resolution.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only one House or where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower: *Provided*, That no provision which is included in an Appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable Appropriation Act for 1972, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as enacted by both the House and the Senate.

(b) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1972 and are listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority—

activities for which provision was made in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1972: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be used for Exercise Reforger or Exercise Crested Cap or similar dual base exercises;

activities for which provision was made in the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1972;

activities for which provision was made in the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1972, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672, and section 655(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended;

activities for which provision was made in the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended;

activities for continuation of high-speed ground transportation research and development;

activities under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, for which provision was made in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1972; the Office of Education and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1972; and the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1972;

activities for higher education, library resources and educational renewal, for which provision was made in the Office of Education and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1972;

activities for social and rehabilitation services, the Office of Child Development, and maternal and child health project grants, for which provision was made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1972, and the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1972;

activities for work incentives for which provision was made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1972;

activities of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission;

activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

activities in support of Free Europe, Incorporated, and Radio Liberty, Incorporated, pursuant to authority contained in the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1477), notwithstanding Section 703 of that Act; and

activities for which provision was made in the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act, 1972, for the National Industrial Reserve established by the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462).

(c) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Senate items under the Architect of the Capitol, to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the budget estimates for fiscal year 1973.

(d) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing the following activities, but at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate—

activities for (1) civil rights education, for which provision was made in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1972; (2) emergency school assistance activities for which provision was made in the Joint Resolution of July 1, 1971 (Public Law 92-38); (3) youth development and delinquency prevention for which provision was made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1972; (4) aid to land-grant colleges, grants for construction of undergraduate facilities, undergraduate instructional equipment, and minor remodeling, and research and development for which provision was made in the Office of Education Appropriation Act, 1972; and (5) functions transferred to the Action Agency by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1971 and Executive Order 11603 approved July 1, 1971.

Sec. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable Appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) August 18, 1972, whichever first occurs.

Sec. 103. Appropriations and funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in subsection (d) (2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

Sec. 104. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

Sec. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

Sec. 106. No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during the fiscal year 1972.

June 27, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 6181

This admonition cannot be repeated often enough until it becomes part of our public policy. Until it does, we will be confronted with the unpleasant task of periodically increasing the public debt limit.

\*That is the task we face today. It is unpleasant, but we cannot avoid the obligation to act. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 15390.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. MILLS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. 15390

A bill to provide for a four-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 92-250 and section 2(a) of Public Law 92-5 are each amended by striking out "June 30, 1972," and inserting in lieu thereof "October 31, 1972,".*

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, no amendments are in order to the bill except those offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There are none, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUNGATE, 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. 15390) to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, pursuant to House Resolution 1021, 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. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 15390 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 168, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—211

Alexander  
Anderson, III.  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Annunzio  
Arends  
Ashley  
Barrett  
Belcher  
Bell  
Bergland  
Blester  
Blatnik  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bow  
Brasco  
Bray  
Broziman  
Brown, Mich.  
Brown, Ohio  
Buchanan  
Burke, Mass.  
Burleson, Tex.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Carey, N.Y.  
Cannon  
Carter  
Casey, Tex.  
Cederberg  
Celler  
Chamberlain  
Collier  
Colmer  
Conable  
Conover  
Conte  
Corman  
Cotter  
Coughlin  
Culver  
Daniels, N.J.  
Danielson  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
Delaney  
Dennis  
Derwinski  
Donohue  
Dorn  
Downing  
Dulski  
Duncan  
du Pont  
Eckhardt  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Ala.  
Eilberg  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.  
Findley  
Fish  
Flood  
Foley  
Forsythe  
Frelinghuysen  
Frenzel  
Garmatz  
Gettys  
Giaino  
Grasso  
Gray

Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffiths  
Gubser  
Gude  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hanley  
Hanna  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harvey  
Hastings  
Hathaway  
Hays  
Heckler, Mass.  
Heinz  
Hicks, Mass.  
Hicks, Wash.  
Hillis  
Horton  
Hosmer  
Howard  
Hungate  
Jarman  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Kazen  
Keating  
Keith  
Kemp  
Kluczynski  
Landrum  
Latta  
Lent  
Lloyd  
McClary  
McCloskey  
McEwen  
McFall  
McKay  
McKevitt  
McDonald,  
Mass.  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Mallory  
Mann  
Martin  
Mathias, Calif.  
Matsunaga  
Mayne  
Mazzoli  
Meeds  
Melcher  
Michel  
Mills, Ark.  
Mills, Md.  
Minish  
Mink  
Minshall  
Monagan  
Moorhead  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
O'Hara  
O'Neill

Passman  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Peyster  
Pickle  
Podell  
Poff  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Quie  
Rallsback  
Randall  
Rees  
Rhodes  
Robison, N.Y.  
Rodino  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Ruppe  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Shriver  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Springer  
Staggers  
Stanton,  
J. William  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Steed  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stevens  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Talcott  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Thone  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Ullmah  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Veysey  
Vigorito  
Waggonner  
Ware  
Whalen  
Whalley  
Whitehurst  
Widnall  
Wiggins  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Winn  
Wright  
Wyder  
Yates  
Young, Tex.  
Zablocki

NAYS—168

Abbutt  
Abzug  
Adams  
Addabbo  
Anderson,  
Calif.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Acher  
Ashbrook  
Aspin  
Aspinall  
Badillo  
Baker  
Begich  
Bennett  
Bevill  
Blaggi  
Bingham  
Blackburn

Brademas  
Brinkley  
Brooks  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Burlison, Mo.  
Burton  
Byron  
Cabell  
Camp  
Carney  
Chappell  
Clancy  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del  
Clay  
Cleveland  
Collins, Ill.  
Collins, Tex.

Frey  
Fuqua  
Gallianakis  
Gaydos  
Gibbons  
Goldwater  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gross  
Grover  
Haley  
Hall  
Harrington  
Harsha  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Helstoski  
Henderson  
Hogan  
Hull  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jacobs  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kastenmeier  
King  
Koch  
Kyros  
Landgrebe  
Leggett  
Lennon  
Link  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
Lujan  
McClure  
McCollister

McCormack  
Madden  
Mathis, Ga.  
Metcalfe  
Mikva  
Miller, Ohio  
Mitchell  
Montgomery  
Morgan  
Myers  
Natcher  
Nichols  
Nix  
Obey  
O'Konski  
Patman  
Patten  
Pike  
Poage  
Powell  
Price, Tex.  
Quillen  
Rangel  
Rarick  
Reuss  
Riegle  
Roberts  
Robinson, Va.  
Roe  
Rogers  
Roncallo  
Rosenthal  
Roussetot  
Roy  
Roybal  
Runnels  
Ruth  
Ryan

Satterfield  
Saylor  
Scherle  
Scheuer  
Schmitz  
Scott  
Sebelius  
Seiberling  
Shipley  
Shoup  
Sikes  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Snyder  
Spence  
Steele  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stokes  
Symington  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Vanik  
Waldie  
Wampler  
White  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wolf  
Wyatt  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Yatron  
Young, Fla.  
Zion  
Zwach

NOT VOTING—53

Abernethy  
Abourezk  
Anderson,  
Tenn.  
Baring  
Betts  
Blanton  
Boggs  
Broomfield  
Broyhill, Va.  
Burke, Fla.  
Caffery  
Chisholm  
Clark  
Curlin  
Davis, S.C.  
Dent  
Dickinson  
Dowdy

Dwyer  
Erlenborn  
Esch  
Evins, Tenn.  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Ford,  
William D.  
Fulton  
Gallagher  
Griffin  
Hagan  
Hawkins  
Hébert  
Hollifield  
Karth  
Kee  
Kuykendall  
Kyl  
McCulloch

McDade  
McDonald,  
Mich.  
McKinney  
McMillan  
Miller, Calif.  
Mizell  
Mollohan  
Mosher  
Moss  
Pirnie  
Pryor, Ark.  
Reid  
Sarbanes  
Schneebeil  
Schwengel  
Sullivan  
Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Abernethy against.  
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Abourezk against.  
Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Dent against.  
Mr. Fulton for, with Mr. Clark against.  
Mr. Davis of South Carolina for, with Mr. Hogan against.  
Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Baring against.  
Mr. Hollifield for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.  
Mr. Karth for, with Mr. William D. Ford against.  
Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Griffin against.  
Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Sarbanes against.  
Mr. Blanton for, with Mr. Dowdy against.  
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee for, with Mr. Dickinson against.  
Mr. Schneebeil for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.  
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Caffery against.  
Mr. McDade for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.  
Mr. McDonald of Michigan for, with Mr. Mizell against.  
Mr. Broyhill of Virginia for, with Mr. Mosher against.  
Mr. McKinney for, with Mr. Schwengel against.  
Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Kyl against.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

June 27, 1972

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 6183

Sec. 107. Any appropriation for the fiscal year 1973 required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need (to the extent any such increases cannot be absorbed within available appropriations) for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases as may be granted pursuant to law to civilian officers and employees and to active and retired military personnel. Each such appropriation shall otherwise be subject to the requirements of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the continuing resolution which will enable the Government to continue to operate after next Friday, June 30. The outside effective date of the resolution is August 18, 1972. Of course, appropriation bills that become the law in the meantime will be the controlling element in the spending of the various departments covered by the particular bill.

## STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. Speaker, when we pass the agricultural appropriation bill on Thursday, the House will have passed 10 of the 13 regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal 1973, which begins next Saturday.

The Senate by the end of this week will, it is expected, have passed nine of the fiscal 1973 appropriation bills.

Three of the annual appropriation bills will hopefully go to the President this week—the District of Columbia appropriation bill, the legislative appropriation bill, and the Treasury—Postal Service—General Government appropriation bill. Conference reports have been filed on them and if they all clear Congress this week, they should shortly become law.

The remaining appropriation bills which we will have to report to the House when we come back on July 17 will be the military construction appropriation bill, the defense appropriation bill, and the foreign assistance appropriation bill.

Certain actions will have to be taken otherwise. For example, we will, I believe, have to provide an appropriation—probably this week—to take care of an addition to the disaster relief fund. The President is today urgently recommending \$100 million additional for disaster relief, because of recent disasters in various parts of the country.

## RATES FOR OPERATIONS

The pending resolution is the standard, garden variety continuing resolution which continues all the agencies and departments of Government, and they are continued at certain specified rates.

For example, on the three bills which will not have passed the House or the Senate, the general ground rule during this interim as to the rate for operations will be the budget request for 1973 or last year's appropriation, that is, fiscal 1972, whichever is the lower. That is standard.

Then, as to any bill which has passed the House, but not passed the Senate, the House figure or last year's appropriation, whichever is lower, will be the general ground rule.

As to the appropriation bills—and we expect there will be nine of them—that have passed both the House and the Senate, the lower of the applicable figures as between the two Houses will be controlling until the expiration of this continuing resolution or, of course, until they are signed into law.

## FREE WORLD FORCES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. In the military authorization bill last year, in the military appropriations bill for the current year, there was a ceiling of \$2.5 billion imposed on expenditures by the Government for activity in Vietnam.

In the authorization bill passed by the House earlier today, that ceiling is sought to be raised to \$2.7 billion.

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

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. YATES. In the bill that was passed by the House today, that ceiling was raised to \$2.7 billion because the administration, I understand, has exceeded the limitation on spending in Vietnam that was imposed by the Congress.

Will the continuing resolution continue our spending at the level imposed by the Congress in last year's bills at \$2.5 billion or at the level of the bill that was passed by the House today at \$2.7 billion?

Mr. MAHON. The continuing resolution will provide for expenditures for free world forces in Southeast Asia at the rate of the existing law, which is \$2.5 billion.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

[Mr. BOW addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

## CONTINGENCY PROVISIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I note this language on page 3 of the bill as follows: *Provided*, That no provision in any Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1973, which makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation, shall be effective before the date set forth in section 102(c) of this joint resolution.

Then turning to page 7 of the resolution, section 102(c) reads or provides:

August 18, 1972, whichever first occurs.

Will the gentleman explain the meaning of that to the House?

Mr. MAHON. The House passed several appropriation bills containing items where there was no related legislative authorization enacted into law as to fiscal year 1973. For example, the authorization had passed the House with reference

to the National Science Foundation and the Coast Guard and some other activities.

The appropriation bills containing such items went to the other body. In passing the bills, the other body added the proviso in various places, providing that those funds should not become available until the related authorization had been enacted into law.

Well, many of the authorizations involved have not become law and will not become law by next Saturday, July 1, when the continuing resolution takes effect. So, if the bill has passed the House and passed the Senate, then according to the yardstick the basis upon which the department or agency will operate is the House or the Senate figure, whichever is the lower. The Senate figure, with the proviso saying that the amount is not going to be effective until the related authorization is passed—the Senate figure in those instances will be zero, so a number of agencies would come to a screeching halt next Saturday unless we add the proviso to which the gentleman makes reference.

## EXPIRATION DATE OF CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. GROSS. I am still not clear as to the meaning of August 18, 1972, the date predicated.

Mr. MAHON. The expiration date of the whole continuing resolution is August 18, the date when it is planned to recess for the Republican National Convention. We will have to pass another continuing resolution if we do not get the appropriation business completed by the 18th day of August.

Mr. GROSS. That is what the August 18 date means?

Mr. MAHON. Oh, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Contingent upon the adjournment for the Republican Convention until after Labor Day?

Mr. MAHON. I would hope that we would get the appropriation bills completed by August 18. Ten bills will have passed the House by this weekend. Nine bills, I believe, will have passed the Senate by this weekend. Only three bills remain to be reported to the House, and they are held up because of lack of legislative authorizations. We passed the Defense authorization bill in the House today. I would think we could complete the appropriation business by August 18. We would be doing quite well if we did so, but it is an objective devoutly to be sought.

May I add that we should be able to bring in conference reports on the seven bills that will be in conference after we come back on July 17. We will have a month to work on them and to process the three bills yet to be reported to the House. As I mentioned earlier, three conference reports are filed and we hope the House and Senate can clear them to the President this week.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include excerpts from the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the pending resolution. It explains the resolution in considerable detail and contains a table on the appropriations bills for fiscal 1973 and certain other pertinent information:

H 6184

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 27, 1972

## DETAILS ABOUT THE RESOLUTION

Comporting with continuing resolutions over a period of many years, the emphasis in the resolution is on the *continuation of existing projects and activities* at the lowest of one of three rates, namely, the current (fiscal year 1972) rate; the budget request for 1973, where no action has been taken by either House; or the more restrictive amount adopted by either of the two Houses. The whole thrust of the resolution is to keep the Government functioning on a minimum basis until funds for the full year are otherwise determined open.

For many years, it has been necessary to provide some stopgap appropriations through continuing resolutions. Officials having responsibility for managing programs during such interim periods are not—certainly should not be—unaware of the fact that the whole thrust behind these measures is to do *only* the minimum necessary for orderly continuation of activities, preserving to the maximum extent reasonably possible the flexibility of Congress in arriving at final decisions in the regular annual bills. Recognizing the almost countless differing situations involved in operating the far-flung activities of government, continuing resolutions have by design always been drawn rather broadly, counting heavily on administrators to follow a prudent and cautious course in respect to a particular program encompassed within an overall appropriation item.

Without laying down any hard and fast rules and short of encumbering, administrative processes with detailed fiscal controls, the Committee nonetheless thinks that to the extent reasonably possible, departments, and agencies should avoid the obligation of funds for specific budget line items or program allocations, on which congressional committees may have expressed strong criticism, at rates which unduly impinge upon discretionary decisions otherwise available to the Congress.

The general basis of operation is this:

*If the applicable 1973 appropriations bill has passed both Houses but has not cleared conference, and the particular amount or authority therein differs, the pertinent project or activity continues under the lesser of the two amounts and under the more restrictive authority. Section 101(a)(3) deals with this.*

In that connection, there is a new proviso added to the usual wording of section 101(a)(3), as follows: Provided, That no provision in any appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1973, which makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation, shall be effective before the date set forth in section 102(c) of this joint resolution.

In several of the appropriation bills for 1973 the Senate has attached provisions to a number of appropriations, making their availability contingent on enactment of authorization legislation. Thus, in these instances the effective Senate-passed amounts are zero and if the provisions are operative as of July 1, under the standard applications of the section 101(a)(3) groundrule they would be without funds come July 1. Pending disposition of the provisions and the authorizations to which they refer, the above-quoted provision in the accompanying continuing resolution is necessary to avoid what would in its absence be the case; namely, an abrupt cutoff of funds for many important

on-going programs and agencies come midnight, June 30.

Where a bill has passed only one House, or where an appropriation for a project or activity is included in only one version of a bill as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity continues under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current fiscal year 1972 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is the lower. Section 101(a)(4) deals with this.

Where neither House has passed the applicable appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1973—and that will, at things now look, be the case for 3 of the 13 scheduled annual bills for 1973—appropriations are provided for continuing projects or activities conducted during fiscal year 1972 at the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate for 1973, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority. Section 101(b) deals with this. And there is an exception in respect to the Department of Defense relating to certain training exercises.

The Committee has included a provision which prohibits the Department of Defense from obligating funds under this resolution for carrying out the Reforger IV exercise of the Army and the Crested Cap exercise of the Air Force. In these exercises United States forces are transported to Europe for coordinated training with other NATO forces. The purpose of this limiting proviso is to carry out the intent of the conferees on the Department of Defense Appropriation Bill for fiscal year 1972. The conference report (House Report 92-754 of December 14, 1971) discusses the conduct of these exercises on page 6 and states in part that:

"The objective of the conferees is to prevent any further obligations for these exercises through the use of funds provided in this bill, and to prohibit the use of funds made available through Continuing Resolutions for similar Reforger and Crested Cap exercises during fiscal year 1973."

*If there is no budget estimate or if the budget request has been deferred for later consideration, special provision is made for continuation until the question is disposed of in the course of processing the applicable regular bill. Section 101(d) deals with this.*

*The resolution does not in any way augment the appropriation for a given project or activity in the regular bills for the fiscal year 1973. In the words of section 105 of the resolution itself:*

"Sec. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law."

In other words, while this resolution—as in the case of similar resolutions of previous years—does not enumerate *specific* amounts that may be obligated and expended for the countless activities of government during the period of the resolution (or such shorter period as the resolution may operate as to particular departments or agencies), the controlling factor, known to all who have any responsibility for the management of the programs or the obligation of the funds, is that whatever is used during this interim must be taken out of, or charged against, whatever amount is finally appropriated, or otherwise made available, for the whole year.

Section 101(a) and following subsections

of that section of the resolution are drawn along conventional lines of similar past resolutions, except as noted above, and deal with appropriation bills that, according to the present schedule, will have passed at least one House before July 1.

Section 101(b) and following subsections of that section of the resolution are drawn along the conventional lines of similar past resolutions, except as noted above, and, generally, encompass those activities to be considered in connection with appropriation bills not yet reported from the Committee on Appropriations or which are otherwise not presently included in a bill.

Section 101(c) relates to Senate house-keeping operations and is identical in substance to previous resolutions.

Section 101(d), also drawn along conventional lines, generally deals with activities being conducted in the fiscal year 1972 for which at the moment there is no fiscal 1973 budget estimate or authorizing legislation, and such items are not effectively covered by previous subsections of Section 101.

Section 102 provides that the resolution ceases to apply to an agency or activity concurrent with approval by the President of the applicable appropriation bill in which effective provision for such agency or activity is made. Thus the scope of the continuing resolution constricts as each bill is enacted; the resolution will be wholly inoperative after the last bill for 1973 is approved, or August 18, whichever first occurs. Any bills not legislatively finalized by August 18 will have to be covered by another continuing resolution.

Section 103 is standard, and obviates a lot of unproductive paperwork that would otherwise be necessary.

Section 104 is standard in continuing resolutions, and is self-explanatory.

Section 105 is also standard and self-explanatory.

Section 106 is also standard in continuing resolutions, forbidding the use of funds provided in the joint resolution to initiate any new project or activity or to resume any which was not being conducted in fiscal 1972.

Section 107 is a standard-type provision made necessary when general civilian or military pay raises, which are mandatory insofar as administrative discretion is concerned, have not been specifically appropriated for or were not in effect for the full period of the prior fiscal year but which by their operation will be annualized in the fiscal year to which the resolution relates. The going salary rates authorized by any pay raise legislation must be continued uninterrupted at the higher rates even though the related specific appropriation increases have not been enacted.

## THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

## Fiscal year 1972

In this session, Congress has processed three appropriation measures relating to the current fiscal year 1972, namely, an urgent supplemental bill; the Second Supplemental bill; and a special resolution relating to gold revaluation.

In summary, budget requests for new budget (obligational) authority considered in these measures totaled \$7,423,419,448. Amounts enacted totaled \$6,905,174,329, for a net reduction of \$518,245,119.

## Fiscal year 1973

The following table on bills relating to the fiscal year 1973 shows the latest situation:

June 27, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 6185

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1973 (AS OF JUNE 26, 1972)

[Note.—As to fiscal year 1973 amounts only]

Bill	Budget request considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (-)	Bill	Budget request considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (-)
<b>In the House:</b>				3. District of Columbia (Federal funds).....	\$343,306,000	\$313,706,000	-\$29,600,000
1. Legislative.....	\$433,627,004	\$427,604,764	-\$6,022,240	4. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary.....	4,704,326,600	4,820,717,769	+\$116,391,169
2. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary.....	4,687,988,600	4,587,104,350	-100,884,250	5. Transportation.....	2,909,181,095	2,906,994,095	-2,187,000
3. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans.....	29,173,185,000	19,718,490,000	-454,695,000	Advance 1974 appropriation.....	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)	
4. Transportation.....	2,909,181,095	2,791,614,095	-117,567,000	6. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government.....	5,066,603,000	5,057,186,000	-9,417,000
Advance 1974 appropriation.....	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)		7. Labor-HEW.....	(27,416,788,500)	(+29,464,035,500)	(+2,047,247,000)
5. District of Columbia (Federal funds).....	343,306,000	332,306,000	-11,000,000	8. Interior.....			
6. Labor-HEW.....	27,327,323,500	28,603,179,500	+1,275,856,000	9. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection.....			
7. Interior.....	2,520,340,000	2,529,558,200	+9,218,200	10. Public Works-AEC.....			
8. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government.....	5,066,603,000	5,057,145,000	-9,458,000	Total, bills cleared Senate.....	33,800,947,594	34,196,696,744	+395,749,150
9. Public Works-AEC.....	5,489,058,000	5,437,727,000	-51,331,000	Enacted:			
10. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection.....	12,952,177,400	12,897,010,900	-55,166,500	1. Legislative.....	519,347,899	513,787,980	-5,559,919
11. Foreign Assistance.....	(5,163,024,000)						
12. Defense.....	(76,986,184,000)						
13. Military construction.....	(3,017,800,000)						
14. Supplemental, 1973.....							
Total, House bills.....	81,902,789,599	82,381,739,809	+478,950,210	Total, bills enacted.....	519,347,899	513,787,980	-5,559,919
<b>In the Senate:</b>							
1. Legislative.....	519,347,899	514,722,880	-4,625,019				
2. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans.....	20,258,183,000	20,583,370,000	+325,187,000				

1 As reported.  
2 Conference report as filed.

Note.—2 other reports filed June 26 and June 27 (D.C. bill and TR.-P.S.-G.G. Bill).

The foregoing table relates only to the regular annual appropriation bills.

COMPREHENSIVE BUDGET SCOREKEEPING

For general reference purposes of Members and others, it may be of interest to again call attention to the periodic budget "score-keeping" reports issued by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reducation of Federal Expenditures. These reports are designed to keep tabs, currently, on what is happening in the legislative process to the budget recommendations of the President, both appropriation-wise and expenditure-wise, and on the revenue recommendations, and not only from actions in the revenue and appropriation bills but also in legislative bills that affect budget authority and expenditures (backdoor bills, bills that mandate expenditures, and so on).

Several such reports have been issued this year—the latest one as of June 16—and another is due shortly. Copies are sent to the office of each Member.

Mr. GROSS. I must say to the gentleman that I fear the worst.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, and that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain tables and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because of a meeting with a group of my constituents on May 11, 1972, I was unable to be present for rollcall No. 145. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14896, THE SCHOOL LUNCH BILL, ON THURSDAY, JUNE 29, UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other legislative business on Thursday it may be in order to call up for consideration the bill H.R. 14896, the school lunch bill, under suspension of the rules.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask what the request would involve? Namely, would it involve a violation of the Reorganization Act of 1970 insofar as the 3-day rule and the rules of the House are concerned?

Second, would it invoke the two-thirds vote requirement as under any suspended rule?

Mr. PERKINS. First, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that, in my judgment, it would not violate the rules of the House. The report has been printed. It was printed yesterday. The bill was reported unanimously out of the committee last week. We complied with the rules of the committee, and I think we complied with the rules of the House.

In answer to the second part of the gentleman's question, I should think it would require a two-thirds vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Would the Chair confirm that if the unanimous-consent request is granted that the rules for suspension would be in effect and a two-thirds vote would be required to suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the gentleman's unanimous-consent request it would require a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Chair. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

QUALITY OF EDUCATION OF AMERICAN CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there are few things with higher priority on the national agenda than the quality of education of American children.

That fact has prompted the Congress to enact and fund the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other legislation, all designed to provide this issue with care and attention commensurate with its importance.

Even so, the American system of public education is still experiencing financial problems. State and local tax rates, which support the system, continue to rise toward the critical level, adding dan-



gerous weight to the taxpayers' burden and giving rise to talk of even greater Federal assistance.

Because of its concern for the minds and characters of young Americans, the Congress is going to respond to this problem to whatever extent is necessary. It should and it will.

An integral part of the American education system—almost since the founding of the Republic—has been the nonpublic elementary and secondary schools which have produced many millions of conscientious, productive citizens.

This other system of education, representing the best of America's pluralism, is likewise experiencing financial difficulties. Higher costs have seriously depleted their resources, shortages of teachers have thinned their ranks. A great part of America is dying.

To cite an example, some 1,300 Catholic parochial schools have closed their doors in the past 5 years. This has added nearly half a million pupils to the public schools. In the diocese of Fall River in my congressional district, 19 schools have closed during this period, moving 5,000 children into public schools.

The seriousness of that situation was brought home to me at a meeting recently in Fall River with the Reverend Patrick O'Neill, superintendent of schools for the diocese, attended by clergy and laity.

I will soon meet with Msgr. John Boyd of St. Patrick's in Fall River and with other concerned persons, Catholic and non-Catholic, on the problem.

This same situation is being duplicated among other nonpublic schools in every part of the country.

Currently, there are about 4.5 million students in more than 13,000 nonpublic school systems in the United States. Of these, 85 percent are Catholic, 7 percent are nonsectarian, 3 percent are Jewish, and 5 percent include various other types and denominations.

The best estimates are that if all or most of these pupils had to be absorbed into the public school systems of this Nation, it would cost local taxpayers in the neighborhood of \$10 billion, to say nothing of the Nation as a whole in terms of increased Federal assistance. Of that amount, approximately \$3 billion would be an annual cost increase and the rest over various time periods for capital expenditures.

In my own congressional district, Mr. Speaker, if all the nonpublic schools were to close, it would increase local tax rates in varying amounts. The real property tax rate in the city of Fall River is expected to be about \$190 per \$1,000 assessed valuation this year. Closing the nonpublic schools would make that tax rate \$236.20, an increase of \$46.20, to give an example of the impact this would have in a specific instance.

Other examples of tax rate increases would be in the city of Attleboro, Mass., an increase of \$6.40 per thousand; in the city of Taunton, an increase of \$39.70 per \$1,000; in the town of Somerset, \$9.20; Swansea, \$34.60; and Westport, \$26.90.

It makes sense that if the public school system as it is today is experienc-

ing financial problems which cry for solution, the swelling of the system by another 4.5 million children would make the problem a national crisis.

Financial problems aside, such an influx of youngsters would seriously hamper the quality of public education itself by overcrowding facilities and severely straining existing resources.

To head off such a catastrophe, I and several other Members have introduced legislation to provide tax relief to the parents of children attending private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Their Federal income tax bill would be reduced by half the total annual tuition they must pay, or by \$400, whichever is less. For those earning more than \$25,000 a year, the tax relief would be proportionately reduced.

We also have word, Mr. Speaker, that the President is going to include a similar proposal in the tax reform package he is preparing to present to the Congress.

That is welcome news, indeed, although I almost wish we do not have to wait that long, because this situation is so critical, it cannot wait for the torturous voyage of a tax reform package through the House and the other body. I would like to see the tax credit legislation separated and proceed on its own.

I have taken this special order today, Mr. Speaker, to point out the seriousness of the situation confronting us and to propose a reasonable solution. I am grateful to those other Members that join me in underlining the critical nature of the problem.

The tax relief I am proposing would cost the Treasury an estimated \$508 million annually. Mr. Speaker, I think that compares favorably with the \$3 billion or more it would cost the taxpayers if these schools were shut down.

I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (Mr. MILLS) and to the ranking Member of the minority (Mr. BYRNES) who have also sponsored this legislation.

I believe this legislation is in the national interest and is needed now. Its passage should be a high priority in this Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentlewoman for obtaining this time for the purpose of speaking about aid for nonpublic schools, which is one of the chief areas of concern in education across the land today.

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our colleague, Mrs. HECKLER, for her recognition of the crisis in private education and to thank her for arranging this opportunity for those of us who share her concern to participate in this discussion.

The private and parochial elementary and secondary schools of America make an essential contribution to pluralism in

our society and provide an alternate and vital choice in our system of education. Private schools of various kinds are able to draw upon financial resources not available to public institutions—and which would not otherwise be available to education. They provide diversity, choice, and healthy competition to traditionally public education and serve the public purpose by providing the means for a substantial group of Americans to express themselves socially, ethnically, culturally, and religiously through education institutions. Our private and parochial schools and colleges add a dimension of spiritual value to education which is invaluable to the moral fiber of the Nation itself; and in my view, it would be a tragedy of the first magnitude if tax-supported State schools were to drive private institutions out of existence.

Many public school systems are currently in the throes of a financial crisis stemming principally from the fact that local and State revenues have not kept pace with spiraling costs. To the extent that financial difficulties have affected most school systems in recent years, they have affected private schools—which have no tax base—even more. Total private school enrollment exceeds 5.2 million, or approximately 10 percent of our schools, and it has been estimated that if most or all private schools were to close or turn public, the added burden on public funds by the end of the 1970's would exceed \$4 billion per year in operations, with an estimated \$5 billion more needed for facilities.

Without weakening our commitment to public education, I believe that Congress must protect and encourage the private option. The private option should not be available only to the wealthy. That is not the American way. And America is richer for the diversity of those groups which prefer a distinctive schooling.

Without question, respect for the doctrine of church-state separation and restraints placed on private school aid by court decisions in interpreting provisions of the Constitution have greatly limited available options. However, the first amendment to the Constitution, which enjoins the separation of church and state, also specifies that nobody shall be prevented from exercising his right to freedom of religion. Forcing a parent to take his child out of a private school because he cannot afford to support two separate school systems is an obvious infringement of the right to religious protection under the first amendment itself. I feel it is essential that we maintain the integrity of the doctrine of church and state and that the state should be neutral in its dealings with religion, but, nonetheless the doctrine of separation does not require that the state be hostile to religion.

I have cosponsored legislation for an income tax credit plan which would allow parents of a nonpublic schoolchild to deduct from their final tax liability an amount equal to one-half of the tuition paid up to an overall limit of \$500 per dependent. By providing assistance directly to the parents of schoolchildren and not the schools, I believe that this

*Bill file*

May 18, 1972

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8117

a uniform method of state taxation as a first step toward tax simplification. This legislation would have a decided, positive effect in encouraging interstate commerce, in that it would remove the single largest roadblock facing small businesses wishing to engage in such commerce. As things stand now, small businesses encounter a virtual jungle of uncertainty in determining if they are indeed subject to state tax, and if so, in computing the tax. A single example illustrates the almost incredible nature of the problem: due to varying methods for determining taxable property, it is not uncommon for the aggregate of the allocation factors for all the states in which a corporation does business to total more than 100%; accordingly, many corporations actually pay state taxes on more than their entire income or capital! The Interstate Taxation Act would help put a stop to situations such as this. In prior years this bill has passed the House, only to die in committee in the Senate. Our Association feels that it deserves to be reported out of committee and enacted into law.

A related problem is the proliferation of federally required tax forms. We are all literally buried in piles of paper. Each attempt at simplification of paper flow seems to result in the addition of a simple new form to cure the ills. This form, although intended to help, is usually added to the already existing forms and actually increases paper work! In time the simplified form becomes more and more complex until someone comes along with a further simplification idea and the cycle resumes. Senator McIntyre of New Hampshire has been holding hearings on this serious burden. SBANE has participated in those hearings because we have seen new businesses drowning in a flood of paper requirements that severely interferes with the drive toward becoming a healthy small business. We hope that members of Congress will recognize that the best approach to resolving this mounting problem is to examine the necessity, rather than the mere utility, of every Government form.

The Administration's small business tax relief bill (S. 544) strikes us as being "too little, too late." However, we re-emphasize our strong support for its proposal to extend from 5 to 10 years the period during which a net operating loss can be carried forward by individuals and by small business corporations. The present 5-year limit is exceedingly unfair to certain small companies. As an example, we cite the plight of small technical products firms, formed in the mid 1960s. Typically, such enterprises experienced several years of losses while becoming established. Then they encountered the economic downturn of 1970-71, which particularly affected sales of capital equipment. As conditions began to improve in late 1971 and early 1972, these companies began to realize profits, only to find that they no longer have a loss carryover deduction from their start-up years. Congress should recognize their plight and extend this needed relief.

Although many believe that America's economy is dominated by large national and multi-national industrial companies, the fact is that without the small businessman, our economy would not provide the average American with the life style we all so eagerly strive for. We are all well aware of the ability of big business to make its position known to government. By contrast, it is extremely difficult for the smaller businessman to have his thoughts and desires heard. We believe that the small businessman can be given an effective voice in the councils of government by establishing the position of Small Business Tax Analyst in the Treasury Department. The main function of such an official would be to review tax legislation and problems from the viewpoint of small business, and to articulate that point of view in the day-to-day workings of the Treasury. We

emphatically endorse this feature of the Bible-Evins bill.

SBANE proposes the adoption of legislation which would enable a small business to elect to be treated as a regulated small business corporation, which would be defined as any domestic corporation (other than a personal holding company) whose stock was owned at least 90% by individuals, with net assets of \$1,000,000 or less determined as of the end of the prior year. An electing regulated small business corporation would be exempt from taxation of its income so long as at least 90% of its taxable income was distributed to its shareholders during the current year or before the filing date of its Federal income tax return. The taxable income of a regulated small business corporation would be computed in the normal manner except for the elimination of the dividends received deduction for nonaffiliated corporations.

SBANE urges the adoption of this legislation to negate the stifling effects of double taxation on small businesses. This classification of corporations would further the congressional intent demonstrated in the enactment of the Subchapter S election. There are many small business corporations which do not qualify for Subchapter S status or whose stockholders do not need or cannot avail themselves of the loss deductions because of their small original investment in the corporation. By electing to be treated as a regulated small business corporation, the stockholders would be taxed on the taxable income of the corporation after deduction of net operating loss carryovers. Since this proposal reduces the present incentive to maximize corporate compensation and other related deductions, we believe it would provide the further advantage of reducing controversies with the Internal Revenue Service.

We cannot leave the subject of taxation without expressing our appreciation to Congress for its wisdom in enacting the export tax deferral program. By means of Domestic International Sales Corporations, many small companies can now gain entry to foreign markets that would otherwise have remained closed to them.

## QUORUM CALL

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 (Mr. SPONG). Without objection, it is so ordered. The extended time for the consideration of morning business has now expired.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1972 CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consider the conference report on H.R. 14582.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14582) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 1972, at p. H4456.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a time limitation on this conference of 1 hour, to be equally divided between the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG), and that includes the time on any amendments in disagreement.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that, for the time being, the time be equally charged against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say that we have up for consideration the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill.

This is a large and an important supplemental appropriation bill and the amount agreed to in the final conference is \$4,347,698,270.

This bill was in conference a large part of the day of May 4, 1972, and practically the entire day of May 11, 1972.

There were 50 separate Senate amendments, and I believe that we performed very well from the point of view of the Senate.

There has already been printed in the record a tabulation which shows the amounts of the budget estimates, the amounts recommended in the House bill, the Senate bill, and the final amounts agreed to in conference on each of the 13 chapters in this bill. I will confine my remarks to a few of the more significant items.

Title II of this bill includes \$2,340,194,728 for increased pay costs as a result of Executive Order 11637 of December 22, 1971, which adjusted the salary rates upward of civilian employees of the Federal Government; Executive Order 11638 of December 22, 1971, which provided an adjustment upward on a comparable basis for members of the uniformed services; and as a result of the substantial increase for members of the uniformed services voted by the Congress, becoming effective in November 1971.

The deductions of \$45,796,120 under the House bill and of \$11,349,000 under the Senate bill in title II, agreed to by the conferees, relate to Department of Defense pay cost items and are possible due to the most recent recomputations

in some line items and to absorptions of additional funds in other line items through savings realized from program changes.

Under title I, the conference agreement totaled \$2,007,503,542—an increase of \$439,041,032 over the House bill but a reduction of \$704,470,169 under the Senate bill.

One of the largest single increases made in this bill by the Senate was \$320 million for the subscription to the International Development Association. The conference committee decided to delete this appropriation, with the understanding that the first of the three annual installments of \$320 million under the new authorization would be provided in the regular annual appropriation bill for fiscal year 1973.

The Senate was able to prevail in connection with the Constitution and land acquisition item under the Forest Service in chapter VI, thus providing \$170,000 for the Alexandria, La., Forestry Center for installation of an emergency water supply system before fire breaks out and threatens the area.

For manpower training under chapter VII, the House had provided \$95 million and the Senate amendment increased the sum to \$247 million. The conference committee is recommending an appropriation of \$156,550,000, including \$15 million for the summer recreation program and \$141,550,000 for the Neighborhood Youth Corps' summer jobs program.

Senate amendment 19 provided an appropriation of \$40 million for the National Cancer Institute, and the House conferees agreed to accept the full amount.

For higher education, the Senate had provided \$300,400,000. In conference, the Senate was able to secure approximately one third of this sum—or \$100 million. The total appropriation includes \$45 million for educational opportunity grants, \$23,600,000 for national defense grants, \$25,600,000 for work-study student loans, and \$5,800,000 for additional projects specifically for veterans under the Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Education Professions Development Act programs. These sums are to be used in the 1972-73 academic school year.

Mr. President, that provision is included in the supplemental bill because we would like to be sure that they are able to use the funds in the coming academic year.

The conference committee agreed to recommend an appropriation of \$20 million for the Office of Economic Opportunity program for emergency food and medical services, as authorized by section 222(a) (5) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Under chapter VIII, the legislative branch, the conferees agreed to recommend the sum of \$650,000 for the expenses of the Inaugural Ceremonies in January, 1973, as proposed by the Senate amendment.

For the Federal Railroad Administration, grants to Amtrak, the Senate amendment provided \$270 million. The conference committee has reduced this

sum of \$170 million, with the understanding that should an authorization in excess of this amount be ultimately approved by the Congress, the additional authorized amount can be considered at a future date.

One matter of great interest in this bill was amendment No. 50. The House language had limited the use of administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, thus precluding the use of funds for relocating the district bank for the fourth district from Greensboro, N.C., or for the supervision, direction, or operation of such bank at any other location. The Senate had deleted this restriction. However, in view of the position of the House conferees the Senate receded on this amendment.

Mr. President, the evidence produced in the conference indicates that in Greensboro, where the bank had been established, over \$2 million had been spent in order to provide the necessary building to accommodate that bank. We thought it was just a waste of money to transfer this institution from where it presently is to another area.

As I said earlier, Mr. President, the grand total of this bill, as recommended by the committee of conference, is \$4,347,698,270. This is \$518,249,119 below the budget estimates; \$393,244,912 above the House-passed bills; and \$715,819,169 under the Senate version of the bill.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. President, I will be glad to answer such questions as I can.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will be remembered that a large group of Senators, 27 in number including myself, had to work very hard in respect of the appropriations for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer jobs and recreation program, pitching that effort very heavily on the problems of youth, both white and black, and also among other minorities where the unemployment rates are extremely high in poverty neighborhoods. For black youths it is as much as 37.4 percent. And generally speaking, in poverty neighborhoods for all groups it is 27.5 percent.

In response to that effort, the Senate Appropriations Committee, exercising a most commendable discretion this time, went all the way with us and allowed the full amount needed for the summer jobs programs to the extent that the U.S. Conference of Mayors certified that the amount could be adequately used and absorbed. They differed with us only on the duration of the summer job opportunities, limiting it to 9 weeks instead of 10 weeks. They provided 947,928 opportunities. The administration wanted an aggregate of 609,300 job opportunities through a supplemental bill. The administration sought a very modest increase, we thought, in what had already been provided, falling very far short, as far as we were concerned, in what they were seeking.

Mr. President, so that the facts and

figures may be fully before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of the 27 Senators, which I had the privilege of presenting to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE TESTIMONY OF SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing on behalf of myself and 26 of my Senate colleagues, to urge that the Subcommittee recommend a supplemental appropriation of \$291.4-million, under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer job program, and for related transportation and recreational activities to meet the needs of poor youths in urban and rural areas, during the coming summer. In this request I am joined by Senators Lloyd Bentsen, Quentin N. Burdick, Robert C. Byrd, Howard W. Cannon, Clifford P. Case, Alan Cranston, Thomas F. Eagleton, J. W. Fulbright, Fred R. Harris, Philip A. Hart, Hubert Humphrey, Henry M. Jackson, Frank E. Moss, Edmund S. Muskie, Bob Packwood, Claiborne Pell, Abraham Ribicoff, Robert Taft, Jr., John Tower, John V. Tunney, Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Robert P. Griffin, George McGovern, Walter Mondale, William B. Saxbe and Richard S. Schweiker, each of whom joined with me in a letter dated April 17, 1972 to the Subcommittee in this regard.

If added to the \$175.7-million now available, the supplemental appropriation would bring to \$467.1-million the aggregate amount available for the coming summer.

As you know, the Administration has requested an additional supplemental appropriation of \$95-million for a total of \$270.7-million, the same amount as last year, or \$196.4-million below the amount which we request.

The following is an itemization of our request in each of the major components of the program, which is administered by the Department of Labor:

\$268.3-million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps job program which provides work experience with public and non-profit private agencies, for poor youth between the ages of 14 to 21, giving them earnings enabling them to complete or to continue their education. Under the program, which begins this June, each youth is employed for 26 hours a week at \$1.60 an hour over the period of the program. The amount we request, together with the \$175.7-million available, would fund 947,928 ten-week job opportunities; the Administration would apply \$82.2-million of its requested supplemental for this purpose, to fund an additional 194,000 nine-week opportunities or an aggregate of 609,300 nine-week opportunities, the same funding and opportunity levels as last year.

\$1.2-million for related transportation necessary for poor youth to participate in the job program, the Administration would provide \$1.5-million out of existing manpower and transportation funds.

\$21.9-million for the recreational support program—providing opportunities to children eight through thirteen years of age; no funds are now available for this program. The Administration has requested a supplemental appropriation of \$12.8-million for this component, again the same amount as was made available last year.

Our requests are based in each instance upon what the National League of Cities—U.S. Conference of Mayors, representing most of the Nation's cities, has documented as required for this summer.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the record a copy of a letter from the National League—U.S. Conference charts documenting these needs on a city-by-city basis: in the job program they show



May 18, 1972

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8119

a need for 410,035 opportunities in the fifty largest cities and 537,893 in other areas.

For example, in New York City there is a documented need for 77,500 slots, compared with the aggregate of 40,541 which could be provided if only the Administration's supplemental request is granted. Seattle, Washington needs 5,000 slots; only 2,682 could be provided under the Administration's request.

The situation in smaller cities is similar. For example, Jersey City, New Jersey needs 2,454 positions compared with the 1,498 which could be provided under the Administration's proposed funding levels.

It should be noted that the National League of Cities' figures represent in each case the number which may be effectively used. Actually, the number of youth who could benefit if funds had been made available earlier is much greater. For example, there are 1.7 million youth who could benefit in the job program—almost twice the aggregate number to be covered if our request is granted.

We submit that the supplemental appropriation of the amounts for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program, and related transportation, is essential to meet the very difficult employment situation among poor youth. While the current national unemployment rate is at 5.9 percent, the most recently available statistics show a jobless rate among teenagers in poverty neighborhoods of 25.7 percent, with the rate among black teenagers in such areas at 34.7 percent.

Experience indicates that even if the overall employment situation improves, as we hope it will, poor youth will still continue to have unemployment ranging from four to five times the norm. There are substantial signs that increases in the number of returning veterans, economic cut-backs, and other factors will aggravate further the youth unemployment situation in the coming summer.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion there is no domestic problem more shocking than that of youth unemployment—except the drug problem to which it relates all too often.

We cannot afford to continue to dash the employment aspirations of so many at such a crucial age.

Unfortunately, we will not be able to look substantially to other public or private resources to deal with the problem. The Emergency Employment Act of 1971, which will provide approximately 130,000 public sector job opportunities in this fiscal year and a similar number in the coming year will not focus upon the needs of poor youth; according to a preliminary survey taken by the Department of Labor only 14 percent of those now covered are in the age group below 21 years of age. Moreover, despite efforts which we hope will be successful, it is likely that general economic conditions will continue to make it difficult for the private sector to take up the slack through such voluntary job programs as those conducted by the National Alliance of Businessmen. The National Alliance—which has a goal of 175,000 jobs for this summer—was able to provide only 150,000 in each of the last two summers, even during times when economic conditions were generally more favorable. I ask that a copy of a letter from the National Alliance of Businessmen be included also in the hearing record.

We do not consider it advisable to cut the program to nine weeks, as proposed by the Administration. It was reduced to a nine-week program for the first time last summer only as a temporary compromise made in the last hour to make very inadequate funds spread as far as possible. From the standpoint of the poor, the difference between ten and nine weeks is more than academic. Poor youth depend upon the wages derived from the program to contribute to the costs of returning to school

and, in many cases to the support of their families.

I urge full and early consideration this year so that public and non-profit sponsors will be able to plan effectively and provide youth with meaningful alternatives to continued frustration and restlessness.

Mr. Chairman, while these sums will not meet the total need they are substantial and they will help enormously. I should point out that they will be returned to some extent in that they will permit many parents now on welfare to engage in employment or training since their children will be occupied during the day. Over the long term they should decrease the possibility that youth participants will fall into welfare dependency themselves or find a way of life grounded in juvenile delinquency, drug addiction or crime, which is of such a high cost to society.

As members know, these programs have been of particular concern to me throughout the years, and I have felt it necessary each year—in the context of the supplemental appropriation bill—to seek more funds.

I am most grateful for the consideration that has been extended by the members of this Subcommittee in past years to this program. While we have disagreed on the amounts or what might be a reasonable figure to fight for in Conference with the House, the members have been most solicitous and understanding.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the matter has now been resolved in this conference report and, naturally, considering the need we cannot jump up and down about the result. But as far as conferees are concerned, I would like very much to express the appreciation of all 27 of us to the conferees for the result achieved.

Mr. President, what happened was that it is, practically speaking, split down the middle, and instead of the Senate allowance of \$247 million or the House allowance of \$95 million, they compromised on \$156.5 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield the House allowed \$95 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, and the Senate figure was \$247 million. That is right. The compromise was just about down the line, as far as the committee is concerned. It allowed some \$15 million for summer recreation instead of the \$12.8 million proposed by the House or the \$21.9 million proposed by the Senate; and \$145.5 million for Neighborhood Youth Corps summer job program instead of \$82 million proposed by the House or the \$223.9 million proposed by the Senate.

As far as transportation is concerned, it allowed some of the funds to be used for that purpose, if necessary, and agreed with the House, subject to concurrence by the two Houses, that the money would be available until September 30, 1972. This will provide about 750,000 9-week jobs with provision for recreation and transportation, as I have just indicated.

I wish to thank the conferees very much for the result which has been attained with great particularity. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) who is the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from New Jer-

sey (Mr. CASE), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, who took a very special part in this effort. I wish to note it is the best we have done in this group of Senators who have been so deeply interested in summer jobs, in all the years in recent times that we have been fighting this battle. I deeply feel that Members will see how helpful this is, especially in the teaming cities, like my own New York City, and they will receive the gratification which the country can give to dedicated men who achieve results like this.

I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations and I know how dug-in people can become on the other side, so I have a double appreciation of this result.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, we could not have had better supporters in conference than the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON). They fought long and hard for the things the Senator from New York is particularly interested in. They got the best possible.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sure of that and I am very grateful.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall make only a few brief remarks.

The total appropriations allowed in conference for chapter VII of the second supplemental appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare is \$1,203,451,000. This sum is \$141,850,000 above the budget estimates, is \$306,962,000 under the total sum recommended by the Senate and \$224,550,000 above the amount allowed by the House.

Mr. President, as usual this was a difficult conference. We were pitted against both the House conferees and the administration as they pressed for figures that were much lower than ours. In the face of such opposition, all the Senate conferees worked hard to provide as much of the Senate increases for chapter VII of this bill as were possible—and in the areas of greatest need.

We are just as disappointed as some members that we could not do better in providing a larger sum in some areas. I am particularly disappointed that we were not able to provide more money for jobs and training of younger people through the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the student aid programs under the Office of Education. Nonetheless, I believe that the views of this committee and the Senate did exert some influence in stimulating the administration to offer a supplemental request—however minimal—for student aid; and I think we can point with some pride to the fact that this bill does include a total of \$259 million for the Departments of Labor and HEW to provide jobs and educational opportunities that would otherwise be closed to needy youngsters.

## NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

In recognition of the extremely high jobless rate among teenagers, the Senate provided funds which, when added to funds already available, would have provided about 950,000 job opportunities for economically disadvantaged

May 18, 1972

S 8120

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

youngsters in urban and rural areas. The conference bill, while falling short of the Senate proposal, will provide additional jobs for about 750,000 youngsters this summer. This is 150,000 more jobs than proposed by the administration and the House. These youngsters will be provided a worthwhile work experience this summer. They will be off the streets and will be provided with earnings which will enable them to complete or continue their education.

## FOLLOW THROUGH

The Senate recognized the need to follow up and reinforce the educational benefits received by preschool youngsters in Headstart programs. The Senate bill included \$9 million to prevent the termination of 26 ongoing projects which are providing services to 8,300 educationally disadvantaged grade school children. Both the House and the administration favored termination of these projects. Nevertheless, we were able to fight to get at least \$3 million restored which will allow continuation of the best projects for at least 1 more year. We are hopeful that many of the remaining projects will be able to be continued under funds appropriated for the educationally deprived children under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

## HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENT AID

Here the Senate recognized the ever-increasing cost of higher education for increasing numbers of students. The Senate bill added \$300 million in order that approximately the same percent of student aid requests could be met in the fall of 1972 as in the fall of 1971. The Senate especially recognized the need for counseling large numbers of returning veterans so that these young people might make maximum use of their GI benefits. This need was apparent to the Senate since only about one-fifth of the veterans are using their GI benefits.

The conference bill includes \$100 million for these purposes. These funds will provide over 165,000 additional scholarships and loans to needy youngsters this fall—most of whom would not otherwise be able to begin or continue their education. The funds will also provide increased counseling to our returning veterans. This is very important "seed" money because it can make the difference between a veteran returning to school to make something of himself and leading a more productive life or being relegated to a life of enforced idleness in a high unemployment economy. It is easy to see how counseling at this crucial juncture can pay great dividends for our veterans and our Nation. Nonetheless, the administration failed to request funds for this item, and it was only because of the hard work of the Senate conferees that this item is in the final bill.

## EMERGENCY FOOD AND MEDICAL RESERVES

The Senate included \$30 million to allow the Office of Economic Opportunity to restore this program to 70 percent of the 1971 level. The Senate added these funds in recognition of the need to provide outreach, transportation and related services to allow some 2 million hungry

and sick Americans in urban and rural areas—especially areas of continuing high unemployment—to fully participate in existing food stamp and commodity programs. The Senate conferees pointed out that the administration's recently announced food program did not involve any real increase in resources—merely a shift in existing funds—a "rob Peter to pay Paul" act. Further, the administration's proposal in contrast to the Senate proposal, would not focus on areas of high unemployment, but would involve merely more of the same. The Senate proposal, in contrast, would concentrate on reaching out to the poor, especially the rural poor, and making existing food stamp and food commodity programs available to them.

Consequently, the Senate conferees were successful in persuading the House to include at least \$20 million in the conference bill for this purpose. Since these funds in no way duplicate the recently announced administration food "plan," the Senate fully intends and directs that these funds shall be spent. The next move is clearly up to the Office of Management and Budget on the release of this money.

## NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

The conference bill includes the full request of \$40 million for construction of cancer centers and training of additional cancer research scientists. This supplemental will allow the National Cancer Institute to get a "running start" on building up the facilities and staff necessary for an all-out effort to conquer this dread disease.

## CONCLUSION

Mr. President, in closing, let me state that I thought chapter VII of the Senate bill was a good one. The conference report before you, today, provides for an amount that should prove very helpful.

The amounts provided for some items are not entirely to my satisfaction; however, in the main, there will be adequate funds to meet necessary expenses of the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, and Related Agencies in fiscal year 1972, and we will be back in this coming fiscal year to see if more can be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to my good friend from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the conference report carries an item of \$650,000 for the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for 1973. I understand from the committee that the amount was determined in the following fashion: The 1969 expenditures were \$347,656. The Architect's estimate for the upcoming inauguration started with that figure. Then, it was increased by a figure of \$114,135, that being what is called the increased cost factor of 32.8 percent, or one might say 33 percent during the 2 years 1970 and 1971. Then, for the year 1972 the increased cost factor is placed at 12 percent. In addition to that, provision is made for snow removal and for administration expenses.

The total is \$570,206, plus \$50,000 for

the Sergeant at Arms and \$30,000 for the joint committee, bringing the total estimated inaugural expenses to \$650,000.

There are several aspects of this matter that have impressed me. One is that the cost for the 2-year period—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield I wish to say to my good friend from Virginia that I think the increase is for 1969, 1970, 1971, 3 years, and the 1972 increase was 12 percent.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. The worksheet given me by the committee shows 1970 and 1971 increased cost factor of \$114,135.

Mr. ELLENDER. The worksheet given to you is not clear. It was really for 3 years.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Three years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator.

The increased cost factor for that 3-year period was 33 percent. Now, we come to 1972, when the cost factor is supposed to have been decreased and inflation is supposed to be more under control and we have a cost factor of 12 percent. So for 3 years we had 11 percent and for the present year 12 percent. That does not indicate to me that inflation is under control. As a matter of fact, inflation is not under control and these figures submitted by an official Government agency show that inflation is not under control.

That is justification for asking for \$650,000 to finance the new inauguration which will take place in January 1973. I think the President of the United States, whoever he may be, should have an appropriate inauguration. I think whatever sum is necessary to give to him an appropriate inauguration should be appropriated by Congress.

However, Mr. President, I do wish to point out that during the 3-year period 1969 through 1971 the costs are estimated to have increased by 33 percent or 11 percent per year, whereas in 1972 the increased cost factor is placed at 12 percent. It would certainly indicate clearly there has not been any leveling off or reduction in the inflationary aspect.

Now, as the Senate considers the \$650,000 appropriation to finance the inauguration of the next President of the United States, perhaps a bit of history might be of interest.

In 1944 my immediate predecessor in this office was the late Harry Flood Byrd, Sr. He was chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and as such was chairman of the Joint Inaugural Committee. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was seeking his fourth term, to which he was subsequently elected. Plans were being made for the inaugural ceremonies for January 1945. Senator Byrd advised President Roosevelt that as chairman of the Inaugural Committee he wanted to cooperate fully with the President, and would introduce legislation appropriating whatever amount of money President Roosevelt desired for the inaugural ceremonies.

May 18, 1972

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8121

The President notified Senator Byrd that the amount of money to be appropriated was a decision for Congress to make, whereupon Senator Byrd recommended a figure of \$100,000.

Later President Roosevelt called a press conference and said he had no idea of spending such a gigantic sum of money on his inauguration, and all he needed was \$25,000, and he would show the economy-minded Senator from Virginia how to economize.

So Senator Byrd then came back to the Senate, revised his request downward from \$100,000 to \$25,000, which the Senate and the Congress approved. That approval was given by the Congress on September 23, 1944.

In November of 1944, immediately after the election, the present senior Senator from Virginia was in San Diego, Calif., waiting to go to the Pacific as a member of Naval Patrol Bombing Squadron 13.

Senator Byrd, Sr., flew to California to spend a few days with my wife and me, and while he was there he got a telephone call from Gen. Edwin M. "Pa" Watson at the White House. General Watson said that they had been doing some refiguring on the cost of the inaugural ceremonies and that \$25,000 would not be adequate.

Senator Byrd informed General Watson that any figure the President wanted for the inauguration, if he would write a letter, he, Senator Byrd, would recommend such amount to the Congress.

Two days passed, and General Watson called again and he said that he had talked with President Roosevelt and that President Roosevelt was reluctant to write such a letter because he thought Senator Byrd might publish it. Senator Byrd told General Watson to tell the President not to be in doubt about that; that he certainly would publish it and would put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Another day passed, and General Watson called again and said that he hoped Senator Byrd would not insist upon a letter from the President. Senator Byrd did insist.

The next day General Watson called again, and he said it was vitally important that Senator Byrd return immediately to Washington, because it was necessary to make sure the financial matters for the inauguration would get straightened out.

While it was inconvenient for him to do so, Senator Byrd did return to Washington. President Roosevelt would not give in by writing a letter requesting an additional appropriation, nor would Senator Byrd give in by making such a request until he got such a letter from the President.

As a result of these two strong-minded men locking horns, the inauguration of 1945 was the most austere, I suppose, in the history of the U.S. Government. I got the figures from the Archives and the records show that of the \$25,000 congressional appropriation, only \$526.02 was used, with \$24,473.98 being returned to the Treasury.

So that was probably a somewhat happy day for the taxpayers, but per-

haps not so happy a day for some of the folks in the White House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. In his investigation as to the costs of the 1944 inaugural, did the Senator learn who was the Santa Claus, because they certainly could not do that for \$500. Someone must have made a contribution.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. That aspect I have some hesitancy putting into the Record. These other records I can substantiate, but I am not able to substantiate an answer to the question asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana. For that reason I have some hesitancy in making a statement, but my understanding is that there were some supplemental funds or contingency funds available from which an additional amount was utilized.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his statement and certainly want to add my words of admiration and appreciation to his distinguished father and others who so consistently practiced economy.

I happen to remember the 1945 inauguration. It will be recalled that at that time we were still involved in a very serious war in Europe and in the Pacific. I do not believe there was a parade, and my recollection is that the inauguration took place at the White House, just outside, and it was a very austere occasion, no doubt brought about by financial need as well as the fact that the Nation was involved in a very grim war situation.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Yes. The Senator from Nebraska brought out a very interesting point. The Nation was involved in war. The inauguration took place only 3 or 4 months before the ending of the war in Europe and about 7 months before the ending of the war in the Pacific, and that, too, of course, had a bearing on the cost. Nevertheless, the facts bear out that plans were being made then for a much more elaborate inaugural ceremony than eventually developed. It was held in the South Portico of the White House.

Mr. President, I say again that, whoever may be President of the United States at any particular point in our history, the American people want him to have adequate appropriations from the Federal Treasury so that he may have an appropriate inauguration. If the committee feels that the \$650,000 figure is an appropriate one, then I do not contest the figure other than to point out that the figures used to substantiate the sum which is being requested are figures which indicate very clearly to me that inflation is not being got under control, because both the committee and the Architect ascertain that costs have gone up 33 percent over the 3-year period of 1969, 1970, and 1971, and they project that the cost will go up 12 percent during

1972—each of these figures being compared with 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has no further time to yield. However, under the consent agreement, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young) has 49 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana whatever time he wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Virginia for giving us the interesting historical background on the swearing in of the late President Roosevelt in 1945. I happened to be here, and that happened to be his fourth inauguration. I think other factors that contributed to the fact that it was a short ceremony and that not much money was spent on it was that it was the first time a President ever took office for the fourth time and it was during World War II.

But I am pleased, Mr. President, with the attitude of the Senator from Virginia. As chairman of the committee, I shall request that an accounting be taken of all expenditures made and that it be submitted to the Senate after the inauguration.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have nothing further to add.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments in disagreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$67,835,000".

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$4,380,000".

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That there shall be advanced in fiscal year 1972, upon request of the board of directors of any regional corporation established pursuant to section 7 of said Act, \$500,000 for any one regional corporation, which the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be necessary for the organization of such regional corporation and the village corporations within such region, and to identify land for such corporations pursuant to said Act, and to repay loans and other obligations previously incurred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That such advances shall

S 8122

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 18, 1972

not be subject to the provisions of section 7(j) of said Act, but shall be charged to and accounted for by such regional and village corporations in computing the distributions pursuant to section 7(j) required after the first regular receipt of monies from the Alaska Native Fund under section 6 of said Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the money so advanced shall be used for the organization of a village corporation that had less than twenty-five Native residents living within such village according to the 1970 census.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

## "HIGHER EDUCATION

"For an additional amount, for 'Higher Education,' \$100,000,000, including \$45,000,000 for educational opportunity grants, \$25,600,000 for college work-study programs, and \$29,600,000 for student loans under the National Defense Education Act: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated herein shall remain available until June 30, 1973."

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$20,000,000".

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

## "CHAPTER IX

## "PUBLIC WORKS

## "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## "Southwestern Power Administration

## "Operation and Maintenance

"For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance', \$180,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Construction,' Southwestern Power Administration

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$170,000,000".

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: "*Provided further*, That the appropriations for the Federal office building (superstructure), Chicago, Illinois; the Courthouse and Federal office building (superstructure), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation building (superstructure), Washington, D.C., shall be available only upon the approval of the revised prospectuses by the Committee on Public Works of the Congress."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 12, 22, 23, 27, 33, and 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that the requirement this conference report be printed as a Senate report be waived inasmuch as, under the rules of the House of Representatives, it has been printed as a report of the House of

Representatives. The reports are identical.

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

## FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATIONS ACT OF 1972

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 3526, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 1200) of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

## UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 1 hour on amendment No. 1194, by Mr. HARTKE, to S. 3526, the time to be equally divided between and controlled by Mr. HARTKE, the author of the amendment, and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT).

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment by Mr. GRIFFIN be temporarily laid aside; that the Senate proceed to the consideration of amendment No. 1194; that the time on any amendments to the amendment come out of the time on the amendment; and that at the conclusion of the hour, or at the conclusion of the vote or votes on amendment No. 1194, or upon the yielding back of the time on that amendment, the amendment by Mr. GRIFFIN then be restored to its original status as the pending amendment before the Senate.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment by Mr. CHURCH and Mr. CASE also be laid aside temporarily, under the same specifications.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum—the time to be equally charged against both sides.

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

The clerk will report the pending amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) proposes an amendment numbered 1194, at the end of the bill—

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Not the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator from West Virginia is not proposing the amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, under the same understanding as before.

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 (Mr. BEALL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) may be recognized for not to exceed 2 minutes, without the time being charged against the amendment which has not yet been reported.

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

## WELFARE REFORM

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, some days ago the Finance Committee announced its decision to replace the welfare expansion portions of H.R. 1 with provisions designed to provide employment opportunities for people. The committee felt that providing jobs and employment incentives was far preferable to providing funds for more and more people to have a guaranteed income from welfare, even though those people could appropriately be expected to go to work.

The idea of providing low-paying jobs rather than a welfare dole is not new. Elliot Richardson, Secretary of HEW, chose to describe these as WPA-type jobs.

Mr. President, the people of this country have had a chance to think about this issue down through the years. If they must make the choice between providing someone with a low-paying job or providing the same amount of money in welfare for doing nothing, I am sure the people of this country would overwhelmingly favor providing a low-paying job.

Secretary Richardson and his group undertook to place some false, misleading, and high estimates on what it would cost to provide work opportunities for people. The committee feels that the type of approach we advocate will cost no more in the short run than the real cost of the welfare expansion program, and

H 6178

my colleague from Colorado (Mr. McKEVITT) in congratulating the conferees on providing \$1,500,000 for a new mint in the Denver area. While the mint is not located in my district, many of my constituents work at the mint to produce the coins so badly needed by our Nation. They will heartily applaud this action.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6. On page 6, line 7, insert:

## "CONSTRUCTION OF MINT FACILITIES

"For expenses necessary for construction of Mint facilities, as authorized by the Act of August 20, 1963, as amended (31 U.S.C. 291-249), \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended."

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14. On page 13, line 13, insert:

## "SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

## "SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, including grants and contracts for drug abuse prevention and treatment programs, \$3,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That this appropriation shall be available to reimburse the appropriation for 'Special Projects', for expenditures made for the purposes of this appropriation: Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 22. On page 22, line 9, insert "Provided, the \$4,209,000 appropriated under the heading 'Sites and Expenses, Public Buildings Projects', in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1971, Public Law 92-18, shall also remain available until expended."

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STEED

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS,  
1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H.J. Res. 742) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert: "activities of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;"

Page 4, after line 20, insert: "salaries of supporting personnel, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services;"

Page 4, after line 20, insert: "activities in support of Free Europe, Incorporated, and Radio Liberty, Incorporated, and Radio Liberty, Incorporated, pursuant to authority contained in the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1437): Provided, That no other funds made available under this resolution shall be available for these activities;"

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of the Senate amendments?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution which passed the House last week, which was modified in a very limited way by the other body. We are proposing to send it to the President without going to conference.

Insofar as I know, the Committee on Appropriations is unanimous in support of the resolution. It was modified in a very small way because certain funds were knocked out on House floor points of order in a bill passed recently in the House, relating to the Maritime Administration and an item in the judiciary. We informally asked the Senate Committee to make two of the amendments on that account. If we do not make provision for these agencies to continue at the beginning of the new fiscal year, they will be without funds beginning tomorrow.

The third change made by the other body was a provision separately specifying the inclusion of funds for continuing the activities of Radio Free Europe.

The Radio Free Europe activities were already included in the resolution as it passed the House. But the other body chose to name it specifically as one of those programs which would be supported. Otherwise, the continuing resolution is identical to the resolution which passed the House, and when it passed the House it provided that Government activities could continue at certain minimum levels of expenditure, to August 6, when the summer recess is scheduled to begin.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the distinguished Chairman for his explanation, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask a question of the chairman of the committee? Mr. Chairman, do you have an estimate for us of how many dollars we are acting on in this particular instance in relation to this continuing resolution?

Mr. MAHON. It is estimated that the Federal Government during the forthcoming fiscal year, which begins tomorrow, will spend about \$229 billion. That was the original January budget estimate. That is the expenditure program, which includes social security, all the trust funds, and other programs and activities. The appropriation bills that the resolution will temporarily substitute for run to about \$150 billion. The resolution merely enables the Government to carry on at certain levels which are prescribed and which have been time-honored through adoption of continuing resolutions by the House and the Senate in the past. The resolution covers the whole Government.

The House has now completed action on 7 of the major annual appropriation bills; three of them will go to the President this weekend. It is estimated that the remaining seven regular appropriation bills may very well be considered during July. Certainly we expect that most of them will be passed by the House during that period. It may be that the Defense appropriation bill cannot move because of lack of authorization.

But it would seem that we have done, if I may say so, a good job in moving the bills in the House of Representatives, and I must say also that the other body is cooperating fully in this undertaking.

I think we have done a good job in June in moving appropriation bills, and if we can do as well in July as we have done in June, I think we will have reason to be proud of our accomplishments with respect to the handling of these particular measures.

Mr. DELLENBACK. May I say to the Chairman that I join in the feeling that the Appropriations Committee is moving in a very commendable fashion. May I also say that I think it is imperative that we pass a continuing appropriation resolution. But do I correctly understand, Mr. Chairman, if you will yield for a further inquiry, that this action we are now taking is, in effect, authorizing spending depending upon the passage of other appropriation bills involving literally billions of dollars?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This is a very important measure. Without this measure, which is a stop-gap arrangement pending investment of the regular appropriation bills, the Government would come to a shrieking halt. This is one of the means by which we are able under our system to continue the operation of the Government.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. May I ask the Speaker to explain to the House, so we



June 30, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 6177

partment, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

## TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

*Office of the Secretary*

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$11,640,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,300,000 as proposed by the House.

*Bureau of Customs*

Amendment No. 2: Provides for purchase of 353 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 203 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Provides for purchase of 343 police-type vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 193 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Deletes one word for technical clarity as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$189,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$174,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The increase over the House allowance is to provide funds to implement the President's Drug Abuse Program which was not considered by the House.

The managers agree that the funds provided in this bill to carry out the President's Drug Abuse Program should be utilized by the agencies to which appropriated in the manner best calculated to achieve the purposes of the program.

*Bureau of the Mint**Construction of Mint Facilities*

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides \$1,500,000 for purchase of a site for a new mint facility, and provides that the funds remain available until expended.

*Bureau of Public Debt*

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$77,490,000 instead of \$75,990,000 as proposed by the House and \$79,240,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Internal Revenue Service**Compliance*

Amendment No. 8: Provides for procurement of 99 vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 49 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Deletes one word for technical clarity as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$792,500,000 instead of \$780,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$797,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## TITLE II—U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

*Payment to the Postal Service fund*

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$1,217,522,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,433,922,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

*National Security Council*

Amendment No. 12: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to provide for declassification and publication of National Security Council documents.

*Office of Management and Budget*

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$19,250,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$19,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention*

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$3,000,000 for the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President to coordinate the President's drug abuse program.

## TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

*General Services, Administration**Construction, Public Buildings Projects*

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$200,440,000 for public buildings projects as proposed by the Senate instead of \$195,919,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$8,339,000 for a Federal office building, Mobile, Alabama, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$2,067,000 for a courthouse and Federal office building in Fayetteville, Arkansas, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$3,248,000 for a post office, courthouse, and Federal office building in Oxford, Mississippi, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$2,454,000 for a post office, courthouse, and Federal office building in Elkins, West Virginia, as proposed by the Senate.

*Sites and Expenses, Public Buildings Projects*

Amendment No. 20: Changes appropriation title.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$17,749,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$15,050,000 as proposed by the House. The additional language provides funds for sites and expenses of the following public building projects: Fayetteville, Arkansas; New Orleans, Louisiana; Las Cruces, New Mexico; and Elkins, West Virginia.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to ratify the intent of the period of availability of the appropriation contained in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1971.

*Expenses, U.S. Court Facilities*

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$2,780,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$2,683,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1972 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1971 amount, the 1972 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills for 1972 follows:

	<i>Amount</i>
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	\$5,567,458,900
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972	4,809,216,000
House bill, fiscal year 1972	4,487,676,190
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	4,752,789,690
Conference agreement	4,528,986,690
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971	2,103,472,210
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1972	—280,229,310
House bill, fiscal year 1972	+41,310,500
Senate bill, fiscal year 1972	—223,803,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes budget amendments of \$28,640,000 contained in H. Doc. 92-133 which were not considered by the House.

\* Direct comparability between 1971 and 1972 figures is not possible due to change in formula for calculating costs pursuant to Postal Reorganization Act, Public Law 91-375.

TOM STEED,  
OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
JOSEPH P. ADDABO,  
EDWARD R. ROYBAL,  
LOUIS STOKES,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
HOWARD W. ROBISON,  
JACK EDWARDS,  
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr.,  
JOHN T. MYERS,  
FRANK T. BOW,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
J. CALSBEGG,  
GORDON ALLOTT,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9271) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. STEED (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the conferees on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill for their excellent work and especially for including funds for a site for a new Denver Mint.

The conferees demonstrated foresight. If Congress continues to support this vital project, the new Denver Mint should be in operation by 1980, or just at the time when the Nation's coin needs will be outpacing present mint capabilities.

With existing facilities, the Bureau of the Mint is capable of providing about 9 billion coins per year. By 1980, it is estimated this need will increase to about 12 billion coins per year and, by 1985, the estimated need will be about 16 billion.

The new Denver Mint not only will benefit Denver but it will benefit the Nation.

There was some urgency in this appropriation because the Bureau of the Mint must find a suitable site in Denver so that work can begin.

Again, my compliments to the conferees for their foresight in this matter. Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join

June 30, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 6179-

may have no misunderstanding as to the nature of the matter upon which we are now being asked to give unanimous consent, will there be a chance to vote on this particular measure if we withdraw objection to the unanimous consent request?

The SPEAKER. There are Senate amendments to a House-passed resolution. These amendments have to be acted upon. They are to be voted upon by the House.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If this Member is desirous of asking for a rollcall vote on the approval of this particular continuing appropriation measure, would this be the time to bring it to the attention of the Chair and withdraw the reservation of objection?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word, the request for unanimous consent was to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 742 making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. The request, I believe, would not open up the measure for a rollcall vote. We would have to use a different procedure if we wanted a rollcall vote on the measure, as I see it. The Speaker, of course, will make his own ruling.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, actually is not the continuing resolution at a lower rate than the proposed budget for fiscal year 1972, so that it is really a saving to vote for the continuing resolution?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct, because the rate of spending under the budget for fiscal year 1972 is higher than would be permitted under the continuing resolution in many instances.

May I say also that in cases where funds are expended for any given program, when the regular appropriation bill for 1972 takes effect the sums expended, under the resolution will be subtracted from, or charged to, the amount made available, in the regular bill. That is provided for in the resolution.

We are using this consent technique merely to save the time of the House, with the thought that there is probably complete unanimity in support of the resolution.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So this is a savings, rather than an increase. It is a savings, and this is an economy measure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object to the unanimous consent request, I do not know whether this question is truly a parliamentary inquiry or a question to the chairman of the committee. It would be my interpretation, from what the Speaker has said, that we will proceed

after the unanimous consent request to consider this matter to a point where we can have a vote.

If I correctly understand the manner in which the chairman of the committee made his request, this is pulled together. If it is desirable that we at least obtain the will of the House, as to whether there will be a vote on this appropriation, literally spending billions of dollars, it will be necessary for me to object, and to ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I know the gentleman from Oregon has indicated he wants a rollcall on all appropriation bills. He has notified me and the Members on our side, and perhaps all Members. Would it not be better, under these circumstances, inasmuch as the gentleman does want a rollcall vote, for the chairman of the committee to withdraw the unanimous consent request and to move in a different manner?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request previously made.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 742—making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert:  
"activities of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;"

Page 4, after line 20, insert:  
"salaries of supporting personnel, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services;"

Page 4, after line 20, insert:  
"activities in support of Free Europe, Incorporated, and Radio Liberty, Incorporated, pursuant to authority contained in the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1437): Provided, That no other funds made available under this resolution shall be available for these activities;"

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 742—with Senate amendments thereto and consider the Senate amendments?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer motions to concur in the three Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can move that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

The Senate amendments—1, 2, and 3—have been explained heretofore, involving the Maritime Administration and the other matters.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If we concur in the Senate amendments we in effect have acted as a House to approve the appropriations involved; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. Just the Senate amendments. The House already has passed the appropriation resolution. These are just the Senate amendments.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Is this the last vote that we will have on the question, in effect, of approving in final form the appropriation involved in the continuing resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. DELLENBACK. 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. The Chair will count. Two hundred eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

So the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the House joint resolution just passed and that I be permitted to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 173 I am recorded as not being present. I was addressing a national association group at the time the vote was taken. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday at the time of the roll-

call vote on final passage of the bill H.R. 9417. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, at the time of rollcall No. 172, I was attending graduation ceremonies of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the request of my constituent who was in the graduating class. Had I been present on the motion to table House Resolution 489 I would have voted "yea."

#### BOBBY MITCHELL WINS CLEVELAND OPEN

(Mr. DANIEL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial.)

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in praise of excellence—excellence, in this instance, as displayed by a young man from my district, Mr. Bobby Mitchell, of Danville, Va.

When this fellow was caddy for me, I addressed him as "Bobby." His performance last week, in earning first place at the Cleveland Open, has won him the title of "Mr. Mitchell."

You will note I said "earning first place"—not winning. For in the field Mr. Mitchell has chosen—professional golf—honors are not won or bestowed, they are earned. They are earned by hard work, by practice, by constant, day-by-day striving until the time arrives when public recognition is achieved.

This young man's whole life has centered around his goal of becoming a professional golfer. He started caddying when he was quite young, and took up the game as a participant at the age of 13. By the time he was 15, he was named assistant pro at the club, and his talent, combined with a dogged determination to succeed began to become obvious.

Fortunately for Bobby, no one told him when he was a young boy that he was "disadvantaged"; no one reminded him, day after day, that society owed him something. Instead, Bobby felt he was the debtor, and recognized a responsibility to his parents and to his younger brothers to help out as best he could by caddying.

Bobby's performance at the Cleveland Open netted him \$30,000—not a bad week's pay for a high-school dropout. But that really is not significant. What is significant is that Bobby has persevered, despite early-life hardships and professional setbacks. For this was Bobby's first big win in 6 years on the professional circuit.

There are many things I might say about Bobby Mitchell, but he says them better for himself, as quoted in the Danville Bee:

I thought I could play like I did the other 3 days. I was not trying to protect, or anything. I just wanted to go out there and play good.

And he did.

At another point, Bobby said—  
Everything fell in place this week.

I believe he was being far too modest. Fifteen years of effort, practice, and con-

tinual striving for excellence were rewarded. He accomplished this himself—nobody gave it to him.

BOBBY: I KNEW WHAT TO DO

(By Al Milley)

Bobby Mitchell, usually a late sleeper, awoke at 7:30 Sunday morning and was unable to go back to sleep.

The 28-year-old Danville pro didn't tee off until 2:01 and he would have liked to have slept longer. The more time he had to think the more nervous he became and it was a long morning sitting in the hotel room.

Mitchell was in the driver's seat with a four-shot lead going into the final round of the Cleveland Open but he'd been there before.

In the 1970 Azalea Tournament at Wilmington, N.C., Mitchell took a four-shot lead into the final round only to three-putt the final three holes and lose by one.

"That was on my mind a lot Saturday night and I had a lot of time to think about it Sunday morning," remarked Mitchell today before returning to Danville with his family and a check for \$30,000 after scoring his first pro victory in six years with a final round 65.

"I think I learned something at Wilmington and I felt that if I ever got in that position again I'd know what to do. I thought I could coast around that final round last year and it didn't work out so this time I decided to keep playing my game and go for birdies the way I had the first three rounds."

The long morning didn't seem to affect Mitchell's game as he opened with three straight birdies, holing 12-foot putts at one and two and tapping in a two-footer at three after narrowly missing a hole-in-one. "I hit an eight-iron about six feet past the pin and it backed up and lipped the cup before stopping two feet in front. Those three birdies got me over my early jitters and gave me a lot of confidence but I still wasn't ready to coast."

Mitchell scrambled for a par at four, holing a five-footer, and went four under for the day with a birdie at six, knocking in a 10-footer. He missed a 10-foot birdie putt at nine and made the turn in 31 for a five shot lead over the field . . . and still not ready to coast.

A hint of possible trouble came at 10 when a bad tee-shot put him under a small pine tree. "The ball was about an inch from the base of the tree and I had to chip out." Despite having to play a safe shot, Mitchell almost birdied the par five hole when he put his third shot (a four-wood) 15 feet from the pin and two-putted for a par.

The lead ballooned to six shots with a two-foot birdie putt at 11 but Mitchell still wasn't ready to start coasting.

He snaked in a 10-foot downhill putt to salvage par at 12 and made routine pars on the next five holes to maintain his lead.

At 17, he birdied from 15 feet and he went to the 18th tee with a seven shot lead . . . and now he was ready to coast.

"It really felt good to have a seven-shot lead on the last hole. I knew I had it then and I really let out off the tee and hit one of the best drives I'd hit all week. I just had a nine-iron to the green and I left it about 20 feet from the hole. I knew I could six-putt the green and still win so I figured I had it."

Mitchell lagged up for his par and the first place check for \$30,000.

His round included 22 birdies, one eagle and two bogies and his 22-under for the tournament was just one shot off the all-time low set this year by Miller Barber at Phoenix.

"If I had known I was that close to an all-time record I might have played those last few holes a little different but I was just glad to make par."

The victory hiked Mitchell's winnings for the year to around \$50,000 with the tournament season just half gone. Last year he won around \$36,000 in official money.

"I'm probably over \$53,000 now in unoffi-

cial money this year and this win will most likely mean a lot more than \$30,000.

"I'll collect on some contracts I've already signed and there'll probably be other endorsements as a result of winning. It also means I'm exempt for next year and it gets me in the \$200,000 match-play tournament at Pinehurst in August and it gets me in the Tournament of Champions next year.

"I waited five years for this and it really felt great. The people in Cleveland were really behind me and they let me know it when I walked up the 18th fairway. It's something I'll never forget.

"I've been playing real good recently and I hit the ball real good at the Open but I didn't score too well. Everything fell in place this week and after three good rounds I was just trying to avoid that 75 round that could blow everything."

Mitchell avoided the 75 and the nightmare at Wilmington showed him what to do . . . and he went out and did it.

#### IT IS TIME TO QUIT PIDDLING AROUND ON MHD

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, during my attempt yesterday to obtain increased funds for MHD, or magnetohydrodynamics, research for the Office of Coal Research in the Interior appropriations bill, I alluded to an article in Fortune magazine on "New Ways to More Power With Less Pollution."

I now submit it for the RECORD, for it is an important statement of our energy situation, and the potential solutions to it.

Fortune comments that research and development work in the energy source field has been at a standstill for over 2 years because of inadequate funding.

I can vouch for that. The administration asked a paltry \$400,000 for MHD research last year. We did get it raised to \$600,000, but that was still paltry measured by need.

The appropriation this year is \$1 million for MHD studies. I sought to raise it to \$5 million, and it really should be \$10 or \$15 million.

Development of MHD generation will cost \$50 to \$75 million. The scientists say that, adequately funded, it can be done in 5 or 6 years.

Fortune magazine tells us in their article that new energy alternatives, including MHD, do not offer instant solutions to our energy shortage "for much hard development still lies ahead, but they need vigorous support now to meet the goals of 1980."

Fortune is right, and we are not going to have MHD ready to go on the line with needed low-cost, low-pollution energy by 1980 if we continue to appropriate a piddling \$1 million a year to accomplish a \$50 million job.

If we need clean energy sources by 1980—and we need them right now—we should be appropriating \$10 million annually to MHD research.

The Fortune article follows:

[From Fortune Magazine, November 1970]  
NEW WAYS TO MORE POWER WITH LESS POLLUTION

(By Lawrence Lessing)

As the pall of power dimouts and pollution creeps over the U.S., warnings are increasing-

November 19, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

the other body. I say it may be. It may not be. There are certain concurrent resolutions that must be passed by the other body, and we have to wait on them.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman give us any idea how long this recess might be? Will that carry us into the night?

Mr. BOGGS. No. My expectation would be that it would not be long, and it may not be at all.

Mr. GROSS. That would be my hope. If we are going into recess for the transaction of business that could run until late, I would certainly make sure that there was a quorum here to transact such business. I only say this because—

Mr. BOGGS. I am entirely sympathetic with the gentleman's point of view. I am as anxious to let the Members conclude today's business as quickly as possible as the gentleman is, but we are all confronted, I think, with certain inescapable facts.

Mr. GROSS. I say that because I think the good things of life ought to be spread to the greatest number.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF NOVEMBER 29

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he will inform us of the legislative program.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. In reply to the gentleman, let me say that we will conclude the legislative program for this week with the conclusion of the pending bill. We will be in recess all of next week.

When we return on Monday a week, we will continue the consideration of the Federal election reform bill. We will be in the amendment stage on that bill when we return, and a final vote is anticipated either on Monday or on Tuesday.

That will be followed by H.R. 11589, the foreign sale of passenger vessels, which has previously been on the whip notice. That has an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Then we will have the D.C. appropriation bill.

I should like to announce in connection therewith that of the foreign aid appropriation and the supplemental appropriation, which are the last two regular appropriations to be considered, are ready for action, we will call them up sometime during that week.

H.R. 1163, strategic storable agricultural commodities amendment, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may, of course, be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. May I just say to the gentleman that according to this an-

nouncement, so the Members may know, the election reform bill will be the first order of business when we return on November 29.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

#### RAILROAD-HIGHWAY SAFETY — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to submit to the Congress part I of a two-part study of railroad-highway safety in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-458).

Railroad-highway grade crossing safety is not a simple issue. It has many complexities which arise from such factors as the division of authorities and responsibilities for grade crossing safety among many governmental levels and jurisdictions, the important role of the private railroad companies who own and maintain the rights-of-way, the division of financial responsibilities between government and the private industry, and the cost and reliability of protective devices and grade separations.

The Report was prepared by the Department of Transportation as a comprehensive background survey of the problems involved. It contains a useful history of the grade crossing issue, a review of current problems and a discussion of the grade crossing problem within the context of highway safety.

Any recommendations for specific action will be presented in Part II of this Report to be submitted by next July 1972, under the provisions of the Highway Safety Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-605).

I commend this Report to you as important groundwork for a better understanding of the issues in this field, and I request that any definite legislative action on this subject be deferred until Part II of the Report has been transmitted to the Congress.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 19, 1971.

#### CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 387 of November 15, I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

#### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the colloquy in yesterday's Rec-

ord between my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) concerning the effect of the Equal Employment Opportunities Act as passed by the House. I must say that all the discussion about the Legislative Reorganization Act and whether or not extensions of remarks should be placed in different type, certainly clouds the issue. The heart of the matter is whether the Erlborn substitute, which was narrowly substituted for the committee bill, supersedes the Equal Pay Act.

In my opinion it does and in rereading the materials which Congressman ERLBORN released at the time he introduced his bill I get the distinct impression that at that time he may have so concluded as well. In the "Explanation and Analysis of H.R. 9247," which the gentleman from Illinois inserted in the RECORD, he states that the effect of his "exclusive remedy" section was: "to supersede employment discrimination proceedings now being filed under the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the National Labor Relations Act, amongst others." If the "amongst others" did not include the Equal Pay Act, I would like to know what others it did include. Mrs. GREEN's repeated contentions then, are absolutely precise.

Let me add in conclusion that our opinion of the effect of the Erlborn substitute is supported by many others outside this Chamber. A casual reading of the hearings held recently by the Senate Labor Subcommittee on their version of the act provides several examples. In particular I call attention to the statements by Olga Mador, vice president of the United Automobile Workers, Mrs. Sherman Ross, chairman of the Legislative Program Committee of the American Association of University Women, and Doris Meisner of the National Women's Political Caucus.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 18, ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND TO RADIO LIB- ERTY

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 699 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 699

*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 (S. 18) to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of

H 11310

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 19, 1971

clause 7, rule XVI are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to find passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 699 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 18 providing assistance to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty. It shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and all points of order are waived against the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI—the committee substitute is nongermane.

The purpose of S. 18 is to provide a means for conducting a one-time study and evaluation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to provide for financing while the study is in progress.

Until this year Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were financed by the CIA. This legislation would establish a tripartite commission, composed of representatives of the legislative and executive branches of the Government and of the public. The commission would expire on July 1, 1973.

The commission will "review and evaluate international radio broadcasting and related activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty" and report to the President by November 30, 1972.

Thirty-six million dollars are authorized to the chairman of the commission for fiscal year 1972 and \$38.520 million are authorized for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for fiscal year 1973 to continue operations pending completion of the study by the commission and action by the Congress.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported the bill by a vote of 23 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that the legislation may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Young) in explanation of the rule. The reason that all points of order are waived is included in the rule is because the Senate bill did not have this Commission in it for the study, so this is new material, and we had to waive points of order so that it could be considered.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is

to authorize funding for both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty during fiscal 1972 and 1973, and to create a commission to undertake a study and make recommendations concerning the future operations of the two broadcasting organizations.

The bill authorizes \$36 million for fiscal 1972 and \$38,520,000 for 1973 to finance the operations of both radio systems.

The report and recommendations which are to be the results of the study required by the bill are to be submitted to the President and the Congress by November 30, 1972. The Commission will cease to exist on July 1, 1973. It is to be composed of nine members as follows:

First, two Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker.

Second, two Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate.

Third, two members of the executive branch, appointed by the President.

Fourth, three members from the public, knowledgeable in mass communications, appointed by the President, one of whom shall be designated as Chairman by the President.

Radio Free Europe broadcasts to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. Radio Liberty broadcasts to Russia. Program content consists of news, music, sports, political commentary, and other features. These programs have a very wide audience, estimated at 50 percent of the population over 14 years of age.

Prior to last year the CIA was the primary source of funds for these operations. Congress has halted this practice and funding is now carried out through the Office of the Secretary of State. However, some permanent system should be developed, if it is found advisable to continue the operations. The responsibility of the Commission is to determine whether these radio systems should be continued, and if so, how they should be administered and funded.

There are no agency letters contained in the report.

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

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

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

FAA IS DERELICT IN ITS SAFETY INSPECTION PROCEDURES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on October 21 of this year, an aircraft operated by Chicago & Southern Airlines crashed in Peoria, Ill., taking the lives of 16 persons. The airline was operating a commuter service between Chicago and Springfield, Ill. It was a service often used by members of the State legislature and others having official business in the State capital.

There were questions from the very beginning about the propriety of awarding this route to Chicago & Southern Airlines. Their record was not good. In fact, the city of Springfield, the Spring-

field Airport Authority, and the Springfield Association of Commerce and Industry all fought the decision to award the route to Chicago & Southern. An injunction was sought by a competitor against the Chicago & Southern operation, but it was denied in Cook County circuit court.

Despite the misgivings of those who questioned the airworthiness of the aircraft operated by Chicago & Southern Airlines, the Illinois Commerce Commission granted a certificate to the company, and the Federal Aviation Administration certified the company's aircraft as well as their pilots and crews. I want to address myself to the FAA's approval of the company's aircraft, pilots, and crews.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the adequacy of FAA certification procedures. Only a month after it was awarded the commuter route, Chicago & Southern Airlines was involved in a series of minor accidents. A major tragedy occurred when a Chicago & Southern chartered plane was involved in a fatal crash in a Cleveland suburb, an accident which also took place after the certificate was awarded.

These FAA-certified aircraft have a record of engine failures, collapsing landing gear, and a propensity for making one-engine approaches to the Springfield airport. Examples of these are enumerated in a complaint filed with the FAA July 20 by the Board of Springfield Capitol Airport.

Why did the FAA certify aircraft with a record such as this? Did the FAA really make a thorough examination of the aircraft operated by Chicago & Southern Airlines and their pilots and crews? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is "No." A review of FAA safety inspection procedures reveals that they were token only, that the FAA, in fact, delegated its safety inspection authority—rather, its responsibility—to the person least likely to perform this function responsibly, the company itself. Oh, it may have made occasional spot checks, but the fact is clear that under FAA's procedures, it authorized inspection of Chicago & Southern Airlines by Chicago & Southern Airlines itself.

Frank Hanson, the pilot who perished in that fatal C. & S. crash of October 1971, was president of the company and a FAA-designated chief check pilot. He was in charge of examining other C. & S. pilots and crews and determining their competency. The company's records disclose that he checked the pilots and approved their competency.

Yet, according to the Chicago Daily News, Frank Hanson himself had been involved in two prior aircraft fatalities, one in Michigan in 1967 and another near O'Hare Airport 3 years earlier. Mr. Hanson had previously been fined for four violations of FAA safety regulations.

On what basis did the FAA find it proper to entrust a pilot with a record such as this with the responsibility for determining the competency of other C. & S. pilots and crews? Compounding this dereliction in safety procedures, the records of the Federal Aviation Administration indicate that Frank Hanson was



November 19, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11311

tested and found competent by his precursor as an FAA-designated check pilot, Mr. James Saterfield. It turns out that Mr. Saterfield was also a Chicago & Southern employee.

The system under which the Federal Aviation Administration delegates its authority in this manner is called the approved inspection program. It is so widespread and patently so inadequate that we must be concerned with the possibility that other crashes will occur at any time under its loose controls.

In the hearings before the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. George Moore, associate administrator for operations of the FAA, estimated that at least 70 percent of their work in the certification was delegated. This figure was later reestimated by Mr. Moore to "go high as 90 percent."

This system of "delegated authority" is clearly inadequate in assuring public safety. Both in the inspection of airline manufacturing and operation, the FAA had abdicated its responsibility. We do not allow the National Association of Manufacturers to determine violations of the Fair Trade Practices Act, the drug manufacturers to approve the safety of their products. Why should airline companies be in almost total control over questions of safety of their operations? Truly, the FAA has hired the rabbit to guard the lettuce patch, the fox to guard the chicken coop.

Our regulatory agencies are supposed to exist for a reason. The FAA is supposed to assure the safety of commercial airlines operations. Under its current practices, it sloughs off its responsibility, it compromises public trust.

In commercial aviation, consumer protection is the protection of a passenger's life and limb. Those who rely on commercial aviation—the passengers especially, the business community, the general public, and the government—have the right to expect that when they board such planes, the Federal Government attests to the fact that maximum safety reviews of pilot and aircraft have been analyzed.

It is up to the FAA to provide this assurance—to tell the public they have done everything possible to insure the safety of the aircraft in which they ride. That is not being done today. And it is up to the Congress to require the FAA to carry out responsibly the safety task assigned to it.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. 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, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 290, nays 3, not voting 137, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—290

- Adams
- Anderson, Calif.
- Andrews, Ala.
- Andrews, N. Dak.
- Annunzio
- Archer
- Arends
- Ashley
- Aspin
- Aspinall
- Begich
- Belcher
- Bennett
- Bergland
- Betts
- Bevill
- Biaggi
- Biestler
- Bingham
- Blanton
- Boggs
- Bolling
- Bow
- Brademas
- Bray
- Brinkley
- Broomfield
- Brotzman
- Brown, Mich.
- Brown, Ohio
- Broyhill, Va.
- Buchanan
- Burke, Fla.
- Burke, Mass.
- Burleson, Tex.
- Burlison, Mo.
- Burton
- Byrnes, Wis.
- Byron
- Cabell
- Caffery
- Carney
- Carter
- Casey, Tex.
- Chamberlain
- Clawson, Del.
- Collins, Ill.
- Collins, Tex.
- Colmer
- Conable
- Conte
- Coughlin
- Daniel, Va.
- Daniels, N.J.
- Danielson
- Davis, Wis.
- Dellenback
- Denholm
- Dennis
- Dent
- Derwinski
- Dickinson
- Donohue
- Dow
- Downing
- Drinan
- Dulski
- Duncan
- du Pont
- Dwyer
- Edwards, Calif.
- Eilberg
- Erlenborn
- Evans, Colo.
- Fascell
- Findley
- Flowers
- Foley
- Ford, William D.
- Forsythe
- Fountain
- Fraser
- Frelinghuysen
- Frenzel
- Frey
- Galifianakis
- Garmatz
- Gaydos
- Gettys
- Giammo
- Gibbons
- Gonzalez
- Goodling
- Green, Oreg.
- Green, Pa.
- Griffin
- Gubser
- Gude
- Haley
- Hamilton
- Hammer-schmidt
- Hanley
- Hanna
- Hansen, Idaho
- Hansen, Wash.
- Harsha
- Harvey
- Hastings
- Hawkins
- Hays
- Hechler, W. Va.
- Heinz
- Helstoski
- Henderson
- Hicks, Mass.
- Hicks, Wash.
- Hogan
- Hollifield
- Hosmer
- Howard
- Hull
- Hungate
- Hunt
- Hutchinson
- Ichord
- Jacobs
- Jarman
- Johnson, Calif.
- Johnson, Pa.
- Jones, Ala.
- Jones, N.C.
- Jones, Tenn.
- Karth
- Kastenmeier
- Kazen
- Keating
- Kee
- Keith
- Kyl
- Kyros
- Landgrebe
- Landrum
- Lennon
- Lent
- Lloyd
- Long, La.
- Long, Md.
- Lujan
- McClory
- McCormack
- McCulloch
- McDonald, Mich.
- McEwen
- McKay
- McKevitt
- McKinney
- McMillan
- Madden
- Mahon
- Mallard
- Martin
- Matsunaga
- Mayne
- Mazzoli
- Meeds
- Melcher
- Metcalfe
- Michel
- Mikva
- Miller, Calif.
- Miller, Ohio
- Mills, Md.
- Minish
- Mink
- Minshall
- Monagan
- Montgomery
- Moorhead
- Morgan
- Morse
- Mosher
- Moss
- Murphy, Ill.
- Murphy, N.Y.
- Myers
- Natcher
- Nedzi
- Nix
- Obey
- O'Hara
- O'Konski
- O'Neill
- Patten
- Perkins
- Pickle
- Pike
- Pirnie
- Poage
- Poff
- Powell
- Preyer, N.C.
- Price, Ill.
- Price, Tex.
- Pucinski
- Quile
- Quillen
- Railsback
- Randall
- Rangel
- Rarick
- Rees
- Reid, N.Y.
- Reuss
- Rhodes
- Riegle
- Robinson, Va.
- Rodino
- Roe
- Rogers
- Roncaldo
- Rooney, N.C.
- Rooney, Pa.
- Rosenblatt
- Roush
- Roy
- Roybal
- Ruppe
- Ryan
- Sarbanes
- Sattler
- Saylor
- Schelle
- Schuler
- Schmechel
- Schwengel
- Scott
- Seiberling
- Shibley
- Shriver
- Sisk
- Skubitz
- Smith, Calif.
- Smith, Iowa
- Smith, N.Y.
- Spence
- Springer
- Stanton
- James V.
- Steed
- Steiger, Wis.
- Stephens
- Stratton
- Stubblefield
- Stuckey
- Sullivan
- Symington
- Talcott
- Taylor
- Teague, Tex.
- Terry
- Thompson, Ga.
- Thompson, N.J.
- Thompson, Wis.
- Thone
- Tiernan
- Udall
- Van Deerlin
- Vander Jagt
- Vanik
- Vigorito
- Waggonner
- Wampler
- Whalen
- White
- Whitehurst
- Whitten
- Widnall
- Wiggins
- Williams
- Wolf
- Wyatt
- Wyder
- Wyllie
- Wyman
- Yates
- Yatron
- Young, Fla.
- Young, Tex.
- Zablocki
- Zion
- Zwach

Gross Hall Schmitz  
NAYS—3  
NOT VOTING—137

- Abblitt
- Abernethy
- Abourezk
- Abzug
- Addabbo
- Alexander
- Anderson, Ill.
- Anderson, Tenn.
- Ashbrook
- Badillo
- Baker
- Baring
- Barrett
- Bell
- Blackburn
- Blatnik
- Boland
- Brasco
- Brooks
- Broyhill, N.C.
- Byrne, Pa.
- Camp
- Carey, N.Y.
- Cederberg
- Celler
- Chappell
- Chisholm
- Clancy
- Clark
- Clausen, Don H.
- Cmy
- Cleveland
- Collier
- Conyers
- Corman
- Cotter
- Crane
- Culver
- Davis, Ga.
- Davis, S.C.
- de la Garza
- Delaney
- Dellums
- Devine
- Diggs
- Dingell
- Dorn
- Dowdy
- Eckhardt
- Edmondson
- Edwards, Ala.
- Edwards, La.
- Esch
- Eshleman
- Evin, Tenn.
- Fish
- Fisher
- Flood
- Flynt
- Ford, Gerald R.
- Fulton, Tenn.
- Fuqua
- Gallagher
- Goldwater
- Grass
- Gray
- Griffiths
- Grover
- Hagan
- Halpern
- Harrington
- Hathaway
- Hébert
- Heckler, Mass.
- Hillis
- Horton
- Jonas
- Kemp
- King
- Kluczynski
- Koch
- Kuykendall
- Latta
- Leggett
- Link
- McCloskey
- McClure
- McCollister
- McDade
- McFall
- Macdonald, Mass.
- Mann
- Mathias, Calif.
- Mathis, Ga.
- Mills, Ark.
- Mitchell
- Mizell
- Mollohan
- Nelsen
- Nichols
- Passman
- Patman
- Pelly
- Petty
- Pettis
- Reyer
- Rodell
- Pryor, Ark.
- Purcell
- Roberts
- Robison, N.Y.
- Rostenkowski
- Rousselot
- Runnels
- Ruth
- St Germain
- Sandman
- Sebelius
- Shoup
- Sikes
- Slack
- Snyder
- Staggers
- Stanton
- J. William
- Steele
- Steiger, Ariz.
- Stokes
- Teague, Calif.
- Ullman
- Vessey
- Walde
- Ware
- Whalley
- Wilson, Bob
- Wilson,
- Charles H.
- Winn
- Wright

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
Mr. Boland with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sandman.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Devine.  
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Goldwater.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Esch.  
Mr. Flood with Mr. McDade.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Mizell.  
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Bell.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Cederberg.  
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Collier.  
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Whalley.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mr. Link with Mr. Nelsen.  
Mr. McFall with Mr. Teague of California.  
Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Pelly.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Winn.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Snyder.  
Mr. Purcell with Mr. McClure.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. King.  
Mr. Slack with Mr. Kuykendall.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Baker.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Horton.  
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Robinson of Virginia.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Jonas.  
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Camp.  
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Mann with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.  
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Pettis.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Kemp.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Hillis.  
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ashbrook.  
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McCloskey.  
 Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Eshleman.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. McCollister.  
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Cleveland.  
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Mathias of California.  
 Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Crane.  
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Veysey.  
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Grover.  
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Latta.  
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Peysers.  
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Conyers.  
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Stokes.  
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Rousselot.  
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Mitchell.  
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. J. William Stanton.  
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Ruth.  
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Sebelius.  
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Dellums.  
 Mr. Cotter with Mr. Shoup.  
 Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Badillo.  
 Mr. Culver with Mr. Steele.  
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Ware.  
 Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Clay.  
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Koch.  
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Hathaway.  
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Harrington.  
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Fisher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the vote was just taken on House Resolution 699, and I wish to announce that if I had been present I would have voted "yea."

#### PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND TO RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 18) to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

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

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 18, with Mr. BRINKLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, S. 18 authorizes funds to finance the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for 2 years. It also provides for a commission to make a study of what these programs are trying to do and the best way to do what should be done in the future.

I am afraid that there is a good deal of misunderstanding about Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

They exist primarily to serve the listening audience in the satellite countries of Eastern Europe and listeners in the Soviet Union with uncensored programs of local interest.

Both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty operate primarily from Munich. Radio Free Europe directs its programs to the Eastern European countries. Radio Liberty directs its programs to the Soviet Union. Both concentrate on news and comment on developments within the individual countries concerned.

They are staffed by people who have left these countries, who speak the language and who know the interests and reactions of the people in the various countries.

These operations are fundamentally different from the Voice of America. The Voice of America is concerned with U.S. foreign policy and with events and issues of worldwide interest.

Originally, these stations were concerned primarily with cold war issues. In recent years, they have focused on news and comments of interest to their listeners, much of which would be broadcast by their own stations if they were not subject to censorship.

Although Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have been in existence for more than 20 years, this is the first opportunity the House has had to pass judgment on them. The reason is that heretofore they have been funded by the Central Intelligence Agency. That source of funds has been ended. It is, therefore, necessary to authorize and to appropriate funds for their continued operation in the usual manner.

Both stations were incorporated in the United States in the years immediately following World War II when the cold war was getting underway. Radio Free Europe broadcasts to five Soviet bloc countries—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. The broadcasts to each of these averages 15 hours a day in their native language. Radio Liberty broadcasts are directed to the people in the Soviet Union. Those broadcasts, which are around the clock, are made in Russian and 17 other major languages that are spoken in that country. Although the administrative headquarters of both organizations is in the United States, their base of operations is principally in Germany. The German Government licenses the stations as foreign non-profit corporations.

The objectives of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are much the same.

Members are well aware that the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc countries practice heavy, even oppressive, censorship within their borders. It is only through the broadcasts of these two organizations that it is possible for the citizens of those countries to know what is going on in their own countries. Each organization maintains a highly specialized staff that analyzes news and information that comes from behind the Iron Curtain, whether in writing or in broadcasts. The quality of the staff work is recognized by western scholars, journalists, and government officials. In addition to news and information, the broadcasts are interspersed with music and other cultural material, sports, and other features.

Clearly, the unique contributions of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty arise from the fact that they provide material that would be available to their listeners if their own governments did not engage in censorship.

The Congress is faced with the issue whether Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty serve our national interests and, if so, what is the best way to fund them.

The Senate provided stopgap financing for 1 year while it awaited the results of two reports—one by the General Accounting Office and one by the Library of Congress—to make a final determination. The administration recommended the creation of the American Council for International Communications, which would be a Government-financed but operationally independent agency.

The committee considered both the interim and the permanent approach. After hearings and executive consideration, we decided that there were too many unknowns to warrant endorsing a permanent organization. We believed that large policy issues should be considered as well as plans for operation.

The committee, therefore, amended the Senate bill to provide for a far-ranging study by a body that would include Members of Congress as well as outside experts. Such a study would be carried out by a commission that would report by November 1972, and go out of business not later than June 1973. Pending the completion of that study, we also authorized funding for 2 fiscal years. In short, ours is also a stopgap measure that makes no final judgment on the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have chosen the only responsible course in this matter. I urge the House to pass this bill.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs could explain what is the difference between these two radios included in this legislation and Radio Free Asia and why is that organization which appears to be on a par with these two not included in the legislation?

Mr. MORGAN. There is, as you know, a broadcasting station on Taiwan that broadcasts to Siberia and the parts of Russia that are in Asia. They do not

November 19, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

broadcast to China, but the transmitter is on Taiwan.

Mr. STRATTON. Is not there an organization which calls itself Radio Free Asia and does that have the same sponsors?

Mr. MORGAN. That does not have the same sponsorship. I do not believe it is financed with Government funds. It may receive private contributions.

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

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

Mr. CABELL. I thank the gentleman in the well for yielding.

I would like to say that several years ago I had the pleasure of serving as State chairman for Radio Free Europe in my State, and to have spent 2 weeks in Germany going over it carefully and trying very diligently to pick it to pieces. I have never found a better instrumentality for putting the American philosophy across to those people behind the Iron Curtain than Radio Free Europe was able to do.

I would like also to call the attention of this body to the fact that Radio Free Europe and its activities are not to be confused with the Voice of America program. Voice of America has a tinge that Radio Free Europe does not have because it has been separated from a strictly governmental agency.

I wish to commend the work that this committee has done and the chairman for bringing this legislation to light. I sincerely hope that this one instrumentality for bringing truth behind the Iron Curtain will be kept up. To prove the effectiveness of the program, if the Russians did not know that we are making inroads on their philosophy, they would not spend the millions of dollars they are spending in trying to jam the programs of Radio Free Europe.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I share his views and I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Can you tell the Committee who is in charge of programing? Who determines the program content?

Mr. MORGAN. They have a large staff of specialists. As I said, the headquarters is in New York, but most of the staff is located in Munich, Germany. The overall supervision is in the hands of people in New York who are not government officials but who understand broadcast operation. Radio Free Europe is headed by William P. Dunkirk. On the board of directors are distinguished individuals including Gen. Lucius Clay. But the real programing is done by the professional staff in Munich, Germany. They run what is largely a news broadcasting operation.

[Mr. CABELL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. MAILLIARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of S. 18. This bill, as amended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, would create a temporary commission for conducting a one-time study of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The legislation would also provide financing for their operations on an interim basis.

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that a study and evaluation of the international radio broadcasting activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is very timely.

These radios have been operating since shortly after World War II. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty act as "domestic" radios providing news and information that is not supplied by the Communist government controlled news organs. The emphasis of these radios is upon encouraging liberalization and peaceful reform. On the whole, I believe they have done a good job.

However, after so many years of operation, I think it is appropriate that a commission conduct an independent and comprehensive study. The commission, consisting of nine members, representing the legislative branch, the executive branch, and non-Government experts, would go out of business after the completion of its study, no later than July 1, 1973.

Radio Free Europe broadcasts to five Soviet bloc countries—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. Radio Liberty broadcasts to the Soviet Union in Russian and 17 other major languages spoken in that country. The focus in both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is upon objective and accurate news reporting and balanced commentaries. They seek to encourage indigenous forces of peaceful reform as they provide news that listeners would receive from stations in their own countries if censorship did not exist.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the difference between these stations and the Voice of America, since their roles and functions are sometimes confused. Voice of America broadcasts on a worldwide basis as the radio arm of the U.S. Information Agency. Its purpose is to report and interpret U.S. life and policy. By contrast Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty emphasize news, information, and entertainment, with a highly localized content and appeal. Their function and purpose are entirely different from the Voice of America. They use different frequencies and different transmitters from the Voice of America.

Mr. Chairman, while Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have done a good job, I believe the time has come to review their operations as we consider their future. In the meantime we should provide interim financing as provided for in the bill before us. I urge your support of S. 18 as amended by our committee.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in

support of S. 18, providing assistance to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty.

The principal purpose of this Senate bill is to create a temporary mechanism for conducting a one-time study and evaluation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and to provide for interim financing of those operations while the study is in progress. To this end, enactment of this legislation will establish a nine-member Commission on International Radio Broadcasting, composed of representatives of the legislative and executive branches of the U.S. Government and of the public.

Both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were conceived in the years immediately following World War II and have been funded, until this past fiscal year, by the Central Intelligence Agency. The legislation before us is nothing more than a stopgap measure until the Commission reports its findings in 1973 as to whether these radio stations should continue in the future to be financed by the U.S. Government and, if so, how they should be financed.

Mr. Chairman, in the 3 years that I have represented the people of Maryland's Fifth Congressional District in this body, I have joined each year during the third week in July—Captive Nations Week—with numerous of my colleagues in commemorating the observance of this week.

Despite the worldwide publicity given to the U.S. Captive Nations Week resolution when it first passed the 86th Congress in July 1959, and the annual reports on it since, it still remains a mystery why so few in the free world comprehend the captive nations concept. Similarly, there are few people today who could give an intelligent answer when asked what Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty are.

To enumerate the captive nations accurately and historically one must begin in 1920 with the subjugation of Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and several others in the Soviet Union. The second wave of Communist aggression reduced Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania to captivity in the early 1940's. The third wave in the late 1940's enslaved a whole new group of nations, including Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and many others.

It was during this third wave, in the late 1940's and early 1950's, that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty came into being. The current emphasis of RFE is to give encouragement to the indigenous forces of peaceful reform and to provide a mechanism for increasing within authoritarian governments the public accountability of public officials for their public acts. Radio Liberty broadcasts, on the other hand, offer positive alternatives to the Soviet system, couched in friendly terms, and for the most part, by indirection. In recent months Radio Liberty has devoted an increasing amount of its programs to the plight of Soviet Jews.

Mr. Chairman, during the 13th annual commemoration of Captive Nations Week this past July, I wrote to each Member of this body requesting my colleagues to join me in sponsoring a res-

olution to safeguard the Hungarian Holy Crown of St. Stephen. In my letter to my colleagues, I said:

In the past years, many of us have joined together during this week and, on the floor of the House, lamented the plight of those many foreign nations who still live under Communist domination and oppression. Unfortunately, too often each year, our words are forgotten as quickly as they are spoken. Rarely is it possible to take some kind of constructive action which will live on after the well-meaning words have long since died away.

Thirty-nine of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring a resolution (H. Con. Res. 385), expressing the sense of Congress that the Holy Crown of St. Stephen—Hungary's national treasure and symbol of constitutional government—should remain in the safekeeping of the United States until such time as Hungary once again functions as a constitutional government established through the free choice of the Hungarian people.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, this legislation before us today again gives the Members of this body another opportunity to act, rather than merely to speak. The hopes of these peoples, and the hopes of their brothers and sisters in this country, are dependent upon the continuance of such activities as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation with dispatch.

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

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I think is extremely important, which should be considered by the committee, and which is referred to in the report, and that is the importance of maintaining the morale of the many devoted people who are working for these agencies.

I myself feel that it would be helpful for us to emphasize the fact that many, if not most of us, believe strongly in the objectives and workings of these agencies and that this report and this action is not in any way meant to prejudge that there will be a termination of these activities.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the gentleman.

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for a period of 2 fiscal years and to authorize the formation of a commission to study the problem of the continuation and support of these two related activities.

The revelation of past governmental support of these broadcasting facilities has raised this problem and obviously it must be settled. I believe that much helpful work is done by these two organizations in news reporting, in commentary upon international happenings and in explanation of the workings of our society. It is interesting to note that the Germans are about to construct a station that will be more expensive by far than

the facilities which we are discussing and the Chinese also have plans for a very substantial facility.

The main justification for the continuance of this function is the gradual education of people behind the Iron Curtain in the ways of democracy and the provision for them of a balanced appraisal of the happenings in this country and throughout the world.

I know from experience the avidity with which people in the socialist countries look for dispassionate news sources and we provide them with a notable service in bringing unadulterated news and commentary to them. In addition, in this way we furnish the basis for the eventual return of representative government to these countries while giving proportion to the distorted picture of the United States which they might otherwise derive from the information agencies available to them. This bill will also provide a commission to make a very necessary long-range study of this whole problem and with directions that a response be made to the Congress in time to determine what the future policy of our Government will be in this regard. I support this bill and hope that it will be adopted.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I arise to say I feel very strongly that both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty make sense. I would guess that any evaluation of their functions would come to that same conclusion. This is not arguing against the advisability of setting up a commission. I certainly would have no reason to suggest that a commission is not necessary.

I think it is important that we continue these activities. This legislation, for that reason, is important, because it does provide authority for the financing for a 2-year period of both these Radios.

I would like also to point out, because there is sometimes confusion, the different roles played by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and the Voice of America. The Voice of America, as its name implies, basically is interested in and concentrates on reporting on the American scene and the American way of life. In contrast, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are in effect national voices of the geographical areas to which they send their broadcasts. They analyze and they organize news from certain countries, and report to them in the same way that an independent radio station would if their governments had such programs.

We need to keep the distinction between the two types in mind, and we need also to recognize that both have their place.

Our committee discussed the possibility of the Voice of America taking over the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Although we should not prejudice, or predict, what the commission may decide, I hope that a merger will not be recommended by the commission, as the responsibilities are quite different.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY AS SEEN  
BY DIPLOMATS AND SCHOLARS

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in looking at the radios, their aims, their methods and their impact, we should consider not only the views of the administration but also the views of independent observers who are able to make meaningful judgments about their work. We need to hear the words of disinterested and expert scholars and journalists throughout Western Europe and the United States. We need to examine the thinking of former Ambassadors who were stationed in the countries concerned and the statements of people who have recently come from those countries and who were dependent for their knowledge on what they heard over those radios.

In the committee hearings, testimony was given by the Honorable U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State, based on his experience as Ambassador to Czechoslovakia. The record also includes impressive, firsthand testimony by three recent emigres from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union, and from two of our former Ambassadors to the Soviet Union and Poland, respectively, Foy Kohler and John Gronouski. The record also includes statements by Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University and by a spokesman for the Polish-American Congress.

All of those witnesses strongly supported the continuation of the work of the radios. They were reflective of the serious concern in the academic and political worlds that this valuable service might be coming to an end. However, these statements were by no means the only ones being made publicly. For example, Dr. Hugh Seton-Watson, the distinguished professor of Russian history at London University and one of the most knowledgeable scholars on Eastern European affairs in the Western World, wrote to the London Daily Telegraph, in part, as follows:

For the great majority of the people in the censor-ridden Communist world, broadcasting is the only means the West has of conducting a dialogue with them. . . . I know from long personal experience that both the Europeans and the Americans responsible for running Radio Free Europe are extremely well informed, balanced in their judgments and in no sense fanatical crusaders. On the contrary, they are people who have been working for years to bring about true understanding.

One might question whether these Western opinions were valid if they were not echoed even more strongly from the East. A recent emigre, Mr. Henryk Bi-recki, wrote a letter to the Washington Star a short time ago in which he outlined his own background as a Communist official in charge of the Department

November 19, 1971

of Cultural Exchanges in the Polish Foreign Office and then made an eloquent plea for continuing the radios. He talked about the deep concern in the Polish Communist Party about the influence of Radio Free Europe and how the decision was made to use all available diplomatic and secret channels to bring about its closure. He then said:

The day when this goal will have been achieved will be a dark one for all these members of the Communist establishment who, like myself, have never lost hope that the system may become more humane and tolerant, less cruel and aggressive. They will lose a powerful ally.

These radios have been called the voice of the silent opposition in Eastern Europe. Their news broadcasts and commentaries are read and discussed daily both by the peoples and by their Communist leaders. There is good reason to believe that even the central committees of the Eastern European Communist Parties start their days by reading broadcast summaries. As Birecki said:

Communist leaders who have become prisoners of their own monopoly of information need this radio for their own private enlightenment, but at the same time fear its impact on others.

After listening to all of the evidence about these radios, the Foreign Affairs Committee voted to report out the bill we have before us. It provides for the establishment of a commission which will examine thoroughly the operations of the radios but will do so within the overall context of international radio broadcasting. Before making its recommendations, the commission can look thoroughly into what the radios do and not just what others say they do. It can look into how the information is gathered, how reliable it is, and what kind of impact it makes. If it chooses, it can examine broadcasting done by others in the area and broadcasting done by the Soviet bloc. All this will take some time and the November 30, 1972, deadline for the commission's report is designed to allow for careful study. To set a shorter period would mean that we would have to consider permanent legislation almost as soon as action on the present bill is completed. I hope that the House will accept this bill and that the funds will be provided to carry on with this important work.

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

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

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for S. 18.

The Commission it would establish is essential to proper congressional consideration of the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The money it would authorize—\$36 million for fiscal year 1972 and \$38.5 million for fiscal year 1973—would continue the operations of these radios during this interim period.

The hearings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have provided firm evi-

dence of the success of these radios during the years in which they have operated.

The need for their services was well stated by former Ambassador to Poland, John A. Gronouski, when he testified before our committee. Mr. Gronouski said:

It is not enough for the people of Eastern Europe to get undistorted news of events in other parts of the world, however important this in itself may be. It is even more important that they have access to information about events in their own country other than that which those in control wish to make known.

For if the international community is to make progress toward the East-West detente about which we all dream, this will come about through pressure exerted on their own governments by an informed citizenry.

This is the role, Mr. Chairman, that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are helping to fulfill in their 24-hour-a-day broadcasts to the oppressed people of the Soviet bloc.

I would remind my colleagues of the House that much as we wish it, the battle for the minds of men is not yet over. So long as censorship prevails in the Soviet bloc, their citizens will seek to know the truth.

If we tire of the competition and write off the minds of millions in the Soviet bloc, we reduce their ability to influence their governments toward the liberalization of policies. To achieve a generation of peace, we must continue to compete for the minds of men.

Mr. Chairman, I would direct the attention of the House to the Commission which this legislation would establish. The Commission—composed of representatives of the legislative and executive branches of Government, and of the public—will perform an extremely important function as it review and evaluates the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The legislation we are considering today is a sensible and reasonable solution to the problem of funding Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I urge its approval.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (Mr. MORGAN) indicated at the outset, the legislation before the House embodies a compromise and provides interim financing for the broadcasting operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

I had suggested that compromise when it became apparent, after several days of active consideration of the matter at hand, that neither the Senate proposal—which called for a 1-year authorization of appropriations through the Department of State—nor the executive branch request—which envisioned the setting up of a permanent corporation to fund these activities—would carry in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The alternative which is embodied in the amended bill, S. 18, attempts to steer a middle course:

It recognizes that these broadcasting activities, financed for years through the

CIA, have been, and may well continue to be, an important adjunct of the overseas operations of the U.S. Government;

It acknowledged that most of us here know all too little about them, or about their relevance to our country's current foreign policy undertaking; and

It provides for a way in which these broadcasting activities can be reassessed by an impartial panel in which the executive branch, the Congress and the public will participate. This task of reassessment is essential.

During the past two decades, without most of the Members of the Congress being informed about it, several hundred million dollars of the taxpayers' money has been spent on these operations.

This represents very substantial, and enduring, commitment of public funds and governmental support.

We cannot, in all logic and fairness, either terminate or perpetuate this commitment without knowing what it is all about.

The solution which I have proposed envisions the setting up of a tripartite Presidential commission which can do a thorough job of evaluating these operations and informing the Congress, and the public, about their relevance to today's and tomorrow's foreign policy of the United States.

This job will take at least a year. When it is completed, the commission will go out of existence and the Congress, supplied for the first time with relevant information, can decide what should be done about these activities.

In the meantime, the legislation before us will also provide interim financing for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—financing through an independent commission, rather than through the Department of State.

#### OPPOSING ARGUMENTS

Mr. Chairman, the amended bill, S. 18, came to the floor of the House with bipartisan support. It was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs by a vote of 23 to 1. And it is, we have been told, fully acceptable to the administration.

Nevertheless, some objections have been raised to it, first, on the grounds that Presidential commissions often have a way of perpetuating themselves without rendering effective service; and, second, on the grounds that interim financing through the State Department would be preferable to an independent agency route.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has considered both arguments and rejected them for the following reasons:

First, the bill before us provides clearly that the commission which will study the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty will go out of existence by July 1, 1973. There is no way in which the commission can perpetuate itself under this legislation. This is a one-shot affair designed to accomplish a specific job. Once that job is done, the commission will be finished and will cease to exist.

Second, as to performance, the commission is being given a very definite, clear-cut assignment. It is required by legislation to report on that assignment



to the President and the Congress. And to assure that the commission does not fall down on the job, part of the membership will be drawn from the Congress.

Finally, regarding the financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty operations, our committee has considered the possibility of using the State Department route and has rejected it for very good reasons. Neither of these two radio operations is a part of the State Department. Neither of them has been officially connected with the normal foreign policy apparatus of the U.S. Government. For some 20 years, these radio broadcasting activities have been financed by the CIA and conducted under the cloak of "private" sponsorship. This is no time to shove them on the Department of State. The administration does not want that; the State Department does not want it; and the Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended against it.

I hope and urge that the House approve the recommendations of the committee.

#### UNITED STATES SPEAKS WITH MANY VOICES

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this occasion to comment on a separate, but related, subject: The need for a thorough reappraisal of all overseas broadcasting activities of the U.S. Government.

For a number of years, while serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, I was deeply involved in a study of the impact on foreign audiences of the many far-flung and uncoordinated overseas broadcasting activities of the U.S. Government.

In Europe alone, for example, there are some 155 U.S.-financed radio transmitters which operate on short-wave, medium-wave and long-wave frequencies, broadcasting American messages to tens of millions of Europeans and Asians.

There is the Voice of America, the official information arm of the U.S. Government.

There are Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, whose primary targets are Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

There is RIAS—Radio in the American Sector in Berlin—which entertains American troops as well as millions of West and East Germans with American jazz, news, and other programs.

Then there is a special megawatt transmitter in Munich which is used occasionally to jam Soviet broadcasts to Eastern Europe.

And, finally, there is the Armed Forces Network which numbers many millions of Europeans among its audience.

All of these activities are supported by the American taxpayers, operate with the sanction of the U.S. Government, and, whether rightly or wrongly, are deemed to carry out Nation's message to the world.

The problem is that each of these operations is fairly autonomous and neither the Congress nor the American people have any clear idea of how much they cost, how they carry out their respective mandates, or whether they con-

tribute to the advancement of our national objectives abroad.

Three years ago, in a report entitled "The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy," our subcommittee recommended that the U.S. Government undertake a thorough reexamination of these and many other overseas information activities financed with Federal funds. The need for such a reappraisal is still urgent.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would again urge the House to approve S. 18 as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This action not only will contribute to a solution of an immediate problem and help the Congress obtain the necessary information to make an intelligent determination regarding the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, but may also provide us with valuable experience and insights regarding how other problems in this area could be approached.

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. WAGGONNER, at the request of Mr. FASCELL, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I submit that if we are going to find a solution to the question of how to preserve the good work of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, we must be very clear about what it is we are preserving.

It has sometimes been fashionable to dismiss these unique communications activities as reactionary left-overs from the cold war. It may have been fashionable, but it has little to do with the facts.

The Los Angeles Times columnist Robert S. Elegant pointed this out last March, in a column which was reprinted in a number of leading papers. The attacks on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty by Communist governments are at least logical from the Communist point of view, Mr. Elegant said, because:

Authoritarian governments are understandably distressed by outsiders challenging their monopoly of information.

But in the West, Mr. Elegant said:

Attacks are levelled by the wrong people for the wrong reasons . . . True liberals should . . . support the stations' aims: free information and East-West relaxation . . . The fundamental point is simple. Neither tensions within Communist society nor tension between East and West would miraculously disappear if both stations went off the air tomorrow . . . Despite their human imperfections, both seek to reduce internal and international tension by the best means known to man—the freer flow of information.

This point deserves repeating. The distinguished Swiss newspaper *Neue Buercher Zeitung* made its own thorough investigation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty this spring and commented on June 30:

The reason and justification for these stations are to be found in the fact that the Communist states know no freedom of opinion—that they hinder a free exchange of information . . . In our modern age of global communications and mass media, the

leaders in Moscow and the East European countries try to work against this communication, keeping the Curtain closed at least to that extent, maintaining a "camp of controlled information."

And the Swiss paper concluded:

It is their sealing-off that is unnatural and contradictory to the tendency of our age toward immediate, global and varied information—not the existence of the two stations, which fulfill important functions as gates to a world-wide process of communication, and thus actually serve that coexistence about which so much is said . . .

If we doubt this, we have only to turn to the Communists' themselves. When Czechoslovakia was occupied by Soviet and allied arms in 1968, and told to restore the censorship it had dropped during the Prague spring, party leader Dubcek and his Central Committee were forced to issue a resolution stating, and I quote:

The press, radio and television are primarily an instrument for the implementation of the policy of the Party and state . . . They are responsible for the mass-information media working in an exclusively socialist spirit.

Now you and I may say that in the long run censorship cannot work. And indeed it does not, but only because organizations such as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty believe that truth is not a tool of political control but an absolute value, and act on that belief.

Even wiser heads in Eastern Europe realize the same things. One notable example is Wladyslaw Bienkowski—an old party man, a distinguished sociologist, a former Polish Minister of Education and friend of former Polish Party Leader Gomulka. Here is what he wrote about his own party's efforts at censorship, in a book published late in 1969—a book which, incidentally, had to be published outside of Poland. I quote:

Today, when techniques of communication have done away with distances . . . the hierarchical method of selecting and censoring information has become a glaring anachronism. . . . If the authorities of a country employ the tactics of evading problems and hiding facts from their own people, there will always be others to do the job for them—who will inform the people, in the language of the country, and tell them why their own government kept these particular facts from them.

And Bienkowski goes on:

It is astounding and alarming how far the influence of this foreign propaganda—represented chiefly by Free Europe—has extended not only over the society, but over our authorities.

Today's Communist leaders would also do well to read their own Karl Marx. Here is what the founder of the movement wrote for a German paper, 139 years ago:

A censored press remains a bad thing, even when it publishes good products . . . A free press remains a good thing, even when it believes in bad products . . . The character of a censored press is the characterless disorder of unfreedom, a 'civilized' atrocity, a perfumed monster.

Now, all of us can agree on the virtues of a free press and a free flow of information everywhere. But there are still two questions to which we should have clear answers:

November 19, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11317

First: If we carefully abstain from activities which the Communist leaderships of East Europe and the Soviet Union find objectionable, will they see the light? Will they abandon their ideological campaigns and efforts to arm their own people against us psychologically?

And second: Are these two radios actually worthy instruments to keep the channels of information open?

As to the first point, let me turn to official evidence from East Europe. In an April 1970 article, the then chairman of the Hungarian Parliament, Gyula Kallai, explained peaceful coexistence this way:

The policy of peaceful coexistence is cooperation as well as struggle at the same time. The method to be applied is cooperation and competition in the economic and scientific fields, and struggle in the political, diplomatic and ideological spheres.

This spring the official weekly of the Czechoslovak Party, *Tribuna*, predicted that through the decade ahead:

There will hardly be any reduction of tension in the ideological field . . . It is a long-term trend which will grow even sharper in the '70's.

As to whether Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are worthy instruments of freedom of information, allow me to quote a few impartial witnesses—neither East European nor American:

I have mentioned the Swiss daily *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* in another connection. In its June 30 study of the two stations, this paper also said, and I quote:

A critical look at the broadcasts shows that RL and RFE work with the same methods and sources as other Western radio stations, and are just as open and accessible as the latter, so that one cannot speak of secret or "agitating" stations . . . the news programs are put together from material from Western agencies and from the official pronouncements of the Communist countries. These news programs are varied and objective.

This June, Poland's Foreign Minister protested to the Bonn Government about RFE's broadcasts, which he called a "hostile activity." The Polish press chimed in to accuse Radio Free Europe of "false information" and "subversive activity." In response, the major West German daily *Sueddeutsche Zeitung*—a supporter of the Brandt administration—took an unusual step: It printed translations of a full day's news programs of Radio Free Europe's Polish service, spread across much of two pages, and invited its readers to judge for themselves whether Radio Free Europe was objective.

The Dutch National Radio Service also made a careful study and broadcast a documentary lasting almost an hour. The broadcast ended with this comment:

Radio Free Europe is not out of date . . . We would be doing an injustice to the people in East Europe if the station were to be closed down . . . Radio Free Europe is looked upon by the peoples of the East bloc countries in the same way we Dutchmen looked upon the BBC and *Radio Oranje* (the Dutch wartime freedom station) during World War II.

In regard to broadcasting to the Soviet Union, we have an eloquent statement from Anatoli Fedoseyev, the Russian scientist recently defected from the Soviet Union to England.

In talking about the shortsighted policies of the Soviet Government in the economic field, he said that the Soviet Union could, under other policies, make rapid advances and doing so would automatically put an end to the present tensions in Europe. He then asks:

What can the outside world do to speed change . . . ? The answer is simple: Increase the flow of information. There is no need for anyone to try to teach the Soviet people what to think. But there is an enormous and insatiable demand for information, for facts, about the outside world, about other Communist countries, and especially about the Soviet Union itself. The citizens of the Soviet Union are often the last people to hear news of events inside their own countries.

Mr. Chairman, all of us want a relaxation of tension and a growth of understanding and trust between this country and the Communist world. But we cannot afford to forget that such policies are real and durable only when they are backed by the will of informed peoples on both sides of the world. Let me close with the words of a very perceptive editorial which appeared in the *Washington Post* June 25. Said the *Post*:

Detente, if it means anything, means widening the West's contacts with the East, not helping the East seal off its people from the West. It means the exchange of people, goods, words and ideas. This is the essential business of RFE and RL. The Congress, in its rightminded determination to shake the stations free of the CIA, should not lose sight of the reason for letting them continue it.

(Mr. SIKES, at the request of Mr. FASCELL, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, I would like to look at the other side of the coin for a moment.

I am speaking of the international political effort of the Communist world—particularly as it displays itself through radio broadcasting.

Of course, you run into a contradiction immediately here. The Communist view of the doctrine of peaceful coexistence—whatever it means—does not include ideological coexistence—that is, a free exchange of ideas and information.

Thus if Western stations broadcast the truth as they see it, into areas under Communist control, that, in the eyes of Moscow and Warsaw and Prague is a violation of the spirit of peaceful coexistence. But if Communist governments are doing the broadcasting—and Radio Moscow is the world's leading international broadcaster—it seems to be something else again. Like all of us—but without any occasional saving grace of humility the Communists believe they have a patent on truth.

Soviet Party leader Leonid Brezhnev drew this distinction very plainly in his "State of the Union" message to the Soviet Party Congress this spring, when he said:

We are living in conditions of unceasing ideological warfare.

The Soviet leader evidently believes he has a patent on truth, and he proposes to use it. He went on to say:

Let the voice of truth about the Soviet Union be heard on all continents of the earth.

It is also interesting that Poland—after abstaining for many years—has recently resumed intensive "jamming" of RFE broadcasts. The Polish regime might be expected to argue—as its propagandists already argue—that RFE is a barrier to relaxing tensions in Europe because it interferes in internal affairs—Communist style.

However, we have heard nothing about any restriction of Soviet-bloc international broadcasts. And some of them are truly remarkable.

For example, in its broadcasts to Japan Radio Moscow has criticized local election candidates for—in its words—"flooding the voters' ears with sweet-sounding promises." To Indonesia, Radio Moscow quoted a publication of the outlawed Indonesian Communist Party and called on the Indonesian people for a confrontation with what it called the "new-order regime and its reactionary schemes."

A Soviet-operated station calling itself "Peace and Progress" radio has consistently criticized the Indian Government as well as non-Communist opposition parties in that country for the last 3 years. Other bloc broadcasts call for their listeners to overthrow the government of Turkey, Greece, Iran, and Brazil.

Soviet propaganda to West Germany goes still further. There is a powerful German-speaking radio—"Soldiers' Station 935"—which tries to create the impression that it is speaking from inside West Germany—but actually comes from East Germany; it addresses itself directly to the West German armed forces, and advises them on how to resist cooperation with NATO.

In other words:

At a time when the Soviet Union and its allies are campaigning to shut down Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, their own propaganda stations are going full blast.

The fact is that the Soviet Union today is broadcasting in some 79 languages for 332 hours daily—an increase of 14 percent in the last 4 years. In 1970, radio stations of the Communist states aired just under 1,000-hours a day in 99 languages. A recent British study of Communist broadcasting concluded that—and I quote:

Radio propaganda remains the most important means at the disposal of Communist countries in their attempts to gain credibility and to influence international developments in favor of Communist aims.

Therefore—even if RFE and Radio Liberty were to use the kind of tactics many Soviet broadcasts do—the Soviet and East European effort to call "foul" against Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty would ring a bit hollow.

Mr. Chairman, the comment has been made in this country that Radio Free Europe is an anachronism, that it is out of place in an age of detente—an age, hopefully, of negotiation.

The answer to that charge is that in the attempt to bring about more normal relations between East and West, it is very important indeed to provide to East

Europeans a full range of news and opinions about their own affairs as well as external matters. It is essential that East Europeans know the full truth about the real requirements for peace. Judging by careful interviews of East European travelers done by public opinion research institutes, Free Europe is heard regularly by 31 million people, over half the population over 14 in its audience area. In effect, it is they who have answered those who contend the radios have no function in the present era. Thirty-one million people do not listen to an anachronism. They do listen to Radio Free Europe in areas where it is very important that our side be heard. I consider it essential that this program continue.

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

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

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting this legislation to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (S. 18).

These two information programs have been in operation since shortly after the close of World War II. At that time the threat of Soviet aggression still existed throughout countries of Western Europe.

To my mind the cheapest and probably the most effective offense and defense that the free world has against Communist aggression is to acquaint the people of the world both behind and outside the Communist Iron Curtain with the real facts and truths about Communist tyranny and enslavement. Numerous reports come from behind the Iron Curtain by the people who listen to the broadcast of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to many of the secret operations of Communist tyranny from the standpoint of concealed enslavement of its people and the punishment rendered to its citizens who do not conform.

Through this information millions behind the Iron Curtain receive first-hand information of important news from the outside world and knowledge that our Nation and other free nations have not given up hope, and that the United States is continuing its programs and sacrifices to aid them in their fight for eventual freedom. Entertainment and informative programs are broadcast into their homes conveying aspects of American life and culture which is of great value to the families who are receiving the service of these broadcasts. For the billions of dollars that the American taxpayers have paid to curb the Communist tyranny from expansion, I think the educational and informative programs originating from Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are the most effective and produce great results in our program to curb Communist expansion throughout the free world.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, wish to express my appreciation of the mission of Radio Free Europe and the way in which it conveys inspiration and encouragement to its millions of listeners behind the Iron Curtain. It does express in very vivid and very appropriate manner the ideals and the true spirit of America, and does keep alive the spirit of freedom in the hearts of those who have reason to feel oppressed because of the environment in which they are forced to live. I have supported this program since its inception and am proud of its achievements.

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I see by the report that Radio Free Europe had an additional \$1.5 million in operating funds, which came from private sources, and Radio Liberty has almost no private contributions. Can the gentleman explain what is the source of the \$1.5 million, and why people would be interested in contributing to one and not to the other?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I cannot give a positive answer to that, but I have heard on the radio and various other places appeals for private contributions for Radio Free Europe. I do not recall ever having heard one for Radio Liberty. They are separate. I would suppose it would depend on the effort they might make to get private contributions.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, Radio Free Europe has always had an organized fund-raising campaign. There have been frequent announcements on television and the radio. Radio Liberty has no organized campaign, and receives only a few small contributions from individuals who have a serious interest in the program. They make no public solicitation whatsoever. Their donations and contributions have been very small, I would say not more than \$5,000 or \$10,000 a year.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I should think that is the case.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I support S. 18.

Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. Chairman, I note that the committee report indicates in recent months Radio Liberty has devoted an increasing amount of its program to the plight of the Soviet Jews, and indicates that cultural programs have been featured along with Jewish holidays. I notice also that the Radio Liberty broadcasts in 17 languages. A number of us have tried to get some of its programming done with full programs in Yiddish. Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe have resisted those suggestions. In my judgment, this is an important symbolic gesture on our part that these programs be made in Yiddish. I am wondering if

the committee took this up and can give us any assurance that this kind of programming may be forthcoming.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I do not recall this particular question coming up during the hearings, but I did not attend them all. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee for a response.

Mr. MORGAN. I agree with the gentleman who asked the question, that it is proper that some broadcasts should be in Yiddish. I want to assure him that the commission that will be formed to make a study under this bill will definitely have a responsibility to determine whether some of the broadcasts should be in Yiddish and Hebrew.

Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. Chairman, then I have the assurance of the committee chairman and the ranking Republican member that they will bend all their efforts to see to it we do get some broadcasts in Yiddish?

Mr. MORGAN. The bill provides that there will be two Members of the House on this commission. I am sure that whoever the the House Members on the commission are, they will recognize the importance of the issue which the gentleman has raised.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I am quite certain that this is one of the subjects that the commission should make some recommendations on.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank both of the gentlemen, and I endorse this program wholeheartedly.

Mr. MORGAN, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this resolution simply because Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have been two of the most effective links that the free world has had with the people behind the Iron Curtain.

I had occasion to review many of the broadcasts of Radio Free Europe and some of the other work they are doing. I believe that Radio Free Europe has provided the heartbeat of hope and it continues to provide that heartbeat of hope for 180 million people behind the Iron Curtain living in the captive nations of Europe who, by listening to the Radio Free Europe program and broadcasts, are constantly reminded that we, as the free people of the United States, have not forgotten them and that we share in their great hope for the liberation and liberalization of these people with their ultimately rejoining the free nations of the world.

I think the adoption of this resolution will be a great morale booster for the many wonderful people who work for Radio Free Europe, people who have been making an enormous contribution. They are all people who have been carrying on this relentless struggle behind the Iron Curtain.

I must say that they have been showing a great deal of professionalism which they have developed over the years and that this has brought a great degree of confidence to the people listening to the broadcasts. Those who listen to Radio Free Europe and its broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain have certainly

November 19, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11319

been given a great deal of hope from those broadcasts.

I have been behind the Iron Curtain to some of those countries and talked to those people and discussed with them the value and the importance of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. In both instances they tell us that frequently this is the only link they have with the free world. Radio Free Europe is the only method by which these people can continue to understand what is happening to the rest of the world.

I certainly hope that the Commission goes over the program and sees to it that we have a continuation of the Radio Free Europe broadcasts after the 2-year period and that they give serious consideration to restoring Radio Free Cuba along with Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

We had a very effective Radio Free Cuba operating into Cuba for a number of years and then it was shut down during the hysteria that swept this country a few years ago.

It seems to me that it is important for us to continue to get behind the Iron Curtain of Cuba and bring to the Cuban people the truth about America and what is happening on this continent.

So, I am most pleased and wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) and his committee on both sides of the aisle for not succumbing to the hysteria that swept our country a few years ago when there were strong voices trying to sweep aside Radio Free Europe for people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Foreign Affairs Committee has shown excellent judgment in bringing this bill before the House and affording us an opportunity to vote on this measure in order to show the people in RFE the great confidence that we have in what they are doing.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the adoption of this measure.

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

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the chairman and ranking minority member for the action they are taking today on bills that were initially introduced by Senator CASE and myself, the purpose of which was to facilitate and insure ultimate direct funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to separate the funding from the CIA, thereby to increase, we believe, the credibility of the stations.

Mr. Chairman, I very much hope that the 2-year funding that is called for in the House version of the bill will prevail in any conference with the Senate. I think the assurance of continuity of these two stations is very important from several standpoints, not the least of which involves the personnel of the stations. Equally important, there are certain diplomatic implications beyond the study.

This study will take 1 year, and I hope that it may conclude not only that there is merit to continuing these stations, but also that they will be placed in broad-

based American Council that would be analogous, perhaps, to the British Council which has so effectively carried forth endeavors that facilitate open communications.

I believe, therefore, that this bill should be supported. I think it only fair to say that when I was recently in Poland it was very clear that Radio Free Europe had played a very key, sensitive, and thoughtful role in reporting on the events brought on by the student riots in 1968 and, subsequently, in 1970.

These stations must become independent of the U.S. Government. Otherwise their credibility will be open to increasing question. And furthermore, we are dealing here with a sophisticated operation that must function within parameters of sensitivity, judgment, and the dictates of the truth.

What is called for is fidelity—straight news reporting, because we get from this a sensitivity to the kind of straight news that these countries do not have because of censorship, but which can be of very real benefit to the furtherance of open communications leading to higher living standards, more freedom and personal liberties in these countries.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 18, as amended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, because I believe the continuance of U.S. assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to be essential to the struggle for human rights around the world.

This legislation proposes a study, to be conducted by a Commission on International Radio Broadcasting, to determine what role the United States should play in the support of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in the future.

The House version also provides interim funds, totaling \$36 million for fiscal 1972 and \$38.52 million for fiscal 1973, to enable these two vital networks to continue broadcasting daily news and features behind the Iron Curtain where many people are denied even the day-to-day reports of events occurring in their own countries.

Through such factual broadcasts they fill the void of information so necessary to world understanding—a void created by Government control of news media.

During hearings on these two stations, the Foreign Affairs Committee heard testimony on the widespread influence and effect of both networks, first by former Soviet residents who believe strongly that the broadcasts of Radio Liberty can reach sufficient listeners to ultimately help bring about changes and give rise within the Soviet Union to greater freedoms. We heard similar opinions expressed by other former Iron Curtain residents about Radio Free Europe.

As one witness so poignantly described it:

Thought control was what enabled Stalin to invade Finland, Poland and the Western Ukraine, what enabled Hitler to occupy much of Europe. It is now being practiced at dangerous levels throughout the Soviet bloc.

While millions of Americans daily listen to and read the news and a divergence of opinion from independent

media, they often take this uncensored dissemination of news for granted.

We in the United States have the opportunity to insure, through Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, that those behind the Iron Curtain will continue to receive at least a little of the truth for which they so hunger.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, these networks can help to bridge the gap of understanding between East and West and the truth itself can provide a foundation for peace with freedom in our time.

Support for S. 18 will guarantee the continuation of this vital service to millions of people who are daily denied the truth and thereby the weapon for freedom.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 18 as amended. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has acted wisely in calling for an extensive evaluation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty while, in the interim, authorizing funds for their continued operation.

The measure reported out of the House Committee would establish a tripartite commission made up of representatives of the Congress, the executive branch, and the public. The commission is to re-evaluate and evaluate the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and view and evaluate the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and submit the results of its study to Congress by November 30, 1972. The bill authorizes appropriations to the commission chairman of \$36 million for fiscal year 1972 and \$38.5 million for fiscal year 1973 to enable Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to continue operations pending congressional evaluation of its report.

This approach is a realistic one. In the first place, it accomplishes the immediate goal of removing all secrecy and hidden funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. At the same time, the bill withholds final judgment on whether and how to fund these broadcast operations. I am gratified that both the measure passed by the Senate and the bill under consideration by the House recognize the importance of continuing RFE and RL broadcasts pending further congressional evaluation.

The debate over the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty has perhaps received as much attention in the foreign press as in our own country. At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues several commentaries about RFE and RL that have appeared in the West European press:

The London Daily Telegraph on June 9 of this year stated:

There is now talk of revising the status of these stations, and signs of a "liberal" offensive on their freedom. It is odd that the self-appointed defenders of civil liberty in the West should have so little concern for the same liberties in the East. Would it really make the world any safer or the Soviet leaders any nicer if our last thin line of communication with the people of the Communist world were cut?

In August 1968, the Manchester Guardian observed:

When the West bemoans that it can do nothing to help, it forgets that it can supply



information, and that is what eastern Europe needs to keep its hopes alive . . . It is not only in Czechoslovakia that honest news is needed. All the other satellite countries keep their people in ignorance of the facts. . . In fighting the sort of tyranny we now see in eastern Europe, a good transmitter is worth at least one nuclear submarine.

The Paris *Nouvel Observateur* commented in January of 1970:

No other station in the world, American or other, exercises such influence direct or indirect on the public opinion of five countries. . . its five radios are certainly more dangerous today than they were yesterday for the East European regimes.

The *Muenchner Merkur*, a West German paper, stated in June of this year:

Careful analyses by the Federal Press Office already showed weeks ago that the American (RFE) take great pains, with extreme journalistic care and objectivity, in the formulation of their broadcasts. Precisely this—the non-tendentious representations of daily events in the West and East—is probably the true stumbling block for Warsaw.

The Hamburg liberal paper, *Die Zeit*, commented on July 2, 1971:

Factual accuracy and objectivity are the first order of news analysis (at RFE), which depends on the superlatively reliable and careful work of an 80-man-strong Research and Analysis Department. . . The "agitation station" in Munich help to close gaps which continue to arise thanks to the anachronistic information policy of the Communist regimes.

Mr. Chairman, the above comments demonstrate the tremendous importance other Free World countries place on the role of RFE and RL. A more extensive analysis of these radio stations appeared in the Zurich daily *Neue Zurichische Zeitung* entitled "Free News for Unfree Countries." This article further illustrates the strong support of RFE and RL by the press in Western Europe and I commend it to my colleagues attention during the current debate:

[Translation from *Neue Zurichische Zeitung*, June 20, 1971]

#### FREE NEWS FOR UNFREE COUNTRIES

With a screeching crescendo, Communist propaganda is increasing its campaign against Radio Free Europe (RFE) and Radio Liberty (RL), and presents them as major hindrances to a relaxation of tensions in Europe. Both stations were set up at the beginning of the 1950's by the Americans in Munich for the purpose of broadcasting information behind the Iron Curtain and to giving the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union their own voice. According to the late President Kennedy, they were created to give the people on the other side of the Iron Curtain a sign that they have not been forgotten, and to guarantee "that the peoples of all countries receive the truth and through it are able [to make] intelligent judgments."

#### OPEN WORLD ON THE AIRWAYS

The two stations, whose programming centers are located in Munich, are independent of each other, have their own desks and broadcasting installations, and have different tasks. Radio Liberty broadcasts to the Soviet Union—from Lampertheim, Spain, and Taiwan, with a capacity of 1,840,000 watts—in Russian and 17 other languages of the Soviet peoples. Radio Free Europe has five transmitters in Holzkirchen, nine transmitters in Biblis, and eighteen transmitters in Portugal (including four each with 100 and 250 kilowatts) with a total strength of 2245

kilowatts, broadcasting daily 20 hours to Czechoslovakia, 19 hours to Poland and Hungary, 12 hours to Rumania, and 8 hours to Bulgaria. The reason and justification for these stations are to be found in the fact that the Communist states know no freedom of opinion, that they hinder a free exchange of information, and that the ruling Party maintains its opinion monopoly with every available means. In our modern age of global communication and mass media, the leaders in Moscow and the East European countries try to work against this communication, keeping the Curtain closed at least to that extent, maintaining a "camp" of controlled information. It is their sealing off that is unnatural and contradictory to the tendency of our age toward immediate, global, and varied information—not the existence of the two stations, which fulfill important functions as gates to a worldwide process of communication and thus actually serve that coexistence about which so much is said, not hindering it, as they are accused of doing.

#### SOVIET COUNTERMOVES

Since Khrushchev's successors, out of their fear of "convergence" and growing intellectual opposition, introduced a re-ideologization in the spirit of the Brezhnev Doctrine, and in April 1968 called for "ideological class struggle," they have been conducting an intensified battle against the influence of foreign radio broadcasts in the area they rule. The programs directed at the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, not only by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty but by the BBC, Voice of America, and Deutsche Welle as well, are fought against as "indirect imperialist subversion." Jamming stations, which had been closed down during the period of Khrushchev's coexistence policy, went back into action (with the exception of Hungary and Rumania); and in the Soviet Union, the punishment for listening to foreign stations was increased. As these countermeasures apparently bore little fruit, the Soviet leaders are trying by propagandistic and diplomatic means to silence the stations themselves. This is the goal of the campaign directed against RFE and RL, which, as American organizations operating from the territory of the Federal Republic, are apparently the most vulnerable.

RL's supporter is the Radio Liberty Committee in New York, whose honorary president is Harry Truman and which is directed by former Deputy Secretary of State Howland Sargeant. RFE belongs to Free Europe, Inc., led by prominent personalities of America and advised by a Western European committee under Dirk Stikker. It had already been known for a long time that these stations were not being operated solely with contributions from American organizations and private persons; the recent revelation by Senator Case of the financing by the CIA was thus no surprise. However, President Nixon's initiative to put the financing of the stations on a new basis and thus insure their further activity is combined by Congress with its own drive for greater control over the government's foreign policy, and has found an opponent in Senator Fulbright.

Communist propaganda is, of course, trying to take advantage of these domestic American discussions. The information broadcast by RL and RFE is presented to their own subjects as "imperialist agitation" from the "CIA's witches' kitchen," and, appealing to latent anti-Semitic sentiments, is denounced as "Zionist propaganda." The 20th Olympic Games in Munich in 1972 are being used as the lever with which to demand a closing down of the stations whose activity, according to the Soviet version, would be contrary to the "Olympic spirit." The magazine *Sport v SSR* even threatened in April that one could not expect Communist sportsmen to appear in a place like Munich where

anti-Communist and "revanchist" organizations were active. However, Avery Brundage indicated in a television interview on May 9 that an exchange of letters with the presidents of the radio stations had given him assurance that they understand the ideals of the Olympic Games and will comply with them, and he said he believed "that there should be no difficulty from this side."

#### PRESSURE ON BONN AND MUNICH

The campaign against the Munich stations is, however, not only concentrated on the Olympics, but is broadly connected with Brezhnev's Western policy. Moscow and Warsaw are obviously trying to infer from the treaties with Bonn the demand for suspension of the freedom stations; they see in them a danger for "European security." The Polish Government recently even undertook diplomatic steps in Washington and Bonn to achieve the closing down of RFE. The Bonn Government, which is responsible for granting the license to broadcast and has just renewed it for another year, has reacted to such pressure soberly and calmly until now. For legal, organizational, and technical reasons it would in any case be impossible to close RL and RFE overnight. Observing the Communist campaign directed against the Munich stations, one can see the GDR as the driving force, as well as the close cooperation among the orthodox forces in the Eastern Bloc. The fact that the radio and press in East Germany, the Ukraine, and White Russia are the strongest agitators against the two stations' presence in the Federal Republic gives rise to the suspicion that these attacks could have something to do with the criticism of Moscow's understanding with Bonn which has cropped up in those areas.

#### NUMEROUS LISTENERS

Communist propaganda's constant attacks on RL and RFE are an indirect proof of their effectiveness among the population of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Even Party leaders admit that the programs from RL and RFE are widely spread in their countries and that they serve as a source [of information] for the rulers themselves. In the Soviet Union, there are about 27 million radio sets with short-wave reception, which means that every fifth adult Soviet citizen can receive foreign broadcasts. It is estimated that in times of crisis over two-thirds of the Soviet citizens listed to foreign stations. Radio Free Europe has, through continuing empirical surveys and constant interviewing of tourists from Eastern Europe, been able to produce a more exact picture of its listening audience and their reactions and attitudes, confirmed and supplemented by official surveys in Eastern Europe. It has been ascertained that nearly 31 million, or one-half, of the residents over 14 years of age in the target countries listen to RFE; in Poland alone, 12 million (59%); in Rumania, 6.5 million (57%); in Czechoslovakia, 5.5 million (50%); in Hungary, four million (55%) and in Bulgaria, 2.5 million (44%). The most recent surveys clearly indicate how, during and after the Polish unrest in December, the number of listeners rose abruptly—RFE's listening audience in Poland to 83%, in Rumania to 66%, and in Hungary to 78%.

#### WIDE SELECTION

A critical look at the broadcasts shows that RL and RFE work with the same methods and sources as other Western radio stations and are just as open and accessible as the latter, so that one cannot speak of secret or "agitator" stations. However, they do place greater emphasis on spoken information; 16% of the broadcasting time at RL and RFE is reserved for news. The news programs are put together from material from Western agencies and from the official proclamations of the Communist countries.



November 19, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11321

These news programs are varied and objective—which even the Communist side cannot completely deny, as they recently have had to wage their battle against the “deideologization” of Western radio propaganda. For instance, Moscow accuses Radio Liberty, which it tries to portray as a disturbance to European “relaxation of tension,” of having a [too] stressed interest in questions of European unity and security.

The two stations have one special and important function: the communication of Western press voices to those countries in which the population is not allowed to buy foreign newspapers. Radio Liberty broadcasts several times daily in 18 languages—a five-minute press review, and transmits in addition texts or excerpts from important editorials and reportage in well-known newspapers. Radio Free Europe broadcasts press reviews daily to Bulgaria, Poland, and Rumania (10 minutes apiece), Czechoslovakia (15 minutes), and Hungary (25 minutes). Not only American newspapers are cited in them, but the Western European press as well has a lot to say, including *l'Unita* and *Humanite*.

Let us look at an example: On May 25, RFE included in its press review for Rumania and in information programs in the Rumanian language the following material: commentaries from AFP, Daily Telegraph, and UPI on Podgorny's trip to Cairo (8 minutes); Federal Chancellor Brandt's interview in *Spiegel* on Ostpolitik and a Berlin agreement (5 minutes); the statement by Czech exile politicians in the *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* on the Prague Party Congress (5 minutes); Paul Wohl in the *Christian Science Monitor* on the ideals and experience of the Soviet population (10 minutes); Ernst Fischer's essay “The Revolution is Different” in excerpts (7 minutes); and Topping's report in the *New York Times* on Chou en-lai's statements on the Soviet-China conflict (8 minutes). This transmission of Western press voices gives the listeners in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union a view of the world which they wish for and something against which to measure their own Party press. Communist journalists have demanded, in the face of RL's and RFE's effectiveness, that greater openness and broader coverage be permitted in their own press and in the mass media.

## EASTERN COPYING

The Communist side even uses as much as it can the freedom of opinion in the West to spread its own propaganda and to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. For example, *Radio Prague* operates in Spanish and Italian among the *Gastarbeiter* in the Federal Republic [of Germany] and Switzerland. The form of organization and manner of working of the two Munich stations has been copied by the Soviet Union and, in addition to the official *Radio Moscow*, an allegedly independent *Radio Peace and Progress* has been created, which is supposedly run by the trade unions, journalists' union, and the *Novosti* agency, and which obviously is connected with the Soviet KGB (Secret Service). This radio, by the way, also uses transmitting installations outside of the Soviet Union—for example, for its German language broadcasts it uses a relay transmitter in the area of Leipzig. *Radio Peace and Progress* by far outdoes *Radio Moscow* as concerns sharpness; in Chinese it is the mouthpiece of anti-Maoist propaganda. When the Indian Government protested against attacks by *Radio Peace and Progress*, the Soviet Government declared (with a shrug) that it has no influence on this “independent station”.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is established a commission to be known as the Commission on International Radio Broadcasting (hereinafter referred to as the “Commission”) composed of nine members as follows:*

(1) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate.

(3) Two members appointed by the President from among officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government.

(4) Three members appointed by the President from private life, including experts in mass communication in the broadcasting field.

(5) The President shall designate one of the members appointed from private life to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

Sec. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to review and evaluate international radio broadcasting and related activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

(b) The Commission shall submit its report to the President for transmission to the Congress not later than November 30, 1972, setting forth the results of its findings and conclusions, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate, including, but not limited to, recommendations with respect to future management, operations, and support of such activities; establishment of a corporate or other entity to administer support for, or to conduct, such activities; and protection of the rights and equities of past and present employees of Radio Europe and Radio Liberty.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1973.

Sec. 3. (a) In addition to his function as head of the Commission, the Chairman of the Commission shall provide grants to support the broadcasting activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and submit to the President for transmission to the Congress not later than November 30, as appropriate, of each grant made and a statement describing the utilization of each such grant.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Chairman for carrying out the purposes of this section, \$36,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972 and \$38,520,000 for the fiscal year 1973. Except for funds appropriated pursuant to this section, no funds appropriated after the date of first appropriation pursuant to this Act may be made available to or for the use of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

Sec. 4. (a) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or officers or employees of the executive branch shall serve without compensation for their services as members of the Commission. Members of the Commission who are not Members of Congress or officers or employees of the executive branch shall receive per diem at the daily rate prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission. All members of the Commission, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, shall be allowed

travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary. Such personnel may be appointed without regard to provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. Any Federal employee subject to civil service laws and regulations who may be appointed by the Chairman shall retain civil service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege. In no event shall any individual appointed under this subsection receive as compensation an amount in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 on the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) In addition, the Chairman of the Commission is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the maximum rates for GS-18 on the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(e) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

Sec. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary for its administrative expenses.

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, this bill was printed August 3 and I am confident that everyone is familiar with its contents. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BRINKLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 18) to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, pursuant to House Resolution 699, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be 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, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 271, nays 12, answered "present" 1, not voting 146, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

YEAS—271

Abourezk	Eckhardt	Lujan
Adams	Eilberg	McClory
Anderson, Calif.	Erlenborn	McCormack
Andrews, Ala.	Fascell	McCulloch
Andrews, N. Dak.	Findley	McEwen
Aununzio	Fish	McKay
Archer	Flowers	McKevitt
Arends	Foley	McKinney
Ashley	Ford.	McMillan
Aspin	William D.	Macdonald,
Aspinall	Forsythe	Mass.
Begich	Fountain	Madden
Belcher	Frelinghuysen	Mahon
Bennett	Frenzel	Mailliard
Bergland	Frey	Martin
Betts	Gailfanakis	Matsunaga
Beverly	Gallagher	Mayne
Blaggi	Garmatz	Mazzei
Biesler	Gaydos	Meeds
Bingham	Gettys	Melcher
Blanton	Gialmo	Metcalfe
Bolling	Gibbons	Mikva
Brademas	Gonzalez	Miller, Calif.
Bray	Gooding	Miller, Ohio
Brinkley	Green, Oreg.	Mills, Md.
Broomfield	Green, Pa.	Minish
Brotzman	Griffin	Mink
Brown, Mich.	Gross	Minshall
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Monagan
Broyhill, Va.	Gude	Montgomery
Buchanan	Haley	Moorhead
Burke, Mass.	Hall	Morgan
Burleson, Tex.	Hamilton	Mosher
Burlison, Mo.	Hammer-	Murphy, Ill.
Burton	schmidt	Murphy, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hanley	Myers
Byron	Hanna	Natcher
Cabell	Hansen, Idaho	Nedzi
Caffery	Harsha	Nix
Carney	Harvey	Obey
Carter	Hathaway	O'Hara
Casey, Tex.	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Konski
Cederberg	Heinz	O'Neill
Chamberlain	Helstoski	Patten
Clawson, Del.	Henderson	Perkins
Collins, Ill.	Hicks, Mass.	Pickle
Collins, Tex.	Hicks, Wash.	Pike
Colmer	Hogan	Pirnie
Conable	Hollfield	Poage
Conte	Hosmer	Poff
Coughlin	Howard	Powell
Daniel, Va.	Hull	Freyer, N.C.
Daniels, N.J.	Hungate	Price, Ill.
Danielson	Hunt	Price, Tex.
Davis, S.C.	Hutchinson	Pucinski
Dellenback	Ichord	Quie
Dennis	Jacobs	Quillen
Dent	Jarman	Railsback
Derwinski	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
Dickinson	Johnson, Pa.	Rangel
Donohue	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Dow	Karh	Reid, N.Y.
Downing	Kazen	Reuss
Drinan	Kee	Rhodes
Dulski	Keith	Riegle
Duncan	Kemp	Robinson, Va.
du Pont	Kyl	Rodino
Dwyer	Kyros	Roe
	Lloyd	Rogers
	Long, La.	Roncallo
	Long, Md.	Rooney, N.Y.

Rooney, Pa.	Springer	Vanik
Rosenthal	Stanton.	Vigorito
Roush	James V.	Waggonner
Roy	Steed	Wampler
Roybal	Steiger, Wis.	Whalen
Ruppe	Stephens	White
Ryan	Stratton	Whitehurst
Sarbanes	Stubblefield	Widnall
Satterfield	Stuckey	Wiggins
Saylor	Sullivan	Williams
Scherle	Symington	Wright
Scheuer	Talcott	Wyatt
Schneebeli	Taylor	Wydler
Schwengel	Teague, Tex.	Wyllie
Scott	Terry	Yates
Shipley	Thompson, Ga.	Yatron
Shriver	Thomson, Wis.	Young, Fla.
Sisk	Thone	Zablocki
Skubitz	Tiernan	Zion
Smith, Iowa	Udall	Zwach
Smith, N.Y.	Van Deerlin	
Spence	Vander Jagt	

NAYS—12

Burke, Fla.	Kastenmeier	Schmitz
Denholm	Landgrebe	Whitten
Edwards, Calif.	Moss	Wolf
Hays	Rarick	Wyman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Seiberling

NOT VOTING—146

Abbott	Edwards, La.	Michel
Abernethy	Esch	Mills, Ark.
Abzug	Eshleman	Mitchell
Addabbo	Evans, Colo.	Mizell
Alexander	Evins, Tenn.	Mollohan
Anderson, Ill.	Fisher	Morse
Anderson, Tenn.	Flood	Nelsen
Ashbrook	Flynt	Nichols
Badillo	Ford, Gerald R.	Passman
Baker	Fraser	Patman
Baring	Fulton, Tenn.	Pelly
Barrett	Fuqua	Pepper
Bell	Goldwater	Pettis
Blackburn	Grasso	Peyster
Blatnik	Gray	Podell
Boggs	Griffiths	Pryor, Ark.
Boland	Grover	Purcell
Bow	Hagan	Roberts
Brasco	Halpern	Robison, N.Y.
Brooks	Hansen, Wash.	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, N.C.	Harrington	Rousselot
Byrne, Pa.	Hastings	Runnels
Camp	Hawkins	Ruth
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	St Germain
Celler	Heckler, Mass.	Sandman
Chappell	Hillis	Sebelius
Chisholm	Horton	Shoup
Clancy	Jonas	Sikes
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Slack
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, Tenn.	Smith, Calif.
Clay	Keating	Snyder
Cleveland	King	Staggers
Collier	Kluczynski	Stanton,
Conyers	Koch	J. William
Corman	Kuykendall	Steele
Cotter	Landrum	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	Latta	Stokes
Culver	Leggett	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Thompson, N.J.
de la Garza	Lent	Ullman
Delaney	Link	Veysey
Dellums	McCloskey	Waldie
Devine	McClure	Ware
Diggs	McCollister	Whalley
Dingell	McDade	Wilson, Bob
Dorn	McDonald,	Wilson,
Dowdy	Mich.	Charles H.
Edmondson	McFall	Winn
Edwards, Ala.	Mann	Young, Tex.
	Mathias, Calif.	
	Mathis, Ga.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ashbrook.  
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McCloskey.  
 Mr. Abbott with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Eshleman.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. McCollister.  
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Cleveland.  
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Mathias of California.  
 Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Crane.  
 Mr. Hogan with Mr. Veysey.

Mr. Young of Texas with Mr. Grover.  
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Latta.  
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Peyster.  
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Conyers.  
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Stokes.  
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Rousselot.  
 Mr. Fraser with Mr. Mitchell.  
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. J. William Stanton.  
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Ruth.  
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Sebelius.  
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Dellums.  
 Mr. Cotter with Mr. Shoup.  
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Badillo.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Steele.  
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Ware.  
 Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Clay.  
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Koch.  
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.  
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Harrington.  
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Fisher.  
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with McDade.  
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Lent.  
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Keating.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Smith of California.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
 Mr. Boland with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sandman.  
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Devine.  
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Esch.  
 Mr. Flood with Mr. McDade.  
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Mizell.  
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Bell.  
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hastings.  
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Collier.  
 Mr. Roberts with Mr. Whalley.  
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Blackburn.  
 Mr. Link with Mr. Nelsen.  
 Mr. McFall with Mr. Teague of California.  
 Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Pelly.  
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Winn.  
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Snyder.  
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. McClure.  
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. King.  
 Mr. Slack with Mr. Kuykendall.  
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Baker.  
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Robison.  
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Robison of New York.  
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.  
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bow.  
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Jonas.  
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Camp.  
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Craney.  
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.  
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Pettis.  
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Michel.  
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Hillis.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the creation of a commission to evaluate international radio broadcasting and related activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, to authorize appropriations to the Chairman of the Commission, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to

November 19, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11323

extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT—WHAT WE NEED IS THE RELEASE OF FUNDS WE HAVE ALREADY APPROPRIATED

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post carried the following big headlines: "Both Parties Push Aid Program for Rural Areas." The story followed, pointing out what a number of my colleagues plan to do toward passing legislation to meet rural needs. Prominent among those mentioned is our good friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT DOLE, Republican Leader in the Senate, and under that—with a question mark—appeared the words, "the White House Bill".

Mr. Speaker, what we need is action, not more talk. What we need is the release of present funds, not more legislation. What we need is to get President Nixon and his Director of the Budget, Mr. George P. Shultz, to turn loose the money we in the Congress provided for rural area programs in the appropriations bill which I authored as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the subject, Public Law 92-73. These funds are available now, but the President and Director of the Budget refuse to release them.

These frozen funds total \$58 million for rural water and waste disposal grants, \$75 million for the Farmers Home Administration to make production loans, \$216 million for rural electrification loans, and \$5.9 million for rural telephone loans, funds for rural housing for domestic farm labor, for mutual and self-help housing, flood prevention, resource conservation and development, land conservation and development.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has done its part; however the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the White House, has cut back the agricultural conservation program, now REAP, by \$55.5 million for next year despite a congressional directive to continue it at its former level. This means that the President and Mr. Shultz are turning their backs on 1 million Americans all over the United States who have each year put up an equal amount of their own money, in addition to their labor, to really do something about pollution.

Such veto reduces soil technicians for the Soil Conservation Service and greatly retards watershed programs as well as regular soil conservation activities.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: What we need is action, not any more talk. What we need is the release of present funds, not more legislation.

#### RED CHINA AT THE U.N. COULD JEOPARDIZE SETTLEMENT OF ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to alert my colleagues to a very serious situation that could arise in light of Red China's recent inflammatory remarks at the United Nations and the earlier expulsion of Nationalist China.

Let me first point out that when Nationalist China was thrown out, a dangerous precedent was set. It was the first time a member of the U.N. was expelled. Now, if they can make a claim that Taiwan is not a "legitimate" government, the same can be said of other governments.

Moreover, Red China has decided to cast itself as the self-styled champion of "third world" rights. The lesser developed nations of the world are ready to listen to the rhetoric of Mao and his cronies, and, what is more important, vote with them. As such this alliance can pose a formidable threat to peace efforts in the U.N.

Here is where the serious problem lies. Red China, in its maiden speech at the U.N. leveled a strong attack on Israel, claiming that it had committed aggression against the Palestinians and that it was not the legitimate government of the area. Will one of Red China's first acts in the U.N. be to order the expulsion of Israel and the seating of the Palestinian guerrillas?

The Middle East situation is the most explosive issue before the United Nations Security Council. The other four permanent members of that body have entered into negotiations in an effort to reach a settlement. Now with Red China on that Council, what chance will there be for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict?

I am sure we will see a Red Chinese effort to thwart every action or initiative taken by the Security Council toward a settlement of the Middle East war. To permit a U.N. negotiated settlement would mean a "victory" for the Soviet Union in Red China's eyes. To see a continued confrontation would mean a greater opportunity for Red China to establish itself in the Middle East. Clearly the United Nations will become more impotent than ever.

I am sure we have not seen an end to the folly of the United Nations action against Taiwan. As one local newspaper recently put it, we have begun the era of "China in the Bullshop."

#### PRINCETON LYNCH MOB

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, 1971, I described on the floor of this House the makeup of a group calling itself the Committee for Public Justice that has been created to harass and

criticize the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

At that time I remarked that at least one member of the Committee for Public Justice, Lillian Hellman, had been identified in sworn testimony before Congress as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In addition, an individual commissioned to prepare a paper for the Committee for Public Justice, Frank Donner, was identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and like Miss Hellman, when given an opportunity to explain his past activities, exercised his right to invoke the fifth amendment.

On November 3, 1971, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat carried editorial comment on this so-called Committee for Public Justice entitled "Princeton Lynch Mob."

I think the editorial pretty well sums up the Committee for Public Justice as a "manufacturer of garbage" and a "kangaroo court."

I would like to insert this editorial in the RECORD.

#### PRINCETON LYNCH MOB

If the Ku Klux Klan announced that it was holding a conference at Princeton University to castigate the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it is highly unlikely that it would be given much credibility or news coverage.

Why then did certain liberal newspapers give a great amount of coverage to a conference at Princeton University held by a far leftist group that everyone knew was called for the single purpose of making a violent attack on the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its director J. Edgar Hoover?

Because certain leftist critics have no real case against Mr. Hoover or the FBI, they have to manufacture the garbage they put out.

Certainly the conference at Princeton (calling it a conference gives this kangaroo court too much stature) has to rank as one of the most vicious in memory. Under the sponsorship of the Committee for Public Justice, they proceeded to make a whole series of undocumented, unsubstantiated charges against the FBI and its director.

How could anyone give such an assemblage the slightest bit of credibility?

Just consider who some of the leading "critics" at the hate-the-FBI session were:

There was Ramsey Clark, who has been conducting a vendetta against Hoover and the FBI for years. In our book Clark was one of the worst Attorney Generals in the nation's history.

He was a weak sister from the word go. Hoover expressed it perfectly when he said several years ago that Clark was "like a jellyfish . . . a softie" when he was Attorney General.

There was Frank Donner, who in 1955 took the 5th Amendment when he was asked by the House Un-American Activities Committee about his connections with the Communist party. Donner made news in 1961 again when he attacked the Un-American Activities Committee in a book that was so biased most St. Louis bookstores refused to handle it.

There was Lillian Hellman, who was identified in sworn testimony before Congress in 1961 as having been a member of the Hollywood chapter of the Communist party, according to Rep. Richard H. Ichord, chairman of the House Internal Security Committee.

Ichord, who denounced the Committee for Public Justice for its hatchet job on the

H 11324

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

November 19, 1971

FBI, said Miss Hellman was a founder of that committee.

There also were three former FBI agents, several former assistant attorney generals, a professor and other known critics of the FBI who made various allegations about FBI surveillance and other operations—none of which had enough support to warrant a further inquiry.

Members of Congress, of course, should ignore the hot air from this verbal lynching of Mr. Hoover and the FBI.

The FBI may not be perfect but it continues to do a most outstanding investigative and enforcement job for the Department of Justice.

This kind of public smear attack on the FBI inevitably boomerangs. Those who engage in such stacked, public name-calling sessions make themselves look silly.

If these are the main accusers of the FBI, then the FBI and Mr. Hoover must be doing very well indeed.

Never has a barrage missed its mark so completely. The big artillery shell intended for the FBI plooped out of the Committee for Public Justice's howitzer and landed on top of the assembled leftist "eggheads." Hopefully this will be the last we will hear from this committee that apparently knows so little about public justice.

#### FREEZE OF FUNDS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from Mississippi cited that some of the funds allocated for agricultural purposes and to help rural America are being held by OMB.

I have an extremely high regard for the gentleman from Mississippi, and I believe our voting records indicate we philosophically agree on most every point, but I believe the gentleman from Mississippi did miss one point, and that is this: This Congress and this House of Representatives consistently have appropriated over the budget, and they have in every instance this year appropriated more money with one exception, and that is the Defense appropriation.

Now, my friends, how in the world is the President of the United States going to spend more money than we have coming in without going out to borrow more money? We have placed a limitation on how much he can borrow. We have only so much money coming in from revenues. When we spend over that someone has to stop spending. The buck stops with the President and the OMB.

I am sure the President agrees with many of us about the desirability of some of the great programs. I certainly agree with the idea suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi that these rural programs are necessary. But the President is doing the only thing he can do, when we are forcing him to spend more than we have and that is to freeze those funds.

#### FREEZE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I just got

in on the tail end of that conversation awhile ago about freezing funds, and I want to say that we can be pennywise and pound foolish.

We froze a lot of funds the other day when this House passed without a record vote the biggest giveaway program Congress has ever participated in and that was not needed. I am referring to the tax program which passed the House about 3 weeks ago. And the President supported that program, and I believe it is going to be disastrous for this country when one considers the fact that this year we will have a deficit of about \$33 billion.

I want to say we could also be pennywise and pound foolish if we hold up money for construction of medical schools and things like that.

So there are two sides to this coin. Certainly there are some useless programs in this country that should be done away with, but it is not all a one-sided story. If the President wants to veto programs let him do so but I object to the withholding of funds to perhaps be released in time for an election.

#### MEXICAN DRUG ENFORCEMENT EFFORT

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I recently spent several days in Mexico conferring with officials and seeing for myself what the Mexicans have done to stop the cultivation and trafficking in illegal drugs. I found, to my surprise, that the Mexicans are really trying to do something about the growing of poppies and the drug problem in general.

The following statistics indicate what the Mexican Government has been able to accomplish in the past 2 years in Operation Cooperation:

TOTALS OF OPERATION COOPERATION, OCTOBER 1969 TO OCTOBER 6, 1971

##### POPPY

Number of fields destroyed: 11,245.  
Area in square meters: 28,534,200.  
Number of plants destroyed: 313,549,402.  
Seeds confiscated: 316 Kgs. 260 Grs.  
Raw opium: 87 Kgs.  
Heroin: 54 Kgs. 159 Grs. 6 Mgs.  
Cocaine: 163 Kgs. 532 Grs.  
Morphine: 11 Kgs.

##### MARIJUANA

Number of fields destroyed: 3,133.  
Area in square meters: 18,006,809.  
Dry Marijuana incinerated: 39 Tons 603 Kgs.

Confiscated Marijuana in stock: 76 Tons 434 Kgs. 550 Grs.  
Seed confiscated: 348 Kgs. 690 Grs.

##### TOXIC PILLS

Barbiturates and amphetamines: 31,009,240.  
L.S.D.: 584.  
"Peyote": 3 Kgs.

##### VEHICLES CONFISCATED

Planes: 5.  
Boats: 3.  
Automobiles: 44.

##### DETENTIONS

Prior investigations: 1,832.  
Persons accused: 5,204.  
Foreigners: 914.

#### INTENSIVE PHASE OF THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST MARIJUANA, 1971

Results obtained to date, in the States of Sinaloa, Durango, Chihuahua, Michoacán and Guerrero.

##### MARIJUANA

Fields destroyed: 1,334.  
Area: (square meters) 5,704,368.  
Plants destroyed: 106,776,433.

##### POPPY

Fields destroyed: 826.  
Area: (square meters) 2,195,871.  
Plants destroyed: 37,992,916.

Despite these impressive statistics, the Mexican Government could be doing a much better job if it had more personnel and equipment. There are only 250 Federal officers in the entire nation. Moreover, only 6.2 percent of the Mexican budget covers the army, navy, general administration, and law enforcement. As a result the Federal agents are not well paid—\$120 to \$150 a month—and there is a severe lack of equipment, especially helicopters and airplanes which are the principal tools in the drug enforcement activities.

Hopefully, the U.S. Government can continue to work closely with the Mexican Government and provide badly needed assistance, such as equipment and training, so that the results can be even more meaningful.

#### ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION TO SOON ANNOUNCE LOCATION OF FIRST LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the next few months the Atomic Energy Commission will announce the site of the first liquid metal fast breeder reactor—LMFBR. This nuclear reactor and its associated research facilities will demonstrate the design and engineering feasibility of the next generation of nuclear power reactors.

The LMFBR will be paid for by the Federal Government—through funds that have already been substantially appropriated—by the manufacturers of the reactor, and by a large group of electric utilities.

My comments today are intended to make you aware of the fact that the people of the Hanford area in eastern Washington, where I live, are almost unanimous in support of locating the LMFBR in the Hanford site. In this respect, my congressional district seems to be unique in the entire Nation.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington is making