

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

U.S. Congress.

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 12

MAY 8, 1973 TO MAY 15, 1973

(PAGES 14579 TO 15852)

When men were procured by a draft, military and civilian leaders did not need to concentrate on the correction of such abuses or on matters pertaining to enlistment or retention of military personnel. The existence of the proposed active standby draft may well cause continued neglect of these areas of personnel management. Only when Selective Service is dismantled will this danger be removed.

6. CONCLUSION

Last week the *Washington Post* carried a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Roger T. Kelley, in which he stated that "it has been demonstrated that we don't need the draft to meet our peacetime military requirements" and that the all-volunteer force "is a better military force than its draft-heavy predecessor of four years ago." Under such conditions the burden of proof for continued funding of Selective Service must be on those who propose it.

With the Congress faced with a budgetary ceiling, unnecessary programs must be eliminated if vital ones are to survive. I would submit that no evidence has been offered that the standby draft is necessary or desirable and that much evidence exists that it is not.

Thank you very much.

THE SO-CALLED BETTER SCHOOLS ACT OF 1973

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Minnesota State Department of Education estimates that about \$9 million in Federal funds will be lost to State schools if the administration's revenue sharing proposal replaces the present categorical funding system.

The biggest cut in the proposed system will be in the area of "support services." These include teacher training, school lunch and milk programs, equipment purchasing, library support, experimental projects, and State administration funds. The present funding has allocated nearly \$17 million to "support services." Revenue sharing is expected to return about \$8.2 million, a reduction by one-half over the current program.

I would like to share with my colleagues just one of numerous letters I receive daily concerning the disastrous impact of the so-called Better Schools Act of 1973. The letter is from Mr. Edwin Cain, Federal Programs Coordinator of the State of Minnesota. Mr. Cain's office has spent some time gathering information about the impact of this administration proposal. He claims the chart designed by the U.S. Office of Education does not indicate a true picture of the revenue which will be lost in Minnesota if this bill becomes law.

Mr. President, I express my concern with Mr. Cain about this bill and ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed at the end of my statement, together with its enclosures.

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

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., April 17, 1973.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRITZ: My office has spent the last week gathering information concerning the impact of the Administration's educational

revenue sharing bill (H.R. 5823/S. 1319) on the school children of Minnesota. The chart designed by the U.S. Office of Education which appears in the March 20, 1973 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 8649-8650 does not indicate a true picture of the revenue which will be lost in Minnesota if this bill becomes law.

The USOE chart is based on the F.Y. 1973 estimated budget of the President and does not reflect those programs he has arbitrarily eliminated nor the monies which have been impounded. While the USOE chart shows an estimated increase for Minnesota under the Better Schools Act, our comparison with F.Y. 1972 categorical programs shows an actual loss of \$9,113,849.

The legal-sized chart, which is enclosed, first lists the categorical programs, then shifts them into the five areas of support as shown in the revenue sharing bill for comparison purposes.

As a Department, we are not opposed to federal program consolidation to insure more effective utilization of resources; however, we are opposed to a bill which reduces dollars and eliminates programs for our most needy children under the guise of grant consolidation.

We appreciate your continuing support of education in Minnesota, and enlist your support in assuring us that the children in Minnesota will not be deprived the necessary services to insure a good education.

Cordially yours,

EDWIN E. CAIN,

Federal Programs Coordinator.

(NOTE.—Categorical grant chart referred to is not printed in the RECORD.)

ADMINISTRATION'S REVENUE SHARING BILL EMERGES AS BETTER SCHOOLS ACT

The President's Educational Revenue Sharing Bill was introduced in both the House and Senate with scathing remarks by the Republican sponsors. Senator Peter Dominick (Colorado), the ranking Republican member on the Senate Education Subcommittee stated there was no opportunity for advice or guidance by congressional leaders in the development of the legislation.

Dominick said that he hoped hearings would be held to provide Office of Education officials with "a set of priorities in education structured by elected officials instead of those faceless ghosts in the White House." Congressman Alphonzo Bell (R-Calif.) stated, "I am introducing the Bill in part because of my obligation as ranking republican on the General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor includes the presentation of administration legislation. . . . I, for one, am deeply concerned about the overall reduction in Elementary and Secondary Education funding reflected by the administration budget for the Better Schools Act."

The Better Schools Act, as explained by HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, would fold 32 existing categorical education programs into a single aid package, but would include the funds for only seven of these programs. If the states were to designate funds for library services, for example, they would be forced to take money from school lunch resources, programs for the handicapped, or one of the other programs receiving funds.

The federal resources would be received by the Governor of each state and allocated to school districts on a complex formula established by the legislation. While it would continue subsidies based on children living on military bases or other federal property, the proposal would change the distribution formula in a way that would hurt a number of states (including Minnesota). It would eliminate entirely subsidies based on children whose parents work at government installations but live in taxable private dwellings.

Each state would receive an allocation under a formula that multiplies its population of economically disadvantaged children by a specified expenditure index. In distributing the monies to school districts, the state would first fund districts with disadvantaged students totaling at least 5,000 or 15% of their enrollments. School districts would then be required to target the monies on the most disadvantaged schools within their boundaries.

In earlier testimony Secretary Weinberger advised Congress that it would be Revenue Sharing or nothing for education in F.Y. 1974. The mood of Congress, however, appears to be that cuts in education will not be tolerated. "It is no longer Republican against Democrat, but Congress versus the President" stated Senator Walter Mondale.

ANALYSIS OF BETTER SCHOOLS ACT

The educational revenue sharing legislation has been changed to the Better Schools Act to reflect the fact that it does not specify revenue amounts. The funding mechanism which the bill provides however, must be taken in conjunction with the budget recommendations of the President for F.Y. 1974 in order that the measure may be fully understood. The full amount of money now specified by the Administration as being available under Revenue Sharing for 1974 is \$2,770,000,000.

The funding mechanism provides that the first allocation under the bill will be for Impact Act category A students. The Administration proposes to terminate funding of Impact Aid category B students for 1974. Payments for category A students under the new bill are determined by a new formula which would result in a reduction in the national total of A category funds by approximately \$37,000,000 under budget level.

Three percent of the total Revenue Sharing amount is provided for the total educational allotment to serve the outlying territories and the Department of Interior.

Of the allocation remaining 60% or approximately \$1.5 billion is earmarked for educationally disadvantaged children. This earmarking now holds harmless for F.Y. 1974 all states and local districts at not lower than fiscal 1973 funding levels. This earmarking, however, does not include the monies to the state agencies for the administration of the disadvantaged program. States will pass through the money for disadvantaged students to local districts in several stages, including the use of a new formula which gives priority to districts with concentrations of children in poverty of at least 15% of the total student population or 5,000 students. This factor would significantly reduce the number of school districts served by these monies.

After the SAFA, territories, and disadvantaged funds have been passed through under the specific formulas, the remaining monies are allocated to the states by school population, to be used 43% for vocational education, 15% for handicapped children, and the remainder for supporting services. Funding in the categories for handicapped and vocational education appear to be at approximately the same levels as current distributions.

The category for supportive services is designed to support at least seven existing categories including Title V ESEA. These categories are listed on the accompanying table. As is shown, comparison of the expenditure levels for 1972 with the levels proposed in the Revenue Sharing bill indicates a shortage of approximately \$250 million in the supportive services category. This shortfall is not readily apparent because of the inclusion of \$244 million in school lunch funds in the revenue sharing budget, which item has never before been carried in the USOE budget.

The funds for the bill would be administered by the governor of the state, "except

that a specified single state agency shall be responsible for such administration" if the governor "determines that the law of such state so provides".

States may transfer up to 30% of the amounts allotted to vocational or handicapped education to any of the other categories except the SAFA category.

PROGRAMS TO BE CONSOLIDATED WITH PASSAGE OF BETTER SCHOOLS ACT

EDUCATION SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

A. Disadvantaged earmark

1. Local education agencies (ESEA, Title I-A).
2. Neglected and delinquent children (ESEA, Title I-A).
3. Migratory children (ESEA, Title I-A).
4. Incentive grants (ESEA, Title I-B).
5. Grants for high concentrations of poor children (ESEA, Title I-C).

B. Handicapped earmark

1. Grants to States (EHA, Part B).
2. Set-aside from Title I (Section 103(a) (5), ESEA).
3. Set-aside from Title III (Section 305(b) (8), ESEA).
4. Set-aside from Vocational Education (Section 122(c) (3), VEA).

C. School assistance in federally affected areas earmark

1. Local education agencies (Section 3, P.L. 81-874).
2. Sudden and substantial attendance increases (Section 4, P.L. 81-874).
3. Assistance for school operations in cases of certain disasters (Section 7, P.L. 81-874).
4. Assistance for school construction in cases of certain disasters (Section 16, P.L. 81-815).

D. Vocational education earmark

1. State advisory councils (Part A, VEA).
2. State vocational education programs (Part B, VEA)—disadvantaged set-aside.
3. Research grants to States (Part C, VEA).
4. Exemplary programs and projects (Part D, VEA).
5. Residential vocational education (Part E, VEA).

6. Consumer and homemaking education (Part F, VEA).

7. Cooperative vocational education programs (Part G, VEA).

8. Work-study programs for vocational education students (Part H, VEA).

9. Smith-Hughes Act.

E. Supporting services earmark

1. Title III, ESEA
2. National School Lunch Act.
3. Child Nutrition Act of 1966.
4. Education Professions Development Act (Part B-2).
5. Grants to States for Education (Sections 304-308 Adult Education Act).
6. Special programs relating to Adult Education for Indians (Section 314 Adult Education Act).

(The following programs were formerly included under the Education Special Revenue Sharing Act of 1971. The President's Budget for F.Y. 1974 proposes termination of these programs, however, funds from the Supportive Services Category may be used by the States to fund these activities.)

7. Title II, ESEA.
8. Title V, ESEA.
9. Title III, NDEA.
10. School Milk Program (To be terminated).

FUND SHARING COSTLY TO STATE

(By Bruce Nelson)

Minnesota will lose \$9 million in federal education aids if the Nixon administration's revenue sharing proposal becomes law, a state Education Department official said Monday.

Edwin Cain, federal programs director for the department, told the state board that the revenue sharing plan would force the department to make major program cutbacks, including the dismissal of a number of department employees.

The federal-state revenue sharing program would replace the present categorical funding system and would have the state distribute the funds on its own.

For example, Cain said Minnesota would receive \$8.1 million for use in "support serv-

ices," which include teacher training, school lunch and milk, school equipment purchasing, library development and experimental projects.

The state will receive \$16.5 million for programs that would fall into that category, Cain said.

"Nixon has engineered things in such a way that it can't be said that he is eliminating programs," Cain said. "What will happen is that state departments will be forced to make reductions because they will have less money from the federal government."

Cain said more than 100 persons are employed in state department positions that are funded through the support services category. If the revenue sharing plan is adopted, he said many of them will lose their jobs.

In another area of federal education funding, one in which 60,000 disadvantaged youngsters receive assistance in Minnesota schools, the differences between the present aid and the revenue sharing proposal is only \$100,000, 2 1/2 per cent of the total program cost.

Cain said the department has not received a "letter of credit" from the federal government which is usually sent out every quarter to assure that the Title I money will be paid. He said he has been assured that the letter will be sent, but does not know how much money will be available for the program in the final quarter of the fiscal year.

"I'm not sure just what this means in the battle between the President and Congress over school financing," Cain said. "But it is causing some headaches."

Cain said members of the state's congressional delegation have told him that Congress is not apt to adopt Nixon's revenue sharing plan without making major changes. He said spokesmen for the administration have warned that all education funds will be cut off July 1 if the bill is not passed.

"So what we're talking about is at best a reduction in aids of \$9 million, and at worst a total elimination of federal funds," Cain told the board.

COMPARISON 1973 VERSUS EDUCATIONAL REVENUE SHARING 1974

(Distribution of 3 percent to all other areas)

	Disadvantaged		SAFA		Handicapped		Vocational education		Support		Total	
	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing
Alabama	37,500	38,062	1,248	845	2,296	2,840	8,865	7,632	10,663	7,277	60,571	56,655
Alaska	2,781	2,886	24,594	16,555	1,191	268	884	721	958	687	30,409	21,076
Arizona	10,413	10,639	10,898	10,160	1,217	1,478	4,334	3,971	3,805	3,787	30,667	30,034
Arkansas	23,122	23,442	1,581	1,048	1,724	1,514	4,880	4,070	6,056	3,880	37,363	33,955
California	128,309	128,142	34,469	31,608	9,909	15,213	35,465	40,886	25,534	38,984	231,686	254,833
Colorado	12,167	12,376	3,551	2,947	2,094	1,792	5,254	4,815	4,482	4,517	27,548	26,520
Connecticut	13,063	13,263	2,009	1,745	2,368	2,340	5,032	6,289	4,670	5,996	27,142	29,634
Delaware	2,918	2,980	14	17	851	454	1,315	1,220	1,487	1,163	6,585	5,835
Florida	34,727	35,569	6,977	6,953	4,229	4,899	14,062	13,167	13,943	12,555	78,938	73,143
Georgia	43,818	44,500	2,143	1,770	2,658	3,726	11,460	10,015	14,198	9,549	74,477	69,560
Hawaii	4,068	4,137	8,571	10,185	651	627	1,801	1,670	2,285	1,593	17,375	18,207
Idaho	3,697	3,749	1,490	1,039	610	606	2,099	1,630	1,977	1,554	9,873	8,578
Illinois	74,316	75,996	5,532	4,669	7,944	8,711	18,982	23,411	17,935	22,322	124,708	134,510
Indiana	20,637	20,885	1,212	1,035	4,055	4,220	11,157	11,341	10,227	10,814	47,189	48,295
Iowa	16,184	16,408	210	113	1,863	2,261	6,246	6,076	6,696	5,793	31,198	30,651
Kansas	10,247	10,630	5,163	4,544	1,959	1,740	5,055	4,676	4,621	4,458	27,045	25,848
Kentucky	34,353	34,782	96	71	2,136	2,569	8,344	6,903	9,425	6,582	54,354	50,908
Louisiana	33,833	34,679	875	802	3,581	3,165	9,582	8,508	12,248	8,112	60,170	55,267
Maine	6,330	6,423	2,190	1,761	967	789	2,636	2,121	2,487	2,022	14,632	13,116
Maryland	21,668	22,083	5,797	5,923	2,765	3,160	7,613	8,492	6,244	8,097	44,086	47,754
Massachusetts	26,521	26,897	5,852	3,588	5,011	4,284	10,521	11,513	10,381	10,978	58,286	57,260
Michigan	59,373	60,144	4,459	4,300	8,008	7,456	17,577	20,037	13,926	19,105	102,975	111,103
Minnesota	23,883	24,241	1,459	1,514	2,606	3,199	8,303	8,598	8,764	8,198	45,015	45,751
Mississippi	39,259	39,239	1,555	2,455	1,537	1,632	5,930	5,392	4,302	4,950	56,623	52,848
Missouri	25,392	25,941	2,869	3,694	3,564	3,601	10,006	9,679	9,679	9,316	51,147	50,805
Montana	4,125	4,197	5,126	3,684	684	597	1,970	1,605	1,720	1,530	13,625	11,624
Nebraska	7,942	8,076	3,283	2,435	976	1,179	3,463	3,169	3,393	3,022	19,607	17,880
Nevada	1,228	1,259	2,236	2,124	448	384	1,124	1,032	984	984	6,111	5,783
New Hampshire	2,284	2,324	1,101	736	723	576	1,687	1,476	1,764	1,687	6,688	6,568
New Jersey	48,887	49,623	5,695	4,985	6,021	5,472	11,663	14,707	9,742	14,023	82,108	88,809
New Mexico	9,148	9,348	11,387	9,449	850	945	2,538	3,096	2,420	2,700	24,708	24,700
New York	213,429	216,246	6,795	7,242	14,678	13,269	28,451	35,661	28,623	34,003	291,977	306,421
North Carolina	56,781	57,468	2,270	1,774	4,319	4,028	13,532	10,821	15,384	10,322	92,286	84,417
North Dakota	5,127	5,185	4,981	3,029	657	533	1,897	1,433	1,983	1,366	14,645	11,556
Ohio	46,538	47,289	1,690	1,637	8,523	8,583	21,571	23,067	17,831	21,994	96,306	102,571
Oklahoma	18,654	18,929	5,660	3,877	1,759	1,947	6,324	5,232	5,890	4,989	38,286	34,975
Oregon	11,071	11,257	1,425	1,043	1,936	1,627	4,796	4,373	4,092	4,169	23,320	22,469

	Disadvantaged		SAFA		Handicapped		Vocational education		Support		Total	
	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing	1973	Revenue sharing
Pennsylvania.....	69,630	70,627	1,063	1,013	9,256	8,903	23,500	23,927	21,191	22,814	124,640	127,285
Rhode Island.....	5,261	5,345	2,884	2,539	897	683	2,251	1,834	1,663	1,749	12,956	12,150
South Carolina.....	32,866	33,293	2,972	2,171	2,257	2,191	7,304	5,888	8,825	5,614	54,224	49,156
South Dakota.....	6,033	6,120	4,604	3,297	746	570	1,976	1,531	2,024	1,460	15,383	12,978
Tennessee.....	34,233	34,739	664	470	2,616	3,050	9,991	8,197	10,532	7,816	58,036	54,272
Texas.....	87,259	88,789	11,704	8,407	8,226	9,138	26,106	24,558	22,224	23,415	155,518	154,306
Utah.....	4,640	4,714	1,958	1,657	927	951	3,150	2,555	3,326	4,436	14,001	12,312
Vermont.....	2,506	2,544	6	7	916	356	1,359	958	1,249	914	6,036	4,773
Virginia.....	35,203	35,773	7,050	5,818	3,269	3,647	11,049	9,802	10,763	9,346	67,334	64,366
Washington.....	16,081	16,339	7,708	7,578	2,600	2,678	7,120	7,193	5,575	6,863	39,084	40,656
West Virginia.....	19,394	19,641	35	30	1,256	1,347	4,586	3,619	4,690	3,451	29,991	28,088
Wisconsin.....	19,161	19,517	976	615	3,681	3,659	9,805	9,834	8,167	9,377	41,790	43,062
Wyoming.....	1,562	1,594	1,824	1,226	487	280	1,083	753	1,068	718	6,024	4,572
District of Columbia.....	11,185	11,341	222	280	1,102	500	1,606	1,343	1,518	1,280	15,633	14,744
All others.....	47,135	46,371	2,133	1,018	2,919	4,946	8,513	13,293	11,032	12,675	71,753	78,304
Total.....	1,524,061	1,545,711	231,998	194,794	158,744	164,878	437,173	443,110	418,976	422,501	2,770,949	2,770,992

COMPARISON 1973 VERSUS EDUCATIONAL REVENUE SHARING 1975

Alabama.....	37,500	37,392	1,248	913	2,296	2,823	8,665	7,586	10,663	7,233	60,571	55,945
Alaska.....	2,781	4,269	24,594	17,879	1,191	267	884	716	958	683	30,409	23,813
Arizona.....	10,413	15,012	10,898	10,972	1,217	1,469	4,334	3,947	3,805	3,764	30,667	35,165
Arkansas.....	23,122	21,314	1,581	1,132	1,724	1,505	4,880	6,056	3,857	3,763	37,363	31,863
California.....	126,909	122,037	34,469	34,137	9,909	15,121	35,465	40,638	25,534	38,748	231,686	250,681
Colorado.....	12,167	13,887	3,551	3,183	2,094	1,781	5,254	4,786	4,482	4,563	27,548	28,200
Connecticut.....	13,063	13,319	2,009	1,885	2,368	2,326	5,022	6,251	4,670	5,960	27,142	29,741
Delaware.....	2,918	4,152	14	18	851	1,451	1,315	1,213	1,487	1,156	6,585	6,990
Florida.....	34,727	53,354	6,977	7,509	4,229	4,870	14,062	13,087	13,642	12,479	73,938	91,299
Georgia.....	43,818	45,414	2,143	1,911	2,858	3,704	11,466	14,198	9,954	9,491	74,477	70,474
Hawaii.....	4,068	4,597	8,571	11,000	651	618	1,801	1,660	2,285	1,583	17,375	19,458
Idaho.....	3,697	3,463	1,123	610	603	2,099	1,620	1,620	1,977	1,544	9,873	8,353
Illinois.....	74,316	71,914	5,532	5,043	7,944	8,658	18,982	23,269	17,035	22,187	124,708	131,072
Indiana.....	20,537	23,166	1,212	1,118	4,055	4,194	11,272	10,227	10,748	10,748	47,189	50,500
Iowa.....	16,184	14,920	210	122	1,863	2,247	6,246	6,039	6,696	5,798	31,198	29,807
Kansas.....	10,247	12,180	5,163	4,908	1,959	1,729	5,255	4,647	4,621	4,431	27,045	27,896
Kentucky.....	34,853	28,652	96	77	2,136	2,553	8,344	6,861	9,425	6,542	54,354	44,685
Louisiana.....	32,883	52,018	875	866	3,581	3,147	9,582	8,456	12,248	8,063	60,170	72,551
Maine.....	6,330	6,174	2,190	1,902	987	784	2,638	2,108	2,487	2,010	14,632	12,978
Maryland.....	21,668	27,637	5,797	6,397	2,765	3,141	7,613	8,440	6,244	8,048	44,086	53,662
Massachusetts.....	20,521	25,037	5,652	3,875	5,011	4,258	10,521	11,443	10,381	10,911	58,286	55,524
Michigan.....	59,373	51,345	4,091	4,709	8,009	7,411	17,577	19,916	13,926	18,990	102,975	102,371
Minnesota.....	23,883	23,835	1,636	1,636	2,606	3,180	8,303	8,546	8,764	8,148	45,015	45,345
Mississippi.....	39,299	35,963	1,555	1,010	1,537	1,920	5,160	5,930	8,302	4,920	56,623	48,973
Missouri.....	23,392	29,923	2,869	2,651	3,564	3,580	10,006	9,620	9,316	9,173	51,147	54,947
Montana.....	4,125	4,803	5,126	3,690	684	594	1,970	1,595	1,720	1,621	13,625	12,503
Nebraska.....	7,942	8,893	3,293	2,630	976	1,172	3,463	3,150	3,393	3,003	19,067	18,848
Nevada.....	1,228	1,888	2,326	2,294	448	382	1,124	1,026	984	978	1,111	6,567
New Hampshire.....	2,294	2,641	1,101	794	723	572	1,887	1,538	1,760	1,467	7,013	7,013
New Jersey.....	48,987	42,336	5,695	5,384	6,021	5,439	11,663	14,618	9,742	13,938	82,108	81,714
New Mexico.....	9,148	13,304	11,387	10,205	850	939	2,904	2,523	3,096	2,406	27,385	29,377
New York.....	213,429	187,523	6,795	7,821	14,678	13,189	28,451	35,445	28,623	33,797	291,977	277,775
North Carolina.....	56,781	45,742	2,270	1,916	4,319	4,004	13,532	10,760	15,384	10,259	82,286	72,681
North Dakota.....	5,127	4,496	4,981	3,271	657	530	1,897	1,424	1,983	1,358	14,645	11,080
Ohio.....	46,538	49,993	1,690	1,768	8,523	8,531	21,453	22,927	17,831	21,861	96,036	105,081
Oklahoma.....	18,654	18,313	5,660	4,187	1,759	1,935	6,324	5,201	4,890	4,959	38,286	34,595
Oregon.....	11,071	12,380	1,425	1,127	1,936	1,617	4,346	4,346	5,092	4,144	23,320	23,615
Pennsylvania.....	69,630	66,405	1,063	1,094	9,256	8,849	23,500	23,782	21,191	22,676	124,640	122,806
Rhode Island.....	5,261	5,588	2,884	2,742	897	678	2,251	1,823	1,663	1,738	12,956	12,570
South Carolina.....	32,866	28,446	2,972	2,345	2,257	2,177	7,304	5,852	8,825	5,580	54,224	44,400
South Dakota.....	6,033	5,822	4,604	3,560	746	566	1,976	1,522	2,024	1,451	13,383	12,922
Tennessee.....	34,233	33,695	664	508	2,616	3,031	9,991	8,147	10,532	7,768	58,036	53,150
Texas.....	87,259	101,908	11,704	9,080	8,226	9,082	26,106	24,409	22,224	23,273	155,518	167,572
Utah.....	4,640	4,899	1,958	1,789	927	545	3,150	2,539	3,326	2,421	14,001	12,594
Vermont.....	2,506	2,501	6	7	916	356	1,359	958	1,249	908	6,036	4,723
Virginia.....	35,203	37,957	7,050	6,284	3,269	3,625	11,049	9,742	10,763	9,289	67,334	66,898
Washington.....	16,081	17,177	7,708	8,185	2,600	2,662	7,120	7,154	5,575	821	39,034	41,999
West Virginia.....	19,394	16,415	35	33	1,256	1,339	4,586	3,597	4,690	3,430	29,961	24,814
Wisconsin.....	19,161	23,671	976	664	3,681	3,637	9,805	9,775	8,167	9,320	41,790	47,067
Wyoming.....	1,562	2,134	1,824	1,324	487	279	1,083	749	1,068	714	6,024	5,200
District of Columbia.....	11,185	10,382	222	302	1,102	497	1,606	1,335	1,518	1,273	15,633	13,788
All others.....	47,155	46,091	2,133	1,100	2,919	4,916	8,513	13,213	11,032	12,598	71,753	77,918
Total.....	1,524,061	1,536,371	231,998	210,378	158,744	163,879	437,173	440,426	418,976	419,941	2,770,949	2,770,992

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, has the time allotted under all of the orders expired?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All of the time on all the orders has been yielded back.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 1973

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, S. 70, which the clerk will state by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read the bill by title, as follows:

A bill (S. 70) to promote commerce and establish a Council on Energy Policy, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

That this Act may be cited as the "Energy Policy Act of 1973."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(a) there are many Federal agencies, created at different times and for different purposes

to handle specialized problems, all directly or indirectly involved in the establishment of energy policy;

(b) there is no comprehensive national energy policy but instead Federal energy activities consist of a myriad of laws, regulations, and inactions resulting in narrow, short-range, and often conflicting decision-making by individual agencies without adequate consideration of the impact on the overall energy policy, nor future national energy needs; and

(c) as a consequence of not having a comprehensive national energy policy, the Nation faces mismanagement of energy resources, unacceptably high adverse environmental impacts, inadequate incentives for efficient utilization and conservation of energy resources, shortages of supply, and soaring energy prices.