

been an involuntary part of Soviet Russia for almost 50 years, yet their valiant fight for independence and freedom in 1918, continuing in exile even today, can certainly be an example to us all in these troubled times.

In commemorating this independence day, we are forced to remember the continuing acts of Soviet oppression still existing in the so-called Soviet republics

and in the Eastern European countries, which make up the Communist bloc. The jailing of intellectuals who dare to deviate from the Soviet line, the suppression of all the basic freedoms which Americans hold dear, and finally, the ruthless invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, are all part of Soviet policy, both past and present, and an indication that attitudes and methods have not changed in the

Soviet Union since the Ukraine was invaded in 1919.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in commemorating this 51st anniversary, and I want to extend my special regards to the Ukrainian Americans for keeping up a fight involving incredible odds, for a country an ocean away, which some of them have never seen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 3, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our sufficiency is from God.—2 Corinthians 3: 5.

Eternal Father of our spirits, whose grace makes us sufficient for every task and whose strength holds us steady as we live through troubled times, speak Thou Thy word to us this day and make known Thy will that we may now and always walk along the paths of righteousness and justice and love.

Unite us as a nation that we may continue to seek the release of the captives, give light to those who sit in darkness, bridge the gulf which separates our people, and support every endeavor which creates and maintains understanding and good will in our national life.

In the spirit of Christ we offer this our morning prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 30, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 17. An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of the Communications Satellite Corp.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-448, appointed Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. HOLLINGS as members, on the part of the Senate, of the National Advisory Commission on Low Income Housing.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, United States Code, section 2251, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. BATES, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, and Mr. McCULLOCH.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title 6, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee to Investigate Nonesential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. MILLS, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. MAHON, Mr. KIRWAN, and Mr. BOW.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, United States Code, section 2501, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON AND RECONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 177

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings whereby the House agreed to House Resolution 177 on January 29, and ask for its immediate reconsideration with an amendment which I send to the desk.

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

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the resolution and what is sought to be done?

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The resolution was the regular resolution assigning the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico to various committees and there was merely a technical error contained therein.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 177

Resolved, That Jorge Luis Córdova-Díaz, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, be, and he is hereby, elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALBERT

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALBERT: Strike out all of line 1, after the word "Resolved," and insert: "That Jorge L. Córdova, the Resident".

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON AND RECONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 176

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings whereby the House agreed to House Resolution 176 on January 29, and ask for its immediate consideration with an amendment which I send to the desk.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 176

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Page Belcher, Oklahoma; Charles M. Teague, California; Catherine May, Washington; William C. Wampler, Virginia; George A. Goodling, Pennsylvania; Clarence E. Miller, Ohio; Robert B. Mathias, California; Wiley Wayne, Iowa; John Zwach, Minnesota; Thomas S. Kleppe, North Dakota; Robert D. Price, Texas; John T. Myers, Indiana; Keith G. Sebelius, Kansas; Martin B. McKeenly, New York; Wilmer D. Mizell, North Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Jack Edwards, Alabama.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: William H. Bates, Massachusetts; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William G. Bray, Indiana; Bob Wilson, California; Charles S. Gubser, California; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Alexander Pirnie, New York; Durward G. Hall, Missouri; Donald D. Clancy, Ohio; Robert T. Stafford, Vermont; Carleton J. King, New York; William L. Dickinson, Alabama; Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Ohio; Ed Foreman,

New Mexico; John E. Hunt, New Jersey; G. William Whitehurst, Virginia.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY: William E. Widnal, New Jersey; Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; Seymour Halpern, New York; W. E. (Bill) Brock, Tennessee; Del Clawson, California; Albert W. Johnson, Pennsylvania; J. William Stanton, Ohio; Chester L. Mize, Kansas; Benjamin B. Blackburn, Georgia; Gary E. Brown, Michigan; Lawrence G. Williams, Pennsylvania; Chalmers P. Wylie, Ohio; Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts; William O. Cowger, Kentucky; J. Glenn Beall, Jr., Maryland.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota; William L. Springer, Illinois; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William H. Harsha, Ohio; Frank Horton, New York; Joel T. Brophy, Virginia; Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas; Gilbert Gude, Maryland; Sam Steiger, Arizona; Catherine May, Washington; Lawrence J. Hogan, Maryland.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR: William H. Ayres, Ohio; Albert H. Quile, Minnesota; John M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Alphonzo Bell, California; Ogden R. Reid, New York; John N. Erlenborn, Illinois; William J. Scherle, Iowa; John R. Delienbach, Oregon; Marvin L. Esch, Michigan; Edwin D. Eshleman, Pennsylvania; William A. Steiger, Wisconsin; James M. Collins, Texas; Earl F. Landgrebe, Indiana; Orval Hansen, Idaho; Earl B. Ruth, North Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: E. Ross Adair, Indiana; William S. Mallard, California; Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, New Jersey; William S. Broomfield, Michigan; J. Irving Whalley, Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, Iowa; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; F. Bradford Morse, Massachusetts; Vernon W. Thomson, Wisconsin; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Paul Findley, Illinois; John H. Buchanan, Jr., Alabama; Robert Taft, Jr., Ohio; Sherman P. Lloyd, Utah; J. Herbert Burke, Florida; William V. Roth, Jr., Delaware.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS: Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; Ogden R. Reid, New York; Frank Horton, New York; Donald Rumsfeld, Illinois; John N. Erlenborn, Illinois; John W. Wicker, New York; Clarence J. Brown, Jr., Ohio; Guy Vander Jagt, Michigan; John T. Myers, Indiana; William O. Cowger, Kentucky; Gilbert Gude, Maryland; Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., California; Paul Findley, Illinois; John H. Buchanan, Jr., Alabama; Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Connecticut.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: James Harvey, Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS: John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; Craig Hosmer, California; Joe Skubitz, Kansas; Laurence J. Burton, Utah; John Kyl, Iowa; Sam Steiger, Arizona; Howard W. Pollock, Alaska; James A. McClure, Idaho; Don H. Clausen, California; Phillip E. Ruppe, Michigan; John Wold, Wyoming; John N. Hasty Camp, Oklahoma; Manuel Lujan, New Mexico.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE: William L. Springer, Illinois; Samuel L. Devine, Ohio; Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota; Hastings Keith, Massachusetts; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; James T. Brophy, North Carolina; James Harvey, Michigan; Albert W. Watson, South Carolina; Tim Lee Carter, Kentucky; G. Robert Watkins, Pennsylvania; Donald G. Brozman, Colorado; Clarence J. Brown, Jr., Ohio; Dan Kuykendall, Tennessee; Joe Skubitz, Kansas; Fletcher Thompson, Georgia; James F. Hastings, New York.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: William M. McCulloch, Ohio; Richard H. Poff, Virginia; William T. Cahill, New Jersey; Clark MacGregor, Minnesota; Edward Hutchinson, Michigan; Robert McClory, Illinois; Henry P. Smith III, New York; Thomas J. Meskill, Connecticut; Charles W. Sandman, Jr., New Jersey; Thomas F. Rallsbeck, Illinois; Edward G. Blester, Jr., Pennsylvania; Charles E. Wiggins, California; David W. Dennis, In-

diana; Hamilton Fish, Jr., New York; R. Lawrence Coughlin, Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES: William S. Mallard, California; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; James R. Grover, Jr., New York; Hastings Keith, Massachusetts; G. Robert Watkins, Pennsylvania; Henry C. Schadeberg, Wisconsin; John R. Delienbach, Oregon; Howard W. Pollock, Alaska; Phillip E. Ruppe, Michigan; Daniel E. Button, New York; George A. Goodling, Pennsylvania; William C. Bray, Indiana; Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., California; Louis Frey, Jr., Florida.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE: Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; Albert W. Johnson, Pennsylvania; Daniel E. Button, New York; William L. Scott, Virginia; James A. McClure, Idaho; Thomas J. Meskill, Connecticut; Donald E. Lukens, Ohio; Lawrence J. Hogan, Maryland.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS: William C. Cramer, Florida; William H. Harsha, Ohio; James R. Grover, Jr., New York; James C. Cleveland, New Hampshire; Don H. Clausen, California; Robert C. McEwen, New York; John J. Duncan, Tennessee; Fred Schwengel, Iowa; Henry C. Schadeberg, Wisconsin; M. G. (Gene) Snyder, Kentucky; Robert V. Denney, Nebraska; Roger H. Zion, Indiana; Jack H. McDonald, Michigan; John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas; Clarence E. Miller, Ohio.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS: James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana; Alphonzo Bell, California; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; Donald Rumsfeld, Illinois; John W. Wylder, New York; Guy Vander Jagt, Michigan; Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas; Jerry L. Pettis, California; Donald E. Lukens, Ohio; Robert Price, Texas; Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Connecticut; Louis Frey, Jr., Florida.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT: Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Robert T. Stafford, Vermont; James H. Quillen, Tennessee; Lawrence G. Williams, Pennsylvania; Edward Hutchinson, Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES: John M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Del Clawson, California; Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana; Albert W. Watson, South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Charles M. Teague, California; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; William H. Ayres, Ohio; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; Seymour Halpern, New York; John J. Duncan, Tennessee; John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas; William L. Scott, Virginia; Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts; John M. Zwach, Minnesota; Robert V. Denney, Nebraska.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: Rogers C. B. Morton, Maryland.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GERALD R. FORD

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GERALD R. FORD: On page 7, lines 5 and 6, strike out "E. Ross Adair, Indiana; William H. Ayres, Ohio;" and insert: "William H. Ayres, Ohio; E. Ross Adair, Indiana;"

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, my amendment, which has just been read by the Clerk, will correct the seniority standing of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIDDLE EAST REPORT

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues another in the series of articles which Carol Stevens Kovner, managing editor of Kovner Publications in Los Angeles, has written on the Middle East situation.

In this article, Miss Kovner points up the determination of Israel to defend her borders from aggression and the loneliness which the Jews feel in this battle. The article follows:

ABBA EBAN DEPLORES STEREOTYPE OF PASSIVE VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

(By Carol Stevens Kovner)

In an interview with Time Magazine in their January 10 issue, Abba Eban, articulate Foreign Minister of Israel, said there is a stereotype of Jews as the passive victims of other violence.

In Israel the Jews resist. They do not suffer passively. But the world, personified by the government leaders and news media who speak for the world community, has not fully absorbed this change in the Jewish picture.

Mr. Eban said, "I have no other explanation for the fact that the Soviet Union, which invaded Czechoslovakia, can condemn alleged Israeli 'aggression' at the UN . . . without the public gallery bursting into laughter."

"If someone could prove that we could survive by giving Arab violence a free rein, then we would do so. But nobody has proved this."

The Pope's sympathetic message to Lebanon's president "deploring violent acts" and asking Lebanon to refrain from taking countermeasures was astonishing, because this was in the context of not uttering a single word of protest when 13 Jewish and Arab shoppers were killed by terrorists' bomb in a Jerusalem marketplace, in the same geographical area.

Was the Pope's message to Lebanon, where there was no loss of life involved, an act of unbiased justice at a delicate moment in history? With his deep interest in the Middle East and the Holy Land, why not speak when Jewish children were being terrorized in Israeli northern villages with unrelenting bombardment in December by Iraqi trained army regulars. Or even when the Israeli engineer, ironically on his way to a UN help mission, was shot to death in Athens by trained-Lebanon terrorists.

But when Israel, defending her small population from guerrilla bands, even eventually from Lebanon, finally after some months of terrorism, struck in warning to the Arab nations that they must control the terrorists or suffer the consequences and destroy 13 aircraft in Beirut—not a drop of blood was spilled.

Yet this "metal and wire and upholstery" as Israeli Ambassador to the UN Yosef Tekoaah called it, this is what brought the Pope to speak out. Not in protest to the copious blood spilled by Israeli civilians in Jerusalem, not the innocent life of a Jew on a mercy mission for the UN, but the mere destruction of material objects.

"Are we to hear that the scrap iron of airplanes is worth more than Jewish blood?" Tekoaah asked in the UN, his voice angry and heart sore, as he stood before the UN Security Council after a decision which never mentioned in the unanimous condemnation a single act of the terrorists from Arab countries, but only Israeli response to the acts of the terrorists.

Abba Eban deplored, "Those who were silent in the face of 13 mangled bodies in Mahane Yehuda market now cry with choking voices over 13 steel skeletons that never breathed life . . . there was an angry outcry only over property that was destroyed—and is insured."

There are six countries sitting on the Security Council which have no diplomatic ties with Israel.

There is the Soviet Union with Czechoslovakian hopes for a freer life crushed under Soviet invading tanks. Continuous anti-Semitic campaigns ricochet to other countries from her shores and the Soviet Union presumes to judge a Jewish country.

There is Britain, still enamored of her personal romantic myth of the Arab riding in the clean open desert (with an Englishman by his side) holding a grudge against Israel for not strangling during the years after World War II, when she did her level best to throttle the emerging country.

There is France, in the grip of an ancient autocrat who suddenly announced a complete arms embargo after the Beirut raid on Israel with no return of \$160 million paid in advance by Israel. Israelis met his announcement with resigned dismay, realizing this was the logical conclusion to the courtship of de Gaulle and the Arabs, with the Russians providing much of his wooing words.

And there is the United States, too, who joined this frivolous and irresponsible farce at the UN, condemning a small country for what we have done ourselves unscathed and uncondemned by the UN . . . in the effort to be more "evenhanded."

There has been much talk in the last two weeks of an imposed settlement by the Big Four, France, Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States. Given their present attitudes, the Russian and French newly sealed trade agreement and support of every Arab move politically, the British psychological antipathy of Israel, and the US's new, weighted evenhandedness, what kind of Great Power intervention would be proposed?

The new Soviet formula going the rounds of diplomatic circles looks similar to the Arab demands for a return to the May 1967 situation. France has proposed putting Great Power troops into all countries involved, but de Gaulle's arms embargo has ruled France out as a future mediator in the Middle East because of his one-sided stand.

Like the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, once the Big Four got rolling together, could they stop short of erasing Israel and the Jewish people off the globe, as their self-imposed silence nearly did in World War II?

ALEXANDER PIRNIE'S TERM AS IPU PRESIDENT

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE) completed his term as President of the Interparliamentary Union and he did this without fanfare or celebration, but it does seem to me that this occasion should not be allowed to pass by the House without some notice of the achievement of ALEXANDER PIRNIE and some expression of appreciation on the part of the House for his work on that august body which was performed essentially as a Representative of the House of Representatives.

ALEXANDER PIRNIE was elected to the Presidency of the Interparliamentary Union in 1968 and served from that time to the present. As a member of that group, I am familiar with his work and with the outstanding contribution that he made not only to the successful func-

tioning of that historic international organization but also in fostering the image of the United States and improving relations between the people of our country and the people of innumerable other countries throughout the world.

Representative PIRNIE capped his service with his election as chairman of a committee composed of members from five countries to study the question of universality and he served in this capacity at the next to the last meeting of the union at Dakar, Senegal.

Mr. PIRNIE performed magnificently at the formal sessions of the Interparliamentary Union. He took an active part in the deliberations of the Union's most active committee, as well as in its ruling council, and in these areas he staunchly defended the record and policies of the United States and proved himself to be a worthy foe of those who attacked our country. In addition to his formal activities and in some ways more importantly, Mr. PIRNIE devoted himself tirelessly to the extraofficial activities of the various conferences. It is an accepted fact that in these extracircular contacts parliamentarians are able to achieve more for their countries than in the formal exchanges of the scheduled sessions and ALEXANDER PIRNIE performed superbly in this department. I am confident that he was responsible for greatly improving the understanding of many of our policies on the part of delegates to the conference who would otherwise have based their judgment of policy on insufficient information.

In addition to this performance, I must also pay tribute to Representative PIRNIE personally as I praise his qualities as a delegation leader. His tact, his courtesy, his thoughtfulness, and his gentle but firm scheduling and performance of delegation responsibilities made it a particular pleasure to serve with him.

I am pleased to bring this brief report to the House today and I am confident that all Members will agree that Representative PIRNIE's service should be a source of great pride and satisfaction to this body. In the name of my colleagues, I thank Mr. PIRNIE for his outstanding service.

LT. COL. WILLIAM ST. JOHN

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of Connecticut's most distinguished military officers has announced his retirement from the National Guard after 42 years of service. He is Lt. Col. William St. John, who for this period approaching half a century has contributed his efforts to the successful operation of our Military Establishment. I have known Colonel St. John for the greatest part of his life and I am personally familiar with his outstanding record that he has compiled.

He has not only been interested in military affairs, but he has always taken an active part in political party activities and civic affairs in our hometown in Waterbury where he was at one time a

formidable and popular candidate for mayor.

Not only has he been a friend of mine for many years, but he acted as my campaign manager in my first successful campaign for Congress in 1958.

Colonel St. John is not the only military member of his family. His son, Capt. Richard L. St. John, whom I was proud to designate is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, a soldier with a distinguished record in Vietnam and at present a professor of military science at Lafayette College in Easton, Pa.

The Hartford Courant recently carried a complete and interesting account of Colonel St. John's career and I think it only fitting at this juncture in the life of one who has served the United States so well to make this account a part of the Record, as follows:

OFFICER ENDS COLORFUL CAREER

(By Theodore Driscoll)

It was July 6, 1944, and the Chinese 36th Division had been thrown back by a surprise Japanese counter-attack that drove them to the Solween River. The river was wide and swift. There could be no retreating across it.

Lt. Col. William St. John, then commander of the American combat section with the Chinese unit, listened with his men to the nightly BBC news broadcast.

There had been a tragic circus fire in Hartford, Conn., 169 were dead, 500 others injured. For St. John it was one of the saddest days he would ever know.

It would be several weeks before he could be sure that his wife and his five-year-old son in Waterbury, his life-long home, had not been at the circus that day.

Half a world away in the jungles of Southwest China this gnawed at St. John, a constant worry, until he got a letter from his wife five weeks after she sent it. They were safe.

NOW RETIRING

St. John sat in his office at the State Armory on Broad Street one day last week reminiscing about this and other things. He had just announced that he was retiring from the National Guard after 42 years of service.

On his desk was a letter to Gov. Dempsey with the latest accounting of the \$25,156,592 worth of state-owned property used by the Connecticut National Guard.

St. John is a kind of overseer for this property. He is the state military property and procurement officer and will continue in this position after his retirement from the National Guard.

His boyhood was spent in Waterbury, at St. Thomas School and Crosby High School and later Brooklyn Polytechnical Institute in New York. He joined the National Guard when he was in high school. That was 1926.

St. John tried and almost got into West Point. He was very proud when his son, Richard, tried and made it. Capt. Richard L. St. John just returned from Vietnam with the Purple Heart and the Silver Star. Now, he is a professor of military science at Lafayette College in Easton, Pa.

St. John and his wife, Mary, have three other sons, William St. John Jr., who is with Travelers Insurance Cos., and a student at Suffolk Law School in Boston; Mark J. St. John, a senior at Sacred Heart College in Bridgeport, and Gregory G. St. John, a sophomore at Boston College.

The Connecticut National Guard was activated shortly after Pearl Harbor. St. John went to the South Pacific where he spent 37 months of the war.

INTELLIGENCE OFFICER

He was an intelligence officer with the Bobcat Task Force and was later assigned to

the 20th Route Army of the Chinese National Army. Then he was with the Chinese 36th Division which fought its way through southwest China over "the Hump" and finally opened the Burma Road.

Chinese soldiers could classify anything growing as edible or inedible, St. John said, and they ate things no one else would.

"The 36th was the damndest dog-loving outfit you ever saw." When St. John joined them, at least half the Chinese soldiers had dogs.

"Ever had dog stew. It's good—tastes like rabbit," that's what the dogs were for and in those circumstances, St. John said it made an "elegant stew."

Memories came to St. John in spurts, as they do after 20 years. Some came alone, some were tied to other memories with no apparent design or reason. Food kept popping up.

"Once we went 21 days without food—real food—we ate blades of grass and things like that. And when finally there was an air drop. Everyone stuffed himself and got sick."

This was St. John's rag-tag army. Army issue clothes soon rotted away and after that they took what they could get. For most that meant Indian Army overalls, size 48 to 50, so the sleeves had to be rolled up and the crotch fell to the knees, St. John said.

St. John commanded about 900 Americans attached to the 36th Division. He was a combination soldier and horsestrader.

When he wanted the Chinese to carry out a particular operation he would bargain with them, "You want rifles . . . then we'll do things this way." The rifles were coming anyway but the Chinese didn't know that. Only St. John did.

A HORSETRADER

The 35-year-old commander of the Chinese understood horsetrading and he understood St. John, who said he would have made an excellent general in any army.

Some things confused the Chinese commander. Why, for instance, did the president of the United States get only \$75,000 while some industrialists got \$100,000.

St. John said the commander asked the question, then answered it himself. His eyes lit up and he said, "Ah, but the kun-cha."

Kun-cha means graft. And St. John said it might not be spelled like that but that is the way it is pronounced.

The commander understood horsetrading. So did the Japanese.

For several weeks the 36th and the Japanese each occupied half a small city in southwest China. Wednesday was market day and there was tacit agreement that the men of the 36th could go to the Japanese-held marketplace safely.

Orders were put in for the following week. St. John remembers bargaining for tangerines and paying extra because the merchant had to bribe the Japanese to get tangerines through their lines.

"You ever hear my famous pigeon story?" St. John asked, letting it become known that just about everyone around the army had.

One of the things St. John's underfed and under-equipped army didn't need was carrier pigeons. At least that's what his men were saying as they carted eight of the big breasted birds along, feeding them every day while they themselves went hungry.

"Those pigeons served a very useful purpose," St. John said. They ate them.

Not all St. John's food stories were like that. Some of them were gruesome.

For instance, there was a Canadian priest who was freed when the 36th liberated a prisoner-of-war camp who explained how he, a thin man, had survived while a fatter colleague starved to death.

"He was squeamish" the priest told St. John.

"I would turn over a rock and eat what-

ever I found. He wouldn't," St. John recalled the priest saying.

And there was the impressment of women and children to carry supplies over the hump". It was a brutal system, St. John said—"It was theirs not ours."

The impressed citizens carried equipment, as did mules, to heights of 16,000 feet over the Himalayas. "The bones of most of them, people and mules, are still up there," St. John said.

St. John remembered the POW camps and how, toward the end of things, they liberated one after another in Burma. Sometimes there were just a dozen men, sometimes there were a thousand.

Some were only starving. Others had completely lost their minds. St. John said that was the saddest thing of all. He remembered one POW, eyes sunken, gaunt and filthy, who stumbled up to him and said, "Hey Saint".

He could not recognize the man by his looks. He remembered the name. The man had come to the South Pacific with St. John three years before.

Not all the memories of war were pleasant. St. John said it was good to have such things behind him, but he would not like to go through them again.

The 36th Division secured the Burma Road and the supplies that had been flown over the "hump" from India to China could then go by land.

In the spring of 1945 St. John went to eastern China where he and others plotted an attack on Canton, still held by the Japanese.

But in July the plotting ended. The word was out, but only in rumors, that the end was near. St. John returned to the United States at the end of the month. He was at Ft. Gordon, Ga., on V-J Day, Aug. 14.

For most of America's 12-million fighting men that was the end. For St. John it was really only the middle. He would spend another 24 years in the National Guard.

MORE ON LEGALIZED USURY AND PROPOSED UNIFORM CONSUMER CREDIT CODE

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

Mr. PATMAN, Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1969, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement concerning the dangers of the proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code, which was prepared under the auspices of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and financed in major part by the American Bankers Association and other segments of the credit industry. This code, calling as it does for interest rates as high as 36 percent on installment sales and loans, would be a great travesty on the American public if enacted. It has many other anticonsumer and public provisions which will be the subject of subsequent analysis. What few beneficial provisions it contains simply are not worth the great detriment to be suffered by consumers if the code is enacted in the States.

Unfortunately, the sponsors of the code have ordered full speed ahead and are mounting a heavy pressure campaign to secure its earliest possible adoption in the State legislatures. The bill is now before the State Legislature of Massachusetts and other State legislatures. Apparently Massachusetts, one of the first States to adopt strong truth-in-

lending and other consumer protection laws, is a prime target for adoption of the code. Fortunately, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has an experienced and effective Consumers Council. The council appeared before the judiciary committee of the State senate, recommending against hasty action on the code and its referral to the Consumers Council for detailed analysis.

Prof. William F. Willier of the Boston College Law School presented the council's position. His statement is an eloquent argument against the code, pointing out the great harm it threatens to progressive consumer legislation in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Professor Willier's statement and the accompanying press release from the Consumers Council follow:

STATEMENT BY PROF. WILLIAM F. WILLIER, ON BEHALF OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMERS' COUNCIL CONCERNING HOUSE BILL 778, THE UNIFORM CONSUMER CREDIT CODE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, JANUARY 29, 1969

The Massachusetts Consumers' Council, after study and consultation, opposes the enactment of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code in Massachusetts at this time.

The Uniform Consumer Credit Code would change many laws and regulations in Massachusetts which were designed and enacted to protect the consumer. Many problems and conflicting viewpoints have been brought to the Council's attention—some obvious and some not so obvious. The General Court should not hastily enact a statute beset with so little understanding and so much controversy. Instead, thorough study by a competent body should be given to the changes, problems and conflicts which enactment of the Code would create. What may be good enough for Colorado consumers may not be good enough for consumers in Massachusetts.

THE FALLACY OF UNIFORMITY

There is serious fallacy in one of the major premises upon which the Uniform Consumer Credit Code was promulgated; that regulation of consumer credit can or ever will be uniform among the fifty states and territories. Population patterns and composition, standards of living, levels of employment, size of communities and the extent and kinds of business enterprises all affect the demand for and supply of consumer credit and the nature of its regulation, and these factors differ from state to state and region to region. The Massachusetts General Court must deal with the problems as they exist in Massachusetts; it must be concerned with the consumers in this state and not with those in other states.

RATE CEILINGS—COST TO MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMERS

In all cases the rate ceilings for consumer credit in the Uniform Consumer Credit Code exceed those in Massachusetts, even though they may equal or be lower than those in other states. The Commissioners argue that high ceilings will allow competition to flourish in the consumer credit market resulting in actual rates below the ceilings. There is ample evidence that for many debtors the ceiling becomes the floor, that high cost creditors always charge the maximum rates. The Council requires much more evidence to the contrary before it could endorse any increase in the rate ceilings in Massachusetts.

The Council concedes that the pattern of rate ceilings in Massachusetts has little consistency, but it has been functioning so far as anyone knows with little hardship on creditors or consumers. The data supplied to the Committee by the Department of Banks, prepared so ably by Mr. Ledbetter, indicates the potential cost to Massachusetts con-

sumers by the Credit Code's rate ceilings. At maximum rates, the first \$200 of indebtedness (which is the lowest breaking point for present rates) payable over one year in twelve installments would cost the consumer the following additional amounts if the Credit Code were enacted:

A small loan.....	\$7.14
A new car.....	25.10
Home appliance.....	21.10
Insurance premiums.....	7.14

Consumers are frequently shocked when they learn how high the rate ceilings already are in Massachusetts. For example, on the first \$200 of debt, they are 30% for small loans; 14% for new cars; 17% for goods and services; 30% for insurance premiums. In all of these cases the Uniform Consumer Credit Code would raise the ceiling to 36%.

OTHER PROBLEMS AND WEAKNESSES

Nothing prevents the legislature from lowering the rate ceilings in the Credit Code so that they approximate present ceilings, although the Commissioners insist that the high ceilings are necessary if competition is to work to lower rates. Were this the Consumer Council's only difficulty with the Code, it might recommend passage with lower ceilings. But there are other problems and weaknesses. At a casual glance, the Credit Code appears to offer protections and benefits to the consumer very much like the ones we have in Massachusetts and to add some new benefits to those. However, a careful look reveals that in a number of instances the Credit Code actually weakens protections already law in Massachusetts. A few examples will make the point.

NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS

Under ordinary rules of law, a buyer who gives a negotiable promissory note to a seller in a credit sale can be forced to pay the finance company to which the seller sells his note for cash even though the seller does not deliver all or part of the goods or services or the goods prove to be defective. Massachusetts forbids the use of negotiable instruments in such cases. So does the Uniform Consumer Credit Code. But Massachusetts also requires that the note be labeled "Consumer Note" so that no finance company can force payment of it if the seller defaults. Such enforcement remains possible under the Credit Code. A violation in Massachusetts subjects the seller to a possible fine and the debtor can recover the entire finance charge as a penalty. The Credit Code does not make the violation a crime and allows the buyer a penalty only at the discretion of a court. Further, the seller can weasel out entirely by showing the violation to be unintentional or the result of bona fide error.

WAIVER OF DEFENSES

To avoid the negotiable instrument problems, creditors often insert clauses in the credit agreement which state that debtors agree not to assert their claims and defenses (such as nondelivery or defective goods) against third parties (usually finance companies or banks) who buy the agreements from the creditors. In Massachusetts, such clauses are unenforceable by decision of the Supreme Judicial Court and by statute. The Uniform Consumer Credit Code as introduced in Massachusetts would give third parties some benefit from such clauses: the third party would never be liable for more than the amount owing to him at the time and the debtor would be limited to set-off against that amount. Presently, the debtor can bring action on his own initiative and does not have to rely upon set-off.

CASH PRICE

Both Massachusetts and the Uniform Consumer Credit Code require a credit seller to reveal as the cash price the price the goods and services are offered to cash buyers. If a buyer in Massachusetts can show the cash

price in a credit sale to be more than in a cash sale, he can recover penalties. The Credit Code presumes that the cash price quoted by the seller is a cash price, creating an almost impossible legal burden for the buyer to overcome in court.

HOME SOLICITATION SALES

The Massachusetts law gives a buyer one day in which to cancel a credit sale made away from the seller's place of business; the Uniform Consumer Credit Code gives three days, which is better. But the Credit Code applies only to sales made at the buyer's residence (not even to his neighbor's), and then penalizes him the lesser of his downpayment or 5% of the price for exercising his right to cancel. Massachusetts has no such limitations or penalties.

BALLOON PAYMENTS

Some creditors induce debtors to enter into a credit transaction by scheduling early low installment payments and then hitting the debtor with a final payment many times the amount of the others. When the debtor cannot pay the final amount, the creditor takes possession of collateral or, usually, offers to refinance that amount often with additional credit on terms similar to the original and, of course, with additional finance charge. Debtors seldom get off the hook in such cases. Massachusetts requires that installment payments be substantially equal unless the debtor is given the right to spread the balloon payment out in amounts and periods equivalent to the other payments or unless the balloon payment reflects the irregular income of the debtor and that fact is stated. The Uniform Consumer Credit Code allows balloon payments of up to double the average of others; if greater than that, the debtor is merely given the right to refinance the payment, which is exactly the abuse which causes the problem.

INSURANCE AND INSURANCE FINANCING

A number of sections of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code indicate that financing of insurance premiums is not regulated at all and it clearly is not if the financing is by the insurer. In c. 255C Massachusetts regulates such financing. Further, there seems to be no restrictions on the kinds of insurance a creditor can require in connection with a consumer credit transaction and for which the creditor makes a separate charge, while in Massachusetts the kinds of insurance are limited.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Buyers of goods and services frequently are asked to sign acknowledgments at the time they enter into a credit transaction stating that all goods had been delivered and services performed even though this was not so. This has been used in home improvement transactions more than any others. When third parties to whom the seller sold the credit agreement sought to enforce payment, courts held debtors to these acknowledgments even though the debtor had obviously been defrauded. Massachusetts gives such acknowledgments no evidentiary effect against a debtor. The Uniform Consumer Credit Code ignores the problem. However, as to disclosure, such an acknowledgment creates a presumption against the debtor even as to the original creditor that he has complied with the statute; as to third parties, the presumption is conclusive. There are no such presumptions in Massachusetts.

REMEDIES

Massachusetts allows a debtor as a matter of right to recover a penalty of all credit charges for most violations, and even more for some violations. The Uniform Consumer Credit Code leaves award of a penalty to the discretion of a court. Massachusetts allows a debtor to take affirmative action in court to have a violation declared void. The Credit Code does not provide for such a right. Massachusetts allows a creditor to

avoid the penalty if the violation was accidental or the result of bona fide error in only three limited situations. The Credit Code allows this escape from all penalties without limit. Mere violation of our Retail Installment Sales Act is a crime (the Attorney General is currently in the process of prosecuting a violator). Only a few violations are crimes under the Credit Code and they must be willful, which is almost impossible to prove.

CONCLUSION

There are many other weaknesses and problems in the Consumer Credit Code too complex or subtle to chronicle in this statement. There are some good points and innovations in the Credit Code which would benefit Massachusetts consumers and the concept of one tightly knit consumer credit code has much to recommend it. But if a scale could be created upon which to balance the gains and losses to Massachusetts consumers, the Council is convinced it would tip in favor of losses if the Uniform Consumer Credit Code were enacted in the form of House Bill 778.

[From the Consumers' Council News, Jan. 29, 1969]

THE POSITION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMERS' COUNCIL ON HOUSE BILL 778, THE UNIFORM CONSUMER CREDIT CODE, AS STATED BY PROF. WILLIAM F. WILLIER, STATE HOUSE, BOSTON, MASS., JANUARY 29, 1969

Dr. Edward R. Willier, Chairman of the Consumers' Council, designated Professor William F. Willier of Boston College Law School to speak for the Council. Professor Willier is the Credit Law Consultant to the Council and, also, is a member of the Advisory Board on Truth-in-Lending to the Federal Reserve Board.

The following is an excerpt from Prof. Willier's testimony: "The State Consumers' Council, after study and consultation, opposes the enactment of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code in Massachusetts at this time.

"The Council's position is as follows: The Uniform Consumer Credit Code would change many laws and regulations in Massachusetts which were designed and enacted to protect the consumer. Many problems and conflicting viewpoints have been brought to the Council's attention, some obvious and some not so obvious. The General Court should not hastily enact a statute beset with so little understanding and so much controversy. Instead, thorough study by a competent body should be given to the changes, problems and conflicts which enactment of the Code would create. What may be good enough for Colorado consumers may not be good enough for consumers in Massachusetts."

Prof. Willier made the following additional points:

"(1) There is serious fallacy in one of the major premises upon which the Uniform Consumer Credit Code was promulgated: that regulation of consumer credit can or ever will be uniform among the fifty states and territories. . . . The Massachusetts General Court must deal with the problems as they exist in Massachusetts; it must be concerned with the consumers in this State and not with those in other states.

"(2) In all cases the rate ceilings for consumer credit in the Uniform Consumer Credit Code exceed those in Massachusetts, even though they may equal or be lower than those in other states. There is ample evidence that for many debtors the ceiling becomes the floor, that high cost creditors always charge the maximum rates.

"The Uniform Consumer Credit Code would raise the ceiling to 36% interest at maximum rates of this new proposed Code. The first \$200 of indebtedness (which is the lowest breaking point for present rates) payable over one year in twelve installments would

cost the consumer the following additional amounts if the Credit Code were enacted:

	Increase
"A small plan....."	\$7.14
A new car.....	25.10
Home appliance.....	21.10
Insurance premiums.....	7.14

"(3) At a casual glance, the Credit Code appears to offer protections and benefits to the consumer very much like the ones we have in Massachusetts and to add some new benefits to those. However, a careful look reveals that in a number of instances the Credit Code actually weakens protections that are already in the laws of Massachusetts."

The Executive Secretary, Mr. Dermot P. Shea of the Council, stated that: "These are just some of the reasons why the Consumers' Council recommends that a thorough study be made in order to protect the rights of the citizens of the Commonwealth. This code might be suitable for other states that do not have the consumer protection credit laws that Massachusetts has, but it is not acceptable to the Consumer's Council as presently drafted."

CONGRESS SHOULD WORK ITS WILL ON SALARY INCREASES

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 178 calling for the disapproval of the salary increase proposal for certain officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government. This resolution was referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Since it is clear that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will not take this subject up prior to the deadline at which time the proposed increase will automatically become law by nonaction, I simultaneously introduced House Resolution 179 which was referred to the House Committee on Rules. This resolution, if favorably reported, would have the effect of bringing the question of the pending salary increase to the floor of the House for a vote.

The chairman of the Rules Committee has scheduled a hearing on this and other identical House resolutions for 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 5, 1969. I expect to appear before the Committee on Rules and to ask the committee to report such a resolution to the floor. The House can vote it up or down.

I do not think that a salary increase—amounting in one case to an increase of 171 percent of present salary—should become effective by congressional nonaction, and such an increase at a time when efforts should be made to reduce instead of increase Federal spending is outrageous.

The annual cost of the salary increases for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches is \$34,700,000. At a time when there is relatively little flexibility in our budget and when conflicting pressures are being exerted to both reduce Federal spending and to increase spending on certain programs, we cannot by nonaction authorize a salary increase of this magnitude with a clear conscience.

When this method of salary adjust-

ment was considered and the Presidential Commission was established by act of Congress in 1967, I opposed the legislation. I think that the creation of the Commission of Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries was unfortunate and constitutes a great mistake. To perpetuate the mistake instead of correcting it constitutes an unwillingness to face up to our responsibilities.

We have delegated our legislative authority and responsibility to an Executive Commission, and by doing so, have disclaimed ourselves of our responsibility to legislate important matters dealing with Federal expenditures. If the House of Representatives wants to approve the provisions of the Commission's report, that is a matter on which the House can and should work its will. The enactment of a salary increase amounting to more than \$35 million annually, however, should not, under any circumstances, be done by nonaction. It should be done only by a rollcall vote.

RECONSIDERATION URGED ON WHITE HOUSE USE OF FOREIGN PRODUCTS

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it is customary for the Congress to give a new administration a reasonable amount of time to get itself oriented, to reappraise past policies, to review its options, and then chart its course. I intend to follow this policy with regard to the Nixon administration.

Nevertheless, I intend also to speak out on issues of importance when the circumstances indicate to me that the administration is receiving bad advice.

One such circumstance apparently has developed already. I refer to an article which appeared in the Washington Post of Saturday, February 1, which contained a report of a formal reception of the diplomatic corps.

It seems to me that the new administration has blundered badly already by deciding to serve French champagne at the White House. I hope that this does not represent an abandonment of the policies of the two previous administrations, which not only were proud to serve American wines, brandies, and champagnes at the White House, but also insisted that American products be served at American posts overseas.

The first Saturday after assuming office President Nixon devoted to a review of our Southeast Asia policies. The second Saturday he devoted to Mideast policies. I hope that the President will set aside an early Saturday for a discussion of White House beverage policies.

I am confident that an unbiased review of this matter would show that unquestionably the best policy would be to serve good California beverages or, in a pinch, those produced in the State of New York, but in no event those products which come from the vineyards of Charles de Gaulle.

Because of my grave concern over this matter I am directing a letter to Presi-

dent Nixon asking that henceforth, where the fruit of the vine is concerned, only American products be used at official American functions.

PRIZEWINNING ESSAY BY MIKE BUNN

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, today, when the subject of crime is discussed so much, individually and through our news media, I would like to submit to you to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following essay written by one of my young constituents, Mike Bunn, a high school senior from Bartow, Fla. Mike won first place in the impromptu essay competition at the Key Club International Convention held in Montreal this past summer on the subject of "How We as Youth Can Prevent the Growth of Crime and Violence in Our Societies." I think that you will join me in applauding this young man's efforts to summarize how best youth—and I might add—adults might help in combating crime and violence in our society today. The essay appeared in the December 30, 1968, edition of one of our fine Florida newspapers, the Polk County Democrat, Bartow, Fla.

The essay follows:

PRIZEWINNING ESSAY: BARTOW KEY CLUBBER REFLECTS ON YOUTH LAW AND ORDER ROLE

Mike Bunn, a senior at Bartow high school, won first place in the impromptu essay competition at the Key Club International convention held in Montreal this past July.

In the contest, participants were given no advance warning concerning the topic, Mike's essay, which follows, was on the topic, "How we as youth can prevent the growth of crime and violence in our societies".

"Since history was first recorded, man has a record of crime and violence. When civilizations progressed to high levels, they made laws to protect their citizens by suppressing the animal character of man.

"But laws are not always obeyed nor is the animal nature of man tamed. Men strike out against each other in wrath and in jealousy. Men steal to live or for 'kicks'. They fail to see the obligation they have toward others.

"Today society tolerates crime or excuses criminals because they are underprivileged. Society first must change its attitudes before crime can be successfully combated.

"Youth will play an important role in the fight against crime. Men are not born thieves or murderers, but learn to steal or kill.

"It is the duty of the youth of a country to aid in the prevention of crime. Violence in modern society is inexcusable and should be dealt with promptly. The 'problem' children, the unreachables, must be brought back into society before they become threats to society.

"Only at a young age can the future criminals be reformed. Thus it will be their peers who must reach them. Example is the best of teachers; therefore youth must set a good example for the generation that follows. Friendship, too, must be given to the problem child; lack of social contact or lasting relationships with their fellow men can be seen in the depraved assassins of the last few years. Communication between individuals and between generations in society must be strengthened.

"Perhaps the greatest weapon against crime is respect. For if men respect the rights of each other how can they deny a man those rights or infringe on his personal freedom? A campaign among the youth of all nations

upholding the worth and dignity of the individual would do much to fight crime.

"Criminals should be justly punished on conviction, but when their debt is paid to society, they should be allowed to return as free of stigma as one who has never committed a crime.

"By making contacts with children in underprivileged areas, by setting a suitable example for our peers and the generations to come, by establishing better communications between individuals, and by campaigning for the dignity of all men, crime can be successfully fought. It is the young leaders of today who must fight for a better tomorrow. It is the work of today that assures the success of tomorrow."

RACIAL JUSTICE, NOT SEPARATISM

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, recent demands by Negroes for separatism are very disturbing. I have devoted much energy during my tenure in Congress, as have a great number of my colleagues, to assure the Negro a position of true equality in our society. I was pleased to find the following editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 27, 1969, dealing with this timely subject.

It is my hope that my colleagues will read this noteworthy editorial:

If the Negro wants to improve his lot, he should be concentrating on developing unity and racial dignity, not separatism. And whites could make an important contribution to the cause of equality by working to change the attitudes of friends and neighbors who are prejudiced.

This is the advice of two leaders here—Dr. Kenneth W. Clement of the Urban League and William Pickard of the NAACP—and it bears repeating.

Dr. Clement has joined civil rights leader Roy Wilkins and others in condemning racial separatism.

In view of the years of frustration and oppression, it is not difficult to see why some Negroes today are urging black separation with perhaps even the setting aside of entire states for Negroes.

But separatism is not the answer. Now, when the national conscience is awakening, is a time to strive for racial justice and a truly harmonious American society in which a man is not judged on the color of his skin.

This does not preclude the cultivation of racial pride in the Negro and the development of knowledge about his heritage. These are laudable goals and they should and can be attained within a single society, without whites and blacks going separate ways.

The Negro, however, is not the only one responsible for bringing about the transition. Whites hold the balance of power in this country and their commitment to racial equality is essential.

Pickard suggests that whites can help by changing the attitudes of fellow whites who are not sympathetic to the plight of the Negro. He is correct.

Prejudice must be actively combated. As fast as the walls of bigotry topple, the Negro will progress in his struggle. Every white who realizes this should be reasoning with his less enlightened neighbors.

POST APPROVES OF DISCIPLINING PEOPLE

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post now editorializes that free speech is rightfully subject to party punishment if essential to preservation of morale in the party.

I do not recall the Post editorializing against those free-speech dissenters who tore up the National Democratic Convention in Chicago.

On the other hand, they have eulogized Castro and even defended the Supreme Court in deciding that a Communist has a right to freedom of association and can work in a defense factory.

One wonders why the editors find no concern for the morale of the people. Should not the people—not the party—have the right to punish?

Who would the Post's editors suggest should pass on the morale of the party—news editors? Other politicians? My people's morale is low—but never beaten.

How would the Post define representative government? Of the people? Or of the party?

The editor of the paper who has been so prodigiously outspoken for free speech, dissent, and an alphabet of other rights suddenly finds more concern about party discipline than he does about the right of our people to vote—free from persecution, intimidation, or punishment.

Does the Washington Post now repudiate the one-man, one-vote theory?

Noteworthy, no suggestion was made of any constitutional provision, law, or statute as authority for the party action. The Post would seem to approve of making laws to fit the occasion and with retroactive effect.

In fact, the action the Post seeks to defend is at most unwritten political tradition or custom—which the same paper bitterly opposed when they moralized against racial segregation in the South as an evil institution of tradition or custom, which denied basic human rights.

A contradictory position from an oracle of the communication media. It even suggests additional punishment of my people by banishing them from the party altogether. Makes one wonder, would the Post extend its extremist logic to refuse the people of my district any representation in Congress because their philosophy of life and country may differ from the feelings of others, including the editorial policies of the Post?

But then, the Post is in the business of selling newspapers. And everyone knows in Washington, D.C., you can sell venom by turning your pen against the people of the South.

The editorial follows:

PARTY DISCIPLINE

The disciplined Congressman from Louisiana, John R. Rarick, missed the point when he said that he is a free American who has a right to support George Wallace if he wants to. Of course he has. But he can't claim all the privileges of a Democratic member of the House of Representatives when he insists on knitting his party in the back.

We think the action of the House Democrats in stripping Mr. Rarick of his seniority was not only fair but also essential to the preservation of morale in that party. Some allowance must be made for party members

who stand on the sidelines during a presidential contest because they cannot conscientiously go along with the nominee of their party. But open support of a rival is a breach of party discipline that cannot reasonably be tolerated. The Congressman from Louisiana will be fortunate if he loses only his seniority and not the right to masquerade under the Democratic label.

PATRIOTISM IS NOT DEAD

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend a magnificent program, "Salute to the Armed Forces," on November 1, 1968, conducted by the Aiken High School Band, faculty, and students. This was a half-time show dedicated to our Armed Forces at the Greenwood High-Aiken High football game. The following editorial appeared in the Aiken Standard and Review of November 6, 1968, and is a tribute to this splendid occasion:

AIKEN—U.S.A.

Though the prophets of gloom depict this era as one of darkness, hippies, yuppies, draft card burners and chaos, on Friday, November 1, at Aiken High School's Hagood Stadium, a light as strong as a laser beam appeared and proved that waving Old Glory is not as old fashioned as some would have you believe.

The Aiken High School band, faculty and students' "Salute To The Armed Forces" moved thousands of fans with a program as stirring as the Spirit of '76. Imagine, if you will, the theme songs of the United States Army, U.S. Marine Corps, United States Navy and United States Air Force being played by the spirited Aiken High School band as each of the Armed Forces Color Guards marched to take their positions on the center of the gridiron. What a magnificent display of the national colors. The stirring music of the Aiken High band brought everyone to their feet and as a welcome was thundered out by the students and fans, the roar became deafening and shattering. The tumultuous welcome for the color guards, the visiting Major General John C. T. Tillson III—Commanding General of Ft. Gordon—Mrs. J. C. T. Tillson, the 861st Radar Squadron, and the soldiers who are now in recuperation at Ft. Gordon Hospital certainly proved that Americans do care.

Following the very warm and dramatic welcome, 5000 fans came to a dead silence as a U.S. Army firing squad from Ft. Gordon echoed the valleys of a 21 gun salute. The silence as Old Glory was placed at half mast as the Bugler and echo sounded Taps made the night take on a reverence never to be forgotten. With this tribute to those who made the supreme sacrifice, the Aiken Band then marched forming a huge letter "A" to signify America, our wonderful country, under God, while the entire audience joined in singing "God Bless America" as 1000 and more American Flags waved.

Indeed, this is America and Aiken is fortunate to have the dedication of its youth, city officials and fraternal organizations who united as a community to pay homage to the greatest country in the world. Old Glory, long may it wave.

POLICE REPORTER

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

from 450 knots at about 250 feet to mach 1.56 at 36,000 feet over Texas, Oklahoma and Arkansas.

I admit that there was some difficulty in knowing over what States of the United States one was flying. Nevertheless it was a remarkable experience, and I personally say to the Parliament that I believe this aircraft to be the greatest flying machine of its type in the world today.

Acting upon the best advice they could get from the senior officers of the Royal Air Force, the colleagues of honourable members opposite in London, the Right Honourable Harold Wilson, Mr. Callaghan and Mr. Erown—all solid Labour men—made the decision to buy (the F-111) from the United States. They said to their own Air Force leaders: "What sort of aircraft will we need for the protection of the United Kingdom?" They were told that the TSR2 would be suitable and that, if they decided not to choose the aircraft built in Britain, without doubt the TFX (F111) should be chosen. They ordered fifty TFX (F111) aircraft from the United States. The Royal Air Force leaders today are crying because their Government lost the courage to try to find the money to buy this aeroplane. The Government of the United Kingdom came with great ease to the decision not to buy the TFX once it realised that it would no longer have a strategic need for the aircraft. The reason why the United Kingdom Government does not want an aircraft with the range, bomb load and other capabilities of the F111 is that Britain is now withdrawing into Europe, where it can rely on the Luftwaffe, which is the most powerful air force in the whole of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. Let us be clear about the situation: The United Kingdom does not need a strategic weapon of this sort. For this reason, added to the salient fact that it was short of money, it cancelled its order for the aeroplane.

I would like to discuss capability briefly. It will not benefit Australians generally or the people in this Parliament if we talk about the possibility of targets and look into a crystal ball in an attempt to find some strategic target that might be worthy of an atomic weapon. There is no merit in this. We seek to base our common defence on regional pacts in South East Asia. We seek to stand side by side with our friends in Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam and Singapore. We will co-operate with them in the future in the creation of the defence forces necessary to protect the area in which we live. We will be able to do this more effectively with a force of F111 aircraft under the control of Royal Australian Air Force pilots who have confidence and high morale and who have been trained to a high standard than we would be able to with any other aircraft that is operating in the world today. This aircraft is a fighter bomber which will be able to carry out a multiplicity of operations.

MARINE SANCTUARY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the weekend papers have been filled with reports and comments on the 10-mile oil slick which floats off the coast of southern California. Unfortunately, this is a story which many of us knew we would read about sooner or later.

In July 1967, I filed legislation which, if enacted, might have prevented such a tragedy. I urged then that ocean areas of vital economic and public concern, such

as Georges Bank—and, if the Secretary should so determine, the Santa Barbara Channel—be set aside by the Secretary of the Interior as a marine sanctuary. Under this concept, the Congress could indicate its concern and would accordingly protect wildlife, public recreation areas, and the fishing and beach resort industries. Unfortunately, the Department of the Interior opposed the bill, although it did indicate its interest in working out an acceptable redraft. Regrettably, they have not yet submitted anything to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I also introduced legislation in 1967—H.R. 16559—which would have given the President the authority to devise methods and provide resources to act quickly and effectively to combat oil spills and leaks whenever and wherever they endangered our seas and shores. Instead, the Nation had to settle for an Executive order that falls far short of what we need.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable CHARLES M. TEAGUE, recently introduced a bill to provide protection against oil pollution. Unfortunately, it is the shoreline of his district that may soon be littered with oil. Passage of my bill might have forestalled this tragedy.

This problem is not an isolated one. The threat of oil pollution faces other areas. In the waters off the Cape Cod National Seashore, oil companies are today conducting research looking for future oil rig sites. The oil industry has stated that the possibility of polluting the shores of Cape Cod and its adjacent waters is remote; it has claimed that there is no proof that contamination will take place when oil drilling sites are located near shore. Well, it has happened, and the proof that the oil industry is looking for is now all too evident along the Santa Barbara coast.

And so, Mr. Speaker, today I am referring a bill to provide for marine sanctuaries.

We in the Congress have the responsibility to cope with problems of this kind. We must find ways to deal with oil slicks of this magnitude. We must be concerned, also, with the safety and well-being of residents and workers who use these offshore areas. And we must, above all, for the sake of posterity, make certain that we balance the use of our Nation's resources.

I hope that the Merchant Marine Committee will take up this legislation at the earliest possible date. And I trust that Secretary Hickel and the new administration will take a positive and balanced approach to the whole subject.

PROPOSED PAY INCREASE

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been assuming that the House would have the opportunity to vote on the Federal pay raise proposal recommended by President Johnson. Delay in organizing the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to which the resolutions of dis-

approval have been referred, indicate to me that this opportunity is an uncertain one and that our time to act may run out unless we move quickly.

It would be unfortunate if no vote were taken. Apparently the Senate expects to vote, judging from weekend news reports, and that distinguished body's involvement in money matters is or should be less direct than ours. Pride in our own institution should lead us to do no less than the Senate in this respect, regardless of how justified we may feel the pay raise is. We made a mistake in giving control over the top level of Government pay to an executive commission; we should not compound that mistake now by putting our reliance in the other legislative body.

I understand there are those in the Rules Committee who are considering taking action to permit the House to work its will on this issue. Mr. Speaker, I want by these remarks to encourage them, and to urge my colleagues likewise to urge the procedural steps which could bring the resolution of disapproval to the floor.

I oppose the proposed pay increase primarily on economic grounds. Those of us who feel strongly that Government expenditures must be kept under strict control at this time if we are to slow inflation and hold the line on taxes, cannot help but view with misgiving the raising of the only effective ceiling on executive branch pay. This proposal, and the manner of its implementation, weaken the lever of congressional restraint when we should be strengthening it.

But even those who favor the pay increase owe it to themselves and to the public respect for our institution to ask for a specific opportunity to vote, rather than backing into an increase by inaction.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY INCREASE

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the Record my position on President Johnson's recommendations to increase congressional pay.

I have previously taken a stand against overinflation caused directly by overspending. By remaining silent, I would make myself a part of the problem itself.

I join with the Member from Indiana, Mr. DENNIS, in cosponsoring a resolution disapproving President Johnson's recommendations for additional salary.

As a new Congressman, I am put in a position of having to automatically ask for a pay raise for myself before I draw my first paycheck. In all good conscience I cannot do this. I shall vote against the increase.

PROTESTING HANGING OF JEWS IN IRAQ

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, in the name

of humanity, I wish to register my protest against the recent public hanging of the nine Jews in Iraq.

This is a step backward in civilization—a step away from eventual peace in the Middle East—a step back in the Dark Ages.

I extend my sympathy to family, friends, and kinsmen of these citizens of Iraq, and join with men of good will all over the world in pledging to work actively against these hasty and inhumane actions, wherever and whenever they occur.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President.

It would combine apportionment of electoral votes to States on the basis of their representation in Congress with a direct election process which would be invoked if no presidential candidacy received a majority of electoral votes.

The amendment would eliminate the electoral college and with this the "faithless" elector. It retains the long-established concept of a federal system by continuing to assign to each State one electoral vote for each Member of the Senate and House. It continues the award of all electoral votes apportioned to a State to candidates receiving the largest number of popular votes for President and Vice President.

It provides, however, that in the event no candidacy receives a majority of electoral votes, victory goes to persons receiving the greatest number of popular votes for President and Vice President. This provision may appeal to proponents of a direct election system who object quite rightly to the present process under which the House could elect as President any one of the three candidates receiving the highest numbers of electoral votes, in the event of an electoral college deadlock.

History suggests this provision would rarely, if ever, be invoked. Not since the Adams-Jackson election of 1824 has a presidential candidate failed to receive a majority of electoral votes, although there have been close calls.

My amendment would remove any uncertainties which could arise under the present system by directing that Congress shall "provide procedures to be followed in consequence of the death or withdrawal of a candidate on or before the date of an election," or in the case of a tie.

There is general agreement that the present system of electing the President and Vice President needs reform. There seems to be no solid consensus, however, concerning any one of the several alternative proposals which have been put forward.

There may be so much debate over the size and shape of the table that pro-

ponents of a change will never get around to agreeing upon a constitutional amendment Congress would approve or the States would ratify. This possibility is reinforced by the fact that of the several hundred attempts, over the past 165 years, to reform the electoral college system, most got nowhere at all and only a handful moved through even a single branch of the Congress.

Unless there can be devised a constitutional amendment which will meet the test of acceptance, this newest quest for electoral reform will be nothing more than another exercise in futility.

I believe the smaller States would ratify an amendment preserving the electoral strength they now have under the federal system, even though it contained this provision for a decision on a popular vote basis in the event of an electoral vote deadlock. As the attached table shows, 36 of the 50 States now have electoral vote representation which exceeds—from slightly to greatly—the weight their respective populations would give them under the direct election process.

Based on the 1960 census, Alaska, for example, has a ratio of 1 electoral vote to 75,380 people. My State of North Dakota has a ratio of 1 to 158,112. For California, the ratio is 1 to 392,930. Abandonment of the electoral vote system in favor of the direct election process would diminish by more than one-half North Dakota's present voice in the selection of a President.

I do not believe the smaller States would willingly surrender the protection they have under the Federal system any more quickly than they could be persuaded to give up their present basis of representation in the U.S. Senate.

During Senate debate on proposed electoral system reform in March 1956, the then Senator from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, spoke specifically on the question of direct elections:

On theoretical grounds it seems to me it would be a breach of the agreement made with the States when they came into the Union. At that time it was understood that they would have the same number of electoral votes as they had Senators and Representatives.

Expanding on this, he said:

After all the States came into the Union as units. Electoral votes are not given out on the basis of the voting numbers, but on the basis of population. The electoral votes belong to each State. The way the system works now is that we carry on a campaign in 48 States, and the electoral votes of that State belong to that party which carries that State. If we are going to change that system, it seems to me it would strike a blow at States rights in major proportions. It would probably end States rights and make this country one great unit.

Had my proposed amendment been in force through the years, it would certainly have changed only one election. The election of 1824 would have gone to Jackson. It probably would have reversed the outcome of the Tilden-Hayes election, because there would have been no disputed electors. It would not have changed the outcome of the 1888 Harrison-Cleveland election, in which Cleveland polled about 100,000 more popular

votes but lost to Harrison by 65 electoral votes.

Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the ratio of electoral votes to population in each State for 1964 and 1968 presidential elections—based on 1960 census:

Rank and State:	Ratio
1. Alaska	75,380
2. Nevada	95,093
3. Wyoming	110,022
4. Vermont	129,960
5. Delaware	149,764
6. New Hampshire	151,730
7. North Dakota	158,112
8. Hawaii	158,193
9. Idaho	166,798
10. Montana	168,692
11. South Dakota	170,129
12. Rhode Island	214,872
13. Utah	222,657
14. New Mexico	237,756
15. Maine	242,316
16. District of Columbia	254,652
17. Arizona	260,452
18. West Virginia	265,774
19. Nebraska	282,266
20. Oklahoma	291,036
21. Colorado	292,325
22. Oregon	294,781
23. Arkansas	297,712
24. South Carolina	297,824
25. Iowa	306,369
26. Maryland	310,069
27. Mississippi	311,163
28. Kansas	311,230
29. Connecticut	316,904
30. Washington	317,024
31. Tennessee	324,281
32. Louisiana	325,702
33. Alabama	326,674
34. Georgia	328,593
35. Wisconsin	329,315
36. Virginia	330,579
36. National average	333,314
37. Kentucky	337,573
38. Minnesota	341,386
39. North Carolina	350,473
40. Florida	353,682
41. New Jersey	356,870
42. Indiana	358,554
43. Missouri	359,984
44. Massachusetts	359,984
45. Michigan	372,533
46. Ohio	373,325
47. Texas	383,187
48. Illinois	387,736
49. New York	390,286
50. Pennsylvania	390,323
51. California	392,930

The text of the joint resolution I am offering follows:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of final passage of this joint resolution:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice President chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President.

"Sec. 2. An election shall be held in each State and in the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States (re-

ferred to in this article as the 'District') to determine which candidates for the office of President and Vice President are entitled to the electoral votes of such State or the District. An election held pursuant to this section shall be held on a day which is uniform throughout the United States, determined in such manner as the Congress shall by law prescribe. The Congress shall prescribe by law the time, place, and manner in which the results of an election held pursuant to this article shall be ascertained and declared.

"Sec. 3. The law of each State shall govern within such State as to any matter with respect to which the Congress is granted legislative power under the next sentence, but only to the extent that such State law is not inconsistent with any Act of Congress in effect pursuant to that sentence. In the case of any election in a State under this article, the Congress shall have power to provide by law for the places at which and the manner in which the election shall be held. The Congress shall by law prescribe the places at which and the manner in which an election required by this article shall be held in the District.

"Sec. 4. The qualifications for voters in any State in an election held pursuant to this article shall be the same as apply in the case of voters in such State in elections of Senators under the Constitution, except that any State may prescribe a residence qualification less restrictive than that which applies in such State with respect to voters in elections of Senators. The Congress shall by law prescribe the qualifications for voters in the District in an election held pursuant to this article.

"Sec. 5. In each election held pursuant to this article a vote may be cast only as a joint vote for the election of two persons (referred to in this article as a 'presidential candidacy') one of whom has consented that his name appear as candidate for President or the ballot with the name of the other as candidate for Vice President, and the other of whom has consented that his name appear as candidate for Vice President on the ballot with the name of the other as candidate for President. No person may consent to have his name appear on the ballot with more than one other person. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this section by appropriate legislation.

"Sec. 6. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress. The District shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State. In the case of each State and the District, the presidential candidacy receiving the greatest number of votes shall be entitled to the whole number of the electoral votes of such State or District. If a presidential candidacy receives a majority of the electoral votes, the persons comprising such candidacy shall be the President-elect and the Vice President-elect. If no presidential candidacy receives a majority of the electoral votes, the persons comprising the presidential candidacy which received the greatest number of popular votes in the election held pursuant to section 2 of this article shall become the President-elect and the Vice President-elect.

"Sec. 7. The Congress shall by law provide procedures to be followed in consequence of the death or withdrawal of a candidate on or before the date of an election under this article, or in the case of a tie.

"Sec. 8. The first four paragraphs of section 1 of article II of the Constitution, the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution and the

twenty-third article of amendment to the Constitution are repealed.

"Sec. 9. This article shall not apply to any election of the President or Vice President for a term of office beginning earlier than two years after the date of ratification of this article."

This constitutional amendment would:

First. Preserve the long-established concept of the federal system by continuing to assign each State one electoral vote for each of its two U.S. Senators and one vote for each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. For the District of Columbia, the number of electoral votes would be equal to the number it would be allocated if it were represented in Congress in the same way as the 50 States, "but in no event more than the least populous State."

Second. Abolish the electoral college but retain the present system of awarding all electoral votes apportioned to each State to the candidates receiving the largest number of popular votes for President and Vice President. Under my amendment, Congress would "prescribe by law the time, place and manner in which the results of an election held pursuant to this article shall be ascertained and declared." This would remove a basic objection to the present system under which the "faithless" elector can cast his vote for candidates other than those on whose slate he ran. It would also eliminate the present possibility that a President and Vice President of different political parties could be elected at the same time.

Third. Prevent any possible deadlock by providing that if no presidential candidacy receives a majority of electoral votes, the "persons comprising the presidential candidacy which received the greatest number of popular votes in the election, shall become the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect." This would eliminate the present provision under which selection of the Nation's Chief Executive would then fall to the House of Representatives or the Senate—through election of a Vice President. This provision should calm the fears of proponents of a direct election system who are rightly apprehensive of the present method which makes it possible for any one of the three presidential candidates receiving the highest numbers of electoral votes to be elected by the House.

Fourth. Remove the uncertainties which could arise under the present system by directing that Congress shall "provide procedures to be followed in consequence of the death or withdrawal of a candidate on or before the date of an election under this article, or in the case of a tie."

Fifth. Offer an alternative which stands a strong chance of being ratified by the required three-fourths of the States. It seems unlikely the smaller States are prepared to accept a diminished voice in the selection of the President and Vice President, as they clearly would under either the direct or proportional election systems which are being proposed. My amendment preserves the principle of federalism in the selection of the Nation's two top officials. The smaller States are no more ready to surrender

this principle than they are to surrender their constitutional right to elect two Members of the U.S. Senate.

Despite its obvious imperfections, the electoral college system has functioned remarkably well. It clearly misfired 144 years ago when John Quincy Adams was elected President over Andrew Jackson, who had received more electoral votes, as well as more popular votes, than his opponents.

During the next 144 years there were two cases in which the candidate receiving a majority of electoral college votes won fewer popular votes than his opponent. In 1876 Samuel J. Tilden received about 250,000 more popular votes than Rutherford B. Hayes, but lost by one electoral vote. In 1888 Grover Cleveland polled about 100,000 more popular votes than Benjamin Harrison, but Harrison received 65 more electoral votes. In all other presidential elections, including the close ones of 1960 and 1968, the candidate with the largest number of popular votes received a majority in the electoral college.

Under my amendment the 1824 election would have gone to Jackson. Tilden probably would have been elected in 1876, because there would have been no disputed electoral votes. Result of the Harrison-Cleveland contest would not have been changed. Had a direct election system been in effect, Jackson, Tilden, and Cleveland would have won.

The proportional system would also have changed the results of at least two past presidential elections. "Proposals To Reform Our Electoral System," a study published by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, says:

In at least two elections since 1860, proportionate distribution would have given the Presidency to a minority candidate who was defeated under the present system. In 1860 Winfield S. Hancock had over 7,000 fewer votes than James A. Garfield, but he would have won by a margin of 6 to 8 electoral votes if proportionate distribution had been in effect. In 1896 William Jennings Bryan won less than 47 per cent of the popular vote but William McKinley's nearly 51 per cent, but proportionate distribution would have given him an electoral vote margin of 6. Although Bryan carried only 17 States, 11 of them were in the South. McKinley carried 23 States in other sections of the country, but under the proportional system he would have lost many more electoral votes outside the South because of Democratic minority votes than he would have gained from Republican minority votes in the solidly Democratic South, and he would have lost the election.

The same publication notes that under the "district" system, which allocates most of the electoral votes on a congressional district basis, results of presidential elections from 1916 through 1964 would not have been changed, except in one case—1960. Under the present system John F. Kennedy won 303 electoral votes to Richard M. Nixon's 219. Under the district system Nixon would have received 280 electoral votes to Kennedy's 254.

Several of the proposals put forward in connection with both direct and proportional elections call for a runoff election if the candidate fails to receive at least 40 percent of the popular or proportional vote. The amendment I have

proposed contains no provision for a runoff in the event that no candidate receives a majority of electoral votes and final determination of the winner is made on the basis of the popular vote.

There are two reasons for this omission. First, it is unlikely that the leading candidate under any of the proposed amendments would have less than 40 percent of either the popular or electoral votes. The electoral college method of electing a President has governed 46 elections, including 1968. In only one case—Abraham Lincoln in 1860—did the top vote-getter receive less than 40 percent of the popular vote. Lincoln's percentage was 39.79, but he was not on the ballot in 10 States. Second, in the unlikely event of a runoff under the 40-percent provision, there would be a period of prolonged uncertainty—weeks, if not months—over who the new President would be. Such a transition gap would be extremely dangerous in this age. Moreover, in a runoff election which might come in midwinter, weather conditions could well disfranchise large numbers of voters.

The amendment I am introducing is quite similar, with one exception, to the proposal drafted by the Honorable HALE BOGES, assistant majority leader of the House. My amendment additionally provides for what amounts to a direct election of the President and Vice President in the event that no candidacy receives an electoral vote majority. As I noted earlier, this has happened only once in 144 years. The gentleman from Louisiana makes what I believe is a convincing case for retention of our electoral system. He says:

This proposal will remove the evils of the present system while maintaining our Federalism. Of course, any role of the House of Representatives will be removed once and for all.

I see no other logical approach, in view of the fact that the candidates of our two major parties are nominated by conventions with delegates elected either in primaries or in conventions in the respective 50 States and the District of Columbia. Thus, Federalism is still basic in the nomination of a Presidential candidate. It should be so in the election. I doubt that the system could be maintained with a direct popular vote.

In March 1956, when several proposed electoral reform amendments were being debated, John F. Kennedy, then a U.S. Senator, strongly opposed any changes which would scrap the allocation of electoral votes to the States on the basis of their congressional representation. He spoke against both the direct election and proportional representation systems, as well as against the district system. He said:

I think we would do well not to abandon the present system. There is an old saying to the effect that one should not take down a fence until he knows why it was put up. In my case, I would be reluctant to take down a fence which has served us pretty well in the past.

Speaking specifically on the direct election proposal, Senator Kennedy said:

On theoretical grounds it seems to me it would be a breach of the agreement made with the States when they came into the Union. At that time it was understood that they would have the same number of elec-

toral votes as they had Senators and Representatives.

Expanding on this, he said:

After all, the States came into the Union as units. Electoral votes are not given out on the basis of the voting numbers, but on the basis of population. The electoral votes belong to each State. The way the system works now is that we carry on a campaign in 48 States, and the electoral votes of that State belong to that party which carries each State. If we are going to change that system, it seems to me it would strike a blow at States rights in major proportions. It would probably end States rights and make this country one great unit.

Senator Kennedy feared, and I believe rightly, that "under the proportional system, splinter parties would be greatly encouraged." I think the same argument is valid in connection with the direct election system. It was Senator Kennedy's contention that under the electoral vote system "various minority pressure groups are discouraged from forming their own party." He added:

Thus they find it necessary to work within the two major parties, moderating their own narrow policies to fit the party structure. Thus the American preference for moderation instead of extremities is continued. But the proportional voting system would enable any number of parties able to attract a sufficient number of its own adherents within a single State to obtain official electoral vote recognition never before possible, and by awarding them electoral votes it will give to such splinter groups a new power they may use to coerce one of the major parties to accede to their demands.

Senator Kennedy had this comment on the contention that the electoral vote system "disfranchises" voters:

The report alleges that millions of voters are disenfranchised under the prevailing system of winner take all, inasmuch as all those who cast votes for the presidential nominee Senator on this floor "might just as well have stayed home. In a sense, that is true, although it is hardly a deterrent on voters hoping to win the State for their candidate—but it is also true of every election for every office under any system other than the European system of proportional representation. Those who voted for the opponent of any Senator on this floor "might just as well have stayed home," too—for, of course, the winner takes all, and those votes are to no avail. Even under Senate Joint Resolution 31 the winner of the presidential race is going to take all—and all the votes cast by his opponent, in that sense, will have been wasted. Indeed, one of the dangers of Senate Joint Resolution 31 is that it may undermine the winner-take-all idea in other spheres—and we will then have a plural executive and a proportionately represented Congress, in which no one's vote is lost but in which no one has any confidence.

Confronted with the fact that winner take all within each State is the accepted system in practically all American elections, proponents then reply that they mean to abolish State lines for purposes of presidential elections, so that each pocket of minority votes within each State can be counted in electoral votes to be added to those from pockets of votes within other States. This is a revolutionary change in our Federal system, and it violates the basic premise that each State acts as a unit in its relations with the Central Government. That is the way the Constitution was ratified; that is the way constitutional amendments are approved—not by pooling the negative votes cast in the legislatures of each State. That is the way the Senate is constituted—even when the

party with the fewer Senators elected received, in all senatorial elections combined, the most votes cast. And that is the way our Presidents have been, and should continue to be, elected.

HON. GUY GILLETTE CELEBRATES 90TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the birthday of a truly outstanding American statesman, the Honorable Guy Gillette, former U.S. Congressman and Senator. Senator Gillette is celebrating his 90th birthday in Cherokee, Iowa, the place of his birth on February 3, 1879, and the place which he has called home ever since.

Guy Gillette began a distinguished career serving the people of northwest Iowa as a lawyer and county attorney in Cherokee County and then as a State senator. He was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1932. At that time he represented the 13 counties of the then Ninth District of Iowa in the 73d Congress. Twelve of those counties are in the present Sixth District which I am privileged to represent.

After representing his district with great distinction for two terms in the House, Guy Gillette was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1936. With the exception of one 4-year period, he served in the Senate until January 1955, when he retired from Government service.

While he made outstanding contributions in many areas, Senator Gillette was perhaps best known for his work on the Foreign Relations Committee. His eloquent voice was one of the most influential in the discussions which led to the organization of the United Nations after the Second World War. During a 4-year absence from the Senate from 1945-49 he remained actively involved in public affairs carrying out a series of highly important special assignments for Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. When he again ran for the Senate in 1948, he won with the highest majority which had ever been received by a senatorial candidate in the history of Iowa.

In and out of public service Guy Gillette has proved himself worthy of the title "Citizen of the Republic" and a true humanitarian. One of his outstanding characteristics has been a commanding appearance, dignified and quietly impressive, earning him the respect and attention of all who heard him.

I well remember what I believe was his last public appearance before he was stricken by illness in the fall of 1966. Guy Gillette very fittingly was invited to give the principal address at the dedication of the new Cherokee County Courthouse on October 16. As he spoke all of us who were privileged to hear him knew that we were in the presence of greatness.

Not only all Iowans but all Americans should be grateful for his outstanding record of service to our State and Nation. But we in northwest Iowa have a special claim on Guy Gillette, as he has on us. I know that the Senator will be receiving many tributes and greetings

on this his 90th birthday, and I am proud to add mine as a former constituent and longtime admirer and friend. And I cordially invite my colleagues to join me in wishing our distinguished former Member, Senator Guy Gillette, a very happy 90th birthday.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED ACTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY ON THE SOYBEAN INDUSTRY

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I should consider it of great importance that I call to the attention of the Congress the very real concern of the soybean industry over the proposed actions of the European Economic Community.

On December 10, 1968, Mr. Sisco Mansholt, vice president of the European Economic Community's Commission for Agriculture, made several proposals for restructuring the agriculture of the Common Market. One of these proposals sent shock waves throughout the length and breadth of not only the 17th Congressional District of Illinois, but throughout the 30 soybean States of the Nation.

All segments of the soybean industry are deeply concerned about the proposed actions of the European Economic Community as they affect soybean oil and soybean meal.

The European Economic Community now has under very serious consideration an internal tax on soybean oil of \$60 per metric ton, and one on soybean meal of \$30 per metric ton. The purpose of these internal taxes is to raise the price and thereby deliberately reduce the import demand for high protein feeds in the EEC. The net effect of these proposed taxes, especially as they relate to soybean meal will be to reduce the importation of soybeans and soybean meal from the United States by the European Economic Community.

During the last marketing year, the European Economic Community purchased about 93 million bushels of soybeans and 2,063,000 short tons of soybean meal from the United States. All of these sales were for dollars, and returned approximately \$500 million in hard currency to the U.S. economy. A loss of a major share of this market would adversely affect our balance of payments.

During the 1967-68 marketing year these exports to the EEC amounted to about 31 percent of the soybeans exported from the United States, and 70 percent of the soybean meal exported.

Competent economists advise me that the proposed internal taxes, especially as they relate to soybean meal, will reduce consumption within the European Economic Community by the equivalent of about 60 million bushels of soybeans. This is the production from over 2 million acres of soybeans. Such a loss of market would have deleterious effects upon the U.S. soybean producer, processor and

distributor. The futures markets would be adversely affected.

This is especially catastrophic in view of the increasing carryover of soybeans which by the end of the current marketing year will amount to 315 million bushels—over 10 times the level at the end of the 1964 marketing year.

In addition, the loss of this market would result in a further sharp increase in the budgetary outlays for soybean price support by some \$150 million. By the end of this marketing year, CCC will have invested some \$700 million in soybeans—under current conditions.

Reduced processing and transportation will sharply curtail labor requirements. I know that my friends in the labor group are conscious of this.

I know that the executive branch of the U.S. Government has protested, and will continue its protest against this proposal in the strongest possible terms. There is unanimity on this issue between the various agencies of the executive branch. Every objective student of this matter knows that this proposal would seriously impair present conditions of access negotiated between the EEC and the U.S. Government.

I would urge the executive branch to take the position that such action would result in a swift reprisal in restoring the balance of trade; for the proposed tax is a violation of the recently concluded GATT negotiations. The proposed items for increased duty have been bound against increase in these negotiations. Soybeans, cottonseed, rapeseed, and all oilcake and meal are bound at zero to the United States. The edible oils are dutiable at rates ranging from 8 to 15 percent.

I want to make one point abundantly clear. I do not intend to stand idly by while this effort is being made to shift the costs of helping EEC agriculture to the backs of the American farmer, U.S. agribusiness, American labor, and the U.S. Treasury.

This whole matter is of such serious consequence that I believe our House Committee on Agriculture should hold a hearing on the subject. Such a hearing would be of value not only to acquaint all the members of that committee with the seriousness of the proposed taxes, but would also give impetus to representations being made by the executive branch of the Government to the EEC countries. After looking into this matter the Agriculture Committee may have a recommendation of action that could be taken by the executive branch as well as the Congress.

WHY REAPPOINT FAUNTROY?

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, serious consideration by the Nixon administration to the reappointment of the Reverend Walter Fauntroy to the Washington, D.C., City Council is "incredible."

As a member of the Black United Front, a group organized and headed by

Stokely Carmichael, and while serving as Vice Chairman of the City Council, Fauntroy attempted to wear "two hats" which frequently embarrassed and handicapped the operation of the government of the Nation's Capital.

The history of Reverend Fauntroy's ineffectiveness as a mediator between black militants and the law-abiding citizens is well documented. In fact, the record indicates that he was more often a "convenient tool" of the militants than a public official who could effectively bridge the various segments in the city.

During the riots last spring, Reverend Fauntroy was ignored and laughed off the television screen when he pleaded with the rioters and looters to "cool it."

Fauntroy was a key figure in the formation and establishment of the infamous Resurrection City, an administrative debacle, which eventually degenerated into a disgraceful "island of lawlessness."

The reappointment of Reverend Fauntroy to the City Council would sabotage and undermine President Nixon's District of Columbia anticrime program.

The present low morale of law-enforcement officers in the District could not be expected to change if Fauntroy, a top official in the Black United Front, an organization guilty of calling a murdered local police officer "justifiable homicide," continues in office.

There are many qualified citizens of every race, color, and creed who could serve on the District of Columbia City Council with the complete dedication and responsibility the position demands. What reason can there be to turn again to one who has been more often a source of embarrassment than of leadership?

All evidence surrounding the reappointment of Fauntroy as a member of the Council proves that the citizens of the District do not approve of his actions and that his continued service in this capacity will only undermine and weaken the city government.

HORTON BILL EXCLUDES SPORTS AWARDS FROM TAXABLE INCOME

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this year when the winners of the Nobel Prizes are announced, these cash awards and other prizes for high achievement in science, art, music, literature, and civic affairs will be excludable from gross income under section 74(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

However, in a Nation which places great importance on physical fitness, teamwork, and sportsmanlike competition, awards for athletic achievement are taxed as ordinary income. This is true even when the award, unlike the cash Nobel Prize, has no utilitarian value.

Today I am proposing a measure to add "sports" to the categories of awards excludable under section 74(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. This will include athletic awards given for overall

sports achievement, not the cash awards and trophies given for victory in a particular contest or series of contests.

This inequity in our Internal Revenue Code was brought to my attention last year by a tax court decision on the suit brought by Mr. Maurice Wills against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue after a deficiency claim had been asserted against him for the 1963 tax year.

This claim was asserted, Mr. Speaker, because Mr. Wills did not include in his taxable income several awards which he had been given as a result of outstanding performance as a baseball player with the Los Angeles Dodgers in 1963.

Among these awards was the S. Rae Hickok belt, a jewel-studded belt which is presented each year to the Nation's outstanding professional athlete.

This coveted award is given in recognition of overall excellence in athletic performance and achievement. Its value is primarily symbolic, recognizing the recipient as a champion among champions. Although the Hickok belt cost \$10,000 to manufacture, it provides no direct financial gain to the recipient.

Nevertheless, the Tax Court ruled that the recipient of the S. Rae Hickok belt was liable for tax on the value of the components of the belt.

The effect of this decision, Mr. Speaker, created a serious uncertainty about the taxability of all other amateur and professional sports awards.

Even though the Tax Court decision correctly interpreted the law as it is presently written, I do not feel that our tax laws ever intended that athletic achievement is to be discriminated from achievement in other fields or that it was to penalize champion athletes through tax liability for nonutilitarian awards.

When the purpose of the trophy is honorary and decorative, the payment of a tax on its component value imposes a serious financial burden upon its recipient.

The bill I am introducing today would amend section 74(b) of the Internal Revenue Code to include within its coverage certain awards and prizes received by athletes.

Section 74(b) already excludes from gross income the value of certain prizes and awards granted in recognition of achievements in the fields of art, music, literature, religion, charity, science, and civic achievement.

In addition, section 74(b) of the Internal Revenue Code requires that the recipient must not be required to render substantial future service as a condition precedent to receiving the award, or have entered into competition for the award.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would extend this category to include sports awards with the same limitations and conditions. When an American athlete has lived up to the finest traditions of American sports and sportsmanship and excelled in his particular sport, he is an inspiration to millions of young, aspiring athletes.

Tonight, Ray and Alan Hickok of the Hickok Manufacturing Co., in Rochester, N.Y., are awarding this year's S. Rae

Hickok belt. To require the winning athlete whoever he will be, to pay for the privilege of retaining his trophy is, in effect, discrimination in our tax laws.

The Ways and Means Committee will shortly be holding hearings on tax reform. I feel this is a particularly fitting occasion to ask my colleagues to join with me in support of this bill to extend to our outstanding athletes the same privileges, honors, and tax benefits, that we extend to those who achieve national recognition in the arts and sciences.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD MAKES INTERESTING READING

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a most historic and interesting document. As Representative to Congress, I am confident that all of us realize the RECORD's importance in performing our daily tasks.

Mr. Speaker on January 16, 1969, the Upper Arlington News, published in a progressive municipality in the district I have the honor to represent, carried an article entitled "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Makes Interesting Reading."

The author is Dr. Ruth Browning of the Upper Arlington Library Reference Department.

Demonstrating how the RECORD is put to good use in one community library, I am confident that republication here of Dr. Browning's article will suggest greater and better use in libraries elsewhere:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD MAKES INTERESTING READING

(By Dr. Ruth Browning)

Anyone not actually acquainted with the Congressional Record might be inclined to assume that the proceedings and debates of our national legislature would make dull reading. However, when one digs into these daily reports from Congress (Upper Arlington Public Library receives the Congressional Record through the courtesy of the Honorable Chalmers P. Wylie; our thanks to Congressman Wylie!), one discovers some very interesting reading material.

Even a quick glance at the opening paragraphs of Vol. 115, No. 1, the Record for Jan. 3, gives us a clear picture of our national life. This is revealed both through the phraseology used and through the activity reported: "The 3d of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the 91st Congress commenced this day." The present concern of our country for "togetherness" comes through in the prayer of the Chaplain of the Senate, the Rev. Fred Brown Harris, as reported in the Record: "In this high hour, may there be lifted at the very beginning of this session the fervent petition whose melody makes us one—God bless America."

The wide range of congressional concerns, and hence, also, of reading matter in the Congressional Record can be seen in these "random" selections of some of the speeches printed in the Jan. 3 issue: "Recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries" ("required reading" for everyone interested in libraries); "Tax Relief for America's Hard-Pressed Middle-Income Taxpayers" (of interest to quite a few people); "Apollo 8: Fantastic Voyage" (of interest to all Americans).

Presumably, the Congressional Record is a complete, verbatim account of the words spoken in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, but actually the remarks are revised and edited before printing. The Record also contains many speeches not delivered before the legislative body, but inserted in the Record under the congressman's "leave to print" privilege. Included also are the president's messages and records of votes on bills (though not the text of the bills).

Library patrons who wish to have other current information on Congressional activity can find this in the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report and the Congressional Quarterly Almanac. The Almanac, published annually, sums up the year in politics, in Congress, and in the presidency. It provides a permanent record of the United States governmental and political action. The Weekly Reports, on which the Almanac is later based, keep the reader up-to-date on political affairs. Evaluating these reports, Dean Louis Shores in Basic Reference Sources says, "All of the reporting, although detailed, is free from bias and is readable."

Two other significant sources of information on congressional matters are available in the Reference Room at the Tremont Library: the Congressional Index, published by Commerce Clearing House, and the Congressional Directory. The latter is an official directory of the Congress, giving biographical sketches of the congressmen, information about the organization and personnel of the executive and judiciary branches of the government also, maps of the Congressional Districts, and other useful information.

The Congressional Index contains weekly reports in loose-leaf format which provides an index to all congressional bills and resolutions of general interest. The Index makes possible quick research on the status of pending legislation and provides the researcher with information on individual voting records.

Students who are particularly concerned with the "pros" and "cons" of legislative activity are finding the Congressional Digest a helpful resource. This independent monthly (really 10 times a year) features controversies in Congress. Among the 1968 topics dealt with by the Digest were the following controversies: "Community Action Programs"; "Federal Anti-Riot Legislation"; "Public Welfare Revision"; and "Revision of the Military Draft." The Congressional Digest is not an official organ of the Congress and as an independent publication it disclaims control "by any party, interest, class or sect."

In the Reading Room at Tremont Library in addition to the Congressional Digest is the Kiplinger Washington Letter which discusses current events and the future "outlook" in the area of business, labor, legislation, and politics.

Among the books now being added to the Reference Room collection is a 14-volume set of the United States Code, 1964 Edition, which contains the general and permanent laws of the United States in force Jan. 3, 1965. Two Supplements contain the laws enacted during the 89th and 90th Congress.

Any way you look at it—through the legislation enacted by Congress in the past, or through the debating and legislating by Congress in the present—the "Congressional record" does make interesting, and important, reading for all Americans.

ALL-VOLUNTEER MILITARY FORCE

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker,

since 1940, with the exception of one brief period from March 1947 to June 1948, this Nation has had a military conscription policy. As we have come to realize, the 1940 peacetime draft, which was viewed as a temporary conscription, has become, for all practical purposes, institutionalized as a permanent fixture in American life. An entire generation of young men have almost reached maturity without knowing a time when the draft did not exist.

By the early 1960's however, the principles that guided our military conscription policy, stemming from the experiences derived from World War II, were no longer applicable. In 1940, the need for an enormous expansion of our Armed Forces was readily apparent; the 300,000 men then under arms were clearly inadequate to insure even neutrality. The country, just beginning to recover from a 10-year depression, did not have the wealth to bid competitively in the labor market for the military manpower that was necessary to secure our defenses. Because of the imminent danger of war, the overriding need of national security demanded that our citizens be deprived of some liberty in the interests of vanquishing a greater evil. Thus, in view of the probability that the demand for this military buildup would utilize all available human resources and the inability to meet it by other than summary means, some form of draft was the only plausible step at that time. Under such conditions, a peacetime conscription, which inherently deprives men of freedom and the direction and control of their own lives, can be justified by what James Madison spoke of as "the impulse of self-preservation."

In the absence of such overriding circumstances, however, the draft becomes intolerable. A peacetime draft, an alien institution in American life, is absolutely opposed to the principles which have always been considered a part of American democracy. Compulsory military service not only results in a severe deprivation of civil liberties, it is also a wrenching departure from the traditional American ideal of liberty and this Nation's most cherished heritage, that of personal freedom.

Furthermore, any system of compulsory military service that selects some and not others cannot be justified under the American concept of justice and equality under law. Approximately 1.8 million young men are being added to the 1½ to 26 draft-age pool. This figure will climb to 2.1 million by 1974. As a consequence of this growing population, the percentage of the Nation's manpower in the draft ages who have entered the service, voluntarily or otherwise, has steadily declined, from 57.7 percent in 1962 to 46.4 percent in 1966. By 1974, this figure will decrease to 34 percent according to Department of Defense projections. As a result, the system which selects the few who are required to serve when many are available has become notoriously inequitable, and perpetuates the discrimination resulting from economic and educational disadvantages within our society for it is a disproportionate number of Negroes, the poor, and the uneducated who are conscripted.

Another disturbing factor associated with the draft is that a number of local draft boards have unlawfully suppressed criticism of the Government's involvement in Vietnam by reclassifying those who protest this policy. Of all our constitutional rights, the freedoms of speech and of assembly are the most perishable, yet the most vital to the preservation of American democracy. Once the erosion of these rights is permitted to begin, it is exceedingly difficult to halt, and the intervening damage may be irreparable. The free expression of views on issues of national importance must never be jeopardized and the reclassification of college students was nothing more than blatantly using the threat of the draft to stifle the first amendment rights of free speech.

The draft, also, is inefficient, both economically and militarily. Military strategy and tactics are continually undergoing radical changes in anticipation of future developments. America's defenses now are so complex, the demands for highly skilled and specialized manpower so great, that the old-fashioned conscript army in which men serve short terms of duty, is less and less suited to the needs of the modern age and it is more and more expensive to maintain. Two years service is by no means sufficient for the making of a competent soldier in a highly technological age. Yet, young men are drafted and sent through costly military training, with the end result being that 93 percent of the conscripts, many employed in distinctly non-military tasks, leave after their 2 years.

The mission of the Defense Department is to make the National Defense Establishment as efficient as possible. Yet, strangely enough, the principles and practices which guide the recruitment, motivation, compensation, and development of men have not changed substantially or kept pace with other changes over the years.

The present American involvement in the armed conflict makes it unrealistic to assume that the draft can be abolished at this time. However, once our participation in the Vietnam war is over, there will be no need for a draft and it should be phased out of American life.

Thus, I am introducing legislation today that would establish an all-volunteer military force, to become effective 6 months following the end of direct U.S. involvement in the hostilities in South Vietnam. A voluntary army is consistent with our American heritage, and with proper salary and career incentives, we can secure the military manpower we need without social or economic injustice.

Mr. Speaker, I am also introducing another bill which would prohibit the use of draftees in undeclared wars without first obtaining their consent. Conscripts should not be forced to serve in any hostility in which Congress has not declared a state of war.

PROSECUTION OF PLANE HIJACKERS

Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his re-

marks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House are aware of the fact that since January of this year, including an Eastern Airlines plane this morning, 12 planes, usually bound for Florida, have been hijacked and diverted to Cuba. So far, by good fortune, there have been no injuries or losses of life or losses of planes. But it is almost inevitable that if this practice continues—and it is growing in frequency—sometimes there have been two in 1 day lately—there will be a tragic loss of life of many of our citizens who are passengers on commercial planes bound for Florida or some other destination in the United States. So today I am introducing a resolution providing that it is the sense of this House—

First, that the President make the strongest demand upon the Castro government through the proper channels for the return, for appropriate prosecution, of the hijackers;

Second, that our Government bring the matter directly to the urgent attention of the United Nations, because eventually we are going to have to do something about it and it therefore threatens the peace that presently sort of exists between the United States and Cuba;

Third, that the Congress make available, or the President should provide for, an immediate funding of a reward of \$100,000 to any person or persons causing the return of a hijacker to the United States if that person is prosecuted and convicted of the grievous offense of hijacking.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the resolution which I have referred to:

Whereas the many instances of the hijacking, sometimes as many as two in one day, of United States airlines enroute to Miami or other Florida points, endangers the lives of the passengers and crew of the planes hijacked, causes great delay to the passengers on such planes and forces the airlines whose planes are hijacked to spend large sums at the Cuban airport where such planes are forced to land;

Whereas such practices are growing in frequency and in all probability will on some occasion lead to the death or injury of all or many of the passengers on such airplanes;

Whereas the Castro government in Cuba has given sanctuary to those hijacking such planes and has refused to return them for prosecution for the grievous offense such hijacking constitutes;

Whereas such sanctuary to such hijackers by the Castro government encourages the vicious practice of hijacking and jeopardizes the lives of United States citizens and is an affront to the Government and to the people of the United States; and,

Whereas such practices have become intolerable to the Government and people of the United States and must be stopped: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, That it is the sense of the House:

1. That the President immediately make the strongest demand through proper channels upon the Castro government in Cuba to return promptly the persons responsible for the hijacking of planes in the United States and diverting them to Cuba to the United States for proper prosecution for their felonious acts endangering the lives of citizens of the United States;

2. That the President urgently call upon the United Nations to exercise its offices and utmost influence to induce the Castro government of Cuba to return promptly to the United States all persons guilty of or charged with the hijacking of United States planes in the United States or within its jurisdiction and diverting them to Cuba; and

3. That the Congress or the President from his contingent fund make available to the Federal Aviation Administration sufficient funds to authorize the Federal Aviation Administration to pay a reward of \$100,000 to the person or persons returning any person hijacking any commercial airline in the United States or within its jurisdiction and diverting such plane to Cuba, upon the conviction of such hijacker for such offense.

VALENTINE'S DAY MASSACRE

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, although Valentine's Day is traditionally a time for expressing love and affection, there are ominous signs that this year will be the occasion for another "Valentine's Day massacre," this time the victims will be the U.S. taxpayers, with the Congress wielding the ax by dereliction.

I refer to the massive pay raise for top officials of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches. Under the unique "reverse veto," a clever little mechanism that was written into the last pay bill commission, the taxpayer is confronted by the old "shell game" when he tries to fix responsibility for this raid on the Treasury. All fingers point back to a Presidential pay commission, whose members few people know, and who bear no responsibility to anyone for their recommendations. The President who, with only minor changes, formally submitted their recommendations, is now back on the ranch in Texas, and he, too, cannot be held liable by anyone since he no longer holds elective office.

The Congress is the only remaining obstacle as the 41-percent pay raise rolls irresistibly along like lava from an erupting volcano. But the House seems frozen, overwhelmed by the ease with which their salaries are to be hiked, and obviously content to say "que sera sera"—what will be, will be.

It should not be allowed to happen and this body, one of two coequal parts of the legislative branch of Government should not hide behind the skirts of our colleagues in the other. I understand there will be debate and a vote taken in that body this Tuesday or Wednesday. Fine, if Congress is to strip itself of its constitutional power to initiate legislation and settle for the power to veto what someone else has decreed, at least they are carrying out even this limited function. But has this body of the people's personal representatives become so timid, that it shies away from allowing its Members to say "yea" or "nay," on a matter of vital concern to the taxpayers of this Nation who will have to foot the bill for our own excesses? Can we then, in good conscience, ask the people to stop the spiral of inflation and truly balance the budget? I think not?

Why do we renege and let the other

body carry the entire burden of decision? The people will not look kindly on men who were chosen to accept responsibility for their actions, and who fail to do so when their own interests are at stake. This is constitutionally and historically a prerogative of this body. The timing as to our recess and the reverse veto stratagem are abominable.

If the increases are allowed to happen without a vote, I at least will be certain that my own decision as to its allocation for charities and other purposes are sounder than the Government which is bestowing them has demonstrated.

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN—CITIZEN OF OUTSTANDING MERIT

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I observe from the RECORD of January 29 that favorable references have been made in the House to the services of Gov. Averell Harriman who recently completed his responsibility at the Paris peace talks.

I wish to join my colleagues in taking note of the great record—and I use the word "great" advisedly—of Governor Harriman. He has served his Nation in many capacities and has always brought credit upon the United States in the services which he has rendered.

We are fortunate to live in a country which produces men of the stature and dedication of W. Averell Harriman.

HIJACKING IS AN INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a suggestion was made yesterday by a responsible Member of Congress that the United States enter into some sort of bilateral discussions with Castro regarding the problem of hijacked aircraft taken to Cuba. I could not think of any greater mistake this country could make.

Obviously this is exactly what Castro wants. There is ample reason to believe some of the hijackings have been inspired by the Castro regime precisely to put the United States into that posture, because after 10 years the Castro regime does want some sort of recognition from the United States.

I believe the wise approach to this problem would be to strengthen existing international treaties by proposing an international extradition treaty on hijacking of aircraft, limited to hijackers of commercial aircraft so that we would not disturb the traditional and historic precedents of our own and other countries in giving political asylum to political refugees.

Such treaties must be limited to a precise definition of a hijacker, otherwise Castro could demand of us the return of political refugees who have been given asylum in this country for other reasons.

I think it would be a great mistake for the United States to enter into any bilateral discussions with Castro alone.

This is an international problem and it should be so treated. We should not do anything alone that would constitute a recognition by the United States of a Communist regime 90 miles off our shore.

VIEWPOINT FROM MID-AMERICA

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have known Dave Broder over the years and have watched him move steadily up the ladder of recognition in the field of political reporting have come to respect him more and more for his straightforward and candid style of reporting. Mr. Broder's article, appearing in volume 1, No. 1, of the Washington Monthly, is still another example of his candor and integrity as he discusses the attitudes, prejudices, and influence of his colleagues in the field of political commentary.

A column, "Viewpoint From Mid-America," by William H. Rentschler, quotes at length from Mr. Broder's article and also provides some significant commentary from Mr. Rentschler. I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

VIEWPOINT FROM MID-AMERICA

(By William H. Rentschler)

Imagine the flap that would erupt if it were disclosed tomorrow that the President of the United States, or any highly-visible Senator is a member of a very small and exclusive private club with no Negro members.

Thunder would rumble all across the land—as it did during the 1968 campaign when such a charge was made—and there would be righteous demands in the press that the President resign his membership forthwith.

Yet perhaps the most exclusive "club" in the nation, with only "a couple of dozen members," is restricted entirely to white newsmen.

Such is the confession of a member of that small, select group, able, scrupulous, refreshingly candid Davis S. Broder of the Washington Post, whose fascinating revelations are carried in Volume One, Number One, of "The Washington Monthly," a brand-new political journal published in the nation's capital.

Broder describes this potent handful of political reporters as a sort of "screening committee" which has almost life-or-death power over the yearnings of potential candidates for the Presidency and other lofty elective posts.

The political writer, says Broder, performs "a positive service" in his role as "talent scout." After all, he notes, "the reporter's job makes him a constant traveler in the political community; he is uniquely well positioned to detect the early intimations of greatness, and to discover these statesmen in embryo and bring their rare qualities to the attention of a wider public.

"But, alas," Broder admits, "it is not quite that simple—or noncontroversial. In his function as a talent scout, the political reporter not only puts some men forward, he rather ruthlessly bars the door to advancement for other men. . . . It's a formidable power, and one that the screening committee of reporters is thoroughly conscious of possessing."

Now about the makeup of that little coterie of reporters who comprise the screening committee. Let David Broder describe it:

"It is small. . . . Its characteristics make

it a highly typical group of Americans. Its members are all Easterners, by residence if not by birth. They are all college graduates. They all enjoy . . . incomes well over the national median. Not one of them is a Negro. Only two are women. Most of them vote Democratic. . . They—or we, I should say—represent a narrow and rather peculiar slice of society."

"I often thought," writes Broder, "as I saw (George) Romney during his Presidential campaign, surrounded by our circle—men a generation younger than he, many of us with cigarettes in our mouths, drinks in our hands, and cynicism in our hearts—that he must have felt as helpless with us as I would feel if my fate or future as a journalist were being decided by a committee of Romney's colleagues among the elders of the Mormon Church."

Closely related to the political reporter's function as talent scout is his role as oracle, or, as Broder puts it "race caller or handicapper." He is supposed to tell his public, every day, how the Presidential (or gubernatorial or senatorial) sweepstakes stands.

What the public wants to know is not what went on yesterday, but what's going to happen tomorrow, and who's going to win or lose.

And that, says Broder—"if the reporter has even a vestige of conscience—is the one question he can never answer with any confidence. . . . "So much of political journalism is an artful effort to disguise prediction as reporting. Look at the use of public opinion polls by newspapers. A public opinion poll, when properly conducted and presented, is a perfectly legitimate tool for measuring opinion at a point in the past, that is, the period of several days when the questions were actually being asked. But if the significance of the polls were accepted in those limited terms, few newspapers would give the polls the prominence they now accord them. . . . Newspapers print and give prominence to the polls because they know their readers will take the poll to be exactly what it is not—a predictive device for guessing how the actual vote will come out. . . ."

"There are literally dozens of examples of inaccurate private polls," writes Broder, "distorting the journalists' and the public's judgment of a political race. Do such misjudgments have an effect on the outcome? Obviously, in many cases they do. The candidate reported trailing in these polls has a substantially harder time raising money, building an organization, or attracting publicity than the presumed front-runner."

Broder's indictment is harsh yet accurate and telling, and he rightly challenges both his fellow reporters and the nation's publishers to lift their sights and meet their obligations to a reliant public.

In still another role, Broder says, the political reporter "tends to carve out for himself a function just a bit more glorious than any that his employer or his readers ever envisaged for him. He becomes, in his own eyes, the Public Defender."

"Reporters," according to Broder, "really don't start the campaign with this role in mind. They couldn't care less who wins, they assure each other. . . . But for months on end, they are locked up covering one of these mortals. . . . Eventually, some of them, at least, will discover that the Candidate is Trying to Pull Something We Don't Like. The candidate and his men are artful manipulators, propagandists, slick Madison Avenue operators. The reporter is the truth-seeker. . . . A wave of moral outrage sweeps over the reporters. It is expressed in the declarations, 'We're not going to let him get away with this.' Demands are sounded for press conferences. Questions are plotted that will cut off every avenue of escape or evasion for the candidate. The trap is carefully set and, unless he is very wary, the candidate sooner or later walks into it."

" . . . Once the reporter appoints himself Public Defender, he abandons almost all pretense of being anything less than an arbiter of the outcome of the election. There is no consistency and no predictability as to when or whether he will adopt the role of Public Defender. Usually, he is provoked into it by the candidate's repeated use of an argument that is offensive to the reporter's own prejudices."

Reporters covering Richard Nixon pounced on him one day late in the campaign for what they felt was his over-emphasis on the upsurge of crime under "the unconcerned Democrats."

"That night," Broder reports, "a wave of 'we-can't-let-him-get-away-with-it' talk swept the Nixon press corps, and the toughest stories of the campaign went whizzing out over the wires. Nixon averted a new press crisis by softening his tone on that issue in succeeding days, a response that was in itself a measure of the power of the press when it goes on the warpath."

"But," pointedly notes Broder, "it doesn't always go on the warpath. Often it is strangely passive. In 1960, for example, when John F. Kennedy promised day after day to get the country moving again, no petitions were passed in the press car demanding that he spell out how. When he spoke of a missile gap, no proof of evidence was demanded. When he spoke of America's falling prestige, no one pressed him on the definition and relevance of that word."

"By contrast, Humphrey last year was hounded at almost every press conference to spell out his difference on Vietnam policy with the Johnson Administration. First Romney and then Nixon were pressed unceasingly to specify their program for ending the war."

This is strong stuff. David Broder, at the risk of alienating his clubmates, raises hard questions. He rates plaudits for raising them.

And many Americans, I am sure, would welcome straight answers from the fellows who usually ask the hard questions.

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with a deep sense of pride and an unashamed sadness, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the greatest Presidents this, or any other, century is likely to know—President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Part of the pride I feel is for the accomplishments of the Johnson administration. For, with his prodding, leadership and help, America has seen enacted into law more social improvements than even seen in any prior administration. In fact, it is hard to imagine any nation whose people have so benefited by the services of one man. Civil rights and justice, medicare, the war on poverty and joblessness, urban rebirth, aid to education, consumer protection, and conservation—these are just a few of the areas in which President Johnson brought the country to accept heretofore impossible and unbelievable horizons. His goals were formed in the crucible of more than three decades of service to his country. His progress toward those goals in 5 short years was nothing less than amazing. Thank God, we could all share in those dreams.

It is often said that the Presidency is the world's loneliest job. And there were many times in the last 5 years when Lyndon Johnson was a lonely and beset man. As cities burned he could have whined and said the ghetto was not of his creation, as most assuredly it was not. He did not. He asked for reason, for calm, and set about the herculean job of removing the ills of the past 200 years that have so manifested themselves in our cities today. No man has ever done more for the oppressed—be they oppressed by poverty or by color. He could have answered those who criticize the war in Vietnam that the war, too, was not of his creation—as indeed it was not. But he did not; instead he sought peace at every possibility or opportunity. The glimmer of hope that appears now in Paris is certainly a monument to his efforts in the face of what at times seemed like hopeless adversity.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself fortunate, indeed, that I have been afforded the privilege of serving with Lyndon Johnson when he was a Member of this body and of knowing and working with him as he became a U.S. Senator, distinguished majority leader, Vice President, and President of these United States. I feel very privileged that I have also had the honor of knowing the gracious and wonderful Lady Bird and her daughters. No man could ever have asked for more loyalty and support than the President received from those lovely ladies.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to borrow a phrase that our friends in the Press Gallery use from time to time. I think it sums up the feelings of all of us about President Lyndon Baines Johnson. It is, "Thank you, Mr. President."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HORTON and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCLURE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
 Mr. DEL CALZON.
 Mr. SKURITZ.
 Mr. CRAMER.
 Mr. FULLER of Pennsylvania in five instances.
 Mr. RUMSFELD in four instances.
 Mr. ESHLEMAN.
 Mr. McCULLOCH.
 Mr. MORSE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
 Mr. FEIGHAN in 10 instances.
 Mr. CORMAN in five instances.
 Mr. EDWARDS of California in five instances.
 Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.
 Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
 Mr. BOGGS in two instances.
 Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
 Mr. FARBERSTEIN in four instances.
 Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in two instances.
 Mr. MILLS in two instances.
 Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in six instances.
 Mr. BROWN of California.
 Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.
 Mr. MARSH in two instances.
 Mr. COHELAN in five instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. RARICK in four instances.
 Mr. KYROS.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
 Mr. ASHLEY.
 Mr. BEVILL in two instances.
 Mr. LENNON.
 Mr. TAYLOR in two instances.
 Mr. PATTEN in two instances.
 Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 17. An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of the Communications Satellite Corp.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 4, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

461. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 35th annual report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the cooperative farm credit system (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board) for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to law (H. Dec. No. 91-18); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

462. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the report of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight instruction program for fiscal year 1968, pur-

suant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2110(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

463. A letter from the President, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of the balance sheet of the Potomac Electric Power Co. as of December 31, 1968, pursuant to paragraph 14 of section 8 of the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 979); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

464. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the annual report of the Institute for 1968, pursuant to section 4 of its charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

465. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certain revisions in the 12th annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, transmitted December 27, 1968; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

466. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 832-A, *Yankton Sioux Tribe, Petitioner, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055 (25 U.S.C. 707); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

467. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1968; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

468. A letter from the adjutant general, military Order of the Purple Heart, transmitting a report of the annual audit of the order for the fiscal period ending July 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of Public Law 85-761; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

469. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report of the agency on positions in grade GS-17 under section 5108(c)(3) of title 5 of the United States Code, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5114(a); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

470. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Department of Justice on positions in grades GS-16 and GS-17 under section 5108(c)(7) and (8) of title 5 of the United States Code, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5114(a); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

471. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the annual report on the estimated amount of the losses or costs (or percentage of costs) incurred by the postal service in the performance of public services during the current fiscal year, pursuant to the provisions of section 201 of Public Law 87-793; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

472. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 under section 5108(a) of title 5 of the United States Code, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

473. A letter from the Federal and State cochairman, Four Corners Regional Commission, transmitting the first annual report of the commission, for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

474. A letter from the Federal and State cochairman, Ozark Regional Commission, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the commission for the calendar year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

475. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of grants approved by that office which are financed wholly with Federal funds, for the period October 31, 1968, to December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 1120b of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

476. A letter from the Chairman and Commissioners, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the 1968 annual report of the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 5804. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. BROZMAN, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, and Mr. ROGERS of Colorado):

H.R. 5805. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron, and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLINSON of Texas:

H.R. 5806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the rental value of parsonages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDEBERG:

H.R. 5807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5808. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5809. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Westfield, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5810. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a national cemetery system within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5811. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for an older Americans community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ERLINBORN:

H.R. 5812. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 5814. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 5815. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5816. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional

immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:
H.R. 5817. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H.R. 5818. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the regulation of mailing list dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:
H.R. 5819. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain awards in recognition of outstanding achievement in the field of sports shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KANTH:
H.R. 5820. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5821. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous material so that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:
H.R. 5822. A bill to prohibit the use of draftees in undeclared wars without their consent; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5823. A bill to provide for meeting the manpower needs of the Armed Forces of the United States through a completely voluntary system of enlistments, and to further improve, upgrade, and strengthen such Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEITH:
H.R. 5824. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means of establishing certain portions of the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and Great Lakes of the United States as marine sanctuaries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LENNON:
H.R. 5825. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5826. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide that the Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy and Air Force shall be a brigadier general or rear admiral, as the case may be; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5827. A bill to amend titles 10 and 31, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5828. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5829. A bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development for a period of 1 year; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:
H.R. 5830. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty

of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:
H.R. 5831. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHEL:
H.R. 5832. A bill to extend from 30 to 60 days the minimum period of time which must elapse between the required publication or service of a proposed Federal regulation and its effective date; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:
H.R. 5833. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5834. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to articles in part of reprocessed or reused wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:
H.R. 5835. A bill for the elimination of health dangers to coal miners resulting from the inhalation of coal dust; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:
H.R. 5836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers, and individuals who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:
H.R. 5837. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):
H.R. 5838. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:
H.R. 5839. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, to strengthen our competitive enterprise system by providing for competition acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5840. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:
H.R. 5841. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of reliable, abundant, and economical electric power supply by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5842. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5843. A bill to prohibit any State from levying income taxes on nonresidents of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:
H.R. 5844. A bill appropriating funds for 10 additional mediators to be employed by the National Mediation Board; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 5845. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to declare a national policy with respect to the right of Americans to employment without regard to sex or age; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5846. A bill to provide additional mediators for the National Mediation Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5847. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5848. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that a chiropractor, naturopath, podiatrist, or other licensed practitioner of the healing arts shall be considered a physician for purposes of health insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5849. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under title II of such act, and to add thereto a new title under which aged individuals are guaranteed a minimum annual income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:
H.R. 5850. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmer Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide a flexible interest rate on loans to associations for water and waste disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLLOCK:
H.R. 5851. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of June 8, 1906, authorizing the President by proclamation to establish national monuments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:
H.R. 5852. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:
H.R. 5853. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of a multilevel parking facility in connection with the Federal building, 800 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 5854. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5855. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5856. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include, among the health insurance benefits covered under part B thereof, coverage of certain drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPHERD:
H.R. 5857. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. UTR):

H.R. 5858. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on olives packed in certain airtight containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5859. A bill to authorize pay and benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such pay and benefits are authorized for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5860. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that no urban renewal project in a city of less than 1 million population shall receive Federal financial assistance thereunder unless it is approved in a referendum by the residents of the city, if 5 percent or more of the voters in such city have requested such a referendum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5861. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for civil service retirement purposes certain periods of service in the armed forces of a government-in-exile allied or associated with the United States in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5862. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT (for himself and Mr. GUNN):

H.R. 5863. A bill to designate certain lands in the Pinalos National Monument in California as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 5864. A bill to amend section 3146 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a person who poses a danger to any other person or to the community shall not be admitted to bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5865. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to remove certain import prohibitions on tomatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 5866. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 5867. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5868. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5869. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 5870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 342. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to

vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMAZT:

H.J. Res. 343. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY (for himself and Mr. JACOBS):

H.J. Res. 344. Resolution to provide for the revision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 345. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.J. Res. 346. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.J. Res. 347. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the manner of electing President and Vice President and granting the right to vote in certain elections to citizens who are 18 or more years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.J. Res. 348. Resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 349. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of age in the case of citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 350. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of age in the case of citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 351. Resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 15 of each year as "National Poetry Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 352. Resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 26th day of March of each year as "Robert Frost Memorial Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.J. Res. 353. Resolution to authorize the President to pay awards for the delivery into American hands of North Korean officials and military personnel who tortured the personnel of the U.S.S. Pueblo; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 354. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.J. Res. 355. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 356. Resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development, to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. Con. Res. 116. Resolution expressing the opposition of the Congress to the proposed consumption taxes of the European Economic Community on oilseed products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 117. Resolution creating the Joint Select Committee on Program Analysis and Evaluation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 118. Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to an international convention on aircraft hijacking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 119. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to aggression in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 120. Resolution to require the collection of the French World War I debt to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Con. Res. 121. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those North Koreans responsible for the capture of the U.S. ship Pueblo and the atrocities committed against the captured Americans shall be branded as international criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H. Res. 195. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H. Res. 196. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COORMAN:

H. Res. 197. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H. Res. 198. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 199. Resolution relative to the hijacking of U.S. aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Res. 200. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5871. A bill for the relief of Domenico and Vincenza Amato and minor children, Giuseppe and Cosimo Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5872. A bill for the relief of Calogero Armandini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5873. A bill for the relief of Fellicula C. Busog, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5874. A bill for the relief of Michele Cafarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5875. A bill for the relief of Antonio and Beatrice Candela and minor child, Gio-

vanni Candela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5876. A bill for the relief of Calogero Candela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5877. A bill for the relief of Angel Chia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5878. A bill for the relief of Vito Colomba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5879. A bill for the relief of Ciro D'Amico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5880. A bill for the relief of Giovanni DiMaggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5881. A bill for the relief of Elsa Dowden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5882. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Ekonomides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5883. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios Ekonomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5884. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel E. and Dalva Lazidis and minor children, Elena and Triantafylla Lazidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5885. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Leontartidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5886. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Marazano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5887. A bill for the relief of Diego and Maria Melodia and their minor son, Ignazio Melodia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5888. A bill for the relief of Rosario Panepinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5889. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Papakonstantopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5890. A bill for the relief of Ricardo D. Sambat, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5891. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sealice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5892. A bill for the relief of Calogera Tranchina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5893. A bill for the relief of Christopher Selmis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5894. A bill for the relief of Francesco Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5895. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5896. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zambianchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5897. A bill for the relief of Elena Salvo Arenò; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 5898. A bill for the relief of H. A. Parr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 5899. A bill for the relief of Juana V. Then-Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 5900. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino, Giovanna, and Antonio Giuseppe Ganctano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5901. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ingrao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna Maria Lunetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5903. A bill for the relief of Angelo, Antonina, and Nunzia Brigida Zuzze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 5904. A bill for the relief of Carl C. Strauss and Mary Ann Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 5905. A bill for the relief of Margarita Badolamenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5906. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5907. A bill for the relief of Leslie Gerard Paul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5908. A bill for the relief of Claudio Salerno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5909. A bill for the relief of Barbara Sears Carroll, nee Barbara Sears; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5910. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Basile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5911. A bill for the relief of Gertrudes Cabagungan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5912. A bill for the relief of Joan Caponong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5913. A bill for the relief of Mary Felace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5914. A bill for the relief of Gaetano La Porta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5915. A bill for the relief of Zenaida C. Delco G., and Marivi Maclas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5916. A bill for the relief of Florentino Mee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5917. A bill for the relief of Amante and Rizalina Cabalda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAIAMO:

H.R. 5918. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Taeko (Natalie Anthony) Lauritano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5919. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Andolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5920. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Giovanni Battista Asaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5921. A bill for the relief of Maria Luisa Bona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5922. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucia Tommasi and Maria Carbonaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5923. A bill for the relief of Consolata Monti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5924. A bill for the relief of Cheung Wun Yung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 5925. A bill for the relief of Herman Boxer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5926. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chandra Prabha Lal; her husband, Daya N. Lal; and two minor children, Padma Lal and Ashis K. Lal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5927. A bill for the relief of Michael T. Mouzas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5928. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Z. Sison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5929. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5930. A bill for the relief of Ng Chan Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5931. A bill to provide for the consideration under the War Claims Act of 1948 of certain claims arising out of the sinking of U.S. fishing vessel *Snoopy*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5932. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Transportation to cause the vessel *Cap'n Frank*, owned by Ernest R. Darling, of South Portland, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5933. A bill to permit certain vessels

to be documented for use in the fisheries and coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5934. A bill for the relief of Julita Funtanilla and her minor children, Wilhelmine Funtanilla, Sylvia Funtanilla, and Josephine Funtanilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 5935. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Henry F. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 5936. A bill for the relief of Kong Wan Nor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5937. A bill for the relief of Agripino Erano Tenchavez, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 5938. A bill for the relief of Accursia Billers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5939. A bill for the relief of Lajos Hedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5940. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Manta Marchese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5941. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Musso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5942. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Paskor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5943. A bill for the relief of Roger Stanley, and the successor partnership, Roger Stanley & Hal Irwin, doing business as the Roger Stanley Orchestra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 5944. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. Vernell Burris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5945. A bill for the relief of Masakatsu Kawano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 5946. A bill for the relief of Thalia Simos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

8. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to absorption of the cost of public welfare by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to providing educational opportunity to students seeking careers in the health professions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to restoring certain lands to the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

46. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to circulation of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

47. Also, petition of the City Council, Elizabeth, N.J., relative to making Inauguration Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.