the concurrent diversification of industry and the provisions of public facilities and services will be crucial to sustaining the region after the coal "boom" declines. The Appalachian Regional Commission will be in a unique position to participate in the formulation and implementation of regional energy policy. In addition, the Appalachian States have an excellent opportunity to use the resurgence of the coal industry as a source of new income to be used for providing infrastructure and repairing environmental damage.

Mr. Speaker, the Appalachian region and the title V regions clearly offer great opportunities for the future of our Nation to decrease its dependence on foreign energy resources. Under the Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act, we have seen many changes in these regions and have made solid progress in meeting the goals set forth by the Congress in 1965. I urge the passage of the bill before us today, Mr. Speaker, and want to commend Congressman ROBERT JONES, chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for his leadership and his efforts which have made it possible for us to bring this conference report before you today.

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4073, the Regional Development Act Amendments of 1975. I specifically want to stress to my colleagues the importance and value of title II of this bill, since it is a new title based on the Senate version and no comparable provisions were previously considered in the House. This title slightly increases funding levels for the title V Regional Commissions, of which there are now seven, and expands their program authority so that they may better carry out their mandate to stimulate economic development in depressed areas.

Members of the House should be aware that although title II is new to you today, the Subcommittee on Economic Development, on which I serve, devoted several days to hearings and discussions on the title V Regional Commissions. While it was our original intention to report a separate bill dealing with these Commissions, our thinking was in complete accord with the Senate amendments to the Appalachia bill. In fact, since our goal was to give the title V Commissions authority somewhat comparable to the Appalachian Regional Commission, it is probably fitting that the two programs be considered in the same bill and I am pleased by the conferees' retention of the Senate's title II.

I have a strong personal interest in the Regional Commissions program since I served as executive director of the Four Corners Regional Commission for 4 years before coming to the Congress. During my experience with the Four Corners Commission I saw firsthand the potential for success of this program. At the same time I was continually frustrated by our inability to realize this potential because we lacked the funding and authority to generate the economic growth needed in the region.

The Appalachian experiment has been an overwhelming success and has proved to be a very sound investment of the taxpayer's dollar. I am convinced the title V commissions could achieve the same outstanding results if their funding and authority were commensurate with that provided the Appalachian Regional Commission. Title II of this bill is a good beginning. It increases the authorization for the title V commissions from $150 to $200 million for fiscal year 1976 and increases it to $250 million in fiscal year 1977. In addition it provides new authority to the commissions to fully fund demonstration projects in the fields of transportation, energy, health, and education. The new authority for developing regional energy strategies is particularly important to the Four Corners Regional Commission and my State of Utah. This Congress will have to answer in November for our success or failure in trying to restore the Nation to a healthly economy. Holding the line on Federal spending and voting for tax cuts are important, but they are only treatments for the symptoms. The title V regional commissions were established to foster real economic growth and they have the capacity to invigorate heretofore nonproductive segments of our economy. But to do this, they have to have our enthusiastic support and the tools to do the job as evidenced in the amendments contained in title II of this bill. I strongly urge House passage of the conference report on H.R. 4073.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to give strong support to the conference report on H.R. 4073, the legislation which concerns itself with regional development, including the continuation of the programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Although the legislation is significantly different from the bill we passed in the House by a vote of 309 to 88 last May 19, I think the conferees have done an admirable and a commendable job of continuing the programs which means so much to the economic development of the Appalachian region.

To my way of thinking, these programs are not really expenditures, but are investments in the future of an entire area—a great area, with wonderful, hard-working thoughtful people. Once we have the facilities we need—the water and sewer systems, the industrial sites, the vocational schools, we will also have the industrial and commercial jobs we need to make the area an economic showplace, and a credit to the thinking of the people here in the Congress who realized what true progress really involves.

I want to mention especially Representative HARSHA, for his work, and I want to point out that the chairman of the Public Works Committee, Representative BOB JONES, deserves the deepest, most sincere admiration of every man and woman who believes in building a better life for the people.

Representative JONES is the legislative giant of the Tennessee Valley of Alabama, a man who has never forgotten and never will forget what it means to farm for a living, fighting the sun and the soil and the weather; or what it means to work hard, hour after hour, sometimes for little pay, to support a family; or the struggle involved to build a business up, plugging away, day after day. He is one of the greats of the House of Representatives, a man for education, a man for health, a man for good government which helps the people, and as this report comes before us for a vote, I just wanted the Members to appreciate a few of BOB JONES many high qualities.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the conference report on H.R. 4073 which extends the Appalachia Regional Commission nonhighway program through fiscal year 1979 and the highway program through fiscal year 1981. In addition, this bill provides for an extension and expansion of authority for the title V Regional Commissions.

I have watched with interest and pride the development of the Appalachia Regional programs over the years. In my congressional district, which presently includes four Appalachia counties, real progress and development has been made as a result of these programs. Supplemental funds provided through the Appalachia program have been responsible for improved educational, health, and vocational facilities. It has been a truly effective Federal-State partnership and deserves credit for economic stimulation and development in an area of the Nation which previously lagged far behind the national average.

The Appalachian highway program has lead to the construction of roads through the region. This improved transportation system has meant that the people of the region are able to travel to better jobs, to get to better health facilities and that goods manufactured in this area are able to be moved quickly to the marketplace. Therefore, the people who live in the Appalachia area now have a reason to remain there to live and work. Thus the outmigration which once was a characteristic of this region has now been reversed.

This legislation is important to continue the job of economic and regional development for these areas of the country. I am hopeful this measure will be enacted swiftly.

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

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING FINANCING ACT OF 1975

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6461) to amend certain provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide long-term financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 11, 1975.)

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized.

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 6461—the Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1975—is a good one and I trust that it will be adopted by the House.

In summary, the conference report would—

First. Authorize not more than $634 million for the 5 fiscal years 1976 through 1980 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—CPB—and public broadcasting generally, but provide that the actual authorization for each fiscal year will be based on non-Federal financial support of public broacasting, with $1 authorized to be appropriated for every $2.50 of non-Federal financial support received by public broadcasting entities in the second preceding fiscal year.

Second. Require that, of the amounts appropriated to the CPB, from 40 to 50 percent be distributed directly to on-the-air noncommercial educational broadcasting stations for their programing, operation, and maintenance.

Third. Authorize the Corporation to engage in the development and use of nonbroadcast communications technologies, such as CATV and communications satellites, for the distribution and dissemination of educational radio and television programs.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 6461 differs in three substantive respects from the bill as passed by the House. I should like to address myself briefly to those differences.

First. The House bill would have provided that for fiscal years 1979 and 1980 $1 would have been authorized to be appropriated for every $3 in non-Federal financial support received by public broadcasting entities during fiscal 1977 and 1978, respectively. The conference report, however, provides that the matching requirement for fiscal years 1978 and 1980 will be the same as for fiscal years 1976, 1977, and 1978; namely, $1 for every $2.50 of support received by public broadcasting entities in the second preceding fiscal year.

Substantial, and I think legitimate, concern was raised with respect to the House matching requirement for 1979 and 1980, Mr. Speaker. There was some belief expressed that no matter how desirable the goals those requirements established, they were unobtainable and may have prevented substantial and badly needed sums of money from being received by the public broadcasting community. Nonetheless we intend to closely follow the trend of non-Federal financial support for public broadcasting and if the $1 to $3 matching requirement appears to become feasible and in the public interest, we intend to establish it as the basis for authorizations of appropriations for public broadcasting.

The second substantive difference between the bill as passed by the House and the conference report is that the conference report omits a provision which would have required that a significant portion of the funds appropriated pursuant to the legislation be utilized for the development and dissemination of instructional programing. Mr. Speaker, the conferees concluded that this was already a policy stated in section 396(a)(i) of the act and that it was unnecessary to include the House provisions on instructional programing.

The third substantive difference, Mr. Speaker, is the omission of the Stokes civil rights amendment which was adopted on the House floor. There was no other difference between the House and Senate versions which gave the conferees on this legislation more difficulty.

The Senate conferees strongly objected to the inclusion of this provision in the conference report on grounds that it raised serious technical problems and that it would place the CPB in the position of a Federal agency for purposes of promulgating and enforcing civil rights regulations. This, of course, is contrary to the whole scheme of the Public Broadcasting Act. Under that act, the CPB is, and was intended to be, a private, nonprofit corporation serving as an interface between the Federal Government and this Nation's noncommercial, educational broadcasting stations. This is in conformity with the intent and spirit of the first amendment.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the Stokes amendment has been omitted in the conference report. This should not be taken as any indication that the conferees believe that there are no problems with regard to discrimination in public broadcasting. Instead it is a reflection of the view that the problems of discrimination require careful consideration in hearings to determine what, if any, legislation is best designed to eliminate it. As the statement of managers spells out, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD) intends to hold hearings as soon as practicable before the House Subcommittee on Communications on the questions raised by the Stokes amendment and to explore fully the underlying problems of discrimination against minorities and women in public broadcasting. A similar commitment was made by the chairman of the Communications Subcommittee of the other body who chaired the Senate conferees.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I think that this conference report is a good one which deserves the support of every Member of the House. Today nearly 80 percent of our population are within the range of our 254 public television stations. The 176 qualified public radio stations can be received by nearly 62 percent of the American public.

The American people support public broadcasting, Mr. Speaker, and are being educated and informed by it in growing numbers. This legislation will allow this process to continue.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman yield at that point?

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I understand the House would like to adjourn at a reasonable hour tonight and I do not want to be forced into asking for a recorded vote, if I can possibly avoid it.

Will the distinguished chairman respond to me? Am I right in assuming that the provisions of the Stokes amendment on title VI of the Public Broadcasting Board has been completely eliminated although it had the overwhelmingly approval of this House?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is corre[illegible] gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKE[illegible] has been informed and he is in agreement with the report as it is now, and with the agreement that there would be hearings held on this subject itself in both Houses.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I cannot talk about my colleague's willingness to accept this capitulation. However, I am unwilling to accept it. I think it is totally unnecessary for the Senate to be adamant in its position on such a fundamental issue as contained in title VI.

Mr. STAGGERS. In reply to the gentleman I might say that their entire objection to it was that this puts us into a position of treating it like a Federal agency. It was felt when this was founded that the Federal Government would not have any say in this. But both chairmen have agreed that the Congress would have hearings and bring something ba[illegible]

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. If [illegible] gentleman will yield for one last question, it is impossible for me to understand the logic of how Federal funds can be funneled into a private agency and we in turn would have no control over the use of those Federal funds. That is totally illogical in my opinion and I wish the gentleman could explain that for me.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say this. When it was set up it was decided that this would be one agency that the Federal Government did not have a hand in and the Public Broadcasting did not have a hand in and they would be completely free to bring things before the Board and it would be a nonpartisan board or a bipartisan board and it would not be just the party in power. This would be here allowing us to say we would be telling them what to do if we had it that way.

But it was agreed under the circumstances this would be looked into fully and be brought back into both Houses.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD) had agreed to that as had the chairman on the Senate side.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I thank

the gentleman from West Virginia for his explanation.

In closing I want to indicate it seems to me that the same promise was made previously that we would go back and study it in effort to try to remedy the situation, and that has not been done.

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, could the chairman explain to me what the status of public versus private has to do with the obligation to obey the law as far as title VI is concerned as long as it is the law?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say to the gentlewoman from Texas there should not be any whatsoever but they say in order to keep the Federal Government hand off this, which was agreed to when it was first put up, that they would not try to tell them how to do it and they th[illegible] it ought to be handled in a different way.

Miss JORDAN. Would the gentleman agree that such an argument is totally without logic?

Mr. STAGGERS. We would be inclined to agree with the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today is essentially the Senate amendment to H.R. 6461. The House bill and the Senate amendment differed in three significant areas:

First. The matching requirements for Federal funding;

Second. The Brown amendment requiring a significant amount of funds to be devoted to instructional programing; and

Third. The Stokes amendment affecting the status of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The House receded in each area due to strong opposition to the House language on the part of the Senate.

I was especially concerned about the rescission with regard to the matching requirements. I understand that since the formula requires the Federal match for a given year to be based on the amount of funds raised by public broadcasters 2 years prior to the year of the match, the 3-to-1 match in the House bill would have had an impact on small broadcasting stations that are dependent on State funds and, therefore, would be unable to raise the necessary amounts in 1977 and 1978. However, I stated in the conference meeting, and wish to reemphasize at this time, that I believe that the matching requirements should be raised in the future to give public broadcasting the incentive to become self-sufficient.

This is not to say that I oppose the adoption of this conference report. The authorization ceilings are the same as in the House bill, so there will not be additional Federal spending under this report. What we lose is the possibility of additional funds generated by public broadcasters.

In clearing this legislation for Presidential action today, we are for the first time in history guaranteeing public broadcasting a financial base on which to operate with some degree of foresight and security. The administration supports the concept of long-range funding; in fact, the President proposed the insulated approach of an authorization and appropriation contained in the original House bill. While this conference report does not give public broadcasting that sort of insulation, it goes a long way in giving CPB the lead time necessary to make decisions with regard to upcoming programing.

In addition to the advance authorization contained in this report, there are several other features which should be mentioned:

First. The report provides for a separation of funds for television and radio. Too long have funds for public radio lagged behind those available for television. While public television is currently available to roughly 80 percent of the people in the United States, public radio is available to only 62 percent and is not present in 34 of the top 100 population centers. With the separation of the funds authorized in this report, radio has the opportunity to mature as a viable partner with television in a much more diversified public broadcasting effort. Such diversification will result in greatly improved service to the varied needs of each broadcast area.

Second. This report requires direct pasthroughs to local noncommercial educational stations of from 40 to 50 percent of the fund apropriated. This is a significant feature for it guarantees funds for each noncommercial educational television station that is on the air and for each eligible radio station on the air.

Third. Congress, through this legislation, will maintain a watchful eye on the Corporation even with long term funding; for it provides that the officers and directors of the Corporation shall be available to testify before appropriate committees of Congress with regard to its annual report, any report of the Comptroller General, with respect to its financial condition, or any other matter that such committee may determine.

Obviously, there are a sufficient number of good points in this legislation, and in the spirit of compromise, I urge its adoption despite my disappointment over the matching requirements.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman now making a commitment that an effort will be made to remedy this situation in the next Congress? Is it the same kind of commitment that we made 1 year ago and I think, if I recall correctly, 2 years ago?

Mr. FREY. I would say this: The gentleman from Massachusetts, Chairman MACDONALD indicated he would hold hearings on this. We have had hearings. I sat through the hearings. He came down to Florida. I am sure the gentleman has read the testimony, and I have noticed this.

We put a great deal of pressure on them to comply and I think we are in the same vein. I think we can speak for the committee, and the parties are here; we will put pressure on, as we did before.

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

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman as one member of the subcommittee that when the time comes I will see that this matter is thoroughly considered and I will hold the chairman of the subcommittee to his word.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I have been and I continue to be a staunch advocate of public broadcasting and educational television. However, I am also very concerned over the lack of participation of women and minorities in employment and decisionmaking in public broadcasting and the failure of the corporation and the Congress to address this issue. That is why I joined Congressman STOKES in amending the original bill.

I am disappointed that the conference committee did not include the House amendment making the corporation subject to the provisions of title VI, VII, and IX of the Civil Rights Act, although the conference report and the House committee report both note that discrimination in employment practices in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) and the local public television and radio station is continuing.

Despite the considerable evidence already compiled documenting discrimination against women and minorities in public broadcasting, the conferees indicate that they, too, will hold hearings on this subject. I would like to point out that hearings were held in the House this past spring and in the Senate last year on the existence of discrimination against women and minorities, but no action was taken. Moreover, the Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting, approved by CPB, has found pervasive under-representation of women throughout the public broadcasting industry both in employment and in program content.

Although women make up almost 30 percent of the public broadcasting work force they are concentrated at the lower levels of responsibility. Few women are hired or promoted to top decision-making positions. A survey conducted by the task force found that women were frequently hired at lower levels and often lower salaries than men of the same age and educational levels, and that subsequent promotions and pay raises followed that same pattern. For example, 42 percent of the women with a post-graduate education who were surveyed entered the profession at the level of secretaries, librarians, production assistants, or at best, assistant production managers, while 42 percent of the men with the same education entered at an executive level.

In public broadcasting nationwide, women outnumber men by more than 3

to 1 in nonprofessional positions. However, women hold only 9 percent of the seven executive-level positions in public broadcasting stations, one-third of the full time jobs in programing, and virtually no jobs in engineering.

During the debate in 1973, Congress discussed discrimination in public broadcasting and considered an amendment to prohibit such discrimination. The House voted to postpone such action in order to study the matter further. Today the conference report suggests we do the same thing again to await the outcome of further committee hearings. In the interim, there has been little improvement by CPB in eliminating discrimination.

This is the time for remedial action; no further study is necessary. Although I am in favor of long range funding for CPB I cannot give them a license to discriminate against women and other minorities with Federal funds. While the conference report acknowledges the continuing discrimination in employment by the public broadcasting industry, it calls on Congress to press for an immediate end to these discriminatory practices. This suggestion is outrageous since Congress, that is the House of Representatives, attempted to do exactly that—end discrimination by making all stations receiving funds from CPB subject to the prohibitions of titles VI, VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and title IX of the 1972 Education Act Amendments.

The Congress can act immediately to end discrimination in public broadcasting by voting down the conference report and then supporting a motion to recommit with instructions to include the House amendment prohibiting discrimination.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to the Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1975, H.R. 6461.

I have been an advocate of this legislation from the beginning. I supported this legislation on its original passage in this Chamber on November 10, 1975, as I do today. It was most unfortunate that the original bill as drafted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee contained appropriations language which was stricken out by a point of order citing rule XXI, clause 5, of the House rules.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW I should like to reemphasize the fact that the subcommittee will approve an initial 3-year financing plan when the Corporation for Public Broadcasting comes to us for funding under this legislation. The subcommittee originally intended to provide only a 2-year initial funding plan. I was most gratified when my colleagues on the subcommittee accepted my proposal to increase the funding plan to 3 years. This funding scheme is most necessary to insure planning and effective pilot projects that are important to the operation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. In the 84 months of existence of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, they have had to endure operating on a continuing resolution basis for 39 months.

I should like to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD), who serves as the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Communications. He and the members of his subcommittee have done a fine job with the expeditious manner in which this legislation was handled.

I stand ready to do all that I can to insure that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting will receive their appropriation for the initial 3-year period with all due expedition as it so rightly deserves.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland) there were—yeas 114, nays 19.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, fully recognizing the yuletide season and in a spirit of brotherhood and with respect for the party going on in the White House, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 72, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 806]

YEAS—313

Abdnor
Adams
Ambro
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Ashley
Aspin
AuCoin
Bafalis
Baldus
Barrett
Baucus
Beard, R.I.
Beard, Tenn.
Bedell
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blanchard
Blouin
Boggs
Bolling
Bonker
Bowen
Brademas
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Mass.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Byron
Carney
Carr
Carter
Cederberg
Chappell
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Conable
Conte
Cornell
Cotter
Coughlin
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Davis
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Derrick
Downing, Va.
Drinan
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
du Pont
Early
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Emery
English
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evans, Ind.
Evins, Tenn.
Fary
Fascell
Fisher
Fithian
Flood
Florio
Flowers
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Frenzel
Frey
Fuqua
Giaimo
Gibbons
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Gradison
Grassley
Green
Guyer
Hagedorn
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hannaford
Harkin
Harrington
Harris
Hayes, Ind.
Hays, Ohio
Heckler, Mass.
Hefner
Heinz
Henderson
Hicks
Hightower
Holland
Horton
Howard
Howe
Hubbard
Hughes
Hungate
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Jeffords
Jenrette
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kasten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
Keys
Kindness
Krebs
Krueger
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Levitas
Litton
Lloyd, Calif.
Lloyd, Tenn.
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McHugh
McKay
McKinney
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mann
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meeds
Meyner
Mezvinsky
Michel
Mikva
Milford
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moffett
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Mottl
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Natcher
Neal
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Nolan
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
O'Hara
Passman
Patman, Tex.
Patten, N.J.
Patterson, Calif.
Pattison, N.Y.
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Pressler
Preyer
Price
Pritchard
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Regula
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Risenhoover
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Russo
Ryan
Santini
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Sebelius
Seiberling
Sharp
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Simon
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Nebr.
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Steelman
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Studds
Symington
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thone
Thornt[illegible]
Treen
Tsongas
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Weaver
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Tex.
Wirth
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zeferetti

NAYS—72

Abzug
Armstrong
Badillo
Bauman
Breaux
Breckinridge
Brodhead
Burke, Calif.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Conyers
Corman
Crane
Dellums
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dodd
Downey, N.Y.
Edgar
Fenwick
Flynt
Ford, Tenn.
Gilman
Gude
Hansen
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Holt
Holtzman
Johnson, Colo.
Jordan
Kelly
Koch
Latta
McDonald
Martin
Mathis
Melcher
Metcalfe
Miller, Calif.
Mineta
Mitchell, Md.
Moakley
O'Brien
Ottinger
Poage
Rangel
Richmond
Rodino
Rose
Rousselot
Satterfield
Schroeder
Schulze
Shuster
Spellman
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steiger, Ariz.
Stokes
Symms
Vanik
Wiggins
Yates
Young, Ga.

NOT VOTING—49

Addabbo
Alexander
Allen
Ashbrook
Boland
Broomfield
Burke, Fla.
Butler
Casey
Daniels, N.J.
Dickinson
Dingell
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Esch
Findley
Fish
Ford, Mich.
Fraser
Gaydos
Goodling
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hébert
Hillis
Hinshaw
Landrum
Macdonald
Maguire
Mills
Moss
O'Neill
Rees
Rooney
St Germain

Schneebeli	Sullivan	Ullman
Sisk	Teague	Waxman
Stanton, J. William	Thompson	Wilson, C. H.
Stephens	Traxler	Winn
	Udall	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Ford of Michigan with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Waxman with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. J. William Stanton with Mr. Maguire.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Fish
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Traxler.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Goodline.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Schneebeli.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois and Messers. CONYERS, MARTIN, STARK, and DODD changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING CERTAIN ASSISTANCE TO AND ACTIVITIES IN ANGOLA

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I addressed the House on the subject of the situation in Angola and our Government's intervention therein and stated that I intended to introduce a resolution today conforming substantially to that which passed the other body's Subcommittee on Foreign Relations yesterday and which will be taken up in the Committee on Foreign Relations tomorrow.

It is a resolution which was authored by the senior Senator from Iowa, and I will now append it to my remarks in the RECORD for the benefit of those persons who are interested in following the situation.

The joint resolution follows:

H.J. Res. 755

Joint resolution prohibiting certain assistance to and activities in Angola

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 665. Limitation on Certain Assistance to and Activities in Angola.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that—

"(1) the people of Angola should be allowed to determine their own political future without military interference from any foreign country;

"(2) the Congress supports efforts by the Organization of African Unity to achieve a settlement of the conflict in Angola and calls upon all countries to terminate any military assistance such countries may be giving to any group, organization, movement, or individual in Angola;

"(3) a disengagement by such countries would be a welcome reaffirmation of the spirit of detente, both throughout the world and in Africa; and

"(4) the President should do his utmost to seek an agreement among the various parties involved in hostilities or in the support of such hostilities in Angola to terminate such hostilities or such support.

"(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided by paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection, no payment of money may be made, no security assistance may be furnished or delivered, and no assistance may be furnished or delivered for military or paramilitary operations, or to provide, in connection with such operations, police training, assistance, or advice, directly, or indirectly, in, to, for, or on behalf of, Angola, any individual, group, organization, or movement in Angola, or any other country for the purpose of furnishing or delivering such assistance, unless such assistance is specifically authorized under this Act.

"(2)(A) The President shall, in the event any such specific authority is requested, describe in writing in connection with such request—

"(i) the extent to which the foreign policy interests of the United States require such assistance; and

"(ii) the amounts and types of assistance which have been furnished and which are proposed to be furnished.

Such materials shall be furnished to the Congress in unclassified form.

"(B)(i) Security assistance, the furnishing of which would otherwise be prohibited under paragraph (1) of this subsection, may be furnished in accordance with this Act after the end of the first period of thirty days Congress is in session following the transmission of any such request under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph unless before the end of such thirty-day period either House of the Congress has agreed to a resolution disapproving the furnishing of such assistance.

"(ii) Such resolution shall be considered in accordance with the provisions of section 301(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1975.

"(iii) For the purposes of such section, the term 'certification', as used in section 301(b) of such Act, shall be deemed to mean a request transmitted under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

"(iv) The term 'resolution', as used in section 301(b) of such Act, means, for purposes of this paragraph, only a simple resolution of either House, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the (Senate/House of Representatives) does not approve of the request for security assistance with respect to Angola, transmitted to the Congress by the President on , 19 .', the appropriate term being selected from the parentheses; and the blank space therein being filled with the date of the transmittal of the request.

"(c) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the President shall transmit on the same day to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a full and complete report describing—

"(1) the military activities of foreign countries in Angola and any military assistance or support provided by such countries; and

(2) steps he has taken to carry out paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, 'security assistance' means—

"(1) assistance under chapter 2 (military assistance) or chapter 4 (security supporting assistance) of part II of this Act;

"(2) sales of defense articles or services, extensions of credits (including participations in credits), and guarantees of loans under the Foreign Military Sales Act;

"(3) deliveries pursuant to any license in effect with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunitions, or implements of war (including technical assistance relating thereto) under section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 or subsequent corresponding legislation; and

"(4) assistance for public safety under this or any other Act.

"(e) The authority contained in section 614(a) of this Act may not be used to waive the provisions of this section.".

OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSED SALE OF THE F-15 FIGHTERS TO ISRAEL

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined our distinguished colleague, Representative BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, in objecting to military sales to the Middle East, by introducing a resolution objecting to another proposed sale of military hardware to that area.

In this particular instance my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 517, objects to the proposed sale of the very sophisticated, very deadly, and very expensive F-15 aircraft to Israel.

Although the details of this proposed sale are classified, I am sure, judging from the equipment in question, that it involves over $600 million.

This proposal comes at the same time of an announced sale of over $1½ billion to Saudi Arabia to which Mr. ROSENTHAL's resolution has objected.

I think it is the height of irresponsibility on the part of the executive branch to be proposing these sales involving billions of dollars on the eve of the Christmas recess.

I consider this action as nothing short of an attempt by the executive branch to deny the Congress an adequate opportunity to review these huge arms sales.

Under the law the Congress is supposed to have 20 days in which to consider these sales.

I am writing, today, to the President and the Secretary of Defense requesting that these proposed offers of sale be withdrawn until the Congress returns from the Christmas recess.

Two of our subcommittees—one headed by Representative HAMILTON, the other chaired by Representative FASCELL—have been studying the issue of the massive arms transfers to the Middle East.

Investigations by other committee members and staffs are also in process.

I do not think that the executive branch should try to circumvent and possibly abort these efforts by rushing through these multibillion-dollar sales to the Middle East on the eve of the Christmas recess, when Congress is preoccupied with the tax bill, the energy

bill, the highway bill, and other important legislation.

Although I take this action for legitimate reasons, I hasten to point out that I also do so after much thought. Mr. Speaker, I want to make abundantly clear that I recognize and support the preservation of the State of Israel. My votes over the years give ample testimony to that support. Where I do depart and begin to take exception relative to U.S. support for Israel is the point at which we begin to equate Israel's preservation exclusively and solely in military terms.

Because the proposed sale of these F-15 jet fighters underlines and endorses that mentality in a dramatic and forceful way, I have been moved to introduce the resolution of objection.

Mr. Speaker, my reasons for taking this action are many and entirely valid. They are based on fact—not the fiction of emotion. They are generated by a genuine attempt to bring a semblance of balance to our efforts in the Mideast and a sincere desire to deemphasize the prevailing military dimension of the conflict.

Among the reasons why I believe this proposed sale should be delayed are the following:

The F-15 is one of the newest and most sophisticated aircraft in our Air Force inventory. Only about 20 of the planes are available for use by the U.S. Air Force and none are in use by our NATO or other allies.

Vital and primary U.S. national security interests could be seriously jeopardized if deliveries to Israel were made out of the Air Force's stocks before our own legitimate needs have been met.

Since it is reported that delivery to Israel would not be made until 1977, the proposed sale at this time is premature.

The transaction is also premature in the sense that the funds for the proposed sale will in all likelihood come from the security assistance legislation currently in the markup stage in the House International Relations Committee, the completion of which is not expected until after Congress returns from its Christmas recess in mid-January. In short, the cart is far ahead of the horse.

Little, if any, consideration has been given to the arms control impact of this proposed sale on the delicately balanced situation in the Mideast. Before approving it we should have a clear and definitive understanding of what potential destabilizing effect and introduction of the F-15 will have, what alternative solutions may be available, and other relevant considerations.

The proposed sale is rationalized on the contention that the F-4 aircraft currently in the Israeli inventory is inferior to the MIG-23 fighter that the Soviet Union has supplied to Syria and Egypt and the MIG-24 reportedly now being flown by Soviet pilots in Syria. That contention is subject to serious doubt since it has never been conclusively proven. Saying it often enough simply does not make it true.

For these many valid and compelling reasons, Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I have introduced today deserves—indeed, demands—serious and careful committee consideration and ultimate approval on the Floor.

In conclusion, I should point out that the notification relating to the proposed sale of the F-15 came to Congress without indicating either the number of planes involved or the total sale price. However, according to recent press reports, the transaction involves a total of $600 million for 25 planes.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I fully support the preservation of the State of Israel. To the extent that prudent and reasonable military capability is necessary to offset Soviet involvement with the Arab States, I support that also. I am convinced, however, that these F-15's will not attain the goal of peace. Indeed, by the oversupply of war material—to both sides in the conflict—we merely make possible more conflict and war. The time for rationality and commonsense is now.

House Concurrent Resolution 517 follows:

H. CON. RES. 517

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress objects to the proposed sale to Israel of F-15 aircraft, spare parts, spare engines, support equipment and training, such proposed sale being described in the statement submitted by the President, pursuant to section 36(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on December 9, 1975 (transmittal numbered 76-22).

EXPLANATION OF VOTE AGAINST THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING AND FINANCING ACT OF 1975 CONFERENCE REPORT

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I had to vote against the Public Broadcasting and Financing Act of 1975, which we just completed, because I am very supportive of public broadcasting, as would be the vast majority of the people in my district.

However, I felt compelled to do so because of the striking of the civil rights provision from that conference report. The reason I find it absolutely necessary to explain that is that there are many who voted against the conference report because they are opposed to the conference report, as such, and object to public broadcasting.

I want my constituents to know, given the opportunity, that I will vote for public broadcasting, but only when it has this civil rights provision in it.

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

Mr. KOCH. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I applaud his statement. I join him in his statement.

It was for the exact, same reason that I also joined my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH), in opposing this legislation.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I too voted for the same reasons and I would like the record to show that I supported public broadcasting for the very reasons the gentleman from New York has stated and that is why I voted against the conference report.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from New York. I too voted for public broadcasting when the bill left the House but I could not vote for the conference report when it came back from the other body without a civil rights clause.

Mr. KOCH. I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

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

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well and to commend the gentleman for his statement on this matter.

I was rather appalled, Mr. Speaker, that the conference committee saw fit to bring back this particular bill without this particular amendment particularly in light of the fact that in the conference report they make the statement that discrimination is intended and that the Congress must take some strong enforcement steps with reference to this discrimination. It is for this reason that those of us who are in favor of public broadcasting in principle could not in good conscience vote for this bill.

I again commend the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, even though I have had some difficulty in the past in supporting public broadcasting authorizations and/or appropriations because on some occasions I have felt that they were too extensive, I did support the effort on this floor to provide proper equity to see that the Public Broadcasting Organization would abide by the same basic ideals and provisions of law that other agencies have to abide by.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) taking this time to make it clear that those who do generally support public broadcasting have had a chance to mention that this was unfortunate that the other body evidently in some haste decided to take this kind of a position when normally there have been champions over there who

have tried to make sure that an equitable position was maintained.

So again I compliment my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) for making this point and I think he should be commended.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. I would like to add that when the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) who is a very good friend of mine, and I are in accord, then we must be correct.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, on roll No. 777, the vote on the conference report accompanying H.R. 9861, Department of Defense appropriation, I was recorded as not voting. I was present at the time and voted "yea." I supported H.R. 9861 when it was first considered by the House, the gentleman from California report as well.

CONGRESS IS IN DISFAVOR WITH THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a time when Federal Government—and particularly our branch of Federal Government here on Capitol Hill—has been in such disfavor.

People are fed up with Washington and with Congress.

They think that we have been all talk and no action on matters that really count in this Nation, and for the most part they have been right.

Unfortunately for our public reputation in the last 2 years—we have shown that we can act and act decisively when it comes to feathering our own nest.

More self-serving measures to benefit Members of Congress have been approved in the past 2 years than during any comparable period in our history.

What we have done for ourselves in 1974 and 1975 simply cannot be justified on the basis of inflation or larger constituencies or increased congressional responsibilities.

We have raised our salaries.

We have created automatic future pay raises for ourselves by tying our salaries to a cost of living index.

We have increased the number of free round trips to our home districts during each Congress from 36 to 52.

We have—in addition—given ourselves and one of our staff members a free round trip to the organizational caucus of each Congress.

We have increased our annual stationery allowance by $1,250—up 23.8 percent.

We have increased our district office allowance by 42.8 percent. We have changed the telecommunications compensation formula with the practical effect of increasing our allowances in this category.

We have increased our staff salary allowance by $32,000—up 18.5 percent.

We have increased the permissible size of our office staffs from 16 to 18—up 12.5 percent.

We have increased the allowance for air mail and special delivery stamps by 25.2 percent.

We have created a new budget—of approximately $5,000 per member—to reimburse the printing costs of two newsletters each year.

We have passed—and await Senate action—on legislation which will probably more than double the tax deduction for our living expenses in the District of Columbia.

In the last 20 years while the population of this country was increasing by 30 percent—and inflation was eroding the value of the dollar by 83 percent—the cost of running Congress has increased by 560 percent.

It has been estimated by one national organization that—in just the last 2 years—the average cost to the American taxpayer of maintaining each Member of Congress has risen from $376,505 to $488,505, approximately a 30-percent increase.

This means that citizens now must pay $112,000 more than they did in 1973 to keep each of us in business.

I am not sure they think we are worth it.

And I suggest that as we wind up our legislative business for this year—and prepare to return home for the holidays—we plan an especially diligent effort to test grassroots sentiment.

When we reconvene on January 6 I hope that we will recognize better than we have in the past that—especially in times of inflation—people expect us to perform as we have urged all other segments of the economy to perform and keep costs down.

If you do not do this, I am afraid there will be a major housecleaning in the elections next November.

And, thereafter, many Members will not be around to enjoy the unprecedented array of conveniences that have been approved on Capitol Hill in the last 24 months.

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

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

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just noticed the gentleman mentioned something about pay raises for Congress. That is a matter dear to my heart since I campaigned against it and I voted against it. It has always been my experience, though, that in the past many Members of Congress supported the same thing and campaigned against it and voted against it, but they were always the first in line to pick it up. So many Members—I do not say just myself alone, but many Members—including myself, took the next step which I believe exhibits our determination to keep spending in line, and that is to turn back in our pay raises. So every month I send a check down to the Department of the Treasury turning back my pay raise, as do many other Members.

I would hope the other gentlemen would support that move. If all 212 or 213 Members of Congress who voted against the pay raise would take that step, that woud return a considerable amount of money to the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. BELL. For the gentleman's information I have been doing that ever since we got it.

Mr. HARKIN. I congratulate the gentleman in the well for that move, and I would hope that other Members would follow suit.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

A NEW COMPACT BETWEEN PUERTO RICO AND THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. BENITEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill approving a new Compact of Permanent Union between Puerto Rico and the United States. After 2 full years of studies, deliberations, hearings and discussions a joint advisory group appointed by the President of the United States and the Governor of Puerto Rico in September 1973 to recommend ways of improving the present Commonwealth status, has unanimously endorsed the adoption of the measures embodied in this bill.

It was my privilege to be a member of that advisory group which included the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CLAUSEN). Both of them, together with the then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Cook, acting as cochairman, the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSTON, the Senator from New York, Mr. BUCKLEY, the ex-Governor of Illinois, Mr. Ogilvie, and Mr. Paul Howell of Texas constituted the appointees of the President of the United States. The delegation from Puerto Rico, appointed by Gov. Hernández Colón, included the founder of the Commonwealth status, former Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, the president of the senate, the speaker of the house of representatives, the secretary of state of the Commonwealth, two other distinguished Puerto Rican citizens and myself.

This new compact involves a reaffirmation and clarification of the basic concepts of Commonwealth status approved by the Congress of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico after an extensive process of consultation conducted in the nature of a compact. That extensive process began with our general elections of 1948 and was completed when all the mutual conditions were agreed upon and that agreement was proclaimed by the Governor of Puerto Rico on July 25, 1952.

The new compact broadens the autonomy of Puerto Rico, formalizes and extends the flexibility of adjustments in the implementation of common purposes which has been an outstanding merit of the relationship between United States and Puerto Rico. The new compact conforms with the findings of the United States-Puerto Rico Status Commission report of August 1966, with the terms of the plebiscite held on July 23, 1967, with the needs of changing times, and with the wishes of the people of Puerto Rico.

As we enter the last quarter of the 20th

century, we are bound to acknowledge that there is no perfect political status anywhere. The free associated State is now and will continue to be quite imperfect. The proposals embodied in the new pact reflect, however, our mature judgment as to what should be done at this juncture by the Congress, the White House, the Government and the people of Puerto Rico to reaffirm, strengthen and facilitate the continued identification of basic goals and our joint democratic striving for a nobler and more worthwhile relationship in the years ahead.

SUPPORT FROM PUERTO RICO

The great majority of the people of Puerto Rico support the principles of the bill. By far the largest segment of such supporters favor the free associated State as a definite, final status for Puerto Rico. But over and above those supporters, many Puerto Ricans endorse this bill even though they may believe in eventual statehood or in eventual independence. They appreciate that the improvement of Commonwealth hurts no one and benefits all. They believe that since their own first choice is out of the question as long as they are a minority, they should support desirable improvements in the present status. They understand that working for a different status is not precluded by the improvement of Commonwealth. They hold that in the meantime the common goal should be to strengthen the community at large rather than to weaken it. This is the patriotic, intelligent, and socially responsible attitude.

Unfortunately, party leaders favoring statehood or independence have such vested interests in their own ideological positions that they fail to see the overriding interests and desires of the majority. Knowing they speak only for a minority in each case, they nonetheless feel bound to oppose any improvement in the position of the community. They act in accordance with the well-known but discredited doctrine that the job of the opposition is to oppose, to oppose and to oppose. Such obstinacy, if allowed to prevail, would only serve to paralyze democratic government. I invite once again all Puerto Ricans, regardless of partisan consideration, to support the basic goals and objectives of this new compact of permanent union.

BRIEF POLITICAL BACKGROUND

For the benefit of those Members who may be unfamiliar with our 77-year-old debate on political status, I shall explain briefly why neither statehood nor independence are majority choices. After the Spanish-American War of 1898 the two political parties that were immediately formed in Puerto Rico, the Republican and the Federal, favored and requested statehood.

THE STATEHOOD REQUEST

It was then generally assumed in Puerto Rico that statehood would be promised immediately by the Congress and extended shortly thereafter. After all, Puerto Rico had just received an autonomous charter in 1897 from the Spanish monarchy and statehood was assumed to be the equivalent of Spanish autonomy. Further on landing in Puerto Rico, in 1898, General Miles had proclaimed that his troops were bringing to the island "the freedoms and blessings of American democracy." It was taken for granted that the history of American expansion to the West, the constitutional constraints, and the genius of American federalism guaranteed full inclusion under the flag, the Constitution, and the Union. On August 15, 1899, the commanding general, George W. Davis, published throughout Puerto Rico a circular from which I quote:

> Under the American Constitution the whole theory of government is based on the principle that the people themselves are to make and enforce their own laws . . .
>
> The changes that have already been made, and those now intended, should supply for the island, until otherwise provided by the Congress, a form of government resembling, as respects the superior branches, the Territorial from heretofore applied in the United States to those portions of the national domain in a transition state or one preparatory to full statehood and membership in the National Union.

Puerto Rican leaders had a rude shock and a bewildered awakening as the Congress, the President, the Supreme Court, and the Nation at large debated the implications of their great leap forward into the uncertainties of "manifest destiny." The immediate outcome was a new chapter in American constitutional development which could be entitled "keep all options open, but some less open than others." That approach was bluntly stated by Chief Justice Fuller, of the U.S. Supreme Court as follows:

> If an organized and settled province of another sovereignty is acquired by the United States, Congress has the power to keep it like a disembodied shade, in an intermediate state of ambiguous existence for an indefinite period.

THE FORAKER ACT—1900–17

The first Organic Act, known as the Foraker Act, was approved in 1900. It lasted until 1917 although it was proposed as an interim bill and was specifically entitled "an act temporarily to provide revenues and civil government for Puerto Rico and for other purposes." The Foraker Act was an extremely limiting political document, sharply contrasting with the Spanish Charter of Autonomy of 1897. It reserved all effective political power to the Governor and to his Executive Council, appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. It allowed an elective House of Delegates which together with the Executive Council would constitute "the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico."

A body politic entitled "The People of Puerto Rico" was established. Its inhabitants were declared to be "citizens of Puerto Rico" and entitled to the protection of the United States. The Supreme Court decided that as such they would be "nationals" but not "citizens." It also created a new category of territorial status, the "unincorporated territory." As such, Puerto Rico could be included in or excluded from Federal legislation. As far as the Constitution itself was concerned, Puerto Rico was not necessarily covered except by such provisions as involved fundamental individual rights or essential structural requirements. This Supreme Court interpretation left a constitutional penumbra which has lasted to the present day. To avoid any implication of eventual statehood, the Foraker bill was amended on the floor so that the elected Representative of Puerto Rico to the United States should be called Resident Commissioner rather than Delegate as had been the case in all previous territories since the Northwestern Ordinance of 1790.

The economic arrangements provided for by the Foraker Act were in sharp contrast with its political provisions. They were designed to demonstrate that there was no intention of economically exploiting Puerto Rico. The Foraker Act provided for a common market, the exclusion of Puerto Rico from Federal taxation, and a basically flexible sui generis case-by-case resolution of tariff provisions.

THE JONES ACT—1917–52

The second and last organic law, known as the Jones Act, was appr[illegible] in 1917. It extended U.S. citizenshi[illegible] Puerto Ricans. It made elective both legislative Houses. The President continued to appoint the Governor and three members of his cabinet with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, but the Governor was entitled to appoint four cabinet members with the advice and consent of the Puerto Rican Senate. The economic provisions of the Foraker Act were retained. They now form part of the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act.

During the first third of the century expressions by Presidents, Members of Congress, and other public figures discouraging statehood for Puerto Rico had served to ruffle the sensitivities of a proud community. Political parties and political leaders in Puerto Rico readjusted their approaches to deal with local problems and to face problems of relationships with the United States.

By 1904 the Federal Party had dissolved itself into a broader political grouping, the Partido Unión de Puerto Rico pledged to "unite the Pureto Rican family" under the banner of local initiative, immediate improvements in self-government, and subsequently statehood or independence. From its inception and until its disappearance in 1932, the Union Party was the leading party in Puerto Rico.

By 1915 another party, a prolabor organization which called itself the Socialist Party, was formed. The Republican Party, which had become the one party which proposed statehood as the only political status acceptable, lost all elections from 1904 until 1932. Yet, when in the 1933 elections it was able to organize a legislative majority in conjunction with the Socialist Party, it refrained from insisting upon statehood, under the assumption that they would be subjected to additional rejections.

ON INDEPENDENCE

The political debate in Puerto Rico acquired a deep note of exasperation during the thirties when the economic depression, two devastating hurricanes and the initial confusions and frustrations of the New Deal uncertainties provided ingre-