

be alerted to these facts and realities if we are to continue to be the best fed nation at the lowest per income-dollar cost in the world."

WOULD CONSUMER PRICES, EXPORT MARKETS, BE THREATENED?

"There seems to be some fear that an attempt to strengthen farm income would result in undesirable prices of food at the grocery store, or that we would lose some of our foreign markets," noted Langren. "But neither fear is valid."

Langren used the sugar industry as an example of better farm prices without much effect on consumers. "Since 1960, the price to the sugarbeet farmer has gone up 23 percent, his gross income has almost doubled, and his net profit per acre has increased by 20 percent while production doubled. But the price of a pound of sugar on the grocery shelf increased by only about half a penny."

"Wheat prices, on the contrary, fell about 40 percent since 1962, down to just \$1.24 these days. But the low price failed to increase our foreign markets for wheat. In fact, our low prices had the reverse effect, forcing foreign nations to increase import fees to protect their own farmers."

"If wheat had increased by the same 23 percent in price that sugar beets experienced, a bushel of wheat today would be \$2.50," said Langren. "What a boon that would have been for rural America! It wouldn't have hurt our exports, and the effect on the consumer would have been very little since the wheat in a loaf of bread constitutes only about 10 percent of the cost."

AGRICULTURE HAS EARNED CONSIDERATION

Congressman Langren said that U.S. Agriculture and Rural America have earned our attention and consideration. "Our farmers have forged the best production story of any industry in this nation, increasing crop production per man hour by some 148 per cent in the past 20 years and livestock production by 149 percent. Every American has been the beneficiary of quality foods, ample supplies, better packaged foods, and at a cost of a little over 17½ cents out of every income dollar, the lowest percentage in the world. With 82½ cents left to the consumer to spend on other items, the farmer thus becomes the real impetus behind the expansion of our other great industries."

THE CONGRESS AND THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

"It is still too early to tell what suggestions or proposals will come from the new Administration," observed Langren. "There are encouraging signs, however, that more attention will be paid to farm prices, and all of us interested in Agriculture must pursue that pressing concern."

"The Congress, where farm laws and policies are formulated, remains much the same in composition as the preceding Congress," said Langren, "so the basic decisions on the direction agriculture will take in the future must come from people like you, at meetings like this. Your concerns and your decisions must be conveyed to the White House, the Congress and the American public. We who believe that American Agriculture should receive a fair return for the contribution it makes to the nation must have the unanimous support of every agricultural interest, whether farms, agri-business, farm organizations, small towns, or what have you."

"We either stand together, or witness each segment of America's largest industry fall in turn," concluded Mr. Langren. "If we expect Congress to face the challenge, we must first face it ourselves, as a united industry."

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS VOLUNTEER THEIR SERVICES

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in this day of revolt and rebellion on the campuses across the country, it is refreshing and reassuring to read confirmation of a fact that we sometimes lose sight of: the overwhelming majority of today's college students are productive, contributing citizens. The letter below pays well-deserved tribute to the students at Kent State University in my district for their countless hours of volunteer activity in conjunction with community service programs in Kent, Ohio.

The letter follows:

[From the Record-Courier, Feb. 10, 1969]

RETIRING WELFARE DIRECTOR CITES KENT STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SERVICE

DEAR SIR: Before I leave my office as executive director of The Kent Welfare and Visiting Nurse Association, I wish to publicly express my appreciation and praise to the students of Kent State University who have devoted hours of service to our agency through the years.

They have come as individuals, in groups, from sororities, fraternities, residence halls, and other organized groups on campus, requesting service projects.

We found them to be enthusiastic, with a keen interest, not only in underprivileged children, but with the aged, the blind, families on low income and shut-ins. They have worked well under supervision and have given countless hours of joy to the very young, the very old and those in between.

They have furnished transportation for children to and from parties which they held for children of all ages at Christmas time, for Valentine's Day, and at Easter.

They have taken children on nature hikes, picnics, to ball games and to movies. Even held a story hour at the Public Library. They have tutored children and in many instances have collected clothing and even purchased new clothing. They have shown a great interest in the deaf children.

They have entertained children and sometimes families in their sorority and fraternity houses.

They have visited the blind, read to them, taken them for walks and, in many instances, these visits have been the blind persons' only contact with the outside world.

They have visited the shut-ins, taken them magazines, plants, cookies and scented soap. They have done household chores for them, such as mowing the lawn, shoveling snow, washing windows, turning rugs, putting up curtain rods, and small repair jobs around the house, even to spring housecleaning.

They have adopted families, remembering them on birthdays, often baby-sitting while another group took the mother out for an evening's entertainment. They have collected canned food on many occasions, hundreds of cans, helped in sorting, packing and delivering food baskets.

It is from this source that much of our volunteer help has come, from these young men and women, who are concerned with those less fortunate, who take time out of their busy schedules to give to others. I am sure their lives are enriched from these experiences and the recipients of their good deeds are indeed grateful.

It has been heartwarming to work with these young, thoughtful, students who have such a keen concern for others and who use their time and effort in such a meaningful way. They have helped to make our organization more humane and far reaching. They have given a personal touch that we could not accomplish because of time and limited staff.

So I salute the students of Kent State University who do care about others and who do something about it.

My hope is that you will continue to work with my successor in the same way.

Mrs. ELIZABETH FOUST,

Executive Director, The Kent Welfare and Visiting Nurse Association, Inc.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 20, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.—Psalm 33: 12.

Our fathers' God, to Thee, author of liberty, to Thee we pray; long may our land be bright with freedom's holy light; protect us by Thy might, great God, our King.

In this temple of freedom we give Thee thanks for the spirit and the service of our first President whom we affectionately call the Father of Our Country. We remember his courage in times of crisis, his fidelity during periods of adversity, and his faith which made him bend his knees on frozen ground that he might find strength and confidence to continue the struggle for independence.

Grant that the remembrance of this great life may strengthen us and our people to live and to labor for the freedom of all mankind. Thus may we ever be one nation, under Thee, with liberty and justice for all.

We pray in the spirit of the Lord of Life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 1969, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER) to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. WAMPLER read the Farewell Address as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be re-

membered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium

of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater

strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations: they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our

foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not

only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false

alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the secu-

urity for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human

nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free

people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by

policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will

only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 263) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 263

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress.

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Friedel, Maryland; Mr. Dent, Pennsylvania; Mr. Lipscomb, California.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Friedel, Maryland; Mr. Thompson, New Jersey; Mr. Podell, New York; Mr. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Mr. Harvey, Michigan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 264) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 264

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration, to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 44 United States Code 3305, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDEZ) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PETTIS).

DESIGNATION OF MINORITY EMPLOYEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 265) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 265

Resolved, That, pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, John J. Williams is hereby designated a minority employee (to fill an existing vacancy) until otherwise ordered by the House, and shall receive gross compensation of \$21,792.12 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the legislative program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills, and we are not prepared at this time to announce the program for the balance of next week. We will announce any further program next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have finished the legislative business for the week, I ask unanimous consent that when the House

adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if I am correct in understanding that no program whatever is being announced for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. None is ready at this time. All the committees are working. We have been in touch with all the committees, but none of them have bills which are ready to be brought up.

Mr. GROSS. Monday is not a suspension day?

Mr. ALBERT. Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills.

Mr. GROSS. And there is no program at all for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Not as of now.

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.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

WINNING SPEECH—VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest, the theme of which was "Freedom's Challenge."

I am proud to present to the Members of the House of Representatives the winning speech from the fine State of Mis-

issippi, which was delivered by Mr. Gary E. Evans, of Iuka, Miss., and reads as follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

How wonderful it is to be able to rise in the morning with no fear of anyone's forcing himself into my house to take me to prison for some unknown reason, to be able to walk out my door and breathe the fresh air with no fear of molestation, to be able to express my opinions openly, and as I please, to be able to walk down the street unafraid of anyone, to have the right to purchase property as I wish, and the most wonderful of all—to pray and worship God freely. I am also greatly thankful as I realize that we in this great land have all of these freedoms, and that they are protected and insured to us by the Constitution of the United States.

We of the United States enjoy so many privileges that many people of other countries long for but never receive. Do we respect and protect these privileges as we should, or do we degrade them and take them for granted?

We in the United States should, each day, thank God for the freedoms which we have. As citizens of the United States, we have great responsibilities upon our shoulders to protect these freedoms for generations to come, for our children and our grandchildren, and also to make ourselves more worthy of them. Just as our founding fathers sacrificed so that we might have these freedoms, we should also be willing to sacrifice to protect them.

To make ourselves more worthy of these freedoms, we must always show respect for the great American flag which today is being downtrodden by so many. One of the best ways to become more worthy is to help all of us in the United States keep unmovable faith in God as our founding fathers did. Also we can uphold, in all circumstances, the freedoms and principles upon which our country is based. By simply reminding those around us, who degrade the freedoms which we have, of just how fortunate we are to even live in a country with such privileges, we will be helping to make this land a better place in which to dwell.

As students today, we can help others become more aware of our freedoms. We can work with the leaders of our community, student government councils, faculties, and administrators to help everyone realize that these privileges are ours to protect and increase or to destroy.

To establish an Honor Society in every school would give students a feeling of greater responsibility and thus prevent much of the cheating in the schools today as well as give the students a feeling of accomplishment. Throughout the country young people need to accept more responsibility. We, the young people, need to know and realize that we are not the leaders of tomorrow but are a great part of the leadership of today. We also need to realize that we have a part in our society, and that, unless we function as we should, an important part of our country's accomplishments will be left unfulfilled. Really, this idea would be to help us young people realize more fully the freedoms that are ours to enjoy, rather than just to place responsibilities upon us. But, at the same time it would make better citizens of us in our future lives.

Yes, we Americans do have many freedoms for which to be thankful, but there are also challenges to be met along with the freedoms. Are we going to accept these challenges? I am, and I'm going to do everything in my power to secure and protect the privileges which we have in our great country. Let's all strive diligently to meet "Freedom's Challenge!"

PROPOSAL FOR A MINIMUM TAX

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this timely occasion to introduce legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by providing for a minimum income tax. It would seem only appropriate that I submit this legislation for the consideration of the Congress at the time when the Ways and Means Committee is undertaking a series of hearings on the general subject of tax reform, including discussion on minimum tax proposals.

It is shocking and immoral to find that 21 people with incomes over \$1 million did not pay any income tax in the 1967 returns. Additionally, 134 more, with adjusted incomes above \$200,000, paid no income tax.

In these times, moneys are so sorely needed for the rehabilitation of our cities in housing and transportation; for the welfare of our citizens, especially in the inner city, in recreation and employment and education; for food to feed the hungry in the depressed urban and rural pockets of our country.

In the recent past we have witnessed—and strongly protested—the diversion of great quantities of our resources away from such badly needed domestic programs, and the crisis of the cities and the poor and the underprivileged has grown until we can no longer afford to ignore their existence.

Certainly the need to redefine our priorities has been demonstrated by the American people. But the revenues to implement the necessary programs must be found. Simply to increase the already heavy tax burden is not the means. Such proposals as the "temporary" surtax have a way of becoming permanent, and the tax dilemma, especially for the middle- and low-income brackets, becomes a particularly critical burden.

It is the low- and middle-income salaried individual who cannot deduct "business expenses" who suffers under our tax system. It is time that the wealthy and the well-heeled businessman pays his fair share.

Mr. Speaker, the answer lies in sharing the burden so that those who can afford it will pay an equitable share of taxes. These particularly well-heeled elements of our society have found nontaxable but certain profitmaking means of deploying their wealth under the existing provisions of our tax structure.

The proposal I offer today would establish a graduated scale of tax rates on the entire gross income of every individual. The tax table would be as follows:

If the defined income is:	The minimum tax is:
Not over \$10,000	0
Over \$10,000 but not over \$20,000	5% of the excess over \$10,000
Over \$20,000 but not over \$30,000	\$500 plus 10% of the excess over \$20,000
Over \$30,000 but not over \$40,000	\$1,500 plus 15% of the excess over \$30,000
Over \$40,000	\$3,000 plus 20% of the excess over \$40,000

In my view this kind of a graduated system would be the most fair. It would help shift the presently unbalanced payment schedule and provide some relief

for the overtaxation of the low- and middle-income tax bracket.

An editorial in the Washington Post of February 12, "Time Has Come for Tax Reform," in stressing tax assistance for the low and middle income, cites the importance of tapping the elusive big incomes which now go untaxed:

The Treasury experts found that "many persons with incomes of \$1 million or more actually pay the same effective rate of tax as do persons with incomes only one-fiftieth as large."

The Treasury Department in its exhaustive study on tax reform, has proposed a minimum tax to correct this deficiency in the law.

Tax reform is something we have all talked long and hard about, and the hour has long passed that action should be taken. Perhaps now we will do something about it.

FEDERALLY CHARTERED BANKS IMMUNE FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court decision last June held that federally chartered banks were found to be immune from State and local taxes.

Yesterday the highest court in the State of New York, the court of appeals, also held that all federally chartered banks in the State of New York were immune from sales taxes, and nondiscriminatory use taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are well aware that this has cost some \$30 million to \$40 million in States revenue from the national banks throughout the United States.

I have introduced legislation which will remove the immunity of federally chartered institutions from State sales taxes.

I shall shortly furnish the Members of the House with a report setting forth the results of the survey I have taken together with my findings as a result of the informal public hearings. I think it is important that I alert my colleagues to the urgency of this problem particularly at a time when there has been a sharp acceleration of State expenditures and we find that our States have already reached tax capacity.

This discriminatory practice of affording immunity to national banks must be stopped. I hope I can have the support of my colleagues.

THE TFX—AN ATROCITY PERPETRATED UPON AMERICA'S TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of February 14 informs us that another TFX has crashed somewhere in Nevada. This was a scheduled 3-hour flight of about 750 miles. The \$6 million aircraft carried two decorated flyers, both veterans of Vietnam.

Eleven of these so-called bombers have crashed in this country and Asia since the dual-service craft was put into operation in 1967.

I have long wished to express myself in regard to this flying deathtrap that an embarrassed Pentagon and a criminally liable corporation have foisted upon an unsuspecting taxpaying public. This plane is such a complete disaster as to now reach the exalted status of a national scandal.

Years have gone by. Billions have been spent. The Soviets have already put two generations of better aircraft into the air from their drawing boards. We are still making excuses for this airborne coffin, loaded down with gadgets designed to "revolutionize" warfare.

Incredible that the Congress and public have remained quiet for so long. Here we see more vividly with each passing day or crash that it is an utter disaster. Yet each time the Pentagon, the five-sided fairy-tale factory across the Potomac, coos sweetly into our ear that every day in every way the F-111A is getting better and better. It will cure cancer next, I suppose. It will do everything except perform its claimed and assigned combat duties and missions.

According to the Pentagon the TFX is about to replace any and all weapons systems devised for air combat since the days of the Renaissance geniuses. It will perhaps walk on water next. But it will not do what it was designed to do.

Mr. Speaker, the TFX is a fraud, a disaster and a grisly monument to all that is evil in the military-industrial complex. Brave men have died flying it, struck down because an American manufacturer cannot turn out an effective piece of hardware. Struck down after the foe in Vietnam failed, because the Pentagon refuses to admit that this plane is a shocking failure and that its own judgment was faulty.

Whenever anyone dares to criticize this gargantuan cropper, reams of press releases pour forth from the criminally liable corporation and the Pentagon. I have but one response to them. After years and billions of dollars and dozens of lives, this plane is a piece of trash, unworthy of being deployed for combat missions in Vietnam; unworthy of being used in any overseas area of American military responsibility and even incapable of making 750-mile, 3-hour training flights with America's top pilots aboard.

If the criminally liable corporation and the Pentagon can prove me wrong as of this writing, I will retract this statement on the floor of the House. I expect that this will happen when someone unties the Belt of Orion. Or when corporations such as the criminally liable one can produce a working piece of hardware in return for the money almost stolen from the public. Or when elephants roost on rosebushes or the Pentagon admits mistakes. Or when the M-16 is as good as the Russian assault rifle being used in Vietnam. Or when cows give beer.

The TFX, Mr. Speaker, is a disaster. A colossal abuse of taxpayer dollars and Government effort. A blood-tinged stain upon our country.

ARAB TERRORISTS ATTACK UN-ARMED ISRAELI AIRLINER

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, again Arab terrorists have attacked an unarmed Israel airliner at an international airport in a neutral country. El Al was simply utilizing its right to pursue a mission of peaceful international trade and travel, utilizing airways. It is that free right to use any international mode of movement that has been challenged through use of terror. All international carriers of any kind are in potential jeopardy through the setting of such precedents. Peaceful pursuit of any goal via international land, sea, and air travel could be compromised.

What if tomorrow Biafra decided to attack Nigerian aircraft at London Airport? Suppose Pakistan sends raiders to shoot up an Indian passenger plane in Istanbul? Or perhaps it will be native guerrillas from Portugal's colonies attacking a Portuguese airliner in Rome? Will the Catholic Irish of the south move against a plane flying out of Ulster? Perhaps next it will be emigres from the Soviet Union using machineguns on an Aeroflot craft. Nothing is too farfetched once precedents have been set.

Yet the world watches calmly while the rights of one small nation to use international air routes are abrogated with impunity by assassins and religious bigots who seek to persecute the Jewish people to death and extinction. The Arabs are inheritors of Hitler's goals.

Already U Thant, has made a few perfunctory blubbery protestations of indignation. They were uttered in one breath, while with the other he swiftly stated his hope that the Israelis would refrain from retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, my contempt for those who will press for Israeli forbearance far exceeds my disdain of the fedayeen. All over the world there will appear statement after statement deploring, condemning, and bewailing. Reams of newspaper will be expended bemoaning the Swiss incident. Airwaves will pulsate with breast beatings about the horror of it all. The perfunctory shredding of garments in Foggy Bottom will be as futile and hypocritical as U Thant's bleatings. It is all useless.

Mr. Speaker, the entire principle of free utilization of the world's airways and sealanes is at stake here. What is being done to Israel will be done to others in the future, utilizing these barbaric acts of senseless bloodshed against peaceful civilian travelers as precedents.

A few weeks ago, Iraq barbarically murdered 14 of her citizens. Nine were Jews. They were executed because of their faith in a manner the Inquisition would have found admirable. The world raged. Israel withheld its hand. What does the world propose that Israel do now? Hand a laurel garland to the terrorists?

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. is an international joke. No one will defend Israel but her own strong hand. She has the right to act in accordance with her international interests. When she strikes to

prevent further acts of this kind, I for one do not intend to condemn her, beat my breast in moral outrage or call for improbable solutions to matter-of-fact situations.

SELECTION OF PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce next week a bill on the democratic selection of presidential nominees. The bill is addressed to the same proposition as that dealt with in the Hughes Commission report which was placed in the RECORD on October 15, 1968, page 31544, by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER). I invite comment from my colleagues, and after considering such, I should like to prepare a bill which some of them might wish to join. The bill will be introduced on Thursday of next week. Please notify me if you feel you may be interested in cosponsoring it. The tentative draft is as follows:

A bill to suspend the equal time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for certain candidates for nomination to the office of President, to provide for television debates for such candidates, and to afford the States a uniform means of selecting and instructing delegates to the presidential conventions of the major political parties to the end that the people will be more directly and equitably represented in the selection of party candidates, that the political processes of the Nation will be more orderly, meaningful, and informative, and that the inordinately high cost of seeking presidential nomination will be reduced

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Television Debate and Presidential Nominee Selection Act of 1969."

TITLE I—SUSPENSION OF SECTION 315 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

SEC. 101. That part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 which requires any licensee of a broadcast station who permits any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, is suspended with respect to the use of a broadcasting station by a candidate for a political party's nomination for President or by a candidate for the office of President in a television program conducted under the provisions of this Act. Nothing in this section shall be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under the Communications Act of 1934 to operate in the public interest.

TITLE II—TELEVISION COVERAGE ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—(a) Congress finds that there is presently too little effective political communication between presidential candidates and voters in the nature of debate and presentation of issues. Therefore, to promote the public welfare and to improve the democratic processes of nomination and election to the Presidency, it is essential to recognize the airwaves as part of the public domain, and to reserve television time for dialog on public issues between presidential candidates.

(b) In the construction and implementation of this title, Congress directs that regard be had to its overall objectives, the fair and equitable administration of the pro-

grams provided for, without favor to any candidate, and with the sole purpose of informing the public as fully as possible on the qualities and positions of each candidate.

SEC. 202. POLITICAL PARTIES ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE.—In order to qualify for participation in nationwide televised debates pursuant to this title, a political party must be a qualified political party under the laws of three-fourths of the States having presidential primary or convention statutes approved by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 203. COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC DEBATE.—(a) There is hereby created a Committee on Public Debate to consist of a Chairman and four other members to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each member shall serve for a term of five years except that (1) the four members first appointed (other than the Chairman) shall serve for terms of one, two, three and four years, respectively, and (2) any member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has qualified. It is the desire of Congress that the President appoint to this Committee citizens of distinction and proven expertise in judging the effectiveness and fairness of modes of public information with respect to candidates for nomination for the Presidency, as for instance, distinguished persons from the academic, scientific, or journalistic fields.

(b) It shall be the continuing duty of the Committee to—

(1) study possible modes of operating the machinery provided in this title, and possible alternatives thereto, and to report from time to time to the President and to Congress on the results of such study;

(2) cooperate with the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the duties mandated to that agency by this title; and

(3) evaluate the particular mode of implementing this title chosen and followed by the Commission, suggesting improvements to that agency while the work is in progress, and reporting to Congress finally on the efficacy and fairness of the operation of this title with respect to the presidential nominating process.

(c) The first meeting of the Committee shall be called on sufficient notice by its Chairman, promptly after the enactment of this Act, and meetings shall be held thereafter, on call by the Committee at its last meeting or by the Chairman, at such times and at such intervals as may be required in order that the Committee may perform effectively the duties given it in the preceding subsection.

SEC. 204. PERSONNEL.—The Committee is authorized to provide for a staff for the Committee, and to promulgate duties and establish salaries for the members of such staff.

SEC. 205. DEBATES AMONG CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION.—(a) The Commission shall administer this section and section 206 of this title.

(b) The duties of the Commission, with respect to the operation of this title, shall be as follows:

(1) The Commission shall determine, no later than the 31st day of May of each presidential election year, the political parties which have met the requirements of section 202 and shall commence the process of determining who are the leading presidential candidates of each such political party. Such leading candidates shall be selected as follows:

(A) The Commission shall select not more than four nor less than two reliable opinion polling agencies sampling national public opinion.

(B) The Commission shall then select or obtain polls conducted by each of the polling agencies chosen representing an accurate measure of the preference of the voters of a party for the candidate for the nomination

of such party for President expressed as a percentage of all persons of the party polled, other than those who are undecided.

(c) The Commission shall then take the average of the polls in order to determine the average percentage of preference for each candidate for the nomination of each party and shall eliminate any candidate having an average percentage of preference of less than two percent within his respective party.

(D) (1) After the Commission has determined the candidates, it shall forthwith notify each such candidate to that effect by the most expeditious means of communication and shall advise such candidate that, unless he requests that his name not be used, his name will be included in the television debates under this section.

(11) If such candidate requests that his name not be used for the purpose of inclusion in the television debates among the candidates for the nomination of a political party under this section, the Commission shall not certify his name for participation in any television debate under this section among the candidates for the nomination of such party. The Commission shall then notify the political party of the person who has so declined. No candidate shall have his name removed from the ballot of any State by virtue of his refusing to participate in any television debate.

(2) Prior to May 31 of each such presidential election year, the Commission shall invite each of the three major television networks to submit the names of four distinguished and nationally recognized journalists. Of these twelve, the Commission shall select three names, using methods customary in arbitration proceedings, permitting the striking of names by candidates, or employing any other fair and equitable means of selection. The Commission shall keep the Committee fully and currently informed on its selection process.

(3) The Commission shall in every way assist and cooperate with the Committee.

(4) (A) For each political party with two or more presidential candidates certified by the Commission there shall be television programs occupying not less than four hours of prime time without cost to the candidates, the parties, or any agency of government. The Commission shall select television stations to carry such programs. Such shall be done on equitable and fair basis so as to provide coverage throughout each State which is eligible to receive Federal assistance under title III of this Act. Such time shall be used on one or more programs in June of each presidential election year.

(B) Should a political party have only one presidential candidate who qualifies for television time under this title, such candidate shall be entitled to only one program of one hour duration.

SEC. 206. ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.—In the event that additional time is afforded voluntarily by television stations, the Commission may provide for programs comparable to programs conducted under section 205. In the event that, after the Presidential primary election or convention in a State which has received Federal assistance under title III, there remains any amount not committed to the costs of the elections or conventions in such State's nominating fund established under section 302(b)(1) at the direction of the appropriate authority of the State, the Commission may use such amounts to purchase television time, equally apportioned between the parties which have met the requirements of section 202, for programs which shall follow the same general format as those conducted under section 205, but in which the candidates selected at the national conventions of such political parties may appear and participate in the debate. The television time shall be separately purchased in the States from whence the excess funds come. Broadcasters shall make television time available, and

such time shall be purchased only at the rate at which such time is sold to the most favored purchaser.

TITLE III—STATE ELECTION AND CONVENTION PROCEDURES

SEC. 301. PURPOSE.—Congress finds there is little uniformity in the States in selecting delegates to the national conventions of the political parties and that the political processes of the Nation will be more orderly and meaningful if more uniformity is established. Congress also finds that the present conglomeration of delegate selection procedures causes a maximum exposure of candidates to political foment of a demonstration or carnival nature and that this political activity continues over a period of many months, exposing the candidates to a maximum of physical exhaustion and danger and to inordinate expense for a minimum return in informing the electorate of issues and positions of the candidates on them. It is necessary and proper that the States be afforded opportunity to activate a common national method of selecting and instructing delegates from a State to the conventions of the political parties.

SEC. 302. STATE LAW STANDARDS.—The law of a State, to be in compliance with this title so as to afford such State the grants and benefits provided for in this Act, shall contain the following provisions:

(a) General provisions.

(1) Delegates from a State to a national convention of a political party must be selected by a convention system or by an election system. One system of selection shall be used to select all the delegates of a political party but the State need not require all political parties in the State to use the same system of selection.

(2) There shall be reasonable safeguards to assure that the election or convention be properly advertised and that the machinery and facilities for such process are such as to afford fair and equal opportunity to all the qualified voters of a State desiring to participate in the parties' affairs to do so.

(3) The election or convention in which delegates to the national convention are selected shall be held not earlier than the first nor later than the twelfth day of July of that presidential year in which the national convention is held.

(b) If a convention system be used:

(1) Any State convention shall be composed entirely of delegates selected from political subdivisions of the State which in the aggregate comprise the entire State.

(2) Votes at the State convention shall be allocated among the political subdivisions directly in proportion to the votes cast in such subdivision for the electors of the party in the last Presidential election, rounded out to the closest whole number. If the party did not appear on the ballot in the last Presidential election, votes at the State convention shall be allocated among the political subdivisions directly in proportion to their population according to the last decennial census, rounded out to the closest whole number.

(3) The delegates shall be free to nominate persons for the party's nomination for President. They shall then hold one ballot at which the delegates, or the delegations from the subdivisions, shall cast their votes. Such method of voting shall be in accordance with a system which affords proportionate representation, by fair and proportionate representative process, to the voters of the State adhering to each political party qualifying.

(4) When the votes for the party's nomination for President are tallied, it shall be determined what percentage of the total vote was cast for each nominee, and the delegates to the national convention from the party conventions of that State who are supporters of each nominee shall be in proportion to the votes cast for that nominee, to

the closest single delegate. There shall be no additional delegates sent from the State to the national convention, such as "at large" delegates. The group of delegates to the national convention, selected as the proportionate representation of each nominee, shall be selected by a caucus of those delegates at the State convention who voted for that nominee.

(5) If any convention of a subdivision, such as the precinct or county convention, elects to send to the next higher convention within the State a delegation which is instructed with respect to the candidates for the Presidency, a like procedure of proportionate representation shall be followed. The group of delegates to the next higher convention selected at any convention in a subdivision of the State, such as a precinct or a county, shall be selected by a caucus of those delegates in that subdivision's convention who voted for that nominee.

(6) In the event that only one nominee is presented at the convention of a State, county, precinct or political subdivision (as in the case of a favorite son nominee) notice may be given by any member of the convention of opposition to such single nominee. In that event, his name shall be presented for votes for or against such nominee and the delegation from the convention shall be constituted in proportion to the yea and nay votes in the same manner as if the yea votes had been cast for one candidate and the nay votes for another.

(c) If an election system be used:

(1) There shall be fair and comprehensive provisions for elections, including qualifications of nominees, the method of placing names on the ballot, and other election details.

(2) When the votes for a party's nomination for President are tallied, it shall be determined what percentage of the total vote was cast for each nominee, and the delegates to the national convention for each of the nominees shall be in proportion to the votes cast for that nominee to the closest single delegate.

(3) The group of delegates to the national convention selected as the proportionate representation of each nominee shall be selected by that nominee or by his designee, which may be his political organization in the State in question, as he shall designate.

(d) Instruction of delegates. Those delegates selected as delegates of a candidate may be bound to support such candidate through the first ballot of the convention and shall not otherwise be bound in any way with respect to support of candidates for presidential or vice presidential nomination. Such instruction shall be imposed only by the body, group or person selecting such delegates as provided in (b) and (c) of this section, and such instruction, if given, must be given in the caucus or in the letter of instruction in which they are named. Such instruction as may be given shall not survive the life of the candidate, and a candidate may personally release such delegates from their instruction by written release delivered to the chairman of the delegation. In the case of such release or in case of death of a candidate, those delegates selected as delegates of such candidate shall not be bound by any instruction with respect to support of candidates for presidential or vice presidential nomination. The rule stated here applies to all convention levels at which there are delegates from a lower convention and applies to delegates to the national convention of a party whether selected under (b) or (c) of this section.

(e) Effect of noncompliance. The failure of State legislation to comply with the uniform standards set out in section 302, or the failure of State legislation to be so certified by the Attorney General, shall not affect the general validity of the State's process for participating in the party presidential nom-

ination procedure but shall render the State ineligible to receive grants or other benefits under this Act.

(e) Financial Assistance to States.

(1) Each State which—

(A) has in effect on January 1 of the calendar year in which the President is elected a primary election statute which the Attorney General has determined is in compliance with this section, and

(B) has established a nominating fund, as provided in this section, shall receive in such calendar year, as a grant-in-aid from the Federal Government for such nominating fund, twenty cents for each vote cast in such year for a candidate for a party's nomination for President in the primary election held pursuant to the certified State statute to aid in defraying the expenses of such election, to be distributed to or used on behalf of each political party using such primary.

(2) Each State which—

(A) has in effect on January 1 of the calendar year in which the President is elected a convention statute which the Attorney General has determined is in compliance with this section, and

(B) has established a nominating fund, as provided in this section, shall receive during such calendar year, as a grant-in-aid from the Federal Government, for such nominating fund one dollar per hundred population of the State to be distributed to or used on behalf of each political party using such convention system.

(3) Any State electing to participate in a system of delegate selection provided for in this Act may submit to the Department of Justice proposed legislation complying with the standards set out in this section; and the Attorney General of the United States may give approval to the form of statute, which shall constitute assurance to the State that, if such legislation is enacted, the State will be in compliance with the uniform standards set out in this section. In that event, no further action, other than notification to the Justice Department by the Governor of the passage of the Act, shall be necessary. Upon receiving such notification, the Attorney General shall certify to the Commission that the State's statute meets the requirements set out herein.

(4) In the event that no such prior notice is given to the Justice Department, or the proposed legislation submitted to the Justice Department is amended before enactment by the State, the Governor of the State shall, after the passage of such legislation, certify to the Justice Department that such legislation has been passed. The Attorney General of the United States shall then consider such legislation. If such legislation is in compliance with uniform standards for such legislation set out in this section, he shall so certify to the complying State and to the Commission.

(5) Whenever the Attorney General determines, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that a State statute approved under subsection (a) or (b) has been so amended that it no longer complies with the requirements set out in section 302, he shall inform such State and the Commission that such State's statute is no longer a State statute which is approved under this section. After the Attorney General notifies such State, no further payments may be made under this Act to such State, or to political parties in such State.

(6) A State shall establish a nominating fund to aid in offsetting the expenses of the primary election or convention process. Such fund may be used by the State in such manner as it may provide by law to further the holding of party nominating conventions or elections and amounts remaining in such after such conventions or elections shall be available for the purposes of section 206. A party's procedure leading to the selection of presidential and vice presidential candi-

dates may be combined with the party's procedures for selecting other party candidates, and expenditures may be made from the fund established under this subsection to pay the cost of such combined procedure. The State may either become the depository of all funds, from whatever derivation, and provide for payment of costs of elections or conventions, or it may provide means by which funds shall go from the State or Federal sources (or both) to the party to conduct such elections or conventions. Thus, if a State generally qualifies to receive grants-in-aid, but because of policy or statutory or constitutional limitation of the State may not receive and distribute such funds to a political party from the State's own treasury of funds, such funds may be distributed directly by the Federal Government to the appropriate political party as the State may direct. No moneys from this fund shall be used for other than the defraying of the costs of an election, a convention, or the costs of the television programs referred to in title II, section 206 of this Act.

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.—

(a) The term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, or any other territory or possession allowed to vote in national political conventions.

(b) "Qualified political party" means a party which has qualified for its candidates or electors to be placed on the ballots throughout the State for president and vice president for the current election year; provided, however: If it has qualified in past years and is not yet required to be qualified in a given election year at the time of the applicability of this Act to the action involved, it is a "qualified political party" if its duly authorized agent expresses the intention of the party to qualify giving notice of intent in such manner as the State law may provide. But at any time that it has passed a deadline for qualification in a presidential year, is not yet qualified and may not qualify under the law of the State, it shall not then and thereafter be a "qualified political party."

(c) "Commission" means the Federal Commissions Commission.

(d) "Committee" means the Committee on Public Debate.

(e) "Population," wherever used, means population according to the last decennial census.

(f) "Attorney General" means the Attorney General of the United States.

(g) "Justice Department" means the Department of Justice of the United States.

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act (other than sections 203 and 204) shall take effect on January 1 of the year following the year in which it is enacted. Sections 203 and 204 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

ABM SYSTEM RIDICULOUS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a thin antiballistic-missile defense system around the United States would be as obsolete as the Great Wall of China. It will be as ineffective as the maginot line. This proposal would be a rerun of the gallant Polish cavalry charging Hitler's panzer divisions. It will be as ridiculous as guerrillas in South Vietnam shooting arrows at low-flying jet bombers.

Mr. Speaker, I remember one day in high school the principal turned out the entire student body to see a picturesque troop of U.S. Army cavalry passing by.

I wondered even then how these splendid men would fare in battle with armored tanks and bombers. Since becoming a Member of the Congress, I recall going on a national TV and radio broadcast to debate a retired general who advocated a reactivation of the horse cavalry. I keep on the wall of my office a picture of Billy Mitchell as a constant reminder that we cannot provide security for this Nation and the cause of freedom on military concepts of the past. To do so today will be playing into the hands of our enemies and will be fatal. If we had listened in the early 1930's to those who advocated airpower, tanks, and modernized weaponry, including aircraft carriers, we might have avoided World War II and preserved the peace of the world. No, Mr. Speaker, we must not fall into the error of taking an instrument of war or defense today and base our security on that instrumentality tomorrow. Alexander the Great conquered the world because he developed something new—the Greek phalanx. Rome conquered the world and maintained its power for centuries by developing something new—the Roman legion. Napoleon dazzled Europe with something new—the mass use of artillery in battle. In defense planning we cannot look backward. We must look forward. This money must be used for offensive instrumentalities of defense. No nation will move against America if they are sure of destruction in their own homeland. Tomorrow the only true defense will be an overwhelming offensive power. With our advances in space, we could remain capable of destroying any aggressor on his home ground.

Mr. Speaker, even laymen are aware there is no defense today against a missile in air or a bomb from space with many hydrogen warheads that can separate in flight and change direction to numerous targets. I urge our new and great Secretary of Defense and the Congress to abandon this thin anti-missile defense as utterly inadequate and ridiculous. I urge the Secretary and the Congress to look to the year 2000 and develop an offensive potential which will promote peace throughout the world and preserve the security of the American people.

THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969." It gives me great pleasure to say that I am joined in cosponsoring this bill by eight distinguished colleagues from both sides of the aisle: the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RED), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY). The improvement of intergovernmental relations is

not and should not be a matter for party politics.

This measure is designed to build on the firm foundation established by the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of last year—Public Law 90-577—and is geared to strengthening further the management of Federal assistance programs. By focusing on the accounting, auditing, and fiscal reporting of grant funds, by facilitating consolidation of functionally related aid programs, by establishing expeditious procedures for processing projects drawing on more than one such program, and by strengthening congressional as well as executive branch grant-in-aid oversight, this measure faces squarely the key administrative deficiencies at the national level that must be corrected if federalism today is to meet and overcome the divisive challenges confronting it and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, which I had the privilege of sponsoring, constitutes the first major step in bringing some order to the confused state of contemporary Federal-State-local relations. By revamping procedures affecting the distribution of Federal grant funds to the States, by authorizing Federal departments and agencies to provide specialized and technical services to other jurisdictions on a reimbursable basis, by mandating a coordinated intergovernmental policy for the administration of development assistance grants, by establishing uniform policies and procedures with respect to the acquisition and disposal of urban land, and by beginning to strengthen congressional oversight over certain grant programs, some of the impediments to the effective operation of our federal system have been removed. How beneficial this legislation will be in the long run depends, of course, on the character of the implementing rules and regulations now being developed by the Bureau of the Budget and on the willingness of Federal departments and agencies to comply with the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Meanwhile, we must move forward on the legislative front. Many serious problems still face us in the area of Federal-State-local relations. No breakthrough has been achieved in improving the fiscal management of Federal assistance programs. No effort has been mounted on a broad, meaningful basis to reduce to a more manageable number the more than 420 categorical grants through the consolidation of functionally related programs into bloc grants. No meaningful procedures have been developed to facilitate the combining of closely related Federal assistance programs by State and local governments. And much too modest steps have been taken so far to provide Congress with the manpower to strengthen its programs oversight responsibilities, or to improve departmental and Executive Office of the President oversight with regard to these programs.

The lack of adequate action in these areas clearly signifies that further reform of the grant-in-aid system should be made a top priority item for this Congress. In large measure, these assistance programs represent a national re-

sponse to the severe public service and the fiscal pressures that State and local governments have felt since the end of World War II, and especially during the past decade. Federal aid to State and local governments experienced a nearly fourfold increase between 1957 and 1967, with an average annual rise of over 14 percent. Federal grants now involve well over 420 separate authorizations, as estimated \$25 billion for fiscal year 1970, and approximately 18 percent of estimated State and local revenue. At least 280 of these programs have been enacted since 1963.

However meritorious the purposes of Federal grant programs may be, this tremendous expansion of Federal aid has brought major problems as well. The extraordinary number and variety of these programs have created conditions of overlapping, duplication, and fragmentation at all levels. The excessive emphasis on narrow program categories has tended to obscure the need to deal with problems from the broad perspective of each level of government as a whole. Differing financial reporting, accounting, and auditing requirements among the various programs have generated as much conflict as cooperation among the personnel involved in these functions. Furthermore, efforts to develop an overview with respect to the operation of these programs—either within the committees of Congress or within the top management sector of the executive branch—have been largely sporadic and largely unsuccessful.

The legislation I introduce today comes to grips with these administrative defects, which undermine the collaborative basis of our federal system. It does so by concentrating on strengthening the financial management of Federal assistance programs, by authorizing a new way to speed grant consolidations, by establishing new procedures to facilitate the packaging of various aid programs, and by strengthening the monitoring of the operation of these programs by Congress, the departments, and the President.

Each of these provisions has been recommended by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on which I am privileged to serve. The goals of the measure as a whole are supported by the major associations of public officials, including the National Governors' Conference, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, and U.S. Conference of Mayors. The financial management, Federal assistance consolidations, and joint funding simplification titles, in many instances, reflect changes urged in testimony at hearings Act enacted last year.

Mr. Speaker, if we face a management crisis in federalism, and I am convinced on the Intergovernmental Cooperation that we do, then this legislation is needed. I earnestly hope that early hearings can be scheduled on this measure and that final House action on it can be accomplished this session.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a section-by-section analysis of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969):

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1969

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

This title contains definitions of two terms used frequently in other titles of the bill.

TITLE II—ACCOUNTING, AUDITING, AND REPORTING OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

Title II amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-577) by adding a new Title VII which deals with the accounting, auditing, and reporting of Federal assistance funds. Section 701 sets forth the purposes of this new title: to encourage the simplification and standardization of the diverse financial reporting requirements of Federal assistance programs, to promote among Federal grant agencies accounting and auditing policies that rely on those State and local fiscal control systems which meet certain professional standards, and to empower the Comptroller General of the United States to establish rules and regulations for use of certain State and local audits in meeting GAO's responsibilities regarding Federal assistance programs.

More uniform financial reporting

Section 702 authorizes the President, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to establish rules and regulations that will simplify and, where possible, make more uniform the financial reporting requirements associated with Federal assistance programs. The purpose here is to bring greater order to a situation where widely varying forms, differing time schedules, and divergent data requests have undermined the basic objectives of meaningful fiscal reporting on Federal assistance programs.

Federal agencies reliance on the financial management control systems of States and their political subdivisions

Section 703 declares it to be the purpose of this section that Federal agencies administering assistance programs to State and local governments shall, to the greatest extent feasible, rely on the internal or independent accounting and auditing of these programs performed by recipient jurisdictions. Under this section, heads of agencies are assigned the responsibility of determining the adequacy of the internal financial management control systems utilized by recipient jurisdictions. In meeting this responsibility, such heads will, among other things, ascertain whether accounting records are maintained and reports prepared according to generally accepted accounting principles, whether audits are carried out in a way that meets generally accepted auditing standards, and whether the auditing function is performed in a timely fashion by a qualified professional staff that is sufficiently independent—in an administrative and political sense—from program operations, so that a comprehensive and objective audit can be performed. Where such control systems are found acceptable, agency heads, in the absence of substantial reasons to the contrary, are required to accept the audits performed under such systems as a substitute for those which otherwise would be performed by their own agency personnel. The periodic sample testing technique is cited as the chief means of verifying the continuing reliability of accepted control systems.

In order to strengthen the cooperative relationships among fiscal management personnel, each Federal agency administering assistance programs is required (under Section 703(e)) to maintain continuous liaison with counterpart State and local fiscal control administrators and the interchange of audit standards and objectives and inter-level collaboration in the development of audit schedules are specifically cited as means of furthering this liaison. To reduce the proliferation of accounting and auditing systems within and between Federal agencies, Federal agency heads are required, to

the extent feasible and permitted by law, to coordinate and make more uniform the auditing requirements of assistance programs coming under their jurisdiction (Section 703 (f)) and to establish cross-servicing arrangements with other agencies for audit purposes (Section 703(g)). The Bureau of the Budget, or such other agency as may be designated by the President, is authorized to prescribe government-wide rules and regulations for the effective implementation of this section.

Acceptance by the General Accounting Office of audits of States and their political subdivisions

Section 704 of this new title authorizes the Comptroller General to prescribe rules and regulations that would permit the General Accounting Office to accept for its grant audit purposes the auditing performed by recipient State and local governments, provided that such auditing is performed under internal financial management control systems whose procedures meet generally accepted auditing standards and whose personnel are professional and in a position to render a comprehensive and objective audit. As in the case of the previous section, periodic sample testing is relied upon as the chief device for verifying the continued reliability of accepted systems. This section also calls for an annual report to the Congress by the Comptroller General on the operations of this section.

TITLE III—CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

This title further amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-577) by adding another title to it dealing with a new approach to achieving consolidations of Federal assistance programs.

Section 801 declares the title's basic purposes and states that the President from time to time shall examine the various Federal assistance programs and determine what consolidations are necessary and desirable in order to upgrade the management and coordination of individual programs falling within the same functional area, and to promote more efficient planning and use by recipient jurisdictions of such programs.

Section 801(b) establishes a Congressional policy with respect to Federal assistance program consolidations and declares that the better management purposes of this title can best be accomplished by its enactment.

Preparation and transmittal of plan

Under Section 802, the President, after finding that a consolidation of two or more functionally-related aid programs is necessary and desirable to achieve the purpose(s) of this title, is authorized to prepare a consolidation plan and to transmit it to Congress along with a declaration indicating his finding that the plan will further the purposes of this title.

Each consolidation plan transmitted must place responsibility in a single Federal agency for the administration of the consolidated program; specify the new, single matching formula and, where the individual programs being combined have apportionment formulas, such a formula for rendering Federal assistance under the consolidated program; include other conditions and requirements for rendering such assistance, including planning and eligibility requirements, which are suggested by counterpart provisions of Federal assistance statutes affected by the consolidation plan; spell out the differences between the formulas, conditions, and requirements of a consolidation plan and those in such counterpart provisions; provide for the transfer or other disposition of records, property, and personnel of the individual assistance programs involved; arrange for the transfer of those unexpended balances of appropriations and of other funds available for the individual assistance programs affected insofar as the President considers it necessary in light of the functions authorized by the consolidated program (except that unexpended balances thus transferred

may be used only for purposes authorized in the original appropriation); and make provision for terminating the affairs of an agency or administrative unit whose programs have been transferred pursuant to the proposed consolidation. With reference to the President's discretion in determining a consolidation plan's formulas, requirements, and conditions, its scope is limited by two factors: first, no such provision can be included that is not present in at least one of the individual aid programs being consolidated, and second, whenever two or more differing matching (or apportionment) ratios are present in such programs the new figure must fall within the bounds set by these ratios.

Finally, this section stipulates that each Federal assistance consolidation plan shall provide for only one consolidation of individual assistance programs and that the President when transmitting such a plan, shall have it delivered to both Houses of Congress on the same date and to each when in session.

Congressional consideration

Sections 803 and 804 of this title set forth the manner in which Congress shall consider Federal assistance consolidation plans. In all major respects the procedure here parallels the provisions that formerly applied under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. One major difference between the two appears in Section 803 which stipulates that a Federal assistance consolidation plan shall only become effective at the end of the first period of ninety calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after transmittal date (rather than sixty calendar days), unless between the day of transmittal and the end of the ninety day period either House passes a resolution not favoring the plan.

Expiration date

Section 805 limits the authority of the President under Section 802 to three years after the date of enactment. This provision is geared to giving both Congress and the Executive Branch an opportunity to review the operation of this title after a reasonable period of time.

TITLE IV—JOINT FUNDING SIMPLIFICATION

Section 401 further amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 by adding a new Title IX dealing with joint funding simplification. Section 901 states that the purpose of the title is to enable States and localities to use Federal aid programs more effectively and efficiently, to adapt these programs more readily to their individual needs by facilitating the broader use of joint projects involving more than one aid program, and to acquire experience that would lead to additional legislative proposals regarding consolidation, coordination, and simplification of Federal assistance programs. The statement of purpose also indicates the basic organizational focus of the title (which differs from that of predecessor legislation introduced in the 90th Congress) wherein primary emphasis is given to developing widespread use of joint projects and joint funding arrangements within individual departments and placing counterpart efforts at the interdepartmental level on an experimental and limited demonstration basis.

Intradepartmental joint projects

Section 902 deals wholly with procedures involving intradepartmental joint projects and joint funding arrangements. Under it, the head of each Federal department and agency administering more than one Federal aid program is authorized to approve combined applications for joint projects requiring funding from two or more such programs falling under his jurisdiction. To develop the necessary departmental or agency capability for achieving the purposes of this title, Section 902(b) requires departmental heads, among other things, to identify related aid programs within his agency

that are likely candidates for joint projects; to develop and promulgate guidelines, joint project examples, common application forms, and other materials that will facilitate development of an interdepartmental joint project program; to review the various administrative requirements of departmental assistance programs in order to identify those that might impede the expeditious processing of joint project applications and where appropriate make the necessary modifications; to establish common technical or administrative rules for related departmental assistance programs; to create common or joint application processing and project supervision procedures—including establishing a single unit for handling these functions; and to develop common auditing, accounting, and fiscal reporting procedures to facilitate establishment of fiscal and program accountability with respect to joint projects approved by him.

In order to provide the means of cutting the red tape arising from the varying procedural requirements associated with individual assistance program, the head of each Federal department and agency administering two or more such programs is authorized under section 902(c) to adopt, subject to such regulations as may be promulgated by the President pursuant to Section 902(f), uniform provisions regarding inconsistent or conflicting agency requirements involving financial administration, the timing of Federal payments, whether assistance must be extended in the form of a grant or a contract, merit personnel systems (but only to the extent that a proposed joint project would cause these requirements to be applied to programs not otherwise subject to them), the accountability for or the disposition of property or structures acquired or constructed with Federal assistance, and other relevant administrative and technical items defined in regulations issued pursuant to subsection (f).

To develop the intradepartmental financial arrangements necessary for expediting joint projects, each head of a department and agency administering two or more Federal assistance programs is permitted under Section 902(d) to set up a single board or panel for the review of combined applications to his department; to prescribe rules and regulations for establishing joint management funds with respect to joint projects approved by him, so that the total amount approved for any project may be accounted for as if the funds had been derived from a single aid program or authorization; to establish uniform rules and regulations governing the fiscal reporting of projects financed through joint management funds; to have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to relevant records and other data of recipient States and local governments relating to moneys received from joint management funds authorized by him; and to establish a single non-Federal share for any joint project authorized by him and covered in a joint management fund.

Section 902(e) permits such heads of departments and agencies, subject to such regulations as may be established pursuant to subsection (f), to enter into agreements with States to extend the benefits of joint projects and joint management funds to cover combined applications involving not only assistance from programs administered by his department but also from those administered by one or more State agencies. In most instances, such arrangements will be restricted primarily to those program areas where Federal assistance is normally channeled through the States.

Under Section 902(f), the President is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to provide for the more effective administration of funds drawn from more than one Federal assistance program or authorization in support of interdepartmental projects authorized by this section. While fewer administrative problems

can be expected to arise in establishing meaningful departmental joint project programs than in the case of interdepartmental projects, energetic and consistent departmental efforts may not always be forthcoming—hence, the need for this section.

Section 902(g) declares that this section shall become effective 120 days following the date of enactment. This extra time is provided to permit departments to develop the necessary internal machinery and procedures for the effective management of a joint project program.

Interdepartmental demonstration joint projects

Section 903 extends selectively the benefits of joint projects and joint management funding on a government-wide basis. This is done in recognition of the administrative difficulties involved in this commendable but complex undertaking. Section 903(a) authorizes the President to approve on a demonstration basis combined applications for joint projects requiring funding from two or more Federal assistance programs administered by more than one Federal department or agency.

Section 903(b) gives to the President with respect to interdepartmental projects authorities comparable to those assigned to heads of departments and agencies under Section 902(b), (c), (d), and (e). This is done in order to facilitate the development of the necessary capability in the Executive Office of the President for processing and administering interdepartmental joint projects and joint management funds.

Section 903(c) authorizes the President to establish rules and regulations requiring the delegation by heads of Federal departments and agencies to other departments and agencies of project or program approval authority insofar as it involves programs or classes of programs included in an interdepartmental joint project(s). Without this authority, it is doubtful whether the goals of this section can be achieved. Such rules and regulations may also call for the delegation to other Federal departments and agencies of powers relating to the supervision of Federal assistance programs. These rules and regulations are conditioned by the proviso that they must be appropriate to assure that the powers and functions delegated are utilized in full conformity with applicable statutory provisions or policies.

Section 903(d) is geared to permitting establishment of joint management funds on an interdepartmental basis. Accordingly, the President is authorized to make rules and regulations, not inconsistent with other applicable law, governing the setting up of joint management funds involving moneys derived from two or more Federal assistance programs administered by more than one Federal department or agency. These rules and regulations will assure that the necessary accounting, auditing, and other fiscal information will be made available to the departments involved, the Congress, and the Executive Office of the President. They also shall stipulate that any department or agency administering a joint fund shall be accountable for the total amount provided for the purposes of each account established in the fund and shall practice accounting and auditing policies consistent with new Title VII. Such rules and regulations may include procedures for determining on a periodic basis whether amounts in the account are in excess of those required, for returning that excess to participating agencies according to an equitable distribution formula, and for making returns to applicable appropriations, subject to fiscal year limitations.

Section 903(e) requires the President to submit annually to Congress a report evaluating the progress in accomplishing the purposes of this title. This report will be submitted in every January beginning with the first January following the end of the first

fiscal year after the effective date of this section.

Section 903(f) underscores the demonstration nature of this entire section. Consequently, individual interdepartmental joint projects initiated under its authority must not exceed 100 in any one fiscal year nor exceed 250 during the three year life of this section.

The final subsection stipulates that this section will become effective 120 days following the date of enactment and will expire three years after it has become effective. Such expiration, however, shall not affect the administration of interdepartmental joint projects previously approved.

Auxiliary provisions

Section 904(a) is designed to help provide technical assistance to State and local governments involved in developing combined applications for joint projects. Under it, appropriations available to any Federal aid program for technical assistance or personnel training may be made available for the provision of such assistance in connection with joint projects involving that program and any other Federal aid program. In addition, the personnel of any Federal agency (pursuant to Section 904(b)) may be detailed from time to time, where necessary, to other agencies to assist in processing combined applications or in administering approved joint projects.

The authority of the Comptroller General of the United States

Section 905 states that the Comptroller General of the United States shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of recipients of intradepartmental or interdepartmental joint projects relating to moneys received from joint management funds for the purpose of GAO audit and examination.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL AND EXECUTIVE OVERSIGHT OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Section 501 of this Act amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 by adding a new subsection at the end of Section 601. This amendment is designed to strengthen Congressional review procedures for grants-in-aid enacted on or after January 3, 1971 and having termination provisions of three or more years. During the year preceding the date on which the program authority is to expire, the relevant substantive Committees of Congress, either separately or jointly, will conduct studies of the program and advise their respective Houses of their findings with special reference to the factors cited in Section 601(a) (1), (2), (3), and (4). The Committee report will be filed with the respective Houses not later than 120 days before the program is slated to expire.

Section 502 amends Title VI of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 by adding two new sections following Section 603 and appropriately renumbering Section 604. The first of these new sections authorizes establishment of the position of review specialist on each standing committee of the Senate and House responsible for the review, study, and oversight of two or more assistance programs. This additional professional staff member will be selected and appointed by the Chairman of the standing committee with prior approval of the ranking minority member. He would serve on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of professional competence. His basic assignment would be to assist the Committee in its performance of functions assigned by this title and he would be under the joint direction of the Chairman and the ranking minority member.

The second new section (Section 605) is geared to strengthening Executive Branch oversight with respect to Federal assistance programs. Under it, heads of Federal departments and agencies administering more than one program would submit annually a report to Congress and the President on the opera-

tions of these programs, beginning with the first fiscal year following the date of enactment. These departmental reports among other things would cover the progress and effectiveness of administrative efforts to carry out the programs' statutory goals; the consultative procedures utilized under each program to afford recipient governments a chance to review and comment on proposed administrative regulations and basic program changes; the various intradepartmental and interdepartmental arrangements for achieving proper headquarters-field program coordination; efforts to simplify and make more uniform application forms and procedures as well as fiscal reporting and auditing requirements; the feasibility of consolidating functionally related assistance programs; the practicability of delegating more administrative authority—including project or program approval power—to departmental field offices; whether the purpose, management, administrative procedures and requirements in such programs should be changed; and the degree to which such programs are meeting the growing and changing needs they were initially designed to support.

This new section (Section 605) concludes with the requirement that the President shall submit a summary report on these various departmental studies not later than January 31 of each year following the first fiscal year after the date of enactment. This report would be a synthesis of the materials presented in the various departmental studies and would stress the broad problems confronting grants-in-aid as effective government-wide devices for intergovernmental cooperation. Presidential proposals for reform might well be a concluding feature of this report.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I submit, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969." This measure serves as a followup to predecessor legislation enacted last year—Public Law 90-577—and constitutes a second major step toward strengthening the collaborative relationships among the Federal, State, and local governments. In essence, it is a good-management bill, in that all of its titles seek to overcome antiquated and ineffective techniques of public administration—techniques which must be revamped if American federalism is to adapt to the rapidly changing needs of our times.

Intergovernmental relations have experienced a major transformation since the end of World War II. Three key factors have triggered this dramatic change: the emergence of a greater role for State and local government, an accelerating tendency to rely upon categorical grants-in-aid, and the dramatic emergence of a more urban America.

Rapid urbanization and the rapid expansion of our population have generated tremendous demands from our citizenry for more and better public services during the past two decades. Most of this demand has fallen on State and local governments. Witness the fact that over the past decade expenditures by these jurisdictions rose at an average annual rate of 8.8 percent compared to 6.3 percent for direct nondefense spending by the Federal Government and that these expenditures now represent two-thirds of all civil governmental outlays.

Given these heavy pressures on the fiscal and administrative resources of State and local governments, the National Government was called upon to

mount its own response and as a result Federal grant-in-aid programs grew steadily both in volume and diversity in recent years. More than 420 categorical grants are currently in operation, involving approximately \$25 billion for fiscal year 1970 and these grant funds account for approximately 18 percent of all State and local revenues. In 1948 by way of contrast, Federal aid amounted to only \$1.8 billion and provided only a little over 10 percent of the State and local revenue.

The emergence of a greater role for all governments—especially State and local governments—and the rapid growth of Federal categorical grants are closely linked to the rapid pace of urbanization that the Nation has experienced since 1945. Fifty years ago, less than half of our population was urban. Twenty years ago, 58 percent fell in this category. Today, more than three-quarters of our people live in urban communities. And by the year 2000 when our population will have surpassed the 315 million mark, approximately 19 out of every 20 Americans will be urban dwellers. With this surging pace of urbanization, there has come an increase in the number of jurisdictions in urban areas and in the number and kinds of urban development programs. During the next fiscal year, approximately \$16.6 billion of the estimated \$25 billion total in Federal aid funds will be spent in metropolitan areas, according to Bureau of the Budget calculations. This figure is nearly twice that spent in 1964 and more than four times that disbursed in 1961.

These developments combine to bring us to a point where the need for intergovernmental administrative reform is mandatory. The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, given proper implementation by the Bureau of the Budget and the Federal departments and agencies affected, began the process of bringing greater order to the management muddle that faces our federal system. The measure I introduce today is geared to accelerating the pace of reform.

There is, after all, a need to simplify and systematize financial reporting requirements of Federal assistance programs. There is a need on the part of Federal agencies as well as of the General Accounting Office to recognize that the financial management systems of State and local governments are not necessarily inferior to those utilized at the Federal level. There is a desperate need for agencies administering grants-in-aid to coordinate and make more uniform the auditing requirements of such programs. There is an even greater urgency with respect to the need to reduce the overall number of categorical grants by combining overlapping and functionally related programs into fewer and larger bloc grants. There is an obvious need for new procedures that will facilitate the packaging of aid programs by recipient jurisdictions—procedures that will be used widely and effectively on a departmental basis and operate interdepartmentally on an experimental basis. There is a need on the part of Congress to acquire the professional manpower to assist the substantive com-

mittees in their oversight responsibilities with respect to grant programs. Finally, there is a pressing need on the part of Federal department heads, the Congress, and the President to acquire a more comprehensive and systematic view of the operations of Federal assistance programs.

The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 establishes ways and means of meeting these needs. Its provisions implement major recommendations advanced by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I am proud to serve as a member, advanced in their massive, two-volume study of "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System." Most of its provisions have been specifically sanctioned by major organizations representing public officials throughout the Nation—the National Governors' Conference, National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, and U.S. Conference of Mayors. Two of its titles received extensive examination during hearings conducted last year by the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee and they now include perfecting amendments advanced during the course of these proceedings.

American federalism is at the crossroads. One road leads to continued chaos in contemporary intergovernmental relations. The other points to strengthening the position of political executives at all levels, the top management sector assisting them, and curbing the power of narrow program specialists at all levels. The bill, I introduce, follows this second high and tough road to intergovernmental reform.

Unnecessary complexity, inconsistent requirements, excessively lengthy and duplicating procedures, time-consuming delays, the multiplicity of programs, widely dispersed authority, unclear responsibility and similar bureaucratic inefficiencies have greatly handicapped State and local officials, diminished the value of Federal assistance, frustrated the expectations of beneficiaries, added to the taxpayers' burdens, and weakened the confidence of the American people in their government's ability to help. This bill will go far toward correcting these conditions.

If Congress is to sustain and reassert its traditional role as "umpire of the federal system," action on this legislation should come at an early date. No less than the future of American federalism depends upon how and whether we respond to the crucial questions to which this legislation addresses itself.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, in conjunction with several of my colleagues, a bill entitled "The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969." The 90th Congress pioneered in efforts to reassert Congress' role as reconciler of conflicts within our federal system. Enactment of Public Law 90-577—the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968—constituted a first step toward reducing friction in our complex system of intergovernmental relations. The legislation, proposed today provides the basis for taking another giant stride forward. The response of this Congress must

be no less positive than that of its predecessor.

As a member of the Government Operations Committee, I cosponsored and fought for enactment of last year's Intergovernmental Cooperation Act but there is need for additional legislation in this area along the lines that I am proposing today. Need for this additional legislation was highlighted in the 10th Annual Report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. In summarizing developments on the grant-in-aid front during the year 1968, the ACIR declared:

The year saw a continued "hardening of the categories" in the immense and intricate Federal grant-in-aid system. Many believed that the passage of a Partnership for Health Act in 1966 might begin a trend toward consolidation and combination of categorical grant programs. But progress on this front was painfully slow. The Partnership for Health grant itself was eroded by Congressional categorization of health programs for migrant workers, alcoholics and drug addicts. In mid-year the Secretary of HEW, responding to powerful national education groups, ordered administration of the Elementary-Secondary Education programs to be withdrawn from regional offices back to Washington. The complex of interests—middle management program administrators at all levels, Congressional subcommittees, and pressure groups—that coalesce around the individual grants carried the day far more often than not, efforts to achieve a simplified, more flexible federalism were thwarted.

The perennial problem of proliferation, fragmentation, and duplication in the grant-in-aid system continues. The record with respect to consolidating functionally related grant-in-aid programs is less encouraging than it should be. There are continuing efforts to erode the few successful consolidations that have been achieved in recent years. Too often those who call for simplified procedures and more grant consolidations that have been achieved in recent years. Too often those who call for simplified procedures and more grant consolidations are at the same time trying to preserve the status quo in one particular program or another. All of this makes it clear that there is a real need for additional legislation to simplify and make more effective the grant-in-aid system.

In seeking to revamp the grant-in-aid system, I want to stress at the outset that reform is sought because the grant device is well worth saving. It is after all a technique for intergovernmental collaboration that has been with us for more than three-quarters of a century. In general, it has proven to be a realistic, reliable way of sharing Federal funds, while helping to achieve National purposes. In the long run and despite certain recent trends, it has demonstrated its compatibility with our decentralized, open-access, political system. If properly structured, it permits a fairly precise congressional review of appropriation requests and facilitates the job of administrative oversight. When sensitively administered, it assures a significant degree of flexibility and local adaptability. Reform, then, not abolition or a rigid adherence to the status quo, must be our goal.

While continuing to study and explore

other alternatives to assist States and localities, such as tax sharing, we must squarely confront the difficulties facing us in the grant-in-aid area. This system, still stands as the basic mechanism for Federal intergovernmental transfers of funds. It is still the major conditioner of the fiscal and administrative features of our contemporary federal system. Notwithstanding its critics, it is a system that is likely to be around for some time. The road to reform, however, is a rough one. The complexity of the system and the multiple clusterings of forces that swirl around and within each of the individual programs makes this largely a pick and shovel job. Bulldozers, unfortunately, are not available for this tough task of rebuilding.

The measure, I introduce today, deals directly with practical problems facing us now in grant administration. Four management problem areas are considered—fiscal administration, grant consolidation, simplified application procedures, and congressional and executive oversight. The deficiencies in these areas have been fully documented in reports by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and by subcommittees of the Government Operations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

In the field of financial management, the bill seeks to bring greater order to a situation where widely varying forms, differing time schedules, and divergent data requests have undermined the basic objectives of meaningful fiscal reporting of Federal assistance programs. To reduce some of the double paperwork, the drain on manpower, and some of the conflict among fiscal personnel, the measure requires Federal agencies administering assistance programs to rely—to the greatest extent possible—on the internal or independent accounting and auditing of these programs performed by recipient State and local governments. In a like fashion, it authorizes the Comptroller General of the United States to prescribe rules and regulations that will permit the GAO to accept for its grant audit purposes auditing performed by recipient jurisdictions, provided that it meets certain standards. To curb the proliferation of accounting and auditing systems within departments administering Federal aid programs, agency heads and the Bureau of the Budget are encouraged to coordinate and make more uniform the auditing requirements of these programs.

To reduce the chaos created by the overlapping and heavily fragmented pattern of more than 420 grant-in-aid authorizations, this measure incorporates a new approach to achieving grant consolidation. Under it, the President is authorized to submit consolidation plans to Congress under procedures similar to those formerly used with administrative reorganization plans. Each plan would involve the merging of individual programs within the same or related functional areas and assign administrative responsibility to one Federal agency. It would specify single matching and, where relevant, apportionment formulas, set forth such other requirements as are suggested by the individual grants being consolidated, and describe the differ-

ences between these new provisions and those of the programs slated for merger. The plan would become effective at the end of 90 calendar days of continuous session of Congress from the day of transmittal, unless either House passed a resolution opposing it.

This remedy for grant fragmentation is a tough one in the eyes of some. But, in my opinion, strong medicine is needed for a disease that is rampant. To those who endorse bloc grants, I commend this new approach. To those who are seriously interested about developing programs that incorporate broader national objectives and offer a more rapid response to changing conditions, I recommend this title. To those who are weary of the conflicting, overlapping, and uncoordinated requirements and procedures in existing grant-in-aid programs, I call attention to the benefits of this technique. To those who are depressed with the slow pace of legislative consolidations, I stress the real breakthrough that can be made in this area with enactment of this title.

The proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 also comes to grips with another basic difficulty in contemporary grant-in-aid management—the need to simplify and render more expeditious the process of applying for Federal assistance programs. Federal assistance in recent years has increasingly assumed an interdisciplinary character—as the problems of our urban society, to which more and more of these programs are directed, have become more interrelated and more interdependent. Yet this interdisciplinary approach faces severe, practical hurdles, in that the necessary funds come from several different programs and authorizations. Here again, another byproduct of excessive categorization is encountered.

Title IV of this measure would enable State and local governments to use Federal assistance programs under two or more programs in support of multipurpose projects. Under it, Federal agency heads would be authorized to establish uniform requirements respecting technical and administrative provisions of law so that jointly funded projects would not have to be subject to varying and conflicting rules of procedure.

Such heads could establish joint management funds in their agencies to finance multipurpose projects drawing upon appropriations from several different accounts, thus eliminating the separate funding nightmare that faces State and local officials seeking to package Federal assistance programs. Strong emphasis is given in this title to developing widespread use of joint projects and joint funding arrangements within individual departments and agencies. This is done in recognition of the obvious fact that these units face fewer problems of bureaucratic and program politics in launching a program of this kind than does the President or the Bureau of the Budget. Interdepartmental joint projects, on the other hand, are placed on a wholly experimental and a limited demonstration basis.

To strengthen further congressional oversight with respect to Federal assistance programs, the proposed legislation requires that the relevant standing com-

mittees review and report to their respective Houses on future grants-in-aid having a termination date of 3 or more years. To meet the staffing problem that many congressional committees face with respect to their grant oversight responsibilities, the post of review specialist is established on each standing committee charged with overseeing two or more such programs. This specialist would be selected and appointed by the chairman, with prior approval of the ranking minority member. He would serve on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of professional competence. His basic job would be to assist the committee in its performance of functions assigned by title VI of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, as amended.

To develop a clearer departmental, Executive Office of the President, and congressional view regarding the operation of grant-in-aid programs, the measure requires departments administering more than one grant-in-aid to submit annually a report to Congress on how its programs are being run. As a followup, the President is required to submit a summary report on these various departmental studies which highlights the materials thus presented and underscores the broad problems confronting grants-in-aid as effective Governmentwide means for intergovernmental cooperation. Presidential proposals for reform, in all likelihood, would be a concluding feature of this report.

In focusing on the fiscal, consolidation, application processing, and oversight dimensions of the grant management problem, this bill pushes boldly into the critical areas that must be probed if our federal system is to be adapted to the needs of the final third of the 20th century. We cannot avoid these areas—though they are controversial and crowded with powerful proponents of narrow program politics. We cannot ignore them and focus simply on easier, more dramatic remedies. We must stand and face these intricate challenges then, as this legislation does. In the final analysis the fate of our governmental system depends heavily on whether we have the capability and courage to bring the benefits of improved public management to these critical areas of intergovernmental administration.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the cosponsors of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 be granted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

MEDICINES AND YOUR FAMILY'S HEALTH

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard so much in recent months about some of the failures and the foibles of

the American drug industry that I am afraid we may be losing a bit of our perspective with regard to this great industry.

I certainly would not condone any wrongdoing in this industry or any other. But I do feel that in our investigative zeal we have perhaps tended to obscure the pertinent fact that in the past several decades the American pharmaceutical industry has made nothing short of phenomenal strides in their ability to combat disease.

Many of us can still remember when pneumonia, tuberculosis, syphilis, polio, and many other dread diseases were a scourge and a threat to many families. Today these and many other diseases have either vanished or become almost routine because of the capacity of new wonder drugs.

Surely, in our discussion of this great industry, we ought not to lose sight of these significant achievements of the drug industry and we ought not unwittingly to lay obstacles in the path of the drug industry that might impair their ability to duplicate such feats in the decades ahead.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a very informative advertisement which appears in the February 1969 issue of Reader's Digest, sponsored by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. It outlines some of these accomplishments which we can all be proud of and many of us can also be deeply grateful for.

The advertisement follows:

MEDICINES AND YOUR FAMILY'S HEALTH

Why some medicines can be worthless—even dangerous—unless their quality can be depended upon.

THE DIFFERENCE IN DRUGS—WHAT DIFFERENCE TO YOU?

In the spring of 1962 eight small children in a major West Coast hospital were undergoing a standard treatment for tuberculosis. The drug they were taking was well-tested and had a proven clinical history behind it.

Suddenly it was noticed that the youngsters were beginning to show alarming disorders hitherto unencountered in this treatment.

Hospital authorities and public health officials immediately launched a thoroughgoing investigation. Their judgment: the drug product had been contaminated, probably during manufacture, with a synthetic sex hormone called diethylstilbestrol.

A common incident? No. But one with a significant lesson: a drug product can be worthless and even dangerous unless its quality can be depended upon.

This is the reason reputable drug makers, regardless of size, devote so much of their time and money to continuous, meticulous quality control. It's also the reason the Federal Food and Drug Administration seeks to assure that its rules of good manufacturing practices—developed with the cooperation of experienced drug firms—are followed. These firms know that their reputation depends on their products' total performance. Assuring that dependability to you, your physician, and your pharmacist involves detailed control and testing.

For example, to reduce the margin of error to the smallest possible degree, a quality producer of a certain antibiotic insists upon 374 tests, consuming 406 hours through 35 stages of manufacture.

What kinds of tests does the producer of reputable pharmaceuticals employ? Many which most people might think hardly nec-

essary, but all of which help assure the quality of his product.

To begin with, the purity of the raw materials must be checked. And the purity of the finished product checked also, to assure that no accidental contamination occurred during the manufacturing process.

With certain drug products the size of the particles is exceedingly important and must be controlled. Since most drug substances are crystalline or powder in form, the size of their particles may be crucial to the rate of absorption, the speed with which the drug takes effect, and the duration of its action. It is not enough merely to know that certain particle sizes are important, the reputable manufacturer will analyze samples from each batch of his product to make certain the particle size meets exact specifications.

This is equally true when it comes to the quantity of active ingredients in each drug product. Because reliable pharmaceutical manufacturers seek to leave nothing to chance, they exercise elaborate continuous controls to determine that the products they sell always have the specified amounts of active ingredients. If a manufacturer cannot afford this kind of quality control he runs the risk of producing products where the drug content may vary widely from dose to dose.

Just as important to you and your doctor is the long-term stability of a drug product. For example, a new, ultrafine crystalline form of vitamin C was used in three preparations: an ordinary vitamin C tablet, a vitamin C injectable, and a capsule containing, in addition to the C vitamin, iron, liver, and other vitamins of the B-complex group. Because reputable manufacturers insist upon long-range stability tests as a normal procedure, it was discovered that, while the ultrafine vitamin C remained potent in the tablet and injectable, it rapidly deteriorated when mixed with the other products in the capsule. To assure stability many months after manufacture, the capsules were made only with coarser particles of vitamin C.

What do all these quality controls mean to the patient? Greater well-being. The knowledge that every safeguard is being used to assure him that the drug will work as it is supposed to. The confidence that a sustained release tablet, for instance, will release its active ingredients gradually as it should and not with one potentially dangerous jolt.

Quality control is the basis of your physician's confidence that the drug therapy he prescribes will be beneficial—and as safe as science can make it. It means he can trust the makers of reputable drug products to be as careful about your health as you would want them to be.

Is there any other way when it comes to your health?

HOW AMERICAN DRUGS HELPED THE KOREANS TO BETTER HEALTH

At twelve noon on April 5, 1955, a group of men were gathered in the main dining room of the White House. Fifty of them were presidents of American drug companies. Another gentleman was the distinguished physician, Dr. Howard A. Rusk. They had been called together by the White House to help improve the frightful health conditions in war-shattered South Korea.

At White House request, Dr. Rusk had gone to Korea to assess the health situation a number of times. His mission had been sponsored by the American-Korean Foundation under the chairmanship of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower. Dr. Rusk rose to report his impressions to the assembled group.

"After four years of fighting," he told them, "one third of the buildings have been destroyed, another third have been unroofed. There is only enough fuel for one hot meal a day. Water comes from polluted streams. Almost 13 percent of the people have tuberculosis, everyone has diseases of the skin and intestinal parasites. Polio, leprosy, dis-

eases of all kinds are rampant, and there are virtually no modern medicines or equipment to fight them with. The average life expectancy is 31 years of age."

He described a hospital for war orphans in Seoul—two children in each bed, little or no heat, no advanced drugs or facilities and barely a subsistence diet.

The problems of reconstruction and rehabilitation were so great that they could only be met by the United Nations and the governments of the free world. "But to supplement this official assistance," Dr. Rusk concluded, "Korea must have the warm, personal support of 'people to people.' This we believe to be essential, for our military efforts will have been in vain unless Korea emerges from the war as a strong, independent democratic nation."

Before the meeting was over, each of the 50 drug company presidents pledged the full support of his organization. Within a matter of hours modern medical supplies were being assembled throughout the United States for shipment to Korea.

Along with the contributions of thousands of other Americans—individuals and business firms in many fields—the drug industry has been building a people-to-people bridge to our Asian ally. Year after year a wide range of pharmaceuticals, vitamins and food supplements has been helping the Koreans to better health.

For example, a few years ago, the Minister of Health in South Korea sent out an urgent call for polio vaccine. An all-out campaign of immunization, he believed, could eliminate the scourge from his country. The head of a drug company, one of the large manufacturers of polio vaccine, was told of this request by the American-Korean Foundation. The company immediately promised to provide enough vaccine to inoculate almost a million Korean children. Dr. Kim Taek II, the Director of Korea's Public Health Bureau, said, "We are very grateful for the donation, which greatly helps our efforts to break the back of polio in this country."

One company alone has contributed a variety of drugs valued at more than a million dollars.

Another not only donated more than a quarter-million dollars' worth of influenza vaccine, but paid the cost of air shipping to Korea.

Still another recently sent 90,000 doses of measles vaccine valued at \$78,000.

Back from a visit to Korea in 1967, Dr. Rusk had this to say: "In 1953, the average life expectancy in Korea was 31 years of age. Now it is 63—more than double! Tuberculosis, while still a major problem affecting five percent of the population, afflicted almost 13 percent in 1953. Substantial progress has also been made against the age-old enemy, leprosy. Polio is on the way out. While much of this has been made possible by the help of governments and agencies and the courage of the Korean people themselves, the American drug industry has been the largest single private contributor to Korean health rehabilitation."

OUR PRESIDENTS' HEALTH—BEFORE THE ERA OF MODERN MEDICINE

Most of us still think of Washington as the robust, rosy-cheeked President of Gilbert Stuart's famous portrait. But Washington spent the first 30 years of his life plagued by a number of diseases and illnesses that modern drugs, properly administered, do much to cure and, in some cases, even prevent.

Between the ages of 16 and 22, Washington suffered his first attack of malaria, a case of smallpox that left his face badly marked for life, and a serious attack of pleurisy, probably tubercular in origin.

Recovering from these illnesses, he came down two years later with a long siege of influenza. Two years after that, in 1757, he was forced to leave his command of colonial troops in the French and Indian War for

several months because of an intestinal infection so severe his physician warned the 25-year-old man his life was in danger.

Just four years later, records show, Washington himself believed he was dying, when he was again stricken with what he thought was malaria, but what, in reality, may have been typhoid fever.

In contrast to the 1st President's early ill-health, Andrew Jackson, the nation's fiery 7th President, survived his youth with attacks of only malaria and small-pox, commonplace diseases in the U.S. then, but no longer, as a result of modern techniques, drugs and vaccines. In 1806, when he was 39, Jackson was wounded in a duel by a 480 grain leaden slug that shattered several ribs and lodged in his chest. The wound never fully healed.

Without modern surgical techniques to extract the bullet, or modern antibiotics to stem the chronic infection it caused, Jackson spent the rest of his life suffering from recurrent attacks of fever, chills, coughing and hemorrhages from the lungs, the result, probably, of a lung abscess caused by the bullet he carried in his chest.

So poor was his health when he took office, many thought he would not survive one term. But Jackson, often weak and in pain, remained active and forceful through two.

President Harrison, inaugurated in 1841 at 68, on the other hand, seemed to be in relatively good physical condition, aside from an apparent tendency to hyperacidity.

Taking the oath of office on one of the coldest inauguration days in history, Harrison nevertheless made the longest inauguration speech on record—an hour and forty minutes. By the time he returned to the White House, he had caught cold. A hectic schedule in the drafty, poorly heated executive mansion further sapped his strength and lowered his resistance.

Two weeks after his inaugural, Harrison grew suddenly worse and doctors diagnosed his condition as pneumonia of the right lower lobe, complicated by congestion of the liver.

Nineteenth century physicians, with little effective treatment at their command, such as that provided by modern drugs, were helpless to change the course of the President's illness.

One month to the day after his inauguration, Harrison was dead, the first American president to die in office.

A later chief executive, James Knox Polk, was more successfully treated for his illness, though not without suffering. Small and frail as a child, he endured, until 1812, when he was 17, the pain and chronic inflammation of what doctors diagnosed as a bladder stone. Their recommendation: surgery.

Surgeons, by then, had made some dramatic advances, but the first use of ether anesthesia in surgery was still 34 years in the future. For young Polk anesthesia was some opium and a slug of brandy. The operation, though short, was agony for the half-conscious patient. The safe pain-killing drugs known today were not available to ease his recovery.

But when Polk returned home some months later, he carried with him—in his hand—a bladder stone the size of a hazelnut.

Even a much more recent President might have been spared the affliction of a disease almost conquered in our country. The paralytic polio that attacked Franklin Roosevelt no longer brings down thousands of youngsters each year, because of modern vaccines.

Today, millions of Americans enjoy the benefits of medical care unknown to the most prominent men of the past. But it is not only the discovery and development of new drugs, and their use by the medical profession, that has helped bring this about. Their availability has also played a signifi-

cant role. They are there when you need them, almost anywhere you are.

YOUR DOLLAR AND YOUR HEALTH

Although in most places dollars are buying less today, at the prescription counter of your local pharmacy they have greater value than ever before.

During 1968, the government's Consumer Index for all prices reached a new high. Compared to a decade ago the purchasing power of the dollar dropped to a new low of 82 cents.

Yet in buying prescription drugs, your dollar has a value of almost \$1.15.

How come?

A number of factors tend to make your money worth more at the prescription counter. For one thing, price and product competition. Thus, such widely used agents as antibiotics and oral contraceptives have fallen in price over the years. Technological advances and marketing efficiency have also helped.

Modern drugs produced by quality-conscious manufacturers often shorten or prevent illness, cut the length of hospital stays, reduce visits to doctors' offices. Some newer drugs, either because they are more effective, or because they cure or ameliorate hitherto untreatable ailments, can lower the actual cost of illness. Others save money since they may be taken less often or for shorter periods, even though the prescription charge at your pharmacy sometimes may be higher than for the less effective drugs they replace.

Individual prescriptions, as every purchaser knows, vary considerably in price. Their research, production, and distribution costs vary. Yet the average prescription costs you, the consumer, only about \$3.50. Four out of five cost less than \$5.

Today, only a half cent of the dollar and only 9.5 cents of the medical care dollar go into prescription pharmaceuticals, actually less than 10 years ago.

The price you pay is not only for the drugs on your pharmacy's shelves today. Part of it goes into drug company research for new and better drugs that will ease pain and prevent and cure disease tomorrow.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN FREEDOM

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today in saluting the people of Lithuania and the people of Lithuanian descent here in America and throughout the world, who on February 16 commemorated the 51st anniversary of the independence of their proud country from Imperial Russia.

For 22 years thereafter Lithuania took her rightful place in the community of free nations of the world, until the iron heel of a new brand of Russian imperialism destroyed her precious independence in the first year of the Second World War.

Yet in Lithuania, as in so many other countries captured and subdued by the Communists, the fierce flame of freedom has never been extinguished by the conqueror. Lithuanians who live under the Soviet yoke still yearn for independence, still keep their rich cultural traditions alive, and still plan for the day when they shall again be free. More than a million loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent take prayerful note of the anniversary of their freedom every year, an observance that cannot be openly made,

of course, in Lithuania, by the 3 million people residing there. But millions of Americans are still proud today to join with these Lithuanians in their hearts and with Lithuanian-Americans in their public observances of our common ideals and heritage of liberty in spite of conquest and oppression.

But homage alone, Mr. Speaker, is not enough. We in Congress who represent a variety of people united in many common aspirations, must also take action to match our words. Some years ago I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) in introducing legislation to create in this House a standing Committee on Captive Nations. That bill did not pass; but I feel just as strongly as ever that such a committee would help to focus much more effectively our national efforts to encourage self-determination among all the many nations of the world who are now held under Communist subjugation. I believe we should act on such legislation in this session without further delay, and I have once again introduced my bill in this Congress.

In my hometown of Amsterdam, N.Y., live many families of Lithuanian descent. Each year they meet to observe Lithuanian Independence Day with a colorful and moving ceremony. Many times I have had the privilege of attending and participating in these ceremonies, and have always been most warmly received by those in charge. These rites exemplify for me the strong bonds which Americans of Lithuanian descent have with their relatives on the shores of the Baltic Sea, and with people everywhere who deeply love freedom.

These bonds must and will be kept strong, Mr. Speaker, despite the rigors of Soviet rule and the years of frustration for the people of Lithuania. Let us resolve, as our compatriots of Lithuanian descent have resolved to do on each anniversary of their freedom, to speed the day when men and women everywhere can control their own national destinies—not only in Lithuania, but in the Ukraine, in Latvia, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in South Vietnam, and in all other countries now under Communist rule or threatened with Communist aggression or subversion.

INCREASE PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income exemption of a taxpayer, including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness.

Under present law, a taxpayer may claim, in the amount of \$600, an exemption for a spouse or other dependent. An additional exemption of \$600 is allowed if the spouse or dependent is over 65 years of age, and a further exemption of \$600 is allowed if the spouse or dependent is blind, regardless of age.

The bill that I am introducing today would increase these exemptions to \$1,200 in each category.

At the present time, the \$600 exemption is nothing more than token relief to the American taxpayer who must provide clothing, food and shelter to his family at a time when inflation is at a high level, and prices are continuing in an upward spiral.

Meaningful relief to the millions of Americans who must readily feel the effect of taxes should be of principal concern to the Congress, and I am hopeful that this legislation will receive early consideration. I might add that I am pleased that the distinguished chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), has begun hearings on tax reform legislation. I believe that any tax reform measures which may be recommended by the committee should include an increase in the personal exemption.

ABOLISH OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has recommended that the Office of Economic Opportunity be continued. And at the same spending level. This comes as a disappointment to those of us who believe that OEO is one of the biggest boondoggles in the history of the Federal Government.

Certainly there are some programs—such as Headstart, some of the self-help housing plans, some foster grandparent programs, day care, and a few others which might well be continued after being transferred to other agencies, but the Office of Economic Opportunity will remain as the symbol of waste, inefficiency and disorganization. It should be abolished.

There is mounting evidence, if any more is needed, on the unbelievable boondoggle known as the Office of Economic Opportunity.

OEO itself now admits that the 1968 summer youth programs completely misfired. Of programs in 48 cities, OEO—which is hardly an unbiased observer—could only find 16 "good programs." Of the Washington youth program, OEO found:

There was no check on income eligibility; and attendance was significantly low. Jobs went to those who knew someone, rather than the poor. Some programs were not in target areas—at least one was found operating near Chevy Chase Circle.

Of the New York attempt, OEO cited it for "nepotism cronyism, and maintenance of effort problems." They called it a monstrosity.

Other OEO programs reflect similar or greater mismanagement. The New York Times recently devoted almost an entire page each day for a week and several pages on Sunday, to the gross theft and embezzlement of funds from OEO programs in New York City. Indictments in that case have just been handed down.

The press here in Washington report that a Federal grand jury is investigating serious charges by the General Accounting Office that a local program has failed to maintain payroll and personnel records, employment tax records, or property management reports. GAO found that in a sample of 104 enrollees in the program, there were 30 allegations of payroll padding and 30 of kickbacks. GAO estimates that 16 percent of the enrollees could not be located during the sample effort. Some addresses were non-existent, others showed that none by the names listed had ever lived there.

Senator ROBERT BYRD, of West Virginia, has stated that Department of Labor officials who were responsible for this particular program had not completed its own evaluation of a draft report of its own auditors which was submitted over 6 months ago.

Practically every Member of Congress has noted similar examples of the failure to act by responsible officials engaged in the poverty program. After repeated efforts to have OEO recognize and stop illegal activities of an OEO program in Florida, I requested and received an investigation by the General Accounting Office, which at last brought about some needed reforms. Just this year I have been advised that OEO is going to discontinue another project operating in my district improperly—over 6 months after I brought specific illegal activity to the attention of OEO.

Throughout all of these OEO projects and others, one can only be amazed at the disregard for congressional intent, the wasting of millions of dollars of funds supposedly provided for the poor, and the failure on the part of the poverty agencies to correct wrongdoing even when the facts are presented to them.

As reported in the New York Times, the situation there was well known to officials. One embezzlement alone reportedly totaled \$1,750,000. Yet the program continues today, and New York has been given another extension of time to get things worked out.

There are investigations, reports, audits, hearings, and assurances. And there is theft, gross mismanagement, and criminal waste of taxpayers' funds. And perhaps even murder.

Victor Riesel has reported on an anti-poverty program in Boston, originally funded at \$1.9 million but suspended by the Government on January 3. Mr. Riesel says the program was to train 500 auto mechanics. Twelve were trained in 5 months. In November, some of its trainees, its consultants, and some of its other officials apparently became involved in a power struggle over the money. Five gunmen, all affiliated with the project, shot down three men, all also associated with the project.

Trouble in the Boston case was reportedly known to officials long before the murders took place. Even after murder, funds were not cut off immediately.

There is special significance in the fact that in each of the cases mentioned here, and hundreds or thousands of others, outside action was finally required before the poverty program acted.

OEO is incapable of cleaning up its own house. It should be abolished, not

continued at the same spending levels. The decision by the Nixon administration to continue down the same path is a blow to all those who were hopeful for a change in direction in this program. It is not very encouraging to those who feel we must return to fiscal responsibility, to sound administrative procedures, or to realistic approaches to the problems of the poor.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

(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, in the Washington Post this morning it was reported, and I have no way of judging the accuracy of the report, that House Democrats in closed caucus, decided after 1½ hours of debate that the answer to the pressure for congressional reform is the increased use of computers.

Increased use of computers is a good idea and I think there will be strong support on this side of the aisle, but it is not a new idea and I am afraid it is only a small part of the problem. I hope this caucus does not mark the end of the interest the majority party has expressed in congressional reorganization.

Obviously little can be accomplished without majority participation in the ultimate decision to modernize our processes. We all know that decision is coming, in one way or another, and that it is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to my colleagues that another 25 cosponsors for the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969 have today been added to those already sponsoring these modest but necessary steps toward congressional reform. Those of us now supporting this legislation hope that more Members from both sides of the aisle will join us.

COMPUTERS IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the preceding remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE). I noted the same article with regard to the recommendation made to increase the use of computers. It certainly would be only a very small step, although perhaps a very welcome one, to engage in such an activity. But if this is a cutoff of any further consideration of congressional reform, I think it would be too bad, and I trust that it is not.

Computers, I am sure we all recognize, can only find answers and put out solutions to the problems for which they are programmed. I hope the interest expressed in computers means that a congressional reform bill, not merely limited to computers, is programmed for early action at this session.

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

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the computers, if the Democrats do adopt them, will do a better job than they did over in the De-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare when someone, in the last year or so, programed obviously incorrect information into the computers and the computers went berserk, authorizing the payment of more than \$2 million in overpayments, payroll payments, and so forth and so forth. I hope they will do a better job for them, if they are going to computerize, in running the Democratic Party, or whatever it is you are talking about.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman.

Again he points out that computers can only put out answers for the programs that are put in.

TIME FOR COLLEGE OFFICIALS TO CLAMP DOWN

(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, last year after the disgraceful student riots at Columbia and Northwestern Universities, I took the floor of the House to point out that the time had come for college officials to clamp down hard on instigators of this type of anarchy. Fortunately, a few administrators have made it clear that this nonsense will not be tolerated, but by and large, the picture is not good as anyone can see from watching the evening news reports on television.

I have noticed that some of the columnists have finally come to the conclusion that this disruption of campus life has reached the limit and in that regard I place in the Record at this point a column by Drew Pearson in the February 18, 1969, edition of the Washington Post; a column by Mary McGrory from the Washington Star of February 17, 1969, and, finally, a copy of my remarks on the House floor on May 7, 1968.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1969]

IT'S TIME FOR CRACKDOWN AT COLLEGES

(By Drew Pearson)

CLARKSVILLE, TENN.—During the past twelve months, this writer has visited approximately 50 college campuses, ranging from the University of Warsaw in Communist Poland and the Sorbonne in Paris to the University of Montana, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Florida, Washington State, MIT, Stout State College in Wisconsin and Austin Peay State College here in Tennessee. It has been a cross-section of colleges, large and small, and at all of the American institutions I have addressed student assemblies and conducted student forums.

From this experience I believe I can accurately report that American students generally are alert, dedicated and far ahead of previous generations in their desire to tackle the problems of the world. They are not interested primarily in becoming engineers, businessmen, or insurance salesmen, as was my generation in college. The majority want to devote at least part of their lives to helping their fellow men. They are interested in the Peace Corps, Vista or going into government.

There was a day when the top graduates of the Harvard Law School were immediately gobbled up by the top Wall Street law firms. That day is over. These graduates and others from the best law schools are now more interested in spending some time in Govern-

ment or other productive community work. If they do sign up with big New York law firms, many specify that they must have time off to handle indigent clients or other community work.

MINORITY RULE

In contrast, there is a minority in many colleges, led by Negroes, which seems determined to disrupt education altogether. It has done so by reversing the American system of majority rule for a system of minority rule.

It has done this, moreover by, using a technique outlawed by American law and tradition—violence.

Minority rule by force and violence has almost paralyzed San Francisco State College, killed one college president, Dr. Courtney Smith of Swarthmore, and disrupted some of the most liberal institutions in America such as Brandeis, a Jewish university, the University of Chicago under liberal President Edward Levi, and the University of Wisconsin, long proud of its liberal LaFollette tradition. All have tried hard for several years to enlist more qualified Negro students, yet this is one of the demands of the Negro minority.

In each of the above institutions there has been a small minority of students which has used violence to sabotage education for the majority. In Swarthmore forty black students locked themselves into the admission office and disrupted education for a thousand others. At Brandeis the ratio was about the same. At Chicago, 400 students tried to force their demands on the 9000-student University by occupying the administration building. At Columbia, a University where I once taught, about 400 students tied up an institution of 30,000 also by occupying the administration building where they rifled the private papers of President Grayson Kirk.

TOUGHNESS JUSTIFIED

My conclusions from having visited many campuses is that it is time for University authorities to realize that they must provide education for the majority, not submit to disruption by the minority. Otherwise, education in their strike-torn colleges will gradually erode. The easiest way to prevent disruption is to get back to previous disciplinary rules and expel violators immediately.

Today, in contrast with the past, striking students have been mollycoddled, given second and third chances and then allowed to remain in school. All of this puts a premium on violence.

This is unfair to the majority of the students who are trying to get an education; also unfair to the taxpayers who put up the money for education and to the alumni who help to finance private colleges.

In San Francisco State, only 350 teachers out of a total of 1100 belong to Local 1352 of the American Federation of Teachers. And of these 350, only 200 wanted to strike. Yet this minority threw the entire campus into turmoil and got the backing of the San Francisco AFL-CIO Labor Council. This is something AFL-CIO President George Meany would hardly sanction—if he knew the facts.

What minority faculty members have got to realize is that alumni can strike, too. So can majority students. Applicants at Columbia's last freshman class were down 21 per cent, in contrast to Harvard and Yale, which had no riots and whose freshmen applications are up 10 to 15 per cent. Students don't want to enroll at a university that may be riot-torn.

Any business firm that loses 21 per cent of its customers in one year is in danger of going out of business. Columbia can weather the slump. But it has been given a stiff reminder that the majority of students go to college to study, not to demonstrate.

More serious may be a Columbia alumni boycott in fund-giving. This is neither organized nor advertised, but it is a fact. If it spreads to other riot-torn campuses, it could be the most serious boycott of all.

STUDENT DEPRIVATION HANGUP

(By Mary McGrory)

The old fogies—which means anyone over 30—are now hopelessly baffled by current campus capers. Whatever happened to goldfish-swallowing and telephone-booth stuffing?

This year's rioter is yesteryear's panty-raider as far as mindlessness goes, granted. But where is the fun for the student who would rather learn than burn?

What tore it for the elders, of course, was the assault on the University of Wisconsin. Nobody with an IQ of 50 could work up a case against that noble tradition of excellence, freedom and dissent practically written into the curriculum.

At Madison, the militants have presented a list of demands that would make Rap Brown blush. The chancellor pointed out that if the "black-only" center, which is supposed to be the militants' main issue, actually ever happened, the university would be in violation of the antidiscriminatory section of the Education Act and thus lose the federal funds which help to keep it going.

Warren Knowles, the governor of the state, sees a pattern in campus turmoil across the country. He's luckier than most.

Who could sort out the new hullabaloo at Berkeley, where a number of students seem to be majoring in rebellion? The University of Chicago sit-in was rendered unintelligible when the fired teacher, presumably its spark, was rehired and refused to accept until "the university has changed."

If there is a common issue in all this, it is probably deprivation. Today's students are deprived. They are deprived of their birthright of struggle and suffering. Affluence and the pill have rendered the old hangups on money and sex obsolete. Their meek parents pay their bills and subsidize their affairs.

They found a conflict in the Vietnam war, which was largely fought by their brothers from the slums and the factories, and they helped to turn it around. Even the old folks could eventually see it was a witless enterprise. They are antiwar, but not antifight, but they have to import the enemy, the police and the National Guard.

Their fathers don't know what lack of trouble means. They were so busy during the Depression scratching for jobs to pay next semester's tuition they had no time to change the system.

The next generation was full of married veterans, hell-bent for degrees. They may have knocked the university in bull sessions; it never occurred to them to try to knock it over.

Cheated of economic pressure and moral strictures, the affluent scholars turned to the blacks for rescue. They have assumed their grievances for their own. They are slaves to changing racial fashions.

Five years ago, integration was in style, and young white students fought, bled, and, in some cases, died in the South for the cause.

Now the militants have changed their minds—separatism is imperative for racial identity. Lads at Wisconsin are storming the barricades for the right of Negroes not to associate with them.

Their lives are without suspense unless they create it for themselves. Their futures are assured. Jobs? Don't be funny. Seniors have to kick suppliant corporation executives off their doorsteps. Government recruiters hang around the Student Union like panhandlers at the Salvation Army.

What is to be done? Richard Scammon, former Census Bureau chief, has suggested prison for rioters—to dignify them. The thought may find a cordial, if secret, seconding among harassed university officials and buffaloed parents.

At least, jail would provide an authentic opportunity to suffer, and a feast for the in-

justice-collector. Wardens are for the most part not infected with the permissive philosophy; guards would not forgive with the readiness that causes the young to despise the endlessly pardoning authorities who populate their present world.

Who knows, they might find out they really like studying. Prison literature is rich in examples of those who improved themselves behind bars. The rioters do not want to be educated. They won't let others be educated. So they could educate themselves. They could study swahili to their hearts' content in their cells while their square classmates were trudging to class back on the campus.

ARE WE SLIPPING INTO A DARK AGE

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out that our Nation is suffering from a serious ailment—minorityitis. After the disgraceful and sorry display at Columbia University, the latest case is the shameful surrender of authority by Northwestern University which allowed a group representing one sixty-fifth of the student body to rewrite rules and regulations affecting the other sixty-four sixty-fifths. This is an age when majority rights are trampled. This is an age where violence is honored, where obedience and observance of law are shunted aside.

I believe it is time that the parents who are paying tuition, those donors who are paying for other costs, and those in charge of endowments, insist that the officials of our universities make clear that the schools are being run for purposes of education, not as field laboratories for revolution—domestic or imported.

College is not mandatory. Therefore, those who do not like a college or university, should be free to go wherever they believe their peculiar views may be more accepted. The idea of depriving the majority of students, who attend institutions of higher education for the purpose of preparing themselves for jobs requiring university-level knowledge, of the opportunity to learn, by tolerating disruption is an affront to commonsense.

When dissidents resort to violence the answer should be clear—a clampdown of authority and use of the law-enforcement agencies available. It is interesting to note that Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown, students, perhaps, of the Communist revolution, were among the demonstrators at Columbia University. It is interesting that many others who were arrested also were not students at all.

In all this ferment and fomenting of insurrection at our colleges and universities, one fact stands out—a very tiny minority is responsible. School authorities have been timid and unresponsive to their duties to maintain order and continuity on campus.

The Chicago Tribune of May 6 editorializes on the sad situation at Northwestern University. I believe the paper hits the problem on the nose, and recounts in sorry detail the flaccid surrender of school officials. It is high time that those who are paying for a decent education for their children to go to school to learn, let school officials know that they do not intend to support those who allow one-sixty-fifth of the student body to set the policies of that institution.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial from the Chicago Tribune and a column by William F. Buckley, appearing in the Washington Star on May 6, at this point in the RECORD:

"[From the Chicago Tribune, May 6, 1968]

"A SAD DAY FOR NORTHWESTERN

"Alumni and friends of Northwestern university must be profoundly dismayed by the university's response to the demands of black power insurgents who seized and held the

administration building for 36 hours. At the same time a handful of white student sympathizers took possession of the dean's office and were unmolested in their assertion of squatters' rights.

"The university administration's capitulation is as complete and humiliating as any event since Henry IV crawled on his knees in sackcloth to Canossa and there made penance and the act of submission to Gregory VII.

"This was an invasion, pure and simple, by blacks of the premises of a private institution—in no way different from the occupation of the home of a private citizen.

"A courageous university administration, with a fit sense of values, would have ended this insurrection within the first 15 minutes and driven out the interlopers. It would have said:

" 'This is a private university. You are here on sufferance. You will abide by the regulations which all other students are required to honor. Your color gives you no sanction and no license. If you don't like it here, you are at liberty to go elsewhere. Now, clear out, or the force necessary to throw you out will be mustered at once.'

"The students would then have received a remission of fees and would have been expelled and sent home.

"This would have been within the administration's proper sphere of action. The black power advocates had no more warrant for trespass and seizure than had the Rev. Martin Luther King when he seized a west side apartment building and proclaimed himself conservator for its owner.

"But the university officials lacked the courage of any convictions. They temporized and, in so doing, condoned the lawlessness with which they were challenged. They made common cause with the invaders in their stand that laws do not govern society and are made only to be flouted and ignored.

"The university has announced that no punishment under law or thru university disciplinary action will be sought for the offenders. If a student were caught stealing an examination paper or cribbing on an examination, he would be expelled or placed on probation, but, in Northwestern's new scale of values, no penalty is to attend students who appropriate the business office, where all university records are kept, or the office of the dean, from which all student affairs are directed.

"Forgotten in the disgraceful articles of unconditional surrender signed by university officials was the fact that friends and alumni who had given countless millions of dollars to Northwestern were not contributing to a Tuskegee or Howard university and had never conceived that their gifts were directed toward creating a racial enclave and calling it Northwestern university.

"In other days, the dean of a university was considered a man of stature and learning. At Northwestern we had the spectacle of the dean running back and forth between his own captive office and the captive business office where the black occupation garrison condescended periodically to hear his professions of penitence, while mattresses, blankets, and food were passed in thru the windows.

"The atmosphere was more like that of an outbreak in a penitentiary than of a university dedicated to intellectual freedom and the formation of individual character.

"All the university's spokesmen had to tell the rebels was that when they got out of the building they could state their supposed grievances to a committee.

"Instead, the administration puts its witness to an incredible document—an abject confession that Northwestern is, and has always been, the embodiment of the sins of 'white racism,' that invidious term coined gratuitously by the Kerner commission and eagerly accepted by every masochistic breast-beater in the white 'liberal' community.

"Not content with this fact of self-humili-

ation, the university then extended its own professed guilt to all other institutions of higher learning in America and to the whole of American society. The soft impeachment will have few takers among the white community.

"The university's frail apology that it really gave away very little beyond what justice demanded is absurd on its face. It has yielded to an infinitesimal minority—no more than 1/65th of the student body—and has made incredible concessions in order to buy peace. It is only buying more trouble and more insurrection in the time to come, for the course of blackmail and appeasement always proceeds progressively.

"Moreover, it has bent the knee to an element that does not ask equal consideration, but special treatment. The Negro militants were not seeking integration or fraternal equality, but their own form of apartheid. They demanded—and got—racial separatism in campus life, and the buying nature of their demands showed their hatred of whites.

"Especially brazen was the demand of the rebels—granted without quibble by the administration—for special tuition supplements for blacks at the expense of poor white students, equally deserving of scholarship aid. The effect is to create a special class, based on color alone, and this represents discrimination in its ultimate form.

"Now that this revolt has succeeded, what may we expect next? Are all the members of the Northwestern football squad going to mount a protest strike until they are assured they will be given straight A grades? Every student, and every man who lives, labors under some degree of insufficiency of talent, or energy, or accomplishment. In the name of absolute justice, are we all to be leveled off so that no man possesses any superiorities by reason of endowment or attainment over any other? These are among the implications of Northwestern's surrender.

"The university administration has taken the easy way out. It has abandoned law and principle when it had the chance to demonstrate integrity and character. It has thought more of the value of property than of the virtues which it was presumed to serve. The black insurgents had as their hostage the computer, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, which processes the university's financial records. They said it would be safe unless they were evicted. Their implied threat of sabotage paralyzed the administration.

"So, when this precious instrument came thru unscathed, the administration was lavish in its praise of the black power faction for its sense of 'order' and 'responsibility.' Property was not damaged, and clean-up squads policed the occupied premises. The wreck of the university's reputation is complete but the job was done cleanly. What a consolation!

"When universities all over the country are collapsing before the campus radicals, Northwestern had the opportunity to show that the values of common sense and probity are eternal in its life. It has grievously damaged its hope of public confidence for the future.

"All its alumni and friends must feel sick today. The university has made needless difficulties for itself in commanding continuing loyalty and support. It will learn the validity of the eternal question: 'What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'

"[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 6, 1968]

"ARE WE SLIPPING INTO A DARK AGE?

"(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

"You have, I hope, mediated the meaning of the charges that have been leveled against the New York policemen who liberated Columbia University. Brutality. It apparently has not occurred to a living soul, to judge from published reports, that the caterwauling students who are charging

brutality because the police interrupted their week-long, whisky-fed stereotypical occupation of other people's property could very easily have avoided brutality by simply obeying the policemen when they were finally dispatched to uphold the law.

"In the flat words of the newspaper account, 'The policemen had first read a statement urging the students to leave voluntarily, and the protesters had refused.' In other words, the police had even been instructed to permit the students to leave with impunity—to get off without arraignment on the charge of criminal trespass. But the students refused. So, under the vigilant eyes of radio, television, faculty, press, the Commissioner of Police, and the head of the local Mau Mau, they were dragged away.

"Oh, yes, there were also representatives there of Mayor Lindsay, whose comment the next morning will never perish from this earth. 'Mayor Scores Columbia Sit-Ins—But Backs the Right to Dissent.' That is as if, stumbling into Buchenwald with the liberating army, General Eisenhower had said, waving in the general direction of the corpses, 'I do deplore all of this, but I stoutly defend German dissent from the Versailles Treaty.'

"What is going on? One is increasingly reminded of the observation of Albert Jay Nock, that it would be fascinating to write an essay on how one can tell one is slipping into a dark age. His point is that if we knew collectively that that is what we were doing, we would simply arrest the process.

"One is tempted to observe that it is incredible that so many members of the faculty at Columbia sided with the demonstrators, and now are criticizing President Kirk for having called in the police after six days. But it is not incredible any longer; incredible though that may be.

"Everybody's doing it. Not quite everybody, but, for instance among the students all the leaders of the various student body groups appear to be unanimous in their condemnation of Mr. Kirk. The president of New York University, though declining to promise that under no circumstances would he ever call the police, professed himself as 'revolted' at the use of the police at Columbia, and stuffed a dollar bill into a jar being passed about to collect money to defend the students.

"A young rabbi recently appointed as chaplain to the Jewish students of Columbia was heard declaiming—get this: 'No amnesty for Kirk and the Board of Trustees!' They are not to be forgiven for restoring order to the campus by invoking those whose job it is to restore order when there is disorder. And then the rabbi attempted to assert his impartiality: 'I want to show you I'm going to be consistent,' he said, reminding his audience that he had sided with all of the demands of the rioters except their call for amnesty for themselves.

"In other words, the rabbi is being consistent by insisting that lawbreakers and law enforcers be dealt with exactly alike. Such anfractuosity is best left for advanced schools of sophistry to defend.

"A few days before the police moved in, Prof. Seymour Melman, who will be remembered as the prophet of overkill, suddenly found himself concluding that the opposite situation exists in Columbia. Columbia, he announced jubilantly, simply hasn't the power to discipline the refractory students: 'How can you dismiss several hundred students?'

"There—there is the revolutionary key. 'We won't be going around and around forever,' said the student head of the SDS, who organized the strike. He meant by that that additional forces are accumulating, and that in due course they will crowd in on Columbia and, in effect, dominate it.

"Mr. Kirk, poor Mr. Kirk whose office was smashed, the walls covered with graffiti, broken whisky bottles strewn about, poor Mr.

Kirk says that calling in the police was the hardest thing he ever had to do. If that is the case, poor Mr. Kirk should be relieved of his misery, and sent out to pasture. Because Columbia needs someone who will do something a great deal harder. Suspend several hundred students for a year or more, and fire one hundred or so of the instigators. If Columbia can't do that and survive as a university, then it ought not to survive as a university, because the society it seeks to serve is mortally ill."

AWARD TO OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and honor for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues the presentation of an award to Oklahoma State University of Stillwater, Okla.

Last night, February 19, 1969, Dr. Robert B. Kamm, president of Oklahoma State University, was presented with the IIE-Reader's Digest Foundation Award for Distinguished Service.

Oklahoma State University was designated as the only educational institution in the United States to receive the 1969 award for distinguished service in the field of international and cultural relations.

Oklahoma State University has led the academic world in providing enlightened leadership, flexible instruction, valuable research techniques, and technical assistance over a 16-year period, in the field of international education, to a gradually widening circle of world neighbors.

Since 1952 in Ethiopia, 183 university staff members have invested 550 man-years, initiating under a U.S. Agency for International Development contract the establishing, staffing, and operating of a regional technical high school at Jimma—1952; designing, building, staffing, and operating a college of agriculture at Alemaya—1956; planning and staffing an agricultural research station at Bishoftu—Debre Zeit, 1953.

In a 16-year period the Jimma school graduated 600 students; the college of agriculture graduated 365 from Ethiopia, Malawi, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, and other African nations.

The university has sent 22 advisers and 11 short-term consultants to three colleges with a combined enrollment of over 1,400 students; 43 Pakistani students have studied on the Oklahoma State campus. In Latin America since 1967, the university has provided consultants and advisers to Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Brazil, and Argentina under cooperative programs with MASAU consortium and other agencies.

Oklahoma State University embarked last year upon a program of technical advice and assistance to the Ministry of Education in Thailand for the expansion and development of trade and industrial education, with annual exchanges of students and faculty projected.

Oklahoma State University's international activities have been directed toward creating independent and self-reliant world neighbors. Instead of leav-

ing behind empty buildings and a superimposed educational curriculum in Ethiopia, this university in 16 short years helped Ethiopians to build an educational system that is staffed with native teaching personnel, whose early training in the Jimma school and the college of agriculture has been augmented with master's degrees and doctorates from the finest institutions in America.

Oklahoma State University has set an example for all of us to follow: international students have had a lasting impact upon all university personnel, enriching them with their cultural heritage and deepening the university personnel's understanding of all men's basic humanity.

ABSENTEEISM AND THE BACKLOG OF CIVIL CASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, an article in yesterday's Washington Daily News dramatized the dilemma of a backlog faced by more than 5,000 persons involved in civil jurisdiction cases in the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

The article indicated that some of this backlog could well be due to prolonged absenteeism on the part of at least one judge. Without passing judgment on the particular instance in question, it should be deemed unacceptable that there be such absenteeism during a time when such a heavy backlog plagues our court system.

President Nixon in his message to Congress on crime in the District of Columbia recommended an increase in the number of judges on the court of general sessions. There is no doubt that this expansion of the bench is gravely needed.

The administration also proposes legislation to increase the effectiveness by revamping the court system. To this end I am sure it will give support to the tenure and reward bill proposed by the Commission on the Administration of Justice. This is one of a package of bills which I am introducing to strengthen our city's crime-fighting machinery.

We must assure that all judges of the bench are able to make a full commitment to their critical duty of rendering prompt justice for all.

ARAB TERRORIST ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound shock, horror, and repugnance that the world learned of yet another Arab attack on an Israeli airliner, this time in Zurich, Switzerland.

I rise today to call upon the administration to take the initiative in the United Nations by calling for a condemnation resolution and whatever U.N. ac-

tion is necessary to make the perpetrators of these crimes feel the pressure of world opinion and end these tyrannical attacks. I have urged the Secretary of State today that this action must be taken immediately, so that there will be no misdeed toward whom this condemnation is directed.

This sneak attack is but the latest in a series of Arab terrorist activities which have been concentrated on unarmed civilians. They are obviously designed to hit innocent civilians in marketplaces, in theaters, on buses, in airplanes.

The perpetrators seem to prefer these cowardly types of hit-run attacks, and what makes these tactics all the more reprehensible is that they are condoned and actually supported by the Arab leaders and their governments. Each day brings us further news of an outright support of these activities, the latest being the embracing of the leader of the notorious El Fatah by King Hussein, of Jordan.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must act now. We must speak out in vigorous protest and we must enlist the world community to support a proposal at the International Civil Aviation Organization council meeting urging immediate action against all interference with international aviation.

Decent people everywhere must do more than deplore these acts. The United Nations, which lost no time in condemning Israel for retaliating to a similar attack, should be equally as swift in condemning this latest episode of uncivilized Arab action. Or, must we wait to see if Israel strikes back and then expect a one-sided censure of Israel? This seems to be the tragic routine of U.N. action, and what makes it all the more deplorable is our State Department's acquiescence via its U.N. votes. This is the sorry record of our previous positions at the U.N.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a new administration now. Let its spokesman speak out loudly in response to this dastardly act. Let the world community be heard so the Arabs realize the impact of world opinion and world repudiation.

ENDORSEMENT OF PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO DEVELOP ALL VOLUNTEER MILITARY FORCE

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the resolution and the list of those Members who have joined MESSRS. HORTON, SHRIYER, STAFFORD, and me in introducing the resolution endorsing President Nixon's decision to develop an all-volunteer military force. We are indeed grateful for the support we have received in this effort and trust that many more of our colleagues will assist us in the coming weeks as the present draft system is again reviewed by the Armed Services Committee. We would hope that a revision of the draft toward the ultimate goal of establishing an all-volunteer Army will be accomplished by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, following the list of cosponsors, I also am inserting an article from the February 24, 1969, issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Volunteer Army—When?"

The material follows:

H. RES. 232

Whereas the need for improving our system of military manpower procurement has grown more and more urgent with each passing year; and

Whereas the present Selective Service System for compulsory military service has forced uncertainty, inequity, and in many cases dissent and doubt on large segments of American youth; and

Whereas many voices in the Congress have sought to encourage steps toward greater reliance on volunteers and recruitment in filling our defense manpower needs; and

Whereas among the uniformed services of the United States (United States Army, United States Marines, United States Navy, United States Air Force, United States Coast Guard, United States Merchant Marine) only the United States Army has relied to a major extent on compulsory service to fill its manpower requirements; and

Whereas the Army and the other services have demonstrated even under present personnel and pay policies that they can attract large numbers of qualified and dedicated volunteers; and

Whereas an all-volunteer military force is inherently compatible with the basic principles of democracy; and

Whereas an all-volunteer military force would be efficient, equitable, and effective in maintaining the national security; and

Whereas in a free society the obligations of service in the armed forces should be enforced through conscription only when necessary to ensure the security of this Nation; and

Whereas an all-volunteer armed forces may be possible within two to five years, if preliminary steps are taken now in pursuit of that objective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives endorses the President of the United States in his efforts, through the Department of Defense, to begin preparation for an all-volunteer military force through administrative changes in the structure of the armed services, and to place new emphasis on the attraction of greater numbers of qualified volunteers to the military.

SEC. 2. That at a time considered appropriate by the President, the House of Representatives will welcome for consideration legislation needed to implement the concept of an all-volunteer military force with a concurrent gradual reduction in the need for compulsory service.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Bell of California, Mr. Biester, Mr. Brock, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Brotzman, Mr. Brown of Michigan, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Bush, Mr. Button, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Clausen, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Collins, Mr. Conte, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Esch, Mr. Fish, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Gude, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Harvey, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Hosmer, Mrs. May, Mr. McCulloch, Mr. McDonald of Michigan, Mr. McKneally, Mr. Minshall, Mr. Mize, Mr. Morse, Mr. Morton, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Robison, Mr. Ruppe, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Taft, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Widnall, Mr. Winn, and Mr. Zwach.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 24, 1969]

VOLUNTEER ARMY—WHEN?

(NOTE.—Wheels are starting to turn on Mr. Nixon's promise to phase out the draft. The

draft law will stay, on a standby basis. But only a flare-up in Vietnam or elsewhere can stop an early, all-out try for a "volunteer Army.")

It is now confirmed that President Nixon is determined to push for an end of the draft and try for an all-volunteer Army.

The President, who campaigned on a "need" to end all drafting at the conclusion of the Vietnam war, is making it clear to Congress and the Pentagon that he means it—and that he wants to get started right away.

As a first step, Mr. Nixon ordered Pentagon officials to draw up a workable plan for creating a volunteer Army. This statement was released by the White House on January 30:

"The Secretary of Defense was advised of the President's conviction that an all-volunteer armed force be established after the expenditures for Vietnam are substantially reduced, and was requested to plan a special commission to develop a detailed plan of action for ending the draft."

What the President has in mind was explained to "U.S. News & World Report" by a top-level Nixon aide. This is the plan:

Keep the draft on the books, continue to register and classify all youths of military age for call in emergency, but gradually cut back on the size of monthly draft calls until they can be suspended altogether.

Reduce the size of U.S. armed forces from 3.4 million men to possibly the 2.6-million level of early 1965, just before the big Vietnam build-up began. This would lessen manpower needs. The cutback will start as soon as possible—by mid-1969, it is hoped.

Raise military pay substantially. Increase other benefits, privileges and prestige factors of military life. Promote recruiting on a major scale.

These steps, the President is said to believe, could bring an end to actual drafting in a relatively short time, at a cost of a few billion dollars a year. No timetable for the shift to an all-volunteer armed force is included in the President's plan. But if the war in Vietnam does de-escalate as hoped, a trial of the all-volunteer approach could start late this year, or early 1970.

Mr. Nixon is aware that manpower officials in the Pentagon have studied this problem for years and have concluded that a total end to the draft would cost untold billions and require a much deeper cut than planned.

The President's theory, however, is said to be that an all-out effort to raise a wholly volunteer Army has never been made since before World War II, so the Pentagon experts do not really know whether it can be done or not.

The history of the 1947-48 effort to do away with the draft tends to support the President's theory. You get that story in the accompanying article, on the next page.

ENLISTMENT UNDER PRESSURE

What is known for sure, as a result of elaborate manpower studies by the Pentagon in the past two years, is this:

The hot breath of today's draft accounts for a large share of the manpower now in uniform. Many more youths are prodded into volunteering by the threat of the draft than are actually drafted into the service.

The most recent Pentagon study shows that 38 per cent of the enlistees in all services would not have volunteered without the pressure of the draft—including 43 per cent of all Army volunteers, 33 per cent of the Navy volunteers, 43 per cent of the Air Force and 30 per cent of all Marines. In the officer corps, the comparable figure is 41 per cent.

Draftees actually comprise only 20 to 25 per cent of the Army's strength. There are no draftees in the Air Force or Navy, only a few in the Marine Corps from time to time. So the basic problem in ending the draft is to find another way to keep volunteering high.

HOW MUCH MORE PAY?

An increase in military pay, the Pentagon studies conclude, may not be enough, by itself, to replace the spur of the draft. Yet better pay is at the top of the list of possible incentives. The big question is how large pay raises must be to lure the needed recruits and re-enlistments.

To maintain a force of 2.6 million men in 1965, the service required an "input" of about 800,000 men during that year, counting inductions, enlistments and re-enlistments.

What it would take to raise that number of volunteers each year without a draft, the manpower experts say, will depend on the state of the nation's economy—just how hard it is to get a good job in civilian life.

Depending on the unemployment rate, Pentagon estimates show that added military-payroll costs would range from 4 to 17 billion dollars a year.

In a year when unemployment reached 4 per cent—compared with the current 3.3 per cent—the most likely minimum cost is given as about 8 billions. Other studies carry more optimistic price tags of from 5 to 7 billions yearly.

But a vital point, military experts note, is that even outlays such as these would not guarantee an adequate supply of the better-educated manpower needed by a force of 2.6 million men in this era of sophisticated warfare.

In particular, they stress, it would be difficult to induce 3,000 or more physicians annually—nearly 50 per cent of those graduating from medical schools each year—to volunteer for military service through increased pay alone.

The same problem is likely to be met, the authorities add, in the case of computer programmers, intelligence analysts, missile repairmen and electronic technicians. Any volunteer plan that is adopted is thus expected to allow for continued drafting of physicians and certain other highly skilled people.

Harold Wool, a top manpower official in the Pentagon for nearly 20 years, gives his view as follows, in a just-published book, "The Military Specialist":

"Exclusive reliance upon wage incentives as a means of increasing the supply of highly qualified volunteers would prove very costly, and probably impracticable, in a high-employment economy."

No halfway system of incentives will work, either, in Mr. Wool's judgment. He puts it this way:

"A comprehensive voluntary recruitment effort must encompass the whole range of living and working conditions which shape the image of military service. . . . It is unlikely that any partial program that does not substantially alter the image of military service can hope to succeed."

Besides higher pay, Mr. Wool sees the need for "better use of individual skills and abilities; opportunities for upward mobility from enlisted to officer ranks; improved housing; and increased emphasis on measures to enhance the status of military personnel" in the American society.

AN ALL-BLACK FORCE?

Would all-out efforts to lure volunteers turn the armed forces into mercenaries, mostly black? This has been suggested by some authorities.

However, a Pentagon study indicates that an all-black military force is not a real possibility. There are not enough Negroes in the U.S., according to the study, to fill up the armed forces, even if every qualified Negro enlisted.

Of the 200,000 male Negroes who turn 18 each year, slightly more than half qualify for the armed forces under present standards. If all qualifying Negroes volunteered and stayed in service for six years, their numbers then would account for only about one quarter of an armed force of 2.6 million men.

On the other hand, if nearly all Negroes

concentrated in the Army, and that branch were fixed at a size of 1 million men, Negroes would soon comprise more than half of all U.S. soldiers, under the assumptions stated above.

As a start in efforts to reduce reliance on the draft, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird announced February 4 he will seek "major revisions" in military pay to stimulate volunteers.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

Changes in the way the draft operates, even if on a standby basis, also are in the wind. Chairman L. Mendel Rivers (Dem.), of South Carolina, of the House Armed Services Committee, said February 10 that his Committee will hold hearings this spring and reopen the draft law to congressional review, to include possibly a lottery selection system.

With firm White House backing, and a growing mood for draft changes in Congress, a trial of the "volunteer Army" idea is considered certain. But its timing depends on events in Vietnam and the need for U.S. forces elsewhere.

THE LAST TIME THE UNITED STATES TRIED TO RELY ON VOLUNTEERS

The U.S. sought to get along without a military draft soon after World War II ended in 1945. The effort was limited, and it failed.

Late 1945 and all of 1946 was a time of chaotic demobilization for the armed forces. They dropped from 12 million men to 2 million by the end of 1946. The draft went on, but calls were low, with none at all called in several months.

On March 3, 1947, President Truman told Congress the armed forces were down near the level of 1,641,000 that was the goal for the year starting July 1, 1947.

"The only assured means of maintaining the Army and Navy at their required strengths . . . is through resort to Selective Service," the President said, but added:

"I have decided, however . . . with the earnest desire of placing our Army and Navy on an entirely volunteer basis at the earliest possible moment, that I should not recommend an extension of the Selective Service and Training Act at this time."

As a result the draft law, which expired on March 31, 1947, was not renewed. The Selective Service System was abolished, its records put in storage.

The armed forces launched a recruiting campaign. The Pentagon got special authority to hire civilians to replace enlisted men.

With no draft, however, volunteering lagged. The civilian economy was booming. Jobs were plentiful. Many people, including high officials, thought atomic weapons had made soldiers obsolete, with no future. And there was no pay raise for the military, despite much talk about changes to make service careers more attractive.

By January, 1948, the armed forces had dwindled to 1.4 million men—15 per cent below the authorized levels, which President Truman had described as "absolute requirements" for "reasonable assurance of security."

In March, 1948, Mr. Truman told Congress this:

"I believe that we have learned the importance of maintaining military strength as a means of preventing war. We have found that a sound military system is necessary in time of peace if we are to remain at peace. . . . We have paid a terrible price for unpreparedness."

The President recommended a system of universal military training, obligating youths to serve at age 18 for 12 months, followed by a period in the reserves. A renewed draft was urged for those already past 18.

Congress rejected universal service but renewed the draft. Volunteering picked up immediately. First draft calls for the period from November, 1948, through January, 1949, were cut back, and only 35,000 were inducted.

From mid-January, 1949, through June, 1950, no one was drafted. But the machinery kept going. Youths were registered, classified, deferred, "kept on the hook" through all of this year and a half of a "standby draft."

Then came the Korean War, which ended the draft lull and talk of an all-volunteer military system.

In 1951, Congress even adopted the name, though not the substance, of a universal military training law. It set up the draft system still in use today—and under increasing attack as outmoded after 18 years and the onset of new conditions.

REDUCED AIR FARES

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) in efforts to amend the Federal Aviation Act to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to continue youth fare reductions on commercial aircraft for students under 22 years of age and military personnel. In addition, this legislation authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Board to extend reduced fares to retired senior citizens.

The current policy of reduced youth fares and military fares are under attack in the Federal courts as discriminatory to the general traveler. This litigation is fostered by interstate bus operators who complain about the shift of passengers from bus to air transport. Some of the major air carriers also seek a termination of these reduced rates which have filled otherwise vacant seats on commercial aircraft.

The low-paid serviceman is entitled to ride commercial aircraft at reduced rates—otherwise a 4-day pass would be meaningless. The morale of the soldier is best fortified by a visit to his home.

Reduced air fares for students have served to divert millions of students from the highways to the airplane. They would never travel by bus. Higher air travel rates would force the student group to the private automobile. Student highway casualty rates would multiply. The 6 million student travelers in 1968 filled seats that would otherwise have been vacant.

The benefits of reduced air travel fares should be extended to the elderly on a standby, or seat-available basis. Most elderly citizens living on retirement income cannot afford to travel at regular rates.

Several years ago, the commercial air carriers imposed a penalty on travelers who canceled air travel plans without ample notice. Such penalties do not now exist and today the airlines suffer great expense because of passengers who either make multiple reservations or do not show at all.

The standby traveler who uses airline carrier space on a space-available basis fills a seat which would be otherwise vacant. He takes his chances on travel. He travels at times of low travel density. The reduced standby travel rate promotes more efficient use of the airlines which today operate half-vacant aircraft much of the time. The revenue passenger miles are less than one-half of the available seat-miles.

The elimination of reduced standby fares will only create more vacant seats in aircraft which at present have twice as many seats as there are passengers.

The reduced fare schedule for standby passengers is good for the airlines and good for the general public.

THE "PUEBLO"

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a good friend—an ordinary everyday citizen—who expresses discerningly and well his sentiments concerning the tragic and sordid case involving the *Pueblo* and her crew.

I am sure he bespeaks the sentiments of many, many Americans who find this whole affair incredible and who demand that never again will honorable citizens of the United States, military or civilian, be abandoned to a fate which in some respects is worse than death.

The letter follows:

As I read in the newspaper the proceedings of the Navy court of inquiry into the affair of the *Pueblo*, I feel a deep sense of resentment about the treatment of the officers and men of that ill-fated ship, not only at the hands of the North Koreans but at the hands of their own Government. A sense of shame sweeps over me as I become ever more deeply aware of how these poor souls were allowed to slip away into an environment of Communist torture and hopelessness by the same Government that once nurtured the face of John Paul Jones, and that is today acknowledged as the most powerful in the world.

Why do we persist in publicizing the Navy's exhaustive cross-examination of the *Pueblo* crew? All we are doing is exposing the weaknesses of our Government, the timidity of our leaders, the pathetic rationalizations of our patent inability to react to a real threat, our obvious unpreparedness, our failure to recognize that the chain of our world-wide defenses is no stronger than its weakest link. Certainly, the examinations taking place at Coronado, California, do not reflect on the men of the *Pueblo* except to show their status as sacrifices offered up to the Red enemy in favor of "not rocking the boat" or not creating a more serious crisis which might call for firm and truly American action.

Just what are we afraid of? And if we are so afraid of the possible consequences of fast and forceful action on our part, why is it that little nations like North Korea are not similarly afraid? Just how can we expect our military men to carry on in unselfish and dedicated performance of their duties when incidents like the *Pueblo* demonstrate no real intention to back them up and to move heaven and earth, if need be, in the process. These men of the *Pueblo* were not cloak and dagger types, operating covertly behind enemy lines. They were not of the sort who, if captured, must never be acknowledged. They were military men, uniformed personnel, performing their mission (even if one of intelligence) in an overt manner. They should have been able to obtain a response to their call for help from any U.S. military capability within range, immediately and without question. The plain truth of the matter is that they were abandoned by their own, shamefully abandoned, and this travesty is still being pursued through the medium of a public court of inquiry.

I wonder and so does many another American what this court of inquiry hopes to prove? So far it proves nothing except ab-

ject failure on the part of our civilian and military leadership to deal courageously with a bunch of bandits in North Korea. And in the process it demonstrates beyond belief the failure of our Government to plan in depth an efficient intelligence operation and to effectively protect the interests of the United States abroad.

Hail to the men of the *Pueblo*! I honor them for enduring their trial of fire—I sympathize with them for what they are going through now—I hope no other Americans will ever have to share their experience—I hope no other American will ever have to feel so alone, so left to his own devices by a country he was born and bred to trust and love and expect great things of.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HAYS, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. CAMP.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(b), Public Law 88-630, the Chair appoints as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. REUSS, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION TO STUDY MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(b), Public Law 90-301, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates and the Availability of Mortgage Credit at a Reasonable Cost to the Consumer the following Members on the part of the House: Mrs. SULLIVAN and Mr. BROCK.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits a special study regarding the administration of the Headstart program. This envelope was received in the Office of the Clerk at 3:55 p.m. on Wednesday, February 19, 1969.

Sincerely,

PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk.

SPECIAL STUDY OF HEADSTART PROGRAM, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-75)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Presi-

dent of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 309 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the President to make a special study of whether responsibility for administering the Head Start program should be left with the Office of Economic Opportunity, or whether it should be delegated or transferred to another agency. Congress asked that a report of this study be submitted by March 1, 1969.

I am submitting the report herewith. This report has been prepared in consultation with the heads of the Executive departments and agencies concerned.

The study concludes that Head Start should be delegated to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It leaves for later determination the question of whether the program should eventually be transferred. As I have indicated in a message to Congress today, I will present a set of recommendations before the end of the current fiscal year on a permanent status and organizational structure for the Office of Economic Opportunity. At that time, I will make a recommendation on whether Head Start should be transferred, or whether it should remain a delegated program.

Section 308 of the same Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the Commissioner of Education to make a special study of the means by which the existing Job Corps facilities and programs might, if determined feasible, be transferred to State or joint Federal-state operation. The Commissioner was directed to report his findings to Congress by March 1, 1969.

As my message today indicated, responsibility for administering the Job Corps will be delegated to the Department of Labor effective July 1. The question of State or joint Federal-state operation is a complex one which may well be affected by the over-all manpower-development proposals now being prepared by the Secretary of Labor. In light of these developments, and in order to comply with the intent of Congress, I have asked the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare, along with the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, and the Director of OEO, to work with the Acting Commissioner of Education in preparing a report responsive to the Congressional directive to be submitted at the earliest possible time. As directed by Congress, the Acting Commissioner will also consult with other Federal officials, with State officials and with concerned individuals.

In its request for these studies, I recognize the interest of Congress in a constant evaluation and review of the way in which new, experimental programs are being administered, and in the measurement of their results. I welcome that interest, I share it, and I will attempt to be responsive to it.

RICHARD M. NIXON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 19, 1969.

TRIBUTES TO MICHAEL MUNKÁCSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SYMINGTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, February 20, 1969, marks the 125th anniversary of the birth of Michael Munkácsy—1844–1900—Hungary's most prominent painter in the 19th century whose fame and material success were greatly enhanced by the sale of his works—numbering more than 60—to various private and public collections in the United States. At the end of the 1880's, Munkácsy was one of the most celebrated painters in this country. His tremendous success is to be attributed here mainly to his medal-winning oil paintings: "Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," 1870, "Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters," 1878, and his two huge canvases on Biblical subjects, "Christ Before Pilate," 1881, and "Christ on Calvary," 1884, all in possession of American collectors or institutions. His visit to the United States in November and December of 1886 established numerous new contacts between intellectuals and philanthropists in this country and Europe, and reinforced the interests in the freedom-seeking nations of Europe, advocated so eloquently by Louis Kossuth and his exiled associates while on a tour of this land of ours in 1851 and 1852.

Michael Munkácsy's career as an artist was one of the most spectacular ones in the 19th century. Having lost his parents in his early childhood, he earned his living as a carpenter's apprentice when his artistic talents were discovered and he was given an opportunity to receive an education as an art student in Budapest. During these early years the subjects of his interest were connected mostly with the memories of the war lost by Hungary against the invading armies of the Austrian Emperor and the Russian czar in 1849. Also, the social ills, caused mainly by the ensuing military occupation of the country which lasted for more than a decade, were treated vividly by the young artist. A prize received at an art exhibit opened the way for him to Düsseldorf, Germany, then one of the foremost centers of the arts in Europe.

While in Düsseldorf, Munkácsy became acquainted with John R. Tait, a young American artist, whose selfless friendship and high regard for Munkácsy's person and talent resulted in the first commission of real impact for Michael Munkácsy. In response to this commission from J. Wilstach of Philadelphia, the young Hungarian painter created a remarkable work, "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," which won a gold medal at the 1870 exhibit of the Salon in Paris, and made the name of Munkácsy famous all over Europe. From then on, Munkácsy's ascension to world fame, accelerated through the establishment of a splendid residence in Paris, which soon became one of the most important meeting places of the leading spirits of intellectual circles in the French capital, developed as one of the most breathtaking achievements in the drama of human artistic endeavor. His great composition,

"Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters," 1878, won for him another gold medal at the Salon. After a triumphant tour of the painting throughout England and continental Europe, it was purchased for a large sum for the Lenox Library in New York, as a symbol of the high cultural tasks of that institution. The climax of Munkácsy's artistic career and popularity, however, came with his two great canvases on Biblical subjects, "Christ Before Pilate," 1881, and "Christ on Calvary," 1884, which were acquired by John Wanamaker of Philadelphia for the highest prices ever paid to an artist up to that time. These two huge paintings, while on tour in Europe, and later in the United States, attracted millions of people, and evoked the highest praises from art critics, clergymen, and from viewers of all walks of life.

After his departure from America, Munkácsy was awarded nobility by Emperor Francis Joseph I, as King of Hungary, and was recognized in his native country as one of the greatest sons of Hungary. On two occasions, he was awarded the Legion of Honor in France, and received other high decorations from various countries of Europe. But all expressions of recognition coming from the high and the mighty did not bring about any change in the straightforward outlook and basic honesty of Munkácsy. His warm interest in the problems of the lowly and the poor found its expression in paintings such as "Nocturnal Tramps," 1873, "Pawn Shop," 1874, or "The Strike," 1895, and are recognized by art historians as proofs of his involvement with the issues concerning the forgotten, the underprivileged masses of his time.

Munkácsy's influence upon our society derives not only from the two great Biblical works which, according to John Wanamaker's instructions, are exhibited every year during the Lenten and Easter season in the Grand Court of the Wanamaker store in Philadelphia and viewed by countless numbers of people, many of whom as it is well known travel there for the single purpose of seeing these wonderful works with their own eyes, but also from his numerous other works all over this country which, by themselves, provide an astonishing spectrum of the great qualities of this Hungarian painter both as an artist and as a man of true compassion for his fellow human beings.

I include the following contemporary opinions on Munkácsy's art and personality at this point:

Gotthold Neuda, Paris: "Munkácsy is not only an artist of great individuality; he is also the creator of a *genre*; he is original, not only by his style of painting, but much more so by the choice of his subjects and by the characteristic comprehension of his times, the spirit of which is reflected in his works." ("Milton", 1878)

"At the beginning of his career he chose national, Hungarian subjects, but gradually he widened the scope of his observation and addressed himself to a more universal muse. But whether he leads us into a Hungarian peasant house, a Westphalian tavern, or a Parisian pawnbrokers' office, everywhere his regards penetrate into the immediate and peculiar life of forms and figures, and discover their artistic element; everywhere he gives us well understood and real types, and his paintings, which impress themselves on his contemporaries by force of character and

dramatic expression, will in future have the value of historical testimony of the popular life of our time." (1878)

"Therein lies, I believe, the principal excellence of Munkácsy, to which, however, his brilliant talent for coloring and his mastery over all expedients in the art of painting have most powerfully contributed; joined to these, as it were, democratic features of his art, he owes his popularity also to the strong, dramatic instinct, which animates his creations and to the breadth of sombre, suppressed passion, which gives them an overwhelming, tragic expression." ("Milton", 1878.)

"In his 'Milton Dictating Paradise Lost to His Daughters' Munkácsy shows himself a complete master of himself, powerful and original as heretofore, but at the same time free from that dark manner which some critics complain of in his former works, uniting the most brilliant *coloris* with a remarkable simplicity of means." (1878)

Albert Wolf, Le Figaro, Paris: "Munkácsy, who lives and works in our midst, should be counted amongst the French; he is more Parisian than Hungarian." (1878)

Gazette du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg: "Munkácsy, by birth Hungarian, has almost become a Luxembourger, as much on account of his yearly prolonged residence amongst us, on his estates in the canton of Redange, as well as by the sympathy which he has always shown to the Grand-Duchy." (1878)

Emile Bergerat, Journal Officiel, Paris: "Of all the paintings exhibited at the Champ-de-Mars, this is the picture one is delighted most to come back. I believe that we have here before our eyes one of those perfectly executed works, to which even the most ill-humoured critic must accord the epithet 'chef-d'oeuvre.' There is but one universal voice as to this Milton being one of the best paintings that have been produced for the last twenty years." (1878)

W. Wyl, Paris correspondent of the Neu Züricher Zeitung: "Never, either in ancient or modern paintings, have I seen an important action of the mind represented in a more captivating manner, never a less ostentatious and simpler use of artistic means. Munkácsy is the painter of this masterwork, which would have delighted Velasquez, the painter of Philip IV., for it is painted with that chaste, natural modesty, which disdains all coquetry." (1878)

Introduction, "Christ Before Pilate, by M. Munkácsy" (Paris, Ch. Sedelmeyer, 1886): "The celebrated painting 'Christ Before Pilate' is uncontestedly the masterpiece of Michael von Munkácsy, the greatest painter of modern time, who is likewise one of the greatest masters of all times, and who has inscribed his name in golden letters in the book of honour of the noble art of painting, which art he has surrounded with a new and imperishable splendour.—Paris, London, Vienna, Berlin, Stockholm, Buda-Pest, Amsterdam, Manchester, Brussels, etc., have had already the opportunity of seeing this picture; two millions of lovers of the Art have admired it; the professional critics of both worlds have paid enthusiastic homage to the powerful creation. And yet the imposing triumphal procession of this great work through Europe is as yet but half accomplished; for Spain, Portugal, Italy, Russia, Roumania and Turkey still await, with unsatisfied longing, that unique sight, which different agents have zealously tried to procure them, even at the greatest sacrifices. The author of the splendid painting and its proprietor and artistic publisher, Mr. Sedelmeyer, have arrested its victorious march through Europe; because the invitations from America have daily become more numerous and more pressing, and because a tribute of due gratitude has to be paid to the United States, whose art-patrons were among the first to recognize and appreciate the genius of the artist."

"To we sure, Europe has followed the development of this chosen artist, first with

attention, then with admiration and lastly with enthusiasm; but America may boast of the loftier triumph of possessing the greater number of Munkácsy's paintings, including some of the most important. If Hungary is his native home, and France his artistic one, America is gradually becoming the lasting home of his works."

"Works by Munkácsy are in the collections of Messieurs Vanderbilt, Astor, Marquand, Aug. Belmont, Moris (sic!) K. Jesup, Judge Hilton, Ferd. Blumenthal, C. J. Osborn, O. D. Mann, Mrs. Rob. L. Stuart, Miss Wolfe, W. E. Walters, of Baltimore, J. Wiltach and H. C. Gibson of Philadelphia, (Mr.) Rice of Boston, and others."

The New York Herald, May 30, 1881 (from its Paris correspondent): "The Salon cuts but a poor figure, after all, beside half a dozen private exhibitions now open in various parts of Paris. Munkácsy's single picture of 'Christ Before Pilate' which for some weeks has been attracting thousands to the galleries of M. Sedelmeyer in the Rue Rochefoucauld, is in itself better worth one's study than all that hangs upon the walls of the Palais de l'Industrie. It rises above them all by a head and shoulders—indeed it would be ridiculous to compare it with them. In the one case we have to deal with a work of genius. In the other, at the best, there is only talent."

The American Register, Paris, May 14, 1881: "The great event in the artistic world after the recent opening of the Salon is the exhibition of Munkácsy's painting, 'Christ Before Pilate', which, as our Paris readers know, was finished too late to be received at the Salon, and which the Musée des Arts Décoratifs finally saw fit to decline exhibiting by itself. Since Monday *le tout Paris artistique* and the lovers of art of every nationality have flocked to Sedelmeyer's Gallery, 6, Rue de la Rochefoucauld, to look at and admire the artist's last and probably grandest creation. We would not fail to call the attention of our readers to this unique exhibition, all the more so as we are told that not only have several offers been made for the painting, but that in all likelihood the same may speedily become the property of one of our countrymen, a well-known patron of art."

The Times, London, January 24, 1884 (on "Christ on Calvary"): "This picture is certainly one of the most perfect which have been produced for many a year, combining all the majesty of classic schools with the modern and personal stamp that marks it of the nineteenth century. When one gazes on this picture and hears Munkácsy speak, one realises the feelings which the contemporaries of Rubens, Murillo or Veronese must have experienced when they conversed with those great masters who were destined to be handed down to the admiration of posterity."

New York Times, March 16, 1885: "The 'Calvary' of to-day, over which not only the world of art but the world of fashions, of thought, and of religion is at present wondering, is indeed a marvellous picture. Taking all things into consideration, it is a strange subject to offer in this century of unbelief, of scepticism, and of scoffing. Who has time now to think of the Man of Sorrows? What artist living in Christian England ever dares to offer such scenes to the critical public, and who could imagine such a subject coming from a Paris studio, where even the last rags and shreds of religion are cast scornfully to the winds?"

The Morning Post, London, May, 1884: "Byron wrote to his mother from Florence, on his return from the Pitti Palace, that he was 'drunk with beauty.' The like effect has been produced here by Munkácsy's noble picture of the Crucifixion. Every one is entranced, intoxicated with this most sublime conception, perhaps which has been ever transferred to canvas—of which, by the way, it covers nearly half of an acre. For many centuries past the Crucifixion has been treated *ad nauseam*. The greatest artists,

ancient and modern, have represented the awful tragedy with the revolting realism of a murder scene at Madame Tussaud's or the Musée Grevin. Their Crucifixions are as horrible as the wax figures in the famous Fenayrou murder or the horrors of the dissecting room. The great Hungarian has divested the subject of all its hideous realisms, and has set it upon his canvas in all its sublime majesty. The contemplation of the most sacred and solemn event in history appeals the gazing multitude, yet attracts them by the exquisite arrangement of the composition; the colouring, the draperies, all are beyond praise. The heart beats with pity, but it is not stirred into repulsion."

Methodist Times, March 12, 1885: "Mr. Munkácsy has given to the world one of the noblest pictures of our incarnate Lord which this century has produced."

The Irish Tribune, March 5, 1887: "Standing in front of this marvellous conception (now being exhibited in Newcastle-on-Tyne), as we did the other day, it was indeed difficult to realize that nineteen centuries have passed away, since the enactment of the most sublime tragedy of the world's history."

"This largest and latest of Munkácsy's works is perhaps the best described by saying that in artistic touch, power of expression, and minute faithfulness of detail, it is simply marvellous. A hallowed hush seems to enshrine it, and we can almost feel ourselves shrouded in that deep darkness which was 'over all the earth until the ninth hour'."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add I would not have had the opportunity to deliver this special order if it had not been for the preparation and research done by my good friend Dr. Elemer Bako of the Slavic and Central European Division of the Congressional Library.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, great artists are gifts of God to humanity, their importance and their message transcends the national, religious, and historical differences of nations. Today when technology seems to be so much in ascendancy as to relegate the humanistic works of the mind into the background and when art has become abstract and so individualistic that only a few who understand the key to its symbolism can decipher the message and enjoy the medium, it is well to recall the great artists of the past, especially those whose message is modern enough in form and structure to be understood by us.

Such an artist was Michael de Munkácsy, the most famous Hungarian artist-painter of all times. He was not favored by fate in his childhood. His father, a subordinate official in the Austrian customs service, was, despite his German origin, a loyal Hungarian who joined Kossuth's army in 1848-49 to fight for Hungarian independence. In the reverses which followed upon the ensuing Russian occupation in 1849, his father was thrown in jail, fell sick, and died there. The 4-year-old Michael, whose mother died soon after his birth, was adopted by an aunt who was killed by robbers as were Michael's other relatives. He was asleep during the ravage and awakened in the morning to find himself near to the corpse of his aunt. An uncle became his foster-father, but being poor, he apprenticed Michael to a carpenter at Bekescsaba. Michael soon made it to journeyman, and acquired the friendship of some high school students who taught him to write and read. Soon he was reading the German poet Schiller and tried to write poetry him-

self. As a carpenter he had to do painting and decorations on his chest of drawers. Soon he found that he had the talent for painting.

He persuaded his uncle, who was now in better financial condition, to let him study with a portrait painter. He soon went to Budapest where he succeeded in selling several of his paintings for increasing prices, but unable to enter the Vienna Academy. Despite his failure and the ensuing eye sickness that almost blinded him for a while, he left Budapest again and worked at Munich. Finally fortune favored him. His painting, "The Deluge," won first prize in Budapest and two others also won substantial prizes. One of his contemporary biographers describes him at Düsseldorf as follows:

He had been attracted thither by the influence of Knaus, but he soon found himself more a master than a pupil. With the hard, dry, conventional Düsseldorf school he had little sympathy. He startled the whole raft of mediocrities there, as the advent of a larger fish might startle the minnows in the pool.

In Düsseldorf, he made his first American contacts, with the painter John R. Tait, the wealthy businessman from Philadelphia, J. Wiltach. The latter commissioned his first major painting: "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," which Munkácsy sent in 1870 to the Paris Salon competition. The painting was considered the picture of the year by the French jury and was awarded a medal. Upon receiving the news Munkácsy returned to Hungary for a visit and then left for Paris. His next work was entitled "War Time," an episode from Hungarian life when the wounded are treated upon their return from the battlefield. Two years later Munkácsy won a second and third medal from the Paris Salon and married the young widow of a rich landed proprietor from the Duchy of Luxembourg—Baron de Marches—and established a home in Paris where princes, world famous painters, artists and businessmen were welcomed and feted. In 1878 at the World Exposition in Paris he won the highest prize with his "Blind Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters." This painting now hangs in the public library in New York, and received the Legion of Honor from the French Republic.

His greatest paintings were "Christ Before Pilate" and "Christ on Calvary." Completed in 1881 and 1884, respectively, they toured Europe for years before audiences cumulatively exceeding 2 million people. In 1886, Munkácsy's two masterpieces came to America where they toured the Eastern States. Soon thereupon Munkácsy himself visited New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C., received by Joseph Pulitzer, John Wanamaker who thereafter purchased both paintings, and several other major families of the day on the east coast, painting portraits of several of the Wanamakers and Mrs. Pulitzer. The critics' notices were ravenous, the Mail and Express wrote on November 20, 1886, as follows:

The most phenomenal career in the art of recent times is that of Michael Munkácsy, who in the space of ten years leaped from indigence and obscurity into opulence and fame, and whose genius, in the painter's thirty-seventh year, culminated in the production of the chef-d'oeuvre of the century.

Great artists exist among his contemporaries . . . but not one of them exemplifies to the same extent, or gives an equal sense of reality to the idea—rather felt than comprehended by those who entertain it—of inspiration.

Munkácsy was not a painter of the elite. Most of his subjects, except the Biblical ones, deal with small people, even with workers and strikers. However, he always kept his belief in the noble side of man's character and in the divine in history. A modern realist, his Biblical paintings occasioned church services under them while on tour and as the Reverend William M. Taylor stated it in 1882:

It is not often that a painter becomes a preacher: but it will be long before I can forget the sermon that Munkácsy preached to me.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, great artists belong to all mankind in their quest for beauty and truth. This is of course true of the greatest artist-painter the Hungarian nation ever produced Michael de Munkácsy, 1844-1900.

Today marks his 125th birthday anniversary, and so we commemorate him as a great artist, a man of inspiration, realism and endless search for the beautiful and noble in men.

Munkácsy was as much at home in painting the most hallowed figure of human history, the Christ, as in depicting the life of simple Hungarian peasants and the poor.

Munkácsy himself experienced the vicissitudes of life in his early childhood and toward the end of his life, despite a meteoric rise to fame and opulence during the 1870's and 1880's when his paintings sold for as much as \$150,000 and were seen by 2 million people in Europe alone.

Munkácsy visited America in 1886 and toured New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. He was received and feted by people like Joseph Pulitzer of the New York World and John Wanamaker.

Munkácsy, while an international painter in his message and style, remained a loyal Hungarian to his death. Except for his Biblical and portraiture work, most of his canvases deal with specifically Hungarian folk themes. One of his famous canvases, "The Coming of the Magyars to Hungary," decorates the hall of the Hungarian Parliament.

Many of Munkácsy's paintings are found in the United States. A former Governor of Michigan, Russell A. Alger, bought some of Munkácsy's paintings and several of them are still in Michigan. But the greatest number are in New York in private and public collections, including one at the public library and one at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. In Philadelphia there are several in the possession of the Wanamaker family. The "Christ Before Pilate" and "Christ on Calvary" are exhibited during Holy Week every year in the Grand Court of the Wanamaker store.

Let us then commemorate the anniversary of this great artist, Munkácsy, the humanist and the loyal Hungarian patriot whose works have become widely known not only in Europe but here in America and whose idea content was never far from the principles of freedom

and democracy which the people of this Republic revere.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, our gifted Hungarian friends have contributed more than their share to the world of the arts. Their many talents glitter in theater, music, literature; in sculpture and painting.

Today marks the 125th birthday anniversary of one of Hungary's finest painters, Michael Munkácsy, whose works are as renowned in this Nation as in Europe. Who is not familiar with his great "Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters"? And who has not been stirred by what many consider to be his finest work, "Christ Before Pilate"?

The only Munkácsy original in the Greater Cleveland area hangs in St. Mary's Romanian Orthodox Church on Warren Road. It is his magnificent 41½ by 21¼ canvas, "Transylvanian Peasant."

Truly this inspired Hungarian dipped his brush in a palette of universal communication. His paintings transcend the barriers of language and time.

As one who knows and loves the Hungarian people, who admires their many-faceted culture, it is my distinct pleasure to join in paying tribute to Michael Munkácsy, who translated his devotion to the spirituality of all mankind on canvas, with brilliant and lasting success.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of the 125th anniversary of the birth of the most outstanding Hungarian painter, Michael Munkácsy—1844-1900—recalls the memories of times past when this great son of Hungary became one of the most honored figures in the opinion of art lovers not only in Europe but also, and perhaps even more, in this country.

Although many prominent Americans promoted him along with his splendid artistic career, the palm belongs to J. Wiltach and John Wanamaker, both of Philadelphia, who played the most important parts in helping Munkácsy along toward his ultimate triumph as an artist of world fame. The reception accorded him in the great city of New York, during his visit to this country in 1886, and the support and interest of great New Yorkers in Munkácsy's works and personality are regarded similarly as very important factors in shaping the ultimate success of this great painter of the 19th century. As a matter of fact, the purchase of Munkácsy's medal-winning painting, "Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters" in 1878, by Robert Lenox Kennedy for the Lenox Library, established the artist's name in the minds of the people of New York as something genuinely their own.

One must look back upon Munkácsy's emergence from the most humble circumstances as carpenter's apprentice in a country town in Hungary. He had to earn his living, having lost his parents in early childhood. As an art student, and a promising young painter, he proved his talents with the pencil and brush and was awarded a scholarship to develop his abilities in Budapest. One can only marvel how this urgently creative artist advanced from one great success to another before he finally won his first gold medal with "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," at the 1870 exhibition of the Salon in Paris.

It gives us a warm feeling that at this important turn in Munkácsy's career a commission was awarded to him by the prominent Philadelphian, J. Wiltach. This made it possible for Munkácsy to achieve that high grade of concentration and devotion without which no intellectual creation can be achieved. This support, awarded to a promising young artist, remains one of the most shining examples of the deeds of great American philanthropists and art lovers, who still today continue to function as the patrons of struggling artists and other intellectuals in various parts of the world.

Munkácsy's rise to world fame and unprecedented material success for a painter came when he completed his first great canvas on a Biblical subject, "Christ Before Pilate," in 1881. Although it could not be exhibited in the Salon, because the artist missed the deadline for the exhibit, the great work shown simultaneously with the Salon's exhibit in a private hall was immediately recognized by experts as "the work of a genius," rising above them all "that hang upon the walls of the Palais de l'Industrie by head and shoulders." This much-loved work was purchased by John Wanamaker, and was first exhibited in New York together with its companion piece, the magnificent "Christ on Calvary," 1884, which also became the property of Wanamaker.

On the occasion of this unexcelled event, New York Hungarians sponsored a dinner honoring Munkácsy. It was presided over by Joseph Pulitzer, another great son of Hungary, who also built a spectacular career far away from his native country. Surrounded by such prominent guests as Mayor-elect Hewitt, Cyrus Field, Henry Ward Beecher, Carl Schurz, Chauncey Depew, and others, Pulitzer greeted the Hungarian artist "because true Americans, having no aristocracy, are ready to worship the aristocracy of virtue and the royalty of genius."

He linked Munkácsy with Louis Kosuth and Franz Liszt, Hungary's other great sons living abroad and finished by saying:

Tonight we are all Hungarians—we are all Americans.

And Pulitzer's paper, the World, wrote of Munkácsy on November 18, 1886:

When the few great artists of our age and time shall have won, by lapse of centuries and art periods, and by the power of their work, the title of "old master," as we now understand the term, Michael De Munkácsy, the Hungarian painter, will hold a foremost place among the immortals of the 19th century, secured for him by his masterpiece, the "Christ Before Pilate."

Thus, in the light of these contemporary opinions, it is no wonder that the creator of such masterpieces of true humanitarian content and spirit remained the same honest person as he was when he first approached his great task as a young artist. In spite of the numerous high decorations, praises, and the unparalleled material rewards showered upon him for his subsequent works, his care for the poor and the needy never ceased—time and again he turned to such subjects and they appear in such works as the "Yawning Apprentice," 1868; "Nocturnal Tramps," 1873; "Pawn Shop," 1874; and "The Strike," 1895; a

surprising variety of works of art for a man who was elevated to nobility by Emperor Francis Joseph I.

It is our privilege and our duty to treasure the memory of Michael Munkácsy, whose life and works created so many ideas for later generations coming from the shores of the old world in order to enrich the realm of the new.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 125th anniversary of the world-renowned Hungarian artist-painter of the 19th century, Michael de Munkácsy, born on February 20, 1844.

Munkácsy was not only a great master of his age, but a fighter for human freedom and human rights. This explains why the works he produced found as much response abroad as in Hungary, and why over 60 of his canvases are today in the United States in museums and private art collections.

Munkácsy's early childhood was overshadowed by the so-called Bach era of Habsburg oppression in Hungary following the tragic end of the Hungarian fight for freedom in 1848-49. Orphaned, the young Munkácsy suffered poverty and injustice and for a while had to earn his living as a carpenter's apprentice. Yet his talents soon won him scholarships and he moved to Budapest. A prize won by one of his canvases won him also a scholarship at the famous Düsseldorf Art School in Germany.

Among his earliest friends was the American artist, John R. Tait, of Baltimore, Md., through whom his patron, J. Wilstach of Philadelphia gave Munkácsy his first commission for a large painting. The work was entitled "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death" and won a medal at the Salon at Paris catapulting the young artist to European fame.

His American connections were reinforced by the interest developed in his works, particularly the magnificent "Christ Before Pilate," by the Philadelphia philanthropist, John Wanamaker and the famous editor of the New York World, himself of Hungarian origin, Joseph Pulitzer.

In 1886 Munkácsy visited the United States after a tour of his painting "Christ Before Pilate" on the eastern coast. In New York, Joseph Pulitzer greeted him with a Hungarian-language headline in the World and while in New York he also painted a portrait of Mrs. Pulitzer. James B. Townsend, writing in the November 18, 1886, issue of the World described his work as follows:

The work is a grandly conceived one; is majestic in its simplicity and tells its dramatic story through no tricks of art, but simply by genius guiding the hand which created it. It satisfies and moves the spectator. "Behold and look if there is any sorrow like unto my sorrow," are the words that come irresistibly to his mind.

The New York Herald also commented on the same day:

It is an impressive and dramatic scene, and one which grows on the beholder. The "Christ Before Pilate" is a work which will be ranked as one of the most remarkable of the century.

Today the New York Public Library possesses Munkácsy's "Milton" and several other paintings are in private collections all over the country.

Munkácsy's message was both real and ideal. The subjects were either simple people, or religious motives, but the message always expressed real conflicts, social and personal, and tried to ennoble the concept of man and his freedom. His message is timeless and is not limited to Hungarians or Americans. He is striving to express man's universal yearning both for freedom and a meaningful life.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in joining my distinguished colleague from New Jersey in commemorating the 125th anniversary of the Hungarian artist-painter, Michael de Munkácsy, we are paying homage not only to an artistic genius but to a great champion of human freedom and human rights of his generation.

Hungarian contribution to music is too well known to be emphasized, but usually we are less aware of the artistic genius of Munkácsy who is revered by his fellow countrymen as the greatest artist of Hungarian origin.

He is a representative of the critical realist school, yet the depth and expressiveness and form perfection of his canvases gave him the reputation of an "old master" in Tintoretto's style. His themes were often Biblical and point from the natural to the supernatural sphere, yet he never became an idealizer of life. Rather he tried to grasp the noble sentiments of man, even among those oppressed and underprivileged. His best-known painting in America became the canvas "Christ Before Pilate" and "Golgotha" both of which toured the United States on exhibitions and are annually shown by the Wanamaker family during Holy Week. Munkácsy visited the United States in 1886 and was warmly received not only by John Wanamaker but by Joseph Pulitzer and indeed by all art patrons of the eastern coast.

In the latter part of his life, he was elevated to nobility by Emperor Francis Joseph and decorated twice with the Legion d'Honneur in France and received the most coveted artistic prizes of Europe.

However, in his heart he remained the warmhearted, compassionate man he always had been, and while painting public personages he did not forget to immortalize in his paintings the lonely, the poor, and the underprivileged. His socially reformist paintings included "The Strike," 1895; "Pawn Shop," 1874; and even the early "Yawning Apprentice" to mention only a few.

As his childhood was embittered by the memories of the Austrian oppression in Hungary following the defeat of the Hungarian War of Independence, in his themes man's quest for freedom always occupied an important place. Thus, he is indeed modern as well as classical and we are happy to have more than 60 of his paintings in the United States in public and private collections.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the greatest Hungarian artist of all ages, Michael de Munkácsy, upon the 125th anniversary of his birth today.

Munkácsy was a representative of critical realism, but his realistic style did not prevent him from dealing with themes that were religious and idealistic. Some of his most famous paintings were con-

nected with Christian religion, like the two major canvases on "Christ Before Pilate" and the "Golgotha," and the equally famous "Ecce Homo." His paintings also exude a great interest and compassion for those deprived of freedom, and he can be truly called one of the great champions of human rights and freedoms of his age.

Munkácsy's childhood was overshadowed by Austrian oppression in Hungary following the defeat of the Hungarian struggle for independence in 1848-49, and the theme of the proud, unbroken, yet fettered man before his oppressor is also a trademark of his work, including the "Christ Before Pilate."

Munkácsy had many connections with the United States. One of his earliest friends was the American artist, John R. Tait, of Baltimore, Md. Among his strongest backers were Mr. J. Wilstach and Mr. John Wanamaker, both of Philadelphia.

Munkácsy visited the United States in 1886, when he was received warmly in New York by Joseph Pulitzer and the social world, as well as in Philadelphia and Washington, D.C.

More than 60 of his paintings are in American public and private collections, many of which are in New York, including his "Milton" at the public library.

His American contemporaries saw in him another old master of the size of Tintoretto. Not less than nine New York papers commented extensively and favorably on the exhibition of his "Christ Before Pilate" and all compared him to the immortals of his century.

It is, therefore, most fitting to remember both the genius of arts and the champion of the oppressed peoples, fighting for their national and personal freedom, at this anniversary of Munkácsy's birth.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

NFL FOOTBALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it may be difficult for many Members of Congress to sympathize with the plight of an athlete who this year is expected to make an income of at least \$100,000.

But the plight of O. J. Simpson, gang-tackled as he is by the callous monopoly of professional football, is the plight of more than 1,000 young athletes who are stripped of their freedom each year. Simpson's situation is only more dramatic.

Unless Congress takes steps to correct these flagrant abuses, Simpson will join the eager young recruits and the tested veterans in the lock-step of slavery. He will be a well-paid slave—one of the

richest in pro football—but he will be just as much of a slave as the lowest-paid journeyman.

Let us analyze the case of O. J. Simpson to illustrate how each and every pro player is victimized by the current system:

Simpson, in case anyone needs to be told, is the most publicized star of our era—perhaps in the history of college football. A running back blessed with a remarkable combination of size, speed, strength and stamina, he made the University of California at Los Angeles one of the greatest powers in the country. He is possibly the most sought-after player by the pros in history—not only because of his outstanding ability but because of his box-office magic.

But Simpson cannot sell his services as a free man. He does not have the bargaining power of the lowliest laborer in our country. He is told he must play in a certain city. He must play in a designated league. He must come to an agreement on salary with one owner. And if he does not like the terms offered, he has only one alternative. He can quit football. Simpson is now in precisely that situation. He has been drafted by the Buffalo Bills under league practices and is that team's property. His recent retention of legal counsel and threatened court action against the league demonstrate that he is the unwilling property of the Bills.

Such unconscionable restraints stem from two practices: the effective evasion of football's own "option clause," and the common draft of the merged National and American Football Leagues.

In theory, the "option clause" seems justified. It is purportedly necessary to create stability among league members and to curtail wholesale yearly raids on personnel by richer owners. This clause in the standard contract provides in essence that, when a player signs a contract initially, or renews it, he also gives the club an option on his services for the following year under the same terms. However, the player may decline to grant this option and thereby suffer a 10-percent cut in his current contract. In this case, the player can then sign with any team for the following season as a "free agent."

This, in my view, is not an unreasonable restraint. Indeed, the late Bert Bell, former NFL commissioner, argued most persuasively that this "escape hatch" for players effectively removed them from bondage, and thus antitrust prosecution was forestalled. Indeed, it was a factor in persuading Congress to exempt the NFL-AFL merger from antitrust jurisdiction. However, experience in recent years has demonstrated that principle and practice are two different things.

As I told the House last October, there is persuasive evidence that the team owners and commissioner have devised means to deprive players of this "escape hatch," thereby rendering the option clause in violation of antitrust laws. I shall discuss this point in more detail shortly.

Up until a few years ago, there were two separate leagues, each holding its own draft of college players annually.

Under this setup, a player had at least a minimal freedom of choice and bargaining rights. He could decide which city and which team offered him the greater advantages, and he could weigh these considerations against the respective salary offers. But with the merging of the leagues, all freedom ended abruptly. Now he goes where he is sent. And if he does not like the city or the team or the coach or the salary, that is just too bad. He is stuck. He is stuck until his legs lose their spring or his arm loses its zip, or the coach decided to trade him. In any case, he has no control over what happens to him.

He has no control because it appears Commissioner Pete Rozelle and other league officials have taken steps to make a mockery of the "free agent" status of athletes who have elected to "play out their option." Last fall, I brought to the attention of the Congress the case of Dave Parks as one of several abuses. It merits review here.

Parks played out his option with San Francisco and signed with New Orleans. It had been the custom up until that time for the new club subsequently signing a player to compensate the old with a player of equal ability and/or cash. This represented a gentlemen's agreement, which in itself was suspect as evading the intent of the option clause. But the NFL went a step further. When the two clubs could not agree on the compensation to be paid for Parks, Rozelle ruled that New Orleans had to give up its first draft choice of 1968—Kevin Hardy, of Notre Dame—plus its first draft choice for 1969.

Let me repeat that this severe penalty meant only one thing, in my opinion. It was a clear warning to players that playing out an option could well result in unemployment; it was an obvious threat to owners that dealing with a free agent would be too expensive. It eliminated the escape hatch of the option clause as effectively as if the provision were physically removed from the contract.

Let me say again that an athlete achieving free-agent status—at a financial sacrifice—can well find himself a drug on the market. Another team will fear to sign him, unless he is a superstar who might be worth the gamble of the probable reprisal.

But even though I have paid particular attention to the case of O. J. Simpson, it is not the superstar I am concerned about. It is the journeyman, the average player with family responsibilities, the athlete with only a year or two left to play in the big time.

In view of this concern, over 3 months ago I requested the Justice Department to investigate the matter with a view to antitrust prosecution. However, in recent communications with the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, I have been informed that no investigation will be undertaken.

The sole explanation offered by Justice Department officials for this refusal is that they "believe the option clause and common draft practices of the NFL to be 'reasonable' restraints under the Sherman Act."

This, in my judgment, ignores both

legal precedent established under the Sherman Act and the intent of Congress in permitting a merger of the NFL and AFL. I am convinced that, in its option clause and player draft practices, pro football has deliberately and callously gone beyond the bounds established by the legislation exempting the merger of the NFL and AFL from antitrust jurisdiction. This legislation, a rider to a nongermane bill, merely exempted "a joint agreement by two or more professional leagues," and during House debate proponents made clear that this language only granted exemption to the actual steps necessary to effect a merger of the NFL-AFL. It most certainly did not give pro football a license to flout or evade antitrust laws in its day-to-day operations.

I am further convinced that the Congress must reexamine its decision to permit a blanket merger of the two leagues.

I have therefore requested the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee to authorize a full investigation of the merged NFL. In my judgment, this course of action is the only way to insure that pro football will survive as one of our most popular sports.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a grave crisis. The haphazard, unplanned establishment, and expansion of our national cemeteries has resulted in an ever-increasing shortage of burial sites for those who have earned the privilege of interment in these cemeteries.

This crisis, which has already resulted in an order limiting burials in historic Arlington National Cemetery, comes as no surprise to those of us who have kept abreast of veterans' needs in the United States.

We have had many warnings during the past several years about the need for a workable, long-term plan to establish adequate gravesites for veterans. Yet each time, the warnings have been ignored.

We cannot continue to do this any longer. Unless the Congress takes action promptly, the crisis which has already all but closed down Arlington National Cemetery will spread to other national cemeteries. In fact, according to the American Legion, for all practical purposes we have already run out of available burial sites for veterans.

A prime example of this heightening crisis is Pinelawn National Cemetery on Long Island. When Pinelawn was established in 1937, it was estimated that this would provide gravesites for veterans until 1975.

In recent years, however, it has become apparent that this projection was far too optimistic, and current estimates indicate that the close-out date is almost upon us. Without expansion, Pinelawn is not likely to serve beyond 1970.

Thousands of acres of Government-owned land is available on Long Island for the expansion of Pinelawn. The time to plan such expansion is now, not on the eve of another crisis.

And there are many other national cemeteries throughout the Nation whose future should be outlined in a well-defined plan, also. Such a plan does not exist and will not exist if the legislation aimed at creating it is not acted upon.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to resolve the heightening national cemetery crisis by eliminating the present outdated system of divided and overlapping jurisdictions and by providing the means to expand existing sites and create additional ones.

This measure would transfer to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, jurisdiction over existing national cemeteries presently parceled out to three other agencies, in addition to the Veterans' administration: the National Park Service, the Department of Interior, and the Department of the Army. It would vest in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs the authority and responsibility for the operation, care and maintenance of these cemeteries.

Further, the bill would direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to plan a system of national cemeteries and to create additional ones so that the capacity and distribution of national cemetery sites shall at all times be sufficient to assure burial in the national cemetery for those who so desire.

To implement this, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would be authorized to acquire such lands as are needed: by gift, purchase, condemnation, transfer, or by any other means.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation is vital if we are to be able to continue to properly pay tribute to the men who fight for the honor and freedom of our country. We can no longer ignore the inevitable. The time for action is now.

I, therefore, urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this bill.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND THE HOLDING COMPANY BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the potential for conflicts of interest among the new officials of the U.S. Treasury Department.

Mr. Speaker, this concern goes particularly to legislation which might go before the Banking and Currency Committee and on which the Treasury Department must comment. The banker influence at the Treasury is hip deep and it is sure to cast a pall on all banking legislation that is sent forward by the Nixon administration.

As I have pointed out earlier, the top policymaking officials at Treasury come directly out of the banking industry. Here is the way the list reads:

Mr. David Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury, formerly chairman of the Continental Illinois National Bank of Chicago;

Mr. Charls Walker, Under Secretary

of the Treasury, formerly executive vice president of the American Bankers Association; and

Mr. Paul Volcker, Under Secretary of the Treasury, formerly vice president of the Chase Manhattan National Bank.

What deeply concerns me is the effect of this banking background on the one-bank holding company legislation which must be considered early in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that these Treasury officials cannot divorce themselves from their backgrounds as they make recommendations on these holding companies. Today, I have written President Nixon about this important issue and I have urged that he withdraw these officials from direct participation in the holding company legislation.

Mr. Speaker, here is what I told the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The forthcoming hearings on the Bank Holding Company Act are of vital importance to every segment of our economy and this once again raises the serious problem of the banker influence at the U.S. Treasury Department.

As you are aware, it would be normal procedure for the Treasury Department to make recommendations on these amendments to the Holding Company Act and to comment on the various proposals. Likewise, normal procedure would involve consultation and approval of the Budget Bureau.

However, all Administration officials in a position to advise the Congress on this vital piece of legislation are only weeks away from their jobs in the banking industry which this legislation is designed to regulate and to restrict.

In fact, the Secretary of the Treasury—who would be expected to make the recommendations of the Administration—participated in the formation of a one-bank holding company while he served as Chairman of the Continental Illinois National Bank of Chicago. He must now draft legislation and make recommendations which will, in effect, decide whether the very holding company which he formed will remain intact. Mr. President, I am sure that the Secretary is a man of high integrity, but such a situation places him in an impossible position where he must rule on his own handiwork.

The same situation exists when the matter goes before Mr. Robert Mayo, your director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Mayo, of course, was a vice-president of the Continental Illinois National Bank and presumably participated alongside Mr. Kennedy in forming the one-bank holding company.

I understand that a great deal of the work on the Administration proposal is being performed by Charls Walker, the under-Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Walker, of course, is former executive vice-president of the American Bankers Association, the lobbying organization largely controlled by the big banks which are now so interested in the one-bank holding companies as a means of expanding their influence in the economy. Mr. Walker has had a close relationship with these banks and has faithfully lobbied for their position on Capitol Hill.

Before he was appointed by you, I am sure that Mr. Walker was in the process of preparing the legislative position of the ABA on the Holding Company Act and it is safe to assume that this position was not contrary to that of the large banks which have formed holding companies.

I am not certain of the role of the other under-Secretary, Paul Volcker, in the holding company talks in the Administration, but I assume that he will have a voice in the final decision. Mr. Volcker, as you know, was vice-president of Chase Manhattan National Bank of New York, which announced plans to form a one-bank holding company just 11 days before Mr. Volcker joined the Treasury.

The background of these policymakers perhaps explains the confusion and constant shifting which seems to be going on inside the Treasury Department on this vital issue. Trying to reconcile their past associations and life-time careers in banking with their current responsibilities, is, I am sure, a difficult, if not impossible task, particularly on an issue as volatile as this.

Originally, I had understood the Treasury Department would send legislation on Bank Holding Companies to Capitol Hill before the Lincoln Day recess. Then later, I noticed in the press that the time table had been changed and that the bill would be forthcoming immediately after the recess, February 17. Later this was changed to February 19 or possibly the 20th "at the latest." Now I understand that all of this scheduling has been changed to next week.

I can only assume that there is some rapid rewriting and re-evaluation going on inside the Treasury Department. I notice in the press that there have been a series of "background briefings" extending over several weeks by an anonymous official of the Department. It is my understanding that these briefings have been taking place not only in the Treasury Department building, but also in the editorial rooms of some of the nation's leading newspapers. Apparently, there is a great effort to justify the Administration's position before it has a position.

What has sifted out of these shifting positions has been discouraging and alarming. The briefings have inspired reports that the Treasury Department wants to give total exemption to all of the one-bank holding companies already formed. Much more serious have been reports that the Administration would weaken the present Bank Holding Company Act through a broader definition of non-banking activities and by splitting the regulation of the holding companies among all the banking agencies.

If these reports are true—and they have not been denied by that anonymous Treasury official—then what we have is a back door assault on the existing regulation, rather than a much-needed strengthening of the Holding Company Act.

All of this points to the extreme difficulty of drafting legislation in a Department dominated by people from the very industry that the legislation purports to regulate.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the extremely critical nature of this issue and its far-reaching impact on the entire economy, I respectfully urge you to withdraw the Treasury Department and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget from direct participation in this legislation.

This may seem unusual, but there is, indeed, ample precedent in our system of government for such action. For example, a judge is obligated to withdraw from consideration of a case in which he may have participated as an advocate before taking the bench. And certainly, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Walker, Mr. Volcker, and Mr. Mayo were advocates for the banks—and bank holding companies—before they took their current appointments.

I am sure that there are others in the Administration—not connected with banks—who could be drafted to work on this legislation and to bring forward your recommendations to the Congress. The Federal Reserve Board, of course, has direct responsibility for the regulation of the registered bank holding companies and I understand that this agency has already studied and

prepared extensive legislative recommendations on this issue.

The important thing, Mr. President, is that we have legislation that truly protects the public interest and in which the public can have confidence. This issue involves much more than the narrow banking interests and its resolution should not be left solely to the bankers. It is something that affects the entire business community and the general public.

You have the power to remove the cloud of suspicion that has arisen about the pending Administration proposals. I respectfully urge you to exercise it.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

ACQUISITION OF CONTROL OF RAIL, MOTOR, OR WATER CARRIERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills having to do with the acquisition of control of a rail, motor, or water carrier. Both bills would amend section 5(2) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which has to do with control, mergers, and consolidations. They are alternative approaches to the same problem.

One would simply change the present statute to make it unlawful for a person which is not a carrier to acquire control of a single carrier. There presently seems to be some doubt in the minds of the Interstate Commerce Commission how far their jurisdiction extends in these cases unless two or more carriers are involved.

The other would add additional criterion to those which the Commission now must consider in the acquisition of control of a carrier by a person not a carrier, namely that such person is engaged primarily in the business of transportation or in a business which is reasonably incidental, or economically necessary or appropriate to the operations of such a carrier or carriers. This is the test which presently applies under the Public Utility Holding Act of 1935. This bill by itself in nowise changes all other restrictions on intermodal control which the act now contains.

I have introduced these bills for the purposes of holding hearings to determine what is the best solution to a problem, which, I think, is of tremendous importance. This problem is whether a railroad or other carrier which is acquired by a person which is not a carrier can fulfill its obligations and responsibilities to the public in providing the kind of service that a common carrier is charged with providing the public.

There are numerous proposed acquisitions of railroads by holding companies, and railroads themselves have former holding companies in their efforts to diversify their current investment. This is true in other carrier fields. I am disturbed, in the absence of adequate information and knowledge about these acquisitions, as to how far they represent and will continue to represent a serious intent to discharge common carrier duties or how far they might chance to be simply erections of financial empires for other purposes. I have introduced these

bills therefore as a vehicle for a considered approach to this matter where all aspects thoroughly might be aired.

OKLAHOMA STATE TECH SHARES HIGH HONOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleague in his salute to Oklahoma State University, which was honored last night for its significant contribution to international education.

Oklahoma State Tech, a vital part of Oklahoma State University, is located in the Second Congressional District at the beautiful city of Okmulgee, and shares in the high honor conferred on the university.

The Oklahoma State Tech facilities and faculty are without a peer in the field of technical education, and this great institution is visited regularly by educators from all over the world who are interested in its programs. Thousands of graduates with much needed technical skills are evidence of its excellence.

As an Oklahoman, I am delighted by the international recognition which was given last night.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PATMAN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EDMONDSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BINGHAM, for 1 hour, on February 26.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks granted to:

Mr. HALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN and to include a newspaper article.

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

Mr. ROTH in five instances.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. BROWN of Michigan.
Mr. WYATT.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. HALPERN.
Mr. BERRY.
Mr. DICKINSON.
Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.
Mr. WOLD.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. GUDE.
Mr. QUIE.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. KEITH.

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

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.
Mr. DE LA GARZA in two instances.
Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in two instances.
Mr. LOWENSTEIN in six instances.
Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
Mr. PODELL in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. ADDABO in two instances.
Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. ST. ONGE in three instances.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in two instances.
Mr. BENNETT in two instances.
Mr. DULSKI.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. MINISH in two instances.
Mr. COHELAN in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. OLSEN.
Mr. FARBERSTEIN in two instances.
Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.
Mr. PATMAN in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 24, 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:

524. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed changes in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91-76); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

525. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the financial statements of the low-rent public housing program fund for fiscal year 1968, Department of Housing and Urban Development (H. Doc. No. 91-77); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

526. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for \$50,000 or more which were awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

527. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July-November 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

528. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to resolve questions of safety

involving certain registered uses of lindane pesticide pellets, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

529. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 82d annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1968; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 7305. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7306. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by the recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELBERG, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7307. A bill making a supplemental appropriation for Headstart programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7308. 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.

H.R. 7309. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7310. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7311. A bill to amend item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 7312. A bill to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the Confederate Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 314, amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 7313. A bill to incorporate Retired Enlisted Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7314. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. ADAMS):

H.R. 7315. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 7316. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$2,000 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. GILBERT:

H.R. 7318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize the taxation of certain cooperatives (other than marketing and purchasing agencies); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7319. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide medical and maternity care in service facilities for certain members of the uniformed services and their dependents after such members are separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7320. 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.

H.R. 7321. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 7322. A bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of certain persons who have been charged with noncapital offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7323. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7324. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7325. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, for the purpose of controlling oil pollution from vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 7326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum tax on individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 7327. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the North Loup division, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7328. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old

age and blindness from \$600 to \$1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7329. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to establish certain requirements with respect to air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7330. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 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. MINISH:

H.R. 7331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 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. MURPHY of New York (for

himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 7332. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the assignment of surplus real property to executive agencies for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 7333. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7334. A bill to designate the lake formed by the waters impounded by the Libby Dam, Mont., as "Lake Kooicanusa"; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7335. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY (for himself, Mrs. REM

of Illinois, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. LIPSCOMB):

H.R. 7337. 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. PODELL:

H.R. 7338. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 7339. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1907, to authorize the Department of Agriculture to conduct a regular program of inspection of reindeer meat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 7340. A bill to provide for the orderly expansion of trade in manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7341. 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. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7342. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7343. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7344. 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. ROYBAL:

H.R. 7345. A bill to repeal subsection (c) of section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to permit adjustment of the status of persons from the Western Hemisphere on the same basis as other aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7346. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7347. A bill to amend section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C.A. 1592), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the estate tax treatment of certain interests created by community property laws in employees' trusts and retirement annuity contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 7349. A bill making an appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7350. A bill to authorize the U.S. Customs Court to maintain an office at the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7351. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7352. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 7353. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 7354. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ST ONGE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. CULVER):

H.R. 7355. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate transportation for certain additional

persons on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 7356. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7357. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit veterans to determine how certain drugs and medicines will be supplied to them; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 7358. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain benefit increases provided for by the Social Security Amendments of 1967 to be disregarded for the purposes of determining eligibility for pension or compensation under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 7359. 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. WIGGINS:

H.R. 7360. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Richard M. Nixon National Historic Site in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 7361. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7362. A bill to amend section 815 of the Internal Revenue Code with regard to certain distributions of the stock of wholly owned corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 7363. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the waiver, in certain cases, of claims of the United States arising out of erroneous payments of pay or allowances to a civilian officer or employee of military departments and the Coast Guard or a member or former member of the Armed Forces, including retired or Reserve and National Guard personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7364. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweek of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7365. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of minimum and maximum age limits governing new appointments of firefighters in the competitive service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN (for himself, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 7366. A bill, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.R. 7367. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act in order to provide for the regula-

tion of the amount of project reservoir storage capacity that may be allotted for water quality control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY (by request):

H.R. 7368. A bill to provide members of the Colville Confederated Tribes with full citizenship and to provide for vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share representing his equity in all reservation assets of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 7369. A bill to vacate and relinquish the reservation of rights-of-way for certain purposes made pursuant to section 321(d) of title 48, United States Code; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 7370. A bill to authorize flood control project on the Sabine River, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RUMSFELD (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. LLOYD, and Mr. LUKENS):

H.R. 7371. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD (for himself, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MIZE, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SCHNEEBELL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ZION, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 7372. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7373. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that a person which is not a carrier may acquire control of a carrier only with the approval and authorization of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7374. A bill to amend section 5(2)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to acquisition of carriers, to add a requirement that any acquiring person not a carrier must be engaged primarily in the business of transportation or a related business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7375. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the U.S. mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 473. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 474. Joint 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. HOLFIELD:

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period January through December 1969 as "International DeMolay Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 476. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 477. Joint 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.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 478. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent 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. OLSEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. WATSON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, and Mr. CONTE):

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to reduced air fares for children, youth, and members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to the furnishing of relief assistance to persons affected by the Nigerian civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Res. 266. Resolution to amend rules X, XII, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 267. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H. Res. 268. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 269. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Res. 270. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 271. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 152; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 272. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of moneys to cover expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency incurred pursuant to House Resolution 152; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. AYRES):

H. Res. 273. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 200; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POLLOCK (for himself, Mr. McCLURE, and Mr. SREIGER of Arizona):

H. Res. 274. Resolution advocating U.S. recognition of Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 7376. A bill for the relief of Gregorio E. Mamerto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7377. A bill for the relief of Girolamo and Maria Aspano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7378. A bill for the relief of Domenica Carlucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7379. A bill for the relief of Baldassare Ciarravino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7380. A bill for the relief of Antonio Giamio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7381. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Naso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7382. A bill for the relief of Jorge Omar and Lidia Triporo Puricelli and minor children Jorge Favio and Walter Omar Puricelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7383. A bill for the relief of Giacomo LaLicata Saccaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 7384. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia A. Buensalido and her minor children, Raymond A. Buensalido and Jacqueline A. Buensalido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 7385. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Il Sun Ko (Baik); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 7386. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Araghi Heshmati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 7387. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title of certain land now owned by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 7388. A bill for the relief of Shukri Abed Zazou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 7389. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Asaro, Francesca Asaro, and Maria Antonina Asaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7390. A bill for the relief of Angelo Joseph Bouchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7391. A bill for the relief of Richard Couture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7392. A bill for the relief of Jean Louis Gaumond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 7393. A bill for the relief of Thomasina Aciarno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 7394. A bill for the relief of Loi Sing Yip, his wife, Szet Pik Shun Yip, and their minor son, Koon Ying Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7395. A bill for the relief of Seferino Duna Castrudes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7396. A bill for the relief of Albert Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7397. A bill for the relief of Fernando Leano del Fierro, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7398. A bill for the relief of Hain Guez, Danielle Cohen Guez, and Michele Guez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7399. A bill for the relief of Josefina del Fierro Hizon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7400. A bill for the relief of Jesus Calapatia Leano and Bayani Calapatia Leano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7401. A bill for the relief of Ricardo

Galec Mactangay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7402. A bill for the relief of Leonisa Pedro Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7403. A bill for the relief of Magtibay Perez Pedro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7404. A bill for the relief of Fernando Vega Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7405. A bill for the relief of Manual Paredes Santiangco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7406. A bill for the relief of Salvado Francisco Sugui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 7407. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands to Herbert E. Counihan, of Temple Hills, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 7408. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Zack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7409. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Aldover Nipaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 7410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chin Jaw Dung (also known as Mrs. Joan Faye Yee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7411. A bill for the relief of Nemecla Macatangay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7412. A bill for the relief of Antonietta Daniele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7413. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hong-Chien Lin, Tzu-Yung Lin, and Hong-Yih Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7414. A bill for the relief of Gianiale and Anna Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7415. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7416. A bill for the relief of Haseline Editha Maughn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7417. A bill for the relief of Rouhama Lebel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 7418. A bill for the relief of Freddy Albertus Zwaagstra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7419. A bill for the relief of Dr. Esteban G. Fria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 7420. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Vincenzo Culotta, Rosaria Culotta, and Fortunata Culotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 7421. A bill for the relief of Jiang Toy Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7422. A bill for the relief of Chung Won Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7423. A bill for the relief of Kowk King Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7424. A bill for the relief of Yee Cheung Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

61. The SPEAKER presented a petition of William Mathias, Joliet, Ill., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.