

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 25, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

If you continue in My word, you are My disciples, and you will know the truth.—John 8: 31, 32.

O Thou who art the truth that makes men free and the love that gives them life, strengthen us by Thy spirit that no danger may overwhelm us and no discouragement overcome us. Make us one of that splendid company who find in Thy service perfect freedom and who in loyalty to Thee commit their lives to purposes greater than themselves.

Help us to make good use of this day, seeking always to know what Thou wouldst have us do. Beginning this hour with a vision of Thy presence, may we continue in dependence upon Thy spirit and come to rest at eventide knowing Thou art with us and that we have been with Thee all the day long.

Bless our President as he seeks peace and unity among the nations. Crown his efforts with enduring success and give him wisdom as he talks with the leaders and people of other lands. Grant him a safe return with greater ideas for the good of all and with a firmer faith in the goals of free men.

In the spirit of our Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker it is always a pleasure to give recognition to a job well done and particularly to honor a Government official who has brought credit to his office and who has played a vital role in the growing success of our legislative goals. Philip Brownstein, Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit and Federal Housing Commissioner, is just such a man. His responsibilities have not only been exacting and complex but in his position, he has played a key role in the successful development of a major aspect of recently enacted housing legislation—that of a growing partnership between Government and private citizens in meeting our housing needs.

Beginning with the Housing Act of 1961, with the introduction of below-market interest rate financing for rental and cooperative housing for moderate-income families, we in the Congress have recognized that Government alone cannot meet the needs of all of our citizens who cannot afford decent housing en-

tirely on their own. There were many who had misgivings that the Federal Housing Administration with its conservative business-oriented background could not adapt to this new responsibility and, as is the case in so many new programs, the BMIR program took some time to gain acceptance. However, the recent sharp increase in activity under this program has fully justified our confidence that the FHA could carry out this new responsibility while at the same time maintaining the soundness of its mortgage insurance operations. Commissioner Brownstein has led FHA into its broadened field with skill and competence. In 1965, the Congress recognized that the housing needs of our lowest income families could not be fully met without the participation of private sponsorship and enacted the rent supplement program to meet that need. The growing public acceptance of the rent supplement program is due in no small part to the leadership of Commissioner Brownstein. The Government-industry partnership through FHA was further developed with the 221(h) program of 3-percent loans to finance rehabilitation and homeownership in 1966 and the major innovation of the 1968 Housing Act of interest subsidies for both homeownership and for rental and cooperative housing.

Commissioner Brownstein has indeed played a pivotal role in a major reworking of the nature of our housing programs. The Congress is heavily committed to the principle of greater private participation in meeting the housing needs of low-income families. By developing the full potential of the Federal Housing Administration and the confidence which Commissioner Brownstein has inspired has been vitally important in making this possible. It is not an easy task in government or in private enterprise to meld a business operation with the objectives of our programs to assist those who cannot afford housing entirely on their own but Commissioner Brownstein has been outstandingly successful in doing just that.

We have made a major breakthrough in our housing efforts in recent years through the partnership of Government assistance and private initiative but we all recognize that the success of this effort depends on skillful administration and we in the Congress who support this new partnership are deeply indebted to Phil Brownstein for the vital role he has played in our success.

Despite his many years of public service, Phil Brownstein is still a young man and he is entering private law practice here in Washington where I am confident he will add further distinction to his career.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the FHA Commissioner, retires from Federal service on February 21 and is embarking on a second career in private enterprise. I want to take a moment to commend him for his significant contribution in the field of housing

and urban development. After his appointment as Commissioner of FHA in 1963, Mr. Brownstein directed the agency's efforts toward mortgage insurance for small towns and outlying areas and the inner city. We urged mortgage lenders to finance residential development and mortgage transfers in rural areas and encouraged traditional lenders to make money available in older neighborhoods. He also directed FHA's efforts toward assuming greater risk in financing home purchases for the low-income and disadvantaged families, particularly those in the inner city. He is a man much admired on the Hill for his dedication to our Nation's housing goals and for his tireless efforts on behalf of all our citizens. We wish him great success as he begins his career in private life.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is not one Senator or Congressman who does not feel a sense of loss with the retirement of Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Each of us represents hundreds of thousands of people back home. Each of us is concerned with the housing of our people. Each of us is confronted frequently with problems regarding housing where Federal interests are involved. Fortunately for us and our constituents, we have had for the past 6 years Phil Brownstein sitting in high Housing and Urban Development office, immensely skillful, resourceful, knowledgeable—and—best of all—personally dedicated to our national goal of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family."

Mr. Speaker, I could talk for a long time this afternoon in relating the many instances where the families of northern California are better housed today because of Phil Brownstein. Every House Member here today could do the same. Suffice to say, Phil was always there when we were in need of help. If our problem was legitimate, within the area contemplated by Congress in the enactment of the law, we could always count on Phil Brownstein.

In his job Phil Brownstein was more than an administrator. He was also an innovator—a principal in the drafting of many of the housing bills that have created a nation of homeowners. It is no secret that Phil has always felt strongly about the opportunity of homeownership to low-income Americans. He has done something, too, about his cherished ideal of homeownership. The laws today that help low-income families become proud owners of American homes have been significantly influenced in their inspiration and creation by Philip Brownstein.

The agency that Philip Brownstein leaves will carry on. It will continue to provide the American people with high-quality service because it is composed of very talented and trained people. That the organization he leaves is top grade is also to Phil Brownstein's credit. He will be remembered by his colleagues with respect and with warm affection. And

that is how he will be remembered in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary Philip N. Brownstein, the FHA Commissioner, is retiring from Federal service on February 21 and is embarking on a new career in private industry. We certainly wish Phil every success in this new endeavor. He has had a remarkable career of public service spanning some 34 years. He started with FHA in 1935—served as Chief Benefits Director in VA and returned to FHA in 1963 to lead the agency he once served as an assistant truckdriver. Mr. Brownstein has many significant accomplishments in his career. Among the most recent would be the redirection of the Federal Housing Administration's efforts to help meet the desperate housing needs of low-income, disadvantaged, and other families living in the inner city. He directed FHA's efforts toward the area of greatest need without diluting the efficiency of the agency in performing its traditional role of public service. He is an administrator who has few parallels in Government and I am delighted to take this opportunity to commend him publicly.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to Mr. Philip N. Brownstein, whose career in public service as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration has been outstanding.

Mr. Brownstein served in FHA for 33 years and was the first Assistant Secretary of the recently created Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Phil Brownstein is an able, genial career employee in Federal service. His competence, ability, and experience are unsurpassed in his field.

While FHA Commissioner—a position he held longer than any of his predecessors—Phil Brownstein made important improvements in the handling of the public's business to facilitate loans and service to the people.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and HUD Appropriations, I found Phil Brownstein to be an effective and articulate administrator in his testimony before our committee.

I commend and congratulate Phil for his great record of public service, and I join with my colleagues in wishing him the very best of good luck and success as he enters the private practice of law in Washington.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the FHA Commissioner, joined FHA in 1935. Just last week he left FHA to enter the private practice of law. Between those two dates lies a career studded with significant achievements of public service.

After 9 years with the Federal Housing Administration, Mr. Brownstein left for 2 years' service in the Armed Forces during World War II. He then joined the Veterans' Administration in its newly established home loan program where he served with distinction for 17 years reaching the post of chief benefits officer. In 1963 he was selected by President Kennedy to become FHA Commissioner

and has served in that capacity for the past 6 years.

Under Commissioner Brownstein's direction FHA has become a vital part of our Government's efforts to solve our pressing urban problems. Through his pioneering efforts he has made it possible for more American families to become homeowners. He has encouraged the development of individual homes for purchase by families of modest means. He has stimulated creation of rental housing for low-income families by non-profit corporations. He saw to it that the services of FHA were available whether the need was in rural America or in the ghetto. We owe Mr. Brownstein a debt of gratitude for his great public service.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 the Department of Housing and Urban Development lost to retirement one of the most capable administrators and innovators that have served our country's housing needs. Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary, is retiring to enter the field of private enterprise after some 34 years as a career public servant. Mr. Brownstein's tenure as FHA Commissioner began in 1963 and is the longest and, in my judgment, one of the most fruitful periods of service in that important office. Phil Brownstein was a Federal careerist who began in Federal service in the mid-1930's and who has devoted all but 2 years—they were for military service—to meeting the housing needs of our citizens both at the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Housing Administration. Mr. Brownstein's stewardship of veterans benefits programs and the mortgage insurance programs of the FHA reflects great credit on him and brings honor to the many hard-working Federal careerists in our Government.

In our hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, Commissioner Brownstein's testimony and comments have always been of exceptional value and most helpful to us in carrying out our responsibilities. I was particularly appreciative of the technical assistance and advice provided in drafting the section 221(h) program which I sponsored to provide for the first time 3 percent financing for the rehabilitation and sale of housing to low income families. This was our first program of direct assistance for home ownership and has proven its worth not only in my own city of St. Louis but elsewhere in the Nation.

Phil Brownstein has set an extremely high standard that Federal careerists can strive for. He has earned the gratitude of his Government and the American public he so ably served. I join my colleagues in wishing him well in his new career in private industry.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, our Government lost to retirement one of its most able and most imaginative administrators. I speak of Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and FHA Commissioner, who has retired to enter private law practice.

Mr. Brownstein's career has been largely in the field of housing; first with FHA in that agency's early years, then with the VA following World War II and then as the head of the Federal Housing

Administration. He is a man who has always been sensitive to our most pressing housing needs—decent shelter for families of modest and low income and for those who had been discriminated against. Mr. Brownstein broadened the focus of FHA's activities to include both the suburbs and the inner city. He cut through redtape and made FHA a most responsive and highly efficient organization.

I know Phil and his lovely wife, Ester, will enjoy the added leisure time and the responsibilities and challenges of his future endeavors. I wish them all the best, but I cannot help regretting that he will not still be overseeing this vital area of our Federal Government.

I am glad to have this opportunity to recognize the very meritorious service of an imaginative and hard-working public servant.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have known Philip Brownstein for over 20 years, and in those two decades, my respect for him as one of this Nation's very finest civil servants and public officials has grown to almost limitless proportions. His ability, his service, his dedication, and his drive have been diligently applied to the administration of some of this Government's most effective programs.

I have also come to know Phil Brownstein as a good man, and a good friend. His departure from the official scene is a real loss to this Government.

I know and respect Phil Brownstein best through our long, pleasant, and productive association in the context of veterans' affairs, although our contact has continued through his years with the Federal Housing Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

He served the Veterans' Administration for 17 years, first as loan guaranty agent immediately after he returned from service in World War II with the Marines. He became head of that service in 1958, and in 1961 was designated chief benefits director for all the VA programs except medical and insurance. In 1963, President Kennedy appointed him Commissioner of Federal Housing Administration and when HUD incorporated FHA, President Johnson selected him as Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit and Commissioner of Federal Housing Administration.

During his service at the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Brownstein's penetrating evaluation of the sound-business side of a good program was strengthened by his compassion and understanding of the millions of veterans and widows and orphans which he served so well. He was, in one sense, the guardian to more than 4½ million veterans, widows, and children in his supervision of the \$4.5 billion compensation and pension program.

He was, in another sense, the housing banker for over 7 million veterans who had homes financed under the \$72 billion loan guaranty program. That loan guaranty program, as we all know so well, was and is the model for effectiveness and efficiency in the Federal Government. It pays its own way, and it continues to be a tremendous force in pro-

viding homes for those who gave so much including thousands who otherwise would not own homes.

During his VA career, Phil Brownstein in yet another capacity, was the overseer of finance for the program that saw more than 10 million veterans receive their education under the GI bill.

His relentless dedication, his skill as an administrator, and his understanding of high finance, in conjunction with his compassion for the millions who want to own their own homes, continued to be his hallmark as head of the Federal Housing Administration and as an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Philip Brownstein was one of the most respected of Government servants throughout the private financial community. The captains of finance learned to respect him, they knew he meant what he said. His word was accepted without question by lenders, bankers, investors, insurance companies, and the home-building industry.

His standing among our own, the Congress, is tall. His integrity, his fairness, and his knowledge of veterans' programs and housing programs were widely recognized by all who dealt with him on legislative matters.

Phil Brownstein was not satisfied with mere efficiency and a smooth operation. He was an innovator, forever seeking ways to improve, to expand, to introduce changes to better serve the citizens he was paid to serve. This won him, in his VA days, the Exceptional Service Award, the highest honor the Veterans' Administration can bestow. It also won him the commendations of the two Presidents in his days with the FHA and HUD.

This man's innovative mind is reflected in some of the programs which he devised in recent years. He expanded the privilege of homeownership to hundreds of thousands of innercity residents, the disadvantaged, the minorities, and other low- and moderate-income families.

This Government is losing a man of excellence, and one of great dedication. This Government is losing the single most competent, well-informed man of housing programs in the United States.

He will be missed at Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Administration, at the Veterans' Administration, and here in Congress. He will be missed by the thousands who worked with him, and worked for Phil Brownstein.

While we will miss him, he goes with our warmest best wishes and our deep gratitude for over 32-years of superb, productive Government service.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to a man who, for more than three decades, has helped expose and explore, meet and mitigate America's urgent housing needs, Mr. Philip N. Brownstein.

After 33 years in Government service Mr. Brownstein has left his position as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration to join the Washington law firm of Parsons, Tennent & Zeidman.

The accomplishments of Mr. Brownstein were summarized briefly in the Washington Evening Star of February 21,

1969, and I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

BROWNSTEIN RESIGNS FROM HUD

Philip N. Brownstein, who started at the bottom rung at the Federal Housing Administration and rose to the top, has resigned as FHA commissioner and assistant secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

President Nixon is expected to appoint a successor soon.

A career federal employee who joined FHA 33 years ago, Brownstein is moving to the Washington law firm of Parsons, Tennent & Zeidman. Yesterday was his last day at HUD.

Brownstein was named FHA commissioner by President Kennedy in March, 1963. When the Department of Housing and Urban Development was created, he was appointed assistant secretary by President Johnson in February, 1966.

In this capacity, he had administrative responsibilities for the Government National Mortgage Association and the mortgage and loan insurance programs of FHA.

Brownstein held the top post at FHA longer than any of his predecessors. In recognition of this long tenure and performance, 13 associations dealing with housing and related fields paid tribute to him by sponsoring a reception last June.

He made a number of changes in FHA's operations during his tenure. He led FHA back into the inner city so that its mortgage insurance programs could be of greater service there.

He stimulated FHA's activity in the field of low and moderate income housing. Under his aegis, the FHA simplified its procedures by shortening processing time in both the home purchase and multifamily fields.

While working for FHA, Brownstein attended George Washington University and Columbus University Law School (now a part of Catholic University) and received his LL.B and LL.M degrees. He is a member of the D.C. Bar.

Brownstein served with the Veterans Administration starting in 1946, after a stint in the Marine Corps, until his appointment as FHA commissioner.

He was the recipient of House and Home Magazine's "Top Performer in Housing" award in 1964, and the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League in 1967. He also was given VA's highest award, the Exceptional Service Award, in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, this article could not, in such short space, itemize the many meaningful and lasting contributions which Mr. Brownstein has made in the housing field.

Suffice it to say, however, that these contributions have been so great that though he may be succeeded as FHA Commissioner he cannot be replaced.

The Federal Government and Department of Housing and Urban Development has lost one of its most able servants and the homeowners of America, past, present and potential have lost a friend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, my close friend, Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the FHA Commissioner, is highly respected by many Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate as a tireless and efficient crusader in meeting the housing goals of our country. Mr. Brownstein is retiring from Federal service on the 21st, and we will miss his leadership and wise counsel. The low-income families of our cities, particularly those in the older neighborhoods, are better

housed today because of Phil Brownstein's efforts. He had done an outstanding job and has earned the gratitude of us all as a truly great public servant.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal service lost one of its most respected career men with the retirement of Phil Brownstein last week. In his more than three decades with the Government, first with FHA, then with VA, then again with FHA as Commissioner and Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Phil Brownstein became one of the most knowledgeable men in the country in the field of housing and home finance. His knowledge, good judgment, and keen mind inspired confidence in all those who worked with him. As FHA Commissioner, he has been of great help to the Committee on Banking and Currency in carrying out its responsibilities in the field of housing, but his greatest contribution has been the skillful administration of the laws enacted. I am sure that he will add further distinction to his career in the private law practice which he is now entering.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most dedicated public servants is leaving Government service with the departure of Philip N. Brownstein as Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

I first became acquainted with Phil Brownstein when I came here as a freshman Congressman, and he was a loan guaranty agent with the Veterans' Administration. Even in those days of infrequent contact, he was impressive.

As he climbed the ladder of responsibility, he became more and more respected as his fine mind and great ability were applied to the programs designed to serve the millions of veterans who served their country so well.

The programs that Phil Brownstein administered in the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Housing Administration are among this Government's soundest, and part of the credit must go to the diligent service of this unusual man. He mastered the complexities of finance, all the time retaining his understanding of the veteran's needs and the home owners' desires with a depth of comprehension that sets him apart.

His sensitivity in dealing with people, and this includes Congressmen and Senators, his own staff and associates, as well as the veterans and homeowners, always complimented a store of knowledge that won him immense respect. He was a topnotch administrator, and ever exhibited a passion for excellence in serving the millions of Americans who enjoyed the privileges of the programs he administered.

As a VA official, as FHA Commissioner and as HUD Assistant Secretary, he was always able to lead, to chart new courses of action, and to enlist the enthusiastic support of his colleagues in the effective application of his ideas.

Millions of veterans, their widows, and their children will ever be indebted to Phil Brownstein for the constant application of his talents in their behalf. Millions who otherwise might be living in poorer circumstances now own their

own homes through FHA and they, too, are indebted to Phil Brownstein.

His retirement, after three decades of service to his country and to his Government, will leave a void that will be hard to fill.

We wish him Godspeed in whatever new career he seeks, and we want him to know that he will be sorely missed.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Philip N. Brownstein has had a long and outstanding career in Government. His retirement last week ended a third of a century of dedicated service in the field of housing and mortgage finance. He served half of that long period in the Veterans' Administration rising to Director of the GI home loan program and then to Chief Benefits Officer of the VA. From that position, he was appointed Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, the agency he had originally started with in 1935. As FHA Commissioner and Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, he administered one of the most complex and most important of all Government agencies. FHA mortgage insurance has helped finance millions of homes and apartments and has played an important role in the tremendous increase in homeownership over the last three decades.

I know all of my colleagues join me in extending best wishes to Phil Brownstein as he enters a new career in private law practice.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks with reference to Mr. Philip N. Brownstein, retiring commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMENDATION FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY BROWNSTEIN

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no finer career than public service and undoubtedly my colleagues will want to join in paying tribute to Philip N. Brownstein for his 34 years in Government. In that time, he has made a major contribution in the field of housing through the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Housing Administration.

As the first sponsor of the veterans housing program, I want to pay tribute to his 17 years of service with the VA which he joined in 1946 after service in the Marine Corps. During this time, millions of veterans were able to buy homes of their own through VA-guaranteed and direct loans. This is one of the most successful programs ever undertaken and, together with FHA, has made this a nation of homeowners. The outstanding ability he demonstrated in those

years brought him the position of Chief Benefits Director of the VA.

In 1963 he left the Veterans' Administration to accept appointment by President Kennedy as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration and, upon creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, was named Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit and FHA Commissioner. He has carried out the difficult and demanding responsibilities of Assistant Secretary with the same skill and distinction that have characterized his whole career.

Our best wishes go with him as he enters a new career in private industry where the judgment and knowledge he has displayed in the past will undoubtedly bring him new success.

UNIFORM CONSUMER CREDIT CODE—BANKERS' BONANZA

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech on the House floor I characterized the proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code as a form of legalized usury. This code, by expressed provision, would permit runaway consumer credit interest rates as high as 36 percent per annum.

Preparation of the Consumer Code was financed almost 100 percent by the credit industry. The most notable contribution of \$75,000 came from the American Bankers Association. In the final analysis the bankers opposed the code because it permitted free entry into the credit markets by lenders other than banks. However, before it was "done in" by the free-entry provision, the bankers got an awful lot for their \$75,000 through incorporation in the code of unbelievable advantages.

As now written, the code permits banks to charge up to 36 percent interest on revolving bank credit card sales. Regular department store revolving credit charge sales can charge a less generous, but still exorbitant, 24 percent per year. This is not the only bank bonanza in the code. On the theory that a bank credit card sale is a loan to the customer to pay the debt to the seller, such "sales" are covered under the loan provisions of the code.

There are a number of restrictions on cash sales which do not apply to bank credit card sales which come under provisions of the code covering cash sales. Most notable is that defenses of the buyer arising out of the sale are not available against the bank if the bank sues for payment. Others include the limitation on referral sales where alleged discounts are offered for referrals of new customers. Also the requirement of notice to the consumer of any assignment would apply.

Thus the \$75,000 ABA contribution is well spent. Even if the ABA loses its current fight to prevent the code's adoption, banks that issue credit cards will enjoy tremendous privileges readily translated into tremendous profits.

Let us apply this situation in a practi-

cal situation. If the code were in effect and a customer buys \$100 worth of merchandise which he charges on his bank credit card, he is subject to an annual interest rate of up to 36 percent. However, if he had had a store card, the rate would be up to 24 percent. If the merchandise is faulty, the customer cannot enter this fact as a defense to pay the bank, whereas the defense would be available to him if he had a store card. If the bank assigns the paper to a finance company, the customer is obligated to pay the finance company. However, with a store credit card, he would not be so obligated unless he received written notice of the assignment.

This discrimination in favor of bank credit cards would be ludicrous if it were not for the stark facts which were published in a Federal Reserve report on credit cards issued last year. According to the Board, bank credit card plans are increasing at a rate which would put rabbits to shame:

As of September 30, 1967, there were 197 commercial banks operating credit card programs. In the subsequent 9 months this figure more than doubled, and as of June 30, 1968, there were 416 banks operating such programs. During this same period, amounts outstanding on bank credit card plans jumped 50 percent, to \$953 million. As of December 31, 1967, "plastic credit" outstanding totaled \$12 billion, with \$800 million of that in bank credit cards.

From these figures it can safely be predicted that, in the near future, bank credit cards will account for most of the revolving credit business. The huge volume which the banks are able to handle in our computerized society, coupled with the bank's assumption of record keeping and collection procedures, make their predominance in this business inevitable.

Lest anyone take these remarks to be a backhanded endorsement of other provisions of the code, let there be no mistake that this proposed Uniform Consumer Code should be rejected even if the bank favoritism is eliminated.

This week the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) is conducting hearings before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The subcommittee will hear from both proponents and opponents of the code.

I commend these hearings to your attention and study.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

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

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, Missouri's winner in the Voice of Democracy contest this year is Larry B. Williams, 620 Van Brunt, St. Joseph, Mo., in the Sixth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

The Voice of Democracy contest is sponsored annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary and this year more than 400,000 school students participated in the contest.

Under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD. I include the winning speech of Larry Williams:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE
(By Larry Williams)

Through the grace of God man mastered a primitive world and began the slow and tedious process of development, above all the other living creatures on the face of the earth. He gathered in tribes for safety, built homes against the wind, and became the hunter, the farmer, the leader, the warrior. He used those gifted abilities of thought to adjust to meet the situation, and by so doing survived a period of history that saw the mass extinction of animals far stronger.

And so man became master and his history began; Egypt, Greece, Rome, and on and on. His mind brought him greatness and he built and developed and grew with the age. He both built and burnt cities. Faced death by disease and war, yet he sought out life, and made a world ruled by men, for men. He crossed a vast ocean and founded what would become a land mark in his future existence. A country and he named it America.

For years it has been a very profound, seemingly unanswerable question as to the extent of man's similarity of the animal. What exactly does man have as instinct and what is taught. I am clearly not a professor of history, or an advanced student of the study of mankind, but I can very easily answer you this. We are born, everyone, with one quality shared by all breathing creatures of the earth, and our years of development have only increased it and years of suppression have never erased it. It's a part of the heart, and a part of the soul. It's the peacefulness of the night with the assurance of the dawn, and as impossible as it may seem, it can be summed up into one word, Freedom.

Freedom . . . a quality that each man has born inside him, perhaps tempered somewhat by his society, but still present beyond a shadow of a doubt. It seems so strange that freedom would be such an expensive word, and it's very expensive. Perhaps more men have died for freedom than any other cause, perhaps all other causes put together. Life's blood lost for freedom has stained the ground of every nation on the earth. Life exchanged countless time and time again for death. For something that seems so natural, isn't it, in a senseless way ironic that the price of freedom could be so high?

Through a chain of events no man could possibly change now, the United States stands as the most powerful and influential of the free nations, a leader of the free people, founded by those seeking freedom from all nations. Like it or not we set the example. We lead the way and they tend to follow!

When an animal is injured or caged in the jungle and cries, all animals within hearing distance are moved, and come if not to the aid of the injured at least to see if the injured can be aided. Simple animal logic.

But what about the human being. What about the human cry, who hears it?

There is a cry and it echoes across oceans, across the mountains, over the plains, down the canyons, up the river bluffs, down the valleys, across the farmland and directly to the heart of freedom. The Americans.

The voice of the free world, American, where the cry of those oppressed is heard and answered. Where the cry of the oppressed is heard and answered. Where the cry of the oppressed is . . . is . . .

What would happen if the cry was ignored? What would happen if America decided to shed all her responsibilities. What would happen to those who cried. Who would come to their aid? The answer is simple, no one.

Another answer is very simple, if we choose to ignore the challenge that freedom has placed upon us, I for one, am afraid the cries would soon be stifled. Ignore, just once, those

cries of anguish and you endanger your own freedom. Here, I guess, is the answer to why the price of freedom is so high. To have freedom you must deserve it, when all men are not free, your freedom is not complete. Freedom is a strange sort of gift, misused it has a tendency to drift away.

The challenge stares America in the face, the decision as in the past is ours. Only history will prove us right or wrong. But the hand is here and it's reaching to strangle the cry and stop the heart. It's our challenge, to face or ignore.

Excuse me if I let my animal instincts show, but this is one boy who would never separate with freedom, that feeling of the wind in your face and the world at your command. I only hope when the challenge arrives for me I meet it valiantly.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS SHOULD BE APPOINTED

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one week ago I called to the attention of the House failure of the President to appoint an Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

At that time I adverted to the crises in Cuba, Bolivia, and Peru and emphasized the urgency of this appointment.

The intervening days have done nothing to lessen this urgency.

The Peruvian problems become more involved as we speed toward the possible termination of economic assistance with the invocation of the Adair amendment. The coming Latin American Congress in Brazil presents another occasion for actions potentially damaging to the United States.

It is a matter of the highest urgency for the Nation that some capable person be appointed immediately to oversee our diplomacy with our Latin friends.

Over the weekend two newspaper articles have referred to this administrative failure.

One by Benjamin Welles appeared in the New York Times on Sunday and an excerpt follows:

Latin-American diplomats here are especially perturbed by what they consider the inexplicable failure of Mr. Nixon to fill the post of assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs. The post, which includes supervision of the United States economic aid program throughout the hemisphere—approximately \$1.3 billion yearly—has remained unfilled since December 31.

On Feb. 6, in his second press conference, President Nixon denied press reports that the "job was going begging" and that "we were unable to find a qualified man."

"I believe we have decided on the assistant secretary," he said. But he added that he was not prepared to make the announcement because the "necessary clearance" had not taken place. It is now known that 'clearances' were not responsible for the delay but the fact that Dr. J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, whom Mr. Nixon had in mind, declined the position for personal reasons.

Another by Jeremiah O'Leary appeared in the Washington Sunday Star. An excerpt follows:

If Americans cannot understand Peru's new militancy, how can the Latin nations collectively be expected to understand why

the Nixon administration has failed to appoint an Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs? The post has been vacant since mid-December and Washington is handling its Latin policy today like the Dutch boy with the dike, except that there are leaks breaking out all over the place.

Once again I emphasize the vital importance of an immediate nomination so that there may not be a further deterioration of our relations with the countries of Latin America.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of Congress a matter which is of vital importance to the people of my State, and I believe, to all the people of this country. In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a State may not deny the right of any person to attend a publicly supported school on account of his race. That decision is now the law of the land, and the people of my State have accepted that law.

Every school district in Alabama has a freedom-of-choice plan whereby any student of any race can attend any school within that school district. This plan worked well and was acceptable to both black and white students and parents. There is not a single public school in Alabama today that a student cannot attend no matter what his race.

But now, the bureaucracy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has decided that merely allowing a student the freedom of choice in attending schools is not enough. Now, the Federal Government is closing certain schools in order to achieve a racial balance in all our public schools. We understand that the new administration has promised the Northern States the same treatment, so many of my colleagues from other parts of the country may soon be hearing stories similar to the ones I hear every day.

In many cases, a practically new school has been closed because too many students of one race were attending. In other cases, students who lived within easy walking distance of their schools now have to make long bus rides to their assigned schools.

Mr. Speaker, it was not the intent of this Congress that the abolishment of segregation in our schools was to mean racially balanced schools. In fact, we have specifically written language into our laws which say that this was not the intent. Yet the bureaucrats and the Federal courts have taken it upon themselves to do something that neither the Congress nor the Supreme Court intended.

Last week during the Lincoln Day recess, a young man who is president of his high school student body came to see me at my home. He told me that a Federal court had ordered his school closed and the students transported to another high school. He pleaded with me not to let this be done. His fellow students are proud of their athletic teams, which have excelled in all sports. They are proud of

February 25, 1969

their glee club and band, which are widely known for their abilities. The entire student body has esprit de corps and want to carry on the traditions of their school.

The young man who came to see me is a Negro. His school is a predominantly Negro school. He is free to attend any school in the county, and any other student in the county is free to attend his school. The teachers, the parents, the clergy, and the entire Negro community is opposed to the closing of their school. Recently, they held a parade through the small town to demonstrate their feelings on this matter. These people do not want their school closed, yet HEW says it will be closed next year.

We in the South have always been accused of being paternalistic toward the Negro. Now who is being paternalistic? Now who is saying to the Negro, "You do not have intelligence enough to know what is best for you, so we are going to tell you what to do?"

Mr. Speaker, I told the young man who came to see me, and I told his teachers and his parents, that I could not help them. It is beyond me and it is apparently beyond this Congress to halt some of the absurd rulings of some of the Federal courts in this country and some of the idiotic rulings of the bureaucrats in the Government. But I promised them that I would tell this Congress exactly what is going on and exactly how the Negro students and parents of a school which is about to be closed for the sake of integration feel.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the following letters from concerned citizens of the community affected, and also an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the February 10 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

PELL CITY, ALA.,
February 14, 1969.

HON. BILL NICHOLS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am very appreciative to you for the cordial reception you gave me in your lovely home on Thursday, February 13, 1969. I enjoyed the conversation and was greatly enthused with the interest you showed in trying to help us maintain the present status of our school.

Letters have been mailed to you from the student body, churches, parents and other civic organization.

We will be very grateful to you for the efforts you render in helping to maintain our high school department.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY CHARLES MCCOY.

PELL CITY, ALA.,
January 30, 1969.

HON. BILL NICHOLS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. NICHOLS: We, the members of the Trustee Board of the St. Clair County Training School, are deeply concerned with the abolishing of our High School Department. The school presently consists of Grades 1-12, and we would like to maintain these grades. If the High School Department is taken away, there will not be one predominantly all Negro High School in St. Clair County. Our school is accredited by the State Department and one of the few schools in the State of Alabama to be accredited by the Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.

We, as board members, feel that we have one of the finest schools in our county, district or State, with an excellent curriculum designed to meet the educational and cultural needs of our children. We realize the excellent job that our competent and qualified principal and staff are doing in preparing our children to be worthwhile citizens and to be able to meet the challenge of tomorrow.

The losing of our High School will bring bleakness and despair to the students, teachers, parents and the immediate and surrounding communities.

So, we are faithfully asking you as our representative to render your service and efforts in helping us to maintain the present status of our school.

Very truly yours,

RONNIE DAVIS,
Chairman of Trustee Board.
JAMES CUNNINGHAM,
Rev. JAMES KIRKSEY,
Board Members.

PELL CITY, ALA.,
January 30, 1969.

HON. BILL NICHOLS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. NICHOLS: We, the Parent Teachers Association, and citizens of the Pell City and surrounding communities are deeply concerned with a perplexing situation. We have been informed that in the very near future, our school, the St. Clair County Training School, located in Pell City, which presently consists of Grades 1-12, will become an Elementary and Junior High School. Our school, a modern brick veneer structure, with a competent and an energetic principal and a qualified staff are working faithfully and diligently with our children in trying to meet their educational, social, and cultural needs. It will be very regrettable to us that if the High School Department is taken away, there will not be one predominantly all Negro High School in St. Clair County. We feel that we have one of the finest schools in our county, district, or the State of Alabama. It is accredited by the State Department of Education and the Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.

We are seeking your help as our Congressman and representative from the State of Alabama and our district to render your service and efforts in helping us to maintain the present status of our school.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,
GEORGIA L. KIRKSEY,
President of P.T.A.
LOUIZA LANE,
Member of Executive Committee.
LIZZIE FORMAN,
Member of Executive Committee.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Riverside, Ala., January 28, 1969.

HON. BILL NICHOLS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. NICHOLS: We, the clergymen, citizens, patrons, and parents of the Pell City and surrounding communities are deeply concerned with a perplexing situation. We have been informed that in the very near future, our school, the St. Clair County Training School, located in Pell City, Ala., which presently consists of Grades 1-12, will become an Elementary and Junior High School.

We are seeking your help as our Congressman and representative from the State of Alabama and our district to render your service and efforts in helping to maintain the present status of our school.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,
Rev. W. F. Poole, Pastor; James Phillips,
Lonnie F. Davis, Deacons; Rev. E. L.

Hawkins, Pastor; James Cunningham, Franklyn Henderson, Lindsey Miller, Billy Gene Bedford, Deacons.

WHAT IS THE "LAW OF THE LAND" ON RACIAL IMBALANCE?

(By David Lawrence)

Ever since the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its opinions in 1954 and 1955 dealing with desegregation and racial discrimination in public schools, there has been a tragic indifference to what is often called the "law of the land."

Local school boards have been under pressure not only to "integrate" but to bring about a "racial balance" by transporting Negro children to schools in white areas or whites to schools in Negro sections. Indeed, federal funds have been withdrawn as a means of punishing those public institutions which have not taken positive action to correct "racial imbalance." Disturbances and disorders have arisen in many cities in the North as school officials have been unwilling to bow to demands that children be bused from one school district to another so as to achieve "racial balance." It has also been insisted that a certain proportion of whites and Negroes be assigned to faculties of public schools.

But the Supreme Court of the United States has never ruled that there must be "integration," much less that "racial imbalance" must be corrected, when segregation is the result of normal conditions and constitutes no deliberate act of discrimination by a public agency.

The Supreme Court has let stand a decision handed down on July 15, 1955, by a three-judge court—consisting of two Circuit Court judges and one District Court judge—in the case of *Briggs v. Elliott*. Its opinion, which is at present the "law of the land" on discrimination in public schools, said in part:

"Whatever may have been the views of this court as to the law when the case was originally before us, it is our duty now to accept the law as declared by the Supreme Court.

"Having said this, it is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided in this case. It has not decided that the federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the States. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend.

"What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains. This, under the decision of the Supreme Court, the State may not do directly or indirectly; but if the schools which it maintains are open to children of all races, no violation of the Constitution is involved even though the children of different races voluntarily attend different schools, as they attend different churches.

"Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend.

"The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination. It does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation. The Fourteenth Amendment is a limitation upon the exercise of power by the State or State agencies, not a limitation upon the freedom of individuals.

"The Supreme Court has pointed out that the solution of the problem in accord with

its decisions is the primary responsibility of school authorities and that the function of the courts is to determine whether action of the school authorities constitutes 'good faith implementation of the governing constitutional principles.'

The Congress of the United States, in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, carried out the basic concepts set forth by the Supreme Court decisions, and provided for desegregation in public education. This statute says:

"Desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance. . . .

"Nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance."

This same law authorizes each federal department or agency which extends financial assistance to any program or activity to issue "rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance." But it makes the following stipulation:

"No such rule, regulation, or order shall become effective unless and until approved by the President."

While President Johnson approved some regulations issued on Dec. 3, 1964, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, nowhere was mention made of the specific prohibition in the law against the issuance of "any order seeking to achieve racial balance in any school." But the "guidelines" distributed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare actually have the effect of imposing a requirement that there shall be certain percentages or quotas of Negro pupils in various public schools. State and local governments have been told that compliance is "voluntary." But they nevertheless have been threatened by punitive action if they failed to carry out the edicts.

In the issue of Feb. 6, 1967, this writer said:

"The U.S. Commissioner of Education is insisting on what might be called 'compulsory volition.' The States and cities are told that the 'guidelines' are purely voluntary. If, however, these yardsticks are not applied, the local governments then can lose federal funds.

"It is the duty of the President of the United States to insist that regulations be issued to prohibit any Department from threatening to withhold school funds or from taking other actions which directly or indirectly seek 'to achieve a racial balance in any school.'

"Why shouldn't officials of our Government be required to obey both the spirit and the letter of the law?

"To ignore an Act of Congress or to violate its explicit provisions is hardly a good example of government under a system of 'law and order.' On the contrary, it is, unfortunately, another tragic infringement during our era of 'civil disobedience.'

Will President Nixon, who has just taken an oath to support the Constitution, permit the "guidelines" of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to remain in effect insofar as they threaten punishment unless "racial imbalance" is corrected?

In many areas of the country efforts have been made to put into operation "freedom of choice" plans, and certainly there is no reason why school boards shouldn't open their institutions to students who come from any part of the city. There is, on the other hand, no reason for the Federal Government to punish a school board when it chooses to admit only the children who live within a particular district as long as admission is open to all, without regard to race or color.

The "law of the land" properly calls for an

end to segregation. But it does not require "integration" as a means of correcting "racial imbalance" which is due to residential patterns or other circumstances not connected with discriminatory practices.

Yet we have observed in the last few years agencies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, proclaiming "guidelines" which, in effect, seek to correct "racial imbalance" by transporting children away from the school which they would normally attend, while other children are bused to that same school. Faculty members are being assigned on a racial basis. The object is to have in some instances at least the same percentage of white and Negro teachers as students in a school.

The big question before the country today is whether the new Administration at Washington will show the indifference to the "law of the land" that has been previously exhibited.

Within the last few days, Robert M. Finch, the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, granted a 60-day extension to five southern school districts which were scheduled to lose federal funds because of an alleged refusal to abolish segregated school systems. Mr. Finch said he has not had an opportunity to establish and review the facts in these cases and has dispatched a team of investigators to each district "to develop workable and effective alternatives within the law." He recalled that Mr. Nixon during the election campaign had set forth "the proper construction of this provision of the law."

The Republican presidential nominee, in a public speech in October, said:

"No child, black or white, should be deprived of an adequate education. I would enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I oppose any action by the Office of Education that goes beyond a mandate of Congress. A case in point is the busing of students to achieve racial balance in the schools. The law clearly states that 'desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.'"

The total vote given to Nixon and to Wallace was in part a reflection of the bitter feeling that had developed throughout the country because the Johnson Administration permitted the issuance of illegal "guidelines," along with threats to curtail federal funds, in order to attain "racial balance" in the schools.

The fact is there are various ways of moving toward racial balance through the voluntary action of the residents in different communities.

Our citizens want a fair deal for every race, and they do not want governmental power used as a means of correcting "racial imbalance" arising from natural causes. The "law of the land" must be properly administered to retain the support of an overwhelming majority of the American people.

ATTACK ON THE SPIRALING CRIME PROBLEM

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, for reference to the appropriate committee, a package of 10 crime bills. It is my belief that these bills will present a united attack on the spiraling crime problem. These bills are similar to those introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF), and I want to commend him for being in the forefront of the congressional attack on crime. His efforts—and I might add, suc-

cesses—in the fight on crime have been many, and I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the remarks he made when introducing similar legislation on January 15, 1969, which appear on page 738 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day. An excellent analysis of the bail reform bill that I am today introducing has been inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH) at page 1136 of the RECORD for January 16, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend here to discuss each bill. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) has done that with eloquence in the remarks referred to above. However, I do want to say that it is my hope that these bills will provide the framework around which an effective crime program can be based. The soaring crime rate is appalling. According to the latest FBI bulletin, crime rose 19 percent in the first 9 months of 1968 over the same period in 1967. Furthermore, the total number of crimes reported in 1968 was about 4.6 million, or really 750,000 more crimes than the year before. One out of every fifty persons will be the victim of a crime this year. One out of every twenty juveniles will commit a crime this year. The cost of crime is also a dark picture indeed. It was \$27 billion in 1967, and about \$31 billion in 1968. But the cold figures on the cost of crime do not tell of the heartbreak and human misery that accompanies those figures.

The future is also bleak. As John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States, said before the Conference on Crime and Urban Crisis of the National Emergency Committee of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in San Francisco on February 3 of this year:

Today crime has assumed a new and frightening dimension which is casting in doubt our traditional ability to be the free and independent men that our forefathers were. The simple fact is that crime is intimidating us—it is forcing us—to change the fabric of our society and our inability to control crime is a courtship with national disaster.

Anyone doubting the validity of this statement need only ask himself a few simple questions. Let me ask my colleagues—are you not receiving complaints from your constituents—the farmer and the merchant, the businessman and the housewife—about the increase in crime? Have they not all felt the sting of crime in some fashion? And in our daily lives, is not the first question we ask ourselves whether the geographical area into which we are heading is a safe area? If we travel at night—especially in the Washington, D.C., area—is not the first question that comes to mind one of personal safety, and safety for our family? I think the answers to each of these questions can only serve to pinpoint the truth of the remarks made by our new Attorney General. The picture is not only bleak—it is almost unbelievable. And for those of us in the Nation's Capital, there is no necessity to shout about the crime rate—we read about it every morning in the paper. The President has made an attack on crime one of the main thrusts of his administration, and I think that the bills I have

introduced would go a long way to aid that fight. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to introduce similar legislation, and hope that hearings on these bills will take place as soon as possible.

**POWELL AGAINST McCORMACK—
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AND
BRIEF OF GEORGE MEADER, AMICUS
CURIAE, IN SUPPORT OF
RESPONDENTS**

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the case against the House of Representatives now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, known as POWELL against McCORMACK, presents an historic confrontation between the legislative and judicial branches of Government. One who is keenly aware of the fundamental issue in that case is a distinguished former House Member, Hon. George Meader, of Michigan. Because of his interest as a citizen in protecting the House, he has followed the case closely. As an able constitutional lawyer, he has found some points that were not argued in the courts below, and has prepared a brief on those points which he has presented to the Supreme Court in support of the House, *amicus curiae*. I am reliably informed that the petitioner, Congressman POWELL, has filed his brief; the respondents have been given until March 17 to file their briefs; and that oral arguments have been set in the case before the Supreme Court for April 21. Because of the interest of all Members in the case, Mr. Speaker, under leave to include it with my remarks, I incorporate Mr. Meader's brief, together with his motion for leave to file it *amicus curiae*. I am further informed that on yesterday the Supreme Court granted Mr. Meader's motion to file a brief *amicus curiae*.

The brief follows:

[In the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1968, No. 138]

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., ET AL., PETITIONERS, v. JOHN W. McCORMACK, ET AL., RESPONDENT

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF OF GEORGE
MEADER, AMICUS CURIAE, IN SUPPORT OF
RESPONDENTS**

May it please the Court:

The undersigned, George Meader, respectfully moves this honorable court for leave to file the annexed brief *amicus curiae* in this case in support of Respondents.

1. Applicant served as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the Second Congressional District of Michigan between 1951 and 1965, and in the Eighty-third and 86th-88th Congresses was a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. Prior to such Congressional service, applicant served for approximately four years, commencing in July of 1943, as Assistant Counsel and then Chief Counsel of the United States Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, popularly known as the Truman Committee. In 1950, Applicant served as Chief Counsel of the United States Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee Investigating RFC Loans, popularly known as the Fulbright Committee. Subsequent to congressional service, Applicant served as Associate Counsel and then Chief Counsel of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress

between March of 1965 and August of 1968. Among the subjects committed to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress for study was relations between the judicial and legislative branches of the government. Applicant has followed with great interest the developments in this case from its beginning to the present time.

2. Applicant believes there are necessarily involved in this case certain historic but delicate constitutional issues which the Court should consider. These issues are:

a. Is this an appropriate class action?

b. May 434 members of the House of Representatives be bound when only 6 members have been served?

c. Is this attempted class action in effect a suit against the House of Representatives as a legislative body?

d. Is the House of Representatives a "person" or "party" that may be brought before the Court as a defendant in a suit?

e. If the House of Representatives is a person which can be made a party, is it clothed with the sovereign immunity of the United States Government?

f. If it is so clothed, has that sovereign immunity ever been effectively waived?

g. Whether the suit is treated as one against the House of Representatives as a legislative body or as against all of its members as individuals, does the Court have any effective sanction for enforcing its decree in the light of the "freedom from arrest" clause of the Constitution?

3. Applicant believes the foregoing issues will not be adequately presented by the parties in this case because these issues were not adequately presented in the briefs before the United States Court of Appeals. Furthermore, Petitioners' brief in this Court does not adequately present these issues.

4. Even though Respondents may prevail on some other grounds, failure of the Court to comment on the issues raised above may be a precedent that the House of Representatives can be sued by a citizen, or citizens, through the device of a class suit. At the minimum, in the event the Court does uphold Judge Hart's dismissal of the above action, on grounds other than those enumerated above, the Court could appropriately include in its opinion a statement to the effect that, having disposed of the case on other grounds, the Court did not find it necessary to consider and reach a decision on the issues raised above.

5. Applicant has requested consent to file a brief *amicus curiae* from the parties to this case under Rule 42 of the Rules of this Court, but has not yet received from either party the written consent requested.

6. It is respectfully submitted that this case affords an appropriate occasion for the Court to grant leave to file the brief annexed hereto.

I therefore urge that leave be granted, and respectfully so move the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE MEADER.

[In the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1968, No. 138]

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., ET AL., PETITIONERS, v. JOHN W. McCORMACK, ET AL., RESPONDENTS

**BRIEF OF GEORGE MEADER, AMICUS CURIAE, IN
SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

Facts

Petitioners commenced this action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia under Rule 23a of the Rules of Civil Procedure against the Speaker and five other members of the House of Representatives of the 90th Congress, individually, and "as representatives of a class of citizens who are presently serving in the 90th Congress as members of the House of Representatives," and also against three officers of the House of Representatives.

The Petitioners sought a temporary and permanent injunction restraining Respondents from enforcing and operating under House Resolution 278, adopted March 1, 1967, excluding Representative-elect Adam Clayton Powell from the 90th Congress.

Attorney Bruce Bromley, after appearing specially on behalf of Respondents, moved to dismiss the action on the grounds that the Court did not have jurisdiction over the persons or the subject matter of the suit.

District Judge Hart dismissed the suit "for want of jurisdiction of the subject matter," basing his decision on the doctrine of separation of powers between the judicial and legislative branches of the government.

The Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia affirmed Judge Hart's order dismissing the suit but in their opinions held that they did have jurisdiction over the defendants and the cause was justiciable but in their discretion they decided it was inappropriate to exercise their jurisdiction.

Question

May Petitioners, either individually, or as representatives of a class, maintain an action in a United States District Court against Respondents, either as individuals in their legislative capacity or as representatives of a class consisting of all members of the House of Representatives of the 90th Congress, or against the U.S. House of Representatives itself as a legislative body?

Argument

Introduction

Although the undersigned has views on the decision of the House of Representatives in House Resolution 278, and on the power of the House of Representatives to judge the qualifications of its members; and the extent of that power, and other issues such as justiciability, the extent of federal court jurisdiction over cases arising under the laws or Constitution of the United States, the speech and debate clause and immunity rising therefrom, and the political-question issue; none of these matters will be discussed in Applicant's brief because the Applicant desires to focus attention upon the propriety of the procedure in this suit, namely, whether or not the device of a class action under Rule 23 of the Rules of Civil Procedure is available for a citizen to commence an action against the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

I. This Is Not an Appropriate Class Action

In determining whether all members of the House of Representatives of the 90th Congress are a "class," so that they may be effectively joined as defendants through the service of process on six members as representatives of that class, the following considerations are relevant:

1. Each individual member is the representative of his own constituency and no two constituencies are the same.

2. Each member must cast his own vote and may not transfer the right to his vote to any other member or person.

3. A seat in Congress, unlike a share of stock, cannot be sold or transferred.

4. To bind member A, who was not served or represented in the instant case, by a decree against member B, who was served and appeared by counsel, would deny due process to A and to the constituents he represents.

5. It is the very essence of a legislative body to hold and advance differing points of view. Indeed, the debate on H. Res. 278 (March 1, 1967), as well as the debate on H. Res. 376 (March 9, 1967) authorizing the Speaker to employ counsel, are evidence of widely differing views of members—not only on the seating of Powell—but even on the manner in which the suit against some members and officers of the House should be defended.

6. Some members of the House of Representatives are Republicans, others are Democrats, some voted in favor of Powell at

various stages in the proceedings of March 1, 1967, other voted against him.

7. It is difficult to see how any small group of members such as the six served in the *Powell* case can appropriately "represent" other members who were not served. It is difficult to conceive, for instance, that Representative Celler, who is a named defendant, could represent Representative H. R. Gross of Iowa.

8. 428 elected members of the House of Representatives are not "too numerous" to be brought before the Court as defendants when the purpose of the action is to bind them individually in the exercise of their legislative discretion.

9. Under Rule 23c of the Rules of Federal Civil Procedure, defendants sought to be joined as a class, but not served with process, are entitled to notice, and have the option of being excluded or entering an appearance through their own counsel. The pertinent provisions are as follows:

"(c) Determination by order whether class action to be maintained: Notice: Judgment: Actions conducted partially as class actions.

"(1) As soon as practicable after the commencement of an action brought as a class action, the court shall determine by order whether it is to be so maintained. An order under this subdivision may be conditional, and may be altered or amended before the decision on the merits.

"(2) In any class action maintained under subdivision (b)(3), the court shall direct to the members of the class the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort. The notice shall advise each member that (A) the court will exclude him from the class if he so requests by a specified date; (B) the judgment, whether favorable or not, will include all members who do not request exclusion; and (C) any member who does not request exclusion may, if he desires, enter an appearance through his counsel...."

10. Even if all 434 members, individually, could be joined as defendants in a class action, as individuals, this still would not reach the result requested by Petitioners. Even if each of the 434 members should individually, or with co-sponsorship in groups of twenty-five, introduce resolutions in accordance with the requests of Petitioners, still no action would occur officially by the House of Representatives until all of the procedures under the Rules and precedents of the House had been undertaken to validly adopt a resolution of the House of Representatives. The only meaningful relief the Court could grant would be against the House of Representatives as a legislative body, not against its entire membership as individual representatives.

II. The House of Representatives Is Not a "Person" Capable of Being Made a Party Defendant in a Suit in the U.S. District Court

A. The House of Representatives is not a "person," natural or artificial. It owes whatever corporate existence it has to the Constitution of the United States, which defines its organization and its powers.

The House of Representatives is one branch of the Congress of the United States and has only the attributes described in the Constitution. Nowhere in the Constitution is the Congress as a whole, or the Senate or the House of Representatives as its branches, given the power to sue or be sued.

Whether the Congress through the exercise of its legislative power could vest in itself or in either or both of its branches the power to sue or be sued would be, for the purposes of this action, idle speculation, because the Congress has never passed such a law.

In the history of our republic, this is the first case ever to reach the Supreme Court in which plaintiffs have sought to make the

House of Representatives or the Senate or the Congress as a whole a party defendant in the federal courts. This historical fact is persuasive in itself that the House of Representatives as a legislative body may not be brought before the federal courts.

B. Even if the House of Representatives is a "person" with the capacity to be made a party defendant in an action, it is clothed with the sovereign immunity of the United States Government which would successfully prevent maintaining an action against it without its consent. Petitioners can cite no law waiving this sovereign immunity of the House of Representatives nor action by the House of Representatives, itself, consenting to be sued.

III. Whether the Suit Is Treated as One Against the House of Representatives as a Legislative Body or as Against All of Its Members as Individuals, the Courts Do Not Have Any Effective Sanction for Enforcing a Decree in the Light of the "Freedom From Arrest" Clause of the Constitution

Article I, Sec. 6, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution provides as follows with respect to Senators and Representatives:

"They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same."

A decree granting the affirmative relief prayed by Petitioners would be enforceable through contempt proceedings and imprisonment of Respondents. Such enforcement sanction against respondents would be unavailable by reason of the "freedom from arrest" clause quoted above.

If the "freedom from arrest" clause is not a bar to imprisonment for contempt, the legislative process would come to a halt.

Conclusion

It is respectfully suggested that the judgment of the Court of Appeals should be vacated and the case remanded to the District Court with directions to dismiss the complaint on the grounds that it does not present an appropriate class action under Rule 23 of the Civil Rules of Procedure; that the House of Representatives as a legislative body may not be made a party defendant in a suit in the United States District Court and that the Court is without power to enter an enforceable decree because of the "freedom from arrest" clause of the United States Constitution.

In the event the relief suggested above is granted by the Court, but on other grounds, it is respectfully suggested that the Court include in its opinion a statement to the effect that because of its disposition of the case on other grounds, the Court did not find it necessary to reach and pass upon the issues raised in this brief.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE MEADER,
Amicus Curiae.

ELIMINATION OF ANNUAL INCOME QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to emancipate a large group of our citizens from the odious chores of being required to complete an annual income questionnaire. This move alone is estimated to be able to save roughly \$5 million in tax funds spent in office work in connection with the preparation, compiling, and filing of these veterans income questionnaires.

The national commander of the Veterans of World War I stated that over

35,000 veterans and widows have been inadvertently dropped from eligibility lists because of misinformation reported on this form, or because of failure to send it back.

My bill simply amends title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate the need and necessity of sending this form to World War I veterans who are 70 years of age and who have been receiving their rightful benefits for 2 calendar years.

Complicated forms are difficult for all of our citizens, but can be even more trying and burdensome to our elderly. I can see no reason why this requirement is necessary as only in very rare instances do we find people in this age bracket who are able to increase their income over what they had been earning the 2 previous years.

ELIMINATION OF LOOPHOLES IN TAX LAWS

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will be beneficial to the American farmer, and for that matter, all taxpayers.

Other bills have been proposed to eliminate present loopholes in our tax laws as they relate to agriculture. However, my bill differs in one respect from the so-called Metcalf bill which has been introduced in both bodies of the Congress—but that change is not without importance.

The change, recommended by the Treasury Department in its published report, would treat all taxpayers alike, regardless of the level of their nonfarm income. While other bills would disallow the offsetting of any farm losses against nonfarm income of persons earning more than \$30,000 off the farm, the bill I am introducing would simply limit the amount of farm losses which could be used as an offset to nonfarm income to \$15,000—regardless of the total earnings of the taxpayer. This would treat all taxpayers the same. Just as all taxpayers receive a personal exemption of \$600, whether they earn \$1,000 or \$100,000, my bill would allow all taxpayers to offset nonfarm income with up to \$15,000 of farm losses without regard to total income. According to the Treasury Department, this legislation would produce an additional \$145 million in tax revenue and would affect 14,000 taxpayers. Of the increased amount, \$55 million would come from about 11,500 taxpayers with nonfarm incomes of more than \$15,000 but less than \$100,000 who reported farm losses—based upon 1964 data. The remaining \$90 million would come from about 2,400 taxpayers reporting nonfarm incomes of more than \$100,000.

Some would suggest that these 14,000 taxpayers have been involved in questionable operations. This is not true. Our income tax laws provide that farmers, due to the nature of their business and their lack of access to sophisticated bookkeeping methods, may adopt a "cash" method of accounting for income tax purposes. Due to further advantages

given certain capital gains, a number of taxpayers have found that by acquiring farm property and combining the "cash" method of accounting with income derived through capital gains, they can reduce substantially the tax on their nonfarm incomes. The law currently allows them to do this.

It is my opinion, and that of others, that the law was not intended for this purpose and therefore I am proposing to change that law. By allowing offsets against up to \$15,000 of nonfarm income, the bona fide farmer and his wife will still be able to incorporate more modest nonfarm incomes with their farming operations. Let me say, with net farm income at today's low levels, many farmers must seek off-farm income just to keep in business.

I do not see farmers gaining from this legislation any more than other taxpayers. But without this legislation, farmers could lose a great deal. The only suggested alternative to this legislation is to put to an end "cash" accounting for farmers. The added cost of accrual method accounting to thousands of American farmers would be disastrous.

**REFORM OF THE POSTAL SYSTEM—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC.
NO. 91-81)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
Reform of the postal system is long overdue.

The postal service touches the lives of all Americans. Many of our citizens feel that today's service does not meet today's needs, much less the needs of tomorrow. I share this view.

In the months ahead, I expect to propose comprehensive legislation for postal reform.

If this long-range program is to succeed, I consider it essential, as a first step, that the Congress remove the last vestiges of political patronage in the Post Office Department.

Accordingly, I urge the Congress promptly to enact legislation that would:

- eliminate the present statutory requirement for Presidential appointment and Senatorial confirmation of postmasters of first, second, and third-class post offices;
- provide for appointment of all postmasters by the Postmaster General in the competitive civil service; and
- prohibit political considerations in the selection or promotion of postal employees.

Such legislation would make it possible for future postmasters to be chosen in the same way that career employees have long been chosen in the other executive departments. It would not, however, affect the status of postmasters now in office.

Adoption of this proposal by the Congress would assure all of the American people—and particularly the more than 750,000 dedicated men and women who

work in the postal service—that future appointments and promotions in this important department are going to be made on the basis of merit and fitness for the job, and not on the basis of political affiliations or political influence.

The tradition of political patronage in the Post Office Department extends back to the earliest days of the Republic. In a sparsely populated country, where postal officials faced few of the management problems so familiar to modern postmasters, the patronage system may have been a defensible method of selecting jobholders. As the operation of the postal service has become more complex, however, the patronage system has become an increasingly costly luxury. It is a luxury that the nation can no longer afford.

In the past two decades, there has been increasing agreement that postmaster appointments should be made on a nonpolitical basis. Both the first and second Hoover Commissions emphasized the need for such action. So did the recent President's Commission on Postal Organization, headed by Frederick R. Kappel. President Harry S. Truman and many Members of Congress from both political parties have proposed legislation designed to take politics out of postal appointments. In the 90th Congress, the Senate, by a vote of 75 to 9, passed a bill containing a provision that would have placed postal appointments on a merit basis. Forty-two such bills were introduced in the House of Representatives during the 90th Congress.

The overwhelmingly favorable public comment that followed my recent announcement of our intention to disregard political consideration in selecting postmasters and rural carriers suggests that the American people are more than ready for legislative action on this matter. The time for such action is now at hand.

The benefits to be derived from such legislation are, I believe, twofold.

First, the change would expand opportunities for advancement on the part of our present postal employees. These are hard-working and loyal men and women. In the past, many of them have not received adequate recognition or well-deserved promotions for reasons which have had nothing to do with their fitness for higher position or the quality of their work. For reasons of both efficiency and morale, this situation must be changed.

Second, I believe that over a period of time the use of improved professional selection methods will improve the level of competence of those who take on these important postal responsibilities.

I would not request this legislation without also presenting a plan which insures that the new selection process will be effectively and impartially administered. The Postmaster General has such a plan.

He is creating a high level, impartial national board to assist him in the future selection of postmasters for the 400 largest post offices in the country. Regional boards, also made up of exceptionally well-qualified citizens, will perform a similar task in connection with the selection of other postmasters. First consideration will be given to the promo-

tion, on a competitive basis, of present postal employees.

The Postmaster General has also initiated action to improve the criteria by which postmasters are selected. The revised criteria will emphasize managerial competence, human relations sensitivity, responsiveness to customer concerns, an understanding of labor relations, and other important qualities.

Proposals for additional legislation dealing with the selection process will be included in the broad program for postal reform that the Postmaster General is now preparing.

Some of the needs of the Post Office clearly require extensive study before detailed solutions can be proposed. Other problems can and should be dealt with now. One objective which can be met promptly is that of taking politics out of the Post Office and I strongly recommend the swift enactment of legislation that will allow us to achieve that goal. Such legislation will be an important first step "towards postal excellence."

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1969.

MINE SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of our first major pieces of legislation must be mine safety. It required major disaster in my home district of West Virginia to shock the public and the public officials into the realization that present safeguards are not adequate. Now, in the wake of that shock it is important that we carefully analyze the deficiencies of our present legislation and its enforcement. Make no mistake that enforcement is lax. The orders issued by the Secretary of the Interior immediately after the Mannington disaster revealed extreme laxness.

Secretary of the Interior Udall stated last year that advance notice of inspection, regular or otherwise, has been permitted by the Bureau of Mines. Mines could be put in order for inspection and once inspection was made, a more casual approach to mine safety would follow. This casual approach contributed to the loss of 290 lives in 1968. Mr. Speaker, we very urgently need to increase the number of required inspections, and to see that they are thorough, and no advance notice is given. We need to increase the number of spot inspections.

But, Mr. Speaker there is a limit to the results that we can hope for through strengthening the current procedures and penalties of mining safety. We must look to science for better results.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important factors in mining health and safety is technology. We have not yet developed the equipment to communicate effectively through our mines. In the area of health, we have not yet developed the scientific knowledge to give us a firm basis to deal with pneumoconiosis.

Mr. Speaker, our engineering on coal mining equipment needs to be geared more to safety. Our mining equipment is not engineered so that dust levels can

conform to the 3 percent milligram standard recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize, we must fight the war against unsafe mining on two fronts. We can, through legislation and administration, tighten our safety practices immediately. With better safety standards and a tougher system of inspections and enforcement, we can expect immediate improvement.

The second front, research and development, will necessarily take more time, but because of that we should begin now. It is primarily in the area of technological development that we find our real opportunities for making mining safe for the miner. This is an area where we must concentrate money and resources, for it is here we can expect great progress. We must have breakthroughs in mining methods, equipment, and health if we are to make mining a safe profession.

We must find ways of committing the resources to achieve these breakthroughs. It is my understanding that the Technical Advisory Committee to the Office of Coal Research has recommended that the entire budget for fiscal year 1970 be allocated to safety and health rather than matters of finding new uses for coal. This may be a very constructive first step depending upon the amount of funds within that budget that are available for reallocation. Government should not be called upon to bear the full brunt of this research and development. Industry should enter as a fully cooperating partner to this effort to apply technology to safety.

Mr. Speaker, Britain has been mining coal for more than 200 years. She enjoys a safety factor approximately twice as great as ours. Our immediate goal should be to equal that standard and then to surpass it. The old fatalism about mining being a dangerous business just is not good enough today.

THE COAL MINES MUST BE MADE SAFER

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was broadcast over WTOP Radio and Television last night:

A BRUTALIZING SYSTEM

This is a WTOP Editorial.

The coal miners of West Virginia are in open revolt this week against a system which has brutalized them for generations. They are up against some tough adversaries, and they deserve all the help they can get.

The miners have shucked their customary fatalism to become political activists, and upwards of half the mine workers in West Virginia have walked off the job in the biggest outpouring of indignation and anger in decades.

Their immediate target is the state legislature, where a strong workmen's compensation law that would make life bearable for victims of black lung—the notorious miner's disease—is being watered down.

One of the most grim illustrations of exploitation and indifference in this country is the small army of miners in West Virginia—some 20,000—who have been driven to premature retirement by black lung and

related diseases, and who are unable to draw any kind of financial compensation for the damage done to them. Even those who have managed to meet the overly rigid requirements for compensation now in effect can eke out only the most primitive existence.

As WTOP News correspondent Bill Zimmerman found, in a visit last week, the traditional power centers still are lined up against the miners. The legislature gives every appearance of being sympathetic to the big coal operators. The Governor and the state government generally are playing to both sides of the issue. And the mine workers' own union, the UMWA, continues to be only mildly enthusiastic about the health and welfare of its own members.

Even if the strikers are able to coax a good law out of the legislature, full justice for the miners will not come until 18th century health and safety standards now applied in this country are made to match the 20th century standards by which coal is mined.

Black lung and mine disasters also are symptoms of a social disease, and so long as they continue needlessly they will diminish our claim to be a civilized nation.

This was a WTOP Editorial—Norman Davis speaking for WTOP.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the editorial appeal for action at the State level, I certainly hope this Congress will rise to its responsibilities and pass meaningful and effective coal mine health and safety legislation. Such legislation must be administered effectively in order to protect thousands of coal miners who have for generations been overlooked in this Nation.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the Members' attention to a most significant anniversary being marked this year by the Institute of International Education, one of the preeminent agencies of the world in the field of educational and cultural exchange among nations. Last week the IIE held its sixth conference on international education here in Washington, D.C. and thereby began a series of events to celebrate its 50th year.

For the Institute of International Education, the 50th year brings primarily a feeling of accomplishment in what has gone before and a sense of challenge in what is yet to come.

Born 50 years ago after a world war that devastated nations and tore them asunder, the IIE dedicated itself to the principle that people could learn to understand each other, and learn to live in peace together, if only they would learn to share with one another experiences of both the heart and the mind. Thus, the concept of international educational and cultural exchange was institutionalized—slowly at first, but rapidly building upon solid foundations.

And although the last 50 years, sadly, have not seen an end of war, the IIE has remained firm in its basic belief: People from different lands and different cultures and even different ideologies can learn from one another and, thereby, can learn to live with one another.

Now the institute, on its golden anniversary, is concentrating its efforts on the development of an even broader concept and an even broader call to action. It is convinced that international education can be an important means to help solve some of the world's most pressing problems—problems related to the population explosion, the world's food supply, urbanization, and educational and political development in the struggling nations of the Third World. And out of this conviction came IIE's sixth conference on international education, which met last week to determine the most effective ways of pooling educational resources and talents to seek solutions to these problems.

Cosponsored by over 100 organizations, the conference brought together approximately 1,500 leaders of educational institutions, Government agencies, private organizations, and business and industry from 70 countries.

The IIE has sought and continues to seek support for its many programs from contributions from individuals, corporations, and foundations. Already these private sources have produced pledges of over \$1 million to launch its 50th anniversary campaign—an indication of great faith in the current program and great expectations for future expansion to meet the needs of the 1970's.

But the institute also relies heavily on financial assistance from the U.S. Government to carry out such worthy programs as the exchange of Fulbright scholars. Yet Congress this past year voted to reduce the budget for international exchange by almost one-half. And Congress has failed to take any steps to provide funds for the International Education Act of 1966. Considering that every dollar spent now for international education may mean that many millions of dollars might not have to be spent for armaments in the future, we in Congress must show our faith and support for the programs that promote the exchange of people and ideas among nations.

During the last session of Congress, it was my privilege to introduce a concurrent resolution urging U.S. support for the designation and worldwide observance of an International Education Year in 1970. The United Nations General Assembly has now resolved that the year should be so designated.

Let us start now, Mr. Speaker, as a salute to the Institute of International Education in its 50th year, to pledge our cooperation in every way possible to further the principles and practices of international educational programs. Only then can International Education Year have meaning next year—and for years and years to come. Only then can we hope for peace and understanding among the nations of the world.

FRANK BORMAN'S SECOND REENTRY

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, when Frank Borman and his fellow astronauts returned from the moon, we welcomed

and thanked them for outstanding dedication to the service of the country. Frank has now made a second reentry from a tour of the earth with Mrs. Borman. Thousands of the world's people who had thrilled to the live news coverage of Borman's lunar orbit have had the chance to see and hear in person a modest young American and his attractive wife, and to know that American technology is still only the servant and not the master of the American man. As one who has witnessed and participated in more than a few good will tours on earth I can testify to the strains they impose on the good will, good nature, patience, and diplomatic skill of the travelers themselves. The Bormans carried most gracefully both their message and the attendant burdens of jet diplomacy. They deserve renewed thanks from all of us for demonstrating that sensitivity and humility can survive success.

RETAIN \$2.50 SOYBEAN LOAN

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

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of a large soybean producing area and in behalf of the producers in my district, I have personally urged our Secretary of Agriculture to resist the pressure to lower price supports for soybeans.

The argument that lowering the price support from the existing \$2.50 to \$2.05 or lower will control production and guarantee a ready market simply will not stand scrutiny. Many of the farmers I represent are primarily cotton growers and plant soybeans as an alternative crop when weather conditions and/or acreage limitations will not allow cotton to be planted. Several times in the past few years weather has precluded cotton planting and these farmers have avoided economic disaster by producing a soybean crop. We know that these farmers have no choice. They are going to grow just as many bushels of soybeans as they can whether the support price is \$2.50, \$2.25, or \$2. Obviously, the only effect lowering the support price could have is a decrease in the farmer's income. In many areas where cotton is predominantly grown, it would require an even more drastic change in the soybean support level to obtain appreciable changes in planting.

We are all well aware of the nearly open-ended potential market for soybeans. Scientific research has disclosed heretofore undreamed of possibilities for the soybean. Thus it would seem to me incongruous and shortsighted to be considering measures to limit production when our efforts should be directed to developing new markets and retaining those that we have. In the latter category would fall the proposals being aired in the European Economic Community for placing an unauthorized tax on oil-seed products traded in that market.

A program of soybean acreage limitations would be far more palatable than a reduction in the support price, if the market were such as to dictate a choice among alternatives.

PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1967, during the first session of the 90th Congress, I introduced a bill that would increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemption for a taxpayer, his spouse and dependents, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness. Today I am reintroducing this legislation. My reasons for doing so are based on the conviction that the present \$600 exemption is unrealistic.

There have been many differing views as to the basic purpose of the individual exemption from income taxes. The one which appears most valid to me is the premise that taxes should not be applied to the income of persons until their minimum basic needs have been allowed for. During the years of World War II, the exemption was reduced from \$750 to \$500 per person. In 1948 the amount of the exemption was increased to \$600. We have never even returned to the prewar situation although every person in the United States knows that it costs more than \$600 to provide for each member of a family.

The \$600 now allowed is demonstrably unrealistic when the eroding effects of inflation and the increasing tax rates are considered. Every taxpayer has seen his earnings eaten away by increases in the cost of living. The cost of living in 1968 alone rose approximately 4.7 percent over 1967. This jump was the largest since 1951 when Korean war inflation caused price increases of 5.9 percent. This is only one part of the economic squeeze that taxpayers face, however.

Fiscal 1969 will go down in history as a landmark year, because taxes, collected at all levels of government, are expected to total \$247 billion. This is \$147 billion higher than in fiscal 1956. Tax receipts by the Federal Government alone are expected to reach \$170 billion in fiscal 1969 and exceed 1968 receipts by \$24 billion. This means that the average family will pay \$3,927 in taxes in fiscal 1969 which is an increase of \$370 over the previous year.

These factors, inflation and increased taxes, make it very difficult, of course, for the American taxpayer to make ends meet financially. Recently the Ways and Means Committee has begun to study proposals for tax reform. It is my understanding that many suggestions have been submitted that would not only make the present tax system more equitable but would also provide relief for the average American taxpayer. In this regard I hope that this bill and other similar proposals will be studied carefully. It is my opinion that this bill will help those who need help the most—the average American wage earner—and should, therefore, receive favorable consideration.

FIFTEEN MINUTES AND OUT

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in any orderly society worthy of the name there are things you do and things you do not do. If you do the things you "don't do", sanctions must be applied against you so that it is publicly recognized as "not worth it"—or whatever the rationale for acceptance of a social norm of conduct.

One of the things you "don't do" is engage in violence or criminal conduct while you are attending school, either public or private. This goes for students or faculty. The "don't" is perhaps written larger for faculty whose responsibility awareness is bound to be greater.

The courts of this land owe it to the Nation to stop mollycoddling deliberate criminal conduct on or off campus by permissive interpretations of the first amendment. Recently the Governor of Wisconsin when responding to a question concerning expulsion from campus forthwith indicated that each time the university administration attempted to take forceful, direct action against disruptive students, challenge was raised in Federal courts and that "almost without exception the court has prevented the university from taking direct action."

However, at Notre Dame University, as recently reported in U.S. News & World Report, the atmosphere is different. There students and faculty are informed in advance that such conduct will result in expulsion forthwith. They will be given 15 minutes to think it over, refrain, or be expelled. This is as it should be, and Notre Dame is to be commended for this clear-cut policy. It should apply throughout the educational institutions of the land and the courts should help not hinder the process of restoring order on the campuses of America.

The article follows:

DEALING WITH CAMPUS CHAOS—NOTRE DAME: 15 MINUTES AND OUT

(One of the strongest stands to be taken by any college against campus violence was announced February 17 at the University of Notre Dame. In a letter to faculty members, students and their parents, the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame, outlined immediate action that will be taken against anyone disrupting university operations. Included: On-the-spot expulsion of students who persist in disruptive tactics after a warning and "15 minutes of meditation." Excerpts from the Hesburgh letter are given here.)

Anyone or any group that substitutes force for rational persuasion—be it violent or non-violent—will be given 15 minutes of meditation to cease and desist.

They will be told that they are, by their actions, going counter to the overwhelming conviction of this community as to what is proper here. If they do not within that time period cease and desist, they will be asked for their identity cards.

Those who produce these will be suspended from this community as not understanding what this community is. Those who do not have or will not produce identity cards will be assumed not to be members of the community and will be charged with trespassing and disturbing the peace on private property and treated accordingly by the law...

After notification of suspension, or trespass in the case of noncommunity members, if there is not then within five minutes a movement to cease and desist, students will

be notified of expulsion from this community, and the law will deal with them as non-students. . . .

There seems to be a current myth that university members are not responsible to the law, and that somehow the law is the enemy—particularly those whom society has constituted to uphold and enforce the law. I would like to insist here that all of us are responsible to the duly constituted laws of this university community and to all the laws of the land. There is no other guarantee of civilization versus the jungle or mob rule, here or elsewhere.

If someone invades your home, do you dialogue with him or call the law?

Without the law, the university is a sitting duck for any small group from outside or inside that wishes to destroy it, to incapacitate it, to terrorize it at whim.

The argument goes—or has gone: Invoke the law and you lose the university community. My only response is that without the law you may well lose the university and, beyond that, the larger society that supports it and that is most deeply wounded when law is no longer respected, bringing an end of everyone's most cherished rights.

I have studied at some length the new politics of confrontation. The rhythm is simple:

1. Find a cause—any cause, silly or not.
2. In the name of the cause, get a few determined people to abuse the rights and privileges of the community so as to force a confrontation at any cost of boorishness or incivility.
3. Once this has occurred—justified or not, orderly or not—yell, "Police brutality!" If it does not happen, provoke it by foul language, physical abuse, whatever, and then count on a larger measure of sympathy from the up-to-now apathetic or passive members of the community. Then call for amnesty, the head of the president on a platter, the complete submission to any and all demands.

One beleaguered president has said that these people want to be martyrs thrown to toothless lions. He added, "Who wants to dialogue when they are going for the jugular vein?"

So it has gone, and it is generally well orchestrated. Again, my only question: Must it be so? Must universities be subjected, willy-nilly, to such intimidation and victimization, whatever their good will in the matter? Somewhere a stand must be made.

I only ask that, when the stand is made necessary by those who would destroy the community and all its basic yearning for great and calm educational opportunity, let them carry the blame and the penalty.

No one wants the forces of law on this or any other campus, but if some necessitate it, as last and dismal alternative to anarchy and mob tyranny, let them shoulder the blame instead of receiving the sympathy of a community they would hold at bay.

The only alternative I can imagine is turning the majority of the community loose on them, and then you have two mobs. I know of no one who would opt for this alternative—always lurking in the wings.

We can have a thousand resolutions as to what kind of a society we want, but when lawless is afoot and all authority is flouted—faculty, administration and student—then we invoke the normal societal forces of law, or we allow the university to die beneath our hapless and hopeless gaze.

I have no intention of presiding over such a spectacle: Too many people have given too much of themselves and their lives to this university to let this happen here. Without being melodramatic, if this conviction makes this my last will and testament to Notre Dame, so be it.

May I now say in all sincerity that I never want to see any student expelled from this community, because in many ways this is always an educative failure. Even so, I must

likewise be committed to the survival of the university community as one of man's best hopes in these troubled times. . . .

We cannot allow a small minority to impose their will on the majority who have spoken regarding the university's style of life; we cannot allow a few to substitute force of any kind for persuasion to accept their personal idea of what is right or proper. We only insist on the rights of all, minority and majority; the climate of civility and rationality, and a preponderant moral abhorrence of violence or inhuman forms of persuasion that violate our style of life and the nature of the university.

RETIREMENT OF PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, Mr. Philip N. Brownstein retired as Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, a post he has held for the past 3 years. His retirement brings to a close a distinguished career of 34 years as a public servant.

Mr. Brownstein joined the Federal Housing Administration a year after it was created. His steady rise through a variety of positions with the agency, culminated in his appointment as FHA Commissioner early in 1963.

During World War II Mr. Brownstein served with the U.S. Marine Corps for 2 years. Following his release from military service, Mr. Brownstein joined the Veterans' Administration and later became the chief benefits director. As director he administered all VA benefits programs.

During his term of service with FHA, Mr. Brownstein played a large part in directing the housing efforts of the Federal Government toward our national goal of a decent home for every family. He is an administrator with few equals and was instrumental in streamlining the operations of FHA. Through increased efficiency and faster service, he made it easier for the general public and industry to do business with this Federal agency. One of Mr. Brownstein's many accomplishments was the reduction of FHA's home mortgage processing time from weeks down to days. He was also responsible for substantially shortening the time it takes to finance an apartment project through FHA.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that time permitted me to mention Mr. Brownstein's many achievements, but they defy listing. His years of service were marked by great personal dedication, innovation, and success. It will be difficult for a successor to follow in the footsteps of Philip Brownstein.

WELFARE OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, last fall, Mrs. James Bond Stockdale, whose husband, a U.S. Navy captain, is a prisoner of war in Hanoi, visited my district office to reiterate her concern for the welfare of all of our brave American fighting men

who are prisoners of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

At that time I expressed my concern to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and he assured me that the Department of Defense will continue to exert every effort to secure the release of our servicemen. My discussions with the Department of State revealed that our Government had been instructed to pursue the matter of prisoner of war treatment as an integral part of the Paris negotiations in which we are participating.

Mr. Speaker, after these many months, I must confess quite frankly my feelings of frustration as I observe the lack of response on the part of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to the repeated efforts of the Government of the United States and numerous other governments of the free world to secure the humane treatment of American prisoners of war which is guaranteed by the Geneva Convention.

Although North Vietnam, like the United States and South Vietnam, is a signatory to the Geneva Convention, its government has ignored the appeals of the International Committee of the Red Cross to extend the specific protections which are afforded to POW's by the Geneva Convention and which are vital to their safety and well-being.

The Geneva Convention provides that prisoners are not to be isolated from contact with the outside world. It specifically states that prisoners are entitled to correspond with their families and friends and to receive parcels from the outside. The International Committee of the Red Cross is entitled to visit prisoner-of-war camps, to speak privately with prisoners of war, and to distribute parcels and comfort items to the prisoners.

The Government of North Vietnam and the Vietcong have rigidly refused to comply with these provisions of the Convention. Some U.S. prisoners in North Vietnam have been allowed to send a few letters, and several prisoners have been seen by journalists and other foreign visitors. However, the great majority have been cut off from every contact with the outside world. Parcels mailed to prisoners in North Vietnam are returned unopened, and we do not know whether letters sent to North Vietnam are delivered to the prisoners. The International Committee of the Red Cross is not allowed to enter North Vietnam, and the prison camps and places of detention are not open to inspection.

This policy of isolation of prisoners of war is both illegal and inhumane, and it gives grounds for deep concern as to the treatment of prisoners by North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I have made here have been repeated many times on the floors of both the House and Senate by many of my distinguished colleagues. My purpose in expressing myself this afternoon is to again bring the matter of the welfare of our prisoners of war to the attention of the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. I would like to have the Members exercise whatever influence and persuasion they may have with President

Nixon and urge him to instruct our negotiators to place renewed emphasis on including the subject of the humane treatment of prisoners of war as an integral part of the Paris talks.

PESTICIDES CAST A POLLUTED SHADOW

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, not too many Americans are overly familiar with the word "ecology"—it deals with the sum total of man's environment. Of late it is more in the news, and with excellent reason.

Man in his drive to bring order to the world to insure his personal comfort is altering our environment, often without a second thought for the consequences of such acts. One of these is the lavish, unrestricted use of pesticides.

One already well proven result of such actions is pollution of our total environment. The ecology of our earth is being altered with the most terrifying potential consequences for mankind.

Recent hearings in Wisconsin and testimony by scientists there have brought to light the framework of a terrifying structure. DDT has been used broadly and often in our Nation since World War II. Many scientists have called for an end to wide use of this pesticide. It is my belief that their opinion should be heeded by the Nation.

Pollution of any kind knows no boundaries. Political lines are crossed with disregard by the filthy air, polluted water and irritants placed in our environment by man. It has been demonstrated that their effect is cumulative.

Wisconsin's waterways have become polluted by DDT, a pesticide that does not break down easily. Instead, it lingers for years in air and waters while building up in the bodies of wildlife. Many species have already been doomed to extinction because of its action.

In the past, scientists have written learned papers deplored such unrestricted use of pesticides. Industry retorts by pointing to beneficial effects of such products claiming they are the best or only method to accomplish such beneficial results.

I submit that industry has done a disservice to our Nation and perhaps our world by deliberately ignoring the fact that dangerous pesticides do not have to be used. There exist safe and nonpersistent agents which are readily available. Industry has an obligation to shift to production of such agents.

Mr. Speaker, why does a segment of American industry persist in such harmful and shortsighted opposition to fair criticism? Why does it ignore such a clear and well-delineated menace? Do these men and their families not breathe same air and use the same water that the rest of us do? Are they not also in jeopardy? Will they not suffer the consequences along with the rest of mankind?

I believe our conservation organizations and the learned gentlemen in Wisconsin have rendered a signal public service to the Nation. They have at last

brought industry out in the open and to a public forum in order to answer these accusations. To date, industry has not provided satisfactory answers to these accusations.

Mr. Speaker, if a segment of industry is so obsessed with profit to ignore the national well-being, society and its instruments of government cannot stand idly by. We have a duty to put an end to the unthinking and shortsighted pollution of the environment, and must act shortly before it is too late.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders here-tofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. YATES, for 30 minutes, on February 26; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. YATES.

Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GAYDOS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in five instances.

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. BURTON of Utah in five instances.

Mr. GROSS in two instances.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. TAFT in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. McCLOY.

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

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. SIKES in five instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. HANNA in six instances.

Mr. PODELL in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in six instances.

Mr. HICKS in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. GILBERT in two instances.

Mr. KOCH.

Mr. FLOOD in two instances.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. WOLF in three instances.

Mr. McCARTHY in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 26, 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:

535. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report on Reserve Forces for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 279; to the Committee on Armed Services.

536. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting a copy of "The Missile Sites Labor Commission," an analysis of the operation of that Commission for the period 1961-67 under Executive Order 10946; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

537. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 34th Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 442, approved June 21, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TUNNEY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. A report on measuring hamlet security in Vietnam (pursuant to H. Res. 179, 90th Cong.) (Rept. No. 91-25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 497. A bill to amend section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended (Rept. No. 91-26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 7206. A bill to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of the Congress (Rept. No. 91-27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 7568. A bill to authorize certain persons to accept gifts of money for the purpose of acquiring objects to be placed in the Capitol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 7569. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 7570. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 7571. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include the sintering and burning of clay, shale, and slate used as lightweight aggregates as a treatment process considered as mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7572. 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.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 7573. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7574. A bill to provide for posting information in post offices with respect to registration and voting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 7575. 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. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 7576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer with adjusted gross income of \$7,500 or less a deduction for the expenses of tuition and certain other fees and charges paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7577. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the 12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 7578. 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. ESCH:

H.R. 7579. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 7580. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARSTEIN:

H.R. 7581. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if any of certain relatives

of such member dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in a combat area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 7582. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 7583. A bill to amend title 42, United States Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7584. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal revenues with States and certain cities and urban counties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. NEDZI):

H.R. 7585. 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.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 7586. 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. HOSMER:

H.R. 7587. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 7588. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude reenlistment bonuses from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 7589. A bill to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 7590. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the penalty provision applicable to a Federal felony committed with a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7591. 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. 7592. A bill to provide for the investigative detention and search of persons suspected of involvement in, or knowledge of, Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7593. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to establish extended terms of imprisonment for certain offenders convicted of felonies in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7594. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7595. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7596. A bill to prohibit the investment of income derived from certain criminal activities in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7597. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for improved criminal procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7598. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Organized Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 7599. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the provisions relating to taxes on wagering to insure the constitutional rights of taxpayers, to facilitate the collection of such taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 7600. A bill to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, including increased authorization for vocational education facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7601. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 7602. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the pollution of Chesapeake Bay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7603. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the immediate retirement of Federal civilian personnel on oceangoing vessels upon separation from the service after attaining 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service, and for other purposes; and to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7604. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 7605. A bill to make it a crime to induce, through fraud or misrepresentation, any person to travel in interstate commerce for educational purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 7606. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. BURTON of California):

H.R. 7607. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide supplementary compensation for permanent total disability or death from lung cancer resulting from exposure to ionizing radiation in uranium mines; to provide grants to States for research and planning with respect to ionizing radiation injuries in uranium mines; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7608. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7609. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide employment and relocation assistance for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 7610. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal revenues with States and certain cities and urban counties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 7611. 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. REID of New York:

H.R. 7612. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7613. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, relating to the construction of waste treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7614. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. SKUBITZ):

H.R. 7615. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7616. A bill to revise the boundaries of the North Cascades National Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 7617. 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. SIKES:

H.R. 7618. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 7619. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to allow containers for certain petroleum products and derivatives to be temporarily imported without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 7620. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7621. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 7622. A bill to provide for orderly trade and market sharing in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 7623. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 7624. A bill to clarify the standard for recognition of certain widows by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 7625. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the John Day

Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 7626. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of certain sugars, syrups, and molasses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7627. 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.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 7628. 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. 7629. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to relieve certain persons from filing the annual income questionnaire in connection with non-service-connected pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. FISH, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.J. Res. 482. Joint resolution to consent to, and enter into, the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution control compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.J. Res. 483. 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. COWGER:

H.J. Res. 484. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.J. Res. 485. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the month of May in 1969 as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. Anderson of California):

H.J. Res. 486. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.J. Res. 487. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.J. Res. 488. 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. VIGORITO:

H.J. Res. 489. 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. CONABLE:

H. Res. 276. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban and Metropolitan Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 277. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study to determine why the percentage of black members of the Armed Forces who are killed in action exceeds the ratio of the overall percentage of members of the Armed Forces who are killed in action; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 7630. A bill for the relief of Felipe Guleng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7631. A bill for the relief of Leon B. Licos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7632. A bill for the relief of Adelina A. Pajel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7633. A bill for the relief of Caterina Callendo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7634. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Cervini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7635. A bill for the relief of Anna Rosa, Luigi, and Amelia Guistino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7636. A bill for the relief of Thomas McHugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7637. A bill for the relief of Rosa Magro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7638. A bill for the relief of Antonio Maida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7639. A bill for the relief of Bruno C. Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7640. A bill for the relief of Mario and Rita Belmonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7641. A bill for the relief of Thomas Henry Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7642. A bill for the relief of Armando Gigante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 7643. A bill for the relief of Vita Maria Abbate and her minor children, Antonina, Giuseppe, and Valeria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7644. A bill for the relief of Angelo Castiglione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7645. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cusumano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7646. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Di Giacinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7647. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Innico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7648. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Lo Bello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7649. A bill for the relief of Giulio Mannino and Alicia Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7650. A bill for the relief of Attilio Marra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7651. A bill for the relief of Filippo Morici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7652. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Passalacqua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7653. A bill for the relief of Michelangelo Petralito and Giuseppa Petralito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7654. A bill for the relief of Paolo Reporto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7655. A bill for the relief of Melchiorre and Mariana Tamburello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7656. A bill for the relief of Spyridon B. Adam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7657. A bill for the relief of Diamantis D. Androustopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7658. A bill for the relief of George Bisbikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7659. A bill for the relief of Catherine Choraitis and Emmanuel Choraitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 7660. A bill for the relief of Pedro Tijan Munoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 7661. A bill for the relief of John Sotiriou Koutsakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7662. A bill for the relief of Esther Bitton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7663. A bill for the relief of Angelo Cardinale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7664. A bill for the relief of Rocco Roppo, his wife, Grazia Roppo, and their children, Michele Roppo and Giacoma Roppo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7665. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eddy Chi-Kwang Tong and his wife, Hoo Pool-Man Tong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7666. A bill for the relief of Joseph Charles Mechaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7667. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zoe Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7668. A bill for the relief of Calogero Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 7669. A bill for the relief of Dr. Zito Alba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7670. A bill for the relief of Mr. Dimitrios Kaldis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7671. A bill for the relief of Mr. George Kaldis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7672. A bill for the relief of Pietro Fiannaca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7673. A bill for the relief of Madeline R. Schreiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7674. A bill for the relief of Christina von Renner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 7675. A bill for the relief of Sheng Ming Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 7676. A bill for the relief of Juanito Pellicer and his wife, Flameta Vargas Pellicer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7677. A bill for the relief of Teresita Villaneuva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7678. A bill for the relief of Bento, Rosaria, and Benedetto Bisconti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7679. A bill for the relief of Biago and Rosa Barbara de Tirrusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7680. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo

Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7681. A bill for the relief of Eugenio and Renata Sanacore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7682. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Domenico and his wife, Giuseppina Di Domenico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 7683. A bill for the relief of John T. Duffy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7684. A bill for the relief of Angelina Cappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7685. A bill for the relief of Rosina Parisi, Donato Parisi, and Gerardo Parisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7686. A bill for the relief of Mario Sarni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 7687. A bill for the relief of Paciencia Mallari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7688. A bill for the relief of Zenaida Legaspi Mayuga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7689. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Theodore J. Violissi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 7690. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stanley V. J. Gan and Trees M. C. Gan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7691. A bill for the relief of Honora Anita Organo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 17TH ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 17th annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast was held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel on Thursday, January 30. It was attended by the President, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of various States, and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Presidents of national and international labor unions, leaders in industry and business, chancellors and presidents from colleges and universities, and citizens from other phases of our economic life were present.

This year, the Armed Forces Radio and Television System broadcast the Prayer Breakfast to millions of men and women in uniform around the globe.

Mr. President, the 2,200 worshippers at the breakfast were given an hour of inspiration and devotion and truth.

Prior to the Presidential Prayer Breakfast, a congressional prayer breakfast was held.

There is a great value in prayer. Elizabeth Cottam Walker has written "Who Once Has Prayed." Her moving lines are:

WHO ONCE HAS PRAYED

Who once has prayed shall live in prayer forever;

This is no passing impulse, to depart
Leaving a life unscrolled, a seeking mind
Untouched by light. A prayer will lift the
heart

To realms unsensed in crowded, active hours
Burdened with tasks. Like a bell's clear ringing

A sincere prayer renews, and echoing, blesses,
And sets each life so touched to rhythmic
singing.

Whom prayer has winged to set the spirit
soaring,

Though brief the flight, shall never rise
alone:

Companied by light, and by an inward
hearing,

Will listen always for a prompting tone.
Who once has prayed, though life be etched
in sorrow,

Shall walk in light toward a bright to-

I ask unanimous consent to have the
text of the two programs and the pro-
ceedings of the latter event published in
the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the pro-
grams and the proceedings of the Presi-
dential Prayer Breakfast were ordered
to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST PROGRAM

Sea Chanters: "God of Our Fathers."
Presiding: The Honorable Albert H. Quie,
U.S. House of Representatives.

Invocation: The Honorable Gerald R. Ford,
U.S. House of Representatives.

BREAKFAST

Introduction of head table and statement:
The Honorable Albert H. Quie.

Old Testament reading and comments:
The Honorable George Romney, Secretary of
Housing and Urban Development.

Prayer for national leaders: The Honorable
Joseph D. Tydings, U.S. Senate.
New Testament reading and comments:

The Honorable Jennings Randolph, U.S. Sen-
ate.

The President of the United States.

Closing prayer: The Honorable James G.
O'Hara, U.S. House of Representatives.

Closing song: "America."

"Our Father's God to Thee,

Author of liberty,

To Thee we sing,

Long may our land be bright

With freedom's holy light

Protect us by Thy might,

Great God, our King."

"The Lord our God is one Lord; and you
shall love the Lord your God with all your
heart, and with all your soul, and with all
your might."—Deuteronomy 6: 4, 5.

"Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is
a reproach to any people."—Proverbs 14: 34.

"and you shall love the Lord your God with
all your heart, and with all your soul,
and with all your mind, and with all your
strength." The second is this, "You shall love
your neighbor as yourself." There is no other
commandment greater than these."—Mark
12: 30, 31.

"Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is
liberty."—II Corinthians 3: 17.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST PROGRAM

Singing Sergeants: "A Mighty Fortress is
Our God."

Presiding: The Honorable Frank Carlson,
U.S. Senate.

Invocation: The Honorable Robert H.
Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and
Welfare.

BREAKFAST

Introduction of head table and statement:
The Honorable Frank Carlson.

Greetings from House breakfast group, The
Honorable Graham Purcell, U.S. House of
Representatives.

Old Testament reading: The Honorable Dr.
Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, Dean of the Diplo-
matic Corps.